Virtual Short Course, “Effective Advocacy for Caribbean Civil Society Organisations (CSOs),” Delivery, Findings and Lessons Learnt Report

Pilot virtual learning initiative developed by CANARI and funded by the PISCES project, to help build Caribbean CSOs’ capacity to engage in advocacy on environmental issues—specifically to aid in the regional push or effort to get the Escazú Agreement signed, ratified and adopted as standard policy.

This project is funded by the European Union (ENV/2016/380-530) \textit{Civil society and small and micro enterprise innovation for marine and coastal conservation in the Caribbean}. It is being implemented by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) in partnership with the Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM), the Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organisations (CNFO), the Environmental Awareness Group (EAG), and the Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine (FoProBiM), the Saint Lucia National Trust (SLNT) and Sustainable Grenadines Inc (SusGren).
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1. Introduction (context)

1.1. Background to the project

The *Powering Innovations in Civil Society and Enterprises for Sustainability in the Caribbean (PISCES)* project (2017-2020) is being implemented by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI), in partnership with the Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM), the Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organisations (CNFO), the Environmental Awareness Group (EAG), the Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine (FoProBiM), Sustainable Grenadines Inc (SusGren), and the Saint Lucia National Trust (SLNT), with support from the European Union.

PISCES aims to support innovative actions by civil society organisations (CSOs) and coastal community small and micro enterprises (SMEs) for conserving marine and coastal biodiversity and developing sustainable and resilient livelihoods in the Caribbean. PISCES is taking place in 10 countries: Antigua and Barbuda; The Bahamas; Dominica; Grenada; Haiti; Jamaica; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; and Trinidad and Tobago.

PISCES will contribute to addressing priority issues and needs in the Caribbean by enhancing marine and coastal biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihoods and socio-economic development. This will be achieved through conserving and building resilience of natural resources upon which the fisheries, tourism and other economic sectors depend, strengthening the small-scale fisheries sector, supporting sustainable and community tourism, strengthening community SMEs and enhancing marine and coastal governance generally as well as specifically within selected priority marine protected areas (MPAs)/marine managed areas (MMAs).

Component 5 of the PISCES project will build the capacity of Caribbean civil society to effectively develop and lead on advocacy on environment and development issues including marine and coastal resources management and governance, environmental justice, climate change mitigation and adaptation and implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), at the local, national and regional levels. CANARI has identified the Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (the Escazú Agreement) as a key multilateral environmental agreement to focus their regional and national advocacy initiatives in 2020.

CANARI has developed a draft regional advocacy strategy for the Escazú Agreement advocacy. CANARI engaged civil society organisations in 6 PISCES project countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago) to lead/co-lead national advocacy campaigns to urge Governments to sign and ratify the Escazú Agreement. CANARI has also conducted a regional survey on the role of Caribbean civil society in environmental governance and decision-making which seeks to determine what advocacy CSOs are already doing in the region, what are the needs and opportunities, and what advocacy capacity building is needed. This information will be used to refine the regional Escazú Agreement advocacy strategy. In implementing this advocacy strategy, CSOs will receive support through training, coaching and resources to conduct national advocacy campaigns on the Escazú Agreement.

An important deliverable expressed under Component 5 of the project is the design and delivery of a regional training on CSO advocacy to provide capacity building on tools, techniques and best practices to civil society advocating on environmental and development issues in the Caribbean. This regional training was reimagined and delivered as a virtual course due to the current physical distancing measures in place around the world to address the COVID-19 pandemic. This virtual course titled “Effective advocacy for Caribbean civil society organisations (CSOs)” used the advocacy toolkit (An advocacy toolkit for Caribbean civil society organisations) developed under the PISCES project as the main course text.
1.2 Course staff

CANARI contracted Michele Matthews-Morancie, independent consultant, who also aided in the development of the course text, “An advocacy toolkit for Caribbean civil society organisations,” to design, develop and deliver the virtual short course. Matthews-Morancie served as lead facilitator of the course while, Course Coordinator/Project Manager and CANARI Senior Technical Officer Sasha Jattansingh and CANARI Technical Officer Candice Ramkissoon served as facilitation aides/small group facilitators and CANARI Communications Officer Sasha Harrinanan served as technical support and general communications staff on the project. For the first two sessions, Melissa Matthews, independent consultant and colleague to Matthews-Morancie, offered additional support as a facilitation aide/small group facilitator as well.

1.3 Course schedule

1.3.1 Live course sessions

The live sessions for the four-week virtual short course were originally scheduled to take place on June 18th and 25th, and July 2nd and July 9th, 2020. However, due to unforeseen circumstances (illness on the part of Matthews-Morancie, lead facilitator, and social unrest in Trinidad making the CANARI offices inaccessible to staff), the course session scheduled for July 2nd, 2020 was postponed and rescheduled to July 9th. This postponement created a one-week, mid-course break for participants, and resulted in the extension of the course by one week with the last session of the course taking place on July 16th, 2020. Hence, the actual course schedule was June 18th and 25th, July 9th and 16th from 10 a.m.-12 p.m. Atlantic Standard Time (AST) via Zoom Meeting (hosted by CANARI).

1.3.2 Facilitator office/meeting hours

Matthews-Morancie hosted weekly office hours for participants to access additional support and guidance on the course materials, assignments and practical application of the tools to their organisation’s advocacy efforts. Office hours were held weekly on Tuesdays from 9 a.m.-12 p.m. AST as well as on Mondays and Wednesdays by appointment only.

