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1. Background

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) has been funded by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization under its Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Support Programme for African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries (ACP-FLEGT Programme) to implement a project. The purpose of the project is to strengthen existing strategies to improve forest law compliance and governance by building the capacity of forest managers in at least six small island developing states in the Caribbean region to facilitate effective participatory management of forests through training, mentoring, development of a tool kit, and documenting and communicating illustrative case studies.

The objectives of the project include the provision of an opportunity for forest managers in the region to share experiences and lessons learned on approaches to facilitating participatory forest governance and case studies of the application of participatory forest law compliance and governance and communicate lessons learned to stakeholders in the project countries.

Five persons from Trinidad and Tobago were selected by CANARI to be part of this project and in April 2011 individuals from various islands, including Trinidad and Tobago convened at a workshop hosted by CANARI. The workshop in April 2011 was titled “Building capacity for participatory forest management for good governance in the Caribbean region”. In order to meet the objectives of this project, forest managers in the region who attended that workshop have been asked to facilitate a workshop in participatory forests management and document the process and outcome.

The Trinidad and Tobago team agreed that the target groups for the workshop would be technical officers (game wardens and forest officers) of the Trinidad and Tobago Forestry Division / Department. The goal of the workshop was to assist in building the capacity and awareness of the technical officers with respect to participatory forest management.

This workshop was crafted on the back drop that the new 2011 Forestry Policy emphasises very clearly to need to implement participatory forestry management in the management of forest
resources. As a consequence the workshop provided participant officers with the tool to begin the process of encouraging and engaging key stakeholders.

2. Workshop Objectives

The objectives of the workshop were:

- To enable Forest Officers and Game Wardens to identify key stakeholders for forest management in Trinidad and Tobago.
- To enable Forest Officers and Game Wardens to acknowledge and understand the rights, roles, and responsibilities of key stakeholders and the need for building relationships for sustainable forest management.
- To document the process of facilitation using participatory processes to assist in the building of capacity of technical forest officers.

3. Method

1. Planning – Facilitators met at the workshop in Jamaica and formulated a work plan detailing actions, timelines and persons responsible with respect to the facilitation of the Workshop. At this meeting it was also agreed that the workshop would be entitled, *Building Capacity of Technical Staff (forest officers and game wardens) of the Trinidad and Tobago Forestry Division/Department in Participatory Forest Management.*

2. A Power Point presentation was prepared in collaboration with facilitators to present the background to the workshop, its objectives and agenda to the participants

3. A detailed session plan was developed which would guide the implementation of the workshop.

The workshop was highly interactive with extensive sharing of participants’ experiences and knowledge. A wide variety of facilitation techniques were used including – plenary discussions,
drama (role play), brainstorming, small group work, individual reflection, round robin with individuals and group presentations.

The Workshop comprised the following major elements:

**A. Introduction**

   Step 1 – Welcome/Introduction of facilitators/participants
   Step 2 – Presentation of background/objectives to the workshop
   Step 3 – Discussion on expectations of the workshop
   Step 4 – Discussion of agenda within the context of the objectives and expectations articulated.

**B. Stakeholder Identification**

   Step 1 – Definition of a stakeholder
   Step 2 – Identification of groups of stakeholders of the forest

**C. Stakeholder Analysis**

   Step 1 - Identification of key stakeholders from the groups identified
   Step 2 – Analyse the rights, responsibilities and roles of stakeholders identified

**D. Analysis of Stakeholder Relationships - Plenary Game**

**E. Evaluation/Review of Expectations**

Throughout the Workshop participants were asked to comment on the processes used and their own experiences as part of the processes.

**4. Results of the process**

1. The mobilisation process was effective in that it resulted in the projected number of participants being present at the workshop. 28 persons participated in the Workshop.

2. Efforts made to prepare participants for the workshop through the dissemination of information through Section Heads of the Forestry Division was not successful as documents were not distributed.

3. The Planning process did not detail a physical meeting of all facilitators before the meeting to discuss implementation of the Session Plan nor a debriefing meeting
following the workshop, which would have allowed for improved analysis of the Workshop and the processes, particularly with respect to what was required by CANARI.

4. The workshop was generally very well received by the participants and there was good cooperation and support among the facilitators.

5. The facilitators were successful in encouraging the active involvement of all the participants at plenary and or group level. However the role play, which involved the participants could have been better guided and managed by the facilitators.

6. The objectives of the workshop were realised and the participants were able to define and identify stakeholders and complete analyses of stakeholders’ roles, rights, responsibilities and relationships. There was however confusion and lack of clarity respect to the conceptualisation of the differences between the terms role, rights and responsibilities.

