



CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE (CANARI)

**Participatory Evaluation of the Integrated Forest Management Development Programme
in St. Vincent and the Grenadines**

Participatory Planning and Management Workshop

29th November -1st December 2010, Kingstown, St. Vincent



1. Background/Introduction

In 2003, the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines established the Integrated Forest Management Development Programme (IFMDP) with the intention of fostering community involvement in watershed management and providing alternative livelihoods to forest dwellers (ganja cultivators) and rural communities. The overall programme objective is stated as “The sustainable management of forest resources thereby ensuring protection of the nation’s water supplies, eco tourism potential and bio-diversity, whilst at the same time, protecting the livelihood of other forest users”.

As the islands of St. Vincent and the Grenadines were losing forests at an estimated 3% per annum, the IFMDP was seen as a plausible response to the threats of deforestation. Implemented through the Forestry Department, the IFMDP was also seen as contributing to its mission of addressing threats to rural livelihoods and ensuring the sustainable use of forest resources.

Through its Forests and Livelihoods programme, CANARI has become familiar with the operation of the IFMDP, under the framework of the project “*Who Pays for Water*” (2004-2006) and also the project “*Participatory Forest Management: Improving policy and institutional capacity for development*” (2006-2010). Seven years into the implementation of the IFMDP, CANARI was asked to undertake a participatory evaluation of the programme to assess its effectiveness to date and to build the capacity of stakeholders in participatory planning processes and conflict management. This was done via a three-day workshop as well as field work involving interviews with key stakeholders in St. Vincent.

2. Participants

The workshop targeted stakeholders involved in forest use and management in St. Vincent. Government agencies, community groups and representatives of the main funders of the IFMDP (St. Vincent Electricity Services Ltd. (VINLEC) and the Central Water and Sewerage Authority (CWSA)) attended and were able to interact with each other. 31 participants attended and the list of participants is attached in Appendix 1.

3. Goals and objectives and desired results

The workshop goal was to conduct a participatory evaluation of the IFMDP to contribute to the development of key strategies for supporting sustainable forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

To achieve this goal, the following objectives were identified:

- a) To build the capacity of stakeholders to effectively communicate their ideas and needs and engage in multi-stakeholder dialogues;
- b) To build the capacity of stakeholders in participatory planning and management and conflict management;
- c) To conduct a participatory evaluation of the Integrated Forest Management and Development Programme;
- d) To identify key strategies for supporting sustainable forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines;

- e) To draft a communication plan on the evaluation of the IFMDP and recommendations on continuing the IFMDP and generally on participatory forest management and forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

It was specifically expected that by the end of the workshop, participants would be able to:

- i. explain the meaning of key terms, including conflict, disputes, participatory planning and management, stakeholder, stakeholder analysis, objectives, results and livelihoods;
- ii. use tools in participatory management, including stakeholder identification, analysis, mobilisation, facilitation and conflict management.
- iii. use tools for improving communication, including stakeholder analysis, identification of appropriate products and pathways for target audiences, and tips for being assertive and not aggressive;
- iv. explain the concept of participatory evaluation and identify the benefits of the process;
- v. identify their desired results for the IFMDP;
- vi. compare with the “official” results of the IFMDP;
- vii. analyse actual expected and unexpected results of the IFMDP;
- viii. identify key issues and lessons learnt concerning the implementation of the IFMDP ;
- ix. identify strategies for supporting sustainable forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines;
- x. draft a communication plan on the evaluation of the IFMDP and recommendations on continuing the IFMDP and generally on participatory forest management and forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

4. Method

The three day workshop combined interactive sessions in which participants were involved in group exercises with plenary sessions. They were first introduced to key concepts and techniques needed to conduct the participatory evaluation of the IFMDP, as well as to build their capacity in participatory processes and conflict management. Key tools reviewed in the sessions included stakeholder identification and analysis and how to communicate information.

Stakeholder identification and analysis was facilitated as a group exercise to first identify the key stakeholders, and then conduct an analysis to determine the roles they play in the framework of the IFMDP. Participants were divided into four groups, each one having a cross-representation of sectors. To conduct the analysis, each group had to work on two stakeholders based on the following questions:

- What benefits do they derive from the forests?
- What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of their use on the forest?
- What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?
- Do they have high, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?
- What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?
- What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, and financial resources)?

The session on communicating information was designed to introduce participants to techniques for effective communication, as well as the challenges with communicating sensitive issues. A group exercise then allowed participants to apply the key concepts of messages, pathways and products, as they had to consider the pathways and products they would want to use to send the messages across to the key stakeholders involved in the IFMDP.

The session to conduct a participatory evaluation of the IFMDP aimed to:

- make participants recall what they learnt about participatory management;
- develop questions for the participatory evaluation of the IFMDP;
- identify results desired by stakeholders; and
- identify “official” desired results identified by the government when they designed the IFMDP.

The workshop agenda is attached as Appendix 2 and the Power Point presentations as Appendix 3.

5. Results

• Stakeholder identification and analysis

Participants first identified the stakeholders involved in the IFMDP project as the multiple actors and institutions all using the IFMDP as a connector. The discussions pointed out that the role of the IFMDP was to connect people, establish a relation to the forest, and promote its sustainable use. Following discussions on who the most relevant stakeholders are in the context of the IFMDP, the following were selected:

- Office of the Prime Minister
- Forestry Department
- Community groups
- Marijuana farmers
- Central Water and Sewage Authority (CWSA)
- St. Vincent Electricity Services Limited (VINLEC)
- Ministry of Tourism
- Ministry of Agriculture

A table showing the collated responses for the exercise is in Appendix 4. In looking at the benefits stakeholders could derive from the forests, it can be noted that some of them can actually be considered as expected/desired results of the programme. The Ministry of Tourism, for instance, saw the potential for increased tourism related activities as a result of the natural resources and attributes of the forests, while CWSA and VINLEC expected access to a reliable and sustainable source of water, as well as financial benefits based on the cheaper cost of generating hydro-electricity, respectively.