1. Course design

2.1 Course overview

Originally conceptualised as a six-week course with 2.5-3 hour sessions “Effective advocacy for Caribbean CSOs” was condensed to a four-week, pilot virtual short course with two hour sessions. The course was developed under the PISCES project in direct support of Component 5 (See Section 1.1). The aim was to broadly:

- enhance and shore up participants’ capacity to engage in strategic advocacy in ways that could then be applied to their work to advance environmental and social developmental causes/issues through organisational advocacy projects and programmes;
- assess capacity of participating regional CSOs to effectively engage in advocacy in support of the Escazú Agreement within their island nations;
- identify other/new potential Escazú champions in countries participating in the PISCES project without previously identified champion CSOs;
● provide participating CSO representatives with a deeper understanding of the advocacy toolkit and how to use it as a means of developing a strong and effective advocacy strategy and implementation plan; and,

● give participating CSO representatives an opportunity to practically apply the tools provided in the toolkit and receive guidance, support and feedback on the effectiveness of their draft advocacy outputs.

More specifically, the aim was to:

● enhance and shore up the previously appointed/identified Escazú champion CSOs’ capacity to engage in strategic advocacy in ways that could be directly applied to their advocacy work in support of the Escazú Agreement; and,

● help regional Escazú champion CSOs draft and finalise Escazú Agreement support advocacy strategies and implementation plans.

2.1.1 Prerequisite coursework benefits and rationale

Participants were asked to complete prerequisite coursework (outlined in Annex 1, the Participant Course Outline) in order to prepare for the first session of the course. Setting the tone for what would be expected of participants for the duration of the course, the prerequisite work, provided an opportunity for participants to:

● identify an advocacy project within their portfolio to focus on;
● read through the toolkit and start practically applying the tools to develop goals and objectives; and,
● create a basic outline or “broad sketch” of their advocacy strategy.

2.1.2 In-session coursework benefits and rationale

The in-session coursework included opportunities for participants to gain greater understanding of:

● the key elements of an advocacy strategy and an advocacy action plan
● identifying, defining and fine tuning target audiences based on available resources;
● effective advocacy messaging and how to craft them; and
● leveraging data to inform and strengthen elements of their advocacy strategy.

It also provided participants the opportunity to discuss, work through and get feedback on:

● their understanding of advocacy and how to enact change or move the needle on an advocacy issue;
● challenges faced when attempting to draft and enact an advocacy strategy and action plan; and,
● strategic approaches to monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

2.1.3 Homework assignments and rationale

The homework assignments were designed to give participants the opportunity to practically apply everything reviewed in the live course sessions to their organisational advocacy efforts. Each assignment was designed to help participants complete a tool (or multiple tools) in the course text that could aid in drafting their advocacy strategy and action/implementation plan. The intent was to give them the opportunity to try to complete said tools on their own and come back to the next session with questions or concerns if they encountered any difficulty in completing the assigned tools.
2.2. Target audiences (invited participants)
The aim was to target 20-25 regional CSO representatives, primarily doing work with a socio-environmental focus, who were also participants in the PISCES, StewardFish or CSOs for Good Governance (CSOs4GG) projects. Invitations went out to 34 CSO representatives from 27 regional organisations; 3 StewardFish project participants, 18 PISCES project participants, 6 CSOs4GG project participants.

Thirty-four CSO representatives from 24 organisations accepted the invitation to participate. Ultimately, however, only 24 representatives from 17 organisations actively participated and some of them could not attend all four sessions due to illness and scheduling conflicts (see Appendix 1: Final Participant List/Attendance Tracker). That, notwithstanding, the quality and commitment of participation for those in attendance at any given session was exceptional - participants asked lots of questions, engaged in active discussion and provided very salient feedback to the plenary group and their small group mates.

2.3 Methodology
The virtual course was highly interactive, building on the participants' existing knowledge and lived experiences, while introducing them to more strategic, holistic, creative and forward-thinking approaches to advocacy and movement building within a regional Caribbean context. The course included:

- module-related guest experience shares;
- question and answer (Q&A) sessions with experience share guests;
- participant-driven and led review sessions;
- plenary discussion and review;
- small group discussion, brainstorming and application of learning;
- slide presentations;
- video-based case study review;
- video aides as the premise for discussion;
- advocacy toolkit as in-session course material and out-of-session course text; and,
- handouts and course material.

2.3.1 Technical setup
At the beginning of the course design and development process, several platforms were considered and discussed. Ultimately, the team decided on the following technical setup for ease of use by the participants and availability of functions key to the desired interactivity of the sessions.

- For live sessions and office hours:
  - Platform: Zoom Meetings
  - Key technical functions to support course operation:
    - waiting rooms,
    - break-out rooms,
    - in-class surveys (assessments and evaluations),
    - virtual whiteboard,
    - share screen (audio and visual),
    - recording; and,
    - virtual background (for facilitator.)

- Pre-session/between-session communication
  - Drop-Box
2.3.2 Course format
The course was divided into five modules that, at the start of the course, were intended to be facilitated over four, two-hour Zoom Meeting sessions. However, all the sessions ran over the allotted time by at least 15 minutes and more often extended to 30 minutes past the advertised end time.

A general format was designed as a guideline for each module to ensure continuity in format throughout the course. That format is outlined in detail in the staff/team course outline (Annex 2).

2.4 Course objectives
The participant and staff/team course outlines (Annexes 1 and 2 respectively) both state that by end of the course and upon completion of all of the assignments, course participants would be able to:

- identify and define the key elements of an effective advocacy strategy;
- write an effective, simple advocacy strategy;
- use available data to:
  - validate their target audiences,
  - craft more effective messaging,
  - choose products and platforms,
  - develop evaluation methods and indicators for M&E;
- Identify and define the key elements of an effective advocacy action (implementation) plan; and,
- write an effective, simple implementation plan.

Additionally, more specific objectives for each module of the course were identified in the detailed module breakdowns and session plans in the staff/team course outline (Annex 2).

