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At the heart of warfare lies doctrine.¹

General Curtis LeMay

Introduction

1. General LeMay’s statement is unequivocal in recognising the importance of doctrine to military endeavours. More contemporary wisdom also recognises doctrine as an essential ingredient of military capability. The Australian Defence Organisation (ADO), for example, recognises eight fundamental inputs to capability (FIC), all of which must interact to generate military capability. Command and management is one of these FIC elements, and encompasses doctrine. An alternative view of military capability suggests that it is derived from three main asset groups: structural capital, intellectual capital and social capital. Structural capital includes the tangible and highly visible assets, such as weapons systems. Social capital is less tangible and includes the notions of leadership, values and morale. Intellectual capital—the organisation’s thinking power—encompasses doctrine and doctrine development.² The constructs may therefore differ, but the conclusion is the same: military doctrine has a pervasive influence on the organisation and structure of military forces, on the training requirements for these forces, and on the military plans for their potential or actual employment. Doctrine is, without doubt, an important enabler of military capability.

2. The term is however widely interpreted. The word ‘doctrine’ has a religious heritage but is now used across many disciplines, giving rise to scientific, political, and military doctrines to name a few. In the military context, most definitions make reference to fundamental beliefs or principles that guide the application of military force. The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) definition is typical: ‘Fundamental principles by which military forces guide their actions in support of objectives. It is authoritative but requires judgement in application’.³ The Australian Defence Force’s (ADF) pre-eminent doctrine publication, ADDP-D—Foundations of Australian Military Doctrine, defines doctrine more broadly as ‘the body of thought on the nature, role and conduct of armed conflict...[which] contains, among other things, the fundamental principles by which military forces guide their actions in support of national objectives’.⁴ Looking at definitions for air power doctrine more specifically, the Royal Australian Air Force’s (RAAF) AAP1000—Fundamentals of Australian Aerospace Power avoids a specific definition but promotes a RAAF view of doctrine encapsulating both fundamental principles and the ideas of teaching and learning. AAP1000 also notes that doctrine is prescriptive and authoritative, but not directive.⁵ The United States Air Force defines air and space power doctrine more precisely as ‘a statement of officially sanctioned beliefs and warfighting principles that describe and guide the proper use of air and space forces in military operations’.⁶ For the purposes of this paper then, a definition of air power doctrine that amalgamates key themes from the above definitions will be used. Air power doctrine is thus defined as a statement of officially sanctioned beliefs and warfighting principles that describe and guide the proper use of air forces in military operations. These beliefs and principles form the basis of institutional teaching and learning, and are prescriptive and authoritative without being directive.

3. Given the important contribution that the RAAF’s doctrine (those officially sanctioned beliefs and principles about the employment of air power) makes to its overall capability, robust and
institutionalised processes for its development, organisation and dissemination might be assumed. Such is not the case however, and an analysis of the problems specifically relating to one aspect of this process—the organisation of RAAF doctrine—is the essence of this paper.

4. **Scope.** This paper will discuss the requirements of a good doctrine hierarchy and describe the manner in which RAAF doctrine is currently organised. ADF guidance regarding the organisation of doctrine will then be reviewed, and alternative doctrine hierarchies employed by other Australian and Allied Services examined. Finally, a new RAAF doctrine hierarchy will be proposed.

**Aim**

5. The aim of this paper is to propose a new RAAF doctrine hierarchy.

**What makes a good doctrine hierarchy**

6. Before examining the RAAF’s extant doctrine hierarchy, the features of a doctrine hierarchy must first be defined. *The Macquarie Dictionary* defines a hierarchy as ‘any system of…things in a graded order’. Different levels of doctrine are therefore implied. In the military context, two such levels are often articulated: capstone and keystone doctrine. Capstone doctrine is defined as the single, foundational doctrine publication that sits at the apex of a doctrine hierarchy, and from which all other doctrine is derived. Keystone doctrine is defined as the principal doctrine publication in a doctrine series. Keystone publications thus support capstone doctrine, and provide a framework for all subordinate doctrine publications in that series.7

7. Unfortunately, the categorisation of doctrine is not limited to levels. Many different types of doctrine are also defined. Some types require no further explanation since their meaning is unambiguous; joint, multinational and single-Service doctrine are three such types. Descriptors for other types of doctrine are less clear however. A perusal of Australian and allied military doctrine publications readily uncovers references to strategic, operational, tactical, philosophical, application, procedural and basic doctrine. Definitions for some of these types are provided later in this paper, but the point to be made now is that military doctrine is categorised in many ways, in terms of both its level within a hierarchy and its nature.

