

# **REA Training Report**

## **REA Training and Training of Trainers**

### **Nathia Gali, Pakistan, 15 – 19 May 2006**

Prepared by E. Clark Hall  
REA Project, Benfield Hazard Research Centre, University College London

#### ***Report Summary***

The three-day REA workshop and following two-day REA Training of Trainers (TOT) was organized cooperatively by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and Church World Service (CWS) Pakistan/Afghanistan. A total of 20 individuals participated in the REA training. Seventeen of twenty participants passed the learning evaluation/test (75% or better correct answers) at the end of the REA training. This report summarizes the organization, methodology, preparation, outcomes and the participant evaluation of the trainings. Part B reports on the three-day REA workshop and Part C presents the TOT workshop evaluation results and lessons learned.

IUCN and CWS supported the travel and logistical costs of holding the workshop while funds for the workshop trainers and materials were provided by USAID/OFDA under the REA Project administered by CARE USA. InterWorks provided one trainer, Elaine Clark-Hall<sup>1</sup>, for the workshops. C. Kelly<sup>2</sup> played a dual role as both trainer and as The Benfield Hazard Research Centre (University College London) resource person.

#### ***Part A: Overview of the REA/TOT Workshops***

##### **The Ingredients: REA/TOT Workshop Venue, Participant Make-up, Training Methodology and Implementation**

The workshop venue was the Hotel Elites in Nathia Gali, a small hill station in the Abbaotabad District, approximately 32 km from Murree and 32 km from Abbottabad. While there were 67 applications for the training, IUCN limited the number to a maximum of 20 participants. They also discussed potential future training. The participants were selected according to who had registered first. There was a good balance of NGO and governmental participation as well as male and female participants. There were 6 women and 14 men present. There was a representative from the Pakistan Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority (ERRA) as the Pakistan Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and government officials from Balochistan and Gilgit (AJK). NGOs were represented by members from Islamic Relief Pakistan, CONCERN, CWS, ActionAid, RedR, WWF Pakistan, IUCN, Qatar Charity, Plan Pakistan, World Vision, SUNGI, SPO and FOCUS Pakistan. Additionally, the workshop participants came from each province of Pakistan: Sindh, Balochistan, Punjab and NWFP. Most participants spoke English fluently and those with difficulties understanding appeared to ask fellow participants to elaborate during sessions. Comprehension was high even if the ability to rephrase or repeat information in English may have been limited by language for a few people.

---

<sup>1</sup>Email [clarkhall@interworksmadison.com](mailto:clarkhall@interworksmadison.com), [emclarkhall@yahoo.ca](mailto:emclarkhall@yahoo.ca)

<sup>2</sup>Email [72734.2412@compuserve.com](mailto:72734.2412@compuserve.com)

The participatory method and the relaxed tone of the workshop set on the first day contributed to participant learning and sharing. Most participants appeared comfortable sharing orally, even if English wasn't their native language. The trainers attributed their high level of interest and comfort to the contextualization of the materials and use of local examples. The participants had a range of relevant environmental or disaster management experience, for example, most had had either personal experience with the October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2005 earthquake or had been working in Disaster Management for many years. Perhaps 3 or 4 had experience in environmental issues (WWF, EPA and a former UNHCR specialist from RedR). Along with specializations in training, economics and other experience, the participant group represented other sectors in disaster management: early childhood development and education, health, rural/community development specializing in hazard risk management, shelter and reconstruction, waste management, forestry, earthquake (EQ) food and relief aid.

### **Three-day REA Workshop Overview**

The workshop began with an opening message by Mr. Latif from CWS introducing the relevance of the REA to Pakistan's environmental concerns as well as referring to the reconstruction discussions being held by ERRA. The tone of the workshop was set by ice-breakers and good humor in the context of serious discussions of disaster management, the links between disasters and the environment, green review of procurement and the foundational concepts underlying the development and use of the REA as a solution. This first phase of training established a common framework for definitions and discussion and laid the background for the introduction of the REA as a methodology and process.

