

## Training of Trainers Workshop in Participatory Forest Management

August 21<sup>st</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> 2007

*Asa Wright Nature Centre, Arima Valley, Trinidad*

### DRAFT WORKSHOP REPORT



Figure 1: Participants at the Training of Trainers workshop. Standing from left to right are Carlton Roberts, Fitzgerald Providence, Michelle Wilson, Gerard Gray, Kamlyn Melville Pantin, Sylvie Raymond, Kemraj Parsram, Betty Perry-Fingal, Paul Diamond, and Leslie Walling. Kneeling from left to right are Nicole Leotaud, Risha Alleyne, Stephen Mendes, Albert “Panman” Bellot, Nadia Mohammed, Sarika Maharaj, and Sarah McIntosh.

### 1. Summary

A four-day training-of-trainers workshop was held August 21<sup>st</sup> – 24<sup>th</sup> 2007 at the Asa Wright Nature Centre in the Arima Valley of Trinidad. The goal of the workshop was to build the capacity of facilitators who have the potential to provide training and facilitation in various aspects of participatory forest management in the insular Caribbean. The workshop was facilitated by the

Facility (NFPF) of the Forest and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). The overall goal of this project is to support the improvement of the socioeconomic and environmental benefits that can be derived from forest management by analysing, promoting and building capacity for participatory planning and management of forest resources at the regional, national and local levels. The project involves regional activities as well as national activities in Barbados, Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Saint Christopher (St. Kitts) & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, and Trinidad & Tobago. Jamaica, which has its own NFPF project, will be invited to participate in and contribute to regional activities.

Nineteen participants attended from a range of government agencies, civil society organisations, international donor agencies, and independent consultants. Participants came from all of the project countries listed above except Grenada. Two additional participants came from Montserrat. Participants were all experienced facilitators and shared their existing extensive skills and knowledge in facilitation and forest management amongst each other.

Sessions were a mix of experiential and participatory techniques, including presentations, plenary discussions, pair work, small group work, individual and group practice, role play, games, nominal group technique, and individual reflection. They focused on a few main areas:

- tools and methods for facilitating participatory processes;
- capacity building needed under the FAO project;
- methods and skills for designing, delivering and evaluating training;
- skills and qualities of a good facilitator.

By the end of the workshop, participants expressed their willingness to assist with co-facilitating the national workshops being held under the FAO project as a way to practice skills and methods developed at the workshop.

A CD with the workshop report, slides from CANARI and participants, handouts, photographs and session plans was developed and distributed to each participant.

## **2. Workshop purpose and objectives**

The goal of the training-of-trainers workshop was to build the capacity of facilitators who have the potential to provide training and facilitation in various aspects of participatory forest management in the insular Caribbean. As an immediate application, this would provide a cadre of trained facilitators to assist with facilitating subsequent national workshops and other processes under the FAO NFPF project in Barbados, Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, Saint Christopher (St. Kitts) & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, and Trinidad & Tobago.

The specific objectives of the training workshop were to:

1. Identify and discuss the principles, values and benefits of participatory forest management;
2. Introduce key tools and methods for facilitating participatory forest management – such as stakeholder identification and analysis, participatory planning, and conflict management;
3. Build skills in facilitation and training techniques.

It was intended that by the end of the workshop participants would be able to:

- and forest management;
2. Explain the use of participatory tools and methods in forest management;
  3. More effectively facilitate forest management processes (e.g. meetings, seminars, workshops, focus group meetings, panel discussions, group analysis and field trips).

### **3. Participants**

Nineteen participants attended from a range of government agencies, civil society organisations, international donor agencies, and independent consultants. Participants came from all of the project countries listed above except Dominica, which had just experienced a hurricane so participants had to cancel given other recovery duties. Two additional participants came from Montserrat. The list of participants is attached as Appendix 1.

The workshop was co-facilitated by Nicole Leotaud and Sarah McIntosh, both from CANARI.

