



DECISIONS UNDER FIRE

HONOR AND LAW IN ACTION

FACILITATOR GUIDE

ENGLISH EDITION



DECISIONSUNDERFIRE.COM

Contents

1. Purpose of This Guide	3
2. What Decisions Under Fire Is - and What It Is Not	3
3. Using Decisions Under Fire in Facilitated Settings	3
4. The Role of the Facilitator	4
5. After-Action Reviews (AARs) and Key Learning Points	4
6. Facilitating Discussion and Reflection	5
7. Facilitated Use Formats	5
8. Mission-Specific Facilitation Guidance	8
Mission 1 - Surrender and Engagement	9
Mission 2 - Surrender and Engagement (Commander)	10
Mission 3 - Enemy Wounded and Surrendering	11
Mission 4 - Safe Capture (Tutorial)	12
Mission 5 - Evacuation Under Fire	13
Mission 6 - Drone: Aid or Target?	14
Mission 7 - Enemy Deception and Protected Emblems	15
Mission 8 - Combat Patrol & Protected Buildings	16
Mission 9 - Mines. Demining (Tutorial Mission)	17

1. Purpose of This Guide

This Facilitator Guide is designed to support trainers, facilitators, instructors, and partner organizations in using **Decisions Under Fire (DUF)** in structured learning and dialogue settings.

Its purpose is to help facilitators:

- introduce DUF in a clear and coherent way;
- frame the experience for participants;
- guide reflection and discussion after each mission;
- adapt DUF to different training formats and audiences.

This guide does **not** provide a legal manual, a checklist of correct answers, or a mission-by-mission “solution key”. DUF is built around experience and reflection, not assessment or certification.

This document complements the **Quick Tour Guide**, which is intended for direct users and focuses on navigation and core experience. The present guide focuses on facilitation, pedagogy, and collective use.

2. What Decisions Under Fire Is - and What It Is Not

Core Philosophy

Decisions Under Fire places participants in realistic operational situations where decisions must be made under pressure, uncertainty, and incomplete information. The scenarios reflect the ambiguity of real-world contexts rather than idealized or simplified dilemmas.

DUF is not a test. There are no scores, rankings, or pass/fail outcomes. The purpose is not to evaluate performance, but to explore how decisions unfold and what consequences they generate - operationally, legally, and humanly.

The tool is deliberately non-judgmental. Participants are invited to engage honestly with the situations presented, knowing that mistakes, hesitation, or imperfect decisions are part of the learning process.

Experiential Learning Logic

DUF follows a simple but robust experiential learning logic:

Experience → Reflection → Application

- **Experience:** Participants are immersed in a scenario and required to make decisions as events unfold.
- **Reflection:** After the scenario, the After-Action Review (AAR) and Key Learning Points provide a structured basis for reflection.
- **Application:** Facilitated discussion helps participants connect the experience to real-life professional, operational, or ethical contexts.

This sequence is intentional. Explanations and legal framing come after the experience, not before, allowing participants to engage with complexity rather than abstract rules.

3. Using Decisions Under Fire in Facilitated Settings

Possible Use Contexts

Decisions Under Fire can be used in a wide range of facilitated contexts, including:

- training sessions and workshops;
- awareness-raising activities;
- briefings and professional discussions;
- dialogue or outreach activities involving diverse audiences.

DUF is adaptable to both civilian and armed-actor contexts, depending on organizational mandates and facilitation objectives.

Individual and Group Use

DUF can be used:

- individually, with participants exploring missions on their own;
- in small groups, sharing decisions and reactions;
- in plenary settings, using a shared screen;
- in blended formats combining individual exploration and collective discussion.

Facilitators are encouraged to choose the format that best fits their objectives, time constraints, and audience composition.

4. The Role of the Facilitator

Before the Session

Before introducing DUF, facilitators should:

- explain the purpose of the tool and the non-judgmental nature of the experience;
- clarify that there are no “correct” answers;
- set ground rules for respectful discussion;
- remind participants that uncertainty and pressure are integral to the scenarios.

Creating a safe and open environment is essential for meaningful engagement.

During the Experience

During mission play-throughs, facilitators should generally avoid intervening. The scenarios are designed to speak for themselves.

The facilitator’s role at this stage is primarily observational:

- noting decision-making patterns;
- observing emotional reactions;
- identifying points of tension or disagreement to revisit later.

