



**Improving civil society participation in the environmental impact  
assessment process in Trinidad and Tobago**

Coblentz Inn  
Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago  
November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013

MACARTHUR  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

## Table of contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	Participants .....	3
3	Goal.....	3
4	Objectives.....	3
5	Method .....	4
6	Findings.....	4
6.1	<i>Roles of CSOs in the EIA process.....</i>	<i>4</i>
6.2	<i>Limitations to CSOs effectively executing their role in the EIA process.....</i>	<i>4</i>
6.3	<i>Recommendations for CSOs to effectively execute their roles in the EIA process.....</i>	<i>5</i>
7	Evaluation.....	6
8	Conclusion.....	6
9	Appendix 1-Participant list.....	8
10	Appendix 2-Workshop agenda .....	11
11	Appendix 3-Power point presentation.....	12
12	Appendix 4- Participant contributions to sessions .....	13
13	Appendix 5-Collation of evaluations completed by workshop participants .....	16

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Civil society organisations<sup>1</sup> (CSOs) have a critical role to play and have already done important work in the development and implementation of conservation strategies and in increasing public awareness of the implications of loss of biodiversity. However, they are currently not effectively and equitably contributing to biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands in several key areas.

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) recognised the need for action to assist CSOs in the region assume this role and received a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The goal of the grant, "[Consolidating the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands](#)", is to strengthen the capacity of CSOs in the islands of the Caribbean to play a larger and more effective role in biodiversity conservation.

A component of the project is to design and pilot a national workshop to build the capacity of CSOs to participate in the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process. This is the report of that workshop which was held in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad on November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

## 2 PARTICIPANTS

18 representatives of 16 organisations attended the workshop. 11 of the 16 organisations were government agencies inclusive of two departments of the Tobago House of Assembly (the local government body on the island of Tobago). Two of the remaining organisations were consultancy firms, one a company engaged in the exploration of oil and gas. The remaining two were civil society organisations. 16 CSOs were invited and confirmed their attendance but did not show up on the day. The list of participants is in Appendix 1.

## 3 GOAL

The goal of the workshop was to derive recommendations on improving how civil society organisations participate in the decision-making process for development planning in Trinidad and Tobago.

## 4 OBJECTIVES

The workshop objectives were to:

- develop a common understanding of the role civil society organisations play and can play in the EIA process;
- identify challenges to civil society organisations effectively participating in the EIA process and recommendations to address these challenges.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this project, CSOs are defined as non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and community-based organisations (CBOs), including statutory bodies such as National Trusts and academic institutions, whether operating at international, regional, national or local level.

## 5 METHOD

The agenda for the workshop is available in Appendix 2. The workshop comprised a mix of presentations (Appendix 3), plenary discussions, and small group work. Mapping of the EIA process in Trinidad and Tobago was done and existing and proposed roles for civil society were identified. Participants identified the challenges to civil society being able to effectively play each of these roles, and identified recommendations to address these challenges. Participant contributions are available in Appendix 4. Finally, priority actions to improve CSOs participation in the EIA process were identified.

## 6 FINDINGS

### 6.1 Roles of CSOs in the EIA process

Most of the roles identified by workshop participants for CSOs were current roles. These were:

- **Engagement:** To get other stakeholders (e.g. local communities) involved in the EIA process
- **Inputting ideas and information:** To provide a grassroots perspective and local knowledge to data gathered for decision making
- **Awareness building:**  
To inform the public by disseminating information to the public on what is being proposed  
To contribute to building awareness of the EIA process and conservation of natural resources
- **Accountability:** To monitor and evaluate the action of developers and governmental authorities
- **Transparency:** To ensure that information on development planning is available to the public

Proposed additional roles were:

- **Advocacy:** To advocate on various livelihood and conservation issues
- **Reviewers:** Input into drafting of permit documents

### 6.2 Limitations to CSOs effectively executing their role in the EIA process

Limitations identified included:

- **Deficiencies in policy and practice:**
  - The National Environmental policy and the Certificate of Environmental Clearance (CEC) Rules, 2001 only give an opportunity for the lowest level of participation (consultation). The current EIA process only gives opportunities to provide information not to participate in decision making. Further, the current EIA process gives opportunities to provide information after critical criteria for the development have already been established.
  - The format in which the documents are presented provides access to only some CSOs and the public. Access is available to those :
    - with a means of travelling to the offices where report/documents are lodged;
    - with ability to read and understand the technical language/data in reports and documents; and
    - with computers and access to the internet in the event that reports are made available online.
  - The current mechanism for public participation via a request for further information from the applicant requires that CSOs write their comments. This only gives opportunities to CSOs with the time, skill and ability to respond in this manner.

