procedures is the means of acquiring more easily the time to move, which allows better management of the situation on the field, there is no single solution.

In fact, it is impossible to completely control people working in peacekeeping operations. Stress, shock or inappropriate behaviors can arise any time without the barriers placed to stop individual action.

Individual and group work is an important parameter to be considered by a nation in order to avoid its challenge for an ethics-related problem.

Is it really possible to have a clean war?

Are face-to-face behavior problems with the civilian population avoidable?

As reality shows (Syria and Iraq), it seems like these goals are not always reached, even by the most powerful armies.
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Assessment and Certification of the Brazilian Troops Deployed to Haiti

Major Leonardo Duarte do Nascimento

ABSTRACT: This work has been developed in order to show the methodology that was applied by the Brazilian Peace Operations Joint Training Center (CCOPAB, acronym in Portuguese), regarding the assessment and certification of Brazilian Contingents deployed in Haiti, as well as the outcomes of the research on the effects of the training of the 23rd Brazilian Contingent in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). The assessment and certification procedures carried out by CCOPAB were described in this study and the outcome of the questionnaire answered by officers, warrant officers and sergeants, who compose the Brazilian Battalion and the Engineering Company in Haiti, was also presented. By means of the outcomes, it has been concluded that the methodology substantially contributes to the fulfillment of the mission of MINUSTAH.


Introduction

The importance of assessing a contingent to be deployed to a peace mission consists in the opportunity of checking in which performance level the military person and the fractions are. Thus, it is possible to point out to the evaluated members, the techniques, tactics and procedures that can be ratified or rectified to improve the training. For the brigade that directs the training, this task aims to present a precise diagnosis of the levels of preparation reached by the troops.

1 Brazilian Army officer - Division of Assessment of the Brazilian Peace Operations Joint Training Center (CCOPAB)
Consequently, the relevance of the certification of the troops to be deployed consists in testifying that they have gone through a systematic training process that qualified them to be deployed according to a pre-established standard.

Therefore, this article aims to present the process of evaluation and certification carried out by Brazilian Peace Operations Joint Training Center (CCOPAB) during the phases of training and employment of the Brazilian troops deployed to the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH). It also aims to show the results of the training on the performance of the former students deployed to the 23rd Brazilian Contingent in Haiti. The goal of the article is to contribute to the creation of a doctrine of assessment and certification of Brazilian troops to deploy to peacekeeping missions.

**Brazilian Peace Operations Joint Training Center in the Preparation of the Brazilian Troops for MINUSTAH**

The Brazilian Peacekeeping Training Center (CIOpPaz) was created by the Army Commander’s Ordinance nr 090 of 23 February 2005. It was in charge of carrying out the preparation of the military personnel for the deployment in the United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) from the 3rd Contingent on. On 15
June 2010, Ordinance nr 952 - Ministry of Defense, of the same date, named the Brazilian Peacekeeping Training Center (CIOpPaz) of the Brazilian Army, responsible for the preparation of military personnel and civilians from Brazil and from friendly nations to be sent to peace missions. This Military unit had its name changed to Brazilian Peace Operations Joint Training Center (CCOPAB).

CCOPAB currently has a structure that seeks to meet the requirements of preparation, so that troop contingents and individuals act in an integrated manner, though with different organizational cultures, when addressing complex situations of crisis. The Division of Assessment is in charge of managing the assessment processes and the certifications of the Courses and Exercises under the Center's responsibility.

CCOPAB's vision of future is to be an international reference in promoting the preparation of human resources with excellence for peace operations and humanitarian demining.

Courses and Exercises

The preparation of military contingents to be deployed to MINUSTAH is under CCOPAB's responsibility. It follows an annual calendar in which there are courses scheduled to build the capacities of military personnel of the Brazilian Armed Forces to act in a mission under the aegis of the United Nations. The courses are: Unit Commanders and Joint Staff Course (EPCOEM, acronym in Portuguese); Subunit Commanders and Platoon Leaders Course (EPCOSUPEL, acronym in Portuguese); Logistics and Reimbursement Course (Est Log Reemb Op Paz, acronym in Portuguese); Civil-Military Coordination Course (CIMIC, acronym
in Portuguese); and Military Translators and Interpreters Course (ETIMIL, acronym in Portuguese).\(^2\)

After concluding the courses at CCOPAB, officers and sergeants are able to replicate the acquired knowledge to their troops (2nd level course). To end this cycle, CCOPAB coordinates the UN Pre-deployment Advanced Field Exercise (EAOP, acronym in Portuguese) to test the whole troop. It evaluates the training and the professional efficiency of the contingents and certifies their aptitude for the deployment to MINUSTAH. The Exercise is carried out according to the UN training standards established by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).