After the Mission

After each mission path, the After-Action Review (AAR) provides a shared reference point. Facilitators should allow participants to engage with the AAR before opening discussion.

The transition from individual experience to collective reflection is a key moment. Facilitators should encourage participants to articulate what they observed, felt, and understood before introducing broader framing.

5. After-Action Reviews (AARs) and Key Learning Points

Purpose of the AAR

The AAR explains the consequences of decisions taken in the scenario. It does not judge intentions or assign blame. AARs:

- link decisions to operational outcomes;
- highlight implications under the Law of Armed Conflict;
- emphasize professionalism, restraint, and protection of civilians;

- reinforce the importance of disciplined conduct for legitimacy and mission success.

Using the Key Learning Points

Key Learning Points are designed to help participants step back from the immediate outcome of the scenario. They should be used as prompts for discussion rather than as conclusions.

Facilitators are encouraged to:

- invite participants to reformulate the points in their own words;
- relate them to personal or professional experience;
- explore how context and uncertainty shape decision-making.

6. Facilitating Discussion and Reflection

Discussion Approaches

Effective discussions focus on:

- how and why decisions were made;
- what information was missing or ambiguous;
- how alternative choices might have changed outcomes.

Open-ended questions help keep discussions grounded in the scenario rather than abstract debates.

Managing Disagreement and Strong Reactions

Disagreement is normal and often productive. Facilitators should:

- acknowledge differing perspectives;
- keep the discussion anchored in the scenario;
- avoid moralizing or lecturing;
- ensure that all participants can contribute.

7. Facilitated Use Formats

Introduction

This section describes the different ways Decisions Under Fire can be used in facilitated settings, depending on the objective, the audience, and the operational context.

While DUF can technically be accessed individually, its primary value lies in **guided and facilitated use**, where scenarios serve as a trigger for reflection, discussion, and professional exchange. The formats presented below are designed to support facilitators in adapting DUF to a wide range of environments.

DUF was conceived and **developed primarily for use with military audiences**, reflecting operational realities, decision-making constraints, and professional responsibilities in armed conflict. The facilitated formats outlined in this section are therefore **structured to support collective reflection**, peer exchange, and contextual discussion, rather than individual evaluation.

The sub-sections below outline common facilitated use formats for Decisions Under Fire. They are intended as **practical reference models** rather than prescriptive templates, and can be adapted to different audiences, timeframes, and facilitation objectives.

Short Facilitated Format (30-45 minutes)

This format is designed as a **standalone facilitated session** for situations where time is limited and where facilitators wish to introduce the *Decisions Under Fire* approach without engaging in a full training programme.

It is particularly appropriate when the objective is to:

- introduce DUF and its methodology;
- allow participants to experience a concrete scenario;
- support collective reflection and discussion within a limited timeframe;
- enable participants to explore additional missions independently at a later stage, if relevant.

Typical flow:

- **Introduction and framing (5-10 minutes):** The facilitator introduces DUF, explains the purpose of the exercise, and sets expectations, with an emphasis on reflection rather than evaluation.
- **Mission paths (approx. 10-15 minutes):** One or more mission paths are explored, either collectively or individually, depending on the setting.
- **Facilitated discussion (10-15 minutes):** Using the After-Action Review (AAR) and Key Learning Points, the facilitator guides discussion on decisions taken, perceived constraints, and alternative approaches.

The purpose of this format is not to deliver comprehensive training, but to provide a **focused and meaningful first engagement** with DUF.

Note: Depending on the organizational context and the setting in which the session takes place, this format may be extended up to approximately one hour. This may be relevant, for example, when the session includes a brief presentation of the institutional mandate, the framework of a conference or event, or the context in which DUF was developed. Such additions should remain proportionate and serve to situate the exercise, without shifting the focus away from the scenario-based experience and facilitated discussion.

Standard Facilitated Workshop (1.5-2 hours)

This format represents the **primary use case** for *Decisions Under Fire* in structured training environments. It is designed to allow sufficient time for participants to engage with one or more scenarios and to explore decision-making processes in a facilitated and reflective manner.

It is particularly suitable for:

- professional training sessions;
- internal staff training;
- workshops with military or security-related audiences;
- capacity-building or educational activities.

