Canadian
Forces
College

Collège
des
Forces
Canadiennes

LEAD OR MANAGE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT?

LCol T. Antsey

JCSP 40

Exercise *Solo Flight*

PCEMI 40

Exercice *Solo Flight*

Canada

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 40 – PCEMI 40

EXERCISE *SOLO FLIGHT* – EXERCICE *SOLO FLIGHT*

LEAD OR MANAGE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT?

LCol T. Antsey

Word Count: 2642

Compte de mots: 2642

LEAD OR MANAGE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT?

INTRODUCTION

What's more important for capability development: leadership or management? The leadership versus management debate continues to be an active discussion topic within the Officer Corps of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF). Concurrently, the CAF is advancing capability development, gaining efficiencies and increasing effectiveness in a department with a discretionary budget. Advancement is slow within this complex and politicized endeavour. Will strong leadership or strong management continue to advance capability development for the CAF? This paper will present a possible solution to this question.

TACTICAL AND OPERATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

There are countless articles and philosophies written about leadership and management. This paper does not conduct a detailed analysis of these writings. It draws upon the basic foundations and definitions available to most personnel within the military and public sectors. *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* defines leadership as "directing, motivating and enabling others to accomplish the mission professionally and ethically, while developing or improving capabilities that contribute to mission success."[1]

---

[1] Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, A-AP-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* (Canadian Defence Academy: DND Canada, 2005), Forward

Management is defined as "…planning, problem-solving and decision making, organizing, informing, directing and leading, allocating and managing resources, developing, co-ordinating, monitoring, controlling, and so on."[2]

Military leadership within the CAF is the basis for career progression. At junior levels, leadership is focused on developing and completing near, real-term problems and missions. The focus is on leading people with the resources and capabilities assigned. As an Officer advances within their career, there will be a point where the number of personnel they are directly responsible for may increase, but their direct connection with them will diminish and their focus will be more towards the institutional issues such as policy, systems, organization, and capabilities. Their direct leadership reduces while their institutional leadership increases.[3] Could not the leadership of the institution be referred to as the management of the institution? Where does management fit into an officer's career?

Throughout their career, formal training and annual assessments include or are centered on aspects of leadership. As a junior leader, the ability to manage resources is developed through experience or small courses based on the duties assigned. Most of these courses revolve around the management of resources to satisfy corporate policies, such as the Expenditure Management Course, when one is assigned financial responsibility. Within the realm of capability management, staff officers may be sent on a project management course.

---

[2] *Ibid*, 9
[3] Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, A-AP-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* (Canadian Defence Academy: DND Canada, 2005), 4

Let's consider the term stewardship. Stewardship is "the conducting, supervising, or managing of something; *especially***:** the careful and responsible management of something entrusted to one's care."[4] Individual persons, leaders and managers do not own resources within the Government of Canada. They are entrusted with conducting, supervising and/or managing resources on behalf of the Canadian people. In essence, military leaders and civilian managers are entrusted with the stewardship of resources. Similar to direct leadership, at the tactical and operational levels, management is focused on the management of resources or stewardship.

Despite the direct management or stewardship requirement, career progression is primarily leadership focused. Providing no significant violation of strategic policy such as the Financial Administration Act, career progression is rarely halted over mediocre stewardship. Providing decisions are made, and the project advanced well, the staff officer will likely receive a good evaluation, whether or not they actually managed the capability well.

Apart from leadership and management, within the military context is the concept of command. Although similar to leadership and often interchanged, the fundamental difference between command and leadership is authority. Command is usually restricted downwards within structures and processes of control, hence the phrase command and control. Leadership is not constrained to the limits of formal authority, or organization.[5]

---

[4] Merriam-Webster on line dictionary, Last accessed 5 May 2015, http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/stewardship.

[5] Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, A-AP-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* (Canadian Defence Academy: DND Canada, 2005), 9

Aside from leadership and management, does command have a place within capability development?

Inverted to military progression, the public service is based primarily on management of resources. Leadership is developed over their experience throughout their career. Their initial assignments are primarily tasked oriented towards the operation of resources, such as the effective operation or repair of computer equipment or processing of travel claims. Depending on their desire and opportunity, they may progress to supervisors and eventually to managers within their respective branch of the Public Service. Their progression model is based on management of resources, of which people is a resources vice the foundation of leadership to accomplish a mission.