In terms of the impacts of their use on the forests, while marijuana farmers and community groups listed these impacts as they relate to the natural resources and, by extension, their livelihoods, it is mainly financial and legal issues that were cited on behalf of the Office of the Prime Minister and CWSA.

Community groups and marijuana farmers had the same perception on what their roles were in the framework of the IFMDP, and viewed it as an opportunity to help with the implementation of the programme and with community mobilisation. Government agencies such as the Forestry Department and the Ministry of Tourism, as well as the Office of the Prime Minister, were said to have more formal roles in the IFMDP, with very limited involvement or partnering with community groups. Provision of financial resources, implementation support, monitoring and enforcement were listed as their main functions. Certainly as a result of that, community groups and marijuana farmers saw themselves as having only medium or low level of power, while

other stakeholders such as the Forestry Department, VINLEC, were seen as having a higher level of power.

The stakeholder analysis also examined the existing or potential areas of conflicts and the stakeholders' capacity to participate in the management of the programme. The different uses of the natural resources were seen as having the potential of creating conflict. Overlapping legislation was also listed under this category. The Forestry Department was perceived as having conflicts related to the use of the natural resources with almost every other stakeholder, such as with VINLEC and CWSA when they do not meet their obligations to contribute to the IFMDP, or with the marijuana farmers who cut trees to plant marijuana. Other stakeholders such as VINLEC and the Ministry of Agriculture saw conflict with the Forestry Department with regard to an overlapping of their roles as all have to work with VINLEC, CWSA, as well as National Parks.

Finally, it is worth noted that the only capacity need identified was related to the need for training in general project management. While no reference was made to capacity for facilitating and engaging in participatory processes, it is a key capacity necessary for the success of the programme that was identified by the Forestry Department when briefing CANARI for the evaluation.

- **Participatory evaluation**

Some participants highlighted the fact that different types of stakeholders have different levels of power. In the case of the IFMDP in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, CWSA, VINLEC are among those who have the most authority, as well as they have the financial resources. However, participants also pointed out that they do not necessarily have the expertise to be able to input into decision-making. As an illustration of this, participants explained that the critical watersheds for the project were selected to satisfy the interests of the main donors and that the communities were not involved in the selection process. They noted that individuals from various communities were consulted to inform the selection process, but not as representatives of any group or organisations, since there were no existing NGOs at that time.

During the discussions, one participant in particular was also very adamant in arguing that this ongoing participatory evaluation of the IFMDP programme in St. Vincent and the Grenadines was biased, stating that to him, CANARI was nothing but a representative of the IFMDP programme. He did not feel that CANARI was neutral.

The preliminary discussions on the participatory evaluation of the IFMDP allowed participants to learn about participatory management and state the various results they wanted to get from the IFMDP. These results were classified into four categories as listed below:

- Conservation of natural resources (forests, rivers, etc.)
- Wider social/economic benefits
- Institutional arrangements
- Capacity building

In order to assess these results, participants were divided into groups, each one of them being assigned a different set of results. They then had to discuss these results and rank them on a scale of 0-5 (from 0: not achieved to 5: completely achieved).

Based on the scores given, participants thought that:

- Conservation of natural resources: the most significant results achieved were the reforestation of critical watersheds, as well as wildlife conservation.
- Wider social/economic benefits: it was felt that the IFMDP has contributed very little to raising public awareness about the importance of protecting the forest, and conserve biodiversity, ranking the wider social and economic benefits rather low.
- Institutional arrangements: Institutional arrangements were ranked quite low, as it was perceived that the number of people in critical areas had not been significantly reduced, while legislation was not better enforced. In terms of the change in policy and legislative framework, it was noted that the Forestry Resource Conservation Act was reviewed and updated, and that the existing formal Forestry policy document was updated as well.
- Capacity building: participants believed the IFMDP has provided alternative livelihoods for rural people, as well as it has helped leverage on projects to contribute to alternative livelihoods. From their perspective, however, the groups have not benefited from the programme in terms of their capacity.

The table outlining the ranks given to each set of results as well as the indicators based on which the scores were given is in Appendix 4. Some groups did have time to analyse and score more than one set of results so scores were not given for all.

- **Draft communication plan – target audiences, messages, products, pathways**

Except for a few stakeholders, participants thought that letters, telephone and electronic communication would be the most appropriate means of communication. Field visits and other less formal pathways such as river outings, and text messages were suggested to communicate the messages to the marijuana farmers and community groups. It has to be noted that the use of cultural practices was not fully explored but it was considered as a pathway for the community members and farmers. The table in Appendix 5 outlines the ideas discussed.

When asked about the messages they would want to convey to the key stakeholders in the project, participants wished to address some of them to specific stakeholders. However, general messages for all were identified as:

- Forests in St. Vincent and the Grenadines contribute to 1% of the country's GDP
- Forest management does require everyone's efforts
- Improving livelihoods should be done in a sustainable way, and be independent of external forces
- The IFMDP will contribute to people using their natural resources sustainably

The table on the messages to key stakeholders that were developed is attached as Appendix 6.

- **Conclusions and recommendations from the participatory evaluation process**

Below are the recommendations that participants wished to convey to stakeholders involved in the implementation of the IFMDP. Recommendations were made under the following categories:

Participatory management

- The management of the project should involve community members. This would provide the opportunity to make management decisions more relevant and effective as they would entail the view from on the ground.
- The composition/structure of the management committee should be reviewed to reflect consideration of the issues identified in the stakeholder analysis.
- The project indicators should be more specific to provide better guidance during monitoring and evaluation of the project.
- A participatory work plan should be developed and utilised for the programme.
- Annual progress reports should be used to promote the achievements of the Programme.
- Evaluation of project activities should be systematic and independent.