Typical flow:

- **Introduction and framing (10-15 minutes):** The facilitator clarifies the objectives of the session, outlines the facilitation approach, and establishes ground rules for discussion.
- **Multiple missions (30-45 minutes):** Several short mission sequences are explored. Individual missions last only a few minutes, with the remaining time used for observation, facilitation, and brief exchanges.
- **Facilitated discussion (30-45 minutes):** After-Action Reviews (AARs) and Key Learning Points are used to structure discussion around decisions taken, constraints encountered, and alternative courses of action.
- **Reflection and transfer (15-20 minutes):** Participants reflect on how insights from the scenarios relate to their own professional roles, responsibilities, or operational environments.

This format allows facilitators to move beyond initial reactions and support **deeper reflection**, while maintaining a focus on professional judgment, collective learning, and contextual understanding rather than individual performance.

Plenary and Conference-Based Interactive Format

This format is designed for **large-group or plenary settings**, such as conferences, high-level meetings, side events, or public-facing sessions, where *Decisions Under Fire* is used as a **collective interactive experience** rather than an individual exercise.

In this configuration, DUF serves as a **shared decision-making moment**, allowing participants to engage simultaneously with a scenario and to reflect collectively on the outcomes.

This format is particularly suitable for:

- conferences and diplomatic events;
- high-level meetings or briefings;
- side events linked to thematic discussions;
- exhibition booths or dedicated interactive spaces.

Typical flow

- **Contextual introduction (5 minutes):** The facilitator introduces the scenario, explains how collective decision-making will take place, and sets the discussion frame.
- **Scenario played in plenary (10-15 minutes):** One or two short missions are played on a shared screen. At key decision points, participants are invited to select options collectively (e.g. by show of hands or other simple voting methods).
- **Collective AAR and discussion (10-15 minutes):** The After-Action Review (AAR) is presented, followed by a moderated discussion focusing on observed decision patterns, trade-offs, and key takeaways.

Depending on the event format, group size, and available time, this sequence can be extended to explore additional missions or to deepen discussion.

The purpose of this format is not to reach consensus or to assess participants, but to:

- stimulate collective reflection;
- highlight diversity of perspectives within a group;
- create a common basis for discussion in a limited amount of time.

Extended and Integrated Training Formats (Half-Day / Full-Day)

This format is designed for **extended training contexts**, where *Decisions Under Fire* is integrated into a broader learning programme or combined with other training components.

It is particularly suitable when the objective is to:

- explore multiple operational dilemmas in depth;
- allow participants to revisit scenarios and compare decision paths;
- combine DUF with other training modules, briefings, or facilitated exercises.

Typical configurations may include:

- multiple missions played sequentially or in parallel;
- repeated play-throughs of the same mission to compare choices and outcomes;
- small-group work focusing on specific aspects of decision-making;
- plenary synthesis sessions to consolidate insights across groups.

In extended formats, facilitators may use DUF to:

- structure the overall training flow;
- introduce or revisit key themes at different stages of the session;
- support progressive learning, moving from initial reactions to more considered analysis.

This format allows for **deeper engagement** and sustained reflection, while maintaining DUF's core principle: learning through experience, guided discussion, and contextual understanding rather than prescriptive instruction.

8. Mission-Specific Facilitation Guidance

Introduction for facilitators

The mission-specific facilitation sheets presented in this section are intentionally concise. They are designed as practical reference tools to support facilitators before, during, and after sessions - not as exhaustive descriptions of each scenario or a substitute for first-hand exploration of the missions.

Facilitators are strongly encouraged to experience each mission themselves and to explore multiple decision paths. After-Action Reviews (AARs) and Key Learning Points (KLPs) vary depending on the choices made, and different play-throughs can reveal distinct operational, legal, and ethical dynamics.

The sheets therefore focus on:

- the core logic of each mission;
- the main dilemmas and decision points;
- the key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs.

They are intended to help facilitators anticipate discussion points and frame reflection, while leaving space for contextual adaptation, participant input, and professional experience.

Across all missions, facilitators are encouraged to frame Decisions Under Fire as a recognizable operational dilemma rather than a legal exercise. Introductions should remain brief, avoid signaling expected outcomes, and allow participants to experience scenarios without guidance during play. After-Action Reviews (AARs) and Key Learning Points (KLPs) should be used to anchor discussion on protection, restraint, and professional judgment under pressure.



Mission 1 - Surrender and Engagement

Operational context

Urban environment on the outskirts of an active conflict zone. Visibility is degraded, civilians may be present, and the situation is highly volatile.