- The approach to stakeholder participation is largely ad hoc and there is no recommended organised approach from the regulatory authorities.
- Key policymakers sometimes exercise their influence, bias CSOs input and skew determinations on development projects.
- **Lack of capacity of government agencies:**
  - There is often not a culture, will or resources within the regulatory authorities to support CSOs participating in decision-making.
  - The personnel of the authorities often do not have the skills to effectively communicate what is needed from the CSOs in the EIA process.
  - The regulatory authorities, in their current organisational format, do not have the time, skill, structures, personnel or money to fully facilitate CSOs participation in the EIA process.
  - The CEC Rules 2001 contain timelines for participation that sometimes cannot be accessed by CSOs.
  - The Environmental Management Authority does not draft terms of reference specific to each development proposal that would allow for meaningful CSO input.
- **Lack of capacity of CSOs:**
  - CSOs are largely not aware of the roles available to them in the EIA process. Community based organisations (CBOs) largely participate in identifying impacts, developing mitigation measures and negotiating compensation packages. There is little effort spent inputting into decision making.
  - CBOs frequently do not have the time, technical skill, personnel or funds to invest into the EIA review process.
  - In some instances, the representatives for CBOs voice personal opinions which are not the agreed opinions of the group which contributes to confusing deliberations.
  - Tools such as stakeholder identification and analysis and the drafting and implementation of a participation strategy are not widely used to identify and select key stakeholders for participation in the various stages of decision making in the EIA process. Authorities and applicants tend to invite participation of stakeholders they have used in the past who do not necessarily provide relevant information for decision making.
  - CBOs generally do not have the skill to clearly communicate their perspective on issues in the EIA process.
  - CSOs are not effectively networking to share expertise and develop and advocate collective positions.

### **6.3 Recommendations for CSOs to effectively execute their roles in the EIA process**

Specific recommendations were made to address the challenges to CSO involvement. Key points included:

- **Authorities should use tools to enhance stakeholder participation** such as stakeholder identification and analysis and the development and implementation of stakeholder participation strategies. This can contribute to a more relevant selection of stakeholders for each stage of the EIA process and can identify possible conflicts for attention and mitigation action. CSOs need to be engaged early on in the process. Community liaison officers should be

identified to facilitate broader engagement and ensure that personal opinions are not taken to represent a group position.

- **Both CSOs and authorities should explore and invest in capacity building initiatives** for them to build technical skills relevant to the EIA process, communication (for example to increase the range of pathways and products in which information is disseminated by the authorities and applicants and to improve the relevance of information given by CSOs) and mediation and negotiation.
- **CSOs should network** to leverage existing technical knowledge and skills, and to facilitate negotiation among CSOs and development of consensus on joint positions for collective advocacy.
- **Authorities should review and revise the EIA process** to better enable effective CSO participation. Actions can include:
  - communicating information on the EIA using a variety of non-technical media (e.g. videos) so that communities can better understand the information;
  - making information more continuously available and accessible (e.g. via exhibitions);
  - explaining the process and creating more opportunities (including convenient meeting times and venues) and time for CSO input;
  - sharing information on meetings and other decisions to improve transparency;
  - addressing perceptions of political and corporate influence and threats to CSOs; and
  - seeking to validate local knowledge and anecdotal data shared by communities.

## 7 EVALUATION

A summary of the 17 evaluation forms completed by the workshop participants is available in Appendix 5. All participants found the workshop useful in identifying recommendations for how CSOs could more effectively participate in the EIA decision-making process for development planning in Trinidad and Tobago. Most participants reported an improved understanding of the context in which CSOs operate and others noted the need to build the capacity of both CSOs and government authorities to improve CSO participation in the EIA process. Many welcomed the opportunity to share ideas with their peers. Most highlighted the need for more CSOs to attend the workshop to provide more CSO perspective on issues discussed. The workshop facilitator indicated that 16 CSOs had indicated their intention to attend and that the two representatives from the CSOs were from CSO umbrella organisations and therefore hopefully provided a collective perspective. Participants identified actions that they could take as individuals and proposed changes to policy and practices within their respective organisations, such as amendments in operating procedures and policies, to contribute to improving participation of CSOs in the EIA process.

