



THE NATIONAL
FOREST PROGRAMME
FACILITY



Community Sustainable Forest Management and Livelihoods Workshop

Tuesday 18th – Thursday 20th March 2008

Nature Seekers, 10¼ MM Toco Main Road, Matura

1. SUMMARY

A three-day workshop was held on 18th-20th March 2008 in Matura, Trinidad to build the capacity of stakeholders to derive livelihood benefits from forest resources. It was held as part of a regional project funded under the National Forest Programme Facility (NFPF) of the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). The workshop was facilitated by CANARI in conjunction with persons trained in an earlier Training of Trainers workshop and organised with the assistance of the Forestry Division and Nature Seekers.

15 participants took part in the workshop (including the facilitators) and a further 6 took part in the panel discussions. However, the inability of most participants to attend the full workshop was a constraint on the achievement of the objectives and highlighted the challenges which several of the groups faced in building strong cohesive organisations, with capacity beyond just the leadership.

Nevertheless, at the end of the workshop all participants identified key areas of learning that they could apply in their own contexts and particularly highlighted the value of networking with other community groups involved in forestry projects, as well as the opportunity to strengthen linkages with the Forestry Division.

Additional needs identified, at least for the newer groups, included facilitation of community visioning and strategic planning processes, training in conflict management and capacity building in several areas of organisational management.

2. WORKSHOP GOAL AND OBJECTIVES

The workshop was conducted as part of CANARI's **Forests and Livelihoods Programme**, which seeks to enhance the contribution of forest goods and ecological services to sustainable livelihoods of the rural poor in the islands of the Caribbean. The programme encompasses research and analysis as well as building capacity at local, national and regional level for equitable participation and effective collaboration of stakeholders in the management of forest resources.

The goal of the workshop was to build the capacity of community-based organisations (CBOs) for participatory forest management that enhances the contribution of forests to sustainable livelihoods.

The main **workshop objectives** were to:

- (a) build understanding and appreciation of how forests can benefit livelihoods;
- (b) assess relevant and feasible potential opportunities for strengthening or developing projects that can benefit livelihoods;

- (c) build capacity to effectively design projects on forests and livelihoods;
- (d) identify opportunities for funding and technical assistance for projects.

A subsidiary objective was to further enhance the facilitation skills of the following members of the Forestry Division, Environmental Management Authority and Nature Seekers who had participated in August 2007 in a Training of Trainers Workshop in Participatory Forest Management, facilitated by CANARI under its Forests and Livelihoods Programme:

Forestry Division:

- Neemdass Chandool, Assistant Conservator of Forests and Head of National Parks Section
- Barry Mahabir, Assistant Conservator of Forests, North-East Conservancy
- Carlton Roberts, Assistant Conservator of Forests, Forestry Information Unit

EMA

- Risha Alleyne, Environmental Programme Officer

Nature Seekers

- Susan Lakhan-Baptiste, President

3. VENUE

The workshop was hosted at the offices of Nature Seekers in Matura, north-east Trinidad. Participants were also accommodated at a guest house part-owned by Nature Seekers and run by its President. In conjunction with the field trip, this experience provided participants with an excellent example of how Nature Seekers and its members have continuously sought to identify new livelihood strategies which can benefit community members.

4. PARTICIPANTS

The target audience for the workshop was community-based organisations (CBOs) in Trinidad currently involved in some aspect of forest management linked to livelihoods. The invitation list, which comprised 10 groups, was drawn up with the assistance of the Forestry Division and the Caribbean Network for Integrated Rural Development, with a view to securing participation from all parts of the country. Each group was invited to send two representatives to facilitate the likelihood of sustained application of learning.

However, only 7 groups eventually participated (see Appendix 1) with a strong bias towards groups in the north and north-east and no group was able to field two participants for the for the full three days of the workshop (except Nature Seekers where Susan Lakhan-Baptiste combined the roles of host, facilitator and participant). This limited the ability to achieve the desired outcomes of the workshop and also highlighted the heavy dependence on one or two individuals in many of the CBOs and the challenges they face with regard to building and retaining human resource capacity. These challenges, which were a recurrent theme throughout the workshop, are considered in more detail in the section on conclusions and recommendations.