   The facilitation process is documented in detail as part of the report on the findings of the Workshop.

7. The Evaluation process was done successfully through the completion of an Evaluation form by participants at the end of the Workshop and the indication of the extent to which they found their expectation met by the workshop. The latter was done with the aid of an Expectations Tree.

8. The Workshop succeeded in the clarification of the concept of participatory forest management and also in stimulating the interest of the forest officers and game wardens in this approach. In this regard follow up action will be well received and is highly recommended.

5. What lessons were learnt about facilitating participatory processes?

1. The participants of the Workshop should have included representatives of other stakeholder groups besides the main target group of technical officers of the Forestry Department. This would have been in keeping with the participatory approach and allowed for the direct input of other stakeholders.

2. The importance of a detailed session plan in the effective implementation of a workshop.
3. Work plan for the workshop should have included at least one physical meeting of the facilitators before the workshop and a debriefing session after the Workshop. In this regard measure should have been put in place to facilitate such important meetings.

4. On line networking tools may not be the preferred method of communication for all persons due to various reasons and this should be given due consideration in the planning of a communication strategy for facilitators.

5. There should be agreement on a clear communication strategy for facilitators who are in different spaces and occupations in order to facilitate necessary interaction.

APPENDIX 1: WHAT MOBILIZATION TOOLS WERE USED?

Tools used in the mobilization process

1. Analyses of challenge- Facilitators converged in Jamaica at the end of the first workshop in April 2011 and assess the need for this workshop. Facilitators felt that there were insufficient examples within the Forestry Division in participatory forest management and that this tool is underutilized in the Division in its attempts to engage communities in the management of Forest resources.

2. Proposal Development- A short proposal was developed at a later stage to win the support of the Conservator of Forest and gain support in acquiring an appropriate funding to support the activity.

3. Brainstorming- A prospective list of participants was developed with the knowledge of the Division (since two members of the facilitation team are also employed within two public service forest management agencies). The list included representatives from all the conservancies in Trinidad and representatives from Tobago Forestry Department

4. Letters of Invitations- Letters of invitation were sent out to the departments about a month before the workshop.

5. Evaluation forms- These forms were prepared to gauge the success of the workshop and whether the expectations of the participants were met.
APPENDIX 2 Tools Used In This Case

1. Expectation Tree
2. Stakeholder Identification
   a. What is a stakeholder? and
   b. Who are key stakeholders?
3. Stakeholder Analysis
   a. What are the Rights Roles and Responsibilities of these stakeholders using the
      analogue of the rules of a football game to help clarify the differences between
      rights, roles and responsibilities
   b. Determine the Rights Roles and Responsibilities of other stakeholders
4. Stakeholder Relationship
   a. Relationship Mapping

APPENDIX 3: WHAT WERE THE FINDINGS?

SESSION 1: WELCOME, FACILITATORS AND PARTICIPANT INTRODUCTIONS
AND EXPECTATIONS

Learning objectives: By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Identify each other and the facilitators by name,
- State what are their expectations of the Workshop and appreciate relationship between
  expectations, workshop objectives and the agenda

➢ Expectations
   o Once a brief explanation and detailed objectives of the workshop was shown to
     participants, they were asked to write on colourful post it sheets, their individual
     expectations. They were encouraged to use colour markers (provided by facilitators)
     because the post its notes were to be stuck onto an expectation tree that was drawn on
     a flip chart paper and stuck on the wall. They were also informed by the facilitator
     that they would be required to read out loud what they wrote on their sticky note then
     proceed to stick his/her expectation on the expectation tree.
Participants were given 10 minutes to write their expectations on the post it. Some were a bit apprehensive about writing their own opinion down and wanted this exercise to be a team one. The facilitator had to continually encourage them by informing them that in no way can any one’s expectation be wrong, but instead just to write what they expected of the workshop.

Once this exercise was completed (writing on the notes individual expectations) participants read out loud his/her expectations, which the facilitator wrote on flip chart paper, after which participants proceeded to stick their expectations on the expectation tree.

All participants participated.

