



Defence Research and
Development Canada

Recherche et développement
pour la défense Canada



Interagency Contact and Training for a Comprehensive Approach to Operations:

*Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-
Military Seminar'*

*Megan M. Thompson
Angela R. Febbraro
Tara Holton*

Defence R&D Canada
Technical Memorandum
DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017
February 2012

Canada

Interagency Contact and Training for a Comprehensive Approach to Operations:

*Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-
Military Seminar'*

Megan M. Thompson
Angela R. Febbraro
Tara Holton

Defence R&D Canada – Toronto

Technical Memorandum
DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017
March 2012

Principal Author

Original signed by Dr. Megan M. Thompson

Dr. Megan M. Thompson

Principal Author

Approved by

Original signed by Keith Stewart

Keith Stewart

Section Head

Approved for release by

Original signed by Dr. Stergios Stergiopoulos

Dr. Stergios Stergiopoulos

Acting Chair, Knowledge and Information Management Committee Acting Chief
Scientist

- © Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2012
- © Sa Majesté la Reine (en droit du Canada), telle que représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2012

Abstract

Interagency training involving both civilian and military actors has been suggested as one important way to mitigate some of the challenges that can hinder the success of Comprehensive Approach (CA) missions. However, such training is complex to plan and execute and expensive in terms of money and time investments by participating agencies. Thus, systematic evaluation efforts are required to determine the effectiveness and areas of improvement in such training and education opportunities. The current research evaluated the effectiveness of the inaugural Civil - Military Seminar, conducted by the Formation Operations Centre of Excellence at the Canadian Army Command and Staff College in Kingston, Ontario. This seminar was designed to bring together military personnel and civilian representatives from various Canadian government departments and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) who are most likely to be called on to work together in a CA context. Results were quite positive: Civilian and military participants found the seminar to be very useful in raising awareness and providing important information concerning organizational mandates and felt that it facilitated networking. Results also indicated that, as a result of the seminar, participants believed that they had changed their impressions of the other groups and that the seminar would affect the way that they interacted with members of the other groups on future operations. Overall, despite the challenges inherent in such training, the data suggest that players in the CA sphere, both military and civilian, should consider this training as important preparation for comprehensive missions.

Résumé

La formation interorganismes rassemblant des acteurs civils et militaires a été présentée comme un instrument de premier plan qui permet d'atténuer certains des défis qui peuvent entraver la réussite des missions d'approche globale (AG). Toutefois, la planification et la dispense d'une telle formation sont complexes, en plus d'être coûteuse en termes d'investissements en temps et en argent pour les organismes qui y participent. Par conséquent, le recours à des méthodes d'évaluation systématique est nécessaire afin de déterminer l'efficacité de cette formation et des activités d'éducation ainsi que les points à améliorer. La présente recherche a évalué l'efficacité du premier Séminaire civilo-militaire organisé par le Centre d'excellence axé sur les opérations de la formation qui s'est tenu au Collège de commandement et d'état-major de l'Armée canadienne à Kingston, en Ontario. Ce séminaire était conçu dans le but de permettre une rencontre entre des membres du personnel militaire et des représentants du personnel civil de différents ministères du gouvernement canadien et d'organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) qui sont les plus susceptibles d'être appelés à travailler ensemble dans le contexte de l'AG. Les résultats ont été très positifs : les participants civils et militaires ont trouvé que le séminaire a permis de sensibiliser davantage les gens sur ce sujet et ils ont pu obtenir des renseignements importants sur les mandats des organisations. De plus, les participants ont eu l'impression que cette activité a facilité le réseautage. Les résultats indiquent aussi qu'à la suite du séminaire, les participants estiment que leur perception des autres groupes a changé et que cela aurait un effet sur leurs façons d'interagir avec eux lors des opérations à venir. De façon générale, malgré les défis propres à une telle activité de formation, les données suggèrent que les intervenants militaires et civils du domaine de l'AG devraient envisager de faire appel à ce type de formation comme outil de préparation de premier plan pour les missions d'approche globale.

Executive summary

Interagency Contact and Training for a Comprehensive Approach to Operations:: Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-Military Seminar'

Thompson, M.M.; Febraro, A.R.; Holton, T.; DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017; Defence R&D Canada – Toronto; March 2012.

Background: A Comprehensive Approach (CA) to operations involves a team comprised of diverse actors, often made up of national and international military and non-military departments and organizations as well as members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who purposefully integrate their activities and efforts under a single mission mandate. CA responses are assumed to provide more immediately effective and longer-term solutions in increasingly complex mission spaces than non-comprehensive or less integrative approaches. Despite the various benefits that are thought to be associated with CA, recent reviews have revealed that there are myriad barriers to effective collaboration in such missions.

Interagency training has been suggested as one important way to mitigate some of the challenges that can hinder the success of CA. Such integrated training has been argued as a key means to build shared awareness and mutual understanding across organizations that work together within a CA. Such training is not the norm, however. Indeed, interagency training is complex to plan and execute, expensive to undertake, and necessarily draws people away from their day-to-day jobs for the duration of the training. Hence, few opportunities for interagency training routinely exist. Just as importantly, these various increased costs associated with interagency training mean that systematic assessment of outcomes related to those training opportunities are required in order to demonstrate their value and to justify the expense, time and high level of commitment by participating agencies. Not surprisingly, few such evaluations currently exist.

The current research sought to undertake such an assessment with the inaugural session of the Civil-Military Seminar held in March 2011. Within the Canadian Forces (CF), the Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Fmn Ops CoE) located in Kingston, Ontario and situated within Land Force Doctrine and Training Systems (LFDTS) collaborated with other government partners or GPs, including the Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy) (ADM (Pol)), the Department of Peacekeeping Policy (DPK Pol), the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), as well as members of the Policy Action Group on Emergency Response (PAGER) such as various NGOs and international organizations (IOs), to establish an opportunity for these groups to interact in a meaningful way. The two-day seminar consisted of a first day of briefings and discussions by representatives from each participating organization. The second day was devoted to a hypothetical crisis response exercise and to backbriefs. All out-of-town participants were offered free rations and quarters and ate and stayed together at the Canadian Army Command and Staff College in Kingston, Ontario.

Results: Our analyses of pre- and post-seminar surveys indicated that the civilians and the military personnel assessments of the Civil-Military Seminar were quite positive, often averaging close to a 4 out of a possible score of 5. Moreover, the response patterns of the civilian and

military participants were largely consistent with each other. In particular, the seminar was deemed to be a great deal of use to both the civilian and military respondents. Results also showed that the seminar served to improve each groups' understanding of the other and to facilitate networking. Thus, the objectives of the Frm Ops CoE for the seminar were accomplished.

The participants, notably the representatives of the civilian agencies, indicated that the seminar had adequately reflected their organizations in terms of planning, procedures, goals and objectives, as well as values, mandates or roles and communication style and terminology, issues which are often a source of conflict in interagency interactions. Moreover, both the civilian and military groups indicated that participation in the seminar had changed the way in which they thought about the other group and believed that the seminar would affect the way that they interacted with other groups in future CA missions. All of these results are quite encouraging in that the seminar was only two days in duration.

Significance: Despite the challenges and expense of interagency training, the current results suggest that players in the CA sphere, including the CF, GPs, NGOs and IOs, should consider this training as important preparation to better ensure mission effectiveness in comprehensive missions.

Sommaire

Interagency Contact and Training for a Comprehensive Approach to Operations:: Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-Military Seminar'

Thompson, M.M.; Febbraro, A.R.; Holton, T. ; DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017 ; R & D pour la défense Canada – Toronto; mars 2012.

Contexte : Une approche globale (AG) aux opérations implique une équipe constituée de différents acteurs venant souvent de ministères et d'organisations nationales et internationales militaires et non militaires ainsi que de membres d'organisations non gouvernementales qui intègrent résolument leurs activités et efforts dans un mandat de mission unique. On présume que les réponses à l'AG offrent des solutions plus efficaces immédiatement et à long terme dans des espaces de mission de plus en plus complexes que ne le font les approches qui ne sont pas globales ou qui sont moins intégratives. Malgré les différents avantages que l'on croit associés à l'AG, des études récentes révèlent qu'il existe de très nombreuses barrières à une collaboration efficace dans ce genre de missions.

