CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE
(CANARI)

CASE STUDY OF THE BLUE AND JOHN CROW MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK, JAMAICA

Christine Scott Dunkley and Shermaine Barrett

2001

CANARI Technical Report Nº 282

Credits

This case study is one of the products of a research project entitled "Synthesizing the Caribbean experience in stakeholder analysis for participatory natural resource management". The project consisted of three major activities:

- the preparation of six case studies from Barbados, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago, and their preliminary analysis by leading actors in each case;
- the convening, in collaboration with the Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust, in April 2000, of a four-day seminar to present and analyse the cases, to identify common themes and concepts related to stakeholder approaches in the Caribbean, and to develop selected principles and skills relevant to the Caribbean context;
- the preparation of a publication presenting the results of the analysis in the form of guidelines for Caribbean practitioners, the six case studies, and an annotated bibliography.

The preparation and editing of the six case studies were supported by the University of the West Indies Centre for Environment and Development, as part of its project entitled *Caribbean Capacity-Building for Environmental Management,* and the International Development Research Centre of Canada, under the framework of the project entitled *Community-Based Coastal Resources Management in the Caribbean.*

The Environmental Foundation of Jamaica provided additional support for the preparation of this study on the Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park.

Case Study of the
Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park, Jamaica

Christine Scott Dunkley and Shermaine Barrett
Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust

1. Background and project description

The Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park (BJCMNP), located in the eastern mountainous region of Jamaica in what was originally the Blue Mountain Forest Reserve, covers an area of 78,200 hectares. The park, which measures 58km by 19km, contains the largest area of primary natural forest remaining in Jamaica, and is high in biodiversity. About 40 percent of the plants and animals found there are endemic to Jamaica, or are found only in the park's ecosystems. The park boasts the highest point in Jamaica -- the Blue Mountain Peak (2256m), important watersheds that provide water for half of the island, and many areas of natural beauty and historic importance.

The Blue and John Crow Mountains, two distinctly different regions in geology and climate, hold unique reserves of biological and mineral resources and contain areas of unparalleled natural beauty. There is a high degree of local endemism in the park, which also has one of the highest levels of endemism in the Western Hemisphere, as well as the highest level of biodiversity in Jamaica. In the Blue Mountain region, of 240 species of higher plants, 47 percent are endemic. In the John Crow Mountains, 32 percent of the 278 species of flowering plants are endemic. It is home to the Giant Swallowtail Butterfly, an endemic species that is the second largest butterfly in the world.

It is an area with great potential for recreational and educational activities, including nature tours, hiking, camping, bird watching and heritage tourism. The value of these forests lies also in their unique gene pool and the potential for yet untested species, which could be used for pharmaceuticals, ornamental plants, agricultural products and craft items. As a watershed, the area supplies high quality water to Kingston, Port Antonio, and other eastern Jamaican towns. Despite its steep slopes, the area is used by small subsistence farmers for cultivation of cash crops, including carrots, peas, ground provisions, bananas, plantains, coconuts, pineapples, otaheite apples, rose apples, cabbages and tomatoes. Small and large coffee farmers produce the highly priced and prestigious Blue Mountain coffee.

In 1989, this area was selected for protection as one of two pilot projects under the Protected Areas Resource Conservation (PARC) project, supported through a bilateral agreement between the Governments of Jamaica and the United States. The 1987 Country Environment Profile[1] identified the need for a system of parks and protected areas in

[1] Natural Resources Conservation Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Jamaica and Ralph M. Field Associates, Inc. 1987. Jamaica country environmental profile. IIED, Kingston, Jamaica. 361p.

Jamaica. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) indicated interest in supporting this initiative and engaged the Government of Jamaica in discussions, culminating in the PARC Project. The overall goal of the project was to contribute to the establishment of a Jamaican National Parks and Protected Areas System. The first two pilot areas included a terrestrial park, the BJCMNP and a marine park, the Montego Bay Marine Park.

The boundary of the original forest reserve was retained to serve as the park boundary. Communities adjacent to these boundaries were designated buffer areas. These were the communities in which there was the greatest use and impact on the park's resources. It was clear from the outset that these communities would be most affected by the implementation of the project and would therefore have to be integrally involved in the management of these resources.