It should be noted that when participants read out loud their expectations and as the facilitator wrote them down on flip chart paper, expectations that were outside the objectives of the workshop was noted. Find below the expectation of the participants at the workshop:

- stakeholder dynamics, interaction, analysis, input
- access to information
- build communication skills
- rights, roles, responsibilities of stakeholders and officers
- improved writing skills
- identifying key forest issues and finding solutions
- working together; co-manage
- learning about sustainable forest management
- identify forest resources managed by Forestry Division
- conflict resolution (conflicts between stakeholders)
- liaise with stakeholders – feedback; constraints
- better able to manage resources
- gain knowledge
- greater strides in forestry in participating countries
- greater interactions and awareness between islands (forestry/forest management etc)
- better management – more cohesion
• identify the role of forest officers
• develop structure for all stakeholders to function in their role cohesively
• how to identify key stakeholders
• funding, training and identification of CBO’s to assist in forest management
• continued workshops and not just a one day study
• well rounded approach to management and access to other countries experiences
• user friendly experience for all – government agencies, relationships with NGO’s and CBO’s
• familiarize with NGO’s and CBO’s in Trinidad and Tobago
• roles and functions – clear interpretation
• legislation governing roles and functions of NGO’s; CBO’s
• networking/relationships
• improved work performance – gaining knowledge, self enhancement
• becoming more effective forest managers
• lunch

➢ Overview of agenda and review of how it responds to expectations/ clarification where necessary re objectives of Workshop
  o Even though the first session explained what the workshop was about and after highlighting the objectives of the workshop it was clear that after the expectations of the participants about the workshop was solicited; some participants needed clarification on what the objectives of the workshop was about
  o This was done by the facilitator thanking every one for participating in the exercise. The participants were then informed that in order to ensure that no one had any false expectations about the workshop or to mitigate disappointment at the end of the workshop, some expectations needed to be reviewed since they would not be met at the workshop, e.g., identification of the forest resources managed by the Forestry Division. Those participants were a little disappointed it was appreciated that at the end of the session everyone was clear as to what the workshop would be about.

At the end of the workshop, after completing and returning the evaluation forms, the participants were asked to place a sticky dot on their note on the expectation tree where a green dot meant
.expectations were met and a yellow dot meant that expectations were not met. Only tree yellow
dots were placed on the noted on the expectation tree. These three expectations that were not met
were as follows:

- To be able to develop a structure that allows all stakeholders to function in their roles
  cohesively
- To be a continuing workshop and not just a one day workshop and proper management of
  forests and its resources; and
- To develop excellent writing skills

SESSION 2: DEFINITION OF STAKEHOLDER

Learning objectives: By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Define the term stakeholder
- Identify major groups of stakeholders who have an interest in forest management in
  Trinidad and Tobago

- Role Play - the government has announced that the hunting of agouti will be banned in
  Trinidad and Tobago. The Conservator of Forests calls a meeting to address the conflicts
  which have arisen since the announcement.

The following roles were played:

1. The Conservator of Forests
2. Representative of Hunters Association
3. Representative of a Community Based Organisation
4. Representative of the General Public
5. Representative of an International Funding Agency – FAO

Persons volunteered to be part of the role play and were given the opportunity to pull from the lot
a stakeholder part to play. The major issue raised in the play was the lack of participatory
approached taken by the government in making this decision and bases for arriving at the
decision.
The discussion brought out clearly that some persons supported it and others didn't. However this was largely on the basis on how each stakeholder used the resources.

➢ With reference to “Session 2: Stakeholder Identification”, it was necessary to seek and arrive at a definition of “who is a stakeholder?”

Hereunder are some definitions received from individual participants:

• Any group, individual or organization having a common interest in the resource

• Any individual or group who will ensure that a resource is not lost or destroyed

• Any individual, group or organization connected to or is affected either directly or indirectly by the use or management of the resource

• A person or persons who is/are interested and influenced directly and indirectly by the resources of the forest

• A stakeholder is a person who when a particular resource is damaged or destroyed or when the circumstances involving the use of that resource is negatively changed, the benefits that they were accustom to will be taken away or diminished

• A stakeholder is anyone with vested interest that is affected by any change in the resource either directly and/or indirectly that gives them the right to protect their welfare

• Anyone having a vested interest both long term and short term which can affect or influence changes in management of the resource in a sustainable manner taking into consideration conservation and protection issues

• A stakeholder is an individual or group of individuals who either manages, utilizes or benefits from a resource

• Any individual or group who has a vested interest or right in the resource who may be affected directly or indirectly by activities in the resource
• A person, group or organization that has a direct interest, involvement and investment in an organization because it can be affected by the organizations actions, objectives and policies

• A lobbyist who has an interest in the development and welfare of a resource

Participants agreed to these definitions:

• One who has a physical right, long term/short term common interest in the welfare of a resource

• Persons directly or indirectly affected by a resource

• Persons connected, influenced or with rights to a resource

Key words used when a definition of the word ‘stakeholder’ was sought

• Interest (long term/short term)

• Welfare

• Affected by

• Influence

• Connected

• Direct/indirect

• Resource

• Right (physical)

➢ Participants were also asked to identify any other groups or organisations that could be included as key stakeholders in Forestry management in Trinidad and Tobago.