**Levels of evaluation used by CCOPAB**

CCOPAB has implemented the evaluation methodology that is recommended by the UN. The evaluations were based on the Practical Guide to Peacekeeping Training Evaluation from the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS) of the Integrated Training Service (ITS), published in 2015. According to this Guide, there are five levels of evaluation for the UN. They are:

a) Level I - Reaction;
b) Level II - Learning;
c) Level III - Application;
d) Level IV - Impact; and
e) Level V - Return on investment.

\(^2\) For more details concerning CCOPAB courses, see: www.ccopab.eb.mil.br
The chart below presents a summary of the levels of evaluation employed by CCOPAB.

Table 1 - Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of evaluation</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Check the student’s reaction towards the experience of the training carried out by CCOPAB.</td>
<td>Daily, partial and final surveys</td>
<td>Given during the courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II                  | Ensure that the content was learnt and the aim of the training was accomplished. Focus on the topics of the Core Pre-deployment Training Material (CPTM). | Diagnostic Assessments (DA), Formative Assessments (FA), Summative Assessments (SA), practical exams and the results from the UN Pre-deployment Advanced Field Exercise | -Minimum final grade ≥ 5.0.  
-Minimum EAOP grade ≥ 7.0. |
| III                 | Check how the training has affected the students’ behavior and performance at work. | Questionnaires to former students.                         | Applied in Haiti during the mission.         |
| IV                  | Point out the impact of the training evaluating the consequences of the changes in behavior and performance. | Questionnaires to the former students’ superiors.         | Applied in Haiti during the mission.         |
| V                   | Determine the profit of the investment made in the course.            | Under analysis                                             | -                                            |

In Level II, the students pass if their final grade is 5.0 (five) or higher, according to the Article 123 of the Learning and Evaluation Guidelines (NAA, acronym in Portuguese), as transcribed below:

\[3\text{ Article 123 - Normas para a Avaliação da Aprendizagem do Exército Brasileiro (NAA), 2}^{\text{nd}}\text{ edition, 2014.}\]
“General conditions to pass or fail
Art. 123 The student passes when:
I - s/he gets a final grade of 5,0 or higher or is classified as ADEQUATE;
II - s/he gets a grade of 5,0 or higher, or is classified as ADEQUATE, respectively, in each subject;
II - s/he gets a grade of 5,0 or higher, or is classified as ADEQUATE, or considered APT, in the Final Exercises of the modules, if there are any; and
III - s/he passes the retake of the subject and in the interdisciplinary activity of the modules, if there are any”.

CCOPAB has reached the following results in the evaluations of Levels I and II.

Table 2 - Summary of the evaluation results in Levels I and II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Has the course met all your expectations? (Level I)</th>
<th>Student's average (Level II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Partially agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCOEM</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCOSUPEL</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est Log Reemb Op Paz</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMIC</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETIMIL</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Done by the author (2016), from the questionnaire data

From analyzing the data of Table 2, it is seen that the Level I evaluation of the Brazilian contingent preparation course meets the students’ expectations with more than 80% of complete agreement. The minimum average of the group results in the course was 7.1, which shows that the learning goals have been reached, as recommended by the Learning and Evaluation Guidelines of the Brazilian Army.
It can be concluded that the work on assessment implemented by CCOPAB in levels I, II, III and IV is in compliance with the Practical Guide to Peacekeeping Training Evaluation from DPKO. Regarding Level V, CCOPAB is studying how to measure the profit of the investment of the training.

