IAIA13 Training Course #6
INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT

Instructors
Gordon Appleby: drgappleby@gmail.com
Mahamadou Ahmadou Maiga: MAIGALEAD@YAHOO.FR
Agnieszka Rawa: RAWAAD@MCC.GOV

95 % above 7
"Threshold" for recommending the course again is 80%

Q1. List 2 or 3 worthwhile things you learned and did during the course.	Q2. Identify 2 or 3 things which helped you to work effectively at this course.	Q3. List 2 or 3 things which kept you from being more effective.	Q4. Rate your overall satisfaction with the course by circling the appropriate number. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)	Comment	Q5. Rate the following aspects of the course putting an X in the appropriate column. (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor 5)					Q6. Other comments or suggestions with regard to the course, the venue, accommodations or facilities.
					Trainer(s)'s knowledge of the subject.	Trainer(s)'s teaching skills and methods.	Course materials.	Practical exercisess.	Time available for content of the course.	
Talked to other practitioners - 100% was a wonderful experience to listen, share, debate - can't value that highly enough. Working through the case study together.		More sharing of examples (good and bad) - including from myself. Discussion issues that had/are coming up in projects to share ideas and different ways of looking at things as a group. Would also perhaps help, as a group 'cement' or function as a networking resource (perhaps?).	10		1	1	1	1	3	Suggest moving the groups more so that we all get to sit with different people throughout the 2 days. Would have loved more time on monitoring. It was a fantastic experience though - thank you.
Principles into practice. Important questions to ask oneself when carrying out a resettlement process.	Case study was interesting, good participation. (…), lively and focused presentations.	More practical exercises.	10		1	1	2	2	2	
Policy perspective. (…) theory/policies into practice from a personal perspective. Case study participation.	Small group size. Practical experience in resettlement.	Not applicable.	10		1	1	1	1	1	None.
Modern tools being used in the resettlement course. The practical case study work we did as a group.	Constant reference to practical examples and resettlement standards. Frequently allowing participants to ask questions or comment.	None.	10		1	1	2	1	1	This course was extremely useful and reflected immense preparation and professional expertise by the instructors. Bravo for a job well done!!!

Learning	What was good	What could be improved	Score	Comment	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	Additional comments
Consolidate knowledge of resettlement related activities (linear-mine). Role of the RPF.	Interaction with the instructors. Knowledge of the sharing of experience.	Although the principles are the same whether we talk about a linear or mining project - mining can be a bit more complex in terms of resettlement.	9.5		1	1	2	1	3	Excellent. All elements of the workshop program were greatly appreciated and well presented. Because of the complexity of IR it could be provided over a 3-4 day period. IAIA should contemplate the idea of (…) and advanced course for practitioners.
Types of resettlement (aerial, linear, mining). Concrete examples (ELS, Mali)	The two instructors were great, very knowledgeable and giving concrete examples. Amperative matrix of RAP, RPF, LRIP.	This course should be longer. I wish there were answers to all resettlement problems but I know it's impossible.	9		1	1	2	2	3	Could we do an "Involuntary Resettlement" advance level?
Resettlement is complex! Numerous stakeholders (not always obvious) can be impacted by resettlement. Data collection is imperative.	Small groups. Good opportunity to ask questions.	Time!	9		1	2	2	2	3	
Share experience. Meet new professionals.	Good structure. Well guided.	Paper version of PP to take notes. More info on tools = at tools.	9	Thank you for your energy, dynamic presentation.	1	1	2	1	3	
I learned a lot of things especially in RAP.	The explanation was very clear.	The time, the course could have more time.	9	The course was excellent, but it could be in more time in order to cover more in depth the topics, giving more examples and experiences around the world projects.	2	2	2	2	3	
Fruit trees, land and crops are not paid for the future. If the properties got all the details, than we go to RAP and ND and t RPF.	The interaction of the group.	Organization and the methodology.	9		3	2	3	3	3	None.
Presented with a "real life" scenario for group discussion and presentation. Practical experiences from varying practitioner backgrounds.	Small number of participants made it more intimate and participatory. Some background (IE professional experience) helped.	The length of time. The duration of time was lengthy especially after long hours of travel time.	9	Course was interactive and fun. Diverse backgrounds made a lot of shared experiences possible.	1	1	2	1	2	
Shared experience and ideas.	Friendly atmosphere.	Sometime, it was difficult to see what is written on the slides.	9	It was very interesting course. Thank you very much.	1	2	2	1	3	
Sharing ideas and standards (cross-reference). I learned that the principles are similar so we can not be totally right or wring always. Team building activities/networking.	Didactic content (physical handouts and digital copies). Sharing expectations and backgrounds at the start.	Too much content, had to fly through PowerPoint slides. Wish there was more time to participate and expand ideas.	9	it was amazing, thank you so much.	1	2	3	2	3	The spelling mistakes on the presentation could be improves. Less content-heavy slides, more time to ground ideas. There should be internet access for free.

Practical examples - group work/simulation. Reviews of existing documents - examples of evaluations.	Clear explanations - encouragement to debate/discuss.	JETLAG!	8		1	2	2	2	2	
Understanding private sector perspective. Practical examples and complexity.	Good participants opportunities. Background at the beginning.	Don't know. My own lack of experience.	8		1	2	2	2	2	
Learned through the presentation and study of complex cases. New tools.	The instructors the basic (…) lectures and participatory (…).	Look of more in depth case studies on complex resettlement.	8	Only because of (3).	1	1	1	1	1	
Scaling of RAP's is allowed, doesn't need to be 100+pgs. There is room for interpretation of the guidelines.	Use of real examples kept it interesting. The level of knowledge of participants was good, so didn't get slowed down w/ simple questions.	In the Mali case study, you could have spent a little less time on the context and more on the actual resettlement steps.	8		1	2	2	2	3	
Census methodologies for groups, housing, etc. (asset inventory). Size of studies needed relative no scope of resettlement.	Group work was useful to apply new learnings.	Course had a range of experience levels and catered t this. It would have been good to perhaps separate out experienced (advanced) into separate sessions.	7	As above perhaps would be good to separate and cater to different levels. Beginner, intermediate, advanced. On making the course explicitly for one level or another.	1	2	1	1	3	More group work and simulations would be good.
The practical exercise was good. The references to Op 4.12 were helpful.		The 1st case had a very long session devoted to a MCC project that was too detailed and not a particularly good example of involuntary resettlement.	7	Professional and personally committed instructors.	1	3	3	2	2	
Lessons learned from past cases. Ability to "ask the experts".	Felt it was a very open forum - everyone at ease to speak candidly and openly.	Too much rambling by presenters of times - off on tangents not on schedule.	6.5	Level was a bit too introductory for what I was hoping but I appreciate would be hard to tailor given group.	2	3	3	3	3	Felt there were some generalizations made about issues by sector - comments bit too sweeping and not enough acknowledgement of challenges getting good, reliable, credible data to support processes.
AVERAGE										
Q4. (Very dissatisfied 0, very satisfied 10)			**8.70**							
Q5. Detailed (Excellent 1, Very good 2, Good 3, Poor 4, Very poor)					**1.20**	**1.65**	**2.00**	**1.65**	**2.45**	
Q5. General average			**1.79**							