8. What then are the characteristics of a good doctrine hierarchy? One characteristic must be that the levels and types of doctrine within the hierarchy are unambiguously defined, and that the relationships between the levels and types are clearly articulated. The levels and types of doctrine should also align across related hierarchies. A good doctrinal hierarchy should present cascading doctrine in a logical and standardised way so that similarly themed doctrine can be easily identified within and between hierarchies. The RAAF doctrine hierarchy should, for example, align with that of the other Services and with joint doctrine. Similarly, Australia’s joint doctrine hierarchy should align as closely as possible with those of our major allies. Such hierarchical compatibility promotes more effective integration of doctrine through easier cross matching of subject matter, and ultimately aids interoperability. In essence then, a good doctrine hierarchy should possess two key features: clearly defined and standardised levels and types of doctrine, and a standardised cascading structure.

**THE RAAF DOCTRINE HIERARCHY**

**Types of RAAF doctrine**

9. The AAP1000 recognises three types of doctrine: strategic, operational and tactical. Strategic doctrine is defined as ‘that collection of fundamental principles associated with the application of military
force as part of a national effort’. The definition of operational level doctrine is more vague however; the AAP1000 states that such doctrine is usually more prescriptive than strategic doctrine, and that it is developed by operational commanders so that subordinate commanders are able to understand how the commander is likely to conduct a campaign, what forces are likely to be employed and in what capacity, and how they themselves might be expected to operate. Finally, tactical level doctrine is deemed to encompass tactical level guidance that is not explicitly directive in nature.  

10. The AAP1000 also states that strategic and operational doctrine exists to define joint operations, and that operational level doctrine is reflected in the procedural series of Australian Defence Doctrine Publications (ADDP). The inference is thus that RAAF views strategic and operational doctrine as joint doctrine only; tactical doctrine alone is alluded to in a single-Service context. The overall conclusion is thus that RAAF recognises three types of doctrine, but that only tactical level doctrine is a single-Service domain. 

11. The AAP1002—Operational Air Doctrine Manual (first edition) was released in March 1999 with the stated intent of guiding commanders in the application of air power at the operational level of war. This manual aligns with the AAP1000 in recognising strategic, operational and tactical doctrine, but also offers a more precise definition of operational air doctrine as ‘the set of fundamental principles concerning the employment of air power at the operational level in support of national objectives’.

Hierarchy

12. The AP1000 does not offer any guidance on the organisation of RAAF doctrine, and actually confuses the issue somewhat by stating that ‘aerospace power doctrine is not a formal part of the doctrine hierarchy…” The AAP1002 does however proffer a hierarchy which accommodates all three types of RAAF doctrine. This hierarchy is represented in Figure 1. The hierarchy clearly identifies the AAP1000 as the sole source of RAAF strategic level doctrine, the AAP1002 as the sole source of RAAF operational level doctrine, and a panoply of Group/Wing Standing Instructions (SIs), tactical procedures and tactics manuals as the sources of RAAF tactical-level doctrine.

**Figure 1: RAAF Doctrine Hierarchy—Extant**
Extant guidance on doctrine hierarchies

13. ADF guidance on the types and organisation of joint doctrine is contained in DI(G) ADMIN 20-1—*Australian Defence Force Joint Doctrine*. This instruction recognises (but does not define) three types of joint doctrine—philosophical, application and procedural—and mandates two publication titles for specific types. Philosophical and application joint doctrine is published as ADDP and application doctrine as Australian Defence Force Publications (ADFP). A hierarchical numbering system based on the Common Joint Staff System (CJSS) is mandated for both ADDPs and ADFPs. Of note, the instruction also identifies three other types of doctrine: draft, authorised and provisional. These descriptors relate only to the status of a doctrine publication however, and are not relevant to the issue of doctrine hierarchies. As such, they are not considered further in this paper.