5. WORKSHOP SESSIONS

5.1. Introductions

Participant introductions

Susan Lakhan Baptiste welcomed everyone to Nature Seekers and facilitated the opening session in which participants introduced themselves and their organisations. While each group's history, approach and activities were different, some interesting themes for discussion emerged:

- why some groups (e.g. Nature Seekers and Fondes Amandes) had managed to continuously build their capacity and range of activities, both within the group and the wider community, while other groups were experiencing high levels of internal conflict and a perceived apathy amongst the membership. Some of the key enabling elements of such success were identified during the discussions as:
 - common vision and values, developed through processes of dialogue and consultation;
 - opportunities for personal development;
 - transparent structure/constitution;
 - membership with commitment and something to give;
 - incentives (financial or otherwise);
 - clear beneficial outcomes;
 - leadership.

The main challenges that participants identified were:

- squabbling between groups (particularly over money);
 - perceptions of people outside groups;
 - over-dependence on a few people – no succession planning;
 - entrenched mindsets
- the tendency for CBOs and NGOs to underestimate – and sometimes under-utilise – the strengths that they have;
 - the nature of the role(s) played by government agencies in catalysing or supporting the groups' activities:
 - in the case of Nature Seekers, the original idea for community-based turtle protection had come from the Head of the Wildlife Section of the Forestry Division. However, this had been seized on by the group, which has continued proactively to build bridges and relationships as a tool for conservation - with research scientists, the private sector, other NGOs and CBOs, and other government agencies, such as TDC, Ministry of Tourism and most recently the National Reforestation and Watershed Rehabilitation Programme (NRWRP).
 - other groups, such as Fondes Amandes Community Reforestation Project, Protectors of the Environment (Lopinot), and more recently Nariva Environmental Trust had been stimulated by community concerns about the impacts of forest fires or over-hunting on the

resource and livelihoods. However, they had subsequently benefited from strong technical support from the Forestry Division. All three groups also now have projects under NRWRP.

- in the case of Sundew Tour Guiding Services, where the initial concern had been about the threats to the fragile ecosystem, the Forestry Division has given both technical support and tacit (though not legally sanctioned) encouragement of their tour guiding activities in the Aripo Savannas Environmentally Sensitive Area;
 - several of these groups also had current or former members of the Forestry Division in their membership.
 - by contrast, the suggestion that Cocorite group (with which Lance Aguilera had formerly been affiliated) should become involved in the NRWRP had initially come from a politician as a means of providing employment opportunities in a depressed area. And the St James Empowerment Group had started as a PNM party group, with multiple community and social development activities in St James, but had independently branched out into agro-forestry in Las Cuevas, based on an agreement with a private land-owner.
- the challenge of retaining staff and volunteers in the current economic climate where high wages are available in government programmes and the construction industry.

In addition to the NRWRP and employment by the Forestry Division as fire or game wardens, some groups had developed independent employment or enterprise activities, such as

- tour guiding (including local and foreign tourists, schools and researchers)
- jewellery-making and other craft activities
- agro-forestry, including organic farming
- vacation camps and other educational activities

CANARI introduction and overview of project and workshop

Sarah McIntosh introduced CANARI and the objectives of the workshop and the overall Forests and Livelihoods project (see Appendix 2, Slides 1-13)

5.2. Participant expectations

Risha Alleyne facilitated a session to gather participants' expectations of the workshop, which were:

- to learn how to have an integrated life with the forest;
- to share views with other community groups/share/learn;
- to share experience of Caribbean Craft Association/use of forests for social progress;
- to learn how CBOs and government can work together for social progress;
- to show how community can use forest for community benefit and manage sustainably;
- to use others' experience to help build sundew and members' commitment/understanding;
- to learn from participants' experience to help build new groups faster/more effectively;

- to bridge gaps between CBOs and management agencies to build livelihoods and reduce disillusionment;
- to learn more about Forest Management and share with others;
- to network and share with other participant's groups.