The second phase of the training, which introduces the REA as a process and methodology, was structured around the use of a simulation. For this training, the simulation was based on two scenarios taken from Pakistan's recent earthquake and current water crisis and hydrological drought. Participants were divided into five groups and each assigned a simulation scenario to use for their exercises. As the tasks in the REA process were introduced, each group would use their scenario information, provided in the form of handouts, to complete a portion of the REA process. Thus, they were tasked to actually complete an REA from start to finish, beginning at the end of the first day and finishing on day three of the workshop.

During much of the group work the lessons of the simulation were highlighted. The simulation is intended to mimic real life pressures and constraints of conducting a REA. Some of these elements are: the fact that information available may be incomplete, conflicting or inaccurate and confusing; that groups must work under intense time pressure and will necessarily have to develop consensus processes; that groups also must face internal issues such as lack of participation, quiet members, or language difficulties; that results must be recorded in such a way that multiple groups can merge their results in an effective manner; and that assessment results must be transmitted in clear, concise manner using effective presentation techniques.

While many participants had experience working on teams in disaster relief others brought their years of experience in other fields to their group work. The simulation provided many opportunities for examples of how to work effectively towards completing the REA given the constraints listed above. For example, some groups consistently came to consensus quickly and produced results in concise fashion while others debated terminology and methodology at length. The variety of methods of achieving the results of the exercises brought out the fact that the REA is a methodology and guidelines to follow when doing an assessment. Thus the variation in the group work contributed to highlighting the goal of teaching the REA – as a tool and a good practice solution to be modified and used in conjunction with other assessments.

On the third day of the REA segment of the workshop, the participants completed a Community Level Assessment (CLA) by going into the “field” and using a pre-determined methodology for gathering data from a “disaster affected community” (see the note below under challenges about the CLA). Several participants, already familiar with PRA and other data collection techniques, contributed much to the success of this exercise. Other participants appeared to enjoy this exercise as a way of ‘getting in touch’ with the needs of the community. Overall the exercise appeared to be successful, fitting well into the allotted time frame and accomplishing the goal of the exercise. When participants returned to the training room they successfully completed the last steps of the REA process, by recording the results of their data collection and consolidating the issues that had been prioritized according to the community and organization level assessments.

The three-day workshop concluded with a learning evaluation, workshop evaluations and a round of applause for participants who had successfully completed an entire REA based on their simulated scenarios and complementary “real” Community Level Assessment. Some participant comments about wanting to know more about how to teach the REA provided a natural segue into the Training of Trainers which followed on the next two days. Learning evaluation and workshop evaluations are presented in Part B below.

#### *Workshop Challenges*

For the most part participants seemed happy with their accommodation although there were some technical problems that affected the delivery of sessions on the first two days. Frequent power surges which cut the power to the computers interrupted the sessions on Monday and Tuesday. On Monday the trainers waited and did “energizers” while waiting for the computer and projector to reboot. Participant feedback about better time management prompted the trainers to improvise more and use the PowerPoint presentations less. During the following three days there were further power outages but everyone was now equipped with lighters and flashlights.

Due to the rains, the proposed location for the Community Level Assessment was changed from now muddy mountainous areas to communities in the Nathia Gali area. The change of plans was accepted with good will by participants who showed good sport about hiking in the mud

#### **Two-day Training of Trainers (TOT) Overview**

The TOT followed the REA workshop on Thursday, introducing a complementary phase of the learning of the REA method and process. The methodology used in the TOT followed on the model of the REA as participatory and based on the assumption that people learn best by doing. Thus, participants were briefed on basic principles of adult learning, effective presentation skills and on good facilitation skills as a background conceptual framework to prepare them to teach others about the REA during two participant practicums (individual presentations and team facilitation). The main objective of the TOT is to familiarize participants with the tools and methods of participatory training in order to better equip them to transmit the ideas and practice of the REA to others in multiple contexts.

In workshops in the past, it was evident that many participants who complete the three-day REA training feel confident to explain the concept and process of conducting a REA. However, they expressed that their confidence level increases dramatically after the fifth day of the workshop and they feel much more capable of teaching it to others. This increases the quality and usefulness of the REA workshop by increasing participants’ ability to give presentations about the REA in the field as a REA team leader or briefing their organization or donors. Another goal

of the TOT is to give participants experience in teaching the concepts and tools of the REA and using the REA training materials to prepare them to facilitate a REA workshop in the future.