## 8 CONCLUSION

The workshop provided an opportunity for key stakeholders to discuss the EIA review process in Trinidad and Tobago. However, there was significantly less CSOs in attendance than anticipated. Hence, there was not an appreciable direct contribution to building CSOs knowledge of the EIA process in Trinidad and Tobago. The workshop produced recommendations on improving how EIAs are presented and how CSOs participate in the decision-making process. The workshop created a greater awareness among stakeholders in attendance (some representatives were senior officers in their respective

organisations) of the context in which CSOs contribute to the development planning process. These outcomes contribute to building a more enabling environment for CSOs to contribute to the development planning process. Further, the workshop potentially could even make a greater contribution to improving the enabling environment if recommendations are implemented by government agencies and private sector partners.

The key challenges limiting CSOs effective participation in the EIA process in Trinidad and Tobago are the limitations on participation provided under the policy and legislative framework (National Environmental Policy and CEC Rules, 2001) and practices to implement these, and lack of capacity of both CSOs and the government authorities. Proposed responses to remedy the situation include capacity building initiatives for CSOs and authorities in areas such as improving technical skills in stakeholder participation processes, communication and networking.

## 9 APPENDIX 1-PARTICIPANT LIST

#	Organisation	Sal	First Name	Last Name	Job Title	Address 1	Tel (W)	Tel (M)	Fax	Email 1
1	Tobago House of Assembly - Department of Natural Resources	Ms.	Crystal	Lawrence	Environmental Officer II	Wilson Road, Unit 6-8 Highmoor Centre, Scarborough, Tobago	660 7636			<a href="mailto:marinaclear@gmail.com">marinaclear@gmail.com</a>
2	Environmental Management Authority	Ms.	Xiomara	Chin	Environmental Officer II	#8 Elizabeth Street, St. Clair	628 8042 ext.231 5		868 628 9122	<a href="mailto:Xchin@ema.co.tt">Xchin@ema.co.tt</a>
3	Ministry of Works and Infrastructure	Mr.	Jason	Ganpat	Physical Impact Specialist					<a href="mailto:jganpat@mowt.gov.tt">jganpat@mowt.gov.tt</a>
4	Ministry of Energy and Energy Affairs	Mr.	Marc	Rudder	Senior Petroleum Engineer	Tower C, International Waterfront, Level 22-26, 1 Wrightson Road, Port of Spain	623 6708	697 7013		<a href="mailto:mrudder@energy.gov.tt">mrudder@energy.gov.tt</a>
5	Trinidad & Tobago Fire Services	Mr.		Davis	Acting Chief Fire Officer	Wrightson Road, Port of Spain	868 625 2671-5		868 623 8463	<a href="mailto:davis_1693@yahoo.com">davis_1693@yahoo.com</a>
6	Council of Presidents of the Environment (COPE)	Ms.	Patricia	McGaw	Secretary	77 B Saddle Road, Maraval			868 753 5177	<a href="mailto:copett2011@gmail.com">copett2011@gmail.com</a>
7	Council of Presidents of the Environment (COPE)	Mr.	Louis	Guy	Project Coordinator	77 B Saddle Road, Maraval				
8	Ministry of Planning and Sustainable Development, Town and Country Planning Division	Ms.	Fayola	Merrique	Town Planner	Eastern Main Road, Tunapuna	663 2726	373 2687	663 2726	<a href="mailto:fayola.merrique@planning.gov.tt">fayola.merrique@planning.gov.tt</a>