La formation interorganismes a été présentée comme un instrument de premier plan qui permet d'atténuer certains des défis qui peuvent entraver la réussite des missions d'AG. On soutient qu'une telle formation intégrée est un outil déterminant qui permet d'établir une connaissance partagée de la situation et une compréhension commune au sein des organisations de ce qui travaille ensemble dans une AG. Une formation de ce genre n'est toutefois pas la norme. En effet, la planification et la dispense d'une telle formation sont complexes, en plus d'être coûteuses à entreprendre. De plus, durant cette période, elle éloigne nécessairement de leurs activités quotidiennes les gens qui y participent. En conséquence, il y a peu de formation interorganismes de ce genre qui se donne couramment (Carafano, 2008). De façon toute aussi importante, les différentes dépenses supplémentaires associées à la formation interorganismes impliquent qu'il est nécessaire de procéder à une évaluation systématique des résultats associés à ces possibilités de formation afin de déterminer leur valeur et de justifier l'investissement en argent et en temps ainsi que l'engagement de haut niveau pour les organisations qui y participent. Comme il fallait s'y attendre, il existe peu d'évaluations de ce genre actuellement.

La présente étude avait pour but de réaliser une telle évaluation de la séance initiale du Séminaire civilo-militaire tenu en mars 2011. Dans les Forces canadiennes (FC), le Centre d'excellence axé sur les opérations de la formation (CE Ops fmn) du Système de la doctrine et de l'instruction de la Force terrestre (SDIFT) a travaillé en collaboration avec d'autres partenaires ou groupes gouvernementaux, y compris celui du Sous-ministre adjoint (Politiques) (SMA(Pol)), le Directeur – Politique du maintien de la paix (D Pol MP), le ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Commerce international (MAECI) et l'Agence canadienne de développement international (ACDI) ainsi qu'avec des membres du Policy Action Group on Emergency Response (PAGER) et de nombreuses organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) et organisations internationales (OI) afin d'offrir à ces groupes la possibilité d'interagir de façon fructueuse. Lors de la première journée de ce séminaire de deux jours, des briefings ont été présentés par des représentants de chaque organisation participante et des discussions ont eu lieu. La deuxième journée a été consacrée à un exercice de simulation d'intervention en situation de crise et à des briefings de

suivi. On a offert les vivres et le logement à tous les participants de l'extérieur de la ville. Ils ont mangé et sont demeurés ensemble au Collège de commandement et d'état-major de l'Armée canadienne à Kingston, en Ontario.

Résultats : Nos analyses des enquêtes menées avant et après le séminaire ont révélé que les évaluations du séminaire civilo-militaire faites par le personnel civil et militaire étaient très positives, les résultats se situant en moyenne près de 4 sur un pointage maximal de 5. De plus, les systèmes de réponses des deux groupes de participants, civils et militaires, étaient très similaires. En particulier, les sujets civils et militaires interrogés ont jugé le séminaire très utile. Les résultats montrent également que le séminaire a permis à chaque groupe d'améliorer sa connaissance de l'autre. Il a aussi été l'occasion de créer de nouveaux réseaux. Par conséquent, les objectifs que s'était fixés le CE Ops fmn pour le séminaire ont été atteints.

Les participants, notamment les représentants des organismes civils, ont indiqué que le séminaire a présenté une image adéquate de leur organisation en termes de planification, de procédures, de buts et d'objectifs ainsi qu'en ce qui concerne leurs valeurs, mandats ou rôles, style de communication et terminologie, des sujets qui souvent sont une source de conflit lors des interactions entre les organisations. De plus, les deux groupes, civil et militaire, ont indiqué que leur participation au séminaire a changé leur façon de voir de l'autre groupe et ils croient que ce séminaire va changer leurs façons d'interagir avec les autres lors de missions d'AG à venir. Tous ces résultats sont très encourageants étant donné que le séminaire ne durait que deux jours.

Portée : Malgré les défis et les dépenses liés à la formation interorganismes, les résultats actuels suggèrent que les intervenants du domaine de l'AG, y compris les FC, les partenaires gouvernementaux, les organismes non gouvernementaux et les organismes internationaux, devraient considérer que cette formation est un instrument de préparation important pour assurer l'efficacité de la mission dans le cadre des missions d'approche globale.

Table of contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Abstract | i |
| Résumé | ii |
| Executive summary | iii |
| Sommaire | v |
| Table of contents | vii |
| List of tables | viii |
| Acknowledgements | ix |
| 1 Introduction..... | 11 |
| 1.1 Background | 11 |
| 1.1.1 The Comprehensive Approach (CA) to Operations..... | 11 |
| 1.1.2 Interagency Training: The Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Fmn Ops CoE) Civil-Military Seminar..... | 13 |
| 1.1.3 Research Objectives..... | 14 |
| 2 Method..... | 15 |
| 2.1 Participants | 15 |
| 2.2 Measures..... | 15 |
| 2.2.1 Pre-Seminar Questionnaire..... | 15 |
| 2.2.2 Post-Seminar Questionnaire | 16 |
| 2.3 Procedure..... | 16 |
| 3 Results..... | 17 |
| 3.1 Overview | 17 |
| 3.2 Demographics..... | 17 |
| 3.3 Pre-Seminar Questionnaire Results | 17 |
| 3.3.1 Reasons for Attending the Seminar | 17 |
| 3.3.2 Seminar Preparation..... | 18 |
| 3.3.3 Definitions of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations..... | 18 |
| 3.4 Post-Seminar Questionnaire Results | 19 |
| 3.4.1 Seminar Evaluation Items..... | 19 |
| 3.4.2 Relationship Quality | 20 |
| 3.4.3 Perceptions related to the Comprehensive Approach to Operations | 21 |
| 3.4.4 General Comments | 22 |
| 4 Discussion..... | 25 |
| 4.1 Conclusion..... | 26 |
| References | 27 |
| Annex A Civil-Military Seminar Questionnaire..... | 30 |
| List of acronyms..... | 37 |

List of tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Number of Prior Overseas Deployments for Military and Civilian Respondent Groups | 15 |
| Table 2: Descriptives and Group Differences for Rationales for Attending the Civil-Military Seminar by Civilian and Military Group..... | 18 |
| Table 3: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Seminar Evaluation Items by Civilian and Military Groups | 20 |
| Table 4: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Relational Items by Civilian and Military Groups | 21 |
| Table 5: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Comprehensive Approach Items by Civilian and Military Groups | 22 |

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the great support of Mr. Steve Fritz-Millett, Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Kingston, Ontario), Seminar Designer and activity leader, who facilitated data collection in the seminar and provided comments on this manuscript. We also owe our thanks to Mrs. Tonya Stokes-Hendriks, who conducted data analyses, and to all participants in the inaugural Civil-Military Seminar for their time and thoughtful answers.

This page intentionally left blank.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The Comprehensive Approach (CA) to Operations

The recent Canadian Forces Joint Publication – Operations (CFJP – Operations, 2010) defines a Comprehensive Approach (CA) to operations as:

The application of commonly understood principles and collaborative processes that enhance the likelihood of favourable and enduring outcomes within a particular situation. The comprehensive approach brings together all the elements of power and other agencies needed to create enduring solutions to a campaign. These may include: military (joint and multinational forces), Canadian government departments and agencies (whole of government), foreign governments and international organizations (e.g. NATO and UN), and publicly funded organizations (e.g. NGOs).

B-GJ-005-300/FP-001 Canadian Forces Joint Publication – Operations, GL-3.

A CA involves a team comprised of diverse actors, often made up of national and international military and non-military departments and organizations as well as members of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who purposefully integrate their activities and efforts under a single mission mandate (Thompson & Gill, 2010; see also, Leslie, Gizewski, & Rostek 2008; Olson & Gregorian, 2007; Patrick & Brown, 2007). The expectation is that, working together, this diverse set of players will provide an overarching capacity through their respective specific skills and resources. Thus, unity of effort, or in other words, “the coordination and cooperation among all participants in the AOR [Area of Operations] toward a commonly recognized political objective, even if they are not necessarily part of the same command structure” (CFJP – Operations, 1-3) is fundamental, even though the traditional military unity of command¹ will be unlikely in CA missions.

The reason that a CA is adopted is simple: it is assumed to be “an essential tool in achieving the desired end state” (CFJP – Operations, 8-2). The various benefits accrued from a CA include increased situational awareness by all players in a complex operational space, proactive sharing of accurate and timely information, and the elimination of a duplication of effort or worse -- working at cross-purposes (Spence, 2002; Van der Kloet, 2006; Wentz, 2006). Each of these benefits is expected to contribute to the ultimate outcome of more immediately effective, as well as more enduring solutions to complex missions, than is possible with a non-comprehensive or less integrated approach. Another benefit is a better understanding of those entities that won't work with other CA partners, or that may even work against CA objectives. Increased understanding of them allows CA partners to develop avoidance and mitigation strategies that are also part of what broadly constitutes the CA.

