



WS: Terminology needs for MAT developers, terminologists and educators as we move from national military doctrine to NATO doctrine.

Lynda W. Hansen, Poland 13-17 APR 2026



Workshop Aims



- Identify and discuss terminology friction in NATO doctrine
- Show DNK case examples to illustrate national interpretation differences
- Identify impact on training and teaching
- Enable discussion on need for greater clarity and standardization to promote shared understanding

+

Examples



Hierarchy btw Operational Themes, Land Tactical Ops and Tactical Activities



- Can be difficult to fully grasp and gives pedagogical difficulties
- Students confuse activities vs operations
- Instructors use different levels inconsistently
- The organisational-level distinctions of, for example, UK FMs make things easier to comprehend and teach.

Discussion Q:

How do you teach this structure nationally?



Combat Power Terminology (APP-28)

- APP-28 states that **fighting power** consists of the 'physical, moral and conceptual components under which troops fight'.
- 'Adding up the combat effectiveness of all troops and support' => **Combat power**: is the total means of force that a military unit can apply at a given time'.
- By contrast, **DEU** sees **combat power** as the **physical component** of fighting power.
- In DNK the general term 'kampkraft' is often used without distinguishing whether it refers to conceptual, physical or moral combat power.

Discussion Q:

What exactly are you measuring? Physical only or moral/conceptual as well?





Domains, Dimensions, Environments



- **Operational Domains:** land, air, maritime, space, cyber (NATO capstone doctrine)
- **Effects Dimensions:** physical, virtual, cognitive (NATO capstone doctrine). NATO and the US also use partially different terminologies in this area, particularly with regard to dimensions - US FM 3-0 pp1-3, + ibid 1-16,1-17)
- **Environments:** physical, information, human (ATP-3.2.1.1)

Overlap creates confusion, planning language becomes inconsistent. There is a need for clearer distinction btw these three umbrella terms)

Discussion Q:

How do you explain this to junior officers?



Reserve vs Echelon (National Perspectives)



- Reserve: reactive, no pre-assigned tasks. Deals with the unforeseen.
- Echelon forces: follow-on forces, proactive, on-order tasks
- Echelon used only for enemy forces in DNK

Discussion Q:

Would your nation treat echelon as reserve?

What are the implications for planning? Do the different interpretations change tasking?



Relief Operations Terminology (ATP-3.2.1.1)



Different terms used for same actors

- RIP: incoming/outgoing forces
- FPOL: advancing/in-place forces
- RPOL: withdrawing/in-place forces

(Why not make do with inbound and outbound?)

Discussion Q:

What terms do you use? Does mixed terminology affect handover clarity?



Mission task verbs – case (ATP-3.2.2.1)



Terminological confusion arises when the concepts are translated into our soldiers' own languages

Order: 'Fix the enemy'

- Different interpretations of 'fix'
- Mismatch with Find-Fix-Strike-Exploit tactical framework.

Discussion Q:

What effect must 'fix' achieve in your doctrine? Any other MTVs that confuse?



Operational Staff Work – Case

- DNK has produced an Eng translation of staff meetings corresponding to the Eng terms in APP-28, (aligned with UK and US FMs).
- But little match in terms of content, so scope for confusion as to the purposes of, for instance, the ‘Mission analysis brief’.
- In a DNK context, MAB provides broad options for completing the task - not the case with MAB in APP-28.

Same term, different output leads to expectation mismatch.

Discussion Q:

Have you experienced this at home or on multinational ops/ex?





Abbreviations: Examples NATO/APP-6



NATO	Internat'l Eng/UK	Remarks
BN	Bn	NATO uses all caps, so we can't discern btw one and >1 words as we can internat'l Eng
CAS	Cas vs CAS	Casualty vs close air support
SEC	Sect/Sy	NATO less clear (section & security & second)
CATK	C-Atk	No punctuation in NATO
O/O	O/O or OO	Why does NATO use punctuation here?
WD	wdr	If NATO prefers 3-letter abbs, why not here?



Take-aways on Abbreviations

- The Oxford Dictionary of English is NATO's reference for the English language; so why does NATO not follow its rules on handling abbreviations?
- International/UK English avoids ambiguity, by using mixed case, distinguishes btw general and specific reference, btw one or more words and produces more readable texts.
- NATO prioritizes simplification and compression (SEC, WD instead of wdr) and relies on context, symbology and placement rather than clear terminology.
- Excessive capitalization (all abbs) reduces readability (legibility and comprehension). It also makes it harder to quickly discern the tac tasks at hand, if the common practice of capitalizing MTVs drowns in a sea of capitals.
- The question is: does clear and consistent language-use enhance interoperability or should we leave it to maps and symbology?



+ **Wrap-up discussion points**

- What are your personal key take-aways?
- Important points for your national context?
- Where does terminology affect operations most?
- Which terms create most friction?
- Should NATO standardise or accept diversity?





Way ahead



- Clarify key concepts in doctrine
- Ensure consistency in NATO FM language use (eg. ‘backbrief’ + ‘back brief’ + ‘back-brief’ are all used (eg in ATP-3.2.1.1 and APP-28). Similarly ‘appendices’ and ‘appendixes’ are both used as as the plural form of appendix in ATP-3.2.2.2)
- Align teaching and terminology (NATO/BILC Style Guide)
- Consider a NATO style-guide outlining, for example, rules on spelling and use of abbreviations as well as giving examples of well-constructed mission statements.