**CASE STUDY: Application of the Principles of Facilitating Participatory Forest Management to a Prospective Local Forest Management Committee (LFMC) in the Morant River Watershed, St. Thomas, Jamaica.**

Jamaica Team Members: Marlon Beale, Noel Bennett, Bernard Blue, Indi McLymont-Lafayette, and Allison Rangolan McFarlane

**Background**

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) hosted a Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEG) workshop entitled “Building Capacity for Participatory Forest Management for Good Governance in the Caribbean Region” from April 11-15, 2011 in Kingston, Jamaica. One of the objectives of the workshop was to apply key tools in facilitating participatory management. To achieve this, each country team was asked to plan and facilitate a participatory management session and document the process and findings in a case study.

The Jamaica team conducted their facilitation exercise at the Hillside Primary School which is situated in the Morant River Watershed Management Unit (WMU) in the southern foothills of the Blue Mountains. The Morant River (with a watershed of 38,403 hectares) is one of three large rivers that drains the Blue Mountains in the southeastern parish of St. Thomas; the other large rivers are the Yallahs River and the Plantain Garden River, with watersheds encompassing 18,813 and 17,947 hectares respectively. The communities represented are contiguous to the Spring Dunrobin Forest Reserve which has been impacted by various encroachment including logging, grazing and farming. The result has been increased fires, soil erosion and siltation of the river. Landslides have destroyed much public and private infrastructure including roads, bridges, the hydro electric power plant and houses which has made life difficult for residents.

In an effort to tackle some of the issues the Forestry Department (FD) has been engaged in a replanting exercise. This has been supplemented by two Forest Conservation Fund (FCF) projects being managed by the St. Thomas Bee Farmers Association (STBFA) and the St. Thomas Environmental Protection Agency (STEPA) respectively. These projects involve reforestation, livelihood activities such as bee keeping, training and environmental awareness. The FD Rural Sociologist and other personnel have been collaborating in the process geared toward establishment of a Local Forest Management Committee (LFMC), which is an objective of the aforementioned FCF funded projects. The process is at the stage where it was determined that in-depth stakeholder identification and related processes could be beneficial. Mr. Terrence Cover, STEPA, and Mr. Delroy McNish, STBFA, were contacted and asked to coordinate the meeting and mobilize the relevant communities, agencies and organizations. The facilitators commend STBFA and STEPA who arranged and covered the costs of refreshment and transportation and are grateful to the community participants for giving of their time and ideas so freely.
1. What were you trying to achieve?

Objective of the Jamaican Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Case (FLEGT) Study

The overall objective of this case study was to enable participants in the FLEGT workshop to hone their skills to facilitate participatory processes in regard to forest management by applying the tools of the facilitation process to assist in the establishment of a prospective LFMC within the Morant River WMU and documenting the process.

The following were also objectives:

- To ensure that the communities within the Morant River WMU participated in the process necessary to establish their LFMC. Many participants were invited from communities involved in the two aforementioned FCF projects and included communities such as Hillside, Soho, Whitehall and Woodside, et cetera.

- To generate critical and relevant information from the stakeholders to ensure insightful participatory processes and stakeholder inclusion in the decision making processes for the Spring Dunrobin Forest Reserve.

2. How did you do it?

Mobilization

The STBFA and STEPA operate in Spring Hillside and Whitehall, Soho, respectively. Both organizations are actively engaged in implementation of projects in their respective areas. FD personnel assisted the mobilization effort at the local level. After telephone conversations, a formal letter was sent to the management of these organizations who gave notices to the people. The logistics of the meeting were finalized by the local persons: STBFA was responsible for refreshments as the event was staged in their operational area and STEPA organized transportation of the people from the communities in which they work. The focus of mobilization was on the local communities and not the allied government agencies such as the Rural Agricultural Development Authority (RADA).