Examples of stakeholders:

• Land developers
• Schools
• HDC
• Environmental Management Authority
• Ministry of Tourism
• Land Settlement Agency
• Water and Sewage Authority
• Wildlife biologist
• Farmers
• Saw millers
• Craft makers
• Community groups
• Town and country planning
• Tobago House of Assembly
• Reforestation workers
• Private sector

SESSION 3: STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Learning objectives: By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

• Explain the terms rights, roles and responsibilities
• Identify the rights roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders involved in forestry management

The session comprised actions both in plenary and in groups as follows:

➢ Plenary – Definition of rights, roles and responsibilities
  • Rights – no permission needed e.g. access to the forest by forest officers
  • Roles – role that one plays e.g. as a manager of forests
  • Responsibilities – actions taken to fulfil roles

➢ Group/Plenary – Stakeholder Analysis

Following the role play and discussions which went before in the plenary sessions, the workshop participants were ready for their first group exercise, which required them to identify stakeholders of forestry management in Trinidad and Tobago and to analyse them based on different roles, rights and responsibilities.

Each group was asked to identify four stakeholders as follows:
  o 1 Government agency
  o 1 International funding Agency
  o 1 Non government or community based organization
  o 1 Group of persons which would represent the interest of the general public

There were as expected challenges for the groups to be clear about the subtle differences between rights, roles and responsibilities. The action of doing the analysis, along with the support of the facilitators assisted in bringing some clarity and the outcome of the work done and presented in plenary by each of the groups, is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment Management Authority (Gov’t)</td>
<td>Granting /denying of Certificate of Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>1. Law enforcement</td>
<td>1. Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Environment policing</td>
<td>2. Identification/implementation of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Education of general public</td>
<td>3. Conducting EIAs and ESAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pollution Prevention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15
### Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation (International Organisation)</td>
<td>Choice of body or organization to support and determination of conditionalities.</td>
<td>1 Provision of funding and other resources. 2. Training and building awareness</td>
<td>1. Allocation of funds. 2. Accomplishment of goals 3. Review and approval of proposals 4. Development and distribution of educational material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASA (Gov’t)</td>
<td>1. Access water from watershed 2. Enforcement of legislation</td>
<td>1. Provision of water 2. Protection of watersheds</td>
<td>1. Ensuring water is provided for the entire nation 2. Security of catchment areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club (General public in)</td>
<td>Provision of assistance to community in beautification and cleanup projects</td>
<td>Promotion of clean up campaigns and planting projects</td>
<td>Planning, coordination and management of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Nations (International organisation)</td>
<td>Interaction with world leaders</td>
<td>1. Ensuring sustainable development 2. Declaration of special days and years</td>
<td>1. Influencing policy 2. Funding of projects 3. Education 4. Ensuring adherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following of the presentation of the above results of the various groups the participants were asked to comment on the process.
Participants responded positively about the experience indicating that they appreciated the opportunity for sharing and discussion of important relevant issues with their colleagues. The major challenge for the group was clarification of the difference between rights, roles and responsibilities.

SESSION 4: STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS

**Learning objectives:** By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

Appreciate the nature of the linkages and relationships between various stakeholders of forest management in Trinidad and Tobago

**Plenary Game**
- The workshop room was reorganized so that sixteen (16) chairs were arranged into a circle.
- Large labels were placed on each chair to represent each of the 16 stakeholders identified in the previous session, namely: Forestry Division, AFEEPO, Hunters Association, FAO, Forestry Division, WASA, Nature Seekers, Plum Mitan Farmers Association, RAMSAR,
Protectors of the Environment (POE), CITIES, UN, Biche R.C. School, Biche Farmers Association, EMA, Citizens and Rotary Club.

- Participants were asked to voluntarily represent each of the stakeholders and sit in the respective chair.

- The facilitator took time to introduce and explain the term the “Institution of Forestry Management”. An institution was defined any structure or mechanism of social order and cooperation governing the behaviour of a set of individuals within a given human community. As such, the “Institution of Football” was used as an example, where, participants engaged in lively discussion on the rules (both formal and informal) that governed the football community and also identified the many stakeholders that constituted this great institution. After this discourse, the participants acknowledged that they had a better understanding of what is meant by the institution of Forestry Management and were ready to map and describe the relationships that constituted it.

