

# Training Report

## RedR Sponsored REA Training, Karen Kenya, 2-4 February 2005

Prepared by C. Kelly (email: 74732,2412@compuserve.com)

### Overview

The REA Project and RedR/United Kingdom collaborated on holding a 3 day training course on the REA process at Kenyan Commercial Bank Training Centre, Karen, Kenya from 2 to 4 February 2005. A total of 21 persons participated in the training.

The REA project provided the training materials and one trainer and RedR handled local arrangements for the training, including finding a venue, publicizing the training and administrative tasks during the training. The materials used in the training were developed by InterWorks as part of the REA project. InterWorks also provided the lead trainer.

The training followed the plan and schedule set-out in the materials prepared by InterWorks. Only minor changes were made to the schedule to respond to participant requests that the training end before 1700 on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day. Each day's training started approximately 30 min late due to the difficulty of non-resident participants getting to the Centre, but overrunning the daily ending time was avoided by slightly shortening exercises or breaks.

The training was largely conducted by one trainer. Plans to have a co-trainer from within East Africa did not materialize. The session on Green Procurement was conducted by Walter Knausenberger (USAID). Part of the session on Community Assessment, dealing with how to conduct a community assessment, was conducted by David Kinyua (USAID). Presentations on personal REA-related experiences were made by Alex Njahani (CARE Tanzania) on the use of the UNHCR REA, and Luke Ojok, (USDA) on the history and some current environmental challenges in southern Sudan.

Participants came from:

Kenya: USAID (5), Concern Universal (1), CARE Somalia (1), CARE Southern Sudan (1), PACT (1), World Metrological Organization (1), Kenya Wildlife Service (1), International Gorilla Conservation Program (1), Sudan Health Transformation Project (2), USDA (1), and Private Consultants (2)

Tanzania: CARE Tanzania (1) and National Disaster Management Training Centre at the University of Dar es Salaam School of Land and Architectural Studies, Dar es Salaam (1)

Rwanda: CARE Rwanda (1)

Alemayehu of RedR also participated as an observer in addition to his administrative tasks.

Each participant in the training received a Participant's Workbook, a copy of the Guidelines for Rapid Environmental Impact Assessment in Disasters and a CD containing the training materials (including PowerPoint presentations and copies of the Participant's Workbook and Trainer's Guide), the Guidelines and additional reference materials useful in REA efforts or dealing with disasters.

## **Administration**

The Kenyan Commercial Bank Training Centre is an academic campus type facility providing classrooms, lodging, dining and recreation facilities. A total of 4 participants and one trainer stayed at the site with other participants commuting from within Greater Nairobi. RedR handled all the local arrangements for the Centre, including contracts, advance and invoicing as well as the collection of participant fees. Alemayehu of RedR's East African office handled all the local details and tasks.

Participants paid a fee to attend the course. The amount of the fee depended in whether a participant was resident at the Centre and whether a scholarship was provided. The amount and allocation of scholarships depended were decided by RedR and the REA project and depended on the type of person attending (e.g., from an NGOs, consultant, donor organization) and potential value of the training to the individual. The trainer and training material costs are paid by InterWorks with funding from CARE under the REA project.

## **Improvements to the REA Process**

Two suggestions came up during the course on improvements to the REA process:

Cross-cutting Issues: In generating the issues and actions table as part of the Consolidation and Analysis process, one of the groups segregated output-focused actions (e.g., providing water) from cross-cutting issues (e.g., increasing self-sufficiency). The former became what needed to be done and the latter some of the ways these actions should be accomplished. This division makes handling these two types of issues and actions easier and can be incorporated into the Guidelines and training materials.

Coding Unmet Needs: It was proposed that the following coding be used in the ranking of unmet needs: Unmet: UM; Lesser part of needs met: LPM; Greater part of needs met: GPM; Largely met; LM and Totally met: TM. This can option can be added as a box in the Guidelines.

## **Outstanding Issues**

Issues raised by participants are covered in the final section below. Three general issues were noted during the course:

Co-trainer: The REA project training plan calls for a co-trainer from a local or regional organization to work with the lead trainer in the REA course. The initially designated co-trainer was not available and the alternate didn't feel sufficiently comfortable with the subject matter to lead sessions. The idea of a co-trainer taking on a significant part of the REA training from a cold start may need to be rethought.

Fees and Payments: Some participating organizations had difficulty following the registration and payment process. The experiences of this training should be compared against RedR's experience in similar trainings to see if this was a specific or general problem.

Residential Training Facility: The selection of a residential training location outside Nairobi was intended to facilitate attendance by people residing outside Kenya. However, the trade-off was that Nairobi-resident participants had to battle traffic to and from the training.

## **Further Training Opportunities**

Discussions during and after the course identified the following further REA training opportunities.

Tanzania: After participating in the course, Dr. Kiunsi from University of Dar es Salaam School of Land and Architectural Studies indicated that the National Disaster Management Training Centre at UCLAS could co-sponsor a similar training in Tanzania focusing on government and non-governmental authorities. The Centre has training but not residential facilities.

The broad concept would be for the REA project to cooperate with the Centre on an initial 3-day training including work with the Centre on adapting the training to local conditions. Based on the initial training, the project and the Centre would work together to the REA and training in Tanzania.