14. The ADDP-D also enunciates a hierarchy for ADF doctrine, but several contradictions exist between the ADDP-D guidance and the requirements of DI(G) ADMIN 20-1. ADDP-D recognises three ‘tiers’ of doctrine: capstone, keystone and ‘other joint (application) doctrine’ compared to the philosophical, application and procedural types endorsed by the instruction. Furthermore, ADDP-D is articulated as capstone doctrine sitting at the apex of two separate sets of doctrinal publications: ADDPs, and single-Service doctrine. ADFPs are acknowledged as ‘procedural manuals’ only, which are ‘not to be considered doctrinal’. This statement contradicts the instruction’s view of ADFPs as procedural doctrine. Fundamental differences thus exist between the two authoritative sources of guidance with regard to the organisation of ADF doctrine.

15. Formal guidance on the organisation of single-Service doctrine, and RAAF doctrine in particular, is much more limited. DI(G) ADMIN 20-1 essentially ignores the issue, and there are no other general or Air Force instructions relating to the organisation of such doctrine. ADDP-D states simply that single-Service doctrine may cover the strategic, operational and tactical levels of operations. Confusingly, the same document also concludes that single-Service doctrine publications cover the operational and tactical levels of war only.

16. In essence then, formal guidance concerning the organisation of ADF single-Service doctrine is practically non-existent. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that information relating to the joint doctrine hierarchy, which might otherwise inform the organisation of single-Service doctrine, is largely contradictory. There thus appear to be few, if any, formal constraints upon the form of any prospective RAAF doctrine hierarchy.

**OTHER DOCTRINE HIERARCHIES**

17. Having thus reviewed the extant RAAF doctrine hierarchy and formal guidance concerning such hierarchies, other doctrine hierarchies will now be reviewed. Specifically, the organisation of Australian joint doctrine and the single-Service doctrine of the Royal Australian Navy (RAN), Australian Army, USAF and the Royal Air Force (RAF) will be reviewed. Such a process serves two purposes: it will provide evidence of what is required to achieve a degree of standardisation across hierarchies; and it may furnish ideas on how to improve the RAAF doctrine hierarchy.

**Australian joint doctrine**

18. Philosophical doctrine. Australian joint doctrine is organised in accordance with the requirements of DI(G) ADMIN 20-1, and is categorised as either philosophical, application or procedural. The ADDP-D—the ADF’s capstone doctrine—sits at the apex of the hierarchy. Five other capstone publications are also identified. These publications, numbered using an ADDP-D.X convention, include such publications as ADDP-D.2—*Force 2020* and ADDP-D.3—*Future*
Warfighting Concept. With the exception of ADDP-D.4—Joint Warfighting, these publications are conceptual works vice doctrine and their inclusion in the hierarchy seems misguided.

19. **Application and procedural doctrine.** The organisation of subordinate ADDP and ADFP publications within the hierarchy is orderly and logical, based as it is upon the CJSS. Under the CJSS, the keystone ADDP for each branch is designated as X.0, where ‘X’ represents the ‘J’ series branch number. ADDP 3.0, for example, is the keystone publication for the operations series. These keystone publications provide the link between each branch and the capstone doctrine contained in ADDP-D. Application ADDPs are numbered using an X.Y convention, where ‘X’ indicates the branch and ‘Y’ the publication’s discrete identifier. ADFPs are numbered similarly, but with an additional number or numbers to indicate their relationship to a parent ADDP and related ADFPs. ADFP 3.1.1, for example, is procedural doctrine related to the application doctrine contained in ADDP 3.1. A partial representation of the ADF joint doctrine hierarchy is shown in Annex A. All philosophical and keystone doctrine publications are shown, but only one series (Defence Logistics) is expanded to show its subordinate application (ADDP) and procedural (ADFP) doctrine. Of note, the USA, Britain and NATO all utilise similar numbering conventions based on CJSS for their joint/multinational doctrine.