During Public Servant progression, responsibilities go from management of resources or stewardship (leading people) to management of the institution (leading the institution). Similar to command, management is based on authority and organizational structures and processes to control the allocation and management of resources. Both command and management refer to leadership as a component.[6] Leadership (command) is one of Henri Fayol's five functions of management. The others being planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling.[7] From a public civilian perspective, management is the higher level function of which leadership is only one component.

The Department of National Defence (DND) employs both military and civilian members within the realm of capability development and requires the support and action of other

---

[6] *Ibid*, 9
[7] Teri McConville, "The principles of management applied to the defence sector," In *Managing Defence in a Democracy,* edited by Laura R. Cleary and Teri McConville, (London: Routledge, 2006), 110

government departments. Under the auspice of Whole of Government Approach (WoG), this essay will equate command to management. Command has a place in capability development. Will command and management be enough to resolve the issue if authorities are restricted to organizations and processes? If not, what is required to mitigate the effects of these WoG internal boundaries?

STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

At the operational level, both military and public servants can perform very well staying within their respective leadership and management strengths, respectively. Once they have aspired to the executive levels, is this enough? At the strategic level, "leadership requires a broader perspective and is uniquely about developing and maintaining the capabilities that will enable success at the tactical and operational levels."[8] At the strategic level, responsibilities are larger, there are more uncertainties, problems are more complex or even wicked, they usually take longer to resolve, and there is a requirement for a vast network of connections to maintain. *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations* highlights the requirement to manage the interactions of the CAF and its major systems internationally, domestically (including other government department) and military capabilities and doctrine. At the strategic level, this requires influence within the military and externally with bureaucrats and politicians, the public and private sectors. The ability to influence or lead reaffirms that leadership is a necessary component of command and management at the Strategic level. Referring back to Henri Fayol's concept that leadership is one of five functions of management; if DND

---

[8] Canadian Forces Leadership Institute, A-AP-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces,…*, 98

is only focused on leadership, they are only satisfying a portion of the overall command and management function. Similar to the theory that not all good commanders are necessarily good leaders, is the reverse true: not all good leaders are good managers? How does DND define good management at the strategic level? The approach will be to apply the Competency, Authority and Responsibility (CAR) model of Dr. Pigeau and Carol McCann to strategic management.

The Pigeau/McCann CAR model illustrates command capability against a commander's Competency, Authority and Responsibility. Even though this model was written for military command, it can be equally applied to civilian management. Balanced management is the desired state. Much the same as ineffectual command, ineffectual management exists when there are high levels of responsibility without the commensurate high levels of authority.[9] If Chief Force Development (CFD) and the Associate Deputy Minister – Material (ADM(MAT)) have been given the responsibility to resolve DND's capability development issue, do they have the authority to do so within WoG? Without factoring the personalities of the personnel filling those portfolios, has the institution of government with its many departments, organizations and processes created ineffective command and management by virtue of organization and process? What can be done to transcend organization boundaries and processes in order to mitigate ineffectual management? The ability to influence and transcend organizational boundaries to develop or improve capabilities to achieve mission success is the definition of leadership. The leadership competency of CFD and ADM(Mat) is critical to advancing capability development.

---

[9] Dr. Ross Pigeau and Carol McCann, "Re-Conceptualizing Command and Control", *Canadian Military Journal 3*, no. 1 (2002), 60

The same applies for dangerous or abuse of command/management, when significant authority has been assigned, but the commander/manager is not willing to accept the responsibility.[10] Is it possible that Canada's commitment to the F-35 project be considered a dangerous or ineffectual management decision? Did someone decide to move ahead with the F-35 without the authority to do so? The intent is not to answer this question, but only highlight the possibilities and potential ramifications if senior command and management such as CFD and ADM(Mat) are not assigned within the required balanced capability space.

CHALLENGES OF CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT

What capabilities does the CAF require and what methodology/philosophy should be used? Who will make that determination? Jones and Legassé discuss the 2010 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Strategic concept of reducing duplication and developing capabilities to be more cost effective.[11] Although the main theme of their article surrounds the concept of developing niche capabilities, some of the concepts can be applied towards capability development in general. En lieu of suggesting that the CAF develop niche capabilities in support of expeditionary operations within an alliance, I posit that the CAF needs to review the existing environmental niche capabilities to determine if they are really required within the overall requirement of the CAF, in order to reduce duplication. Jones and Legassé refer to the requirement for Canada to have more realistic and sustainable capabilities given the size and unpredictability of the defense budget. Who will conduct that analysis, present the recommendations, and make

---

[10] *Ibid*, 60-61.