Core scenario logic

A patrol encounters enemy fighters who appear to be surrendering. The situation rapidly escalates into an ambush when concealed fire wounds one member of the patrol. The participant must react immediately under pressure, with limited situational awareness and a direct threat to the unit.

As the scenario unfolds:

- the initial threat is neutralized;
- one enemy fighter attempts to flee;
- unidentified individuals later appear at a distance.

Key feature of this mission

This mission is designed to challenge initial assumptions. What appears to be a clear situation involving enemy surrender rapidly becomes ambiguous and dangerous, highlighting how quickly operational decision-making can shift under pressure.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Perceived surrender versus deception.
- Immediate force protection versus restraint.
- Pursuit of a fleeing fighter versus containment.
- Engagement versus waiting when individuals appear at a distance.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Protection of persons hors de combat and loss of protection through conduct.
- Risk of misidentification under degraded visibility and stress.
- Cumulative effects of sequential decisions rather than isolated actions.
- Professionalism, restraint, and situational awareness under pressure.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Persons who are hors de combat, including surrendering or incapacitated fighters, must not be targeted.
- The presence of uncertainty does not remove the obligation to distinguish between combatants and civilians.
- Force must be used in a manner that is necessary and proportionate.
- Decisions taken in sequence may cumulatively lead to serious legal and operational consequences, even if each individual action appears justified in isolation.



Mission 2 - Surrender and Engagement (Commander)

Operational context

Urban environment on the outskirts of a recently contested city. Civilians remain present, damaged infrastructure limits visibility, and enemy resistance continues despite indications of surrender. As the operational commander, participants must provide clear tactical direction while balancing mission success, protection of civilians, and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC).

Core scenario logic

The mission places participants in the role of an operational commander leading a reconnaissance patrol following heavy fighting. Initial orders establish the commander's intent before an ambush forces rapid decisions on the use of supporting fires. Once the immediate threat has been addressed, participants must decide how surrendered enemy personnel are handled, illustrating how command decisions shape both operational outcomes and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.

Key feature of this mission

Unlike the soldier version, this mission explores decision-making at the command level. Participants issue operational orders, select appropriate supporting fires, and determine how surrendered personnel are treated, demonstrating how leadership, discipline and lawful command influence both mission success and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Aggressive mission orders versus restrained command guidance.
- Selection of appropriate means and methods of attack in a populated environment.
- Balancing military necessity with the protection of civilians and civilian infrastructure.
- Lawful and humane treatment of surrendered personnel during questioning.
- Balancing mission effectiveness with professionalism, discipline and operational legitimacy.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Commanders are responsible not only for mission success, but also for ensuring operations are conducted lawfully.
- Clear and disciplined orders promote distinction, restraint and compliance with LOAC.
- Precision, proportionality and precaution remain essential when employing supporting fires.
- Humane treatment of prisoners reflects professionalism and strengthens operational credibility.
- Ethical leadership reinforces mission success, discipline and trust.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Commanders are responsible for issuing lawful orders and ensuring operations are conducted in accordance with LOAC.
- Commanders should carefully consider the choice of weapons and methods of attack to minimise the risk of civilian harm while achieving the military objective.
- Persons who have surrendered must be treated humanely and protected from threats, coercion or violence.
- Humane treatment of prisoners and respect for civilian protection contribute to both operational effectiveness and mission legitimacy.
- Mission success depends on making decisions that are both operationally effective and consistent with the Law of Armed Conflict.



Mission 3 - Enemy Wounded and Surrendering

Operational context

A combat patrol advances through a damaged urban area following recent fighting. Visibility is reduced by debris, smoke and the aftermath of mortar strikes. The patrol encounters several enemy casualties, including one wounded soldier who has dropped his weapon and is clearly signaling surrender. The tactical situation remains uncertain, requiring participants to balance operational security with their obligations under the Law of Armed Conflict.

Core scenario logic

The mission examines how combatants should respond when encountering a wounded and surrendering enemy during an ongoing operation. Participants must distinguish between lawful military objectives and persons who are hors de combat, while maintaining tactical vigilance and preparing for possible threats in the surrounding environment. Correct decisions lead naturally into the Safe Capture tutorial before the scenario continues.