### **4. Workshop process**

The workshop demonstrated a mix of experiential techniques that can be used to engage a variety of learning styles. These included presentations, plenary discussions, pair work, small group work, individual and group practice, role play, games, nominal group technique, and individual reflection. Debrief of techniques used and session objectives were conducted at the end of each session so that there was a strong emphasis on process throughout the workshop. In this report, the key techniques used during the sessions are highlighted in bold italics.

The workshop was experiential and thus required each participant to apply facilitation skills by presenting material at least once. Names of participants are underlined when they presented under that session.

The draft agenda is attached as Appendix 2. Sessions focused on a few main areas:

- tools and methods for facilitating participatory processes;
- capacity building needed under the FAO project;
- methods and skills for designing, delivering and evaluating training;
- skills and qualities of a good facilitator.

Key points from the sessions are highlighted below.

### **5. Session 1: Welcome, introductions and participant expectations**

Participants were introduced to the workshop goal and objectives, the facilitators and the project. A simple **game** was used to introduce participants and help them remember names where they were asked to introduce themselves using an adjective beginning with the same letter as their name.

Participants gave the following names:

Bouncing Betty

Participatory Paul

Naughty Nicole  
Smiling Sarah  
Curious Chan (Chandool)  
Sociable Suzan  
Sweet Sarika  
Courageous Carlton  
Likable Leslie  
Positive Panman  
Bright and Brilliant Barry  
Kind Kamlyn  
Friendly Fitzgerald  
Green Gerard  
Sensitive Stephen  
Space Tooth Sylvie



Figure 2: Spectacular view of the Arima Valley looking south from the Asa Wright Nature Centre

The **round robin** technique was used to have participants state their expectations which were recorded on sticky notes on a “tree of expectations” on the wall. These were **compared** with the stated objectives and outcomes for the workshop. Participants were asked to **volunteer** for the roles of Chair, Rapporteur and “Maco” for each day. “Ground rules” for the workshop were proposed by the participants and agreed to by all as:

Respect different ideas	CELL PHONES - Off/Silent/Step out for calls
All questions welcomed	Limit side conversations
Don't interrupt	Try not to fidget
Active listening	Stick to time
Manage your interventions	Speak up!

## **6. Session 2: Determining what encourages or hinders effective facilitation**

Participants played a matching card game to work in pairs to explore the subtle differences between the definitions of some key terms. Some pair contributions were for example:

**Learners:** Individuals or groups (stakeholders) who desire or are required to acquire new knowledge, skills or competencies to meet specific objectives that are managed related or for personal development.

**Consultation:** A process whereby one party seeks information and knowledge from stakeholders and/or experts. This process can use objectives or individual methods to obtain information and knowledge. Information is qualitative or quantitative. Knowledge is from academic, practitioner, local or technical sources. Consultation can be at any scale - from

contributing, sharing and applying what was learned.

**Training course:** Group of people who meet at a place and time to discuss and share; goal of learning and sharing new skills; personal contact is the most important part; sharing and applying this knowledge.

**Trainee:** Person receptive of learning; a sponge; absorb as much information as possible and writing it out; gain and give output; be willing to become an apprentice.

**Instructor:** Someone who shows a method of doing a particular task and uses different styles – audiovisual, practical, global, highly participatory.

**Trainer:** Person who has the required knowledge, skills, attitude and experience in a particular topic and is able to adequately transfer or captivate an audience which s/he understands through necessary communication and learning methods.

**Facilitator:** Aims to communicate and coordinate the exchange of information to an audience in a timely and effective manner.

**Small group work** with presentations and **plenary discussion** explored the factors that hinder or facilitate adult learning in the context of existing theory (handouts distributed for further study). Participants then **brainstormed** the qualities of a good facilitator, which were put on cards stuck on the wall. This would be re-examined at the end of the workshop. Some key training tools and techniques to address adult learners were **discussed**. Participants were divided into **small groups** to discuss adult learning and factors that hinder or facilitate learning. Factors presented by the small groups are listed in Table 1 below.

### **7. Session 3: Introduction to participatory processes**

The **game** “shark” was played as an icebreaker and after-lunch energiser. The lesson on the value of cooperation was drawn out to make the link with the purpose of participation.