Capacity building

- There should be more training in leadership, management and report writing, in order to strengthen the capacity of Forest Officers to support the development of sustainable forest-based livelihoods.
- Training should be provided for community-based organisations (CBOs) in project management and proposal writing to contribute to accessing resources external to the government for the development and implementation of sustainable forest-based livelihoods.
- CBOs need to build their capacity in a number of areas such as participatory management, conflict resolution to fully assume their role in the development and implementation of sustainable forest-based livelihoods.
- VINLEC and CWSA, the two key funders of the IFMDP programme, should be encouraged to build their capacity in participatory management and livelihoods. This would assist them broadening their concept of the benefits achieved from the programme and contribute to a better understanding of their role and stake in the management of the forest.

Project development

- The next phase of the project should include more specific, measurable goals and objectives developed through participatory approaches.
- In order to avoid confusion and overlapping of roles among project team, responsibilities should be more clearly defined and periodically reviewed with project staff.
- A systematic review of current programmes and projects, specifically those focusing on issues of poverty alleviation and social development, should be performed to identify potential areas to complement the IFMDP project.

Communication

- A communication and advocacy plan should be developed as one of the main elements of the project, to highlight and promote the achievements of the IFMDP and the benefits that can be achieved from sustainable forest-based livelihoods.

- Greater ongoing exchanges about the project should be facilitated among all stakeholders (Forestry Department, other government agencies, members of the public etc.)
- A champion for the IFMDP should be identified and used to promote the achievements of the IFMDP and the benefits that can be achieved from sustainable forest-based livelihoods.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on public education, outreach and promotion to raise the profile of the programme and to stimulate more support.

6. Workshop evaluation

Participants were overall very satisfied with the content of the workshop, as well as they seemed to have appreciated the facilitating methods used. A summary of responses to the Evaluation Form filled out by participants on the last day are attached in Appendix 7.

Appendix 1: List of participants

NAME	ORGANISATION	OCCUPATION	ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	
1	Ajit Duncan	K.O.T.E.	Forest Attendant	Greiggo	5368594	LOTI.39@hotmail.com
2	Anthony Simon	Forestry	F.O.I.		4916286	
3	Amos Glasgow	Forestry	Forestry Supervisor		4528594 / 5320919	amosgla@vincysurf.com
4	Arlene Williams	Rose Hall Red Cross	Library Assistant	Rose Hall	4582925	-
5	Ashley Cain	MAFF	SFPL	Reehland Post	5282089	ashleycain@gmail.com
6	Branson Thom	Tourism			71502	
7	Brian Johnson	Forestry Department	Directory of Forestry	Park Hill	4578594	forestrysvg95@yahoo.com
8	Casikus Mclfod	Forestry	Forestry Supervisor		5311337	amleod_69@yahoo.com
9	Cornelus Richards	Forestry	Forestry Supervisor		4948905	c.richards@thssvg.com cornicrich@yahoo.com
10	Erica Douglas	MAFFLCON	A.I.		4500312	-
11	Gauntha Young	Ministry of Agriculture	Agriculture Officer	Kingstown	456111 ext. 472	citumaf@hotmail.com
12	Glenn Grant	Forestry	Forestry Officer	Brighton	5263539	glenn27@hotmail.com
13	Jeanette Jacob	M.A.	Tech A	Richmond Hill	4500312	-
14	Joel Poyer	Forestry Department	Forestry Officer III	Slon Hill	4542276/5261828	joelpoyer@g.comm
15	Junior Colre	IFMDP	Community Officer	Largo		kambui_svg@yahoo.com
16	Katesha Burke	Rose Hall Red Cross and RHCDO	Unemployed	Rose Hall	4550973	evalene1987@hotmail.com
17	Kurt Dougan	Rural Transformation	Rural Development Officer	Kingstown	4512707	office.rutrans@mail.gov.uc
18	Lennie Adams		Agric. Ext. Rd Consultant	Mesopotuing P.O. Mt. Pleasant	4581789/5271825	elaves@vincysurf.com

19	Lystra Culzac Wilson	MOA Earth & Environment	Project Manager	Queens Drive	4930851	lystraculzac_wilson@hotmail.com
20	Melissa Lela	Forestry	Forestry Officer	Campdon Park	7844578	makonnen3012@yahoo.com
21	Noretta John	NOHE	Project Co-ordinator	Bay Hill	4856992	norettajv@gmail.com
22	Patricia Fraser		Social worker	Sanby Bay	4576493	patfraser62@gmail.com
23	Rodicai Tainnis	National Parks Authority Rivers and Beaches	Site Services Supervisor	P.O. BOX 195	5275706	rodicatannis@gmail.com
24	Roger Young	Community Development Division	Supervisor	Rivulet	5288236/4548236	rogeraly@hotmail.com
25	Roriel	VISME	Labour	Louman's Hill	5295896	isatash@hotmail.co.uk
26	Simeon Greene	Env. Watersized Project	Farmery Consultant	San Souci	4915310	simeon_greeneo@hotmail.co.uk
27	Sylvarru Foster	VINLEC	Supervisor	Cumberland	4582345	
28	Sternely Walker	National Parks Authority	Park Ranger	P.O. BOX 195	5275706	miracletaste@yahoo.com
29	Steve Stewart	Uncon Island Museum Society	Civil Servant	P.O. BOX 2088	4917156	crouge180@yahoo.com
30	Tamara Job Sprott	VINLEC	Communications Officer	Kingstown	4561701 ext. 215	tjob@vinlec.com
31	Yoland London	Caribbean Youth Environment	Community Development		5300627	vincygirl_22@hotmail.com



Participatory Planning and Management Workshop

Fisheries Conference Room, Kingstown, St. Vincent.

