

**REA Training Report<sup>1</sup>**  
**Kenya Commercial Bank Training Center,**  
**Karen, Kenya, 3-5 April 2006.**  
**Co-sponsored by RedR-IHE East Africa and the REA Project**

**Overview**

This report covers a REA workshop held at the Kenya Commercial Bank Training Center, Karen Kenya from 3 to 5 April 2006. The workshop had two objectives, to:

1. Provide participants with the knowledge and skills needed to conduct an REA and,
2. Conduct an actual (“real time”) assessment of the impact of the drought on Kenya.

A separate report covers the assessment results developed during the workshop.

The REA workshop was organized in collaboration with RedR East Africa. Kate Otega and Sophie Loveday of RedR-IHE EA handled local finance, logistics, site arrangements and local promotion. Other tasks were managed by the REA Project. Funds for the workshop were provided by USAID/OFDA under the REA Project administered by CARE.

The REA Project Lead Researcher (C. Kelly) led the training in collaboration with Ephraim Kiragu. Sammy Mutua led the organization of the Community Level Assessment and assisted participants in the consolidation and analysis process.<sup>2</sup>

Interworks provided the training materials and technical backstopping to the training activities. A REA CD and printed course materials developed by Interworks were provided to each participant.

A Community Level Assessment (CLA) exercise was conducted as part of the workshop. For the exercise, participant teams conducted group and individual interviews in the communities of Olempeti, Tinga, Laibon. All three CLA sites are in the Massai area of the Riff Valley west of Karen. The sites were chosen based on their proximity to Karen as well as the reported impact of the drought.

As noted, Sammy Mutua organized the CLA effort in collaboration with Mr. Kiragu and Julius Pulei, a workshop participant from an NGO which works in the Riff Valley. Staff from a local NGO assisted in translation with community representatives.

A total of 12 individuals participated in the training (list attached)<sup>3</sup>. Several participants were not present at the training on a constant basis due to work related demands. The majority of the participants were from or working in Kenya, with two participants from southern Sudan. All 11 participants who took the learning evaluation answered 75% or more of the questions correctly.

The workshop schedule and sessions were adjusted from the standard format to reflect the objective of using the workshop to generate real results related to the drought in Kenya (schedule attached). Specifically:

---

<sup>1</sup> Report prepared by C. Kelly, REA Project, Benfield Hazard Research Center, University College London.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Mutua and Mr. Kiragu participated in an REA workshop in South Africa in 2005 and were familiar with the response to the drought in Kenya.

<sup>3</sup> RedR EA's Training Officer Kate Otega also participated in significant portions of the workshop as an active observer.

- Discussion in the Disaster and Environment session focused on the drought in Kenya. Materials prepared for this session but covering other types of disaster were not used. Participant experience with the drought was drawn upon in the group work in this session.
- Session 1.6 – Simulation Launch, was not presented. Instead, participants were provided with key background documents to read before the workshop, as well as packets of actual reports on the Kenya drought sourced from ReliefWeb to be read as part of the workshop.

Although the amount of reading was significant, the packets were presented as representative of the need to “get up to speed” with available information before an assessment. Observations indicate that the materials were used on completing the rating forms.

The evaluation results suggest that the fact that this session was skipped was not well understood by some participants, or that participants wanted more background on the real assessment component of the workshop.

- No specific session covering participant experience was held. Evaluation results indicate that participants did not necessarily see the informal exchange of experience in the working groups as effective, or were confused by the reference in the evaluation for to a specific session rather than the general level of exchange which occurred in the workshop.

An additional change in the normal workshop process is that participants were increasingly asked (or tasked) to take active roles in the REA process as conducted through the workshop. While most of the first day was dedicated to lectures, with a few group exercises, work on day three was largely the responsibility of the participants with advice and direction from the training team limited to the degree possible.

The shift from a lecture-student format to a less classroom like atmosphere at the end of day 2 and for most of day 3 fit with the overall objectives of the workshop. But this shift may not have been clearly understood by all participants.

The shift in instructional approach may also have made it hard for participants to complete the Instructional Method rating section of the evaluation (a maximum of 4 participants completed this part of the evaluation.)

Finally, with respect to instructional methods and the workshop process, additional time should have probably been made for more detailed discussions between the instructors. Most of the pre-workshop time was spent on preparations for the CLA exercise.

As Kelly, Kiragu and Mutua had worked together previously on subjects similar to the Kenya drought, a basis for synergy existed before the workshop began. More time and specific pre-workshop consultations may be needed for a similar synergy to develop if the instructors involved in a combined REA workshop and real assessment have not worked together previously.