Participants **brainstormed** what is participation and **illustrated this with examples** from their experience. These were considered in the context of a theoretical classification of types of participation that was presented. Participants **discussed in pairs** what factors determine which type of participation is aimed for and **ideas were shared in plenary**.

A brief overview of key tools and methods for facilitating participatory processes was given, noting that several of these would be explored further in the workshop.



Figure 3: Betty, Kemraj and Carlton get friendly during the game of “shark” as they try to all fit on one

Group	Learning	Factors that hinder	Factors that facilitate
1	Learning by doing (hands on) Applying person, experience Use of analogies Use of teaching tools Interactions Humour/personality Individual vs group work Establish ground rules Recognition & inclusion of ideas Seating arrangements	Clear instructions Appearance Mannerisms Learning environment	Clear instructions Appearance Mannerisms Learning environment Experience Receptiveness Teaching Tool or Techniques Natural Affection
2	Different ways of learning Visual rather than auditory Practical use of a variety of methods including A-V, hands-on experts Small group sharing Acting of writing down what you hear Welcome environment/free to participate	Condescending Inappropriate techniques /methods Moving "too fast" Not knowing audience Wrong setting - uncomfortable room Inconvenient time Intimidation Lack of incentives Disorganised planning Wrong tools No motivation "Hidden" agendas by organisers	"Tailored" techniques /methods Comfortable setting Meeting felt needs Showing genuine interest in participants Equal opportunity to participate Clear communication Good use of time Convenient time Power of the point
3	LEARNING TECHNIQUES 1. Demonstrations 2. Learning by doing – Practice 3. Dramatization 4. Repetition 5. Reward 6. Visual representation 7. Use of most appropriate trainer – gender, skills, expertise 8. Examples that people can relate to 9. Relevant topic	Jargon Condescending Tone Style Monotony Discomforts Resistance Cultural insensitivity Ambience Inconvenience	Use of practical & relevant examples Demonstration Simplicity – Structure, content, examples, language Overview & feedback to lecturer Visual Aides Use of different learning styles Setting/Ambience Use of humour Good communication skills Keywords
4	Interactive One on one Local example Achievement milestones Continuous evaluations Informal setting Participants develop framework Giving credits	Attitudes Delivery Facility Language Dead personality Timing (length of lecture, water breaks, lunch), toilet	Overview/Road map Purpose/Objectives Use of Audio Visual Jokes/Analogies Knowing your audience

### **8. Session 4: Introduction to stakeholder identification and analysis**

A **definition** of who is a stakeholder was **presented** together with some proposed criteria to analyse who is a key stakeholder. This was **discussed and validated** by the group. The **nominal group technique** was used to identify what participants felt were the most important criteria. In addition to those on the slide validated by participants, the following types persons were also identified as having a higher degree to importance:

- Those who can prevent degradation
- Those who have more to gain or lose

A brief *lecturette* was used to review the process of stakeholder identification. This was *illustrated with an example* of what can go wrong when a key stakeholder is omitted from a process and a *case study* of stakeholder identification. Participants that had been *resource persons* involved in the case study were *questioned* about the process.

The purpose and process of stakeholder analysis was presented and *illustrated with examples*.

Participants were divided into *small groups* to each *apply the methods presented to different case studies* and conduct a stakeholder identification and analysis. The case studies used were:

- Sea urchin harvesting in Laborie, Saint Lucia – participants involved acted as *resource persons* and a *video* was provided to give background context – group members: Paul, Michelle, Sylvie, Leslie
- Institutional mapping for Aripo Savannas Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) management, Trinidad – participants involved acted as *resource persons* – group members: Kemraj, Fitz, Chandool
- Conflict analysis for species management planning in Montserrat – participants involved acted as *resource persons* – group members: Gerard, Stephen, Risha, Barry, Betty, Panman
- Stakeholder analysis for Main Ridge Tobago ESA – participants were able to *interview* persons on site for information – group members: Kamlyn, Sarika, Carlton, Cornelius, Suzan



Figure 4: Participants working on stakeholder identification for Main Ridge, Tobago. Photo courtesy Carlton Roberts.