## ***Part B: Three-day REA Workshop Evaluation Results and Lessons Learned***

A total of 20 individuals participated in the REA training. Seventeen of twenty participants passed the learning evaluation test (75% or better correct answers) at the end of the REA training. A REA CD was provided to each participant.

Out of the 20<sup>3</sup> participants who completed the workshop evaluation form, only 12 answered the question regarding the overall rating of the course. Of those 12, 7 found the workshop to be “excellent” (58%) and 3 found the course “very good” (25%) and 2 scored the course as “good” (16%). Of those participants who responded, 13 found that the course was the correct length, while one said it was too short. Of the 13 who responded to the question, 10 indicated there were “just enough” participants, while three felt there were “too few” participants.

### **Three-day REA Training Next Steps**

Participant comments on the evaluations as well as at the closing ceremony on Friday, indicated a need for follow-up programs or activities. Mr. Lamy, head of the IUCN Islamabad office, communicated a desire on the part of IUCN to organize some sort of follow-up to the training. Many participants expressed appreciation of IUCN and CWS of their efforts in organizing the workshop and thanks to the trainers for their efforts as well. The concluding note of the workshop indicated that many participants would want to use the REA in their organizational programming. One idea was informally proposed to institutionalize the REA as a governmental authority or to establish an REA roster of trainers/team leaders in Pakistan who could respond in the case of any disaster. The need to develop an internal Pakistan-wide listserv also was proposed as well as the importance of staying in contact with experts via the Disaster and Environment Listserv.

### **Three-day REA Training Lessons Learned**

As seen in the participant comments below, more illustrations and examples could be added to the sessions. The use of the training materials could be augmented with easier to use format (such as using a stiff card divider with a tab to separate sections or using spiral bound books instead of three ring binders). As such by using the binders for the participant guides trainers did not refer to the lessons in the participant guides during the sessions. Referring to the pages in the participant guides could help non-native English speakers follow the message. Also reproducing some of the graphics into the training materials (such as the Disaster Crunch Model) might aid non-native speakers “bookmark” or follow along with the message of the session.

---

<sup>3</sup> One evaluation form was lost during workshop cleanup.

## Part B: REA Training Evaluation Results

20 respondents completed the form:

Question	Average Score	Rating Range: Strongly Agree: 5, Agree: 4, Neither Agree or Disagree: 3, Disagree: 2, Strongly Disagree: 1
1. Subject matter was adequately covered	4.4	
2. Content was suitable for my background and experience	4.45	
3. Program was well-paced	4.4	
4. Training materials were relevant	4.7	
5. Participants were encouraged to take an active part	4.85	
6. The program met my individual objectives	3.95	
7. Program was relevant to my job	4.55	
8. I would recommend this program to my colleagues	4.6	
9. I feel prepared to conduct an REA	4.05	
Topic	Average Score	Rating Range: 5=excellent to 1=poor.
10. Lecture method	4.5	
11. Facilitation team	4.45	
12. Small group sessions	4.3	
13. Simulation Exercises	4.26	
14. Meeting space	4.21	
15. Overall organization	4.45	
16. Other participants	4.35	

### Suggestions or comments by participants on the course (Quoted verbatim)

- Duration should be more.
- Group work is good idea, but sitting around can get to be not good.
- The phases of the disaster need to be disseminated and further explained because it say about pre-disaster, in-disaster and post disaster.
- If will be better if the duration may be increased to understand the procedures step-by-step.
- This course was very informative and all the contents are very relevant.
- If time could be increased a bit and some key notes be given or addressed after each session. Means to share summary in a bit more detail.
- Excellent initiative by IUCN/CWS.
- Excellent trainers Mr. Kelly and Ms. Allain (Elaine), are very professional and are successful in floating the REA knowledge. In fact, I have gained a lot and am thankful to all who made this possible, My vision is broadened and now I have got a piece of thought for environmental safety in my mind 4ever.
- I would suggest that IUCN may organize this training in the future of any changes in the guidelines, methods.
- Materials may also [be] provided on CD.
- An excellent workshop with superb facilitation. Everything from management to training was something that really helped in our learning in the best possible way.