- Participants were given a ball of string and asked to hold on to the end of the string while sending the ball to another stakeholder with whom they perceived there is a strong linkage or relationship. This sending of the ball of string continued among the stakeholders until a complex web of relationships was created.

- The participant representing the Forestry Division was selected to start the “ball rolling”. Each time the ball was sent, the sending stakeholder was asked to elaborate on the kind of relationship they had, or desired to have, with the stakeholder that they selected, i.e., weather it was strong or weak, financial or supportive, existing or desired etc.

- The activity was documented as it progressed. A flip chart with graphical representation of the stakeholder circle was set-up to map the linkages as they were established. Additionally, notes and symbols were scribbled on the flip chart lines as the participants described or elaborated on their relationship with the selected stakeholder. Documentation of this kind was important, in that, after the mapping game was done the flip chat diagram and notes became the platform for further analysis and discussion.

➢ RESULTS
STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP MAPPING
RESULTS
STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIP MAPPING

Figure 1: Map of stakeholder relationships derived from flip chart diagram. The numbering of the stakeholders (boxes) is an adaptation based on a suggestion arising out of discussion with participants. Numbering the boxes facilitated ease of note taking.

Table 1: Tabulation of the notes written on the flip as participants described their relationships with stakeholders they selected. These notes were scribbled between the lines of the relationship map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>WASA</td>
<td>Collaborates in raising awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters</td>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>Provides recourses and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsar</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>Want to establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>Want to build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: This table demonstrates a suggested method for quick and easy note taking using the same flip chart information in the table above, and the numbered diagram illustrated in figure 1. This “short-hand” notes taking method could be done in real time, using a separate sheet so that the flip chart map remains uncluttered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Description and comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 (EMA)</td>
<td>12 (WASA)</td>
<td>16 Collaborates with 12 in awareness campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 provides water resources for 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14 want to establish links with 16 (maybe by funding projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 wishes to build existing relationship with 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (FD)</td>
<td>13 (FAO)</td>
<td>1 (Forestry Dep’t) is dependent on 13 (FAO) for significant funding of projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

Due to time constraint, the mapping exercise was curtailed after about fifteen minutes to allow for analysis and discussions. It was explained that this method of mapping stakeholder relationships, when used in a real situation, may be limited to key stakeholders and more time can be allocated to the activity. Discussions were then held to allow participants to make observations of the results of the game with respect to relationships among stakeholders.

- It was observed that the key stakeholders could be identified based on the number of links going to and from those stakeholders. For instance, the Forestry Division (FD) was deemed to be the primary stakeholder based on the fact that they had the most links (6). Other key stakeholders were: UN (5), CITES (4), EMA (4), Schools (4).

- It was also noted that if a key organization within the institution of Forestry Management were to fail in its functions, that this situation could weaken the entire intuition. The participant representing the Forestry Division was asked to let loose of his stings to see what would happen. When he did, the network of stings became very slack and tangled. This demonstration generated much discussion on what could be done to solve such a problem. It was noted that other existing organizations would now have to pick up the slack where FD had failed or, another organization may have to emerge to fulfil FD’s functions in the institution.
• The point was also emphasized that the game was useful in clarifying where stakeholders needed to establish relationships with other stakeholders with whom they had no existing relationship.

• It was noted, given the participants were primarily from the Forestry Division, that acting on behalf of another organization posed a challenge to some, i.e., not knowing enough about the other organizations/stakeholders to properly represent their views. However, this challenge also presented opportunities for the participants, with some effort, to see the point of view of other organizations/stakeholders within the institution of Forestry Management.

• A suggestion was made on how the documentation of the process could be improved; the stakeholders could be represented on the flip chart using numbers (i.e., instead of words) and a key could be written on a separate sheet of paper to allow for clearer mapping. Further, the notes describing the relationships between stakeholders could be written on a separate sheet. Implementation of these suggestions would leave the chart less cluttered and make note taking clearer (These suggestions are illustrated in the results section above).

EVALUATION/WRAP UP

➢ Evaluation forms

These forms were developed in order to determine how we can improve on the workshop and how the participants felt about the workshop etc. It was discovered that there were mistakes on the form so that was a definite weak area about the workshop.