Methods used in the Facilitation Process

In the conduct of the facilitation process with the Morant River Watershed communities (prospective LFMC) a variety of methods were employed in order to achieve the objectives including: questioning, discussions, role play, visual representation, brainstorming, demonstrations, use of humour, repetition, games, feedback and debriefing.

Ice Breaker and Introduction

The facilitation process began with the use of an icebreaker activity involving each person choosing one letter from the Local Forest Management Committee acronym, LFMC, and sharing with everyone present a word beginning with that letter that reflected something they
personally associated with a LFMC. Each individual was also asked to state his/her name and to share the name of the organization(s) or community from which they came.

Agenda
An agenda was presented as well as the objectives of the facilitation process which provided the participants with an understanding of what the whole exercise was about; the sequence of activities and their role in the process, as well as guided the deliberations. Participants were urged to get fully involved, making whatever input they deemed necessary freely and openly.

Setting the ground rules
The introduction of the ground rules by which the facilitation process was going to be conducted was outlined. One rule was originally established in which the participants were encouraged to contribute actively during the discussions and to respect the opinions of each other. Following an interruption by a ringing cell phone, an amendment was made to include a second rule whereby the owner of any ringing cell phone would be fined for the interruption.

Session I: Stakeholder Identification
The participants first identified some of the (natural) resources in their communities. Resources were identified under the general categories of Rivers, Forests, Land and Heritage Sites (see Findings below). The participants then identified and listed the functions and then the stakeholders of each resource category. Different volunteers were asked to write the information on flipchart paper mounted on the chalkboard.

The focus then shifted to identifying the key stakeholders from the list developed. Participants were divided into groups (i.e. persons in close proximity to each other) and each group was then asked to identify the key stakeholders from the list of stakeholders that had been identified.

Initially, the facilitators recognized that the participants were having difficulty in understanding what they were supposed to do and gave further clarification, which proved beneficial to all and resulted in the successful completion of the activity.

Energizer
Session II: Institutional Mapping required some reorientation of the seating arrangements. The group was therefore asked to rearrange the classroom to form a circle and then adjust it slightly so that everyone would be able to look at the chalkboard.

Additional time was also required for the facilitators to mount the previously used flipchart sheets at another location in the classroom, mount more paper on the chalkboard, and reorganize and write the names of the top five key stakeholders identified at the end of Session I on construction paper. The participants were therefore invited to dance in the circle that had been created.

Session II: Institutional Mapping
The institutional mapping session began with the participants listing a number of persons and groups who would participate in a football game. These were written on flipchart paper mounted on the chalkboard.
After listing the participants in a football game, the persons present were then asked to describe the relationships between two pairs of selected participants in a football game and define whether the relationship was (a) formal or informal and (b) one-way or two-way.

The facilitators explained that “institutional mapping“ was a way of describing and depicting relationships between stakeholders whether they are individuals, groups, organizations, government agencies, etc and that the “institution“ comprised all these different stakeholders (i.e. in this instance “institution“ and “organization“ were not used interchangeably).

Some reorganizing of the key stakeholders identified previously was done and the rationale (i.e. to reduce duplication and be as inclusive as possible) was explained to the participants. The top five stakeholders were selected for representation from this reorganized grouping. The name of each stakeholder was written on construction paper and one individual asked to represent each stakeholder. Wool (passed from one key stakeholder representative to another) was then used to demonstrate the relationships between each of the five key stakeholders.

**Session III: Rights, Responsibilities and Interests**
The participants were asked to break out into groups with each group representing one of the key stakeholders from the previous session. Each group was asked to list, on a sheet of flipchart paper the rights, responsibilities and interests of the key stakeholder they represented. A brief explanation of each term was provided so that everyone was clear about what they were expected to do. One member of each group was then asked to introduce the members of the group with whom they worked and present the groups’ findings to everyone present. The presentations were done in plenary which facilitated the sharing of the findings of each group with everyone and engendered more ideas from the larger group.

