internal world models, and perceptions of the six notional planning staff members might lead to the production of a more robust plan that could provide contingencies for a wider range of possibilities than a plan produced by a single individual in isolation. The planning process could be further enhanced by the construction of facilities that support the definition and use of indicators that provide feedback information in a precise and timely manner and support plan modification, for example.

It is also necessary to consider the two different mechanisms of direct and indirect interaction caused by an intended, planned tasks and the effects that they will cause. Different activities and processes should support caused effect in order to support the development of a suite of indicators that can provide sufficiently comprehensive operationally based information to a planning staff. The STRATMAS facility, mentioned below, uses both direct indicators (such as the percentage without food, water, and shelter) as well as relatively indirect indicators such as disaffection and level of ethnic polarization) to provide feedback to its users.

Direct and indirect interaction mechanisms may require the definition of different types of indicator in order to provide appropriate levels of information to a planning staff, for example. Direct interactions occur when a task directly causes an event concern. An indirect interaction appears when a task is indirectly leads to an event, through its interaction and impact on other factors that in turn will interact and produce an event of concern. Our planning team may tend to see fewer effects coming from indirect interactions than direct interactions effects. Indirect interactions effects may occur when blue soldiers take action on resident population and the population is responding in a violence level. This raise in violence level may produce a growth environment for terrorism. To identify an individual as a terrorist based on his or her pattern of behaviour before they have undertaking a terrorist event can be extremely difficult. Even more difficult is the task of unravelling the reasons why a particular individual might actually be a terrorist. Such reasons may be based on events only indirectly interactions and linked to other mechanisms. Direct interactions such as interactions between soldiers on a battlefield are easier to develop tactics for.

If we do not see the result of indirect interactions as clearly as we do the results of direct interaction, we mostly need support to infer the indirect interaction. This support needs to be developed. We argue that the staffs has to consider in the future planning processes more indirect interaction indicators as well as the direct interactions indicators in stated End State, the Centre of Gravity, the Lines of Operations or operational functions, the Phasing of tasks and the Decision Points that they define.

There is a need for notational systems that capture the dynamics of political and other types of systems and generate information that could be readily parsed and analyzed by man and/or machines. This notational system should support a user when (s)he experiments with direct and indirect interactions either alone or in groups. There is also a need to identify who should have the responsibility to define the indicators needed to support operational planning and assessment. Should this task be undertaken by political executives, by strategic military executives, or by specialists in political science based on their research on failing states and related issues?

Furthermore, is there a possible relation between the indicators that the political executive branch is using and those that a strategic military planning staff could use? If so what would those indicators look like? If it is the strategic planners who construct the plan they also