The following day groups *presented* their results and probing questions were used to *debrief* the results and the processes. Benefits of working in a team and qualities of an effective team identified by participants are given in Table 2 below.

<b>Benefits of working in a team</b>	<b>Qualities of an effective team</b>
More than one idea is brought to the discussion	Sensitivity
Sharing workload	Flexibility
Sharing experience	Listen
Shared responsibility	Trust
Faster response	Organised
Rigorous decision making process/peer review	Structured
Collective strength	Honest
Division of workload	Report
Mutual support	Shared Ideas
More effective management of complexity	Process oriented
Unites diverse skills	Committed
Enhanced ability to respond rapidly	Constructive debate
More adaptive to change	Willing compromise
Enhances motivation	Openness
Higher quality decisions	Move to consensus
Sense of belonging	Creative
Collective and individual ownership	Support

### **9. Session 5: Values and challenges of participatory approaches**

A **role play** was conducted to **debate** the values and challenges of three types of participatory approaches for a **hypothetical case study** where a Ministry needs to decide on what type of process will be used to develop a new Forest Policy. Four roles were played:

- Group 1 – Staff in the Finance Department who believe that the Forest Policy should be written by the technical officers in Forestry and the Ministry and that there is no real value in involving other stakeholders.
- Group 2 – Technical Officers believe that only a few stakeholders should be consulted to react to the draft Policy prepared by the technical officers in Forestry and the Ministry.
- Group 3 – Consultants believe that there should be opportunities for all interested persons and organisations to input into the development of the Forest Policy at various stages.
- Minister – The Minister’s views are unknown. One person will play this role.

Each group presented their case to the Minister on **why** the type of participation they recommend should be used and they could also respond to other arguments.

Ideas were **recorded on flip chart and compared with prepared slides**. A **plenary discussion and debrief** was conducted on the value of different types of participation and when each should be used.

### **10. Session 6: Training needs assessment**

A **role play** was used to introduce why conducting a training needs assessment is important. This simulated the start of a workshop on community based tourism where a needs assessment had not been conducted and in fact participants had the skills being taught, similar training had already been conducted, participants were not interested in this area, a model used elsewhere would need to be adapted, and the key need was not a training need but was for providing funding and other support for small business development. Key points were elicited from participants. A **case study**



**technique** was used to have participants prioritise training needs.

### **11. Session 7: Selection of training themes**

An **energiser game** was played after lunch. Participants were given a **worksheet** and asked to identify other participants who had specific skills, knowledge or experience listed on the sheet. This required walking around and interacting amongst each other. The **debrief** emphasised that the skills, knowledge and experience on the worksheet were taken from the application form, interviews and observation of participants, which all contribute to the training needs assessment.

Referring back to the priority training needs identified in Session 6, participants were divided into small groups to work on a few of these. First participants were **randomly assigned by counting off** to illustrate that this was **not** an appropriate technique to use to divide people into groups because persons needed to have specific interest and expertise. Then, participants were asked to identify **by show of hands** which training themes they felt most comfortable working on. This **volunteering for groups** was noted to be a more appropriate method for this type of small group work. Four emerging training themes that small groups would focus on in following sessions were:

- 1) Organisational development – small group members: Carlton, Sarika, Paul, Stephen, Kemraj
- 2) Identification and implementation of income generating projects – small group members: Barry, Suzan, Gerard, Risha, Sylvie
- 3) Project management – small group members: Michelle, Cornelius, Leslie, Panman, Fitz, Chandool
- 4) Conflict management – small group members: Chandool, Kamlyn, Nadia, Betty



Figure 5: Group 2 working on developing their session objectives

### **12. Session 8: Developing learning objectives**

A mix of **lecturette using slides** with facilitated discussion to draw out key points was used to review how to develop learning objectives for the development of desired terminal behaviour (knowledge, skills and attitudes) for the training. Presentations of facilitator's objectives, learning objectives and

skills such as remembering and understanding needed to first be achieved before the setting desired terminal behaviours as applying, analysing, evaluating and synthesising. The need to make objectives SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound) was introduced and then **applied to some examples**.