[11] Peter Jones and Philippe Lagassé, "Rhetoric versus reality: Canadian defence planning in a time of austerity," *Defense and Security Analysis* Vol 28, no. 2 (June 2012), 140

the decisions? What stakeholders are involved? Will command and management or leadership enable the assessment and recommendation? Henri Fayol would propose that it is a function of management/command.

A key aspect of Capability development is the Capability Based Planning (CBP) process. CBP is being used by the CAF and its allies to help defense organizations focus on what capabilities are required to address current and future security threats, instead of seeking platforms and systems.[12] Do defense organizations, including DND, really understand CBP? Webb, Richter, and Bonsper state that even though there are many articles pertaining to CBP, few leaders give clear and concise direction on how their defense organization will implement and employ CBP, in conjunction with fiscal accountability. The main reason revolves around confusion and an overall lack of understanding surrounding CBP.[13]

The intent of the Canadian Armed Forces capability based planning is to move strategic decision making from a traditional reactive system replacement, to a proactive capability development process. The second generation CBP process presented by Rempel and the Strategic Planning Operational Research Team commences with a Future Security Analysis follow by the analytical process of Capability Planning, Management, and Integration.[14] The process contains five analytical methods: Chief of Defense Staff Action Team 3 Capability Assessment Methodology (CATCAM), to evaluate and prioritize elements within force planning scenarios through the use of complex

---

[12] Natalie J. Webb, Anke Richter, and Donald Bonsper, "Linking Defense Planning and Resource Decisions: A Return to Systems Thinking," *Defense and Security* Analysis Vol 26, no. 4 (December 2010), 389

[13] *Ibid*, 389

[14] Mark Rempel, "An Overview of the Canadian Forces' Second Generation Capability-Based Planning Analytical Process," *DRDC CORA*, no. TM 2010-198 (September 2010), iii

algorithms; Scenario Capability/Capacity Requirements Assessment and Outlook Tool (SC2RAT) which takes the outputs from CATCAM to determine the health of capabilities over time for each planning scenario; Concurrency investigates the force requirements of concurrent scenarios through a triad of calculations and levels of risk tolerance; Optimization provides a set of capability investment alternatives to best address capability deficiencies; and Cost Sensitivity assesses the risk of capabilities due to cost.[15] It is not possible to summarize this complex scientific decision process within this essay, but one could say that one probably requires the knowledge, education and experience of a potential defense scientist to completely understand the intricacies of these methods.

In their Command Capability Space, Pigeau and McCann discuss how the attractiveness of automated command capabilities could place a commander in either an abuse of authority or ineffectual command quadrants. Their reasoning is centered on the responsibility component of CAR. The will to accept responsibility is a human trait that cannot be delegated to inanimate objects, systems, or algorithms. Automated systems are incapable of accepting responsibility although the commander may have delegated their responsibility to them, creating an abuse or dangerous command situation. Ineffectual command results in the commander being expected to be responsible for the actions of the automated system, of which s/he has delegated.[16]

Does the reliance on complex scientific analytical methods, within an analytical process resemble an automated command capability? Considering they are both based on

---

[15] *Ibid*,8-17
[16] Dr. Ross Pigeau and Carol McCann, "Re-Conceptualizing Command and Control", …, 61

complex algorithms and technology, the CAF may have situated itself in a dangerous and/or ineffectual management situation. Just as Pigeau and McCann articulate that command (management) capability is achieved through the expression of human will (i.e. only humans can be competent, be granted authority and assume responsibility), only humans can be responsible for management decisions and lead people and control processes.[17] Science and technology are only tools and their use should be restricted to assisting the decision process, they should never replace it.