The representative of the St James Empowerment group had also hoped to gain some technical tips on tree planting; although this was not an objective of the workshop, Forestry Division representatives were able to provide the necessary contacts.

5.3. What do we mean by “livelihoods”

Sarah McIntosh introduced a discussion on what is meant by the term “livelihoods”. All participants agreed that it meant more than just ‘being employed’ or ‘earning money’ and should encompass other elements that contribute to quality of life, such as health and access to services. Sarah explained that the Forests and Livelihoods programme had adopted a definition that encompassed all the “assets” and activities required to make a living and have protection from external “shocks” and risks. These include natural, human, physical, financial, social and political assets (see Appendix 2, Slides 17-27 for more details). She also noted that the consensus of those who had been involved in the programme to date was that livelihoods were therefore ‘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

5.4. Panel discussion

This session, chaired by Neemdass Chandool, was designed to provide participants with information from support agencies. Panellists from 5 agencies each made a short presentation, followed by a discussion/question and answer session.

Richard Laydoo, UNDP GEF SGP

Richard explained that the 1992 Earth Summit gave birth to the UNDP Global Environment Fund (GEF), which is implemented by UNDP, UNEP and World Bank. The Small Grant Programme (SGP) was introduced in recognition of the fact that the benefits of the GEF were not trickling down to, nor providing sustained results at, community level. The SGP programme, which is described in more detail in Appendix 3, has been operative in Trinidad and Tobago since 1995. The main focus of the SGP is on reversing environmental degradation, through five programme areas: Biodiversity; Climate change; International waters; Persistent organic pollutants; and Land degradation. There is also an option to submit a proposal that covers multiple focal areas. The SGP in Trinidad and Tobago has been extended to Poverty Reduction, HIV/AIDS and Democratic Governance.

The grants are designed to support demonstration projects which can contribute to finding global solutions through local actions. The grant mechanism is divided into two components:

- TT\$12,000 planning grant to support the development of a viable proposal
- Up to TT\$300,000 for the main grant.

Before the discussion session, Richard challenged participants to observe over the remaining two days all the instances they witnessed of forests contributing to livelihoods.

In the subsequent discussion, Suzan Lakhani Baptiste noted that even with the planning grant, the process of developing an SGP proposal requires quite high capacity within the group. Also that the percentage of funding available to cover administrative costs is relatively low. Richard responded that the core responsibility for the building of CSO capacity lies with the state, through agencies such as the Community Development Fund and programmes under the Ministry of Education, with the private sector (e.g. through BP or BHP Billiton) also supporting some aspects of capacity building. He acknowledged that the contribution to administrative costs is only intended as seed funding.

There was also a rich discussion on the importance of monitoring and evaluation, including the collection of some baseline data against which to compare the eventual results. Richard noted that the evaluation of a project is perhaps the most important stage as it facilitates an understanding of what worked and what didn't and why.

Elizabeth Sundar, YTEP

Elizabeth explained that YTEP had recognised the importance of locating training within the communities rather than just in a few centres. The emphasis is on skill and career enhancement through six-month training programmes that include attitudinal, microenterprise and skills development in order to provide participants with the basis for business activity. YTEP programmes are open to organisations not individuals but the organisation does not necessarily need to be registered though it must have a bank account. Programmes usually have a maximum of 20 participants. The target audience is persons between 15 and 25 but some programmes have included people up to the age of 40/45. The community or community group can identify the skills in which they wish to be trained and YTEP will try to find an appropriate trainer. For example, Susan Lakhani Baptiste of Nature Seekers acts as a YTEP facilitator for tour guide training. The community also selects the most appropriate dates time of day. Participants are eligible to receive a daily stipend of \$60 but Elizabeth noted that the introduction of programmes like CEPEP has made this seem less attractive to prospective participants.

YTEP has a long list of programmes it offers including agriculture (e.g. grow box), aquaculture and organisational training and development. In the case of an agricultural project, YTEP will also provide the equipment (e.g. tractor) to prepare the land. A Business Development Officer also works with the trainees at the conclusion of the programmes.