➢ Sticky dots

After completing and returning the evaluation forms the participants were asked to place a sticky dot on their note on the expectation tree where a green dot meant expectations were met and a yellow dot meant that expectations were not met. Only three yellow dots were placed on the notated on the expectation tree. These three expectations that were not met were as follows:

• To be able to develop a structure that allows all stakeholders to function in their roles cohesively
• To be a continuing workshop and not just a one day workshop and proper management of forests and its resources; and
• To develop excellent writing skills

These activities allowed for a wrap up of the workshop. Participants were warmly thanked for their participation, willingness and cooperation during the workshop.
APPENDIX 4: PARTICIPANTS EVALUATION ANALYSIS

➢ No of participants = 28

1. Clarity of objectives – five questions were asked and participants were asked to answer by using a scale from 0-5, where 0 is "No Basis for Opinion", 1 is "Strongly Disagree", 2 is "Disagree", 3 is "Neutral", 4 is "Agree", and 5 is "Strongly Agree".

- Objectives for the workshop were clearly explained

  13 participants strongly agreed that the objectives were clearly explained
  10 participants agreed that the objectives were clearly explained
  1 participant was neutral regarding the question
  1 participant disagreed that the objectives were clearly explained
  3 participants failed to answer the question

- The stated objectives were realized

  9 participants strongly agreed that the stated objectives were realized
  13 participants agreed that the stated objectives were realized
  3 participants were neutral regarding this question
  3 participants failed to answer this question

- I have learned new ideas and/or skills

  13 participants strongly agreed that they learned new ideas and/or skills
  12 participants agreed that they learned new ideas and/or skills
  1 participant was neutral regarding this question
  2 participants failed to answer this question

- There was time for hands-on practice (if appropriate)

  11 participants strongly agreed that there was time for hands-on practice
  14 participants agreed that there was time for hands-on practice
  1 participant was neutral regarding this question
  2 participants failed to answer this question

- I would recommend this workshop to others

  18 participants strongly agreed that they would recommend this workshop to others
  6 participants agreed that they would recommend this workshop to others
  1 participant was neutral regarding this question
  3 participants failed to answer this question
Overall, I was favourably impressed by this workshop

18 participants strongly agreed that they were favourably impressed by the workshop
6 participants agreed that they were favourably impressed by the workshop
1 participant was neutral regarding this question
3 participants failed to answer this question

2 Learning

Did the environment encourage and support learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did the course content and delivery:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage learning?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 did not answer question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage you to participate?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the information provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 did not answer question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to your needs?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• What did you learn that will be of most benefit to you?
  o Interaction skills
  o Who are stakeholders and their roles?
  o All stakeholders have rights, roles and responsibilities
  o Identifying stakeholder roles, rights and responsibilities
  o Learned the various roles, rights and responsibilities of stakeholders that would prevent
    me in the future from knowing their rights
  o The difference with role and responsibilities and even rights
  o Identifying stakeholders and the need for consultation
  o The right, roles and responsibilities of a stakeholder
  o The stakeholder string game
  o The benefits from this was that I was able to identify key stakeholders and distinguish
    between roles, responsibility rights
  o To appreciate the importance of networking and to have a clearer understanding of other
    stakeholder views
  o To respect the rights of other agencies
  o Knowing that I need to identify stakeholders; to determine their roles and responsibilities
  o What are the rights of a stakeholder
o Being better able to understand the rights, roles and responsibility of stakeholders and their linkages
o Rights, roles and responsibility
o What roles, rights and responsibilities and clearly defined as with respect to co-management
o Each stakeholder has rights
o Don’t ignore any stakeholder because they have some form of interest and function in any consultation
o To identify stakeholders and assistance that can be identified from them
o The importance of stakeholders in the management of forest and its resources
o The amount of stakeholders involved and what is a stakeholder
o What is a stakeholder and how to identify their rights, roles and responsibilities?
o Identification of stakeholders and their relationships with one another
o The rights of stakeholders
o Rights, roles and responsibility of stakeholders
o To be able to identify stakeholders and overlook roles and responsibilities

3 Facilitators and Workshop

• The facilitator(s) were well organized

11 participants strongly agreed that the (facilitators) were well organized
15 participants agreed that the (facilitators) were well organized
2 participants were neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

• The facilitator(s) made good use of the time allotted

18 participants strongly agreed that the facilitator(s) made good use of the time allotted
7 participants agreed that the facilitator(s) made good use of the time allotted
1 participant was neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

• The facilitator(s) seemed knowledgeable about the topic

17 participants strongly agreed that the facilitator(s) seemed knowledgeable about the topic
6 participants agreed that the facilitator(s) seemed knowledgeable about the topic
3 participants were neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