29th November – 1st December, 2010

AGENDA

Workshop objectives:

- a) To build the capacity of stakeholders to effectively communicate their ideas and needs and engage in multi-stakeholder dialogues;
- b) To build the capacity of stakeholders in participatory planning and management and conflict management;
- c) To conduct a participatory evaluation of the Integrated Forest Management and Development Programme;
- d) To identify key strategies for supporting sustainable forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines;
- e) To draft a communication plan on the evaluation of the IFMDP and recommendations on continuing the IFMDP and generally on participatory forest management and forest-based livelihoods in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

29th November 2010

8:00 a.m.	Registration
	Welcome, introductions, ice breaker, participant expectations, workshop overview
	Defining key concepts (conflict, disputes, participatory planning and management, stakeholder, stakeholder analysis, objectives, results, livelihoods)
	<i>Break</i>
	Introduction to tools for participatory planning and management
12 noon – 1:00 p.m.	<i>Lunch</i>
	Plenary session – Identification of key stakeholders Small group work - stakeholder analysis
	Communicating information – Developing tips for being assertive but not aggressive (role play and analysis)
4:00 p.m.	Evaluation, wrap up and close

30th November 2010

8:30 a.m.	Review of first day
	Plenary session - Communicating information – Target audiences and pathways
	Break
	Plenary session - Communicating information – Target audiences and pathways (cont'd)
	Develop criteria for a “good” participatory process
	Introduction to participatory evaluation of the IFMDP (purpose, benefits, expected outcomes)
12 noon – 1:00 p.m.	Lunch
	Formulating the questions for the evaluation
	Small group work - Identifying desired results from stakeholders
	The Integrated Forest and Management Programme (identifying original objectives, outcomes and outputs)
4 p.m.	Evaluation, wrap up and close

1st December 2010

8:30 a.m.	Review of day 2
	Plenary discussion
	Comparison and analysis of the IFMDP, “official”, desired results and results identified by the workshop.
	Break
	Small group work - evaluation and analysis of results
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
	Small group feedback, discussion
	Issues and challenges encountered by IFMDP
	Recommendations
3:30 p.m.	Evaluation, wrap up, next steps - field process with Steve and close.


Appendix 3: Participatory planning and management workshop presentations



Participatory Planning and Management Workshop

of the project
Participatory Evaluation of the
Integrated Forest Management and Development Programme
in St. Vincent and the Grenadines

29th November to 1st December 2010 Fisheries
Conference room,
Kingstown, St. Vincent.



Welcome and Introductions



CANARI

We are a regional non-profit organisation whose mission is to promote equitable participation and effective collaboration in managing the natural resources critical to development.



CANARI seeks to achieve its mission through:

- applied and action **research** on, and analysis, monitoring and evaluation of, innovative policies, institutions and approaches to participation and governance;
- sharing and dissemination of lessons learned, including **capacity building**; and
- fostering **partnerships**, particularly those that build on regional assets and talents and contribute to closer regional cooperation



Getting to know each other




What you have to do

- Draw an image which depicts your role and function in the IFMDP
- You have 3 minutes to think and draw the image
- Show an example.



Facilitator



Definitions of key concepts



Key terms & concepts

- participatory planning and management
- stakeholder
- conflict
- dispute



Reforestation of ganga clearing
St. Vincent
Credit: Fitzgerald Providence



Key terms & concepts

- livelihoods
- objectives
- results



Secondary forest, Trinidad



What is participatory planning and management ?

Participatory Planning



Where do we want to go?

How do we get there?

Where are we?
What do we have?
(and what do we lack?)



Participatory management

Structured collaboration between governments, commercial and non-commercial users, interested organisations and community groups and other stakeholders to achieve shared objectives. (Geoghegan, T. 2002. Participatory forest management in the insular Caribbean: current status and progress to date. CANARI Technical Report No. 310: 29pp.)



Stakeholders worked together in the field to plan how to manage the forest.




What is "participation"?


Stakeholder involvement in decision making



CANARI's Forest and Livelihoods Action Learning Group visited Chateaubelair to learn about the Partners of the Environment project.



Spectrum of participation



Top-down decision making – most powerful stakeholders inform some of the other stakeholders of some decisions	Most powerful stakeholders "sell" the decision to some stakeholders	Most powerful stakeholders present tentative decision for discussion	Joint analysis but final decision still with most powerful stakeholders	Inputs, analysis and decisions made with equitable involvement of all stakeholders
---	---	--	---	--




Why participation?

- Incorporates a wide range of perspectives and ideas, resulting in improved management
- Improves the knowledge and skills of all stakeholders



The Ebano Verde protected area in the Dominican Republic managed by the CBO, Progreso.



- Increases the likelihood of stakeholder support through involvement in decision-making
- Can provide a forum for identifying conflicts between users and negotiating solutions to them



- Can contribute to stakeholder empowerment and local institutional development, especially when the sharing of management responsibility is involved



Stakeholder

The individuals, groups and organisations that are involved in or may be affected by a change in the conditions governing the management and use of a resource, space or sector.



Partners of the Environment working on their UNDP project in Greggs



Conflict

Differences between related parties that are definite.

Disagreement of ideas




Dispute

Incidents that are most often the focus of efforts at resolution and are a feature of conflict.

Disagree or argue about something




Livelihoods

- The capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living.
- Includes concept of well-being and quality of life.



Capital assets for sustainable livelihoods




Livelihoods are sustainable when they...

- are resilient to stresses and shocks
- do not depend on external support
- do not compromise the productivity of the resource base
- do not undermine the livelihoods of others




Banana farm, Saint Lucia




Objectives

- Explain how the goal will be achieved

Results

- What is expected at the end of the project
- May be tangible e.g. reports, workshops or intangible e.g. increased skills




Stakeholder Identification and Analysis




Who is a stakeholder?

Stakeholders have rights to a resource if they:	Stakeholders have responsibility for a resource if they:	Stakeholders have interest in a resource if they:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ have a traditional link to it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ undertake actions that change the nature of it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ have a cultural attachment to it
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ depend on it for their livelihood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ derive economic benefits or well-being from it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ derive some enjoyment from it
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ own the land or access to it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ are formally or informally managing it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ are actively involved in its conservation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ have been conferred rights via some legal mandate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ have a statutory responsibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ have an intellectual association with it (e.g. through research)




Who is a key stakeholder?

- What is their purpose/focus/interest/mission?
- What is their level of power/authority/influence? What political, social and economic power do the stakeholders have? What legal mandate do they have?