9	Ministry of Planning and Sustainable Development, Town and Country Planning Division	Mrs.	Wilsa	Wilson	Assistant Director	Level 17, Eric Williams Financial, Port of Spain	627 9700	701 6057		<a href="mailto:wilsa.wilson@planning.gov.tt">wilsa.wilson@planning.gov.tt</a>
10	Eco Engineering Consultants Limited	Ms.	Debbie	Reyes	General Manager	62 Eastern Main Road, St. Augustine	645 4420		662 7292	<a href="mailto:ecoeng@ecoenggroup.com">ecoeng@ecoenggroup.com</a>
11	Eco Engineering Consultants Limited	Dr.	George	Sammy		62 Eastern Main Road, St. Augustine	645 4420		662 7292	<a href="mailto:ecoeng@ecoenggroup.com">ecoeng@ecoenggroup.com</a>
12	Water Resources Agency	Ms.	Sara Jade	Govia	Environmental Specialist	179-181 Eastern Main Road, Barataria	645 5900 Ext 6517	466 7475		<a href="mailto:givi1551@wasa.gov.tt">givi1551@wasa.gov.tt</a>
13	Water Resources Agency	Mr.	Stephen	Thomas	Environmental Specialist	179-181 Eastern Main Road, Barataria	645 5900 Ext 6517	684 1946		<a href="mailto:thom375@wasa.gov.tt">thom375@wasa.gov.tt</a>
14	Coastal Dynamics Limited	Ms.	Laishalla	Carr	Senior Project Manager	9 Stephens Road, Maraval	622 9638		622 1525	<a href="mailto:lai@coastaldynamics.com">lai@coastaldynamics.com</a>
15	BP Trinidad and Tobago	Mr.	Glenn	Goddard	Regulatory Compliance and Environment Manger	5-5a Queen's Park West, PO Box 714, Port of Spain	623 2862 Ext 5095	725 6605		<a href="mailto:glenn.goddard@uk.bp.com">glenn.goddard@uk.bp.com</a>
16	Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources, Marketing and the Environment - Fisheries Division	Mr.	Che	Dillon	Fisheries Services Officer	Glen Road, Scarborough, Tobago	639 4354		639 1382	<a href="mailto:dmrf2010@gmail.com">dmrf2010@gmail.com</a> <a href="mailto:chedilli@hotmail.com">chedilli@hotmail.com</a>

17	Ministry of Environment and Water Resources	Mr.	Raynaldo	Phillips	Forester 1	Long Circular Road, Port of Spain				<a href="mailto:raynaldo.phillips@gmail.com">raynaldo.phillips@gmail.com</a>
18	Ministry of Food Production Division of Fisheries	Mr.	Saheed	Mohammed	Health and Safety Officer	Cipriani Boulevard, Newtown, Port of Spain				<a href="mailto:smohammed3@gov.tt">smohammed3@gov.tt</a>
19	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)	Mrs.	Neila	Bobb- Prescott	Senior Technical Officer	Unit 8, Building 7, Fernandes Business Centre, Eastern Main Road, Laventille, Trinidad, W.I.	626 6062			<a href="mailto:neila@canari.org">neila@canari.org</a>

## 10 APPENDIX 2-WORKSHOP AGENDA



MACARTHUR  
The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

### Improving civil society participation in the environmental impact assessment process in Trinidad and Tobago

Battimanzelle room, Coblenz Inn  
# 44 Coblenz Avenue, Cascade  
Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2013

**GOAL:** The goal of the workshop was to derive recommendations on improving how civil society organisations participate in the decision-making process for development planning in Trinidad and Tobago.

#### **OBJECTIVES**


The **workshop objectives** are to:

- develop a common understanding of the role civil society organisations play and can play in the EIA process;
- identify challenges to civil society organisations effectively participating in the EIA process and recommendations to address these challenges.

#### **AGENDA**


8:30 – 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:30	Welcome and introductions
	Overview of the project Objectives and overview Establishing ground rules
9:30 - 10:30	Introduction of workshop participants Review of expectations
10:30 – 11:30	Break
11:30 – 1:00	Sharing reasons for civil society participating in the EIA process Agreeing on a conceptual representation of the EIA process in Trinidad and Tobago Defining the roles for civil society in the EIA process
1:00 – 2:00	Lunch
2:00 – 3:30	Identifying challenges and formulating recommendations to civil society effectively executing their roles in the EIA review process.
3:30 – 4:00	Evaluation, wrap up and close.

## 11 APPENDIX 3-POWER POINT PRESENTATION



## Improving civil society participation in the environmental impact assessment process in Trinidad and Tobago


Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2013  
Battimanzelle room, Coblenz Inn  
# 44 Coblenz Avenue, Cascade



## CANARI

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute has been operating in the islands of the Caribbean region for over 30 years.