**RAN**

20. The RAN’s pre-eminent doctrinal publication, RAN Doctrine 1—Australian Maritime Doctrine, endorses a hierarchy comprising keystone, philosophical, application and procedural doctrine. RAN Doctrine 1 is identified as the keystone doctrine for the RAN. No definition or example of philosophical doctrine is offered. Application and procedural doctrine are said to relate to the operational and tactical levels of war and the detailed mechanics of operations at sea, but again definitions are not provided. A prospective publication, RAN Doctrine 2—Australian Maritime Warfare, is alluded to in the context of operational level doctrine, and Australian Maritime Tactical Instructions are identified as tactical doctrine.

21. RAN Doctrine 2—The Navy Contribution to Australian Maritime Operations was released in mid-2005, and offers a slightly different perspective on the RAN doctrine hierarchy. It identifies RAN Doctrine 1 as the Navy’s philosophical doctrine, and promotes itself as the RAN’s source of application doctrine. It is thus possible to infer from both sources a hierarchy for RAN doctrine, as depicted in Figure 2.

---

**Figure 2: RAN Doctrine Hierarchy**
Army

22. The Army’s pre-eminent doctrinal publication, LWD 1—The Fundamentals of Land Warfare, recognises the same three types of doctrine as DI(G) ADMIN 20-1: philosophical, application and procedural. Furthermore, comprehensive land-centric definitions are provided for each type, as follows:

   a. Philosophical doctrine explains the fundamental principles behind the employment of land forces in military operations, and also describing the basic tenets under which land forces operate in a joint environment. LWD 1 is identified as the sole philosophical doctrine publication within the Army.

   b. Application-level doctrine explains how philosophical principles are applied and is embodied in the LWD series.

   c. Finally, procedural doctrine describes the skill-sets that are fundamental to the performance of set tasks by every individual soldier. It includes minor tactics, military techniques and procedures in the detail necessary to ensure team effectiveness and interoperability. Procedural doctrine, which has relevance in all-corps training and in the employment of skills across the Army, is referred to as Land Warfare Procedures – General. Doctrine that is only relevant within specific corps or functional areas is termed Land Warfare Procedures – Special.

23. The Army doctrine hierarchy is illustrated in Annex B. The numbering of keystone application doctrine accords with the CJSS. The numbering of subordinate publications was not researched.

USAF

24. The USAF recognises three types of air and space doctrine: basic, operational and tactical. Each type is defined as follows:

   a. Basic doctrine articulates the most fundamental and enduring beliefs that describe and guide the proper use of air and space forces in military action.

   b. Operational doctrine describes the more detailed organisation of air and space forces and applies the principles of basic doctrine to military actions. It guides the proper employment of air and space forces in the context of distinct objectives, force capabilities, broad functional areas, and operational environments.

   c. Tactical doctrine describes the proper employment of specific weapon systems individually or in concert with other weapon systems to accomplish detailed objectives.

25. AFDD 1 is the USAF’s basic doctrine. Its stated purpose is to promulgate the USAF perspective on the employment of air and space power, and it thus focuses on how USAF assets can be organised, trained, equipped, and operated to conduct and support joint operations. USAF operational doctrine is contained in AFDD 2-series publications. These publications are organised functionally, with a keystone publication heading up each of eight functional series. Finally, USAF tactical doctrine is codified in Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-series manuals.

26. The USAF’s doctrine hierarchy is depicted in Annex C. As alluded to in para 25, publications are not numbered in accordance with the CJSS but rather as either 1-series, 2-series or 3-series, based
on whether they contain basic, operational or tactical doctrine respectively. Publications in the same series are numbered sequentially using an X.Y convention, where ‘X’ is the series number and ‘Y’ is the publication’s number within that series.