The PARC project represented the first partnership between the Government and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) for natural resource management in Jamaica. The project brought together the Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust (JCDT), a fledgling NGO at that time, the Natural Resources Conservation Department (NRCD) now the Natural Resources Conservation Authority (NRCA), the Forest and Soil Conservation Department (FSCD) now the Forestry Department, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC), a US-based NGO with international experience in protected areas management and building institutional capacity of organisations involved in park and protected areas management.

The philosophy of the PARC project was based on the modern concept of conservation -- wise use of natural resources. Acknowledged in the design of the project was the need to involve local communities in the sustainable management of the park's resources, in addition to collecting reliable environmental data to guide protection and sustained use of these natural resources.

A community assessment survey conducted by the JCDT in 1998-99 identified the resources found and utilized in the surrounding communities in the park's buffer zone. These include rivers, springs and waterfalls; forest and agricultural lands; historic sites and trails; minerals and building materials; herbs, spices, ornamental and medicinal plants; and lumber and orchard trees. The main economic activities based on these resources are nature tourism, logging (legal and illegal), charcoal production and agriculture. These are not limited to the immediate residents of the buffer zone areas, as many of the larger farmers and tour operators in particular live in major urban areas such as Kingston. Many of these activities, however, have over time contributed to the degradation of the resource base. Before the park was established, collection of tree ferns, orchids, giant swallowtail butterflies and other endangered species, heavy use of unmanaged trails and poor farming and forestry practices were the main causes of soil erosion, deforestation, littering, and depletion of flora and fauna, which were taking place at a frightening pace.

Use of the forest is influenced by the isolation of the populations in the buffer areas and their lack of infrastructure; difficulties in transportation to other economic centres; the lack of opportunity for education and employment; land tenure and access to suitable, affordable land; the tradition of small farming in the area and the almost unfettered access to the resources.

Although the area was gazetted as a forest reserve in the 1950's, management of the resources was limited. Prior to the PARC project, the area was managed by the FSCD, which had wardens working in the area. FSCD also had responsibility for watershed protection and soil conservation programs, including the restoration of vegetative cover. However, the department was understaffed and under-resourced and the area was too large for effective monitoring by the wardens.

Since political support for production of export crops was much stronger than for protection of forest and maintenance of the forest reserves, over the years conflicting and unsustainable commercial activities were encouraged. Significant portions of the reserve were leased to the Forest Industry Development Company (FIDCO) for commercial lumber production. Access roads were put into previously inaccessible areas, pure pine plantations established and logs extracted without replanting. The Coffee Industry Development Company (CIDCO) leased lands for coffee production, and both large and small farmers cleared acres of forest for establishment of coffee plantations. Many farmers were ignorant of, or unwilling to carry out, mitigative measures to reduce soil erosion and other negative impacts. Pesticide and herbicide use in the area increased, resulting in pesticide residues appearing in rivers and streams. Waste from coffee pulperies also contributed to pollution of rivers and streams.

With the plethora of resources, and their importance to a large number of people, resource users (both large and small farmers, coal burners and loggers) initially feared for their livelihoods with the establishment of the park. People who lived in the surrounding villages were afraid of being thrown off the land they had occupied for years. Many persons believed that the park was being set up to put the forests in the hands of “rich white people”. It was therefore critical for these fears to be allayed in the initial phases of the project, and that stakeholders be made aware of the potential benefits that could be accrued from the park.

2. Stakeholder identification

Three broad categories of stakeholders were identified by the park management. The first, *frontline stakeholders*, was defined as those persons having any functional relationship to the resources of the park, particularly those communities in geographical proximity to the park and buffer areas. More simply put, it referred to anyone who had an impact on the park and the resources of the buffer zone. This stakeholder group included the residents of the buffer communities and sub-groups like small farmers, Maroons, and coffee growers. The second

category, *functional stakeholders,* included those persons or agencies that provided or could potentially provide goods and services to the park and/or frontline stakeholders. These included government agencies such as the National Water Commission and private entities such as tour operators. Other stakeholders identified were called *passive stakeholders*, which included "outsiders" who interacted with the resources for a limited time such as tourists.

The PARC project management brought the functional stakeholders of the larger PARC project together on a quarterly basis for Inter-Agency Meetings. These included all the agencies which could have any potential role or impact on any components of the project including the BJCMNP, Montego Bay Marine Park, National Water Commission, Police, Geological Survey Division, Jamaica National Heritage Trust, Conservation Data Centre, Forestry and Soil Conservation Division, Commissioner of Mines, The Nature Conservancy and the Survey Department. This committee facilitated consensus building, conflict resolution, sharing of information and overall coordination and planning.
From the outset, community involvement was regarded as an essential component to the development of the park which itself had to be relevant to community needs. The park adopted a four-point approach which took into account the following:

- the pivotal role and early involvement of the community;
- the need for conflict resolution mechanisms;
- the necessity for strengthening community capability; and
- the need to secure economic benefits for the community.