The Institute's 2011-2016 Strategic Plan builds on the foundation of important results, strong partnerships and experience to address critical and current issues facing the region, through implementation of its mission and vision in 11 programme areas.




## CANARI

CANARI is an independent technical non-profit organisation, registered in 1989 (but born out of an initiative started in 1976).

The Institute is registered in Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Croix. It has 501(c) (3) status in the United States and charitable status in Trinidad and Tobago. Its geographic focus is the islands of the Caribbean.




Map taken from: <http://www.beachbumparadise.com/maps-jamaica-costa-rica-caribbean/>



## CANARI's mission

Our mission is to promote and facilitate equitable participation and effective collaboration in the management of natural resources critical to development in the Caribbean islands, so that people will have a better quality of life and natural resources will be conserved, through action learning and research, capacity building, communication and fostering partnerships.





### The CANARI Team



CANARI's innovative internal operating structure, the Partnership, leverages the collective skills of elected Board members and senior staff.

CANARI's Associates support the Institute in achieving its mission, and provide a flexible human resource pool for CANARI.



Programme Advisors give strategic advice and guidance on programme development, implementation and evaluation.



### People with whom we work

CANARI works with a wide range of stakeholders in implementing its mission. These include:

- Resource users in rural communities
- Community-based organisations (CBOs)
- Local, regional and international governmental organisations (NGOs)
- Media
- Private sector
- Academic institutions
- Donors, technical assistance organisations
- Government and intergovernmental agencies




### Our key partners

CANARI has developed a few formal partnerships with organisations. These are:




*The Karipanou Alliance* established among CANARI, the Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies) and Panos Caribbean.



*The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC)*, with which it has a MOU for climate change communications.



*The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)* - CANARI is the current Chair of the IUCN Caribbean Regional Committee.




### Our programmatic approach

The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan sets out CANARI's tri-dimensional approach to focus work on:

- 2 Thematic Programmes
- 5 Strategy Programmes
- 4 Issue Programmes





### Thematic programmes

Our thematic programmes define the areas *where* we work; these revolve around the places where natural resources are found and the livelihoods that are connected with the use of these resources.

The two Thematic Programmes are:

1. Forests, Livelihoods and Governance
2. Coastal and Marine Livelihoods and Governance





### Strategy programmes

Strategy programmes define the *way* we work. Various strategies are used to engage others, learn new methods, share information, build capacity and improve our operational efficiency.

Our strategy programmes are:

1. Research
2. Action Research and Learning
3. Communication
4. Capacity Building
5. Internal governance and operational systems






### Issue programmes

Our issue programmes address *areas of current and emerging importance* for human development, the sustainability of natural resources and the livelihoods dependent upon them.

Our four issue programmes are:

1. Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction
2. Green Economy
3. Rural Livelihoods
4. Civil Society and Governance

### The project

**Consolidating the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands**



**Location:** Regional

**Funded by:** John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation

**Project goal:** To strengthen the capacity of CSOs in the islands of the Caribbean to play a larger and more effective role in biodiversity conservation.



### The workshop

#### Goal

To derive recommendations on improving how civil society organisations participate in the decision-making process for development planning in Trinidad and Tobago.



### Objectives

- develop a common understanding of the role civil society organisations play and can play in the EIA process;
- identify challenges to civil society organisations effectively participating in the EIA process and recommendations to address these challenges.



### The agenda for today





### Defining civil society organisations

Civil society organisations are defined as non-governmental and community-based organisations, including statutory bodies such as National Trusts and academic institutions, whether operating at international, regional, national or local level.



### Ground rules



### Getting to know who's here



Name	
favourite hobby	expectations
reasons for civil society organisations participating in the EIA process	role of civil society in the EIA process

**NO WORDS !!**



**Why should civil society participate in the EIA process in Trinidad and Tobago?**



**Reasons for civil society participating in the EIA process**

- ✓ Improve the overall quality of the decision-making process
- ✓ Can minimize or avoid public controversy, confrontation and delay
- ✓ Builds understanding and legitimacy
- ✓ Can contribute concerning values, impacts, innovative solutions and alternatives



- ✓ Provide information on the environment from traditional knowledge, which can be sometimes the only information available, to help identify trends to advise decision making
- ✓ Monitoring of implementation
- ✓ Perform research
- ✓ Provide opinions from stakeholders



- ✓ Serve as a conduit to disseminating, analysing and evaluating information on the particular project



### Issues to consider

- Who or what benefits? - The process, the CSOs, the applicant, the government agency?
- What is the benefit to CSOs participating?
- How should they cover the cost (personnel time, transport etc.) of participating?