**Lunch**
The lunch break was much later than originally planned as persons were engrossed in the activities.

Coincidentally, a team of FD personnel and consultants were on a tour of projects in the area and stopped by the venue and had informal discussion with participants around the same juncture as occurred at the facilitation field trip in Holywell.

**Session IV: Livelihoods**
The questioning method was used to elicit from participants a list of livelihood activities that were being pursued in their respective communities in a brainstorming session. As the emphasis of the facilitation process was about participatory forest management, the participants were asked to specifically identify forest livelihoods.

The responses of the participants were organized into six categories and written on flipchart paper (see Findings below). The involvement of all participants was elicited when they were each provided with stickers and then asked to place the sticker in the category/ies where the livelihoods in their respective communities fell. The participants were then asked to explain why they chose the particular category/ies.

**Debriefing**
Debriefing was done at the end of each session and at the end of the day’s activities and allowed the facilitators to:

- Summarize key findings of the facilitation process;
- Link the findings of the session to the training objectives;
- Link the findings of each session to those of previous sessions; and
- Present and/or discuss additional, important points that were not addressed during the activity.

The final session allowed the facilitators and participants, particularly the latter to give an individual review of the approach, the content and lessons learnt. The linkage with the proposed LFMC was also made and there was affirmation that the LFMC processes should continue as a better understanding of the stakeholders involved had been developed. The participants agreed to a bimonthly joint meeting of the communities and participants present while the Spring/Hillside group indicated that they would continue their monthly meetings.

3. What were the results of the process?

Evaluation of the Facilitation Process

Mobilization

Mobilization was deferred to STBFA and STEPA as they were already in contact with the people in the communities in which they operate. The rapport that had already been established with the community members enabled the mobilization process to be more efficient and effective. The communities involved were already targeted for LFMC development; meetings had been initiated with Spring Hillside a few months earlier and had become a monthly routine. The Whitehall and Soho communities and those further afield were slated for active meetings; thus the opportunity was seized to get all the communities together and apply the facilitation methods for practice with respect to the CANARI objective to host a workshop to apply key tools in facilitating participatory management and to serve the larger purpose of publicizing the LFMC process.

Icebreaker and Introduction

The participants were receptive and although, initially, a few participants needed some encouragement, the icebreaker was successful. It was important for everyone to introduce themselves and provide information about the communities and organizations with which they were connected. It also allowed two things to be accomplished simultaneously: everyone was able to focus on the main purpose of the participatory session, i.e. assisting the participatory process of establishing an LFMC, while introducing themselves to everyone else present at the meeting. This allowed for the creation of an atmosphere and process that encouraged dialogue, openness and learning, clarifying expectations and building group dynamics. The facilitators also explained the purpose of the meeting during the introductory process.

Agenda
Setting an agenda and writing it on the chalkboard in a location where it was visible to everyone helped to highlight the purpose of the meeting and outlined the steps that would be followed to accomplish the objective of the meeting.

Setting the ground rules
The introduction of the ground rules by which the facilitation process was going to be conducted sought to establish the guiding principles by which each participant would be expected to abide in order to (a) ensure that each person had the opportunity to share his/her opinion, and would be respected, (b) reduce any conflicts, (c) prevent domination of the sessions by one or two persons, and (d) reduce distractions. The need to add and/or amend rules as necessary proved useful when it was realized the distraction posed by ringing cell phones had originally been overlooked.

Session I: Stakeholder Identification
Initially, the participants seemed a little uncertain of the overall purpose of the process and/or their role in it. There was also some uncertainty about the kind of information to be shared and discussed i.e. the identification of natural resources in the various communities. Further explanation by the facilitators and general discussion helped to answer the outstanding questions and provide additional clarification. After a few examples and some probing questions, the participants seemed comfortable identifying and listing the resources, functions and stakeholders.

This session took a little longer than originally anticipated and could perhaps have focused specifically on the traditional forest resources, and disregarded the other natural resources in the interest of time. However, if this approach was employed and the other resources not been explored in greater detail, the linkages between the other resources that were identified and the forest resources may have been overlooked.