Ann McCarthy, Network of Civil Society Organisations under the EU-sponsored Poverty Reduction Fund

Ann McCarthy described the scope and objectives of the Regional Micro Projects Fund and provided participants with the project information/concept sheet that groups need to fill out to access the grants.

Over 400 grant applications have been funded so far. The focus of grant applications must be poverty reduction and the organisation must be registered with Community Development, have a bank account, and be able to demonstrate that at least 10 people will benefit from the proposed activity. The initial maximum for a grant was TT\$25,000 but this has now been increased to \$75,000 which requires more criteria to be met. Proposals are for activities that can be completed within a year but organisations can apply for a new grant once they have successfully completed the previous project.

She also described the Network of Civil Society Organisations, which was formed out of the early consultations on the EU-sponsored Poverty Reduction Programme. Its activities and its relationship to the Regional Social and Human Development Councils (RSHDC) (Appendix 4) is described in Appendix 5. Two members of the network sit on the Cabinet-appointed multi-sectoral Board of the RSHDC which has contributed to greater mutual understanding between government and civil society representatives of each other's perspectives. Civil society members also participate on the Appraisal and Monitoring and Evaluation Committees that oversee the grant-giving process. The success of the Network varies greatly at regional level, but appeared to be particularly strong in the Sangre Grande Regional Corporation area.

Jasane Phillip, NEDCO

Jasane explained that The National Entrepreneurship Development Company (NEDCO) provides a range of services, including technical support and loans of up to TT\$250,000, to actual or potential small entrepreneurs. Unlike the programmes described before, it is targeted primarily at individuals and small businesses. Its objective is to foster a culture of entrepreneurship in Trinidad and Tobago, including encouraging people to think of small and micro-businesses as "an alternative to unemployment". NEDCO provides loans for all types of business except those involving alcohol and real estate, and agriculture where loans are available from the Agricultural Development Bank (ADB)¹.

NEDCO's loans are essentially 'character loans' in that they do not require the usual collateral but rely instead on the individual's character and the capacity that NEDCO helps to build even before making the loan. NEDCO offers a range of training programmes (see <http://www.nedco.gov.tt/>) and also coordinates the Youth Entrepreneurial Success (YES) programme for people between 18 and 30.

Barry Mahabir, Forestry Division

Barry outlined the various ways in which Forestry Division supports community based forest management and livelihoods:

- direct employment;
- appointment of Honorary Game Wardens
- the services of the Forest Information Unit which provides training and mounts forest-related exhibitions and events;
- access to the library;
- enforcement of the laws relating to illegal activities on state/forest land;
- the Private Forestry programmes, which offers seedlings at below-market rates and also provides incentives for fire tracing, planting, trails, vehicles, and tools. (The Ministry of Agriculture also provides incentives vehicles and tools but you can only apply under one of programmes not both).
- granting some permissions on state lands, e.g. wood for dwellings;
- assisting the Ministry of Agriculture with the upkeep of agricultural access roads, e.g. upgrading the roads used by saw millers and their own access to production forests;
- emergency response to clear fallen trees on roads etc.;
- through its linkages with other agencies such as UNDP, EMA and CANARI.

¹ A representative of the ADB had also agreed to be on the panel but was unavoidably detained at a previous appointment.

He also noted that most parks are free and Forestry's conference facilities are inexpensive. As parks, such as the Matura National Park, are developed, there are likely to be further employment and tour guiding opportunities.

He noted that a shift in government policy meant that the teak and pine that formerly went to Tanteak is now made available to saw mills with a view to encouraging small and medium enterprises (SMEs). You can now apply to the relevant Conservancy for a permit to harvest.

Wildlife farming also offers a business opportunity which also conserves the resource but must be registered with the Wildlife Section of the Forestry Division and sales can only be made during the open season.