2.5 Course content
The agreed upon module descriptions and the topics each module was slated to cover prior to the start of the course were as follows:

- **(Week #1) Module #1: “The ABC’s of Effective Advocacy Strategy”** — *this session will review the key elements of an effective advocacy strategy; and, explore how strategic targeting and well-thought-out messaging (language) can contribute to the success of/bolster an advocacy strategy in the Caribbean. It will help participants apply best practices and guidance from the toolkit to start identifying suitable targets and crafting effective messaging for their own advocacy strategies.*

- **(Week #2, Part 1) Module # 2: “The 123’s of Effective Advocacy Strategy”— this part of the session will address how to effectively use data to inform advocacy efforts and strategy on a number of fronts—from validating the need for an advocacy effort/campaign and reason specific target audiences are honed in on to the means by which a CSO disseminates its messaging and measures its overall impact.*
● (Week #2, Part 2) Module #3: “Advocacy in Action: Key Advocacy Implementation Tools and Their Role in Effective Advocacy” — this part of the session will review the advocacy action tools in the toolkit and help participants understand what part they play in the success of an advocacy strategy. It will also help participants gain a better understanding of how to use/apply the tools to their own advocacy efforts (and start drafting their implementation/advocacy action plan for review and feedback)

● (Week #3) Module #4: “Advocacy in Action, Play by Play-Part 1: Team, Timing and Resources” — this session will address and help participants think through who in their organisations and partner organisations possess the skills necessary to move their advocacy efforts forward, what roles those people should occupy within the effort, what the optimal timing for advocacy is based on their goals and what resources they have available to them to invest in their organisational advocacy efforts.

● (Week #4) Module #5: “Advocacy in Action, Play by Play-Part2: Impact and All-In-One”—this session will explore how to execute/implement the M&E component of the participant organisations’ advocacy strategies and guide participants through completing Action Tool #5, Advocacy Action Plan At-a-Glance to complete their implementation plans and ensure readiness for advocacy action/campaign execution.

Prior to the start of the course, very detailed and specific session plans were developed to help achieve the stated aims in Section 2.1 (see Annex 2 to review agreed upon/approved session plans). However, as a first-time initiative and pilot for future implementations of a CANARI virtual short course, the lead facilitator and support team used the implementation process to adapt and fine tune the content based on the needs of the active participants and the overarching goal of Component 5 of the PISCES project (see Section 3).

2. Course delivery: findings and adaptations

3.1 Participants' capacity level

3.1.1 Baseline indicator(s) of participants' capacity

The team’s past experiences working with some participants and relevant observations as well as the registration form responses served as baseline indicators for the capacity of participants prior to the start of the course (as the team fine-tuned and sought approval for the final session plans).

Responses to the following registration questions heavily informed the project team's assumptions and considerably influenced the "final" approved session plans prior to the start of the course.

● Has your organisation engaged in any advocacy on environmental or development issues at the community or national levels?
  ○ 30 of 36 respondents answered in the affirmative, stating "yes."

● If yes, briefly share some examples of advocacy you have done and what were the results.
  ○ "It was good; we work with the different schools on [the] island teaching about mangrove, wetland[s] [and] sea turtle conservation."
  ○ "Rainwater harvesting among young people."
"The protection and management of coastal and marine resources and the development of MPAs. We have had some success in passing legislation and activities with local community groups."

"Getting the Government to not develop a transshipment port in the Protected area. This was a joint effort with other entities and it was successful. Included public lectures and engaging on local TV and radio and through social media and meetings. It also entailed engaging leaders including the Prime Minister. This also included an economic evaluation of the impact of the port."

"Turtle Monitoring where we protect the turtles from poachers and because of regular monitoring we manage to get one of the poachers to become a member of our organisation. we also work with ministry of health to educate the community on litters issues and much more"

"COVID19 we submitted to the government concerns from a gendered perspective."

"We are a gender justice advocacy organisation. I as a member am interested in future eco feminist advocacy. WOMANTRA presented along with the Sanitation Workers at the Caribbean Workers Forum based on research on Gender, Climate Change and Labour."

"Womantra is a young, queer women-led feminist organisation with an advocacy mandate. For 2020, we have been involved in awareness raising around GBV and anti-Black racism. In January, we coordinated the Raise Your Voice Orange Day action to speak out about the increased incidence of fatal acts of violence against women. We received the support of the TTPS, which has also formed the basis of a burgeoning partnership with their GBV Unit. In March, we produced the Rights Deconstruction campaign, in which we critiqued the Gender Policy and produced a public exhibition featuring campaign infographics and interactive learning activities to engage and educate over 50 attendees. These are just two."

"Sustainable consumption and production, waste management (elimination of styrofoam products and reduction of single use plastics)."

"Most recently has been the development of the maritime ocean Collection (http://maritimeoceancollection.com/) which is being shared among organisations and schools as part of a virtual learning experience."

"Protect Camerhogne Park!! - as part of the Grouping of CSOs- advocating for the preservation of Camerhogne Park, public green space and beach front access to Grand Anse access be protected in perpetuity; not to be given over to hotel resort development; (ii) No to Cottages on the Lagoon- advocating that there should be no buildings on the Lagoon Park - cottages as proposed by "developer" Peter D.Savary- a public green space to be protected for the use and enjoyment of the public. Both to date have staved off the "developments."

"Raise awareness about the impacts of climate change on the livelihoods of fishers - community worked together to obtain grant funding and built a more climate resilient fisher village; raise awareness about the benefits of establishing Marine Managed Areas - The community supported establishment of the St. Kitts and Nevis Marine Management Area; Raise awareness about the impacts of land based pollution on marine life and marine ecosystems - obtained grant funding to provide a dumpster at the fish landing site to reduce littering."

"The Trust has worked closely with natural resource users especially in the south of the island. We were the lead organisation that trained over 20 sea moss farmers, and got
them certified. We also play a key role in getting community groups to play a more important role in taking care of our mangroves while sustainably using these resources.