Some umbrella groups such as community based organizations (CBOs) and non-governmental organization (NGOs) were identified during the stakeholder identification process; organizations that were a part of these umbrella groups were also identified in some instances. However, following identification of the stakeholders, it would have been useful to reorganize the entire list of stakeholders placing all the organizations in their respective umbrella groups. The key stakeholders would then be identified primarily on the basis on umbrella groups, not individual organizations.

Once the stakeholders were identified, the participants easily identified the key stakeholders. Many of the participants identified the same key stakeholders. In the absence of complete reorganization of the stakeholders into umbrella groups prior to identification of the key stakeholders, the facilitators reorganized the key stakeholders into umbrella groups and presented the reorganized grouping to the participants along with the rationale for the proposed regrouping. Interestingly, a number of the participants had themselves done some reorganization into umbrella groups identifying government as one key stakeholder for example. After reorganization, the top five (5) key stakeholders were: Government Agencies (which included the National Environment and Planning Agency - NEPA, Jamaica National Heritage Trust - JNHT, Social Development Commission - SDC, RADA, Island Special Constabulary Force - ISCF, etc.), Forestry Department, NGOs/CBOS (including STPEA, STBFA, Community Development Councils - CDCs, etc.), Farmers, and Householders and Schools. All the
government agencies, except Forestry Department were placed in one group; the Forestry Department remained separate because it was expected to lead the establishment of the LFMC, and received a very high score. The participants were asked if there were any objections, comments or concerns regarding the proposed regrouping; there were none.

**Energizer**

Reorganizing the seating arrangements and inviting the participants to dance enabled a smooth transition between the first and second sessions and allowed the participants the opportunity to partake in an entertaining, unexpected activity. One participant took up the challenge to dance in the circle created for Session II: Institutional Mapping. The light interlude was well received.

**Session II: Institutional Mapping**

The level of involvement in the introductory activity for this session was good at least partly because the participants were all familiar with football and the various persons and groups who would be present at and/or participate in a football game. The football analogy was useful in conveying the concept of relationships and institutions using an everyday example while allowing persons present to actively participate in the illustration and explanation of the concept to be explored.

The institutional mapping activity went well and the participants easily identified the relationships between each of the key stakeholders; as each relationship was identified, the nature of the relationship was described, and a determination was made whether it was formal/informal and one-way/two-way. Initially, there was some uncertainty whether only the persons representing the key stakeholders were expected to participate in the identification and description of the various relationships or if everyone was to contribute; this should have been clearly communicated from the outset and once it was clearly articulated that everyone was encouraged to contribute, a very good level of involvement and information sharing was achieved.

The institutional mapping activity provided a vivid, visual representation of the intricacy of the network formed by the various relationships between the key stakeholders and also emphasized the importance of each stakeholder in the network. The effect of one stakeholder no longer fulfilling their role in the network was presented in a manner similar to that used during the field trip to Holywell in Jamaica where the CBO/NGO representative was asked to drop the wool that she held and everyone was able to observe the visual impact on the network. The visual effect of the web-like linkages was commended by participants who expressed satisfaction during and at the end of the exercise.

Representatives from the Forestry Department were present. However, it would have been beneficial if representatives from the other government agencies identified as key stakeholders were present for this session because they could have provided a more fulsome explanation of the existing as well as the potential relationships. Their absence was due partly to time constraints in the planning process and also to the fact that the mobilization effort had focused primarily on the communities and not the allied government agencies. However, the participants were well versed in the roles of the various government agencies having worked closely with them on previous occasions.