- The field exercise should be in a real situation.
- Duration may be increased from 3 to 5 days.
- The website needs to be modified, e.g., schedule needed to be displayed in advance.
- Field visit guidance: raincoat, cap, shots, etc.
- Period prolong.
- Soft copied along with CDs.
- Time to be reduced from 0830 to 1530. Reason: Govt. Senior Officer use to attend office from 0900 to 1300 hrs normally.
- More time is required for such training.
- It might be nice to go through [the] 11 tasks of the REA the first day of the REA (in a half an hour) to get participants to better visualize what they are going to do [the] next couple of days.
- In the future the instructors resource person should have national language experienced to overcome barrier of communications problems.
- Need more advance workshops.
- It provided some information about assessment done in earthquake and experience sharing.

**Feedback at the End of Day 1:** Participants' comments are in response to asking for, "what are some things that went well, and things that could be improved."

*What went well:*

REA approach, strong communication and simulation exercises.  
Interactive  
Friendly learning environment

*What could be improved*

Time management  
Room Temp with work station

**Learning Evaluation Scores:**

7.5	10.5	8.5	11.5
6	10.5	8	10.5
9.75	7.5	9	11.5
6.75	8	10	7.5
7.5	7.75	10	5.5

**Passing:** 75%, based on 10 questions.

17 of 20 passed

## Part B: 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)	Instructional Methods (average score)
1.1 Welcome / Introductions	4.00	4.00
1.2 Disasters and the Environment	4.11	4.07
1.3 Overview of Disaster Management	4.35	4.33
1.4 REA Conceptual Framework	4.55	4.36
1.5 Rapid Assessment in Disasters	4.50	4.21
1.6 Module 1: REA Context Statement	4.30	4.21
1.7 Factors influencing environmental impacts	4.35	4.21
2.1 Simulation Launch – SimEx 1 and SimEx2	4.40	4.33
2.2 Environmental Threats of Disasters	4.40	4.27
2.3 Unmet Basic Needs	4.35	4.33
2.4 Negative Environmental Consequences of Relief Activities	4.47	4.13
2.5 Presentation / Discussion	4.35	4.27
2.6 Participant Experience Sharing	4.24	4.31
3.1 Module Two: Community Level Assessment	4.60	4.53
3.2 Module Three: Consolidation and Analysis	4.50	4.53
3.3 Module Four: Green Review of Relief Procurement	4.11	4.33
3.4 REA Implementation Issues	4.00	4.21

## ***Part C: Two-day TOT Workshop Evaluation Results and Lessons Learned***

A total of 20 individuals participated in the REA TOT and all participated in giving individual and group presentations and facilitations. 55% of the participants who completed workshop evaluation forms found the workshop to be “very good” and 45% found it to be “excellent” .65% of participants rated the trainers as “excellent” and 35% rated the trainers to be “very good.” Day 2, the “Team facilitation Practicum & Feedback” received the highest scores on the evaluations for its usefulness (4.60 on a scale of 1 to 5) while Day 1’s individual practicum & presentations and received a lower score (4.05).

### **Evaluation of Participant Participation**

Participants seemed receptive to participatory methods introduced and in their individual and team facilitation exercises diligently prepared and in timely fashion presented content related to the REA. From this perspective the main goals of the REA TOT were achieved. The overall critique of most individual presentations was that each needed to condense the information a little bit more in order to make the best use of the time. However, despite this challenge, participants’ reflected an ability to condense REA concepts and tools into the allotted time and to concisely present the information. Their ability to use participatory methods increased in the second practicum the Team Facilitation Exercise.

### **Next Steps**

A REA CD was provided to each participant along with contact information for Kelly and Elaine for future reference and guidance in using the REA/TOT training materials. Kelly also gave participants information on how to join the Disasters and the Environment listserv.

Participant comments from the evaluations (shown below) requested more information about adult learning principles and more training practice. For some this experience was the first time giving presentations and facilitating groups. Despite this challenge and the linguistic challenge of presenting in English, the participant presentations and innovative group presentations made contributed to a lively, thought provoking and interesting close of the workshop. The trainers both commented that they learned techniques and interesting approaches to the content from the trainee’s presentations.