- What is the size of their stake? What is the level of responsibility of and benefits to be gained by the stakeholders? How much lands do the stakeholders own/manage/use?




- What is the scope of their involvement? What is their level of benefit, impact, responsibility? What is their level of dependency on the resource for their livelihood? What is the level of their vulnerability to a change in management of the resource?
- What capacity does the stakeholder have to be involved?



Small group work

- What benefits do they derive from the forest?
- What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of use on the forest?
- What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?



- What level of power do they have? High, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?
- What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?
- What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, financial resources)?



COMMUNICATING INFORMATION



Pathways


Means for a stakeholder to access or absorb information




Messages

Information to be transferred

Will return to these at the end of the workshop







Products

Take account of the way target audiences absorb information

Tangible means of transfer of information



Participatory Evaluation of the IFMDP



What is an evaluation?

- is a process that critically examines the project/programme.
- It involves collecting and analyzing information about a project/programme's activities, characteristics, and outcomes.




Purpose

- Ensures effectiveness
- Identifies areas of improvement
- Informs project/programme decisions



Benefits

- Increases effectiveness
- Shares results
- Demonstrates success or progress
- Better communicates impacts to others
- Provides feedback



Expected Outcome

- Recommendations for planning
- Recommendations for improvement
- Identify successes
- Contribute to building support for the programme
- Improve networks



Appendix 4:

Stakeholder identification and analysis

Participants listed a number of stakeholders, 8 of which were identified as the main ones and considered for the purpose of the analysis.

<i>What benefits do they derive from the forests?</i>	Community groups	Marijuana farmers
<i>What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of use on the forest?</i>	<p><u>Positive impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Charcoal burning - Increased interest in forest protection - Use of forests to create awareness - Control/regulate wildlife population <p><u>Negative impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Squatting - Deforestation - Loss of biodiversity - Water/air pollution - Loss of aesthetics - Mass wasting (erosion, etc.) - Overhunting 	<p><u>Positive impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of new species (genetic variability) - Education/research on marijuana (medicine, food, vegetable meals) <p><u>Negative impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fear of access to forest by members of the public - Reduced forest patrols and related forest activities - Removal of natural vegetation/biodiversity - Short crop and monocrop (susceptibility to pests and invasive species) - Invasive species (pigs, dogs, cats etc.) - Slash and burn

<p><i>What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Act as key contact in community mobilisation - Target base for dissemination of information - Police the forest - Contribution to livelihood interventions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide opportunity for collaboration - Potential source of conflict and dispute - Partners in the IFMDP
<p><i>Do they have high, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?</i></p>	<p>Medium level of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By their numbers and political affiliation - Could make or break projects 	<p>Medium to high level of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Same as groups - Community and government support
<p><i>What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>
<p><i>What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, financial resources)?</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>

<p><i>What benefits do they derive from the forests?</i></p>	<p>Central Water and Sewage Authority (CWSA)</p>	<p>Office of the Prime Minister</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliable/sustainable source of water - Access to source 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Secured tenure - Meeting international obligation - National security and sustainable development

<i>What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of their use on the forest?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interruption of the hydrological cycle - Value added to forest resource 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies (main driver: the Cabinet) - Support to conservation measures - Legislation passed for fauna and flora protection - Construction of cross country road
<i>What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial support - Management involvement - Sharing of data - Security of forest - Collaboration in programme/project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategic intervention - Support (access to funding etc.)
<i>Do they have high, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal authority to use and regulate the use of water - Legislation to protect watershed <p>Basis of power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through legislation of water supply authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Major policy decision making that affects all levels of development in the forest <p>Basis of power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Head of executive arm of the government
<i>What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?</i>	Overlapping legislation	<p>New areas are being deforested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of policy initiative which may impact on forest without relevant consultation with key stakeholders
<i>What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, financial resources)?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial resources - Knowledge of water management - Capacity to manage ecosystem if forest and use of other resources is insufficient 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial and legislative participation - International agreements - Acknowledgement and recognition of the importance of livelihoods as a component in the marijuana eradication exercises

<i>What benefits do they</i>	Forestry Department	Ministry of Tourism
------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

<p><i>derive from the forests?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opportunity to generate revenues - Opportunity to provide goods and services to other agencies - Clean water - Climate control - Opportunity to study different subject areas and research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ecotourism products, e.g. trails, hiking (income generating) - Increased tourism as a result of natural forest attributes and resources, nice mountain tops
<p><i>What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of use on the forest?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved forest covers - Improved watershed quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Debarking of trees - Development of projects for visitors' comfort - Over crowding of sites (bulk tourism)
<p><i>What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is the organisation under which the project falls - It is the supporting agency to the implementation of the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To ensure the forest is protected so the country remains the natural place to be (ecotourism potential) - Promote the forest as a part of tourism - Provision of financial resources
<p><i>Do they have high, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?</i></p>	<p>High level of power Basis of power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The power was given by the Cabinet - Forest Conservation Act - Wild Conservation Act 	<p>Medium level of power Basis of power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Ministry of Tourism is represented on the National Parks Board - National Park system plan for protected areas <p>However, National Parks does not have site management teams</p>
<p><i>What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Marijuana farmers cut down trees to plant marijuana - Farming in high slopes by farmers leads to slippage and soil erosion as well as the interference of the water supply 	<p>Management of the same resources</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Illegal hunting of wildlife - VINLEC and CWSA do not meet their obligations - Illegal extraction of non-timber forest products - Squatting and cutting down of trees for building - Forest fires 	
<p><i>What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, financial resources)?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training in general management - Training in fire fighting - Conflict management - Project management - Annual budget <p>What is lacking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Human resources - Finances - Networking with other stakeholders, e.g. forest users - Facilities within SVG - Legal framework to supply groups 	<p>Training of personnel in marketing and promotion</p>