Other support agencies

During the discussion with the panellists, a number of other relevant support agencies were identified as follows:

- Ministry of Agriculture (incentives, technical support)
- Agricultural Development Bank (loans, technical assistance)
- Civilian Conservation Corps and Defence Force (assistance with labour/infrastructure)
- BPTT Spirit of Community Awards
- British Gas
- BHP Billiton (N.E and E Trinidad, SW Tobago)
- Veni Apwann (training and mentoring)
- National Self-Help Programme
- National Social Development Programme
- Tourism Development Company/Ministry of Tourism
- Fernandes Trust
- Canada Fund for Local Initiatives

DAY 2

5.5. Field trip

The field trip was originally designed to be in two parts: a morning in Matura to look at the areas Nature Seekers is working on and the afternoon in Grande Riviere to look at the work of the Grande Riviere Tourism Development Organisation (GRTDO). However, since the GRTDO was unable to participate in the main workshop because of an unexpected crisis and the morning session ran longer than anticipated, the part of the 'field trip' in Grande Riviere was actually converted into a presentation by GRTDO on its work, followed by a lively general question and discussion session.

Matura

Before the field trip, participants were allocated the roles of key stakeholders in the reforestation and associated activities (e.g. Forestry Division; Tourism Development Company; Ministry of Agriculture; Tour Operators; Community Members/other forest users) to encourage them to analyse the projects

in more depth. This was very successful where participants were prepared to enter fully into the role but it failed to engage some of the less forthcoming participants.

In Matura, members of Nature Seekers guided participants through an extensive area of land reforested under the programme, pointing out some of the challenges (e.g. the quarrying infringing on State land) and the successes (fire traces, the variety of successfully planted trees, a howler monkey tour being conducted). Participants were also able to see the area which Nature Seekers has applied for to do organic agro-forestry. More detailed feedback on this part of the field trip is included under the feedback session on Day 3.

Grande Riviere

Len Peters and Nicholas Alexander outlined the origins of GRTDO, which evolved in about 1998 out of a number of groups which were associated with the co-management of turtles and turtle tour guiding and tagging. Although the turtles attracted a lot of visitors, this was seasonal and there were few other activities for them. GRTDO therefore recognised the need to develop other natural attractions, and particularly forest-based activities such as bird watching, hikes to the waterfalls and tours in the Matura National Park. They also recognised the need for greater oversight of the forest to curb problems like illegal logging and over-hunting. 29 members of the community were therefore trained in activities designed to enhance their appreciation of the value of the forest, for example through mapping and identification of important species and historical sites.

In 2005, GRTDO was awarded a reforestation project under the NRWRP. However, in agreement with NRWRP the 'standard' programme was varied to better reflect local needs and projects and therefore included:

- reforestation of 25 acres;
- development of 52 miles of trails (16 different trails)
- development of brochures and post cards
- business development, including the development of a nursery which supplies exotic local trees, an initiative that has become quite lucrative.

GRTDO is also now exploring the potential of tours that include overnight camping

The focus of the reforestation is not only on watershed stabilisation but also on enrichment planting, for example by planting native fruit trees along the trail to expose visitors to native fruits.

Beneficial outcomes include the change in mindset of those hired under the reforestation project, who are drawn from five different communities. They have developed greater respect for the need to balance extraction with replanting and there have been no fires or incidences of slash and burn. There has also been less hunting but this may in part reflect the fact that there are currently more employment opportunities (mainly government jobs/programmes and construction).

GRTDO have developed a deliberate policy of incorporating more women on the reforestation project since they have discovered that they tend to work better together than men. Since the project started in 2005, they have had to change nine people for unsatisfactory performance and none of them were women.

GRTDO identified the support of the National Parks Section ("our second parent") as a critical success factor and a mutually beneficial relationship. GRTDO receives technical support (e.g.

mapping, technical information, dendrology workshop, loan of a power saw for a year), while National Parks Section calls on GRTDO whenever it needs help in the area. On the other hand, it thought that the Tourism Development Company should be providing more support.

While GRTDO remains driven primarily by environmental values, it has identified the need to develop more revenue-generating activities in order to become sustainable. All members of the group currently have 'day jobs' but it is encouraging members to take courses, such as culinary arts, that could become the basis for entrepreneurial activities. It is proving to be something of a challenge to encourage community members to become more proactive and GRTDO recognises that changing mindsets takes time, particularly as in rural communities "everything come easy". They think there is considerable potential for organic agriculture ("the climate here means things grow fast") and for involving women in particular in agro-processing, e.g. women could process the cocoa. There is already some craft activity but this is mainly confined to use of materials found on the beach such as driftwood.