RedR/East Africa: Discussions with Alemayehu of RedR indicate that the REA training materials can be integrated into an existing RedR course on Needs Assessment. Once this is done, the “REA empowered” course would be offered by RedR in East Africa. Alemayehu will forward the REA materials to the RedR training material specialist to see how the integration can be managed.

RedR may also consider offering the basic REA course annually as part of their regional training program (the annual program runs from April to March and the next cycle of courses is currently being planned.) The REA project could provide support, including TOT for RedR-linked trainers, for such an annual course.

Francophone Great Lakes/Africa: Discussions with Jean Claude Gasana of CARE Rwanda indicated that training in a French version of the REA would be useful to NGO staff working in Rwanda, Burundi and Eastern Congo. This training could focus on location-specific issues, such as recurrent drought and floods in Rwanda, return and resettlement in Burundi and conflict in Eastern Congo.

This francophone training could also include participation for other francophone African countries although a cross-regional focus would make development of country-specific modules difficult.

## **Participant Feedback**

(Based on 17 respondents)

**Course length:** Correct: 13 respondents;  
Too short: 4 respondents.

**The number of participants were:** Just enough (all respondents)

**The overall rating of the course was:** Excellent: 6 respondents;  
Very good: 10 respondents;  
Good: 1 respondent.

### **Feedback on Overall Aspects of the Workshop**

Scale Used: Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 4, Neither Agree nor Disagree: 3, Disagree: 2, Strongly Disagree: 1

<b>Question</b>	<b>Averaged Score</b>
1. Subject matter was adequately covered	4.41

2. Content was suitable for my background and experience	4.35
3. Program was well-paced	4.06
4. Training materials were relevant	4.56
5. Participants were encouraged to take an active part	4.88
6. The program met my individual objectives	4.59
7. Program was relevant to my job	4.11
8. I would recommend this program to my colleagues	4.59
9. I feel prepared to conduct an REA	4.18

Scale Used: Excellent: (5) to Poor (1)	
Topic	Averaged Score
10. Lecture method	4.71
11. Facilitation team	4.47
12. Small group sessions	4.44
13. Simulation Exercises	4.24
14. Meeting space	4.41
15. Meals/refreshments	4.18
16. Overall organization	4.24
17. Other participants	4.47

### Session Specific Feedback

Scale used: Excellent: 5; Good: 4, Poor: 2, Unacceptable: 1; Does not apply: 0		
Session No. & Title	Quality (averaged score)	Value to my Work (averaged score)
1.1 Welcome / Introductions	4.41	4.13
1.2 The Environment – Disaster Connection	4.35	4.16
1.3 REA Conceptual Framework	4.47	4.47
1.4 Overview of Disaster Management	4.24	4.18
1.5 Module 1: REA Context Statement	4.31	4.35
1.6 Factors influencing environmental impacts	4.35	4.59
1.7 Simulation Launch – SimEx 1 and SimEx2	4	4
1.8 Presentation / discussion of results	4.29	4.24
2.1 REA and Disasters Assessments	4.65	4.53

2.2 Environmental Threats of Disasters	4.47	4.41
2.3 Unmet Basic Needs	4.35	4.41
2.4 Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities	4.41	4.59
2.5 Presentation / Discussion	4.35	4.35
2.6 Participant Experience Sharing	4.19	4.19
3.1 Module Two: Community Level Assessment	4.41	4.44
3.2 Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis	4.29	4.44
3.3 Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement	4.08	3.02
3.4 REA Implementation Issues	4.58	4.25

### General Comments

- Improve gender balance of participants (3 women, 18 men!).
- Incorporate field people instead of managerial ones.
- Conduct this course with some decision makers.
- Use real disaster scenarios for case studies and common disaster scenarios which occur in Africa frequently.
- Include some local examples.
- Practical session/field work will be very useful, that to test the tool.
- Potential for field assessment with a real cast example to visit and assess (as a possible follow-on to course – optional 2-3 days).
- Comparison with real-life situation/experience/lessons learned, e.g., after every simex session, e.g., what was summary result in Sri Lanka.
- Use actual reports for disaster situation for review and evaluation.
- The duration was short.
- More explication on introduction and methodology.
- Do this (REA and Disaster Assessments session) sooner instead of debating definitions.
- More action and fewer definitions the first day.
- More time and background to modules.
- Develop rational slowly.
- Slow start, too much opportunity to debate definitions.
- Additional time for simulation exercises.
- It may be possible to add more information to the exercises, including conflicting information and push us harder on time.
- (For simulation exercises) More info and less time.
- Role of communities and informants requires more definition.
- Scenario based on (unintelligible) environments – could help us internalize more.
- Green Procurement exercise needs work.
- The course is very advanced but I suggest you encourage “training of trainers” to build capacity in countries.
- Conduct on a ½ yearly basis.
- (Would recommend course to colleagues) After having taken the ENCAP course.
- The meeting room had poor ventilation.

- The course was far from Nairobi.
- The training went a bit too late on last day.
- You could number the forms according to the module so that they are more clearly organized.
- You have a good definition of vulnerability on the PP slide. Add it to the definitions list.
- Guidelines are “text heavy”, with many steps and array of forms. REA may be difficult to undertake without significant (1-3 days) training.
- (Provide) PowerPoint slide handout (x6/page).
- The facilitator was good but too much in three days, not enough time hands on, and very little fun.
- There is a need for more than one facilitator.
- USAID staff who know the tool too well should not talk too much as it confused the participants who have not heard anything about the REA.
- The REA works as a focused approach to wide impact issues.