• The facilitator(s) presentation style was effective in helping me

13 participants strongly agreed that the facilitator(s) was effective in helping
11 participants agreed that the facilitator(s) was effective in helping
The teaching/training methods used were appropriate for the workshop

11 participants strongly agreed that the teaching/training methods used were appropriate or the workshop
10 participants agreed that the teaching/training methods used were appropriate or the workshop
3 participants were neutral regarding this question
4 participants failed to answer this question

The materials provided will be useful to me

13 participants strongly agreed that the materials provided will be useful to me
7 participants agreed that the materials provided will be useful to me
4 participants were neutral regarding this question
4 participants failed to answer this question

I enjoyed the workshop

10 participants strongly agreed that they enjoyed the workshop
16 participants agreed that they enjoyed the workshop
2 participants failed to answer this question

I understood the concepts as presented in the workshop

13 participants strongly agreed that they understood the concepts as presented in the workshop
9 participants agreed that they understood the concepts as presented in the workshop
3 participants were neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

The workshop improved the my understanding of the topic

15 participants strongly agreed that the workshop improved their understanding of the topic
10 participants agreed that the workshop improved their understanding of the topic
1 participant was neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

The workshop improved my ability to utilize skills related to

9 participants strongly agreed that the workshop improved their ability to utilize skills related
12 participants agreed that the workshop improved their ability to utilize skills related
4 participants were neutral regarding this question
3 participants failed to answer this question

The knowledge and skills I learned will be useful in my job
10 participants strongly agreed that the knowledge and skills learned will be useful in their jobs
4 participants were neutral regarding this question
3 participants failed to answer this question

- I would recommend this workshop to others

5 participants strongly agreed that they would recommend this workshop to others
20 participants agreed that they would recommend this workshop to others
1 participant was neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

- I would attend other workshops offered by these facilitators

18 participants strongly agreed that they would attend other workshops offered by these facilitators
7 participants agreed that they would attend other workshops offered by these facilitators
1 participant was neutral regarding this question
2 participants failed to answer this question

4 How could this workshop be improved?
- More time
- More visual arts and technology should be used
- By inviting other stakeholders to share their opinion
- More could be done for officers by having more workshops
- More time could be allotted to the programme
- Follow up session
- By having representative of different stakeholders present
- More days allotted and more practical – have more stakeholder interactions
- Instead of having persons from one organization a mix might bring out a wider range of views and opinions
- Use an actual project where consultation is needed so that the actual problem can be identified
- Forms could have been more clear for evaluation
- More actual interaction of actual happenings in various stakeholders
- By having more workshops – a continuation and having more stakeholders
- More writing materials needed eg., notepads
- Provide literature to participants
- Broken up into two parts
- Better organization with a clear purpose and reaching objectives
- Better seating facilities also better audio and display facilities
• Having more representatives of stakeholders in Forestry Division – show how involved they are with Forestry Division
• Invite other stakeholders
• By having follow up sessions
• Increasing to more days
• By having it continued
• Use local examples where technical officers often encounter
• Provide supporting literature relevant to the topic
• Additional information on what some stakeholders have to offer

5 In what area do you need additional help?
• Additional information on what some stakeholders have to offer
• Relationships with whom Forestry Division are affiliated with
• What some of the organizations do
• Deciding what role, rights and responsibilities
• Focusing on topic and issues
• Distinguishing between rights and roles
• How to communicate effectively with stakeholders
• Clearer understanding of my role and responsibility was met – better able to co-manage
• To organize and meet with stakeholders
• Knowing some of the organizations which are out there
• Not really additional help but refresher workshops
• Communication and expression
• The issue of rights could be further discussed
• Environmental management
• Increase in food and travelling
• To acquire a travelling post
APPENDIX 5: SESSION PLAN

Project Title – Building Capacity of Technical Staff (Forest Officers and Game Wardens) of the Trinidad and Tobago forestry Division/Department in Participatory Forestry Management

Activity 1 – Stakeholder Identification and Analysis

Task - 1 Day Workshop

Workshop Objectives-

1. To enable forest Officers and Game Wardens to identify key stakeholders for forest management in Trinidad and Tobago
2. To enable forest Officers and Game Wardens to acknowledge and understand the rights, roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders and the need for building relationships for sustainable forest management.
3. To document the process of facilitation using participatory processes to assist in the building of capacity of technical forest officers.