**Session III: Rights, Responsibilities and Interests**
A brief explanation of each term - rights, responsibilities, and interests - was provided. The groups were first given the opportunity to brainstorm amongst themselves. After some time had elapsed, the analyses/examples presented in the manual were read to them. This gave the participants the opportunity to compare their ideas with those presented by the facilitators. For the most part, the participants’ ideas and those presented in the manual were similar. The participants appeared to have a clear understanding of the rights, responsibilities, and interests of each of the key stakeholders and they were also encouraged to use the resource persons in their midst if there were questions that needed to be answered.

Each group chose a representative to present the group findings. The presentations were well done and even those persons who were initially reluctant to present, clearly articulated and thoroughly explained the group perspective. The other participants had the opportunity to ask questions and/or make comments on the presentations; however, there were few questions and/or comments. This was likely a result of participants’ familiarity with the information being presented and/or the clarity with which it was presented.

Again, it would have been beneficial if more representatives from the key stakeholder groups were present for this section because they could have provided a more fulsome explanation of the rights, responsibilities and interests. However, the participants were sufficiently well versed in the rights, responsibilities and interests of the key stakeholders having worked closely with them on previous occasions.

Session IV: Livelihoods
This activity was a good introduction to the concept of livelihoods and livelihood assets. Again, the discussion was based on a concept that was familiar to everyone present and therefore allowed everyone to participate. However, in addition to identification of the various livelihoods within the communities, the concept of livelihoods was presented and discussed from the slightly different perspective of livelihood assets.

The participants initially appeared a little reluctant to begin identifying the livelihood assets that existed in their communities and explain the rationale behind the assets identified. Contributing factors may have been that the participants were unaccustomed to describing their community livelihoods in terms of livelihood assets and needed some time to contemplate their responses; this session was also the final session and was held immediately after lunch, and a number of persons were probably beginning to tire after a long day of activities.

In the absence of time constraints, this topic could easily have been discussed in greater detail; however, the discussion and activities which were completed during this session were useful. This brief session emphasized that ideal is not always attainable but each piece of information, no matter how small, can be useful and beneficial to a process and should be garnered as the opportunity presents itself.

General Comments
The facilitation methods employed allowed the communities to focus on livelihood issues that were common to their existence and identify the range of stakeholders that must be considered as the LFMC process unfolds. The fact that the first joint meeting was executed so successfully signalled the possibilities for the same into the future and the people embraced the concept.
Each session followed logically from the previous session and the participants seemed comfortable transitioning between sessions and applying the findings of the previous sessions to the subsequent sessions. Active participation and engagement of the persons present contributed tremendously to the overall success of the process. The debriefings between sessions and at the end of the day indicated that the participants thought the overall participatory process was useful and had gained some additional insight into the process of establishing a LFMC.

4. What lessons were learnt about facilitating participatory processes?

Facilitators should consider the following:

1. Always have a formal start with set agenda and protocols established.
2. An “icebreaker” is a crucial tool to set the tone and must give everyone in the session an opportunity to be heard or something to do.
3. People are willing to participate if given the chance, but objectives must be clearly stated at the outset and engagement activities must be constant and varied.
4. Set realistic goals within the allocated time and resources and remain flexible as there needs to be allowance to pursue unforeseen developments/revelations/information.
5. Even when groups are engaged, be prepared to clarify an exercise or aspects of it, repeatedly.
6. Teamwork must flow seamlessly toward the goal even when adjustments have to be made at short notice.
7. Breaks (especially lunch) must be timely and strategic for facilitator(s) and participants and informal conversation during break can provide useful information.
8. Always make connections between the facilitation activities and the wider goal of forest/environmental management.
9. Do not swamp local issues/interests/concerns with large overarching themes but be on the lookout for parochialism.
10. Be on the lookout for and manage competition among participants who might be pushing an agenda or an ego display.
11. Record/document all ideas even if not immediately applicable.
12. Do not underestimate literacy/spelling/penmanship challenges; keep your surprise hidden if someone your thought could, does not exhibit at a level you anticipated; give assurance that each contribution is welcome/appreciated.
13. The facilitator(s) body language and tone must always be positive even when fatigue starts to creep in.
14. Always review the day’s activities and express appreciation for the participants’ contribution to the process.