<p><i>What benefits do they derive from the forests?</i></p>	<p>St. Vincent Electricity Services Limited (VINLEC)</p>	<p>Ministry of Agriculture</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial benefits, as it is cheaper to generate hydroelectricity - Hydro generation of electricity (between 9-30% depending on the season) - Proper forest management (less siltation, less maintenance) - Creation of a value for water 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role of the forest in rainfall and water conservation – irrigation and its role in producing crops - Research potential - Financial resources, lumber

<p><i>What are the current impacts (positive and negative) of use on the forest?</i></p>	<p><u>Positive impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislation protecting special watersheds <p><u>Negative impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less water available for downstream users - Loss of aquatic life - Cleaning of damp affects downstream water quality - Deforestation 	<p><u>Positive impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil conservation - Chemical use and control <p><u>Negative impacts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Exotic pests and diseases due to the introduction of new species - Loss of biodiversity
<p><i>What role do they play formally and informally in the IFMDP?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial support - Monitoring and enforcement of law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Role in the genesis of the IFMDP programme - Oversight of Forestry department - Education and legislation - Monitoring
<p><i>Do they have high, medium or low power? What is their basis and source of power?</i></p>	<p>High level of power Basis of power: Legislative demand</p>	<p>Medium level of power due to bureaucracy Basis of power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislation and networking - Technical capacity
<p><i>What are the existing or potential areas of conflict?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conflicts between community users and farmers - Overlapping of legislation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overlapping of roles (work with Forestry, VINLEC, CWSA, National Parks) - No harmonised legislation - Conflict with community users
<p><i>What is their capacity to participate in management (skills, knowledge, relationships, structure/level of organisation, world view, financial resources)?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very strong capacity to participate in training - Availability of skills, money and respect 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Well trained staff - High human resources for overall reach, networking - Better relationships with departments within the Ministry of Agriculture

Appendix 5:

Assessment of results and lessons on process

Results	Score (1-5)	Indicators
Conservation of natural resources (forests, rivers, etc.)		
Reforestation of critical watersheds	3	Targets were not clearly stated (35 acres in Montreal, 10 acres in Richmond)
Improved biodiversity conservation	2	Increase in biodiversity – not necessarily as a result of the IFMDP; may be an indirect consequence
Improved ecosystem service	2	There has been a fall of in the pressure on the land due to the decline in agriculture (increase in see forest)
Decreased soil erosion	2	Thinning of plantation has contributed to improved ground cover
Wildlife conservation	3	Significant increase in wildlife
Wider social/economic benefits (2 groups)		
Improved/maintained water quality	3	Potable water quality is good
	2.5	10 acres of land (forest) was rehabilitated (Richmond)

Awareness among all levels of society about the importance of protecting the forest	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reforestation of 10 acres of land ▪ Good forest management techniques ▪ Pavement was developed into an eco-tourism site
	1	The project was not properly designed and sold
Institutional arrangements		
Restricted access to critical priority areas	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less people in the critical areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People moved out originally but returned after promises were not met - GIS data has shown that more farming was occurring since the inception of the project ▪ Greater enforcement of legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initially, more arrests, but the numbers could be reduced with increased compliance. There has also been an increase in law enforcement presence (forest rangers and police) ▪ Decrease in the level of deforestation and increase in forest cover (reduction in cutting and debarking of trees)
Amendment of Wildlife Protection Act	3	<p>Passing of legislation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of draft document - Submission of amendment to Cabinet - Submission of regulation to Minister of

		Justice
<p>Mainstreaming of integrated approach into all sectors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Parks legislative approach - Environment Act - NISP - SLM representative - Agriculture Strategic Plan - National Tourism Plan - CWSA and VINLEC sit on IFMDP - Stream flow monitoring 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced relationship with relevant ministries and agencies (Ministry of Tourism, CWSA, VINLEC) ▪ Development of a formal strategy outlining an integrated approach to mainstreaming (to be developed by stakeholders) ▪ Incorporation of aspects of IFMDP project into the annual work plan of stakeholders (more social integration among stakeholders)
Change in policy and legislative framework	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update of existing formal Forestry policy document (Involvement of other Forestry and other stakeholders) ▪ Endorsement of updated policy document by Minister and Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry ▪ Submission to Cabinet approval followed by the gazetting of the document ▪ Review and update of Forestry Resource Conservation Act and regulation (some regulations have been drafted)
Capacity building (2 groups)		

Capacity built in community groups	2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knowledge increased ▪ Increase in group size ▪ Groups have attracted other sources of funding ▪ Groups now have the ability to carry out effective projects
	1	One of the major failure of the project
Alternative livelihood opportunities available for rural people	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A number of projects were identified (charcoal, mauby, exportation of wildlife meat, handicraft, eco-tourism) ▪ The groups invested on some of the projects ▪ The life of the projects was actually curtailed due to the lack of funds
	2	Some initiatives were taken but the absence of adequate funding has seriously hampered results
Leverage on projects to contribute to alternative livelihoods – as a component of the IFMDP	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monies have been sourced from GEF-UNDP, CANARI ▪ Assistance was insufficient ▪ Technical assistance was obtained from the Forestry department
	4	It opened up new opportunities from external sources (GEF, FAO, IWCAM etc.)

Appendix 6:
Draft communication plan

	Pathway	Products
VINLEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter (direct delivery) • Telephone • Emails • Word of mouth • Consultations • Field visits • workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter - Printed materials - Be part of VINLEC communication department - Photos, DVD, project website
Ministry of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter (direct delivery) • Telephone • Emails • Word of mouth • Field visits • Farmers' Day • Radio programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter - Emails - Printed materials - Photos, DVD, project website
	Pathway	Products
CWSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter (hand delivery) • Telephone • Fax 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letter - Leaflets - Booklets - Audio-visuals - IFMDP Reports (annual)
Office of the Prime Minister	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings • Exhibition (displays of achievements of the project) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leaflet - Memorandums - Audio-visuals