DAY - Monday 27th June 2011

SESSION 1: WELCOME, FACILITATOR AND PARTICIPANT INTRODUCTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS
9.00 – 10.45

Learning objectives: By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Identify each other and the facilitators by name,
- State what are their expectations of the Workshop and appreciate relationship between expectations, workshop objectives and the agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Topic(s)</th>
<th>Activity/Method</th>
<th>Materials etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 –</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Welcome and</td>
<td>Plenary session</td>
<td>Power Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Topic(s)</td>
<td>Activity/Method</td>
<td>Materials etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:30   |             | introductions  | • **Welcome** all to workshop  
• Particularly **thank** those who have contributed to making the workshop arrangements a success  
• **Introduce Facilitators.**  
• **Introduction of participants**  
• **Brief background to Workshop**  
• **Objectives of Workshop** | Presentation – projector and laptop |
| 9:30 - 10.00 | TBD  | I Expectations • Overview of agenda | • Solicit **expectations** for the workshop and put on expectation tree  
• Overview of agenda and review of how it responds to expectations/ clarification where necessary re objectives of Workshop | Post-its  
Expectation Tree drawn of flip chart paper |
| 10.00  |             | BREAK          |                                                                                 |                |
| 10.30  |             |                |                                                                                 |                |

**SESSION 2: Stakeholder Identification**  
**11.00 -12.35**

**Learning objectives:** By the end of this session, participants will be able to:
- Define the term stakeholder
- Identify major groups of stakeholders who have an interest in forest management in Trinidad and Tobago

| 10.30-11.45 | TBD  | Definition of Stakeholder | Plenary  
Role Play – the government has announced that the hunting of agouti will be banned in Trinidad and Tobago. The Conservator | Table and Chairs  
Flip Chart Paper |
of Forests calls a meeting to address the conflicts which have arisen since the announcement. The following roles would be played:

- 6. The Conservator of forests
- 7. Representative of Hunters Association
- 8. Representative of a Community Based Organisation
- 9. Representative of the General Public
- 10. Representative of an International Funding Agency – FAO

Following role play participants will be engaged to discuss observations about the role play and to respond to the following questions:

- Who were those persons in the role play representing?
- Why were they there?

Key words from the discussion will be noted and used to build a definition of a stakeholder which would be compared to other formal definition of stakeholder.

Participants will be asked to identify any other groups or organisations that could be included as key stakeholders of Forestry management in Trinidad and Tobago.

### SESSION 3: Stakeholder Analysis

**Learning objectives:** By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Explain the terms rights, roles and responsibilities
- Identify the rights roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders involved in forestry management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.45 - 12.30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Definition of rights, roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>Plenary&lt;br&gt;• Review of role play to discuss interests of various groups represented within the context of rights, roles and responsibilities towards arriving at definition of each.&lt;br&gt;• Definitions result from key words used in the discussions following which they can be compared to other formal definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 – 2.15</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis to determine rights, roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders of forestry management in Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>Group Activity&lt;br&gt;Participants will be divided into groups. Each group will be asked to identify an equal number of key stakeholders based on the discussions in the previous sessions and on their own personal relationships of working in forestry management.&lt;br&gt;Each group will determine the rights, responsibilities and roles of each stakeholder and complete a table to show results of their discussions. Results can be documented using words or drawn images.&lt;br&gt;Plenary&lt;br&gt;Each Group will report on the outcome of their discussions using prepared tables.&lt;br&gt;Comparison of any similarities in the roles, rights and responsibilities will be noted and identified by the use of sticky dots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SESSION 4: Stakeholder Relationships

Learning objectives: By the end of this session, participants will be able to:

- Appreciate the nature of the linkages and relationships between various stakeholders of forest management in Trinidad and Tobago.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.15 - 3.00</th>
<th>Stakeholder relationships</th>
<th>Plenary Game</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants are placed in one or two circles depending on number of participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In each circle each person will represent a stakeholder already identified in the previous sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One of the stakeholders will be selected randomly and be given a ball of string and asked to send the string across to another stakeholder with whom there is a strong linkage or relationship. This sending of the ball of string continues among the stakeholders until a web is created in keeping with the relationships identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions are held to allow participants to make observations of the results of the game with respect to relationships among stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Points are recorded on coloured paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.00 – 3.30</th>
<th>Evaluation – Fulfilment of workshop expectations</th>
<th>Plenary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants will be encouraged to comment on the process of facilitation of the Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ball of string</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coloured Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flip chart paper and markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sticky dots</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Expectations placed on Expectation tree to determine how many were met - participants would be asked to go to the expectation tree and to use the sticky dots to indicate which of their expectations were met.

The results of this exercise would be shared with all the participants of the Workshop

Participants will be asked to complete an evaluation form