¹ Unity of command occurs when the power and authority to plan and execute activities resides with one commander.

In reality, however; many barriers to effective collaboration in the CA context exist. Some organizations within the CA team will have conflicting political agendas, or at least incompatible objectives. At least some NGOs will explicitly resist the idea of collaboration with, or in some cases even contact with, military forces, citing both philosophical (e.g., violations of the NGO principles of impartiality, neutrality, and independence; see McHarg & Coppock, 2011, for a cogent and concise discussion of this position) and safety concerns (McHarg & Coppock, 2011, see also Holton et al., 2011; Neuhaus, 2008). Indeed, a strong and consistent theme in the literature is the increasing concern about the militarization of humanitarian missions (Meharg, 2007; Olson, 2006, Tamas, 2009).

More prosaic issues also undermine collaboration: disparate organizational structures (e.g., hierarchical and centralized vs. flat and decentralized) exist, which affect underlying organizational culture and the flow of information in terms of planning and decision making. Incompatible knowledge management and communication and financial systems, and indeed differences in language and communication styles, can also be a significant impediment to collaboration. Personnel turnover and few formal lessons-learned mechanisms mean little or no corporate memory about best practices (Olson & Gregorian 2007, p. 13; see also de Coning, 2008; Fritz-Millett, 2010; Morcos, 2005; Patrick & Brown, 2007; Spence, 2002; Stephenson & Schnitzer, 2006; Winslow, 2002). The factors above also can readily contribute to the development and maintenance of stereotypes, which in the absence of positive opportunities for interaction can continue to undermine effective collaboration (Thompson, Febbraro, & Blais, 2011).

Interagency training has been suggested as one important way to mitigate some of the challenges that can hinder the success of CA (see Jenny 2001; Leslie Gizewski, & Rostek, 2008; Spence, 2002; UK Comprehensive Approach, Joint Discussion Note, 2006; US Marine COIN Manual, 2006).

Training should be thought of as one of the most important factors for the success of future [interagency] actions. ... Indeed, training is arguably the best way to foster understanding ... As such it significantly helps in bridging the culture gap and in fostering mutual respect. This in turn facilitates a clear division of labour and helps create channels of communication which will prove of great help should any possible misunderstanding arise during the mission. (Jenny, 2001, p. 31)

As promising a solution as interagency training is, it is also complex to plan and to execute, expensive to undertake, and necessarily draws people away from their day-to-day jobs for the duration of the training. Hence, few opportunities for interagency training routinely exist (Carafano, 2008). Just as importantly, these various increased costs associated with interagency training mean that systematic assessment of outcomes related to those training opportunities are required in order to demonstrate their value and to justify the expense, time and high level of commitment by participating agencies. However, relatively few such evaluations currently exist.

Our past research has started to investigate the issue of the effectiveness of interagency training, specifically by exploring the perceptions of members of Government Partners (GPs)² regarding the effectiveness of a large-scale training exercise, EXERCISE MAPLE GUARDIAN, conducted for the Canadian CA mission in Afghanistan. Results of that study suggested that some of the greatest benefits of the experience included the chance to learn more about the roles and responsibilities and mandates of the other departments as well as a chance to meet and interact with members of other departments that would be on the same CA team in the upcoming deployment (Thompson, Febraro & Blais, 2011). The current research continues this line of inquiry in the context of the inaugural Civil-Military Seminar developed by the Canadian Army's Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Frm Ops CoE), located in Kingston, Ontario.

1.1.2 Interagency Training: The Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Fmn Ops CoE) Civil-Military Seminar

The Formation Operations Centre of Excellence (Fmn Ops CoE) within Land Force Doctrine and Training Systems (LFDTS) has worked collaboratively with GPs in support of the whole-of-government (WoG) mission in Afghanistan and contributed to interagency training through such initiatives as the Formations Operations Centre of Excellence run Operational Planning Process and Counterinsurgency Workshop for Government of Canada Civilians. Over 80 civilian personnel from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canadian International Development Agency, Correctional Service Canada, Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Department of National Defence (DND) participated in the five serials of this workshop that were conducted in the 2008 - 2010 timeframe. Following the WoG effort in Afghanistan, there was a desire to continue the excellent interagency training that had been developed. The Formation Operations Centre of Excellence therefore engaged organizations such as Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy) (ADM (Pol)), the Department of Peacekeeping Policy (DPK Pol), the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), as well as the Policy Action Group on Emergency Response (PAGER)³ to establish an opportunity for these groups to interact in a meaningful way. One of the first results of these discussions was the development of a Civil-Military Seminar, the goal of which, at a minimum, was to provide a semi-structured forum that would lead to increased understanding and facilitate professional networks. To this end, and based on discussion with WoG and PAGER member organizations, the seminar was structured as a two-day activity. The first day consisted of overview briefs by representatives of all attending organizations. The second morning was devoted to a seminar exercise that involved the application of a CA to operations. In order to make the seminar financially feasible to civilian organizations (both governmental and non-governmental) who wished to send attendees, rations and quarters for the two days were provided free of charge at Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Kingston. All out-of-town participants stayed in quarters at CFB Kingston and had meals

² Although commonly referred to as Other Government Departments (OGDs), at least some members of this group have indicated a preference for the term Government Partners (GPs) which reflects a more equal status to the military within WoG missions.

³ PAGER is an informal, flexible and responsive forum of operational Canadian humanitarian agencies whose mandate involves responding to humanitarian emergencies worldwide. Its membership includes representatives from NGOs, international organizations (IOs), CIDA and DFAIT. PAGER was created to fill a perceived gap between operational realities and policy making, and to promote greater information sharing and co-ordination between agencies concerned with humanitarian action. PAGER is the only forum to provide this interface in Canada.

together, an approach which was designed to promote informal interaction and discussions outside of the formal seminar itself.

1.1.3 Research Objectives

As this activity represented the inaugural session of this seminar, there was a desire by the Frm Ops CoE to assess various aspects of civilian participants' and Canadian Forces (CF) members' perceptions of the effectiveness of the Civil-Military Seminar pilot project. This goal was consistent with the research objective of the Organizational Behavior Group at Defence Research and Development (DRDC) Toronto to understand the impact of integrated training opportunities on preparation for comprehensive missions, currently an empirical gap in the CA literature.

The specific questions asked were developed in collaboration with Mr. Steve Fritz-Millett, Frm Ops CoE, who designed and coordinated the seminar. Keeping in mind the requirement to be as brief as possible, we limited the scope of our questions to those of most interest to Frm Ops CoE. Accordingly, we wished to determine the average number of prior overseas deployments and the average level of prior contact that civilian participants had had with CF personnel and vice versa, as well as pre-seminar familiarity with the term "Comprehensive Approach to Operations." Although not always the case, the intergroup contact literature suggests that a higher degree of contact between diverse groups is usually (although importantly not always) associated with more positive attitudes (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000) as well as more effective intergroup relations (i.e., lower levels of conflict and competition) under certain conditions (Richter, West, Van Dick, & Dawson, 2006).

We also assessed participants' reasons for attending the seminar, noting that the motivation literature predicts that internal motivations, such as a desire to learn more about other organizations, are associated to a greater degree with a range of positive learning outcomes than are external motivations, at least those related to external control (see Ryan & Deci, 2000), such as being tasked, being "voluntold," or attending based on a supervisor's instructions or orders. The course designer also wished to determine the degree to which providing rations and quarters at no charge to civilians figured into the decision to attend the seminar.

In addition, we sought to determine perceptions of the training effectiveness of the Civil-Military Seminar from the perspectives of the GP participants. Finally, we collected their thoughts as to measures that might improve the Civil-Military Seminar training experience from their point of view. Beyond documenting the average responses across all respondents, we also sought to determine if the civilian or military groups would differ in their ratings of the training in any systematic way.