Community involvement in the BJCMNP is supported by organized community groups called Local Advisory Committees (LACs). The concept of the LAC was built into the project design: management of the areas outside of the park boundary would be the main responsibility of the communities, whereas park staff would be more concerned with the areas within the boundaries. The objective of using LACs was to build awareness among stakeholders of the need for sustainable use of the park's natural resources. The LACs provided the forum through which feasible options to strengthen community capacity and effect positive changes in their welfare without further environmental degradation, were presented and discussed.

The original project design only envisioned one LAC. However, because of the size of the park, the location of the main populated areas and resource use patterns, the original design was modified and three LACs were established. Stakeholder groups were not defined by their functional relationships to the resource (e.g., small farmers, charcoal burners, tourism operators) but rather by geography and community. Consequently, many different resource users were represented in each LAC.

The LACs were integral to two-way communication between park staff and communities and for obtaining valuable feedback from the community. They were designed to facilitate:

- involvement of the people;
- education about the park and the management of its resources;

- development of the capabilities of the local people and communities; and
- cooperation in protecting the environment.

The LACs were expected to meet regularly to discuss issues affecting the park, give advice to and help the Blue and John Crow Mountain National Park in its activities, educate and inform others about forest regulations and report breaches to wardens and other park staff.

The first park employee was the Community Outreach Officer, (COO) hired in 1990. By mid-1991, two LACs were formed and another was being encouraged. This one was later formalized in 1993. Prior to the project implementation, Peace Corps Volunteers assigned to JCDT and the PARC Project made initial contact with communities and identified established community groups. The park's COO was instrumental in following up this initial contact and getting the various community groups and residents together to form the LACs. These were:

LAC 1 - Area One - located in northwestern St. Thomas just outside of the eastern St. Andrew border, centred around the community of Minto; launched in May 1991. The LAC in Area One comprised representatives from five communities, including small farmers, larger coffee growers, teachers, pastors, community leaders, a tour company and youth.

LAC 2- Area Two - located on both sides of the border between northern St. Andrew and southern Portland, centred around the community of Hollywell; launched in May 1991. The area encompassed 11 communities. This LAC consisted of small farmers, large coffee farmers, women, youth and business people.

LAC 3 - Area Three - the most rural communities, nestled in between the Blue and John Crow Mountains in the Rio Grande Valley of Portland, centred around the community of Millbank, included farmers and two Maroon communities; launched in 1992.

3. Stakeholder participation

Although community participation was written into PARC project design, no meaningful community consultation took place during the design phase. The project design team deployed by USAID included local and foreign consultants, among them representatives from The Nature Conservancy. Project design and implementation was based on:

- Identification of candidate national parks and reserve sites
- Genetic resources analysis
- The legislative framework
- Economic analysis
- Technical analysis of the terrestrial and marine parks
- Social soundness analysis.

The social soundness analysis was not optimistic about the chances of co-opting local support, especially of the youth. It is important to note that while the stakeholders did not participate in the PARC project design, they were instrumental in the development of the park management plan which was completed in 1993[2]. There was no set formula for the development of the Local Advisory Committees, their structure, composition, activities, or their relationship to the park. Park staff realized that the plans to manage the park and the local advisory committees had to evolve simultaneously, bearing in mind that cooperation from the communities would only be forthcoming if they saw the benefits that the park could bring to them. Fears about access and "locking away" the resources of the park therefore had to be assuaged.

The Community Outreach Officer was the liaison between the park staff and the existing community groups, and was later joined by a park manager in early 1991 who was fully involved in LAC meetings and activities. The rangers, who were hired in 1992, were trained to understand the role of the stakeholders and how the park could enable them to play that role. On joining the staff, the rangers attended LAC meetings, gave educational presentations, and gave reports to, and solicited feedback from, the communities. PARC project management staff attended these meetings in order to observe the process at work and ultimately allocate funds requested by the park staff to support community initiatives.