**The Evaluation and Certification in the UN Pre-Deployment Advanced Field Exercise**

The Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System (PCRS)\(^4\) recommends in its methodology that each Member State delivers a certification for the basic training. CCOPAB is the military unit which carries out this evaluation and certifies the preparation of the Brazilian troops. They are evaluated according to the Guidelines of Specific Troop Preparation in Peace Missions (BRABAT and BRAENGCOY), developed by the Land Operations Command (COTER, acronym in Portuguese)\(^5\) for each contingent to be deployed and also following the Evaluation Plan of the UN Pre-deployment Advanced Field Exercise, developed by CCOPAB. The certification is given to the troops after the assessment in this Exercise (EAOP).

In EAOP, the Brazilian Battalion (BRABAT) and the Brazilian Engineering Company (BRAENGCOY) are given a fictitious Area of Responsibility (AOR), in which the troops develop and participate in various activities following a program. This schedule is composed of many events that simulate everyday situations of the troops.

---


\(^5\) COTER is the Department of the Brazilian Army that is responsible for "guiding and coordinating the preparation and the employment of the Land Force, in compliance with the strategic policies and guidelines of the Army."
During EAOP, BRABAT’s and BRAENGCOY’s evaluations are coordinated by CCOPAB and they are carried out by officers and sergeants who act as Observers, Controllers and Assessors (OCA). This team is composed of former contingent members to use their previous experience as much as possible in the preparation of the Brazilian troops for MINUSTAH. They carry out the After Action Review (AAR). In the AAR, the students are given feedback on the activity. The positive and negative aspects, the recommendations and opportunities of improvement are pointed out. The OCA’s evaluate and are responsible for filling in the Evaluation Forms of the tasks.

The evaluation is based on the parameters in the Evaluation Forms, which are tools for the coordinators of the Field Exercise to measure the students’ learning or to order them to characterize more clearly the performance level of the students (fractions and Staff cells).

The fraction or the Staff cell that reaches the minimum of 70% in the Evaluation Forms during EAOP is considered apt to the certification. This minimum grade was established by CCOPAB as it is considered the average of the grades between 6,000 and 7,999. They are, respectively, the inferior and superior limit of the reference that corresponds to “Good”. Such grades are in compliance with the rules of the Department of Education and Culture of the Brazilian Army (DECEX, acronym in Portuguese). CCOPAB’s command understands that, with this passing grade there is a higher level of demand from the troops to be deployed to a peace mission.

The “Certificates of Apt for Deployment” are given to the ones

---


who successfully go through EAOP. These certificates are handed in a ceremony that closes the Field Exercise and the pre-deployment phase, which CCOPAB is responsible for.

Levels III and IV Evaluations of the 23rd Brazilian Contingent in MINUSTAH

The evaluations of level III and IV are done in the employment phase of the troops. They are done when the troops have already been deployed to the mission for more than half of the time scheduled.

In order to accomplish these evaluations, two different questionnaires were given *in loco* (in Haiti) to the military of the Brazilian Battalion and of the Brazilian Engineering Company of the 23rd Brazilian Contingent, between 2 and 5 March 2016. The target-audience was composed of officers and sergeants who participated in any of the courses delivered in the Center and who were also present in EAOP. The survey had two objectives: the first was to point out the effect the training had on the former student during the mission (level III evaluation); the second, to determine the impact of the training on him/her, from the immediate superior’s perspective (level IV evaluation). To develop this evaluation, studies of quantitative and qualitative nature were carried out.

4.2.1 Results and Discussion

4.2.1.1 Level III Evaluation:

From obtained answers, results are presented according to the graphs below.

The quantitative data of the level III evaluation show that most of the former students thought that the courses carried out at CCOPAB strongly contributed to the mission accomplishment (graph 1). They
Graphs 1, 2, and 3 - Questionnaire results of Level III evaluations (80 surveys).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 1 - To what extent did the knowledge/abilities acquired during the course give you conditions to be efficient in your mission accomplishment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fully</strong> - 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially</strong> - 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ave Rage</strong> - 10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 2 - How often did you use these/this abilities/knowledge?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always</strong> - 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very frequently</strong> - 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong> - 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 3 - Did the course aims meet your function needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> - 92,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partially</strong> - 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong> - 2,5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Questions:

4 - What type of achievements were there throughout the mission due to the knowledge/abilities taught in the course? Could you give examples?

5 - Are there new abilities, tasks, actions or demands from the UN that you carry out, but were not mentioned in the course? If so, which do you think that should be included in the training?