2 Method

2.1 Participants

Thirty individuals (10 civilian representatives: 7 NGO, 3 GP; 20 CF members) voluntarily completed the Pre-Seminar Questionnaire⁴. Their ages ranged from 28-54 years with a mean age of 41.4 years. The majority of attendees were male (24 males and 5 females)⁵. Most participants had previously deployed overseas, with only 1 person having no previous tours, 6 having 1 previous tour, 4 having two prior tours and 15 respondents having 3 or more prior overseas tours⁶. The military group was about equally dispersed over a number of prior tours, while the greatest number of civilians had 3 or more previous tours (see *Table 1*). There was no significant group difference in terms of the number of prior deployments. Three military personnel reported having previously worked for a civilian GP/NGO/IO agency,⁷ whereas none of the civilians had previously worked for the military.

Table 1: Number of Prior Overseas Deployments for Military and Civilian Respondent Groups.

| Number of prior deployments | Military N= 20 | | Civilian N=10 | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---------|---------------|---------|
| | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| 1 | 6 | 30 | 1 | 10 |
| 2 | 5 | 25 | 1 | 10 |
| 3 | 7 | 35 | 7 | 70 |
| Missing | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

2.2 Measures

2.2.1 Pre-Seminar Questionnaire

The Pre-Seminar Questionnaire began with demographic items including age, gender, previous overseas deployment experience, and familiarity with the term “Comprehensive Approach to Operations.” We also asked about reasons for taking the seminar (My supervisor instructed me to; I want to learn more about the other organizations; Rations and Quarters were provided free of charge; Other) and the degree to which the person felt adequately prepared to take the seminar. All quantitative questions used a 5-point scale: 1 = not at all/none; 2 = a little; 3 = some/somewhat; 4 = a great deal; 5 = completely.

Open-ended questions included a request to provide a definition of the comprehensive approach to operations, a space for people to indicate other reasons that they were taking the seminar, what

⁴ Twenty-five individuals (10 civilians, 15 military personnel) completed the post-seminar questionnaire.

⁵ One participant did not provide gender information.

⁶ Note that military and GP, NGO tour lengths can vary substantively from between months to over 1 year.

⁷ One had worked with an NGO, 1 had worked with a GP, and 1 had worked with both an NGO and GP.

they found to be useful preparation for the course, and what else they would have found useful as preparation (see **Annex A**).

2.2.2 Post-Seminar Questionnaire

The Post-Seminar Questionnaire included items tapping the degree to which the seminar had provided adequate information concerning NGOs, the CF and GPs, whether or not the person's organization was engaged in the planning process for this seminar, whether or not the seminar adequately reflected the input of the person's home organization, and whether or not the seminar as a whole and the hypothetical scenario exercise specifically were useful experiences. We also assessed the degree to which people felt that their home organization's approach to planning, procedures, goals and objectives, values, mandates or roles, and communication style and terminology had been taken into account in developing and running the seminar. Questions also assessed the degree to which respondents felt that the format of the seminar, range and type of participants, and the venue selected for the seminar were appropriate. The latter question was posed specifically as the seminar was being held in a military venue and there was some concern that civilian attendees might prefer an organization-neutral venue (see Holton et al., 2011). A final set of questions focused more on the relationships and interpersonal aspects of the course such as the degree to which participants felt that their relationship with members of the other group had changed as a result of taking the seminar, how the seminar affected how people would interact with members of the other group in the future, whether or not their perception of the other group had changed as a result of taking the seminar, and the degree to which the seminar had facilitated their professional networks with the other groups in attendance at the seminar. As was the case with the Pre-Seminar Questionnaire, spaces were left at several points so that participants could expand upon their answers if they so chose (see **Annex A**).

2.3 Procedure

The three authors attended the Civil-Military Seminar. On the first day and prior to the beginning of any course briefings, a research team member provided a short overview to all seminar attendees on the objectives and approach of the study. It was made clear that participation in the study was voluntary and that individuals could end their participation at any time and skip any question that they preferred not to answer. The Pre-Seminar Questionnaire was completed by interested participants at this time and handed back to a research team member prior to the beginning of the seminar.

The Post-Seminar Questionnaire was completed after the seminar, following completion of the seminar exercise on Day 2, but before any post-seminar debriefing or wrap-up occurred, in order to obtain each individual's thoughts and perceptions on the seminar prior to any group discussion of the seminar. Participants were given approximately 10 minutes to complete the Post-Seminar Questionnaire and were asked to hand back their questionnaire to a research team member when completed. Questionnaires were kept anonymous and the pre- and post-seminar data for each participant were linked via a participant-generated identification code. The questionnaires and study procedures were reviewed and approved by the DRDC Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

3 Results

3.1 Overview

As this was the inaugural Civil-Military Seminar, this research is essentially exploratory in nature. Therefore, although we opted to use a standard probability level for statistical significance of .05, at this point, we chose not to statistically control for the number of analyses conducted, and occasionally discuss findings of note that are marginally significant. Also, due to the small total number of participants, few group-level analyses beyond civilian versus military groups could be validly undertaken.

3.2 Demographics

While an overview of key demographic findings were presented previously in the Participants section (**Section 2.1**), we also sought to determine whether or not the civil and military groups differed by any relevant demographic variables. Additional analyses revealed that the civilian and military groups were not significantly different in terms of their age, or number of prior overseas deployments. However, the military group did indicate a higher (self-reported) degree of familiarity with the term “Comprehensive Approach to Operations” than did the civilian group (i.e., means of 4.21 for the military vs. 2.6 for the civilians), $t(19) = 3.41, p = .002$.

3.3 Pre-Seminar Questionnaire Results

3.3.1 Reasons for Attending the Seminar

We asked participants about their motivations for taking the course, seeking to determine which motivations were dominant and whether or not military and civilian groups would differ on their reasons for attending the seminar. As *Table 2* demonstrates, a desire to learn more about the other organization was rated as the chief rationale for taking the course, with an average score of over 4 out of a possible score of 5, suggesting a high positive intrinsic motivation for attendance, rather than an extrinsic motivation reflected in the item “my supervisor instructed me to”, which received an average rating of 2.5 across groups (i.e., “a little”). As the results also show, the provision of free rations and quarters during the seminar was not rated as a key reason for attending the seminar (with an overall mean score of 2.19, or “a little” for this item). There were no statistically significant group differences in any of these rationales for taking the seminar.

Table 2: Descriptives and Group Differences for Rationales for Attending the Civil-Military Seminar by Civilian and Military Group

| Reason | Mean (SD) CF | Mean (SD) Civilian | <i>t</i> | df | <i>p</i> | N CF | N Civilian |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|----|----------|---------|---------------|
| Supervisor instructed me to | 2.29 (1.61) | 2.88 (1.55) | 0.85 | 23 | ns | 17 | 8 |
| Learn about the other organizations | 4.44 (0.62) | 4.50 (0.76) | -0.20 | 24 | ns | 18 | 8 |
| Rations and Quarters were free | 2.19 (1.83) | 1.43 (0.79) | 1.04 | 21 | ns | 16 | 7 |

A few open-ended responses were provided under the ‘Other’ category associated with this item. Each of these responses indicated essentially a desire to learn more about other organizations and to use the seminar as an opportunity to network.

3.3.2 Seminar Preparation

We also sought to determine whether or not the civilian and military groups would differ on the extent to which they felt prepared to participate in the seminar. Moreover, there was some pre-seminar information and reading that was sent to attendees concerning the seminar and we wanted to determine if the participants considered this material to be adequate preparation. Results of t-tests revealed that the military participants reported feeling significantly more prepared to take the course (i.e., “a great deal”) than did civilian participants (“somewhat”) ($t(23) = 2.93, p = .008$).

Comments associated with this item indicated that additional pre-seminar information would have been helpful, especially an overview of the other organizations that would be in attendance (although at least one civilian indicated that (s)he had not had time to read the information package that had been sent out).

3.3.3 Definitions of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

Nine of the 10 civilian respondents provided definitions of CA. Of these, 3 responses included the key aspects of CA, as reflected in these examples:

“An approach to natural disasters and complex emergencies where all relevant gov’t departments are working in a coordinated manner, trying to accomplish the same overarching objectives.”

“An approach to operations that takes into account all the players and areas that come into play, ensuring that all work together in an effective & coordinated way.”

One of the non-governmental civilian respondents indicated that (s)he was “Not at all familiar [with CA], as I am outside the government. Hope to learn more during this seminar”.

All of the military provided some definition of CA. Most of these were quite similar to the official CF definition:

“The application of commonly understood principles and collaborative processes that enhance the likelihood of favourable and enduring outcomes within a particular environment.”

“Marshalling all elements of national power towards a common goal or mission.”