Key feature of this mission

This mission introduces the concept of hors de combat and reinforces that wounded or surrendering enemy combatants are no longer lawful targets. It also demonstrates that humane treatment and force protection are complementary rather than contradictory obligations.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Determining whether a wounded enemy is genuinely surrendering and therefore protected.
- Deciding whether to engage immediately or approach for capture.
- Balancing tactical security with the obligation to protect wounded and surrendering combatants.
- Maintaining situational awareness while preparing to secure the individual and assess potential threats nearby.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Persons who are hors de combat, including those wounded, incapacitated or surrendering, must not be attacked.
- Humane treatment is a core obligation even in hostile environments.
- Distinction, precaution and humanity remain fundamental principles guiding battlefield decisions.
- Tactical patience, careful assessment and restraint improve both mission success and legal compliance.
- Professional conduct under pressure strengthens operational effectiveness and credibility.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Wounded, incapacitated and surrendering combatants who are hors de combat are protected against attack.
- The Geneva Conventions require humane treatment of such persons and prohibit violence against those who are defenceless.
- Combatants must continue to apply the principles of distinction, precaution, proportionality and humanity throughout the operation.
- The obligation to protect persons who are *hors de combat* must be balanced with continued vigilance and appropriate force protection.



Mission 4 - Safe Capture (Tutorial)

Operational context

Following the successful decision to approach a wounded surrendering combatant in Mission 3, participants enter an interactive tutorial that demonstrates the procedures for safely securing an enemy who is hors de combat. Although the surrendering combatant no longer poses an immediate threat, the surrounding environment remains uncertain, requiring continued vigilance, situational awareness and tactical discipline.

Core scenario logic

This mission provides step-by-step guidance on conducting a safe and lawful capture while maintaining operational security. Participants learn how to secure the area, establish verbal contact, verify the enemy's surrender, assess potential threats, provide initial medical assistance, and prepare for the continuation of the mission. Throughout the tutorial, participants are reminded that humane treatment and force protection are complementary responsibilities.

Key feature of this mission

Unlike the other missions, this tutorial reinforces practical battlefield procedures rather than testing alternative decision paths. It translates the legal obligations associated with persons who are hors de combat into concrete actions that promote both operational safety and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Securing the area before approaching the surrendering combatant.
- Confirming the enemy's intent to surrender and ensuring disarmament.
- Maintaining situational awareness while checking for concealed threats.
- Providing appropriate medical assistance while preserving force protection.
- Continuing the mission only after the situation has been properly assessed and secured.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Tactical vigilance and situational awareness remain essential throughout the capture process.
- Once an enemy combatant is wounded or clearly expresses an intention to surrender, they must be treated humanely.
- Safe capture requires teamwork, communication and disciplined procedures.
- Safe capture procedures help protect both the patrol and persons who are hors de combat.
- Professional conduct during capture contributes to mission success and operational credibility.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Persons who have surrendered must be treated humanely and protected from violence.
- Combatants must take appropriate precautions to ensure both their own safety and that of persons who are hors de combat.
- Once the individual has been safely secured, appropriate medical assistance should be provided.
- The obligation to protect persons who are hors de combat must be balanced with continued vigilance, situational awareness and appropriate force protection.
- Lawful capture procedures reinforce professionalism, discipline and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.



Mission 5 - Evacuation Under Fire

Operational context

Following the successful capture of two wounded enemy combatants, the patrol begins evacuating them by HMMWV towards a safe area. During the evacuation, the patrol comes under enemy fire and one friendly soldier is wounded. With limited vehicle capacity and an ongoing threat, participants must rapidly decide how to evacuate casualties while balancing mission safety, available resources and their obligations under the Law of Armed Conflict.

Core scenario logic

The mission places participants in a casualty evacuation scenario where tactical pressure, limited resources and humanitarian obligations intersect. Participants must decide how to prioritise the evacuation of friendly and enemy wounded while ensuring continued care and protection for those who cannot immediately be evacuated.