### **Lessons Learned**

The minimal use of the materials during the three-day REA could have potentially been a disadvantage to the participants when it came to the TOT. (One of the goals of the TOT is to familiarize the participants with using the training materials). In future, it might be good to print the materials in a different fashion (instead of using three-ring binders use spiral bound books in which it is easier to find information quickly) and to refer to the printed material as a reference during the REA sessions in the first three days.

However, participants did seem to be comfortable with using the Instructor Guides as a resource when planning their innovative team facilitation activities. The Instructor Guides were distributed only after the individual presentations. This meant was intended to encourage participants to use their Participant Workbooks and notes to prepare their presentations. In retrospect it seems that distributing the Instructor Guides as a resource for individual presentations would be a better option as it would provide participants with an extra resource for quick preparation.

## Part C: Training of Trainers Course Evaluation Form Results:

20 respondents completed the form below. The average of their answers is in at the right. When fewer than 20 answered the question it is noted in parentheses below the average.

**Answers to questions using a 1 to 5 Rating Scale have been averaged below.  
(1 to 5, where 5 means "very useful" and 1 means "not useful at all")**

1. How useful did you find the following presentations:
  - a) Adult Learning & Learning Styles **4.42**
  - b) Presentation Skills **4.47**
  - c) Effective Facilitation & Discussion Skills **4.42**
2. How useful was Day 1 "Practicum: Participant Presentations & Feedback" in giving you ideas on how to improve your presentation skills? **4.05**
3. How useful was Day 2 "Team Facilitation Practicum & Feedback" in giving you ideas on how to improve your skills in designing and facilitating an interactive learning exercise or discussion? **4.60**
4. Overall how would you rate the Training of Trainers Course? **4.45**
5. Overall how would you rate your TRAINER for the Training of Trainers course? **4.65**
6. What did you most like about this Training of Trainers course?
  - Group work, participation, & sharing information and developing linkages also.
  - Team work focus on the proper subject properly within the limited period.
  - Presentation group works, geed back from trainers.
  - Team facilitation Practicum. Not at all, this is my first training of this kind.
  - Different skills/methods used by trainers to train trainers.
  - Simulation exercises and the participants giving a training on a certain topic. Participation by participants.
  - Presentat6ion skills.
  - All interactive methods like participatory work in group work.
  - The way of teaching, how they involved everyone. In this course I like most the way to communicate with the participants.
  - Adult learning and learning styles.
  - The method to train the participants. It leads towards practicability of the REA training. Feedback, engaging audience.
  - The practicality & group work.
  - More beneficial and useful. It was comprehensive. Group presentation on day 2
7. How would you improve this course? (\*\* Concerning the replies to this question, please see the note below.)
  - When I practically implement ...
  - We can improve by regular working on the topic to ensure environment on sustainable ground.
  - Its already very good by improving tone.
  - Engaging participants in constructive discussion and feedback.
  - This was very improved course.
  - Once I conduct this training at least once, I will be able to suggest any improvement. I think it was perfect. attending more advance workshop.

- Translate into local language and then replicate in our area.
- By practicing again and again. It is already useful, but I will keep doing it the same way. By some case studies about TOT and rating of difficult courses.
- By practicing exercises and more learning.
- Adding more practicum and increasing duration.
- Would like to learn more about different learning styles. Although the training was the best if we could be but could have been made more effective if other techniques could have been practiced by the participants.
- More practical/demonstration-through slides & real pictures, barrier of language could be removed. Need time management (more time).
- More input regarding adult learning theories, practices and one small activity so that to realized in participants it's importance.

\*\* Please note that question #7 appears to have been understood by some respondents as “how did you improve as a result of this course” while others replied to the question, “how could this course be improved?”