- "Goat Islands - Lobbying against the proposed Chinese transshipment port."
- The protection and management of coastal and marine resources and the development of MPAs. We have had some success in passing legislation and activities with local community groups.
- "We raise awareness about environmental observances like Earth Day, World Oceans Day, World Environment Day, etc, by organising activities and using social media, as well as organise membership activities like tree-planting and turtle watching. Additionally, we have promoted mangrove revegetation, bio-security checks in protected areas, and managed some environmentally significant sites as well."
- "The Network remains in the forefront for the call for finalising and passing of the Gender Policy. The Policy is still in draft as a Green Paper, while the Network uses the media and letter writing to highlight the non passage. Another example is with the clandestine introduction of the NPO bill, the Network called organisations together to examine the bill, which was found to contain many articles which were detrimental to the NGO movement. The advocacy for change continues to a reasonable passage."
- "We have lobbied the government and local communities around issues of sea turtle poaching and responsible beach use. The most recent successful examples were getting turtle friendly adjustments made to a Jazz on the Beach event in 2018 and securing funding for beach patrols from the government in 2019."
- "Advocacy on the passing of the Environmental Protection and Management Act 2015; advocacy against unsustainable infrastructural development projects."
- "Petition for the passing of the Beverage Container Bill."

- Please rate your organisation’s capacity to lead on advocacy on environment and development issues (from 1 to 5; 1 being low capacity and 5 being high capacity)
  - The average response of participants was 3 indicating some understanding of advocacy; the breakdown of respondents’ responses was as follows:
    - "1" - two respondents
    - "3" - 19 respondents
    - "4" - 13 respondents
    - "5" - two respondents

3.1.2 Assumptions made about participants’ capacity

Considering the vast majority of the invited participants represented organisations that engage in a fair to considerable amount of public outreach and issue advocacy within the communities they serve, the aforementioned responses to the registration form as well as prior experience working with some of the participants, the following assumptions were made:

- developing an advocacy strategy, even if they hadn't done one before, would not be a new or foreign concept to most participants;
- the basic elements of what makes an advocacy strategy effective in a regional context would be known and understood and therefore, just be a point of review for most participants;
- participants would already have an understanding of their weak points with respect to engaging in advocacy and be prepared/ready to confront and work through those weak points;
- participants would have completed the prerequisite coursework or have such a strong understanding of the advocacy projects their organisations are working on that they would be ready to attempt practical application in-session and with little orientation needed; and,
overall, the capacity of participants would be high level allowing for the in-class plenary and small group discussion and work to go deeper, allow for practical application of the skills reviewed/topics covered to complete the tools and peer to peer feedback loops on approaches to advocacy, etc.

3.1.3 Findings about actual participant capacity
Initially, as a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) measure, the team developed pre and post session evaluations for session #1. This was done as a means of gauging participants’ self-evaluation of their:
• understanding of advocacy;
• capacity to engage in effective advocacy; and,
• expectations of the course and first session.

Several responses to the pre-session survey questions for session #1 (administered at the start of the session) were indicative of a much lower level of confidence in their own abilities to effectively engage in and lead advocacy efforts. In some instances, it even revealed less understanding of how to engage in advocacy. Below is a sampling of the responses that clearly hinted at lower capacity for advocacy among participants.

- What are your expectations of the course and today's class session? The responses to this question below are indicative of participant's having limited to no knowledge of advocacy strategy prior to the course.
  - "Understanding the components of an effective advocacy strategy in a manner that will allow us to create one."
  - "A solid grounding for foundation of advocacy interest."
  - "Able to quickly identify actual specific targets that can best address the problem"

- Rate your confidence in your ability to list the key elements of an advocacy strategy and explain their importance.
  - Of the 17 responses garnered, the average response was 2 indicating low confidence in their ability to identify even the basic elements of an advocacy strategy; the breakdown of respondents’ responses was as follows:
  ■ "1"-six respondents
  ■ "2"-six respondents
  ■ "3"- five respondents

Additionally, questions and responses that arose out of the small group part of Session #1 further indicated a lack of understanding of the elements of an advocacy strategy and hinted at lower capacity to actually develop/understand how to develop an advocacy strategy from a vocal majority.

3.2. Course adaptations
As stated in Section 2.5, prior to the start of the course, very detailed and specific session plans were developed to help achieve the stated aims in Section 2.1. However, as a first-time initiative and pilot for future implementations of a CANARI virtual short course, the lead facilitator and support team used the implementation process to adapt and fine tune the content based on the needs of the active participants and the overarching goal of Component 5 of the PISCES project. The course sessions were adapted in several ways to accommodate for the challenges discovered during the delivery of the course (see Section 4: "Challenges, lessons learnt and recommendations" for a more complete list of challenges).

The adaptations made to the sessions were as follows (Annex 3, Adapted/Amended Session Plans can be consulted to see how each individual session was impacted by these adaptations):
● the bulk (90%) of the practical application, small and plenary exercises were removed from the in-class sessions and assigned as homework;
● the plenary case study exercises were relegated to homework due to time constraints;
● the number of small group exercises was reduced to one small group exercise per session and at least one session was conducted without a single small group session to allow for greater plenary discussion and understanding;
● more time was allotted for plenary review of the strategy and action tools found in the toolkit/course text;
● assignments were lengthened to account for topics unable to be covered in class;
● time was spent brainstorming solutions to perceived challenges to engaging in advocacy on the ground;
● from a technical perspective, the facilitator took over the slide presentation to allow for smoother in-class experience for participants;
● support team members were more formally engaged via facilitator guides and notes to improve the small group facilitation aspect of the course;
● office hours were extended to include days not originally agreed to in order to accommodate participants' schedules; and,
● pre-session and post-session Google Forms surveys were abandoned due to lack of response from participants and were replaced with more broad questions asked at the beginning of the sessions and responses garnered verbally or via the chat box function of Zoom Meetings.