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet committee • Press conferences (PM's speeches) • Social/cultural event 	
	Pathway	Products
Marijuana Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish a network of liaison persons • Face to face meetings • Field visits • River limes • Posters • Newsletter • Local artistes • Carnival t-shirt band • Talk shows • Newspaper articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pamphlets - Paraphernalia - Documentary - Text messages - Signs (in the forest) - T-shirt/caps
Community groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmentally focused match boxes and wrappers • Text messages • Church visits • Printed and electronic media • Clinic/hospitals visits • Youth groups • Competitions (poster, rapping, essay writing) 	
	Pathway	Products
Forestry department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memorandum • Face to face meetings • Telephone (land lines and cell) • Presentation at staff meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Booklet - CD/ DVD - E-newsletter

Ministry of Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Workshop• Exhibition• Letter• Telephone• Email• Liaison person	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Booklet- CD/DVD
----------------------------	---	--

Forest management needs everyone								
The wider community needs to know more about forest management			X					
The Forestry Department does more than enforcement, they also work with communities								X
The IFMDP requires long term, sustained and substantive commitment for success	X	X			X	X		
Integrated forest management and alternative livelihoods need an enabling legal and legislative framework	X	X	X					
Livelihoods initiated/enhanced should be sustainable and independent of external forces	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
The IFMDP will contribute to people using their natural resources sustainably	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Appendix 8:

WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

1. *Did you find the workshop useful to you in guiding how you or your organization will approach an evaluation?*

Yes: 19

No: 0

Please explain:

1. Able to put a systematic plan together for an evaluation; know the approach to adopt and how to execute the evaluation
2. By explaining the stakeholder's analysis
3. Very insightful. Methods of sensitization through group work and participation proved efficient in getting points across.
4. Know how to prepare and participate in decision making in unified process e.g. all stakeholders and ministries working and making decisions together.
5. It helped to reinforce the need to set clear goals and targets so as to ensure that evaluation is smooth.
6. I now know the process and steps to take in evaluating a project.
7. I am now in a position to determine how an assessment should be done in terms of achieving goals and what needs to be done to overcome obstacles.
8. It is important to have an appropriate process and methodology as well as participatory approach.
9. The content of the material was simple and clear to allow easy understanding.
10. The way it was conducted, developing the major objectives and trying to achieve them.
11. The information that was learnt will be beneficial to the groups that I represent because we will be better prepared for the project the group plans on doing.
12. Yes because it makes you stay within the guidelines, which help you to develop different methods.
13. The methods used to extract information made the process less taxing even though there was initially very little knowledge on the programme.
14. It gave an insight into what's required, I learn some skills in doing evaluation.
15. Better equipped to plan and carry out an evaluation in an objective manner
16. It explains the process to follow in order to get the relevant information about the project or program.
17. Helped to give a broader perspective on conducting an evaluation.
18. It is a pragmatic way to conduct evaluation.

2. *What is the most important thing that you learned / understood / felt from this workshop?*

1. When undertaking a programme/project it is important for all stakeholders to have common understanding, agreement and commitment to realise the project.
The evaluation exercise is very important to a project and should be in the positive (know where you are, what to do etc.)
2. The role of the IFMDP in the development of our forested areas through collaborative efforts with their ministries.
3. It is always good to say exactly what you mean and say what you are all about (be clear on targets and indicators).
4. The workshop was generally very good. Learned a lot.
5. The review strategy, using the story telling method and the mood investigator also the stakeholder analysis, the criteria used to determine who the major stakeholders are.
6. The most important thing learnt is how critical it is to involve all stakeholders in planning a project and making decision which are integral parts of the overall success of any project.
7. The IFMDP should have been better organized and implemented. A number of weaknesses were identified and recommendations should make the programme significantly better if followed.
8. The importance of conducting an evaluation and a stakeholder analysis in the life of a production. Understanding the stakeholders and communication is important.
9. The IFMDP was more explained during the workshop and clarity was given.
It also seems that most participants knew about the project for the first time.
10. I understand the role that the program (IFMDP) plays in the protection of our (rain) forests as well as the intention of helping to develop alternative lifestyles for farmers involved in illegal farming as well as those who are farming in areas considered as critical areas that may disturb the watersheds.
11. I learnt how to keep up with the stakeholders' rules within forestry guideline and how you can conserve and protect the wildlife.
12. That groups working together with specific goals under relaxed atmosphere produce at commendable levels especially so when food is available.
13. More than ever, the need for the project.
14. Most important thing learned is the background of the project, where it is now in terms of progress.
15. Importance of understanding stakeholders, their interest and possible conflicts that must exist when dealing with resources.
The importance of the forest and how its management or lack thereof can affect our island.
16. Clarifies a successful implementation of such multidimensional programmes.
17. Evaluation should be ongoing to increase effectiveness and allow for adjustments and it is not mainly to look at failures.

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

1. Full participation by all, great exercise by group activities. The content is relevant and practical. Break and lunch was great....
2. Very informative
3. The group activities and discussions were enlightening. The bouncing of ideas amongst group members brought critical issues to light which should be addressed.

4. I like the interaction of members of the workshop. The working in groups.
5. The process was very useful.
6. The participation, the interaction with the comrades and the way the facilitators conduct the seminars.
7. I like the way different opinions and thoughts were brought together in order to move the project forward.
8. The collaborative support of the group endorsing a most open desire to express objectively their views guaranteed to provide the best possible evaluation with the available information.
9. The practical sessions. The facilitators endeared to generate the participants' participation. A review of the previous day was done at the start of a new day.
10. The method pies used by the facilitator was good.
11. I like the fact that it was informative and individuals were able to give their views freely rather than having information pushed/forced on to us.
12. I liked the presentation and the interaction with the groups and also introduction to and the participatory approach.
13. It could have been done in 2 days and include visuals of the projects attempted.
14. Participatory approach
15. The group works were the most enjoyable for me. I like the way the facilitator made her presentations.
16. It was interactive and allowed for participation. Information was made realistic and applicable to everyday life.
17. The openness and frank approach by the facilitators and participants.
18. Keen interaction between participants which helped to bring out the issues more clearly and potential solutions.
19. It was wonderful – very participatory