The Community Participants expressed the following:

- Unity is strength, individual power is not. Complete cooperation in the use of different resources in different communities will strengthen the communities.
- The forest is common to all, and we have right to take care of it.
- The forest is about more than reaping and planting.
- Communities can now contribute more to conservation.
- We care for it (forests) more so we and our children can benefit.
- Aim for no forest fires.

When asked the final question “Was the exercise beneficial?” the participants responded:
- We edify each other.
- Everyone got involved.
- Techniques used in bringing across information were good.
- Other techniques can be used but may not be as visual.

Conclusion

The facilitators are satisfied with the outcome of the exercise. The objectives of this case study as stated previously were achieved. The process allowed firsthand interaction in applying tools learnt at the CANARI training held in April 2011 without the direct guidance of the CANARI trainers. Having identified the range of stakeholders and the linkages the participants affirmed the purpose of getting the LFMC established to coordinate conservation of the forest. The role of STEPA and STBFA in setting the foundation was lauded and it was confirmed that they would continue to provide mentorship and guidance. In the meantime the communities will develop the institutional capacity to take charge of their own affairs and move forward as they are now more aware of what is involved in the LFMC participatory process.

In keeping with the agreement to continue of the LFMC process, the Spring/Hillside community will continue its monthly meetings, and a joint meeting, with the participants forming the nucleus, will be held bi-monthly. It was indeed a rewarding experience for all concerned. There was a clear increased awareness of the issues impacting forestry and livelihoods in the area. Although the communities were meeting for the first time under these auspices, it was evident that the rapport and camaraderie bode well for the future. The absence of some government stakeholders, though regretted, did not significantly impact the quality of the assessment as the roles of those agencies were understood. The space afforded by the absence of these stakeholders allowed the community members to have clarity of their local situation. As the LFMC process develops, the input of those entities would be more valuable; it was of some significance that the community members were able to identify and articulate the role and responsibilities of those agencies. Given the above it was obvious that the communities had some informed relationship with various agencies that comprise the external stakeholders and the need for fostering such during the LFMC process would be that much easier. For the purposes of the study, it was more crucial to place the relationships at the local level on firm footing; a feat the exercise achieved quite successfully, and which was further emphasized by the cooperation between the two mobilizing NGOs was also of signal importance as there was sometimes a perception of friendly rivalry between them.
Appendix: What were the findings?

Session I: Stakeholder Identification
The resources, functions and stakeholders of the area were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>Drinking, washing, fishing, irrigation, recreation, tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>Agroforestry, recreation, apiary culture, Tree cover, soil conservation, animals (wild hogs, birds), food, employment, coffee, livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>Diversity of plants/animals, cattle farming, quarrying, housing, recreation, employment, wealth creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Sites</td>
<td>Stony Gut (National Hero Paul Bogle lived in this community and started his long walk to Spanish Town from here), history, tourism, cultural development, educational, income generation,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders
The group identified the following stakeholders:
- Fishermen/women
- Serge Island Dairy
- Farmers
- Householders
- NGOs – St. Thomas Environment Protection Agency, St. Thomas Bee Farmers Association
- Community-based Organizations (CBOs)
- Schools (Hillside Primary and Basic, White Hall Primary and Basic)
- Coal Burners
- Furniture Makers
- Forest Industry Development Company (FIDCO)
- Forestry Department
- Hunters (Wild Hogs, Birds)
- Fire Department
- Tourists
- Social Development Commission (SDC)
- Rural Agricultural Development Authority (RADA)
- Jamaica Agricultural Society (JAS)
- Jamaica National Heritage Trust (JNHT)
- Institute of Jamaica (IoJ)
- Financial Institutions (Funding Agencies)
- Quarry Operators
Key Stakeholders
The key stakeholders were ranked in the following categories:
- Forestry Department
- Other Government Agencies
- Farmers
- Non-Government Organizations/Community Based Organizations
- Households & Schools