4. Challenges, lessons learnt and recommendations

There were several challenges that arose during the delivery of the course that led to changes in the way the course was facilitated, the participants' experiences with homework assignments as well as how the course was ultimately staffed and managed. Those challenges, lessons learnt and correlating recommendations for how to avoid said challenges in the future are captured in "Table 1. Course challenges, lessons learnt and recommendations," below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Lesson Learnt</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Duration of the course (number of sessions); this advocacy course was initially conceptualised as a six to eight week initiative, but was curtailed due to scheduling conflicts and time constraints with respect to deadlines to achieve outcomes on issue advocacy for the Escazú Agreement.</td>
<td>Shortening the duration of the course must be followed by amending the course objectives to ensure that objectives are still attainable within the new timeframe. In this instance, the fewer number of sessions impacted our ability to cover the topics in-depth and to allow in-class practical application of the tools in the toolkit.</td>
<td>For future iterations of this course, allow for at least six sessions to adequately cover the topics and allow participants to engage in practical application during class sessions. To allow for even more substantive work to occur, allow for eight to nine weeks to give time for peer review and feedback of draft materials, both during and in between class sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schedule/timing (the length of the individual class sessions); the sessions were set to take place over two hours, but consistently ran over time and session plans had to be abbreviated repeatedly. Objectives of the course called for far longer sessions than the budget and designated staff time allowed.</td>
<td>For interactive virtual experiences to work as intended, there has to be adequate space and time included in each session to allow for discussion, review and practical application, if necessary. The absence of those elements can result in participants feeling rushed, having a hard time grasping concepts and missing opportunities to gain clarification on parts of the subject matter.</td>
<td>In the future, allow class sessions to be at least 3 hours in duration so that the spacing of the parts of each module can be given the time needed so participants feel like they grasp the lessons being imparted, have time to digest and seek clarification where needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support team roles were vague and unclear until after session # 1.</td>
<td>Interactive virtual class experiences require more staffing than might be required in a face to face environment, especially with the use of breakout rooms.</td>
<td>Additional support staffing should be budgeted and accounted for prior to the start of any implementation of this online advocacy course and/or that of courses with similar levels of participant engagement using the same or similar methodologies employed by this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Office hours were only attended 5-7% of the time it was available to participants.</td>
<td>Though put in place as a means to offer additional support and guidance to participants given the limited timeframe of the actual in-class sessions, taking advantage of office hours seemed like an additional burden/tax on the time of the participants. Applying this time elsewhere would have been more beneficial for participants.</td>
<td>Do away with set office hours and apply part of the time designated for that additional support to the actual in-class time. That would result in longer sessions, but based on participant feedback, that would be a more useful and welcome way to spend their time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Technical glitches and growing pains with respect to recording the sessions, operating the</td>
<td>Even in a virtual space, the low technical option is always the path of least resistance and greatest efficiency for class participants.</td>
<td>Course summary notes should be written into the scope of work for this advocacy course in the event that a recording is lost or corrupted during the duration of the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
slides, ensuring the technological aspects of the class like audiovisual learning aides on the part of the facilitators and low to no internet connectivity served as distractions to learning for the plenary group.

- The facilitators and guest presenters should control their own audiovisual aids to ensure a relatively smooth in-class experience for participants.
- Provide participants with notes on optimal Internet speed so that they can participate fully without constant interruption.

### Baseline KAPs, Accounting for Participants’ Capacity Levels, Participant Follow-through

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Lesson Learnt</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Participant capacity was all over the map and did not always meet the baseline standard used to develop the course materials; this course had participants of extremely high capacity and others with far lower capacity and levels of understanding where advocacy was concerned. | - Registrants/prospective participants are not always clear about what level of capacity they and their colleagues are functioning at when it comes to advocacy engagement and execution.  
- Higher capacity CSO representatives need to connect with other high functioning peers in order to extract value from an interactive, virtual course of this nature.  
- Lower capacity course participants benefit greatly from peer feedback and experience shares. | - Do more research on invited groups and/or individuals to establish a true baseline using KAPs, a more in-depth assessment survey and track record to discern actual level of capacity to engage in advocacy.  
- Create two tracks of the course to account for different participant capacity levels;  
  o "an introduction to effective advocacy strategy and implementation course" for lower capacity CSOs and representatives which uses the amended/adapted session plans from this course  
  o "developing effective, comprehensive advocacy strategy and implementation plans" for high capacity CSOs and representatives that uses the "final, approved" session plans for this iteration of the course. |
| 2. Participant drop-off was noticeable due to connectivity as well as prior engagements and participant follow-through on assignments was extremely low. | Participants do not always see the value of homework assignments even if the assignment directly correlates to work they are already doing for their organisation. Assigning work without clearly spelling out how it correlates to what was covered during the class session, may result in participants not understanding and by extension, not completing the assignments. | - Start all assignments during the class session and instruct/remind participants as to how the assignment is relevant to their work and/or meeting the course objectives.  
- Tie homework completion to certificate acquisition.  
- Communicate the time commitment required well in advance of the start of the course, inclusive of time allocated for homework assignments.  
- Communicate ahead of time, the bandwidth necessary to participate in the course.  
- Tie class attendance and participation in the live session to certificate acquisition. |
5. Participant outputs and feedback