The small groups were then assigned an **exercise** (a **handout with instructions** was given) to develop training objectives and an outline of a workshop for the training themes.

Small groups needed to present their outlines to the whole group for discussion and peer review. Criteria for the peer review process were given as being: whether the group fulfilled the task, the SMARTness of objectives, proposed content (in Table 3 below), and presentation skills. Ground rules for feedback were agreed to be that feedback should be positive first, the ideas should be critiqued but not the person and constructive suggestions should be provided.



Figure 6: Group 1 planning their presentation on organisational development

Presentation skills being examined were proposed by participants as being:

- Use of graphics / visual aids – with titles
- Pictures – explained
- Confidence – knowledge, comfort, preparedness
- Establishing focus from the beginning
- Voice inflection, gestures – establishing rapport, enthusiasm
- Make the best of own style
- Projection of voice
- Speed
- Lack of spelling or other errors
- Use of appropriate props

Group	Objectives	Outline/ notes
1: Organisational development	Participants will be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Know what is a team and how it functions</li> <li>2. Develop a team</li> <li>3. Identify benefits of a team</li> <li>4. Identify challenges and apply strategies to overcome challenges</li> </ol>	<u>Workshop theme:</u> teambuilding <u>Workshop goal:</u> to contribute to the process of teambuilding. <u>Session 1: Define a team 15 mins.</u> Functions and operations of a team Lecturette, question and answer, demonstration <u>Session 2: Developing a team 45 mins.</u> <u>Session 3: Usefulness of a team (benefits) 60 mins</u> Opportunities for teambuilding <u>Session 4: Challenges and strategies to overcome challenges 55 mins.</u> <u>Session 5: Establish and operate as a team 40 + 50 mins.</u>
2: Income generating projects	Participants will be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Choose to harvest mature tirite stems (&gt;30cms in length) and leave at least 1 stem on each cluster.</li> </ol>	<u>Entering behaviour:</u> Too short/ All Stems <u>Terminal Behaviour:</u> Choose mature stems/leave 1 <u>Sessions:</u> Field trip – demonstration site, set procedures and practices
3: Project management	Participants will be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain the 5 steps in the project management (PM) cycle</li> <li>2. Articulate at least 4 benefits of using project cycle management // appreciate why it is important</li> <li>3. Link and analyse experiences</li> <li>4. Practice / apply skills</li> </ol>	
4: Conflict management	All participants would be able to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify 3 reasons for establishing a hunting season for hunting crabs at the end of the workshop.</li> <li>2. Identify 3 tools/techniques in conflict management at the end of the workshop.</li> </ol>	<u>Target audience:</u> Crab catchers Environmentalists Forestry Division <u>Behaviour:</u> Entering: differing perspectives Terminal: appreciate different perspectives. Some agreement. <u>Session 1: Laying de foundation</u> Intro: 10-15 mins. Ground Rule: 45 mins - 1 hr. Setting stage: expectations & perspectives: 30 -45 mins. Nominal assessment: 15 mins. Total = 2 hrs.15 mins. <u>Session 2: Building blocks</u> Lecturette: 30 mins. Assessment: Audience Participation: 15 mins. Total = 45 mins <u>Session 3: Tools &amp; Toiling</u> Role playing: 30 – 45 mins. Processing: 45 mins. Total = 1 hr. 30 mins. Nominal assessment

Participants were given **handouts with instructions** on how to design a training session and instructions for a small group exercise to develop and design a training session. These were **reviewed and explained**. With participant input, it was agreed that components of a session plan included: session objectives, time, audience, method, tools, content, roles, resources/props/materials, and philosophy/degree of participation context. Key points to consider were sequence and logic of activities, location, and analysis of facilitator skills and knowledge available.

**Small groups** worked on their sessions and then presented them to the entire group. The sessions were extremely lively and interactive and included:

- A role play and demonstration with live material by Group 2;
- A facilitated discussion by Group 4;
- Use of visual aids and graphics by Group 3;
- A team-building game by Group 1.