### The EIA process



### The role of CSOs

#### Screening

- Identification of significant impacts

#### Scoping

- Identification of public's interest and values
- Identification of priorities for assessment
- Encouraging public understanding of the proposed project




#### Mitigation

- Contributing local knowledge and values to the prediction, evaluation and mitigation of impacts

#### EIA report review

- Evaluating the quality and acceptability of report




**Decision**

- Providing opinion/s on the acceptability of project impacts


**Monitoring**

- Evaluating the impacts that occur and supporting project environmental management process




**Issues to consider**

- For government organisations, is this role stated in the legislation (CEC rules, EM act and TCP act), policy or plans?
- For non-government organisations is this role stated in policy of the company, mission statement?
- Or is it a role executed because of precedence?
- Any other reasons?



**Identifying challenges and recommendations**



Role	Challenge	Recommendation
Identifying significant impacts (Screening)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Time constraint in processing from EMA</li> <li>•Number of request</li> <li>•Capacity of the CSOs</li> <li>•.....</li> </ul>	



## Close

- Evaluation
- Next steps
- Vote of thanks

## 12 APPENDIX 4- PARTICIPANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO SESSIONS

### REASONS FOR CSOs TO PARTICIPATE IN THE EIA PROCESS

- To have participation of stakeholders/ To input into decision making/ To make CSOs' voice be heard
- To contribute to building consensus on decisions
- To give CSOs an opportunity to contribute information and ideas to be analysed for decision making
- To facilitate a "bottom-up approach"
- For conservation
- To share ideas
- To have more efficient decision making processes
- For CSOs to make money
- To compliment the technical view
- Because projects impact civil society
- Because the EIA process is consultative
- Because this is a way to achieve sustainable development of natural resources

### GROUP WORK OUTPUT ON CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CSOs TO EFFECTIVELY EXECUTE THEIR ROLE IN THE EIA PROCESS

Group 1

ROLES OF CSOs	CHALLENGES	RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Sharing information /mis-information	Providing objective, accurate information Vested interests Lack of avenues to highlight views on extraneous topics Lack of technical skills	Explore conflict of interest (by applicant through a process) Build capacity through training
2. Advocacy throughout the process	Fear of litigation (by developers) Threat to CSOs from residents	Mediation
3. EMA consulting CSOs on preparing draft Terms of Reference (TOR)	Time to respond during the timeframe Expertise	Networking among the CSOs to share relevant expertise Financial compensation
4. Developer/ consultant to collect information from CSOs	Validity of data	Networking among CSOs in the data gathering process Ground truthing of anecdotal data
5. Identify environmental concerns at first public meeting	Convenience of meeting Suitable venue and time	Alternative communication media/ participation
6. Advocacy role		

Improving civil society participation in the environmental impact assessment process in Trinidad and Tobago

specific to public meetings		
7. Commenting on draft TORs	EMA competence Biased proponents can influence responses Time constraints imposed by external agencies	Strengthen EMA in technical competence to focus on including criteria specific to the application in the TOR

#### Group 2

<b>ROLES of CSOs</b>	<b>CHALLENGES</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
1. Providing traditional knowledge	Technocrats don't listen to persons from the communities with knowledge Request for knowledge made at a late stage when it is no longer useful Anecdotal information not easily verified so difficult to include	Establish Community Liaison Officer from communities to identify persons with traditional knowledge Engage knowledgeable people early in process
2. Identifying environmental impacts	Understanding project (format and presentation) Communities often have an unrealistic perception of the nature and scale of proposed projects and a limited understanding of local and national level effects	Use other methods (site visits, video presentation) Provide continuous access to information (e.g. exhibition) Do a stakeholder analysis Tailor initiatives to audience
3. Provide alternative mitigation measures	Proposing unreasonable alternatives has implications for greater impact and cost and are technically unfeasible	See above
4. CSOs view/feedback from negative impacts	No feedback	EMA to circulate minutes/ notes of review meeting Understanding process for decision-making Improving on transparency in final decision-making * Environmental Management Act 2000 requires a record to be created on each action. The requirement has no timeline. A record has never been created.
5. Review after EIA is submitted	Engaged late in the process	Include CSOs from early in project and process and continue
6. CSOs included in review panel	Insufficient stakeholder analysis (ad hoc process is used to select stakeholders for inclusion in the process)	Proper stakeholder analysis
7. CSOs input in drafting CEC	CSO in attendance at workshop do not see this as their role	
8. Monitoring through	Capacity: staff, resources	Training

