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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Building Capacity for Participatory Forest Management for Good Governance in the Caribbean Region is an initiative by the Caribbean Natural Resource Institute (CANARI), under the Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) support programme for Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

At the first CANARI Capacity Building Workshop for Forest Management which was held in Jamaica during the months of February and April 2011, representatives from participating member states were given the responsibility to use the participatory techniques learned at country level with community groups for presentation on the same at the second CANARI workshop that is scheduled to take place in Dominica during the month of September 2011.

On the advice of the Forestry Dept., the representatives from Grenada engaged the Rose Hill Community Group, in the Parish of St. Patricks Grenada, using participatory methodologies to derive the following:

- Stakeholder Identification and Ranking;
- Determination of Group roles, Responsibilities and Interest;
- Institutional Mapping and
- Livelihood Analysis

1.1. **Rosehill Community Group: (RESDO)**

The assignment was accomplished through a series (3) of community engagements. The first dealt with Stakeholder Identification and Ranking and determination of roles, responsibilities and interest. The second consultation pertained to institutional mapping and the final had to do with livelihood analysis. In addition, the group participants were given the opportunity to evaluate the facilitation of the presentations. Furthermore, the group also had the chance to express what they would like to see happening for their organisation in the future. The following were the methodologies and outcome for the above categories of CANARI assignment:

2. **STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION AND RANKING:**

Officers from the Forestry and National Parks Department had consultations with the Rose Hill Community Group prior to the CANARI assignment and hence, the group had previous limited knowledge about stakeholders.
2.1. Methodology for Stakeholder Identification

- The entire process was highly participatory and interactive. Members of the group were asked for their understanding of the word stakeholder - who is a stakeholder?
- Facilitators gave an official definition for stakeholders and compared with group contribution;
- Group representatives were then asked to say who are their stakeholders

The following stakeholders were identified by the group:

- Fisher folks
- Forestry Department
- Ministry of Tourism
- Ministry of the Environment
- St. Patrick’s Environmental and Eco-Tourism Organisation (SPECTO)
- The Rose Hill Community
- Ocean Spirits
- Other Groups / NGOs
2.2. Methodology for Ranking Stakeholders

- Facilitators asked group representatives to rank the stakeholders - in order of importance. Each person was asked to rank his/her most important five stakeholders on the basis of 1 to 5, with 1 being the most important and 5 being the least;
- The scores were added and the stakeholder with the lowest score was the one with the highest ranking.
- Stakeholders were Ranked as Follows in order of importance:

  1. Forestry Department
  2. Fisheries Department
  3. Fishermen
  4. Hunters
  5. Crab catchers
  6. Charcoal burners
  7. Levera Developers
  8. Ministry of Tourism/Grenada Board of Tourism
  9. St. Patrick’s Environmental Community Tourism Organisation
  10. Ocean Spirits (Environmental NGO engaged in turtle research and turtle watching)
  11. Communities

3. Determination of Group Roles, Responsibilities and Interests:

3.1. Methodology

- Facilitators then gave definitions for roles, responsibilities and interest;
- Facilitators first asked participants to their perspective in roles, responsibilities and interest in relationship to the interests. This was done in a very interactive manner, thus ensuring that all group members contributed;
- The individual responses were then summarized.
The following summarizes the response of the group members:

3.1.1. **Interests:**
- Improving sustainable livelihoods using community NR – e.g. using the Levera Pond, community tourism
- Protection of natural resources (environment and conservation of environment for traditional users)
- Community Empowerment and Development

3.1.2. **Responsibilities:**
- Educate the community and the surrounding
- Uplift standard of living in the community
- Protect the natural resource
- Facilitate environmental education
- Develop/enhance sustainable livelihoods using community natural resources
- Respect closed season

3.1.3. **Roles**
- Roles which support community development activities
- Being supportive of the community group – e.g. fundraising and increasing membership
- Environmental Education
- Protecting the community environmental resource - e.g through monitoring activities
- Advocacy and partnership
4. INSTITUTIONAL MAPPING

Group representatives were very excited about the activity and participated fully.

*Photos depicting institutional mapping approaches*

4.1. Methodology for Institutional Mapping:

- Each individual of the group was assigned to be one of the key stakeholders that the group had identified in the *Stakeholder Identification and Ranking* exercise.

- Participants representing the various stakeholder institutions sat in round table formation and twine were used to establish connections/links between the institutions.

- Simultaneously with the round table plotting operation was a mapping exercise flipchart that mirrored the links established with stakeholders around table.

There were also active discussions on institutional links to illustrate strength, weaknesses and opportunities for establishing links. Noted were able to see whether links were stronger and where the potential existed for relationships.

5. LIVELIHOOD ANALYSIS

Like the other components of the assignment, Livelihood Analysis was no exception, discussions were lively and everyone made contributions and the exercise was very participatory. Participants understood that knowledge of the community/individual assets was essential to livelihood analysis.
5.1. **Methodologies Adapted for the Livelihood Analysis**

- Facilitators introduced the topic and gave definitions (with participants’ contribution) for Livelihoods, Sustainable Livelihoods and Assets.
- Through a brainstorming activity, participants listed the various community assets.
- Assets were then categorized into seven groups (Human, Natural, Social, physical, financial, Political and Cultural assets) following definitions shared by the facilitators.
- Where the main asset list had not captured assets for a particular asset group, definitions and group discussions assisted participants identifying those assets.
- Discussions sought to enhance group understanding on how the various assets contributed to livelihood opportunities.