Figure 7: Panman and Michelle conducted a hysterical role play on a last minute "cook" to demonstrate the importance of project cycle management



In **debriefing**, participants were asked to critique first in their role as target audience and then as colleagues and fellow trainee facilitators.

Figure 8: Kemraj lead Carlton towards the area of a hanging bell so that members of his team could give him instructions to enable him to ring the bell in a game designed to illustrate how teams work



facilitates preparation, serves as a record, enables sharing of team support, ensures that everything is covered, enables high standards, and clarifies structure. Disadvantages were that it takes time, can get boring to produce, may seem rigid, and may give a false sense of order and security.

#### **14. Session 10: Evaluating training**

**Probing questions** were used to elicit from participants why they think doing an evaluation is important. A prepared slide was used for backup and validation. Participants emphasised the value of participation because it:

- Helps to improve a facilitator's ability to meet participant needs
- Facilitates continuous improvement
- Informs reporting
- Provides and analysis / validation of the method
- Assesses to what extent the training objectives been met
- Assesses to what extent participant expectations have been met

Participants were given a **handout** that had a checklist to evaluate a trainer and asked to **work in pairs** for 15 minutes to evaluate the 2 trainers for this workshop. They could either evaluate them individually or as a team. The activity was debriefed using **probing questions** to get feedback on key qualities of a good trainer and evaluating the trainers in this workshop.

#### **15. Session 11: Re-examining qualities of a good facilitator**

Participants were asked to **return to notes take on flip chart** on qualities of a good facilitator being identified throughout the workshop and see if participants want to add any additional qualities. The qualities identified throughout the workshop were:

Observant\*

Anticipate problems, adapt, have alternatives, flexible, spontaneous

Pleasant/Approachable

Healthy & Energetic, Enthusiastic

Patience

Sense of humour

Open minded

Committed

Understands audience

Time Management

Good use of time

Language

Good listener - Active\*

Neutrality

Good Presenter – clarity & methods

Structured, clear, organised\*

Knowledgeable

Engage Participants

Credibility

Personal values

Model values

Tolerance

Appropriate dress

Leadership  
Confidence (apparent) – via Preparation\*  
Reasonable with audience – their needs  
Experiential & interesting  
Maintain focus

Control process  
Main order & discipline  
Loud, soft, clear modulated voice, intonation  
Coach/draw out people  
Poise, maintain composure  
Character - style

Participants were asked to *individually reflect* on their own personal knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence and other qualities as a facilitator. Some participants shared their reflections and on their personal growth during the workshop.

### **16. Session 12: Workshop evaluation**

The use of various methods to evaluate a workshop was reviewed. These include open plenary discussions, observations, interviews, returning to reflect on the “tree of expectations” developed at the start of the workshop

A summary of the written evaluations by participants is given in Appendix 7.

### **17. Session 13: Next steps for NFPF national workshops**

Participants all agreed to volunteer to co-facilitate the national workshops being held under the FAO NFPF project. CANARI would be contacting persons individually. Next steps noted for CANARI were to:

1. Expand needs assessment
2. Get agreement key partners
3. Identify trainers
4. Plan workshops
5. Mobilise stakeholders
6. Facilitate workshops
7. Rapporteur workshops

It was agreed that participants could play a role in any and all of these activities



Figure 9: Fitz explaining project cycle management using a graphic illustration

The participant evaluations were extremely positive and validated the need for training of trainers in participatory processes. Participants noted that more time would have been useful for looking at case studies and specific examples, more specific application of facilitation to participatory forest management processes, and to allow for more practice sessions for participants. The interaction and networking among participants to share experiences was also highly valued. It is therefore recommended that:

- 1) Follow-up workshops and practice sessions should be held with this same group of participants (in addition to the NFPF national workshops);
- 2) Continued networking among participants to share experiences and further develop relationships should be facilitated;
- 3) Additional training of trainers workshops should be held with other participants to build capacity in the region.