Other ways of informing stakeholders and the general public about the park included attractive brochures which were vetted by the communities; calendars, fact sheets, slide shows, a video and media coverage of park events and LAC activities such as training programmes and an eco-tourism convention. The Giant Swallowtail Butterfly Project, a multi-faceted communication and education campaign conducted in 1993, used the endemic butterfly as a focus for protecting the park (its habitat) and for engendering pride in Jamaica's natural resources. Through school visits, a mascot, signs, posters and a competition, this campaign reached approximately 250,000 persons in the four parishes in which the park is located.

When the first LACs were convened in mid-1991, there was very little awareness of the park. The inaugural meetings included park staff, representatives from FSCD, USAID, the PARC Project Management Unit, JCDT, PIOJ, NRCD, TNC and representatives from the proximate communities. Depending on the LAC, between 50 and 100 persons attended these initial meetings. The concept of the park had to be explained to the people, many of whom understood 'parks' as recreational areas with 'fountains and picnic tables'. LACs were told their ideas and needs were important and were reassured that they would get priority from the park and benefit from the work that was created within.

[2] Noted in 1992 Evaluation Report of the PARC project. Paper referred to unavailable to author.

The LACs were convened about once per month initially. At the inaugural meetings, officers (chairpersons, treasurers, secretaries) were elected and formal structures encouraged. Minutes and attendance registers were kept for each meeting. Any member of the community could attend a LAC meeting and participate. Meetings were held in community facilities in the evenings or on Sundays to encourage full participation. Attendance at LAC meetings varied over time, but the average meeting attracted about 30 persons.

LACs were asked to identify community concerns. Many of these revolved around the lack of infrastructure - roads, water, telephone and electricity. Land tenure, health, lack of skills training and employment opportunities were also critical issues across all three areas. Each LAC functioned differently and accomplished different things, depending on the communities' interests, enthusiasm, social dynamics and relationships with park staff. Some initiatives were more successful than others. However, the park staff succeeded in bringing the relevant agencies together, facilitating a 'roundtable' of the different frontline and functional stakeholders to address critical needs.

Many LAC activities took place or were initiated before the official opening of the park in 1993, at which the keynote speaker was a female farmer from Minto. During the development of the park management plan in 1993, the LACs were invited to a retreat to review the plan.

The initial enthusiasm generated by these early successes unfortunately diminished after Phase I of the project was completed and changes made to the overall management of the PARC project and the park itself. The departure of the original park manager in 1994 and the subsequent departure of the Community Outreach Officer resulted in a loss of continuity and the need for the new park manager to rebuild relationships with communities. The communities did not readily accept the new park staff and the relationship with the rangers changed as many of the original rangers left. During this time, membership in the LACs declined and the concept had to be refined whereby the LACs became 'watchdogs'. In 1996, the JCDT was officially delegated the responsibility to manage the BJCMNP under the NRCA's Protected Area policy. This new development coincided with a renewed thrust on the part of JCDT to rebuild the relationship between the park and the communities. Meetings resumed more regularly in 1996 and additional community projects were undertaken.

Although the park had worked closely with these communities since 1991, there had never been a formal community assessment and collection of baseline socio-economic and demographic data on the communities represented in the LACs. In 1998, the JCDT received funding from The Nature Conservancy through a project called Community Conservation and Enterprise Development to work more closely with the communities and gather information on population size, density, land use, natural resource uses, social and economic needs, health, status of social amenities and perceptions of the park. Two

additional community outreach officers were hired, so that there was one present in each of the three areas. For six months, the Community Outreach Officers worked within 15 communities and collected information through focus group discussions, informal interviews, participation at meetings of community organisations and literature reviews. This information was collected for use by JCDT, the park and the communities to guide planning and development of community enterprises and build community capacity.

As a result of this information, the park has a documented profile of the communities which surround the buffer zone. They are:

> "...generally small with populations ranging between 2,700 to 4,500 persons. The population across all communities is generally young with approximately 40% being between the ages of 5-24 years of age. In general, the cluster communities of all three areas are low-income farming communities in which many families are engaged in farming small plots of land and/or are employed to larger plantations, particularly coffee.
>
> While all have access to electricity, there is mixed availability of piped water. Access to telephone service is non-existent or poor. All communities are plagued by bad roads, inadequate transportation and inadequate infrastructure generally. Access to health care was limited to clinics, which in some communities were too far away or not adequate to meet the health needs of the communities. There is general access to basic, primary and all-age schools, however secondary and tertiary education have to be obtained outside of the communities. As a result, the most pressing community concerns center around provision of infrastructure, particularly roads and water; telephone services, health care and skills training/education. Many active community based organisations exist in these communities, including PTA's, sports/recreation clubs, neighborhood watch groups, citizens associations, park local advisory committees and farmers co-ops. There are also many churches. In many instances, these community groups have been able to mobilize assistance from donor and other agencies to support community improvement projects."