8. What other suggestions or comments would you like to make?

- More and more implementation practically and training with community public also.
- Such type of training will improve our capacity building. God helps those who help themselves.
- Finally excellent course, REA & TOT, very knowledgeable and successful training.
- It was an excellent training, training place, working environments etc. No comment, it was a very useful and informative course.
- I appreciated the IUCN and Church World Service for organizing this course.
- I specially thank for Mr. Shahzad for such coordination.
- Mr Kelly and Ms. Elaine did well.
- You guys (IUCN) were amazing.
- A similar workshop may be arranged at Quetta Balochistan which is confronting disaster - drought. Overall training was good.
- If something is added to REA regarding re-construction activity. Later on I could give suggestions.
- It was a good course, interactive and extensive.
- It is proposed to have refresher course after sometime.
- As the course was about REA I agree (with the speed) but the TOT was carried out in a speed just as the REA.
- It would be better if we could develop proper modules for the REA TOT, and pre-list all its modules in a training like this.
- As per tradition, time scarcity and participation on behalf of trainees sometimes need to be directed. Nice workshop and enjoyed learning the
- Charles Kelly and Elaine C. Hall. Good luck to both of you.

## Annex 1: Participants List

S#	Name	Organization	
1.	Abdul Karim	P&DD Govt. of Balochistan	No email
2.	Abdul Qasim Jadoon	Plan Pakistan	<a href="mailto:abdul_qasim@yahoo.com">abdul_qasim@yahoo.com</a>
3.	Afnan Khan	IUCN	<a href="mailto:afnan.khan@isb.iucnp.org">afnan.khan@isb.iucnp.org</a>
4.	Atta Muhammad Murtaza	REDR-IHE	<a href="mailto:atta@redr.org">atta@redr.org</a> <a href="mailto:attamuhammadmurtaza@yahoo.com">attamuhammadmurtaza@yahoo.com</a>
5.	Babar Khan	WWF Pakistan	<a href="mailto:babarwwf@yahoo.com">babarwwf@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:babarhunzai@yahoo.com">babarhunzai@yahoo.com</a>
6.	Dr. Arifa Alvi	IR Pakistan	<a href="mailto:arifa.alvi@irp.org.pk">arifa.alvi@irp.org.pk</a>
7.	Engr. Ejaz Muhammad	CWS-P/A	<a href="mailto:civilians@gmail.com">civilians@gmail.com</a>
8.	Engr. Sher Hassan	CONCERN	<a href="mailto:sher.safi@concern.net">sher.safi@concern.net</a>
9.	Farzana Altaf Shah	ERRA	<a href="mailto:far_02@yahoo.com">far_02@yahoo.com</a>
10.	Ghulam Rasool Jamali	EPA, Balochistan	<a href="mailto:grasool_jamali@yahoo.com">grasool_jamali@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:epa_balochistan@yahoo.com">epa_balochistan@yahoo.com</a>
11.	Haji Zulfiqar Ahmad	Northern Areas Administration	No email
12.	Hajrah Ishaq	ActionAid	No email
13.	Irfanullah Tunio	EPA, Sindh	<a href="mailto:tunio@cyber.net.pk">tunio@cyber.net.pk</a> <a href="mailto:tunio@yahoo.com">tunio@yahoo.com</a> <a href="mailto:tunio@hotmail.com">tunio@hotmail.com</a>
14.	Jamila Sikander	FOCUS	<a href="mailto:jamilamughalpk@yahoo.com">jamilamughalpk@yahoo.com</a>
15.	Mamoona Wali Muhammad	Pakistan Forest Institute	<a href="mailto:mamoonawali@hotmail.com">mamoonawali@hotmail.com</a>
16.	Naveed Ahmad	SUNGI	<a href="mailto:naveed.ahmad@sungi.org">naveed.ahmad@sungi.org</a>
17.	Osman Ali Saad el-Din	Qatar Charity	<a href="mailto:haqbrother@gmail.com">haqbrother@gmail.com</a>
18.	Shazia Junejo	SPO	<a href="mailto:shazia@spopk.org">shazia@spopk.org</a>
19.	Sikander Azam	World Vision International	<a href="mailto:sikanderpk@yahoo.com">sikanderpk@yahoo.com</a>
20.	Tabassum Ahmed	P&DD, Govt. of Balochistan	<a href="mailto:ash_hasni@yahoo.com">ash_hasni@yahoo.com</a>

### IUCN and CWS Staff

21.	Gul Najam Jamy	IUCN Pakistan
22.	Shahzad Ahmad	IUCN Pakistan
23.	Maira Zahur	CWS-P/A
24.	Mansoor Raza	CWS-P/A