“An approach to the conduct of operations which integrates all elements of national power (Diplomacy, military, economic etc. and other actors from civil society.”

A few of the definitions provided by the military participants also included other important aspects of the underlying intent or spirit of CA as well:

“Taking all of the factors of each organization and developing a shared understanding of the situation, capability that each brings, common objectives and end states, and developing a plan to achieve the mission &/or campaign ... i.e., a collaborative approach.”

“The interaction and cooperation/working together of OGDs and NGOs in order to meet the needs of the affected population while meeting the needs and mandates of the contributing organizations.”

“A concept that understands that complex problems require a complex solution in which each actor’s actions affects or reinforce the global resolution of the issues over a mid to long term time frame.”

3.4 Post-Seminar Questionnaire Results

3.4.1 Seminar Evaluation Items

The first set of items in the Post-Seminar Questionnaire addressed specific course evaluation-related issues. Results of analyses of these questions, presented in *Table 3*, revealed only two significant group differences between civilian and military groups on these items. That is, both military and civilian groups indicated that they felt that their home organizations had been “somewhat” involved in the planning process of the seminar and that the seminar had adequately reflected input of their organizations. Both civilian and military groups reported essentially equal levels of the degree to which their respective organizations’ approach to planning, procedures, goals and objectives, values, mandates or roles were taken into account in the seminar. Similarly, there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of their ratings of the usefulness of the seminar, the appropriateness of the range and type of participants, and the appropriateness of the venue used for the seminar. Indeed, mean scores for each of the items were all above the scale mid-point for both groups, and often close to a score of 4 out of a possible 5, indicating strong positive endorsement of these aspects of the seminar. Two significant differences on this group of items did emerge, however. Regarding two questions that addressed

the extent to which the seminar 1) took into account the communication style and terminology of the respondent's home organization, and 2) took into account the appropriateness of the format of the seminar, civilian participants' ratings were significantly lower than those of the military group (in bold in *Table 3*). Civilian scores on these questions were above the mid-point of the scale, close to "somewhat", while military groups' ratings were at or close "to a great extent."

Table 3: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Seminar Evaluation Items by Civilian and Military Groups

| Item | Mean (SD) CF | Mean (SD) Civilian | <i>t</i> | df | <i>p</i> | N CF | N Civilian |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------|---------------|
| Do you feel that your organization was engaged in the planning process for this seminar? | 2.80 (1.52) | 2.90 (.99) | -0.18 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| Do you feel that this seminar adequately reflected the input of your organization? | 3.53 (1.13) | 3.50 (.97) | 0.077 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| Do you feel that the seminar took into account your organizations approach to | | | | | | | |
| ... planning | 3.60 (1.06) | 3.30 (1.06) | 0.70 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| ... procedures | 3.73 (1.03) | 3.40 (.97) | 0.81 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| ... goals and objectives | 3.87 (.83) | 3.90 (.99) | -0.09 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| ... values | 3.93 (.88) | 3.40 (1.17) | 1.30 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| ... mandates or roles | 3.93 (.80) | 3.40 (.70) | 1.72 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| ... communication style/terminology | 3.93 (.70) | 3.10 (.99) | 2.46 | 23 | 0.02 | 15 | 10 |
| Was this seminar a useful experience? | 4.13 (.74) | 4.20 (.63) | -0.23 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| Was the format appropriate? | 4.00 (.39) | 3.60 (.52) | 2.16 | 22 | 0.04 | 14 | 10 |
| Were the range/type of participants appropriate | 4.00 (.76) | 3.90 (.74) | 0.33 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| Usefulness of scenario exercise | 3.33 (.72) | 3.40 (.70) | -0.23 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |
| Appropriateness of training venue | 4.07 (.80) | 4.30 (.82) | -0.71 | 23 | ns | 15 | 10 |

3.4.2 Relationship Quality

Five additional items assessed the extent to which respondents believed that participation in the seminar will affect aspects of their current and future relationships with members of the other group. For example, the military participants made their assessments concerning the extent to which the seminar provided adequate information about civilian organizations, and civilian participants provided their assessments concerning the military on the same dimensions. As *Table 4* shows, military and civilian respondents indicated that the seminar had provided enough information concerning the other group. Further, all respondents felt that the seminar had positively influenced several relational dimensions, including contributing to an understanding of the other group, changing their relationship with the other group, and in terms of facilitating their professional network with members of the other group. Group averages for each of these items were above the mid-point and with one exception were close to indicating that the seminar positively affected each of these dimensions "to a great extent." Moreover, there were no

significant differences in the degree to which the two groups endorsed these dimensions. Two items (whether participation in the seminar will change future interactions with members of the other group, and whether perceptions of members of the other group had changed as a result of the seminar) also yielded largely positive responses from all participants, yet also yielded significant group differences (in bold in *Table 4*). In these cases, civilians reported that the seminar had more of an influence on their perceptions of the military, and that the seminar was more likely to affect their future interactions with the military, than military members reported with respect to civilians.

Table 4: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Relational Items by Civilian and Military Groups

| Item | Mean (<i>SD</i>) CF | Mean (<i>SD</i>) Civilian | <i>t</i> | df | <i>p</i> | N CF | N Civilian |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|---------|---------------|
| Did the seminar provide enough information about the other group? | 3.61 (.86) | 3.75 (.71) | -0.40 | 20 | ns | 14 | 8 |
| Did this seminar increase your understanding of _____ ? | 3.93 (.90) | 4.00 (.50) | -0.20 | 22 | ns | 15 | 9 |
| Has your relationship with _____ changed as a result of this seminar? | 3.07 (1.43) | 3.56 (1.13) | -0.88 | 22 | ns | 15 | 9 |
| Has this seminar helped to facilitate your professional network with _____ ? | 3.87 (1.06) | 4.00 (.71) | -0.33 | 22 | ns | 15 | 9 |
| Will this seminar affect how you interact with _____ on future deployments? | 3.04 (1.34) | 4.13 (.84) | -2.03 | 18 | .06 | 12 | 8 |
| Has your perception of _____ changed as a result of this seminar? | 2.82 (1.04) | 3.60 (.70) | -2.04 | 22 | .05 | 14 | 10 |

3.4.3 Perceptions related to the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

Table 4 presents the results of the quantitative responses to two questions related more specifically to the Comprehensive Approach to Operations. The first asked about the degree to which respondents' perception of the concept of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations had changed as a result of the seminar. The second question asked about the degree to which participants felt that the seminar had contributed to their understanding of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations. Results, presented below, show that military and civilian groups both indicated that the seminar had changed their perception of CA, and had contributed to their understanding of CA to some extent. There were no significant group differences on either of these questions.

Table 5: Descriptives and Group Differences for Self-Reports on Comprehensive Approach Items by Civilian and Military Groups

| Item | Mean (SD) CF | Mean (SD) Civilian | <i>t</i> | df | <i>p</i> | N CF | N Civilian |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|----|----------|---------|---------------|
| Has your perception of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations changed as a result of this seminar? | 2.78 (1.09) | 3.14 (.90) | -0.71 | 14 | ns | 9 | 7 |
| Did this seminar contribute to your understanding of the Comprehensive Approach to Operations? | 2.89 (.93) | 3.33 (.82) | -0.95 | 13 | ns | 9 | 6 |

3.4.4 General Comments

Nine of the civilian participants provided additional comments that were entirely consistent with the numerical data, and underscored the value and utility of this training.

“I really enjoyed the seminar. It was well organized, the participants were very knowledgeable and engaged and the facilities are good; Very good mix of discussions, presentations, & simulation.”

“Grateful for the invitation. Let’s maximize the opportunities for constructive engagement.”

“Hopefully this is the beginning of ongoing collaboration/discussion/training. Other staff of PAGER & DND need to build on this understanding (other sessions required).”

“Thank-you! Looking forward to building on this first contact to get more into the details of how we operate on the ground and practically improve our coordination.”

“useful introduction to CIMIC [Civil-Military Cooperation]; to relevant terminology; useful to understand CF’s best intentions.”

As enthusiastic as they were concerning the benefits of the seminar, the civilians also provided constructive suggestions for ways to improve future iterations of the seminar:

“From an NGO perspective, my main request is that we be given more involvement in the planning process and more lead time regarding the timing and objectives of the seminar. I would highly recommend that we do these seminars on a periodic basis and look for other ways to train and dialogue with each other.”