6 - What procedures were changed/implemented in relation to the students throughout the course? What were the new procedures implemented?

7 - What type of obstacles did not allow the applicability of the abilities/knowledge you acquired?

8 - What best practices supported your performance when using the abilities/knowledge you learnt?

9 - If you have observed any opportunity to improve any of the aspects above, write them down below:

Source: Done by the author (2016), from the questionnaire data
also said that the knowledge acquired was often put into practice during the period covered by the survey (graph 2). To almost all the military personnel, the goals of the various courses met the needs of the performed functions (graph 3). The qualitative answers confirm the quantitative results, always reinforcing the importance of both the courses and EAOP for the accomplishment of the mission in MINUSTAH.

The qualitative research shows that the military personnel from more technical functions have fewer opportunities to take part in operational activities in Haiti. This fact did not let the results of the level III evaluation reach higher numbers in relation to the use of the knowledge in the mission. The same happens to the military personnel that were transferred from an operational to an administrative function during the mission.

4.2.1.2 Level IV Evaluation:

From the answers, results are presented according to the graphs below.

Graph 4, 5 and 6 - Questionnaire results of Level IV evaluations (22 surveys).

Graph 4 - To what extent did the knowledge/abilities taught at CCOPAB during the course contribute to the mission accomplishment of your subordinates?

- Fully - 86%
- Partially - 14%
- Average

Graph 5 - How often did your subordinates use these/this abilities/knowledge?

- Always - 41%
- Very Frequently - 55%
- Rarely
- Never
- Sometime - 4%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph 6 - Did the course aims meet your subordinates' function needs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative Questions:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - What type of achievements were there throughout the mission due to the knowledge/abilities your subordinates were taught in the course? Could you give examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Are there new abilities, tasks, actions or demands from the UN that your subordinates carry out, but were not mentioned in the course? If so, which do you think that should be included in the training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Did your subordinates show creativity, autonomy and development in functions related to the lessons taught in the course? Please, share additional comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - What procedures were changed/implemented during the current mission that you believe to be essential to be mentioned in the next course? Please, comment on the reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - What type of obstacles did not allow the applicability of the abilities your subordinates learnt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - What best practices supported your subordinates' performance when using the abilities/knowledge they learnt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - What is your impression of these subordinates' performance in relation to the application of their knowledge in the preparation period?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Other relevant comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Done by the author (2016), from the questionnaire data
The quantitative data of level IV evaluation show that 86% of the former students’ chiefs thought that the knowledge/abilities taught at CCOPAB during the courses strongly contributed to the mission accomplishment of their subordinates (graph 4) and their knowledge was frequently employed (graph 5). The aims of the various courses successfully met the subordinates’ function needs (graph 6).

In the qualitative answers, the chiefs reinforce that their subordinates employed correctly the lessons they learned in the courses and they were able to advise them timely and wisely. The acquired knowledge generates safe and conscious actions, mainly in relation to the rules of engagement. There were some situations in Haiti that were identical to situations in EAOP, which reinforces that the training is coherent and very close to the reality.
The results observed in this section point out that the courses and EAOP strongly contributed to the military performance in the accomplishment of the mission. The aims of the courses and EAOP are to prepare the military personnel to perform their tasks in the contingents of MINUSTAH. Such fact is proved in the percentages found in the questionnaire of level III and confirmed in the results of the questionnaire of level IV.

**Final Remarks**

CCOPAB carries out assessment and certification in compliance with the Practical Guide to Peacekeeping Training Evaluation and The United Nations Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System (PCRS). This contributes to its vision of future to be internationally recognized as a Center of excellence in the preparation of the military personnel for peace missions.

The results of the evaluations of levels I and II, from CCOPAB’s perspective, show that the preparatory courses of the Brazilian Contingent meet the students’ expectations. The average of the students’ performance shows that they have learned and the training goals have been reached, as recommended by the Learning and Evaluation Guidelines of the Brazilian Army.

The results of evaluations levels III and IV prove that the training carried out by CCOPAB fits the reality the students face in the mission. The training influences the students’ performance positively while they are deployed.

It can be concluded that the methodology used by CCOPAB to prepare the Brazilian military strength presents plenty of good results.