Session II: Institutional Mapping
Identifying the links between the key stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Formal/Informal</th>
<th>One-way/Two-way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>Two-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking and Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Government Agencies and Forestry Department</td>
<td>FORMAL</td>
<td>Two-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization of meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects (funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, Householders and schools</td>
<td>BOTH</td>
<td>Two-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share environmental interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Session III: Rights, Responsibilities and Interests
I. Government Agencies
Identified Government Agencies were:
- The National Environment and Planning Agency
- The Social development Commission
- The Rural Agricultural development Authority
- Island Special Constabulary Force
- The Jamaica National Heritage Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The National and Environment and Planning Agency</td>
<td>To seek resources from government to fulfill its mandate</td>
<td>To act on behalf of the government To see that institutions comply with environmental regulations</td>
<td>To protect the environment of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jamaica National Heritage Trust</td>
<td>To invest in the national heritage of Jamaica</td>
<td>To see to the protection and proper use of Jamaica’s heritage</td>
<td>To gather and share information on our heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development Commission</td>
<td>To seek resources from government to fulfill its mandate</td>
<td>To organize and mobiles communities</td>
<td>To enhance local governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rural Agricultural Development Agency</td>
<td>To seek resources from government to fulfill its mandate</td>
<td>To engage the farming community in agricultural production</td>
<td>Food security and sustainable agricultural development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Special Constabulary Force</td>
<td>To seek resources from government to fulfill its mandate</td>
<td>To see to the enforcement and compliance of the laws of Jamaica</td>
<td>Safe and Secure communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. Forestry Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that trees are not removed illegally</td>
<td>To protect the forests and rivers from illegal activities e.g. Dumping, Squatting and Deforestation</td>
<td>To inform relevant authorities of illegal activities (e.g. ISCF) To encourage planting of trees to prevent soil erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To give license to access forest resources and rights to patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. Householders and Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By tradition to the free access of fresh air, bird watching, site seeing, fresh fruits and vegetables Traditional herbs for medicine and sale For schools to get furniture and books for the education of the children</td>
<td>To protect the forest by keeping it clean, avoid lighting fires and cutting of trees without a proper license No deforestation</td>
<td>Continuation of the protection of the resources e.g. replanting of trees Information sharing from children to parents and vice versa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. Farmers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Land) Inheritance &amp; legal ownership (River) Livelihood; Irrigation (Forestry) Cultural rights; Livelihoods</td>
<td>(Land) Farming practices (River) Avoid pollution; Proper disposal of used chemical containers (Forestry) Avoid deforestation and forest fires; prevention of erosion</td>
<td>(Land) Agriculture; Development; Employment (River) Irrigation, Feed animals, Recreation (Forestry) Hunting, Recreation, Restoring of destroyed areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Non-Government Organizations/Community Based Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood; traditional including washing, fishing, drinking water and bathing &amp; Inheritance</td>
<td>Free from Pollution Maintenance</td>
<td>Nectar production Avoid soil erosion Keeping river clean Passing it on to the next generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified NGOs/CBOs were:
St. Thomas Environmental Protection Association (STEPA)
St. Thomas Bee Farmers Association (STBFA)
Community Development Councils (CDCs)

Session IV: Livelihoods
Identified Livelihoods related to land resource in communities from which participants were drawn were:
1. Farming
   a. There were types faming types which included Pineapple, Coffee, Cattle, Goats and Bees
   b. Other occupations include Coffee pickers, workers of Serge Island, Teachers, Firemen and Small Businesses
2. Forest Livelihoods in include: Yam, Banana, Wild Hog, Roots, fruits and Ginger

Livelihoods Assets discussed included: Human, Natural, Physical, Financial, Political and Cultural Natural asset was overwhelmingly chosen followed by human, cultural and physical; financial and political were given very low recognition.