5.2. **Assets Identified By Participants**

The assets identified by the participants are captured in Table 1 which follows.

Table 1: Assets identified by community group representative in collaboration with facilitators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category</th>
<th>Corresponding Asset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Assets</td>
<td>Hunting skills, Fishing skills, Knowledge (local traditional knowledge (LTK), Historical, Cultural and Environmental), Advertising skills, Construction Skills, Agricultural skills, Tour guiding and Handicraft skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Assets</td>
<td>Pond and Island within mangrove, Welcome Stone, Fauna and Flora, Sulpha Spring, Fresh Water Lake and Fishes, Turtle, View from Piton, Mangroves, Bat Fish and Caves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assets</td>
<td>Cultural Groups, Advertising, Basketball, Football, Cricket, Churches (Adventist, Baptist, Church of God, Mission Baptist), Boss FM, Shops and Sou Sou.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assets</td>
<td>Basket Ball Court, Community Centre, Schools, Health Centre, Historical Road and Bridge, Boats, Well and Fort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assets</td>
<td>Shops, Land, Sou Sou, Jobs, Savings, Credit Union at River Salley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Historical</td>
<td>Leapers Hill, Cannon at Levera, Petro glyphs, Museum, RC Church, Cemetery, Fort, Well, Great House, Chambo Copper, Janet House, Tree Mc Donald, Carib Stone, Slave Pen, River Antoine Rum Distillery, Shan go, Salaka* and Drumming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Assets</td>
<td>Political representation - Member of Parliament was the Prime Minister; Political Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* community feast of thanksgiving of African origin
6. **KEY LESSONS LEARNT:**
   - Preparation and planning are essential.
   - Knowledge of the participants: It is useful to get an idea of who the participants are likely to be to get an appreciation of their capacities and levels of understanding in order to deliver appropriately.
   - Importance of warm-ups and ice breakers; essential to get participants comfortable, relaxed and receptive.
   - Using the appropriate methodology for the group is key to effective delivery.
   - Participants need to be engaged and involved throughout.
   - Learning by doing.

7. **CAPACITIES NEEDED BY FACILITATOR:**
   - Ability to communicate at various levels
   - Patience
   - Value community knowledge – must have the philosophy or “world view’
   - Acquainted with and able to use a number of different techniques for engaging community

8. **MOST EFFECTIVE TOOLS:**
   - Practical exercises and use of examples were the most effective in delivering
   - Mobilisation tools (use of community group representative, phone etc.)

9. **ENABLING FACTORS**
   - Forest Policy
   - Management Plans
   - Forestry Department –staff trained in participatory approaches
   - Community interest and cooperation
   - Group prior engagement with FNPD

10. **WHEN PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES ARE MOST EFFECTIVE**
    - Beneficiaries have an interest or stake in the outcome of the approach
    - When levels of awareness are high –on both high side
• When there is trust
• Cohesiveness and understanding of collective functions

11. BENEFITS OR PARTICIPATORY APPROACHES
• Individual and community empowerment,
• Confidence and capacity building,
• Network and relationship building,
• Synergies
• Ownership

12. COST AND CHALLENGES
• Time
• Requires money
• Internal conflicts
• Determination of best approaches

13. EVALUATION

For this exercise, numerical scores (1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) were suggested, where a score of 1 would indicate the highest level of participants satisfaction. A score of 5 on the other hand will indicate the lowest satisfaction. The following are scores /level of satisfaction for the various areas:

13.1. Stakeholder Analysis

- 100% of participants that were present for the session gave a score of 1 thus indicating the highest level of satisfaction.

13.2. Roles, Responsibilities and Interest

- 66.6% of participants gave a score of 2 (second highest level of satisfaction) and 33.4% gave a score of 1 (highest level of satisfaction)

13.3. Institutional Mapping

- 100% of participants that were present gave a score of 1.
13.4. **Livelihood Analysis**

- 66.6% of participants gave a score of 1 and 33.4% gave a score of 1.

13.5. **Group Request:**
The group requested training/capacity building and support in the following areas:

- Collaborative Skills/building partnerships
- Understanding citizens rights to development
- Communication Skills
- Administrative Support (registration of group etc.)
- Funding Support.

14. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Mechanisms must be put in place at the national and regional level to ensure that the basic capacity development needs of groups can be addressed in an efficient and effective manner.
- Synergies (cooperation, coordination and collaboration) among national and regional community groups and NGOs should be encouraged, established and strengthened. Example exchange visits among islands.
- Sustainable livelihood opportunities for community groups using state natural resources in collaboration with NGOs and Government be formalised and intensified.
- Increase opportunities for empowering local communities and groups.
- Development of regional projects for the implementation of national community groups initiatives.
- Regional NGO and community group policy and programmes should be considered.

15. **CONCLUSION:**

The objective of the meeting was meeting. Participants displayed a high level of involvement / interaction throughout the entire exercise which contributed significantly to the success of the sessions.