Capacity building that is still needed is training and mentoring in micro-entrepreneurship and money management and strategic planning for the group and the development of a community vision.

General discussion

Akilah Jaramogi of FACRP identified both the Nature Seekers and GRTDO experiences as good examples of communities taking charge of their own future and building the requisite capacities (e.g. how to cut fire traces, dendrology, wide knowledge of flora and fauna, and the good blend of community persons involved). She identified arts and crafts and other cottage industries as areas which have further potential for revenue generating activities.

Barry Rampersad of Protectors of the Environment, Lopinot (who was unable to return the following day) identified the following as the things he had gained from the workshop and particularly the field trip:

- a sense of empowerment and strength because "you are not alone", the other groups are resources you can draw on, and it makes you realise "you are doing good but you can still do better"
- sharing of community knowledge, "talking the same language"
- the need for and some ideas about people management
- moving on to another market if the first one gets saturated

DAY 3

5.6 Debriefing of field trip, lessons learned and recommendations

Kemba Jaramogi briefly reported on the field trip and her reflections on what she found useful:

- taking on another role forces you to consider someone else's perspective;
- observing how others go about the activities such as fire traces, pest control, tour guiding;
- observing the scale and potential impacts of the quarrying in the Matura area.

Lance Aguillera noted that it had really brought home to him the importance of conservation.

Lessons learned

Most of the lessons learned revolved around issues of stimulating participation, communication and conflict resolution and were drawn both from the field trip and participants' own experiences:

- keeping the community's interest up by identifying what's in it for them and how they can be involved;
- the value of incorporating the wider family of group members and employees so that they understand the bigger picture;
- the need to maintain open channels of communication within group and community, to value different ideas and to know that there will be disagreements but these can be surmounted, particularly if group members are taught how to give feedback;
- the value of social and collective events, e.g. the Matura community walk or the Fondes Amandes Gayap;
- the importance of common values to the cohesion of the organisation;

Recommendations

- Wildlife Section should consider a ban on hunting to increase the number of animals; this was countered by a suggestion that wildlife farming should be seen as an opportunity;
- Institutional partners (e.g. government, donors) should place more emphasis on capabilities and experience and less on paper qualifications. However, it was also noted that adding a qualification can help you to negotiate and communicate better with partners;
- Exploit opportunities for animal husbandry, e.g. sheep, goats and rabbits, that can also help with clearing fire traces;
- Groups should get training in disaster preparedness

5.7 What opportunities exist for community groups to get livelihood benefits from the forest?

This session was originally intended to be conducted as small group work but participation had by then dwindled to four participants plus two 'trainee' facilitators (from Forestry Division and Nature Seekers) so it was decided to conduct it in plenary

The following were identified in a brainstorming session as the potential areas:

a) Forest-based activities that increase financial assets:

- Government reforestation programme
- Agroforestry
 - organic fruits and vegetables
 - wild life farming
 - herbs and medicinal plants
 - small ruminants
 - seedling production/grafting
- Agroprocessing, e.g.
 - Jams, jellies, juices & seasoning
- Tourism, recreation, research and education

- Tour guiding
- Booths in area to rent for vending
- Associated guest house or host home
- Interpretative centre
- Film and photography
- Adventure games/team-building
- Camps – children/ story-telling
- Mountain biking
- River-based water sports
- Canopy board walks
- Volunteer tourism
- Craft, e.g
 - belts
 - key-rings
 - jewellery
- Charcoal production from trees on ground for the domestic barbeque market

b) Forest-based activities that enhance other livelihood assets:

Natural assets

- Access to land

Human assets

- Technical skills such as tour guiding, agroforestry, reforestation, fire prevention (suggested that capacity is best built if groups send a mix of senior and junior members to workshops to build sustainability and larger percentage of group that is committed)
- Management skills, such as documentation of achievements, building organisational strength, marketing/market research
- Awareness of the value of the forest
- Members of the group and employees
- Enhanced personal development of individuals and their families