RAF

27. The RAF recognises three types of doctrine: strategic, operational and tactical. These types are defined as follows:

a. Strategic doctrine states the most fundamental and enduring principles that guide the use of air forces in military action. Strategic doctrine is the foundation of all air power doctrine; it establishes the framework and effective use of air vehicles.

b. Operational doctrine applies the principles of strategic doctrine to military actions by describing the use of aerospace forces in the context of distinct objectives, force capabilities, generic mission types and operational environments. Operational doctrine describes the organisation necessary for the effective use of air assets. It also anticipates the changes and influences that might affect future operations.

c. Tactical doctrine applies strategic and operational doctrine to military actions by describing the proper use of specific weapons systems and other types of systems to achieve detailed objectives. Tactical doctrine deals with the execution of roles and tasks.\(^\text{21}\)

28. AP 3000—*British Air Power Doctrine* is the sole source of RAF strategic air power doctrine. RAF operational doctrine is guided by AP 3000 and framed by Joint Warfare Publication (JWP) 0-10—*United Kingdom Doctrine for Joint and Multinational Operations*. The *RAF Air Operations Manual* straddles the operational and tactical levels and provides detailed guidance for commanders. Dedicated RAF tactical doctrine is contained in various Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (TTP) manuals published by the RAF’s Air Warfare Centre (AWC).

29. RAF doctrine does not exist within its own framework however, but rather as part of a complex web of doctrine comprising single-Service, joint UK and multinational NATO doctrine. The preponderance of NATO publications in particular, many of which are sponsored by the UK, negates the need for specific joint or single-Service doctrine in many cases. NATO Allied Joint Publications (AJs) and Allied Tactical Publications (ATPs) articulate NATO operational and tactical doctrine, and it is UK policy that national doctrine should be consistent with this NATO doctrine wherever possible. In circumstances where the UK does not ratify NATO doctrine or when NATO doctrine either does not exist or fails to adequately address specific areas, the UK typically develops national joint doctrine in the form of Joint Warfare Publications (JWPs) to address the deficiency. The net result is a wealth of joint and NATO operational and tactical doctrine covering most aspects of warfare, and a reduced need for specific RAF doctrine, particularly at the operational level.

30. RAF doctrine must therefore be placed in context by viewing it as part of the much larger hierarchy of British defence doctrine, which incorporates single-Service, joint and relevant NATO publications. A simplified hierarchy of British defence doctrine, which draws out the key air power elements, is shown in Annex D. Several features of this hierarchy stand out. First, there is relatively little operational RAF doctrine; the large majority of doctrine at this level is in fact allied or joint. Second, RAF strategic doctrine is not directly linked to the hierarchy. Finally, the keystone operational publications are organised along CJSS.
Analysis of hierarchy review

31. Having reviewed various doctrine hierarchies, it is now possible to draw some broad conclusions about the requirements and possible shape of a new RAAF hierarchy. As discussed previously, a good hierarchy should possess:

   a. clearly defined and standardised levels and types of doctrine; and
   b. a standardised and logically cascading structure.

32. When considering the issue of standardisation, the broader issue of interoperability and specifically government policy regarding interoperability priorities comes into focus. This policy dictates that interoperability within the ADF is pursued within each Service first, then between the Services, then between Australia and the US, and finally between Australia and her other allies.

33. **Types of doctrine.** When considering the levels and types of doctrine that should comprise the RAAF doctrine hierarchy, standardisation between the Services and with joint doctrine is a priority. The levels of doctrine are straightforward; the terms ‘capstone’ and ‘keystone’ are clearly defined and uniformly applied. The types of doctrine pose more options however. Both allied air forces endorse operational and tactical doctrine, and either strategic or basic doctrine at the highest level. Australian joint doctrine and Army doctrine align in recognising philosophical, application and procedural doctrine, whilst RAN also recognises these three types in addition to keystone doctrine. There is no compelling argument as to why the RAAF should continue to categorise its doctrine differently, and the use of philosophical, application and procedural doctrine types to form the new hierarchy is therefore proposed.

34. **Structure.** Most hierarchies that were reviewed were organised along CJSS lines, with the exception of the USAF and RAN. The USAF system was elegantly simple but non-standard when compared to Australian joint, Army and British examples. The RAN system on the other hand had nothing much to recommend it. Discounting both the USAF and RAN systems then, the CJSS seems an obvious choice as the basis for a doctrine hierarchy. Looking at the issue of publication titling/numbering, the ADDP/ADFP system of differentiating procedural doctrine from other doctrine by title and of using a cascading numbering system also seems eminently sensible.