Aside from the difficult task of identifying capabilities, procurement is another daunting and complex component of capability development. Procurement spans across many government departments and policies. DND, Industry Canada, Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC), and the Privy Council Office (PCO) are a few of the main actors. This complex organizational issue does not exist within the private sector. Any desire to apply private sector procurement and management theory to solve or mitigate the challenges of military capability development must be scrutinized carefully.[18] The concept of re-engineering to streamline processes across DND by the Management Command and Control Re-engineering Team (MCCRT) could be a means to mitigate capability development across departments. Aside from the various opinions and desired outcomes of the MCCRT, the concept of re-engineering processes within the WoG, across the traditional stovepipes of DND, Industry Canada, PWGSC, and PCO could significantly mitigate the inherent organizational management authority. The establishment of a special defence procurement cell and defense procurement strategy

---

[17] *Ibid*, 61
[18] Lieutenant-Colonel Michael Rostek, "A framework for Fundamental Change? The Management Command and Control Re-Engineering Initiative," *Canadian Military Journal* (Winter 2004-2005), 70

within PWGSC is a step towards mitigating this issue. Who will champion such an overall WoG initiative? Will it be someone who is a leader, commander, or manager? Leadership would be required to establish the relationships and open the possibility of synchronizing processes. Once established, the function and control of those processes would be a collaborative command and management responsibility. Within this context, considering the span of departments, leadership from PCO may have to be the dominant authority.

CONCLUSION

Command and management entail authority and accountability, as outlined by the Pigeau/McCann CAR model. Capability development is complex or wicked. It involves processes within DND and across government which require control and the aspect of accountability to the Canadian public. From a foundational, conceptual perspective, command and management must be the overarching function in order to advance capability development. It cannot be done without leadership. Leadership is a core component of command and management. Without leadership, the ability to influence organizations, to synchronize different processes, to support military capability development cannot be achieved. To use a tactical term, leadership is the vital ground of command and management within capability development. Without it, success will not be accomplished at the strategic level, which could lead to mission failure at the operational and tactical levels.

Pigeau and McCann highlight the requirement to find the correct balance between creative command (mission command) and controlling command (micro-management)

within a complex military environment.[19] To apply a similar philosophy to the complexity of capability development, there should be a balance between command/management and leadership.

DND and the WoG must be cognisant of the commanders and managers which have been placed in senior capability development positions that may lack the required leadership competency and the will to accept responsibility, commensurate with their assigned authority.

The proposed solution is rightfully Canadian. There are no absolutes. Balance and collaboration is the Canadian way.

One final thought. The Revolution of Military Affairs (RMA) may not be technical and linked to globalization and purely defence research related. RMA may be linked to a cultural change within militaries to embrace management as the overarching endstate, of which leadership is the core component.

---

[19] Dr. Ross Pigeau and Carol McCann, "Re-Conceptualizing Command and Control", … 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Canada. Canadian Forces Leadership Institute. A-AP-005-000/AP-004, *Leadership in the Canadian Forces: Conceptual Foundations*. Canadian Defence Academy: DND Canada, 2005.

Canada. Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector. Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat. Date modified: 15 December 2011. https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pol/doc-eng.aspx?id=25049&section=HTML.

Jenkins, Tom. *Canada First: Leveraging Defence Procurement Through Key Industrial Capabilities.* Canada: Public Works and Government Services Canada, Feb 2013.

Jones, Peter, and Philippe Lagassé. "Rhetoric versus reality: Canadian defence planning in a time of austerity." *Defense and Security Analysis* Vol 28, no. 2 (June 2012).

Lieutenant-Colonel Rostek, Michael. "A framework for Fundamental Change? The Management Command and Control Re-Engineering Initiative." *Canadian Military Journal* (Winter 2004-2005).

McConville, Teri. "The principles of management applied to the defence sector." In *Managing Defence in a Democracy,* edited by Laura R. Cleary and Teri McConville. London: Routledge, 2006.

Pigeau, Ross and Carol McCann. "Re-Conceptualizing Command and Control", *Canadian Military Journal 3*, no. 1 (2002).

Rempel, Mark. "An Overview of the Canadian Forces' Second Generation Capability-Based Planning Analytical Process." *DRDC CORA*, no. TM 2010-198 (September 2010).

Webb, Natalie J., Anke Richter, and Donald Bonsper. "Linking Defense Planning and Resource Decisions: A Return to Systems Thinking." *Defense and Security Analysis* Vol 26, no. 4 (December 2010).

Merriam-Webster on line dictionary. Last accessed 5 May 2015. http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/stewardship.