complaints and reports to EMA		Partnering with other organisations Access grants from donor organisations
9. Establish Community Liaison Officer to encourage public involvement in the monitoring of projects	Sourcing right person (local, skills, training) Availability and access to Community Liaison Officer Bias towards employer Political affiliation	Community working group rather than one person Use different means of communications



## 13 APPENDIX 5-COLLATION OF EVALUATIONS COMPLETED BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

### Workshop evaluation form

1. Did you find the meeting useful in improving how EIAs are presented and how civil society organisations participate in the decision-making process for development planning in Trinidad and Tobago?

Yes 17

No

#### **Please explain:**

- A timely reminder that work needs to be continuously done to improve the EIA process in T&T
  - Among the diverse issues all round capacity building was observed to be a big issue
  - Yes to some extent, I am concerned as to whether all the decision makers will make the required adjustment to really have these improvements made
  - Identified need for further strengthening capacity to evaluate the process
  - Obtained an understanding of challenges faced, and got to discuss some recommendations, obtained ideas for improving the process
  - If explored opportunities for improvements from three points of view
  - At present CSOs have little input into the decision making with respect to EIAs. The recommendation made here may be suggested for implementation
  - Identified gaps in the current process and gave recommendations for improvement as it relates to the regulators, CSOs and applicants
  - The ideas generated could be implemented by the relevant agencies
  - It identified key areas in the EIA process where CSO participation be active and areas where participation is inadequate
  - Not really needed more CSO attendance for more ideas to come out
  - To ensure the decision making process is documented
  - It not only provided recommendations for civil societies but also for governmental agencies
  - I was not aware of the multitude of challenges faced by CSOs or even the type of organisations that make up CSOs
  - It gave me a deeper understanding of the need and requirements of CSOs interaction
2. **What is the most important thing that you learned / understood / felt happened at this meeting?**
- CSOs have an important role and function in the EIA process
  - We need to listen! An important skill
  - Various types of stakeholders had an opportunity to communicate to each other their views and concerns on the EIA process and the roles of the CSOs
  - Better understanding of role of value added component from interaction between consultant, CSOs and government organisations
  - Discussions among holistic groups/networking
  - Networking
  - The lack of recommendation and capacity and technical time with the majority of CSOs. The importance of local knowledge and role of CBOs in speaking for EIA awareness of the

importance of the role. Key stakeholders in moving the process EIA towards making it transparent to CBOs

- Sharing of experiences and understanding the challenges faced by not only the CSOs but the regulator, applicant and other government agencies
- There are many challenges to involving CSOs in the EIA process and there needs to be concerted efforts to make a change as much as possible
- The most important thing is learned is that in the EIA process there are areas where CSOs are not aware whether or not their comments in EIA affect the issuing of non-issuing of a CEC
- Understanding of challenges from different perspective
- Civil society organisations involvement in EIA formulation at all levels of implementation
- Sharing of information and experience
- Communication of EIA participants
- The EIA process was carefully outlined and explained. The roles and functions of each stakeholder were determined
- The fact that all sides/parties involved in the EIA and CEC process found consensus view of the challenges facing the CSOs
- The CSO consultation process is seriously flawed and inadequate

### **3. What did you like most about this workshop?**

- The discussions and views from the different groups
  - There was good interaction
  - The facilitator attempted to keep the workshop highly interactive to ensure participation from all
  - The number of difference interest groups participating
  - Eye opener for improving process and my organisation's role
  - Getting developers and consultants to sit and talk
  - Open participation. Learnt new stuff like the EIA process
  - Drawing exercise
  - Many alternative solutions were presented that can be employed to improve the situation
  - Interactive
  - Work group sessions, brainstorming sessions
  - Participating and interactive feedback from participants
  - Discussion and group discussion
  - Information exchange
  - The content of participation
  - Active discussion
  - Interactive and participatory
- 

