

# Workshop Monitoring and Evaluation Report



Monitors: Shane Stevenson,  
Dates: 16 - 20 November 2009  
Location: Jamoat – Guliston, Jangalobod Jamoat – Bahor,  
Author: Shane Stevenson  
Date: 23<sup>th</sup> November 2009

### **3.1. Aim and Scope:**

To monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the UNDRMP project working with Natural Disaster Risk Management held for the heads of villages in districts around Dushanbe.

The scope was the first workshop out of four workshops so that recommendations and amendments could be made for the following three workshops.

### **3.2. Activities:**

The activity consisted of a four day programme of teaching and practical exercises presented by the CAMP Kuhiston, Red Crescent and the Committee of Emergency Services.

Moderators:

CAMP Kuhiston – Bozor Rahmonov, Fattoh Mirzoev, Davlatbek Davlatov.

Red Crescent – Tojiniso Holova

CoES – Hurshed Gadoev, Shamsuddin Abdulloev, Mahbuba Saidova

### **3.3. Monitoring:**

#### **Day 1:**

#### **Logistics**

- 3.1. There was some room for improvement in preparation on the first day. The result was that the workshop started thirty minutes late, however all the material planned to be covered in a day was included. *(the car breaking down compounded this)*
- 3.2. The room was a little dark and cramped. Several rooms in the Jamoat building and the school were checked before the workshops.
- 3.3. There was a problem with electricity supply and generator.
- 3.4. Food and coffee breaks were well organised.
- 3.5. The posters around the room helped create an atmosphere of learning.

Course Material:

- 3.4. The participants were engaged from the beginning and stated their aims and objectives from the course.
- 3.5. The initial presentation on the role of CoES was well received.
- 3.6. The Session on hazards, provoked a lot of discussion and became a more of a discussion group on past disasters. It lacked a little focus and could be more structured, however the discussion engaged the participants.

- 3.7. The CoES session in the afternoon was a too long and a little dry. There was not much interaction between participants.
- 3.8. The CAMP and Caritas DVD were well received and provoked comment and discussion. These are good tools for the dissemination of information.

#### DAY 2:

- 3.9. Session on Fire Hazards was well presented, however a little long as participants were struggling to remain engaged.
- 3.10. The review of the risk assessment form was well presented and the example worked well. However, it was a lot of information to take in at one time.
- 3.11. The movie provided by CoES was poor and did not engage the participants.
- 3.12. There were changes in the personnel who attended the workshop.

#### DAY 3:

- 3.13. The family disaster plan exercise appeared to work well. The participants engaged well in the exercise.
- 3.14. The Session by Red Crescent was excellent, there was over 50 member of the village watching the demonstration, most of whom stayed until the end.
- 3.15. The discussion on the mitigation requirement of the village was a little short and could have been further extended.
- 3.16. The field trip out to the proposed mitigation places was useful to see what previous mitigation measures have previously been completed, and to see how successful these schemes had proved to be. Also discussion about the appropriateness of new mitigation proposals was helpful.
- 3.17. The concept of vulnerability was further clarified by seeing houses and electricity pylons in immediate danger.

#### DAY 4:

- 3.18. The venue changed to the second Jamaot and the room was more suitable.
- 3.19. The participants from Guiliston were late.
- 3.20. The session from CoES, but did not engage the participant too much.
- 3.21. The session on the MECO risk assessment seemed a little excessive information. However, the moderators on further discussion said that it was useful and should remain the programme.
- 3.22. The practical exercise from the Red Crescent was very useful, participants were asked to practice, however not all participants were able to practice.
- 3.23. The site visits to two-village again were useful, the first demonstrated the need for engineering works and the second the need for more control on land use planning. The session was very relaxed and possibly could have been more engaging.

#### **4. Evaluation:**

The training session went well. The feedback from the participants was high and there was a high degree of attendance.

- 4.1. The workshop successfully brought together the working of three organisations. However, there was considerable discussion and time spent bringing the project to realisation.
- 4.2. The participants clearly stated what they required from the workshop, however the overall objective of the workshop came across as dissemination of information. There is scope to demonstrate how the outcomes of the workshop fit in to a 'Bigger Picture' or structure.
- 4.3. There was too much material in the workshop programme. The workshop would benefit from less material presented in more interactive ways.
- 4.4. The presentations from CoES were very dry and not engaging. Although participants probably understood the underlying message.
- 4.5. A lot of information was presented and the outcome was that the participants have a better understanding of Natural Hazards.
- 4.6. First Aid course was a little rushed and would have benefited from more time to undertake more practical exercises.
- 4.7. The purpose of the MECO assessment appeared to be out of context.
- 4.8. The Family Disaster Plans were effective in highlighting and focusing attention on what was vulnerable.
- 4.9. The site visits were valuable and helped demonstrate some of the points in the classroom.
- 4.10. The Fire exercise would have benefited greatly from practical demonstrations.
- 4.11. The general preparation of the course was effected by the provision of food stuffs for lunch and coffee breaks.
- 4.12. The use of the DVDs was excellent.
- 4.13. The overall attendance was good, but several participants left at various stages of the workshop, therefore missing out on the full benefit of the trainings.

#### **5. Recommendations:**

The following recommendations are suggested if the project is undertaken again. Some of these have already been implemented for the following workshops, other recommendation are in project design.

- 5.1. The content of the programme should be reduced. *(The programme has been re-evaluated and some content removed were there was felt to be repetition between different presenters)*
- 5.2. The information presented by CoES was not overly engaging and their trainers could benefit from further training in presentation skills.
- 5.3. There is scope for all trainers to have further training to improve their own technique.

- 5.4. Although 'a lot' of information was passed on, the workshop overall objective could have been made a little clearer. *(After further discussions with moderators there will be further emphasis on the participants being able to complete their own risk assessment and develop a proposal for submission to local government and other organisations)*
- 5.5. The programme seemed a little disjointed and overlapped between presenters. *(There are now some alterations in programme)*
- 5.6. Participants are not use to sitting and engaging for long periods of time. Maybe more interactive training could be further developed in this programme.
- 5.7. The responsibility of the food should be taken away from the moderators, who are then left to concentrate on the course. *(This has now been delegated out).*
- 5.8. The CoES DVD should be left out of the next workshop.
- 5.9. A generator could be provided to help with the intermittent power supply.
- 5.10. It should be made clear that for participants to receive a certificate of attendance they have to attend the entire workshop.

### **Summary:**

The workshop at head of village level is an excellent concept and with some further development will prove to be an effective tool. The focus of the workshops should be developed further from the dissemination of information, to include the ability of participants to be able to produce hazard risk assessments and proposals for submission to local government and other organisations. It felt like the participants had been provided with lots of really useful information and tools, but were not provided with a focus as to what to do with them.