4. Analysis of the stakeholder committees

Prior to the establishment of the park, all the communities had existing local organisations, which in addition to traditional community institutions such as the church and school attempted to address community development concerns. These pre-existing groups were used to convene the LACs. In Area One (Minto) the active existing community groups included the Blue Mountain Youth Club, Blue Mountain Development Committee, Friends of the Blue Mountain Park (formed in 1990), three church groups and the Hagley Gap Women's Committee. In Hollywell, the Sonic Action and Cascade youth clubs had been formed through the efforts of the Groundwork Theatre Company to promote craft training and small income generating projects. In the Rio Grande Valley, the Millbank Progressive

Group, which had been formed to promote skills training, was the lead group with which park staff worked to encourage the formation of the LAC.

Area One

This LAC established land and water committees to address the lack of access to land and water. It served as a forum to initiate discussions for moving small scale farmers off forest reserve land to private and government lands. In addition to being illegal holdings with no security of tenure, some of these small farms were contributing to landslides which endangered hikers.

Special farmers meetings to deal with the relocation and other issues related to farming in the buffer zone were held but attendance by the larger farmers was poor. Of this group, it was mainly those whose lands were occupied by the small farmers who attended. Suitable land at Chesterfield was identified for the relocation of the farmers within the forest reserve and all relevant parties brought to the table: large and small farmers, FSCD, the Commissioner of Lands, and FIDCO, which leased the land but was willing to allow resettlement of farmers. Unfortunately, the negotiations collapsed because of a change of heart on the part of FIDCO which 'discovered' mining rights on the property. Many years later however, with the expiration of the mining rights, interest in the property was rekindled and talks have resumed.

The LAC established the Top of Jamaica Tour Guide Company, with the assistance of park staff, JCDT, Jamaica Tourist Board, US Peace Corps and The Nature Conservancy. The enterprise consisted of 25 local community youth members and a Board of Directors. Top of Jamaica was given control of a cabin managed by JCDT and the participants trained in business management. Through the efforts of JCDT, the company received a grant of J$168,000 to capitalize the company. Top of Jamaica offered cabin facilities and guided tours of the Blue Mountain Peak and Portland Gap Trails. While the prospects of the company were promising, the lack of a common vision among members resulted in the demise of the company.

Other activities carried out by the stakeholders in support of the Park were environmental education and clean-up activities including a trail improvement day at Portland Gap.

An important accomplishment of the LAC was the repair of the Yallahs fording, an important access point. This project had already been planned prior to the formation of the LAC, however additional resources were mobilized through the 'roundtable' model and the repairs completed. Where larger farmers and professionals had particular expertise (e.g., engineering), resources and contacts, they participated in the projects and made valuable contributions. However, this group tended not to attend meetings because they felt there was 'little in it for them'.

Area Two

The LAC at Hollywell established the Blue Mountain Adventure Tours, and has provided training in trail interpretation by park staff, Jamaica Tourist Board and Peace Corps volunteers. The LAC also established the Hollywell Conservation Trust to raise funds for the management of the existing Hollywell recreation facilities. The LAC also conducted tree planting days, trail work-days, clean-ups, erected signs and brought electricity to the community of Section.

The thrust of the LAC was towards promoting nature tourism and offering guided tours of the Hollywell trails and Section. This community is noted for its excellent views, roasted coffee, and food and beverage services. However, insufficient attention was given to the identification and development of the market. Within this LAC, there was a significant economic gap between members of the community, particularly residents and land-owners around Hollywell who were in the higher income bracket. As a result the LAC tended to take its direction from this influential component, and park staff, aware of the potential for the wealthier contingent to have a disproportionate influence on the activities of the LAC, had to balance the needs of the community against the contribution that this group could make to the park.

The attempt by the Hollywell Conservation Trust to upgrade the recreational facilities at Hollywell was the cause of some tension between the wealthier residents who had guest houses, restaurants and attractions, and others in the community, who did not benefit as anticipated from the increase in tourism. The former wanted to proceed at a pace faster than the other residents were able, and the latter felt they should be partners in these ventures, not employees.