### **4. What did you dislike about this workshop?**

- A series of workshops would have been good. Time was limited, as discussions were meaningful but had a time constraint
- More NGOs needed
- Biasness of opinion (in some cases)
- The lack of CSOs present at the workshop
- Perceived bias towards CSOs

- Facilitator 'pushed' discussion in a particular direction
- Venue
- Required more than a 1-day workshop more attendees required → CSOs, government agencies

**5. Which sessions did you find particularly useful:**

- Group discussions
- The group discussions
- The break-out session where the groups had to determine challenges and recommendations
- Sharing and interaction – identifying challenges, recommendations to improve roles - EIA review process
- Session between break and lunch
- Documenting recommendations
- Break out session where all ideas were pooled and the identifying of recommendations
- Identifying the role of the CSOs → existing and idealistic
- The group session was useful
- Identifying the input of CSO in the EIA process
- Group
- The group dynamic discussion
- Group discussion
- Working group
- The group break out session
- Group presentation
- The detailing of the entire EIA process and discussion and analysis

**6. How could the workshop have been improved?**

- Additional/longer representation by different groups
- More time to continue debating the issues
- A better turnout from more CSOs, NGOs, (I saw they were invited but would have been better if they were here to engage in discussion)
- More NGO/CBO participation
- The workshop should be done over a period of 2 days
- Inviting more CSOs to represent a broader view
- Additional time to formulate
- The documentary feedback
- Wider participation
- More attendance of more CSOs
- See 4 above
- More participants from CSOs to gain a broader view point

**7. How would you rate the following areas of the workshop structure and delivery? Please tick one for each area.**

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Clarity of objectives	9	7		
Content	7	9		

Materials	4	6	4	
Facilitation	7	8	1	
Practical sessions	11	6		
Relevance to your needs	12	5		

Any additional comments on the above:

- Keeping the good and needed work of facilitation
- Considerably exceeded expectations
- A two day workshop to explain the information in a more clinical level
- Facilitator had some preconceived ideas and tended to 'guide' discussion toward those

---

8. Do you think the workshop has contributed to developing a common understanding of the role civil society organisations can play in the EIA process?

- Yes
- Yes, it has provided greater understanding especially in how CSOs view themselves
- Yes, if taken to another level or have a follow through. It has – but the actions from the outcome is important
- Yes. There are projects that could come out of it
- Yes. CSOs play an integral role to be the linkages between the environment and community
- Yes, a better group of how the CSOs can fit in the EIA process. The significance of advocacy and their involvement in improving the process
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes
- Yes, their involvement was shown to be critical
- Yes
- Yes

9. **Do you see a new/ different role/ action for your organization in contributing to civil society organisations more effectively participating in the decision-making process for development planning? Please describe.**

- To help build capacity and increase involvement of CSOs
- Yes, the organization can take a more proactive effort in education the CSO about the process, so that their contributions can be more directed and significant
- Need for increased technical and advocacy skills to ensure more meaningful participation
- Yes, will look at gearing more towards a participatory approach rather than consultation
- Outcome of workshop can steer out social investment initiatives
- Yes, getting them more involved asking for contribution in proposed development
- Implement a stakeholder analysis and documented communication strategy
- Yes, to ensuring (when involved) that CSOs are actively engaged in the TOR and EIA review phases. Personally identifying stakeholders that should be involved
- Yes, in providing resources for CSOs to engage our organization for clarification of sessions that they may not grasp correctly
- Yes

- Yes, better communication of information relevant to the EIA to the CSOs affiliated with my organization
- Yes – alternatives to existing methods used for public participation
- No
- Yes, they can also be include in my agency’s consultation and decision making processes
- Greater involvement from feasibility phase
- Urge applicants to ensure that their interaction with CSOs during the EIA process is productive and substantial

---

**10. What do you intend to do in your organisations to make this happen?**

- Develop relevant programmes through further discussions
- Research the above and create SOPs for implementing them for use in the EIA process
- Discuss with leaders
- Ensuring CSOs are presented, undertaken our own stakeholder analysis to input on their representation
- To be pro active in the EIA process
- Put in place mechanisms for CSOs to engage our organisation and key personnel resources that can be tapped into for consultation
- Strengthen training and communication exploring other methods of media for communicating with other organization
- Stakeholders analysis
- Include in the environmental policy as an action item

**11. Any other comments:**

- Great job!