5.1. Participant outputs

5.1.1 Capacity-building assignments

During the course of the five-week span and four-week course, participants have been engaged and undertaken a considerable amount of work to increase their understanding of and capacity to engage in effective, impactful advocacy work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment/Activity</th>
<th>Participant Output(s)</th>
<th>Benefit(s) to Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If my Caribbean CSO’s advocacy strategy were a person&quot; (The Anatomy of an Effective Advocacy Strategy) ...Using the provided worksheet, please label the “body” with the parts of an effective strategy and note why you assigned said elements to the parts of the body you have chosen for them.</td>
<td>● Completed body chart worksheet listing key elements of an advocacy strategy and denoting their value/importance to the participant organisation. ● Definitions of the elements of an effective advocacy strategy from their perspective ● Notes on other participants’ perspectives for consideration</td>
<td>● Review and clarity on the elements of an effective advocacy strategy for higher capacity participants. ● Identification of elements of advocacy strategy and their importance for lower capacity participants ● Foundational reference worksheet to aid in conception of advocacy strategy when completing strategy and action tools from toolkit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bullseye: Effective, Strategic Targeting Brainstorm&quot; and Strategy Tool Review: Strategy Tool #4 ...Please respond to the following questions:</td>
<td>● Notes on the value of identifying and defining their target audiences ● A reflective list on past target audiences their organisations have attempted to influence and why as well as notes on success or failure with considerations for how they could have approached said audiences differently ● Notes on considerations that should be taken when deciding who needs to be targeting for an advocacy campaign</td>
<td>● Review and clarity on the importance of target audiences to effective advocacy for higher capacity participants. ● Understanding the importance of target audiences to an effective advocacy campaign for lower capacity participants. ● Greater understanding of 360-degree considerations for target audiences: who can positively affect their advocacy? Who can negatively impact their advocacy? Who can partner to bolster their efforts?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Key work assigned to participants

In-class session coursework and related outputs
**What are some things we should consider when deciding who to target for our advocacy efforts?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Who Feels it, Knows it&quot; Experience Share Q&amp;As</th>
<th>&quot;How to Start a Movement&quot; Video and Brainstorm on Movement-building.</th>
<th>M&amp;E and My Advocacy Activity...You have 5 minutes each; please:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Thought-provoking questions and comments about strategically identifying and defining target audiences, crafting messaging, using data to inform and bolster, and monitoring and evaluating their advocacy efforts.</td>
<td>● Notes on how advocacy needs to be entrenched in an organisation's work on every level.</td>
<td>● Synopsis of their advocacy project work and update on progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Feedback on the experience share guests' contributions and correlations to their own work.</td>
<td>● Thoughtful commentary and questions about what building a movement means and what ends it achieves for beneficiaries in their organisations' frontline communities, how it moves the needle on advocacy for socio-environmental and development issues.</td>
<td>● Notes on their approach to M&amp;E and why they chose that approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Notes on additional resources and new approaches they had not considered.</td>
<td>● Greater context for the importance/value of their organisation's advocacy efforts.</td>
<td>● Verbal feedback to other class participants about their take on what the other participants shared and how it relates to their own work and advocacy engagement journey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| First-hand accounts of effective advocacy in a regional context. | Understanding of the need for sustainability measures and phased efforts when implementing advocacy campaigns. | First-hand accounts of effective and ineffective M&E for advocacy in a regional context. |
| Practical tips and tricks they can apply to their own advocacy efforts. | Practical tips and tricks they can apply to their own M&E approaches to their advocacy efforts. | Step by step explanations of what approaches worked and didn't work for other, similar organisations and why. |
can consider/should incorporate.
- pick a group member to share next.

---

**Homework assignments and related outputs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Participant Output(s)</th>
<th>Benefit(s) to Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Part One:** Watch the case study video (0:00-9:05). Take notes as you watch the video using the “Working the Case [Study]” worksheet as a guide. Using your notes and observations, complete Strategy Tool #4 (“Defining +Targeting Our Targets”) for the case study subject CSO. (If you need more clarity on targeting, read pages 22-23 of the toolkit, “Step 2: Defining and identifying your target audiences”) | - Completed Strategy Tool #4 for the case study subject CSO.  
- Completed Strategy Tool #4 for their advocacy project.  
- One key message for the case study subject CSO.  
- One tailored message for the case study subject.  
- Three key messages for their advocacy strategy.  
- Three tailored messages for a key target audience of their advocacy efforts. | - Practical application of skills discussed in session with the opportunity to practice identifying and defining target audiences for a case study subject, from an objective point of view.  
- Practical application of identifying and defining target audiences for their organisations’ advocacy work.  
- Drafts of elements of their advocacy strategy for current/impending advocacy projects completed with the opportunity to garner professional feedback from someone versed in advocacy regionally and internationally (the course facilitator with support from the CANARI team). |
| **Part Two:** Complete Strategy Tool #4, “Defining +Targeting Our Targets” worksheet, for your own advocacy effort. | | |
| **Part Three:** Read pages 25-27 of the toolkit, “Crafting effective advocacy messages.” Take notes/highlight key points. Using your case study notes, completed Strategy Tool #4 for the case study and Strategy Tool # 5, “Crafting effective advocacy messages checklist” draft ONE key message for the case study subject. Pick one target audience you identified for the case study subject and adapt the key message you developed for that audience. | | |
| **Part Four:** Draft THREE key messages for your advocacy effort. Pick any one of your identified target audiences and adapt/tailor each key message to sway the target audience you chose. | | |

---

**Part One:** Complete Assignment #1.  
**Part Two: Strategic Targeting** (Identifying Target Audiences):  
- Fine tuned target audiences for the case study subject CSO.  
- Fine tuned target audiences for their advocacy projects.  
- Recrafted, data-cognisant key  
- Practical application of skills discussed in session with the opportunity to practice fine tuning target audiences and recrafting key messages based on available data.
1. Consider the following using Strategy Tool #’s 2, 4 (completed in Assignment #1) + your knowledge/lived experience + “Working the Case: Collecting the Data” (attached) for reference...
   a. What do you know about who they want to target?
   b. How can we use the info in Strategy Tool #4 and our lived experience of their target audiences to further narrow down or widen the scope of this group?
2. Based on the stats and other data you have, should the case study subject narrow down or widen the scope of their targeting? Why or Why not?
3. If they should widen it, who would you add to their target audiences?
4. If they should narrow it down, who would you eliminate and who would you keep? Why or Why not?
5. Repeat steps 1-4 for YOUR advocacy project/campaign.