A new RAAF doctrine system

35. The conclusions from the previous analysis provide a solid foundation upon which to build a new RAAF doctrine hierarchy. A proposed new hierarchy for RAAF doctrine is depicted in Annex E. The key features of this hierarchy are as follows:

   a. **Types of doctrine.** It incorporates three types of doctrine, as follows:

      (1) **Philosophical.** Philosophical doctrine articulates the fundamental and enduring principles that guide the use of air power in military operations. It provides broad guidance on how an air force should be organised, trained, equipped, employed, and sustained, and is the foundation of all air power doctrine; it establishes the framework for effective use of air vehicles.

      (2) **Application.** Application doctrine explains how philosophical principles are applied in campaigns and major operations. It describes the use of air power in the context of distinct objectives, force capabilities, generic mission types and operational environments.
(3) **Procedural.** Procedural doctrine describes the proper use of specific weapons systems and other types of systems to achieve detailed objectives. It deals with the execution of roles and tasks at the tactical level of warfare.

b. **Titles.** Philosophical and application doctrine publications are titled Air Force Doctrine Publications (AFDP). Procedural publications are titled Air Force Tactical Publications (AFTP).

c. **Capstone doctrine.** One philosophical publication—a capstone document—sits at the apex of the hierarchy. This publication is titled AFDP 1-01, and would be similar in scope to AAP1000.

d. **Keystone doctrine.** A series of keystone publications embodying application doctrine are arranged along CJSS lines. These series align directly with the ADDP series of application doctrine. Each keystone publication is numbered using the X.0 convention. For example, the keystone AFDP heading the Operations series is numbered AFDP 3.0.

e. **Application doctrine.** Subordinate application doctrine in each series is also embodied in AFDPs, which are numbered using an X.Y convention. For example, application doctrine in the Operations series subordinate to the keystone doctrine is numbered AFDP 3.1, AFDP 3.2, etc.

f. **Procedural doctrine.** Procedural doctrine is embodied in AFTP, which are numbered sequentially according to their parent doctrine using an X.Y.Z convention. For example, procedural doctrine in the Operations series subordinate to the AFDP 3.1 would be numbered as AFTP 3.1.1, AFTP 3.1.2, etc.

36. The specific publication numbers and titles listed in the annex are intended only to illustrate the proposed numbering system, and do not imply specific content. Furthermore, the existence of all eight series is indicative only; it may transpire that less than eight are required, particularly if ADF joint doctrine is particularly comprehensive in specific areas. Application doctrine is, by its very nature, more joint and most application doctrine could be expected to reside in joint publications. Notwithstanding, certain aspects of air operations, such as the detailed functioning of an Air Operations Centre (AOC) would probably reside in RAAF doctrine.

**Disadvantages of proposed hierarchy**

37. **Doctrine development effort.** A hierarchy such as that proposed does have potential disadvantages. To date, the RAAF has been unable to institutionalise its doctrine-writing program in the same way that the Army has. The Air Power Development Centre is essentially focused on the production of philosophical doctrine, and the development of lower-level doctrine is somewhat ad hoc. Effective institutionalisation of the development of all types of doctrine will require considerable investment, particularly in experienced personnel, and the RAAF must be prepared to fund this investment if the hierarchy is to be populated with relevant and engaging doctrine. A failure to institutionalise the doctrine development process will result in a hollow and essentially useless structure.

38. **Irrelevance.** A second disadvantage of the proposed hierarchy is that its relevance may diminish as the space for single-Service doctrine becomes smaller in the face of a consolidated move
towards increasing jointness. There will always exist a fundamental need for professional mastery at the single-Service level, and such mastery will be underpinned by procedural doctrine. The relevance of single-Service application doctrine in particular is more subject to change.