### Workshop Objectives – Participant Perspective

Workshop objectives from the participant perspective, collected at the start of the workshop, are provided below. A review of these objectives by the participants at the end of the workshop indicated that all but one of the objectives had been met.

- Assess environmental information in extreme conditions (conflict or drought)
- Be able to conduct the REA.
- To learn and also to know more about the REA, what it entails in its duties.
- To get more information on rapid environmental impact assessment: how to identify needs/problems and have action plans to address the identified needs.
- Learn to share the REA disaster prediction process.
- I expect to better understand environmental issues as they relate to humanitarian emergencies, i.e., what environmental issues are most important to monitor/analyze at the onset of a disaster.
- To learn the methodology and application of the REA.
- Learn more on environmental impact assessment in emergency relief.
- To get an insight into how to conduct an environmental impact assessment in a disaster situation and the timing of the exercise, number of personnel involved/resources required, etc.
- To understand what REA is and how I can apply it in minimizing human wildlife conflict far back in our protected areas, i.e., parks and reserves.

### REA Training Evaluation Results

Question	Average Score (11 respondents or as indicated)	Rating Range: Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 4, Neither Agree or Disagree: 3, Disagree: 2, Strongly Disagree: 1
1. Subject matter was adequately covered	4.55	
2. Content was suitable for my background and experience	4.36	
3. Program was well-paced	4.10 (10 responses)	
4. Training materials were relevant	4.64	
5. Participants were encouraged to take an active part	4.91	
6. The program met my individual objectives	4.27	
7. Program was relevant to my job	4.64	
8. I would recommend this program to my colleagues	4.27	
9. I feel prepared to conduct an REA	4.18	
Topic	Average Score	Rating Range: 5=excellent to 1=poor.
10. Lecture method	4.27	
11. Facilitation team	4.18	
12. Small group sessions	4.36	

13. Simulation Exercises	4.18	
14. Meeting space	4.40 (10 responses)	
15. Overall organization	4.27	
16. Other participants	4	

- Of 11 participants responding, one rated the workshop *excellent*, eight rated it *very good* and two rated it *good*.
- Of the 10 respondents answering a question as to the length of the workshop, eight indicate it was the *correct length*, and two indicated it was *too short*.
- Of the 10 participants responding, eight indicated there were *enough participants* and two indicated there were *too few participants*.

Suggestions or comments provided in the workshop evaluation or at the end of the first day (indicated by a \*).

- Improve the Simex timeframe.
- It would've been nice to have a "good" example of a completed context summary form.\*
- (There needs to be) access to the internet.\*
- Coordination of the REA process forms packet with the training manual (needs to be improved). At times one would get lost.\*
- Sessions are running over time.\*
- More focus on best practice would be useful.
- (The presentations should follow the Power Point slides more exactly.)\*
- Methods of outreach/advocacy for aid agencies would be useful as well.
- The timeframe for the course coverage (should be) increased to five days.
- Simulation exercises to be allocated more time.
- Timing of the course should be tied to disaster periods.
- There is a need to incorporate statistical methods in (to the) REA.
- Please increase the duration and add such topics as prediction of disasters.

### Rating of Individual Workshop Sessions

Scale used: Excellent: 5; Good: 4, Average: 3, Poor: 2, Unacceptable: 1; Does not apply: 0		
Session No. & Title	Session Content (average score) (11 responses or as indicated)	Instructional Methods (average score) (4 responses or as indicated)
1.1 Welcome / Introductions	4.60 (10 responses)	4.25
1.2 Disasters and the Environment	3.73	3
1.3 Overview of Disaster Management	4.18	3.25
1.4 REA Conceptual Framework	4.45	3.75
1.5 Rapid Assessment in Disasters	4.09	4 (3 responses)

1.6 Module 1: REA Context Statement	3.7 (10 responses)	4
1.7 Factors influencing environmental impacts	4.09	4
2.1 Simulation Launch – SimEx 1 and SimEx2	4.36	4.25
2.2 Environmental Threats of Disasters	4.09	4.25
2.3 Unmet Basic Needs	4.18	3.75
2.4 Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities	4.18	4
2.5 Presentation / Discussion	4.27	4
2.6 Participant Experience Sharing	3.91 (8 responses)	3.75 (3 responses)
3.1 Module Two: Community Level Assessment	4.25	3.67
3.2 Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis	4.18	4
3.3 Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement	4.36	3.75
3.4 REA Implementation Issues	4.36	3.75