“the syndicate discussions may have benefitted from a format that kept people

more active and engaged, making a space for all to play a role and make a contribution.” (Syndicate 2)⁸

“the participation was generally appropriate, however would have been useful to have more CF who had deployed with DART [Disaster Assistance Response Team]. Also could have been a better balance btwn CF and other orgs.”

“good to have more NGOs – Red Cross especially...”

“need to balance presentations, questions, discussions (btwn DND and PAGER members and btwn blocks of time allowing time for questions; put civilians in charge of some discussion groups/topics)”.

“additional knowledge of who’s who in the CF regarding disaster relief.”

Eleven of the CF participants provided additional comments that were also consistent with the numerical data, and further underscored the value and utility of this training from their perspective.

“The seminar was great. It gave insight into how OGDs and NGOs work, plan and coordinate. It was a good way to network for future relationships for training purposes.”

“Very useful ref. NGO interaction.”

“Absolutely should be more (seminars) because it allowed all agencies to interact and understand how they react. Training value was very good.”

“Provided an excellent venue to exchange ideas and foster understanding.”

“I have a far better appreciation of how NGOs work.”

“Excellent reps from respective organizations, right mix of mil/civ.”

“Good opportunity to network.”

“It was the first time that I had so much info from NGO speakers. It was great-very informative.”

Several suggestions for future seminars were also offered by the CF participants:

“More NGOs would be better, and maybe less military as I think we overwhelmed them a few times.”

⁸ On Day 2 of the seminar, participants were divided into two syndicate groups for scenario work. While both syndicates were provided with the same scenario and questions to work through, Syndicate 1 focused on working the scenario based on their real-world roles, while Syndicate 2 focused more on having all participants answer the questions, rather than working through the scenario itself.

“It was good for people that are new in the field...more experienced people could have done with a side bar...”

“The second day was not really suited to all players and had minimal relevance to comprehensive approach.” (Syndicate 1)

“A simulation of a more complex emergency would have been more challenging and would have revealed more differences between the military and civilian spheres.”

“Would have been nice to have some UN [United Nations] groups here such as a cluster lead (UNDP [United Nations Development Programme], UNHCR [United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees]).”

“Good conference, [syndicate] back brief not required, just talk, talk, talk.”

“Important that progress is made, i.e. lessons learned, combined training exercises.”

4 Discussion

The results of these analyses suggest that the civilian and military assessments of the Civil-Military Seminar were quite positive, often averaging close to a 4 out of a possible score of 5. Moreover, the response patterns of the civilian and military participants were largely consistent with each other. In particular, the seminar was deemed to be a great deal of use to both the civilian and military respondents. Results also showed that the seminar served to increase each groups' understanding of the other and to facilitate networking. Thus the Formation Operations Center of Excellence objectives of the seminar were accomplished.

Further, the participants, notably the representatives of the civilian agencies, indicated that the seminar had adequately reflected their organizations in terms of planning, procedures, goals and objectives as well as values, mandates or roles and communication style and terminology. Respondents, including members of civilian organizations, rated the military location as an appropriate training venue. This was a useful finding in that there had been a potential concern that the use of a military establishment would be seen as an attempt at the militarization of the seminar and so be rated as a less effective activity for civilians (see Holton et al., 2011). These results show this was not the case for these civilians. Moreover, respondents indicated the range and type of participants to be quite appropriate for this type of activity, although they encouraged an even greater variety of participants from the GP and NGO world, and one military participant advocated for more equal numbers of civilians and military attendees. All of these results are quite positive, especially as the above are issues that members of civilian organizations often identify as friction points in their interactions with military personnel (e.g., Holton et al., 2011; Ball & Febbraro, 2011).

Civilians also reported that their perceptions of military personnel were changed somewhat by the seminar experience. Military members similarly reported that their perceptions of civilians had been changed somewhat by participation in the seminar. Both groups indicated that they believed that their participation in the seminar would have an effect on their interactions with members of the other group on future deployments, and this was particularly true for the civilian group. This result is perhaps particularly positive in that these changes in perceptions occurred with only two days of interaction.⁹

Civilian participants also indicated that the seminar had contributed somewhat to their understanding of the CA concept. This is encouraging in that there was only one overview presentation that was specifically directed toward CA. That the average score for the military group was somewhat lower than the civilian average for this particular item is not surprising given that these military personnel indicated a greater understanding of CA on the pre-seminar survey, relative to the civilian group. Thus, the overview of CA presented as part of the seminar would not have provided much new information to military participants.

It is also of note that, among those participants who completed the questionnaire, the primary reason reported for seminar attendance was a desire to learn more about the other groups working

⁹ Although the answer to the attitude change item did not specify whether the change in perception was positive or negative, given that the responses to other questions were quite positive, it is reasonable to assume that the perception of the other group also changed in a positive direction.

within the CA context. This makes sense as the seminar attendees (and those who completed the questionnaires) were all volunteers. The motivational literature would suggest that wanting to learn more about the other groups would be associated with more positive training outcomes. Indeed, the ratings pertaining to the seminar's usefulness, the facilitation of professional networks, the effects on future interactions and the call for future seminars all attest to this being the case.

Some seminar feedback provided suggestions for improvement in future seminars. This feedback included civilian interest in greater inclusion in the planning process for future seminars: this item received somewhat lower average scores from both the civilian and the military groups. The specifics of the scenario exercise were also rated somewhat lower than other items in the survey. Again, this is not surprising given that this was the first iteration of the seminar as a whole. This feedback has already been incorporated into the development of the next iteration of the course generally and the scenario more specifically.

Of course, the current results only speak to individuals' *perceptions* of greater understanding of others' roles, mandates and constraints and their *predictions* concerning their future interactions with other groups within a CA mission. The tight timings inherent in the current seminar design did not allow for the objective assessment of increased knowledge, nor was there an assessment of actual increased coordination during the exercise. As well, the current research design did not allow for assessment of the longer-term effects of participation in the seminar. Ideally, we would like to incorporate more objective assessments of collaboration within the seminar exercise itself, and/or follow-up with these participants either in future scenario-based training, or during a deployment in a CA mission. Nonetheless, these are certainly encouraging preliminary results in this regard.

4.1 Conclusion

Despite the challenges and expense inherent in designing a course of this nature and the fact that this was the inaugural iteration of the seminar, these results suggest that joint information sharing and training activities such as the Civil-Military Seminar can serve important functions related to CA collaboration. For instance, activities such as this exercise work to increase an awareness of the objectives, goals and mandates of the various groups that will likely interact in a future crisis. This conclusion is underscored by the fact that the findings from the current study are entirely consistent with those provided by participants in our earlier research conducted within the context of EXERCISE MAPLE GUARDIAN (Thompson, Febraro, & Blais, 2011), who also reported that gaining knowledge of the other players' roles and responsibilities were among the greatest benefits of participation in the exercise, along with meeting the people from other departments that they would be interacting with on their future mission. Thus, despite the challenges of such training, the data suggest that players in the CA sphere, including the CF, GPs, NGOs and IOs, should consider this training as important preparation to better ensure mission effectiveness in comprehensive missions.

References

1. Ball, L. C., & Febraro, A. R. (2010). Discovering effective civil – military cooperation: Insights from the NGO – CF relationship. In M. Rostek & P. Gizewski (Eds.), *Security operations in the 21st century: Canadian perspectives on the comprehensive approach* (pp. 25-34). Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: Queen's Policy Study Series, McGill-Queen's University Press.
2. Carafano, J. J. (2008). Managing Mayhem: The Future of Interagency. <http://www.heritage.org/Press/Commentary/ed030308b.cfm>.
3. de Coning, C. (2008). The United Nations and the Comprehensive Approach. *DIIS Report 2008*, 14, Copenhagen, Denmark: Danish Institute for International Studies.
4. B-GJ-005-300/FP-001 Canadian Forces Joint Publication – Operations. (2010). Joint Doctrine Branch, Canadian Forces Experimentation Centre, Department of National Defence.
5. Canadian Forces Joint Publication – Operations. Available from www.cfd.forces.gc.ca/.../CFJP_3_0_Ops_Updated_EN_2011_09.
6. Fritz-Millett, S. (July, 2010) Ad hoc WoG Investing in Canada's whole-of-government approach. *Vanguard*. Available from <http://www.vanguardcanada.com/AdHocWoGFritzMillett>.
7. Holton, T. Febraro, A., Filardo, E-A., Barnes, M., Fraser, B. & Spiece, R. (2011). The relationship between non-governmental organizations and the CF. In M. Rostek & P. Gizewski (Eds.), *Security operations in the 21st century: Canadian perspectives on the comprehensive approach* (pp. 215-226). Montreal, QC & Kingston, ON: McGill and Queen's University Press.
8. Jenny, J. (2001). Civil-military cooperation in complex emergencies: Making it work. *European Security*, 10, 23-22.
9. Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre, *The Comprehensive Approach*, Joint Discussion Note 4/05, (Shrivenham, United Kingdom: Ministry of Defence, January 2006). Available from www.mod.uk/NR/rdonlyres/BEE7F0A4.../0/dcdc21_jdn4_05.pdf.
10. Leslie, A., Gizewski, P., & Rostek, M. (2008). Developing a comprehensive approach to Canadian Forces operations. *Canadian Military Journal*, 9, 11-20.
11. McHarg, M. & Coppock, K. (2011). We share the same space, not the same purpose: The comprehensive approach and Médecins Sans Frontières. In M. Rostek & P. Gizewski (Eds.), *Security operations in the 21st century: Canadian perspectives on the comprehensive approach* (pp. 67-71). Montreal, QC & Kingston, ON: McGill and Queen's University Press.