Social and political assets

- networks (e.g. with other community groups, with other groups involved in forest conservation, with volunteers)
- groups
- relationships with formal forest managers and other relevant government agencies
- websites and email lists
- political connections (though partisan politics may disrupt the other social networks)

Physical

- buildings (e.g. for office, interpretation, processing, craft)
- equipment for processing
- vehicles

5.7 What are the best arrangements for collaboration between community groups and the Forestry Division?

Neemdash Chandool launched this discussion by asking participants what they thought were the advantages and disadvantages of formalising arrangements. He noted that the reforestation project had still not issued contracts and that many successful and long-standing relationships, such as those between Forestry and Nature Seekers, FACRP, GRTDO and FoE had been built without contracts.

Participants were ambivalent about the value of contracts since it was felt that the building of mutual trust and respect was in a sense both more important than and a prerequisite for a contract. Susan Lakhani-Baptiste Nature Seekers felt that a contract in the early stages might not have been a good idea as it stimulated them to prove themselves first. Kemba Jaramogi of FACRP thought that the informality had had some advantages as it made it easier to adapt arrangements as circumstances changed. On the other hand, it was agreed that a contract might provide added security from changes in the political directorate or development directions.

The other things that were identified as critical to the relationship from the CBO perspective were:

- competent forestry officers to guide the reforestation programme and provide technical support. The standard of support appeared to vary by region and individual and it was suggested that the shifting in the differentials in rates of pay between Forestry Division and NRWRP had led to instability and some reduction in expertise;
- open channels of communication (including those between Forestry Division and NRWRP), fast responses to questions, and access to extension services/technical assistance and training, sometimes on a repeat basis as new members came in;
- regular meetings with the relevant Forestry Division or NRWRP to facilitate adaptive management when circumstances change.

5.8 Workshop evaluation and closure

The workshop closed with brief oral evaluations which highlighted

- the value of the networking and support provided
- the need for all participants to make a greater commitment to full participation. It was suggested that more notice of the meeting.

Written evaluations were also completed which are attached at Appendix 6 and which provide some valuable additional insights into the extent to which the workshop achieved its objectives.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The mix of experienced, established groups with relatively new ones/ones that had only recently become involved in forestry worked surprisingly well, with all highlighting the value of networking and continuing personal and organisational development. However, the dwindling and inconsistent participation was a challenge to fully achieving the workshop objectives. This might be addressed in part by earlier and more individualised mobilisation, preferably with the support of the Forestry Division and NRWRP, including greater emphasis on the objectives of the workshop and how the groups stand to benefit. Although this

was outlined in the letter of invitation, it was clear that at least one participant had anticipated technical training in forestry.

However, it was also evident that several of the groups were overstretched in meeting their responsibilities and beset by internal conflict and this seems to be the more critical factor in determining who attended and for how long. Conversely the groups that were well established, had a clear vision and mechanisms for addressing conflict were the ones able to participate fully and which were deriving the greatest livelihood benefits from the forest. This suggests:

- a) that the degree of organisational development in a group should be one of the criteria for selection into programmes like NRWFP; and
- b) that relevant organisational capacity building needs to be done, alongside any technical training, to maximise the livelihood impacts, e.g.:
 - facilitation of community visioning and strategic planning, preferably using independent facilitation;
 - training/mentoring in basic organisational management (e.g. management of human and financial resources, proposal development);
 - training/mentoring in conflict management and effective communication;
 - building new leaders and succession planning

More research is also needed to identify what catalyses the entrepreneurial spirit within groups that may start out primarily with environmental or conservation objectives (e.g. pre-existing entrepreneurial experience, predisposition to risk-taking, local models of success, training or mentoring, access to capital etc.).