Participants also noted that they saw the need for additional training in their organisations in conflict management, strategic planning, leadership, organisational management, team building, interpersonal communication skills, etc. Although all participants strengthened their facilitation and training skills, they each had different abilities in core areas important to facilitating participatory forest management. It is therefore recommended that there should be:

- 4) Further training should be provided for these participants in core areas of content relevant to participatory forest management, including: strategic planning, organisational management, proposal writing, project cycle management, conflict management, forest resources, and forest management.

Opportunities to continue to build capacity of this group of participants through the FAO NFPF project and other CANARI projects will be used. Opportunities include the national workshops, Action Learning Projects, Action Learning Group, small grants programme, and regional conference. Additionally, it is recommended that:

- 5) Other agencies in the region should contribute to building the capacity of this cadre of trainers in participatory forest management.

There is an extremely high demand for skilled facilitators of participatory processes in the region, and it is recommended that:

- 6) CANARI and other agencies in the region should utilise the services of this cadre of trainers to facilitate participatory processes.

In order to support efforts by the participants to share the skills and knowledge gained at this workshop with their colleagues in their home organisations, it is recommended that:

- 7) A manual should be developed with modules on process (facilitation skills) as well as content (e.g. forest resources, project cycle management) for trainers to use in facilitation of participatory processes and to build the capacity of others.

Participants will be asked to assist with co-facilitating the national workshops being held under the FAO project as a way to practice skills and methods developed at the workshop.

A CD with the workshop report, slides from CANARI and participants, handouts, photographs and session plans will be distributed to each participant.

**Risha Alleyne**

Environmental Programme Officer 1  
Environmental Management Authority  
8 Elizabeth Street  
P.O. Box 5071  
St. Clair  
Port of Spain  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Tel: 868 628 8042  
Fax: 868 628 9122  
Email: [rsalleyne@ema.co.tt](mailto:rsalleyne@ema.co.tt)

**Albert Bellot**

National Coordinator  
GEF Small Grants Programme  
UNDP  
P.O. Box 169  
Bath Estate  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Tel: 767 440 4345  
Fax: 767 440 4349  
Email: [gefsgpcompact@cwdom.dm](mailto:gefsgpcompact@cwdom.dm)

**Neemedass Chandool**

Head National Parks Section  
Ministry of Public Utilities and the Environment  
Farm Road  
St. Joseph  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Tel: 868 622 5214  
Fax: 868 628 5503  
Email: [nchand20@hotmail.com](mailto:nchand20@hotmail.com)

**Ronald Charles (cancelled)**

Assistant Forest Officer  
Forestry and Wildlife Division  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and the Environment  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Tel: 767 266 3815  
Fax: 767 448 7999  
Email: [forestofficerprotection@cwdom.dm](mailto:forestofficerprotection@cwdom.dm)

**Paul Diamond**

Nevis Historical and Conservation Society  
P.O. Box 563  
Hamilton House, Low Street  
Charleston  
Nevis  
St. Kitts and Nevis  
Tel: 869 469 5786  
Fax: 869 469 0274  
Email: [bones@caribsurf.com](mailto:bones@caribsurf.com)

**Gerard Gray**

Director of Environment  
Department of Environment  
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Housing and the Environment  
P.O. Box 272  
Brades  
Montserrat  
Tel: 664 491 2546/2075  
Fax: 664 491 9275  
Email: [grayg@gov.ms](mailto:grayg@gov.ms)  
[grayg@candw.ms](mailto:grayg@candw.ms)

**Cornelius Isaac**

Deputy Chief Forest Officer  
Forestry Department  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
Stanislaus James Building  
Waterfront  
Castries  
Saint Lucia  
Tel: 758 450 2484  
Fax: 758 461 6359  
Email: [cornel\\_isaac@yahoo.com](mailto:cornel_isaac@yahoo.com)

**Arlington James (cancelled)**

Forestry Officer  
Forestry, Wildlife and Parks Division  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Botanical Gardens  
Roseau  
Commonwealth of Dominica  
Tel: 767 266 3817  
Fax: 767 448 7999  
Email: [forestry@cwdom.dm](mailto:forestry@cwdom.dm)