### Participants List

First Name	Family Name	Organization	Email
Rose	Aduol	Dan Church Aid Food Security Specialist	rose.kenya@dca.dk; roseaduol@yahoo.com
David Solomon	Adwok	CARE Somalia/South Sudan Project Manager	adwok@ci.or.ke; dsadwok@yahoo.com
Bertha	Ojany	IRC Registered Nurse	b_ojany@yahoo.com
Liebo	Oyitjwok	CARE International (South Sudan Programme) Team Leader	liebo@ci.or.ke; oliebo@yahoo.com
Sugumi	Tanaka	UN - HABITAT	sugumi.tanaka@unhabitat.org
Patrick	Gichuhi	Presbyterian Church of East Africa Development, Media & Comm Officer	wgichuhi@yahoo.com
John	Marinos	UNHCR Geographical Information Systems Officer	marinos@unhcr.org
Denis	Ruyscchaert	UNEP Programme Officer	denis.ruyscchaert@unep.org
Dickson	Aduwo	Kenyatta University Masters in Public Health Student	aduwod@yahoo.com
Muktar Ahmed	Hassan	Wajir South Development Association (WASDA)	wasda@wananchi.com
Julius	Pulei	None	<a href="mailto:jpulei@yahoo.com">jpulei@yahoo.com</a>
Evelyn	Oroni	Kenya Wildlife Service	evise2001@yahoo.com
Ephraim	Kiragu	CWS – Instructor	eakiragu@cwsea.org
Sammy	Mutua	CWS – Instructor	smutua@cwsea.org



**Agenda  
REA Workshop – Karen, Kenya  
3 to 5 April 2006**

<b>3 April 2006 (Day 1)</b>	<b>4 April 2006 (Day 2)</b>	<b>5 April 2006 (Day 3)</b>
0900 1.1 Introductions & Overview 1000 1.2 Disaster Management 1100 <b>Coffee/Tea</b> 1115 1.3 Disasters & Environment 1200 1.4 REA Conceptual Framework	0900 Review of Day One. 0930 2.1 Factors Influencing Environmental Impacts 1030 <b>Coffee/Tea</b> 1045 2.2 Environmental Threats & SimEx 3 1145 2.3 Unmet Basic Needs & SimEx 4	0730 Departure for fieldwork 0800 Arrive at CLA sites 0900 Community Level Assessment field work. 1130 Discussion of CLA results (at field site). 1200 Return to Karen
1300 <b>Lunch</b>	1245 <b>Lunch</b>	1300 <b>Lunch</b>
1345 1.5 REA & Disaster Assessments 1545 <b>Coffee/Tea</b> 1615 1.7 Module 1: OLA <sup>4</sup> Context Statement 1715 Feedback on Day1	1330 2.4 Negative Environmental Consequences & SimEx 5 1500 2.6 OLA Reports and Review 1530 <b>Coffee/Tea</b> 1545 3.1 Module 2: Community Level Assessment 1630 CLA Fieldwork Instructions and Planning	1345 Completion of CLA Data Extraction Form 1400 3.2 Module 3: Consolidation & Analysis 1445 <b>Coffee/Tea</b> 1500 Exercise: Consolidation & Analysis 1545 Presentations & Discussion 1630 Module 4: Green Review 1700 REA Workshop and Learning Evaluation 1745 Workshop closing

**REA Learning Evaluation Questions**

1. How many tasks and modules does the REA have?
2. What is the definition of “disaster” used by the REA?
3. State one way in which disaster assessments are different from normal assessments.
4. Which of the following is not part of the “4 R” methodology?  
Recycle, Reallocate, Reduce, Reuse, Recover
5. State one reason for the Context Statement in the REA.
6. Task 4: Unmet Basic Needs assess the needs of outside relief experts sent to assess the disaster. True or false?
7. Why is the Community Level Assessment an important part of the REA?
8. What are the three words used as an aid in prioritizing environmental issues in the REA?
9. Name one type of action which can be taken once an issue has been identified as needing action in the Consolidation and Analysis section of the REA?
10. The REA is a balance between time and \_\_\_\_\_.

**Bonus Questions:**

11. Name one method for collection of information in a community.
12. Name one other way the Negative Environmental Impact of Relief Assistance form can be used to avoid or reduce the negative impact of relief assistance.

<sup>4</sup> OLA=Organization Level Assessment, CLA=Community Level Assessment