Key feature of this mission

This mission demonstrates that obligations towards wounded enemy combatants continue after capture, even during active combat. It explores how humanitarian obligations, force protection and operational realities can be balanced when resources are limited.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Prioritising casualties when evacuation capacity is limited.
- Balancing the care of friendly and enemy wounded.
- Protecting the patrol while conducting casualty evacuation under fire.
- Deciding how best to care for wounded personnel who cannot immediately be evacuated.
- Balancing humanitarian obligations with operational necessity.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Care for the wounded and sick applies regardless of their affiliation.
- Medical priorities should be balanced with operational realities and team safety.
- Providing supplies and cover can help protect wounded personnel when immediate evacuation is not possible.
- Strong leadership requires balancing humanitarian obligations with tactical constraints.
- Professional and disciplined decision-making strengthens both mission success and operational credibility.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Wounded and sick persons must be respected and cared for without adverse distinction.
- Humane treatment applies equally to friendly and enemy wounded who are *hors de combat*.
- When immediate evacuation is not possible, reasonable measures should be taken to protect and care for wounded personnel.
- Decisions should balance humanitarian obligations with the safety of the patrol and the realities of the operational situation.
- Effective casualty evacuation reflects professionalism, sound leadership and compliance with the Law of Armed Conflict.



Mission 6 - Drone: Aid or Target?

Operational context

A drone operator observes a wounded enemy soldier on the battlefield from a distance. Although the individual appears incapacitated, closer observation reveals that he is still holding a weapon while showing no immediate hostile activity. Participants must determine whether the individual remains a lawful military objective or has become *hors de combat*, balancing force protection with their obligations under the Law of Armed Conflict.

Core scenario logic

The mission places participants in a remote decision-making role where limited information and uncertainty influence the use of force. Participants must decide whether to engage immediately, order a ground capture, or gather additional information before acting. The scenario demonstrates the importance of verifying a person's status before making decisions that may have irreversible legal and operational consequences.

Key feature of this mission

This mission explores how technology can support lawful decision-making in combat. Rather than focusing solely on the use of force, it demonstrates how drones can improve situational awareness, facilitate surrender, and reduce risks for both friendly forces and wounded enemy combatants.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Determining whether a wounded combatant continues to pose a threat.
- Acting immediately versus gathering additional information.
- Balancing force protection with humanitarian obligations.
- Deciding whether remote technology can reduce operational risk.
- Maintaining control of the situation while reducing unnecessary risk.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Distinguishing between active combatants and persons who are *hors de combat* remains essential.
- When doubt exists, additional assessment should be undertaken before using force.
- Technology can support better operational decisions when used to improve situational awareness.
- Technology can be used to facilitate surrender, reduce risk and support lawful battlefield decision-making
- Professional judgment requires balancing military necessity, precaution and humanity.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Persons who are *hors de combat* must not be attacked.
- When a person's status is uncertain, all feasible precautions should be taken before deciding to use force.
- Taking feasible measures to facilitate surrender can improve both operational safety and legal compliance.
- Technology can support better operational decisions, but it does not replace human judgment.
- Careful assessment before engagement contributes to both operational effectiveness and legal compliance.



Mission 7 - Enemy Deception and Protected Emblems

Operational context

During a combat patrol in a recently retaken urban area, participants identify armed enemy combatants inside a building displaying a Red Cross emblem. Intelligence suggests that enemy forces have repeatedly misused protected emblems, but the situation remains uncertain. Following the engagement, the patrol comes under fire and must rapidly decide how to seek cover while limiting risks to civilian objects.

Core scenario logic

The mission explores how participants should respond when uncertainty surrounds protected emblems and civilian objects. Participants must verify the situation before engaging enemy combatants and later decide whether military necessity justifies using a school as cover while under fire. The scenario demonstrates that lawful decision-making depends on careful assessment rather than assumptions or previous experience.

Key feature of this mission

This mission reinforces that enemy misuse of protected emblems does not remove the obligation to verify targets or respect protected civilian objects. It also highlights the importance of balancing immediate tactical needs with the long-term protection of civilian infrastructure.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Acting on assumptions versus verifying the target before engagement.
- Distinguishing between enemy combatants and the protected status of the building.
- Choosing between precision engagement and attacking the structure itself.
- Deciding whether military necessity justifies using a school as cover.
- Balancing tactical advantage with the protection of civilian objects.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Medical facilities and other protected civilian objects retain their protection unless specific legal conditions are met.
- Enemy misuse of protected emblems does not remove the obligation to verify targets.
- Precision and careful target assessment reduce unnecessary harm while supporting mission success.
- Military use of schools should be limited to situations where no viable alternative exists.
- Respect for civilian objects strengthens operational legitimacy and public trust.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Buildings normally used for civilian purposes must be presumed protected unless verified as lawful military objectives.
- Misuse of a protected emblem does not automatically remove the protection afforded to a building.
- Before attacking a protected facility, participants should verify its status and, where circumstances permit, provide an effective warning.
- Military use of schools and other civilian buildings should be carefully balanced against the risks to civilian protection and long-term humanitarian consequences.
- Respecting protected emblems and civilian objects contributes to lawful operations, military discipline and operational legitimacy.



