

Training Report Form

Name of Event: Urban WASH in Emergencies			
Event Date: 8-12 December 2014		Event Location: Royal Hotel, Skopje, Macedonia	
Name(s) of Trainer(s): Toby Gould, Cyril Cadier			
Total number of participants: 18 (2 did not attend the full course as they had no real English and were not aware of the theme of the course which was not relevant to their role) so 16 throughout the week			
Men: 11	Women: 5	International:	National: 16, all from E European Countries

NB: For someone to be considered national they would need to fulfil both of the following two criteria:

- Be working in their home country, and
- Be working for an international organisation in a regional or field office or for a national organisation.

Section 1: Daily Feedback

Indicate below the main areas of feedback that was given at the end of each day and indicate which of these were addressed during the course.

Areas Identified/ Comments made	How they were addressed by the trainers
<p>Participants' expressed expectations of the course outlined at the beginning of the first day included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban DRR and WASH, • planning, strategy and coordination tools for urban emergencies, • differences between rural and urban emergencies, • implementing water and hygiene in urban emergencies, • standards for urban WASH emergencies • sharing of experience and field example <p>Feedback on the first day was around:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timekeeping 2. Relevance to the region (no Africa examples, latrines etc.) 3. Relevance to government disaster staff and ways of working in emergencies 4. Sharing of experience from within the region 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The first day we had to spend time about 90 minutes exploring the participants' experience and expectations as so few had filled in the LNA form beforehand. We overran by almost 30 minutes on the first day, we adjusted the timetable during the first day to better meet their expectations and ensured that we did not overrun by more than 5 minutes on days 2 to 4. Participant evaluation forms showed this was not an issue after the first day. 2. We spent a lot of time in the evenings reshaping the course to meet spoken and implied expectations. A session on WASH Disaster Risk Reduction was developed, all mention of technologies that were seen as developing world (handpumps, wells, latrines) were taken out or where still relevant, the relevance explained and contextualised. 3. Sessions and case studies were rewritten

<p>Positive feedback on day 1 was about the good general overview of WASH in emergencies and about urban settings.</p> <p>Less formal feedback, at the end of each day, produced general satisfaction of efforts made and the resulting direction and elements of the course.</p>	<p>to minimise the “humanitarian” language, shorthand and bias. Instead lessons learnt and tools were more generalised, to make them more accessible to government staff. Staples such as the cluster system were redrafted to be seen as one way of several to coordinate and discussions around coordination were strongly directed towards E European mechanisms.</p> <p>4. Daily presentations by participants (4 in total of between 10 to 30 minutes) and longer discussions of tools, ways of working, and examples from E Europe were promoted. Sessions were changed to include more chance for dialogue and sharing of experience. We also used the case study and video of one participant working in Bosnia floods in the hygiene promotion session to show the necessity of HP in E Europe.</p>
---	--

Section 2: Event Report

2.1 To what extent did the course meet the learning needs of the participants in your opinion?

The participants came from a wide variety of backgrounds, some with senior positions in government disaster management committees, some with National Red Cross and Federation of the Red Cross Societies (IFRC) and some as firefighters carrying out search and rescue and recovery missions. A Learning Needs Assessment was carried sent to the participants beforehand but we had received only 8 of 18 responses by the start of the course. On the whole, therefore it met many or most of their learning needs.

2.2 Was the course run according to the timetable? If not, indicate any alterations that were made and explain why.

Doubts about the applicability of the course content to the participants were expressed a couple of days before the course started when participants’ LNAs were received. We therefore adjusted the first day’s timetable to accommodate time to explore participants’ experience and expectations. Further major changes were made in the timetable to meet as much as possible their expectations (as run timetable provided as annex). The course was also shortened to finish at 12.30 on the last day so that several participants could catch flights back home that afternoon.

2.3 What was most successful about the learning event delivered?

It had been adapted to

- the E European context (possibly more could be done) and
- the focus on strong government disaster response
- typically smaller scale disasters
- the lack of large scale international humanitarian community intervention.

2.4 What was least successful about the learning event delivered?

The adaptations made the scheduling of each day difficult, which participants picked up on but accepted

due to the need for changes. The changes also meant much of the participants' workbook was irrelevant and we often had to say we would ensure we would provide back up information (downloaded articles/books) for changed/new sessions.

2.5 How effective were the administrative arrangements before and during the course?

Due to national governments agreeing participants' attendance at a late stage and therefore their details not being made available (or the wrong people attending), the participants' list was sketchy. Much of the course material preparation had not truly been adapted to the context – developed countries with strong government response to typically small scale response. Having said that, even participants acknowledged that there were few studies relevant to the context.

The small lead time to the course and the time commitments to ebola training programme and other courses was evident in the administrators' workload. That they were able to produce a complete set of training materials and support resources in time for us to fly to Macedonia was really appreciated, it meant that we had a strong basis from which we could adapt the sessions to suit.

DPPI provided for the first 2 days excellent full time support from Vlatko and then his two assistants for the last 3 days. They were less interested in the progress of the course than he was but were more than willing to support us administratively. When one of the participants suffered from lung pains, they, and two local participants (one a doctor) were able to get him tested at a local hospital and provide necessary drugs.

Section 3: Follow-up

Please identify two or three participants who would be good contacts for RedR to follow up in future – to assess the impact of the training on these individuals and their work/careers.

Name	Contact email or phone	Why is this person good for follow-up (e.g. what is their current role, why are they taking this course, what do they plan to do next)
Mirjana Dimovska		Strong public health background who found the course useful
Martin Zakov		Red Cross Disaster manager – useful contact