Area Three

Area Three has the most isolated and rural communities whose main concern was transportation and the condition of the road. In this area, attention had to be given to basic community infrastructure. A significant accomplishment of this LAC was the repair of the Millbank Swing Bridge, a 49m long bridge which had been impassible since about 1976. The bridge is the gateway to the White River waterfalls -- 12m of cascading waters and a pool for swimming surrounded by lush green vegetation. This was a community effort made possible with funding from the Green Fund of Canada and the British High Commission, lumber from the Jamaica Public Service Company and technical skills from the Engineering Corps of the Jamaica Defence Force. The LAC is currently investigating the tourism possibility that the bridge has opened up for the community. Recent activities include a series of leadership and personal development seminars in the community.

Post Mortem

Eight years after the establishment of the park and formation of the LACs, the community assessment conducted by JCDT between October 1998 and March 1999 revealed mixed results in all three areas, which related directly to the level of activity and interest of the LACs since the inception of the project.

In Area Three (Rio Grande Valley) the majority of citizens interviewed in 1998-99 were ignorant about the term 'park'. However, those who had knowledge of the park were those who were involved in some activities of the park. People were aware of rangers, but knew only some of their functions, and viewed them as police to enforce the law and "protect" the environment. There was a perception that the park should develop income generating projects, assist farmers, facilitate training programmes/workshops, utilize local resources and skills within the community.

On the other hand, in Area Two (Hollywell), most persons were aware of the park through the LAC and the presence of rangers in community organisations and schools. Most persons agreed with the goal of the park but felt that community needs such as employment and relocation should be addressed. There was still a concern that the 'small' people did not benefit from park income generating activities.

In Area One, older persons were more aware of the park, but saw its role largely confined to enforcement. These persons however thought it was important to preserve the watershed and the forests and were concerned about the pollution of rivers from coffee pulperies. The young people were less aware, with little or no views on the role of the park, and even how the park could assist the communities.

Residents in all three areas were aware of some of the harmful environmental practices that they carry out, but justified them as enabling them to earn a living. Many were aware of the alternatives but chose not to practice.

5. Lessons learnt

Role of the lead agency in phased projects.

For ongoing projects, community participation requires the ongoing presence of the lead agency with a designated contact person(s) in order to maintain momentum, and to keep stakeholders informed about current management issues.

Communication and facilitation techniques.

All staff, particularly the outreach staff, need to have good 'people' skills. The LACs were more successful when the park had staff with a clear understanding and attributes which made them better able to relate to communities. Without good rapport between staff and residents it is difficult to engender trust. Between 1994 and 1996 the park also

suffered from high turnover in personnel which meant that new staff had to be given time to allow these personal relationships to redevelop.

Understanding the social and political culture.

Park staff need to be aware of the peculiarities and characteristics of the localities and the local social dynamics. In order to manage conflict and ensure that one stakeholder group does not hold undue influence over the other, familiarity with social and political culture of communities is essential.

Needs assessment studies should predate commencement of project.

The in-depth community assessment and resource mapping that was done in 1998 should have been done earlier as it might have assisted in addressing the socio-economic problems which were identified at the outset, but which still exist today.

Documentation of stakeholder issues.

To soften the transition from old to new staff, particularly in the case of high staff turnover, stakeholder issues must be documented and made available to incoming project personnel.

Continuous education and public awareness.

Advocacy through education and public awareness should be an on-going process, and persons delivering it need to be properly trained. Additional resources and information need to be passed on to the key persons in the community -- e.g., teachers and educational institutions -- so that the community can inform itself from within about the park. Participation of schools in the JCDT's School's Environment Programme is a step in this direction.

Community vision.

Visioning needs to be an important element in relation to communities in order for them to buy into how the park can positively affect their lives.

Guard against dependency.

Parks must avoid creating the image of being a "godfather" or encouraging what is described as the dependency syndrome. It should help communities build their own capacity to manage projects or activities. Over the years, the LACs have since developed increased capacity for project development, management and implementation, and have secured donor funding for community projects.

Income generating projects require special expertise and time.

The experience in developing a small business within the park, as tried with the Top of Jamaica, was a challenge. Additional time should have been invested in developing capacity and additional expertise should have been recruited for this purpose. When the park staff withdrew from the project, the community did not have the capacity to sustain the project

and they felt abandoned. Adequate time and expertise must be invested in the community, particularly when dealing with income generating projects.