**Messaging:**
Consider the following using Strategy Tool # 2 (complete this using the info you have), Strategy Tool #5 + your knowledge/lived experience + “Working the Case: Collecting the Data” for reference...
   a. What messages have you crafted for them?
   b. What have you learned about their issue (with respect to statistics/qualitative data) that will allow you to further bolster/add credibility to the message you’ve crafted for them?
   c. How can and should you alter the key message to add credibility/bolster it for at least one of their target audiences? What should the key message(s) be redrafted to say?
Repeat steps 1-3 for YOUR advocacy project/campaign.

**Part Three:**
**Products & Platform;** consider the following using Toolkit Section 2.2, Step 4 (page 28), Strategy Tool # 2 (complete this using the info you have) + “Working the Case: Collecting the Data” for reference...
   - Recrafted, data-cognisant key messages for their advocacy projects.
   - A list of products and platforms that can be used to disseminate the messages of the case study subject CSO.
   - A list of products and platforms that can be used to disseminate the messages of their organisation’s advocacy campaign.
   - Draft M&E tools and approaches for the case study subject CSO.
   - Draft M&E suggestions for tools and approaches for their organisations’ advocacy efforts.
   - Completed Strategy Tools 1-4 and draft message notes.

for a case study subject, from an objective point of view.
   - Practical application of fine tuning and/or refining target audiences, key and tailored messages for their organisations’ advocacy work based on available data.
   - Practical application of drafting product and platform plan for their organisations’ advocacy efforts.
   - Practical application of drafting M&E tools and approaches for their advocacy efforts.
   - Drafts of ALL of the elements of their advocacy strategy (by way of completion of all of the strategy tools) for current/impending advocacy projects completed with the opportunity to garner professional feedback from someone versed in advocacy regionally and internationally (the course facilitator with support from the CANARI team).
1. What communications products and platforms would you use to reach the target audiences you’ve identified with the messages you drafted?

2. What do you know about the habits or patterns of their existing targets that can inform what products and platforms you suggest they use to reach those targets?

3. If you factor in their habits and/or patterns, how would or should you change the products or platforms you use to reach them?

4. Repeat steps 1-3 for YOUR advocacy project/campaign.

**M&E:** consider the following using Toolkit Section 2.2, Step 5 (page 29) + Strategy Tool #2 + Participant knowledge/lived experience + “Working the Case: Collecting the Data” for reference...

1. What typical M&E indicators and evaluation methods would you generally apply to any advocacy campaign of this kind?

2. Based on what you now know of the case study/test subject, what indicators and evaluation methods would be most helpful in measuring the impact of their advocacy?

3. Repeat steps 1 & 2 for YOUR advocacy project/campaign.

**Part Four:** Review all of the Strategy Tools and ensure you’ve completed a draft for YOUR advocacy project/campaign.

- Review the Action Tools in the toolkit and start thinking about how you would complete them for your CSO and its advocacy efforts

**Part One:** Apply the feedback you received on Assignment #2 to that work and resubmit the corrected versions

**Part Two:** Complete the action tools for your advocacy campaign/project

- Completed draft of an advocacy strategy for their organisation’s advocacy efforts.
- Completed draft of an advocacy action plan for their organisation’s advocacy efforts.

Completed draft of an advocacy strategy that can be implemented for their organisation.

Completed draft of an advocacy action plan that can be implemented by their advocacy team once agreed upon by the powers that be within the organisation.
5.1.2 Completed work received to date
Of the active participants, about 20 of them have completed 100% of the in-session classwork either by participating in the live class sessions or via review of the recordings of the sessions and by submitting queries, seeking clarification from the course facilitator. However, only 10 of those active participants have submitted at least one homework assignment, only six have submitted two assignments and none of the participants have submitted all the assignments to date.

Interestingly, however, in the course evaluation survey, the majority of the participants acknowledged the value of the homework assignments to their work. Their acknowledgements are listed below.

- "Helped to contextualize the materials but lacking a specific active project or current objective to tie it to, it was hard to find the time to really focus on it with all the many other things currently going on here - this is totally all on me and us as a group right now - not a reflection on the materials or approach"
- "Had to think through the tools more thoroughly."
- "They allowed me to get a better understanding of the concepts described in the sessions by experiencing it for myself. The assignments provided a taste of real-world application which for me was better as I learn more by doing."
- "Gave me an opportunity to go deeper in the topics."
- "The information is relevant and easy to understand."
- "It would help me to put the theory into practice."
- "It helped me to go over that section of the toolkit and learn more about that section or area."

While, other responses from the evaluation survey confirm a lack of understanding as to the need for and benefits of the homework. Responses that confirm this observation are listed below.

- "I did not expect the homework and the time I would need to give to that."
- "Homework could be short answers, multiple choice and true/false questions."
- "[I disliked] the amount of homework because it has been a hectic period at work during the pandemic."
- "[I disliked that there was] not enough time for homework and sometimes the homework was not so clear."
- "[The course could be improved by having] shorter assignments, or assignments integrated into the course."

5.2 Participant feedback

5.2.1 Soliciting and compiling course participant feedback
Several measures were put in place to solicit participant feedback throughout the four-week course, including:

- pre and post-session surveys for Session #1;
- in-session question and answer (Q&A);
- start and end-of-session one-word reflections;
- informal WhatsApp group Q&A; and,
- the course evaluation survey.