Finally, it appears that a formal agreement is not an essential to the success of CBO co-management of forest resources although it may be desirable, particularly where the land tenure is insecure (e.g. informal settlers) and/or there are likely to be pressures to convert it for other uses (e.g. prime land for housing or quarrying). On the other hand, mutual respect and trust are essential ingredients and need to be built and maintained over time, which implies responsibilities for both parties – mentoring and technical assistance from the formal management agencies and transparency and accountability from the CBO.

Appendix 6: Summary of participant responses to workshop evaluation

1. Did you find the workshop useful in thinking about and guiding sustainable forest management and livelihoods approaches in your organization?

- Yes – 6

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

- One of the thing I learned is building community is important not leaving out anyone
- Day 1 – networking, presenters
- Different groups require different support
- Each community must be very specific in order to become sustainable
- The importance of networking
- Information from programmes or assessment should not be generalized but group specific not withstanding the expectation of best practices from groups that have been in existence successfully in their conservation efforts
- These skills should be shared or thought by group leaders
- The new approach from the Ministries/Government and their involvement in brainstorming, collaborating with the NGO's. CBO's vision to move forward simultaneously
NB there were many more

3. What did you like about this workshop?

- This workshop has given me the resources, and information I need to take my group to a different level
- Set in community of conservation
- The composition of the groups
- The environment where workshop held
- Very interactive and relaxed. The field trip gives a better sense of what has been accomplished
- Different things were pointed out ad examples used to bring out the lesson
- Each community group must be very specific in order to become sustainable
- Groups that were present spoke openly on successes and challenges of programme
- The openness of this workshop and the available solutions derived from the existing groups to new groups

4. What did you dislike about this workshop?

- It was all good or excellent
- Persons did not stay for entire programme
- Nothing to do with the course outline but participants could of have their phone on vibrate or silence and the commitment of participants could have been better
- Membership size

- The seeming unavailability and attendance from some group in making this workshop a priority

5. Please indicate which sessions you found particularly useful:

- All was useful to me
- Items pertaining to general group S.W.O.T
- All
- Where individuals look at the contribution that is being made and value should be placed on it. No ground in itself is without resource and we need to see the benefits and value of what exist
- Wednesday: change of??
- Getting to see the views of other stakeholders
- Within the environment/agroforestry sector
- All

6. How could the workshop have been improved?

- They could improve by more groups involved
- ?? on broader context of forest management
- More diverse forest system analysis
- More groups involved
- More groups with common interest, so that they could have benefited from more experienced groups
- People want to see solutions to their problems, so maybe nothing but if this workshop's issues can be satisfactorily dealt with then the importance of another or future may be more readily attended

7. How would you rate the following areas of the workshop structure and delivery?

Please tick one for each area.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Clarity of objectives	3	2		
Content	4	1	1	
Materials	2	3	1	
Facilitation	4	1	1	
Field trip	4			
Relevance to your needs	4	1	1	

Any additional comment on the above:

- I did not attend field trip
- Commendations to the facilitators

8. What is one thing that you will apply from the workshop in your organization's work?

- I would like to get every one meaning getting all stakeholder involved
- Networking of agencies
- The need o understand other people's views
- No need for formal arrangements between state and community
- To always have group taking part in all decision making. Group should always know their vision mission, goals and objectives
- Better communication with forestry
- Looking at volunteer connections (internal & local sources)
- Connecting of the social, political etc strengths to gain what is required for growth

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

- Nothing
- Objections bosses/policy constraints
- Nothing
- Availability of contacts
- My own perceived limitations (i.e. organizations)

10. Do you or your organization have any additional training needs?

- Yes
- Understanding forest environments
- Too many to name
- Yes
- ?? animals
- Bird identification (identification of endangered species in FACRD)
- Technical

11. What recommendations would you like to make for CANARI'S Forest & Livelihood Programme?

- That all stakeholders come and make a contribution by helping other groups
- Keep spreading the message
- Help create networking /Establish data base
- To train other groups in project implementation and group management
- Facilitator probably needed; land & surveys; housing
- Cant think of any

12. Any other comments:

- Good job Sarah

- This workshop indicated clearly that the need to meet as community groups is very important. To learn from each other and understand the struggles and different methods in dealing with issues
- Splendid workshop