12. Meharg, S.J. (2007). Clash of the titans: Navigating new identities in conflict geographies. In S.J. Meharg (Ed.), *Helping hands & loaded arms: Navigating the military and humanitarian space* (pp. 115-140). Clementsport, NS: The Canadian Peacekeeping Press.
13. Morcos, K. (2005). *Principles for good international engagement in fragile states*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. DCD(2005)8/REV2.
14. Neuhaus, S. J. (2008). Medical aspects of civil-military operations: The challenges of military health support to civilian populations on operations. In Ankersen, C. (Ed.), *Civil-military cooperation in post-conflict operations: Emerging theory and practice* (pp. 201-224). New York, NY: Routledge.
15. Olson, L. (2006). Fighting for humanitarian space: NGOs in Afghanistan. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 9, 1-28.
16. Olson, L., & Gregorian H. (2007). *Side by side or together? Working for security, development & peace in Afghanistan and Liberia*. The Peacebuilding, Development and Security Program (PDSP), Centre for Military and Strategic Studies, University of Calgary.
17. Patrick, S., & Brown, K. (2007). *Greater than the sum of its parts? Assessing "whole of government" approaches to fragile states*. New York: International Peace Academy.
18. Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice: Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: The Claremont Symposium on applied social psychology* (pp. 93-114). Lawrence Erlbaum: Mahwah, NJ.
19. Richter, A.W., West, M.A., van Dick, R. and Dawson, J.F. (2006). Boundary spanners' identification, intergroup contact and effective intergroup relations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 1252-1269
20. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary and Educational Psychology*, 25, 54-67.
21. Spence, N. (2002). Civil-military cooperation in complex emergencies: More than a field application. *Journal of Peacekeeping*, 9, 165-171.
22. Stephenson, M. & Schnitzer, M. H. (2006). Interorganizational trust, boundary spanning, and humanitarian relief coordination. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 17, 211-233.
23. Tamas, A. (2009). *Warriors and nation builders: Development and the military in Afghanistan*. Kingston, ON: Canadian Defence Academy Press.

24. Thompson, M., Febraro, A. & Blais, A-R., (2011). Interagency training for the Canadian comprehensive approach mission in Afghanistan. In M. Rostek & P. Gizewski (Eds.), *Security operations in the 21st century: Canadian perspectives on the comprehensive approach* (pp. 203-214). Montreal, QC & Kingston, ON: McGill and Queen's University Press.
25. Thompson, M. M. & Gill, R. (2010). The role of trust in whole of government missions. In C. Leuprecht, J. Troy, & D. Last (Eds.), *Mission Critical: Smaller Democracies' Role in Global Stability Operations* (pp. 225-244), Montreal and Kingston: Queen's Policy Studies Series, McGill-Queen's University Press.
26. The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual (2006). Available from <http://www.usgcoin.org/library/doctrine/COIN-FM3-24.pdf>
27. van der Kloet, I. (2006). Building trust in the mission area. *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, 17, 421–436.
28. Wentz, L. (2006). An ICT Primer: Information and Communication Technologies for Civil-Military Coordination in Disaster Relief and Stabilization and Reconstruction. Center for Technology and National Security Policy: National Defense University.
29. Winslow, D. (2002). Strange bedfellows: NGOs and the Military in humanitarian crises. *The International Journal of Peace Studies*, 7(2). Available from http://www.gmu.edu/academic/ijps/vol7_2/cover7_2.htm.

Annex A Civil-Military Seminar Questionnaire



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

Dr. Megan M. Thompson, Ph.D.

Project Manager
 Interagency Trust
 DRDC Toronto
 Megan.Thompson@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
 416-635-2040

Dr. Angela R. Febraro, Ph.D.

Project Manager
 JIMP Essentials in the Public Domain
 DRDC Toronto
 Angela.Febraro@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
 416-635-2000 Ext. 3120

DRDC Toronto is a human sciences laboratory within Defence Research and Development Canada, an Agency within DND. Two research projects look specifically at the human aspects of working within the comprehensive approach to operations. One explores issues related to the development and maintenance of Interagency Trust. The other explores the dynamics of interacting with different aspects of the public, including local populations, etc.

The objectives of both of these projects is to understand the key social and organizational issues that affect working in a comprehensive mission, with a goal to improve the ability of decision makers to address issues based on systematic feedback from the people who do the jobs, and to improve training for these contexts. With this in mind we wondered whether you might answer a few questions related to your experience in this Civil-Military Seminar and a few questions that describe yourself in general terms. Your answers will assist improvements in this seminar, as well as to our research projects.

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Please Note: | 1. Your answers are confidential and your participation is completely voluntary. |
| | 2. Your answers will be assigned a unique identification number. |
| | 3. Only authorized researchers will have access to the data and only group results are presented. Note that the Directorate of Access to Information and Privacy (DAIP) is also required to remove any personally identifying information about you prior to releasing information in the unlikely event of an Access to Information request. |
| | 4. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. People may have differing experiences and we are interested in what your experiences are. |
| | 5. We appreciate your input and ask that you be as honest as possible so that our information accurately reflects your experience and the things that are important to you. |

~PLEASE FEEL FREE TO KEEP THIS FIRST SHEET FOR YOUR FUTURE INFORMATION~



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

CIVIL-MILITARY SEMINAR PRE-SURVEY

Date: _____

Your PIN: 1st 3 letters of mother's maiden name _____, your birth year _____, 1st 3 letters of home town _____

1. Age: _____ 2. Gender: Male Female
3. I am currently working for: an OGD an NGO the CF Other (e.g., I/O)
4. Please indicate if you have previously worked for each of the following (in months) (indicate all that apply to you):
 OGD _____ NGO _____ CF _____ Other (e.g., I/O) _____
5. I have previously deployed overseas 0 1 2 3+ times

| Please answer each of the following questions according to the scales provided | NGOs/IOs | | | | | OGDs | | | | | The CF | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 1 Not at all/ None | 2 A Little | 3 A Little | 4 A Little | 5 A Little | 1 Not at all | 2 Somewhat | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 A Great Deal | 1 Not at all | 2 Somewhat | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 A Great Deal |
| In my previous deployment(s) I have interacted with members of _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I am familiar with the term the Comprehensive Approach to Operations | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I define the Comprehensive Approach to Operations as being: (use back of sheet if needed): | Not at all | | | | | Somewhat | | | | | A Great Deal | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|--|
| I am taking this seminar because: | | | | | | |
| My supervisor instructed me to | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely | |
| I want to learn more about the other organizations | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely | |
| Rations and Quarters were provided free of charge | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely | |
| Other: please explain: | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Do you feel adequately prepared for this seminar? | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely | |
| If yes, what did you find useful? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| If not, what would you have found useful? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| What do you wish to learn from this seminar? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