5.2.2. Summary of participant feedback collected
Feedback over the duration of the course was consistently and overwhelmingly positive with respect to the content and facilitation of the course. However, participant feedback has also consistently underscored the lessons learnt and correlated recommendations found in Section 4 of this report. The
course evaluation survey also indicated a surge in participants' perception of their capacity to engage in and potentially lead advocacy efforts on environment and development issues.

Below is a sampling of the responses that participants gave to questions in the course evaluation survey as of 6 p.m. AST on July 27th, 2020 (16 of 24 active participants had completed the survey by this time).

- Please tell us about the course sessions/topics you found particularly useful and why
  - "Crafting key messages and the importance of monitoring and evaluating. Developing key messages is often challenging but important as people live busier lives, attention spans are very short and use of social media which generally accommodates short messages is the order of the day. Monitoring is important as it helps to assess whether the objective is actually being achieved or was achieved and is an area where most agencies fail."
  - "I appreciated the part on data collection; the part on Monitoring and evaluation, and especially the weekly sharing "who feels it" when you get the opportunity to learn from others."
  - "Target groups - how to determine who they influence. Sometimes we focus on who to target but did not think about their impact."
  - "I appreciated the part on data collection; the part on Monitoring and evaluation, and especially the weekly sharing "who feels it" when you get the opportunity to learn from others."
  - "The toolkit is a definite keeper. It has all that is needed to carry out a successful advocacy strategy."

- How could the course have been improved?
  - "I think it was as close to perfect. especially as it was based on a document that was developed. The number of tools to which we were introduced allowed for better practice and understanding."
  - "If it extended over a longer period."
  - "It would be useful to have more case studies where we analyse them in groups and pick out the dos and don'ts of advocacy. I also would have enjoyed a few more days of course sessions."
  - "Be realistic about time you need to complete. Either have less content or more sessions. Tell people up front how many hours they need including attending sessions and completing the homework."

- Following this course, please rate your organisation's capacity to lead on advocacy on environment and development issues (on a scale from 1 to 5; 1 being low capacity and 5 being high capacity)
  - The average response was 3.5; there were 16 respondents to the survey and the breakdown of participants' responses was as follows:
    - "3" - three respondents
    - "4" - 12 respondents
    - "5" - one respondent

6. Next steps and conclusion

The formal course sessions have come to a close for most of the 24 active participants. However, for the participants who have been identified by CANARI and PISCES as country leads on the Escazú Agreement issue advocacy campaign, the real work of practical application of the course materials has just officially started. Those CSO representatives will be guided, mentored and coached by Matthews-Morancie through the development and implementation of their Escazú Agreement advocacy strategies and implementation plans from now (July 2020) until September 2020 (the impending deadline for countries to sign and ratify the Escazú Agreement regionally).

Though it was not without its challenges, the pilot implementation of the virtual short course, "Effective advocacy for Caribbean CSOs" was largely successful and lauded by the participants. Based on the
participant feedback, there is a great opportunity for this course to be tweaked and offered more widely to Caribbean CSOs. It should be noted at this juncture, however, that the true benefits of the course to participants will also be continuously measured by the ability of the participants to apply the course text and materials to their advocacy efforts going forward; the Escazú country lead participants, under the PISCES project, will be the first measured in this regard.
## Appendix 1: Final Participant List/Attendance Tracker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Session 1</th>
<th>Session 2</th>
<th>Session 3</th>
<th>Session 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Vincent Clarke</td>
<td>Eco south tours inn</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Nicole Leotaud</td>
<td>Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mina Booker</td>
<td>St Andrew’s Development Organization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Olujide Obonyo</td>
<td>St. Marks Fisherfolk &amp; Cooperative Society</td>
<td>No (internet problems)</td>
<td>No (internet problems)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jean Wiener</td>
<td>FoProBiM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ingrid Parchment</td>
<td>Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Brandon Hay</td>
<td>C-CAM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Katrina Coy</td>
<td>Union Island Environmental Attackers</td>
<td>No (ill)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (ill)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Josue Celiscar</td>
<td>FoProBiM</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Dennis Sammy</td>
<td>Future Fishers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Joanne Norville</td>
<td>Saint Lucia National Trust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Stephan Faublas</td>
<td>Fondation Corail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Joanna Rosemond</td>
<td>Saint Lucia National Trust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(watched session recording)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Molly Brady</td>
<td>Foundation Corail</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kariana Kelsick</td>
<td>The Environmental Awareness Group</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Akarda Ventour</td>
<td>St Andrew’s Development Organisation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Tanya Clovis</td>
<td>SOS Tobago</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Vicki Assevero</td>
<td>Green Market Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Pamashwar Jainarine</td>
<td>Guyana National Fisherfolk Organisation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization/Club</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>Yes (via Ingrid’s connection)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Arica Hill</td>
<td>Environmental Awareness Group (EAG), Antigua</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Martin Dudley</td>
<td>EAG</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Audwin Andrews</td>
<td>Sustainable Grenadines Inc</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sandra Pyke-Anthony</td>
<td>Inspired Speakers Toastmasters Club</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jacquie Burgess</td>
<td>Network of NGOs of T&amp;T for the Advancement of Women</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Gia Gaspard Taylor</td>
<td>Network of Rural Women Producers Trinidad and Tobago (NRWPTT)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jeanelle Brisbane</td>
<td>WildDominique</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jahson Alemu I</td>
<td>SpeSeas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sandra C.A. Ferguson</td>
<td>Agency for Rural Transformation</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Moya Black</td>
<td>Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Janice D. Hodge</td>
<td>Newcastle Bay Foundation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Karetta Crooks Charles</td>
<td>Saint Lucia National Trust</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ann Sutton</td>
<td>Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (via Ingrid’s connection)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Conrad Mitchell</td>
<td>Patient Advocate Mission (PAM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
<td>No (couldn’t attend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Abigail Bobb (Abigail Taylor on Zoom)</td>
<td>Nature Seekers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>