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

1. Not enough attention to conflict resolution
2. Nothing except the veggie food
3. The timing of the workshop was not the best. It should have been done earlier or put off to next year.
4. The lunch, the cold room and the seating arrangement
5. Cannot say
6. It could have been done in 2 days and include visuals of the projects attempted
7. Nothing
8. More handouts could have been made available
9. Three days was tiring
10. Nothing
11. Lack of audio-videos or learning/teaching aids – which can be transferred to co-workers

5. *Please indicate which sessions you found particularly useful:*

1. Small group work – Identifying desired results from stake holders. The IFMDP (identifying original objectives, outcome and outputs)

2. 1. Day 2 Communication information.
2. Day 3 Comparison & Analysis of the IFMDP.
3. Evaluation and analysis results.
4. The planning sessions on day 1 and 2.
5. 1. All, however I was particular impressed with the review sessions on both days
2. The stakeholder analysis was thorough.
6. The group sessions which enabled discussions and constructive arguments.
7. Stakeholder analysis. Communicating information
8. The group discussions
9. 1. Identifying desired results from stakeholders
2. Communicating information
3. Identifying desired results from stakeholders.
10. The group work helps us to put together ideas and be creative and make evaluation.
11. Evaluation and analysis of results.
12. All were useful
13. All
14. 1. Communication
2. Analysis of information
3. Evaluation
15. 1. Stake holder analysis
2. Group discussions and presentations
3. Interpretation to goals for participatory planning
16. The exercises.

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

1. Possible visuals of achievement by the IFMDP
2. Nil
3. By inviting a wider cross section of stakeholders particularly marijuana growers and community groups.
4. Making sure that all parties that are involved in some way or the other, take part in most of the sessions
5. A longer duration but spread over a two week period
6. Arrange seating in a semi-circle, so that we could have seen each other's face.
7. The forms of reference could have been discussed with key stakeholders beforehand to improve them if necessary.
8. A brief introduction to the project could have been presented at the start to bring participant who were not aware of the project up to speed.
9. Starting on time.
10. 1 Less day, more visuals, timing was adequate for the sessions

- 11. More community participation outside the government service
- 12. It was ok.
- 13. Greater participation from more stakeholders
- 14. By having some slide show about other project to compare.
- 15. Inviting an outside audience/cross section.

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	7	12		
Content	10	8		
Materials	2	9	7	
Facilitation	12	6		
Relevance to your needs	5	11	2	

Any additional comments on the above:

- 1. The facilitator is very verse and knowledgeable on the subject. She is no point for granted and easy to work with
- 2. Need more writing materials for personal notes etc.

7. *What is one thing that you will apply from the workshop in your organisation's work?*

- 1. The means of good communications practices (pathway, messages and products)

2. Methods used in handling large groups of people. Methods used seemed to motivate persons and induce discussion. May work entail meeting with communities so those methods will be practiced.
3. Pathway and products
4. More participation in decision making for e.g. specialization of responsibility.
5. The exercise to come up with pathways and products.
6. Project (work plan) evaluation, review and activities came out by my unit.
7. A professional approach.
8. Improve communication within SVG administration and with other organizations.
9. The methods of communicating information to other workers and stakeholders.
10. The introduction of participants. Introducing more group discussions. The pathway & product session
11. The project which we aim to do will enhance the alternative lifestyle & aspect of the IFMDP.
12. Introduction to participatory evaluation in the organization.
13. The method used on evaluation and analysis.
14. Communicating information, pathways and products.
15. Communication skills learnt
16. Openness and frankness approach to participants.
17. Evaluation procedures and methods to facilitate discussions

8. *What would prevent you from applying the ideas discussed in this workshop?*

1. No support from my superiors / department
2. Methods may not work with the demographic dealt with in our ministry.
3. Supporting materials (hand outs)
4. Nothing
5. My daily work routine
6. Time resources
7. Lack of interest from other persons
8. If the other members of the group reject the information that was passed on to them.
9. Nothing
10. Nothing only the expertise.
11. Forestry and other resources.
12. Maybe finances
13. Time, financial resources.
14. Group dynamics most group do not have the capacity at present
15. Nothing

9. *Do you or your organisation have any additional training needs?*

1. Yes: Project Planning & Writing/Financial Management
2. Other officers in the ministry may want training in the same group motivation techniques demonstrated.
3. Yes in resolving conflicts.
4. Yes, we have capacity building needs in many ways. Report writing, group dynamics, group managements.
5. Yes training in Conducting Participating evaluations of Development projects.
6. Project writing and Management.
7. Yes.
8. Yes, in numerous areas.
9. How to develop inter and intrapersonal relationship with co-workers and stakeholders. Writing proposals.
10. Yes. Training in Management, Project meeting. Financial management.
11. Yes. The aim of our project is to be on aspect of Eco-tourism, therefore training needs for Tour guides and Craft teachers will be of great help.
12. Yes. Because some of the methods which had been used we don't have it.
13. Yes. Project Composition and writing i.e. identifying the components of what can make up a project and stating them with clarity.
14. Yes. Project writing/management.
15. Sustainable forest management and sustainable use of the forest resources for livelihood
16. Group dynamics
17. Project writing.

10. *What recommendations would you like to make for CANARI's approach to facilitating the evaluation?*

1. Make the situation relaxing as possible
2. None
3. This is a good way of approaching these evaluations. Don't think you should get more from the top stakeholders' participation.
4. Information on the project components should have been provided to participants prior or during workshop.
5. Can't say.
6. There is a need to do this on a regular basis
7. None
8. Generally good
9. Incorporate more local experiences

11. *Any other comments:*

1. Looking forward to the report

2. One of the better workshops I have attended so far. There was no urge to leave, sleep or miss any of the sessions. Attention was there throughout due to excellent facilitation and methodology uses to have us participate.
3. The session was well executed, especially with the teaming of each section and the ability of each participant to contribute without intimidation.
4. No.
5. The workshop provided a good opportunity to look at the project and approve on possible ways of improving it.