Advantages of proposed hierarchy

39. The proposed hierarchy does, however, offer advantages for RAAF capability, including the following:

a. **Standardisation.** It is based on the CJSS and thus aligns with a number of related doctrine hierarchies. Cross-referencing of similarly themed doctrine should therefore be easier.

b. **Identification of doctrine gaps.** The organisation and titling of doctrine will be standardised, providing scope for identifying gaps in current doctrine and making it easier for third parties to identify and access relevant doctrine.

c. **Recording of tactical lessons.** The hierarchy will provide a robust structure for capturing the lessons of recent operational experience in written form.

d. **Research resource.** The hierarchy, if properly populated, will provide a valuable resource for those seeking to determine the current state of air power doctrine in Australia. It may therefore serve as a launching pad for more focused conceptual thought on contemporary Australian air power issues.

e. **Low cost implementation.** Implementation of the new hierarchy is essentially an academic activity, and can be achieved at minimal cost.

Conclusion

40. Doctrine is an important contributor to military capability, but a sub-optimum doctrine hierarchy undermines its contribution in the RAAF context. The issue of doctrine hierarchies is confused however by a preponderance of terms for the different types of doctrine. Thus, one feature of a good hierarchy is that it clearly defines the types of doctrine that it accommodates, and that these types are standardised with related hierarchies. A second feature of a good hierarchy is that it presents cascading doctrine in a logical and standardised way so that similarly themed doctrine can be easily identified within and between hierarchies.

41. The current RAAF doctrine hierarchy lacks both features. The AAP1000 and AAP1002 agree on the types of doctrine—strategic, operational and tactical—but they disagree fundamentally on the applicability of these types to RAAF doctrine. AAP1000 promotes a very tactical view of RAAF doctrine, with higher level doctrine being deemed to be exclusively joint, whereas AAP1002 endorses a full suite of RAAF strategic, operational and tactical doctrines. Furthermore, the endorsed doctrine types are different to those used in the Army, RAN and joint hierarchies. The RAAF hierarchy also lacks a clear structure.

42. Examples of better doctrine hierarchies do exist, and the ADF joint doctrine structure in particular offers useful insights into how the RAAF doctrine hierarchy could be improved. Such improvements might include a reclassification of RAAF doctrine types to philosophical, application and procedural, and the adoption of a hierarchy structure based on the CJSS and a cascading numbering convention. A new hierarchy possessing these features will only be useful if it is populated
with contemporary and engaging doctrine, but this will require a more institutionalised approach to doctrine development than the RAAF currently endorses. The new hierarchy will, however, promote greater interoperability through easier cross-referencing of similarly themed doctrine, and will highlight gaps in doctrine more obviously than is currently the case. Implementation of the new hierarchy can also be achieved with minimal cost, since it is essentially an academic undertaking.

**Recommendation**

43. It is recommended that the RAAF adopt the proposed new hierarchy for RAAF doctrine, as detailed in para 35.

**Annexes:**

A. Partial ADF Joint Doctrine Hierarchy  
B. Army Doctrine Hierarchy  
C. USAF Doctrine Hierarchy  
D. Simplified British Defence Doctrine Hierarchy  
E. Proposed RAAF Doctrine Hierarchy
Endnotes


7. These definitions were obtained online on the DRN by searching the Australian Defence Glossary. The glossary is part of the Defence Language Management System maintained by the Chief Information Officer Group, and can be accessed at <http://dlms.dcb.defence.gov.au>.


9. Procedural doctrine is actually promulgated in Australian Defence Force Publications (ADFPs), and not ADDPs.

10. This definition is nothing more than an adaptation of a more general definition of doctrine.


12. ibid., p. v.

13. The CJSS comprises eight separate branches, each identified by a number as follows: 0 – Command, Leadership and Management; 1 – Personnel; 2 – Intelligence; 3 – Operations; 4 – Logistics; 5 – Plans; 6 – Communications and Information Systems (CIS); 7 – Training.


15. ibid., p 1–3.

16. This would seem to be in contradiction of the definition of capstone doctrine.

17. There is no official military definition of a concept, but they are generally described as untried and unverified ideas cast in a medium to long-term timeframe which have been developed in response to either changes in the strategic or security environment or focused on emerging technology. Such ideas have to be thoroughly investigated by rigorous debate, systematically analysed and tested practically in order to transform them from simply creative thought into an accepted tactic or practice i.e. doctrine.

18. The ADFWC website depicts the complete hierarchy of all ADDPs and ADFPs, and includes status reports. The website address is: <http://intranet.defence.gov.au/jdde>.
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