Mission 8 - Combat Patrol & Protected Buildings

Operational context

During urban combat, intelligence indicates that enemy fighters are operating from the vicinity of a hospital and may be storing weapons inside the facility. Participants must assess the situation and respond while operating in a protected medical environment.

Core scenario logic

The mission unfolds in two stages. Participants must first determine whether and how to conduct military action against a protected medical facility suspected of being used for hostile purposes. Once the hospital has been secured, they face a second set of decisions concerning the treatment of wounded enemy combatants, medical personnel and sensitive information. Throughout the mission, participants must balance operational objectives with the continued protections afforded under the Law of Armed Conflict.

Key feature of this mission

This mission demonstrates that even where military action against a protected medical facility is justified, important legal protections continue to apply. It reinforces the need to preserve medical care, respect medical neutrality and exercise restraint when dealing with protected persons.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Determining whether the available information justifies military action against a protected medical facility.
- Selecting means and methods that neutralise the threat while minimising damage to the hospital and its medical function.
- Deciding whether medical personnel should continue treating wounded combatants or be separated for questioning.
- Balancing intelligence gathering with the protection of wounded enemy combatants and medical personnel.
- Determining which decisions should be managed at unit level and which should be referred to higher command.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Hospitals retain special protection unless strict legal conditions for loss of protection are met.
- Even where military action is lawful, restraint remains essential to preserve the hospital's medical function.
- Medical care should continue without unnecessary interference.
- Wounded combatants and protected medical personnel continue to benefit from legal protection during military operations.
- Complex legal decisions involving protected persons should be referred to the appropriate level of command.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Hospitals may only be attacked under exceptional circumstances and subject to strict legal conditions.
- Even when military action is justified, operations should minimise damage to the hospital and preserve its medical function as far as possible.
- Persons *hors de combat* must be treated humanely and may only be questioned on a voluntary basis.
- Medical personnel should be allowed to continue their medical duties unless imperative operational requirements make this impossible.
- Respect for medical neutrality contributes to lawful operations, military discipline and operational legitimacy.



Mission 9 - Mines. Demining (Tutorial Mission)

Operational context

Following the recapture of a town, your unit is conducting post-combat clearance operations. Enemy forces have left behind anti-personnel mines, booby traps and unexploded ordnance (UXO). Civilians are expected to return soon, requiring participants to balance operational requirements with the obligation to protect civilians from explosive hazards.

Core scenario logic

This tutorial mission focuses on responsibilities that continue after active hostilities have ended. Participants first decide how to deal with captured enemy mines before determining whether conditions are sufficiently safe for civilians to return. The mission demonstrates that protecting civilians from explosive remnants of war remains an integral part of military operations after active hostilities have ended.

Key feature of this mission

Unlike the previous missions, this scenario focuses on post-conflict responsibilities rather than combat decisions. It highlights the importance of mine clearance, civilian protection and precaution in reducing the long-term humanitarian consequences of armed conflict.

Main dilemmas and decision points

- Deciding whether captured enemy mines should be marked and reported or reused for military purposes.
- Balancing short-term tactical advantage with long-term civilian protection.
- Determining whether civilians can safely return before explosive hazards have been cleared.
- Considering the operational consequences of precautionary decisions after combat has ended.

Key themes emerging across AARs and KLPs

- Captured mines should be marked, reported and disposed of through appropriate procedures rather than reused.
- Protecting civilians from explosive hazards remains an operational responsibility after combat.
- Precaution includes preventing foreseeable civilian harm from mines, booby traps and unexploded ordnance.
- Clearance operations and safe resettlement planning contribute to operational legitimacy and civilian protection.
- Lawful military conduct continues after the fighting has stopped.

Applicable legal and protection considerations

- Parties to a conflict should take all feasible precautions to protect civilians from explosive hazards remaining after hostilities.
- Captured mines should be marked, reported and disposed of through appropriate clearance procedures rather than reused.
- Civilian return should only be supported when the risk posed by explosive hazards has been appropriately assessed and managed.
- Post-conflict protection measures reinforce military professionalism, operational legitimacy and civilian safety.