CIVILIAN-MILITARY SEMINAR POST-SURVEY

| | 1 Not at all/ None | | 2 A Little | | 3 Some/ Somewhat | | 4 A Great Deal | | 5 Extensively/ Completely | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---|---------------|---|------------------------|---|-------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NGOs/IOs | | OGDs | | The CF | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please answer each of the following questions concerning the Civil-Military Seminar according to the scales provided: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| The NGO CF Seminar contained enough information about _____ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do you feel that your organization was engaged in the planning process for this seminar? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do you feel that this seminar adequately reflected the input of your organization? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Do you feel that the seminar took into account your organizations approach to _____: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| planning | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| procedures | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| goals and objectives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| values | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| mandates or roles | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| communication style/terminology | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Was this seminar a useful experience? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Comments (e.g., If so, how? If not, why not?): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Was the format appropriate? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| Comments (e.g., If so, how? If not, why not?): | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Were the range/type of participants appropriate | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely |
| Comments (e.g., If so, how? If not, why not?): | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Was this the appropriate venue for the seminar? | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely |
| Was the hypothetical scenario useful? | 1 Not at all | 2 A Little | 3 Somewhat | 4 A Great Deal | 5 Completely |
| Has your relationship with _____ changed as a result of this seminar? | NGOs/IOs | | OGDs | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Has this seminar helped to facilitate your professional network with _____? | NGOs/IOs | | OGDs | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Will this seminar affect how you interact with _____ on future deployments? | NGOs/IOs | | OGDs | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Has your perception of _____ changed as a result of this seminar? | NGOs/IOs | | The Comprehensive Approach to Operations | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Did this seminar contribute to your understanding of _____? | NGOs/IOs | | The Comprehensive Approach to Operations | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Did this seminar contain enough information about _____? | NGOs/IOs | | The Comprehensive Approach to Operations | | The CF |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |



DRDC Toronto Research Program on the Comprehensive Approach to Operations

In order to have the best quality of information possible, we need people like you who would be willing to be contacted in the future by a member of our research team about your ongoing experiences in the context of a comprehensive approach to operations. This will provide valuable information to better inform decision makers about the important issues arising in these operations. If you are willing to be contacted, please fill out as much of the information below as you know at this point in time. Note that indicating your name does not commit you to future participation, only that you are willing to be contacted in the future. You are, of course, free to decline to participate at any point in time.

Name: _____

Permanent Address: _____

Telephone Number: _____ Email Address: _____

Would you be willing to be contacted while you are deployed? Yes No

Deployment Contact Info (including e-mail if possible):

Thank you for your time. Please feel free to contact us with any questions and comments.

Sincerely,
Dr. Megan M. Thompson, Ph.D.
Project Manager, Interagency Trust
DRDC Toronto
Megan.Thompson@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
416-635-2040

Dr. Angela R. Febraro, PhD
Project Manager, JIMP Essentials in the Public Domain
DRDC Toronto
Angela.Febraro@drdc-rddc.gc.ca
416-635-2000 Ext. 3120

List of acronyms

| | |
|--------------|---|
| ADM (Pol) | Assistant Deputy Minister (Policy) |
| AoR | Area of Responsibility |
| CA | Comprehensive Approach to Operations |
| CF | Canadian Forces |
| CFB Kingston | Canadian Forces Base Kingston |
| CFJP | Canadian Force Joint Publication |
| CIDA | Canadian International Development Agency |
| DFAIT | Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade |
| DND | Department of National Defence |
| DPK Pol | Department of Peacekeeping Policy |
| DRDC | Defence Research & Development Canada |
| Fmn Ops CoE | Formation Operations Centre of Excellence |
| GPs | Government Partners |
| HREC | Human Research Ethics Committee |
| IOs | International Organizations |
| LFDTS | Land Force Doctrine and Training System |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| OGDs | Other Government Departments |
| PAGER | Policy Action Group on Emergency Response |
| WoG | Whole of Government |

This page intentionally left blank.

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| 1. ORIGINATOR (The name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared, e.g. Centre sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in section 8.) | | 2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (Overall security classification of the document including special warning terms if applicable.) | |
| Defence R&D Canada – Toronto 1133 Sheppard Avenue West P.O. Box 2000 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9 | | UNCLASSIFIED NON-CONTROLLED GOODS DMC A REVIEW: JUNE 2010 | |
| 3. TITLE (The complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title.) | | | |
| Interagency Contact and Training for a Comprehensive Approach to Operations:: Assessment of the Formation Operations Center of Excellence 'Civil-Military Seminar' | | | |
| 4. AUTHORS (last name, followed by initials – ranks, titles, etc. not to be used) | | | |
| Megan M. Thompson; Angela R. Febraro; Tara Holton | | | |
| 5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (Month and year of publication of document.) | 6a. NO. OF PAGES (Total containing information, including Annexes, Appendices, etc.) | 6b. NO. OF REFS (Total cited in document.) | |
| March 2012 | 42 | 29 | |
| 7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (The category of the document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) | | | |
| Technical Memorandum | | | |
| 8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (The name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development – include address.) | | | |
| Defence R&D Canada – Toronto 1133 Sheppard Avenue West P.O. Box 2000 Toronto, Ontario M3M 3B9 | | | |
| 9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.) | | 9b. CONTRACT NO. (If appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.) | |
| | | | |
| 10a. ORIGINATOR'S DOCUMENT NUMBER (The official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) | | 10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NO(s). (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.) | |
| DRDC Toronto TM 2012-017 | | | |
| 11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (Any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) | | | |
| Unlimited | | | |
| 12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (Any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11). However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in (11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.) | | | |
| Unlimited | | | |

13. **ABSTRACT** (A brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), (R), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual.)

Interagency training involving both civilian and military actors has been suggested as one important way to mitigate some of the challenges that can hinder the success of Comprehensive Approach (CA) missions. However, such training is complex to plan and execute and expensive in terms of money and time investments by participating agencies. Thus, systematic evaluation efforts are required to determine the effectiveness and areas of improvement in such training and education opportunities. The current research evaluated the effectiveness of the inaugural Civil - Military Seminar, conducted by the Formation Operations Centre of Excellence at the Canadian Army Command and Staff College in Kingston, Ontario. This seminar was designed to bring together military personnel and civilian representatives from various Canadian government departments and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) who are most likely to be called on to work together in a CA context. Results were quite positive: Civilian and military participants found the seminar to be very useful in raising awareness and providing important information concerning organizational mandates and felt that it facilitated networking. Results also indicated that, as a result of the seminar, participants believed that they had changed their impressions of the other groups and that the seminar would affect the way that they interacted with members of the other groups on future operations. Overall, despite the challenges inherent in such training, the data suggest that players in the CA sphere, both military and civilian, should consider this training as important preparation for comprehensive missions.

La formation interorganismes rassemblant des acteurs civils et militaires a été présentée comme un instrument de premier plan qui permet d'atténuer certains des défis qui peuvent entraver la réussite des missions d'approche globale (AG). Toutefois, la planification et la dispense d'une telle formation sont complexes, en plus d'être coûteuse en termes d'investissements en temps et en argent pour les organismes qui y participent. Par conséquent, le recours à des méthodes d'évaluation systématique est nécessaire afin de déterminer l'efficacité de cette formation et des activités d'éducation ainsi que les points à améliorer. La présente recherche a évalué l'efficacité du premier Séminaire civilo-militaire organisé par le Centre d'excellence axé sur les opérations de la formation qui s'est tenu au Collège de commandement et d'état-major de l'Armée canadienne à Kingston, en Ontario. Ce séminaire était conçu dans le but de permettre une rencontre entre des membres du personnel militaire et des représentants du personnel civil de différents ministères du gouvernement canadien et d'organisations non gouvernementales (ONG) qui sont les plus susceptibles d'être appelés à travailler ensemble dans le contexte de l'AG. Les résultats ont été très positifs : les participants civils et militaires ont trouvé que le séminaire a permis de sensibiliser davantage les gens sur ce sujet et ils ont pu obtenir des renseignements importants sur les mandats des organisations. De plus, les participants ont eu l'impression que cette activité a facilité le réseautage. Les résultats indiquent aussi qu'à la suite du séminaire, les participants estiment que leur perception des autres groupes a changé et que cela aurait un effet sur leurs façons d'interagir avec eux lors des opérations à venir. De façon générale, malgré les défis propres à une telle activité de formation, les données suggèrent que les intervenants militaires et civils du domaine de l'AG devraient envisager de faire appel à ce type de formation comme outil de préparation de premier plan pour les missions d'approche globale.

14. **KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS** (Technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Comprehensive Approach to Operations

Defence R&D Canada

Canada's Leader in Defence
and National Security
Science and Technology

R & D pour la défense Canada

Chef de file au Canada en matière
de science et de technologie pour
la défense et la sécurité nationale



www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca

