

MACARTHUR

The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation



**Introduction to Action Learning: Consolidating the Role of
Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) for the Conservation of
Biodiversity in Jamaica**

**Hotel Four Seasons
18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10**

Thursday, 14 February 2013

Workshop Report



Illustration: www.reflectiongraphics.com

Contents

1.	Introduction and Overview.....	2
2.	Workshop Objectives	2
3.	Participants.....	3
3.1	Profile	3
3.2	Motivation for attending the workshop.....	3
3.	Methodology and Process	4
4.	Main Results	4
4.1	Outcomes	4
4.2	Reflection on the process	5
4.3	Assessment of progress towards meeting workshop objectives.....	5
5.	Participants' Assessment.....	6
6.	Summary Discussions.....	6
6.1	Participant introductions.....	6
6.2	Introduction to the action learning methodology	7
6.3	Role of CSOs in biodiversity conservation: issues and challenges.....	8
6.4	Trail AL set	9
6.5	The way forward	10
6.6	Wrap up and closing.....	11
	Appendices.....	12
Appendix I	List of Participants	12
Appendix II	Workshop Agenda	16
Appendix III	Summary of Evaluation Results	17
Appendix IV	Practice Action Learning Set Questions	22

1. Introduction and Overview

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) is implementing a project on “Consolidating the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands”, funded by the MacArthur Foundation for 2011-2013. This project is designed to enhance the ability of CSOs to access the CEPF and other relevant grants by building capacity in core areas such as effective development of projects, writing proposals, managing projects, project monitoring and evaluation, and effective communication with diverse target audiences as well as their overall organisational development (including strategic planning and management, financial management and fundraising, and human resource management). The project will target organisations applying to and implementing projects under the CEPF, especially in the highest priority key biodiversity areas identified under the CEPF Ecosystem Profile.

As part of this project, a workshop to pilot a national Action Learning Group (ALG) was held in Kingston, Jamaica on 14 February 2013. A similar workshop was held in the Dominican Republic in mid-2012. The overall purpose of these ALGs is to promote and facilitate networking among CSOs to share information and experiences on biodiversity conservation initiatives in protected areas.

The objectives of the ALGs are to:

- a) Share information and experiences on the role of CSOs in biodiversity conservation initiatives in protected areas;
- b) Facilitate joint analysis of lessons learnt and development of recommendations on what capacities and enabling conditions are needed so CSOs can play a more effective role; and
- c) Promote ongoing sharing of information, coordination and collaboration among CSOs to enhance the effectiveness of their work.

The workshop was facilitated by CANARI Associate, Nicole Brown. Asha Bobb-Semple and Charmaine Webber, two of the three Jamaica-based Volunteer Mentors trained by CANARI as part of the “Consolidating the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands” project, provided support during the workshop and prepared inputs to the workshop report.

2. Workshop Objectives

Against the backdrop of the purpose and objectives of the ALG, the pilot workshop sought to:

- a) Introduce the Action Learning methodology to CEPF grantees and applicants and other CSOs with an interest in biodiversity conservation across the island.
- b) Identify key challenges and barriers to the effectiveness of CSOs with a biodiversity conservation mandate.
- c) Ascertain participant interest in the establishment of ALGs in Jamaica.

3. Participants

3.1 Profile

Twenty CSO representatives from seventeen organisations took part in the workshop, along with the two CANARI-trained Volunteer Mentors. See Appendix I for the list of participants. Of the 17 organisations represented, four were CEPF grantees and six were current applicants (see Table 1 below.)

Table 1 Participating CEPF Grantees and Applicants

CEPF Grantees		CEPF Applicants	
Large Grants	Small Grants	Large grants	Small Grants
CCAM Foundation	JCDT	The Nature Conservancy	Cockpit Country LFMC
Panos Caribbean		Trelawny Town Maroons/ Accompong State	Dolphin Head LFMC
SCSCB		Windsor Research Centre	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica

The groups represented included national nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), international NGOs, site specific NGOs, and community based organisations (CBOs) (see Table 2). The organisations represented work island wide in parishes such as Kingston and St. Andrew (Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park) St. Mary (Oracabessa, Buff Bay), Westmoreland (Bluefields, Negril), Trelawny (Cockpit Country), Hanover (Dolphin Head) and Clarendon (Portland Bight). The site-specific organisations included groups working on both terrestrial and marine protected areas/areas of special importance. Participants were also drawn from CSOs that work on crosscutting themes such as media and the environment, policy, and funding.

Table 2 Participating organisation by type

Organisation Type	Number
National NGO	3
International/Regional NGO	4
Site-based NGO	5
Site based CBO	5

3.2 Motivation for attending the workshop

Participants were invited to share why they decided to accept CANARI’s invitation to the workshop. Responses included:

- Positive experiences of previous CANARI workshops.
- To learn about a new methodology/an opportunity to upgrade oneself and one’s organisation.

- To hear other peoples'/organisations' experiences in biodiversity conservation.
- To engage in a conversation with other NGOs about biodiversity conservation, given the seriousness of the current state of biodiversity conservation and the extent of what needs to be done to get to an effective level of biodiversity conservation.
- To network with other NGOs.



Photo 1 Workshop Participants

3. Methodology and Process

The workshop was delivered using a range of participatory tools and featured one formal presentation on AL. A copy of the workshop agenda appears in Appendix II. Prolonged discussions after the presentation reduced the time available for practical exercises and instead of testing the AL methodology in small groups, that activity was done in plenary only.

4. Main Results

4.1 Outcomes

The main immediate result of the meeting was the increased understanding of AL by 20 NGOs and CBOs working across Jamaica.

While the group did not decide to form an ALG in Jamaica, at least two organisations said publicly that they would be willing to explore how they might use AL in their work. Additionally, the workshop evaluation results (see Section 5 and Appendix III) indicate most participants would be interested in being part of an ALG. This suggests there is openness among Jamaican CSOs to applying the

methodology. Should CANARI, therefore, decide to use AL as part of any future projects that will engage Jamaican CSOs, it will likely find there is some degree of receptivity to use of the method.

The meeting provided a forum for informal exchange among NGOs and CBOs working across the island on marine, terrestrial and cross-cutting thematic issues. Several participants welcomed the opportunity for such exchange and at a number of points during the day's discussions concerns were raised about the lack of opportunities and fora for ongoing NGO networking and exchange.

CEPF-grantee Panos Caribbean used this forum to make preliminary contact with the organisations with which it intends to engage in implementing its information and communication capacity-building project. Responses to the project were favourable. Panos signalled the possibility of using one of its planned webinars under the project to further explore what might be done to support improved capacity development and networking among CSOs working on biodiversity conservation and environmental management issues.

4.2 Reflection on the process

A longer than intended discussion on the method during and after the formal presentation about AL reduced the available time for practical exercises. Participant feedback suggests devoting more time to exercises would have helped solidify learning. The AL method requires that all involved adopt a new way of thinking about problem solving, which goes against the grain of how people and organisations typically approach problem solving.

During the course of the practical exercise, the presenters and the group became visibly more comfortable with the method and adjusted both how questions were asked (group) and how they were received (presenters). The quality of the reflective questioning improved as did the ability of the presenters to engage in reflection during the exercise and provide more interpretive answers. The activity challenged both listening and questioning skills, and highlighted the importance of integrating coaching into the process of establishing an AL group/set. The presenters felt the process was insightful and sparked new ideas and thoughts about how to approach the problem. They agreed to provide feedback to the group. (See Section 6.4 and Appendix IV for more information about the practical exercise.)

4.3 Assessment of progress towards meeting workshop objectives

Introduction of the AL methodology: The workshop achieved its objectives of introducing the AL methodology to CEPF grantees and applicants as well as to other CSOs working on biodiversity conservation in Jamaica. All of the current CEPF grantees and applicants based in or with a presence in Jamaica took part in the session.

Identification of key issues and challenges faced by NGOs working on biodiversity conservation: The workshop identified key challenges and barriers to the effectiveness of CSOs with a biodiversity conservation mandate. One issue that received repeated attention throughout the workshop was that of networking among CSOs and the need for opportunities to do this in a more systematic manner. While the specific exercise geared at identifying issues and challenges did so, the nature and focus of the workshop did not allow for a thorough ventilation of the concerns raised, nor did it allow the groups to develop strategies to address them, beyond the opportunity afforded the organisation that acted as the Presenter during the practical exercise.

Participant interest in establishing ALGs in Jamaica: As outlined in section 4.1 above, there was no groundswell of support for setting up a national ALG emerging out of this workshop, but two participants showed an interest in using the tool in their own contexts and most participants are generally receptive to being part of an AL set in the future.

5. Participants' Assessment

The report that synthesises participants' responses to the written evaluation administered at the end of the workshop appears in Appendix III.

The workshop met or exceeded the expectations of the majority (19 or 95%) of the participants. The same number felt it was relevant to their work. Participants felt the value of the exercise lay in the exposure or introduction to the method and the questioning technique that it uses. Some participants were disappointed by the limited discussions on biodiversity conservation issues. There was a desire for more time to be spent on practical exercises.

Most participants (18 or 90%) felt they will be able to apply something from the workshop to their work. Many of them see potential for using reflective questioning in their context. The identified barriers to applying learning included lack of organisational support or limited buy-in from stakeholders, difficulty in finding a peer group to work with, and not enough knowledge to apply the tool. Suggested improvements to the workshop included allocating more time for the activity, devoting more time to practical exercises, and holding the workshop in a different location to reduce the travel time for some participants.

Seventeen or 85% of the participants said they would be interested in taking part in an AL group or set in the future.

6. Summary Discussions

6.1 Participant introductions

After introducing themselves and their organisations, participants took part in an ice breaker, called Listen Up, which aimed to set the stage for the practical exercise that would take place later in the day. The purpose was to demonstrate the importance of trust in communication and spark personal reflection about listening and speaking styles and habits.





Photo 2 The Listen Up Exercise

6.2 Introduction to the action learning methodology

Prior to the PowerPoint presentation, participants were asked to share their experiences, if any, with AL. Six participants said they had some experience with action learning. Participant's experiences were mostly positive; they identified key features of AL as:

- peer networking
- opportunities to learn from each other
- sharing in a structured/formal/explicit way
- the learning 'loop' where groups reflect on what they have been doing while they are doing it and apply lessons learnt to their work going forward.

During the preliminary discussion, the distinction was made between participatory decision-making and AL.

The main discussion points during and following the PowerPoint presentation on the AL methodology included:

- *The challenges of identifying a group of peers and convincing other to be part of an ALG:* One participant asked how to get peers to sit down and be a part of the ALG as this could be a challenge. Another participant followed up by indicating that their Board Members usually do not engage in discussions about problems but simply ask them to deal with it. It was suggested that a CSO leader first needs to define an appropriate group of his or her peers and these individuals may not necessarily be part of the organisation. It was also suggested that stakeholders could be encouraged to be part of the process of defining solutions, as decisions made or outcomes will affect them, and it may therefore be in their interest to be a part of the process of determining a solution.



Photo 3 PowerPoint presentation on Action Learning

- *Suitability of the length of the ALG process to real world problem solving needs:* One participant questioned whether AL is too long a process to develop a solution for urgent problems and wondered about its application. It was suggested that it is up to the CSO to determine the scale and scope of the problem and whether or not one really needs feedback from peers to come up with a viable solution. Participants were reminded that AL works best on open-ended problems that have no right or wrong solutions.
- *Applicability/usefulness of the methodology:* It was noted that the methodology is more applicable to macro issues that all peers may be facing.
 - Action Learning can be used to get over bottlenecks in dealing with the government.
 - One participant from an LFMC indicated that it is a good tool for LFMCs as meetings would be more meaningful and chairpersons would not be the only person blamed for actions taken for the group.
- *Application of the methodology:* In discussing the roles within an ALG, it was observed that one assumes that the 'presenter' is able to move forward after the ALG and implement the action that is necessary. It was suggested that it is up to the presenter to reflect on the questions and experiences shared and come up with a new plan of action to try. One participant asked whether AL was building the capacity of the 'presenter' or the group. It was concluded that although AL will build the capacity of the 'presenter,' other members will also benefit.
- *Action learning vs. participatory decision-making:* Participants were also reminded that the purpose of Action Learning is not to try to build consensus as it is not a participatory decision-making methodology.

6.3 Role of CSOs in biodiversity conservation: issues and challenges

Brainstorming activity on Challenges Facing Biodiversity Conservation

A brainstorming session on barriers to CSOs maximising their roles in biodiversity conservation in Jamaica generated the list of issues and challenges below.

1. Lack of core funding
2. Lack of capacity and will on the part of the government
3. NGOs working alone
4. Government hostile towards NGOs
5. Inadequate legislation for biodiversity
6. Lack of understanding of biodiversity; lack of awareness of importance of biodiversity conservation at all levels
7. NGOs impotent in the face of inappropriate legislation
8. Lack of buy-in from media
9. Lack of enforcement
10. Competing and conflicting issues with no way of resolving them
11. Lack of understanding by civil society of how the system works
12. Double standards by enforcement agencies
13. Insufficient human resources
14. Lack of trust within the[NGO] sector and reluctance to collaborate
15. Limited information and knowledge sharing among CSOs
16. Donor driven priorities
17. Limited opportunities for public participation in decision making process
18. Failure to comply with treaty and convention obligation
19. Lack of regulations; outdated regulations
20. Science of the ecosystem approach is challenged by how communities are organised and land use patterns
21. Collapse of the Fish Sanctuary Network
22. Lack of a networking organisation for CSOs
23. Lack of funding to support networking

The following issues were highlighted from the list above, as having the potential to form the core of a problem to be used in an AL Set:

- ♦ Lack of understanding of biodiversity; lack of awareness of importance of biodiversity conservation at all levels
- ♦ Lack of buy-in from the media
- ♦ Collapse of the Fish Sanctuary Network

The issue of networking received a fair amount of attention from the group, with several participants noting the need for mechanisms for sharing information and developing strategies for common problems. There is no functioning formal mechanism in place for doing this, and organisations feel this is an unmet need. Efforts at formal networking among the organisations delegated to manage the fish sanctuaries have not resulted in a robust Fish Sanctuary Network.

6.4 Trail AL set

Indi McLymont Lafayette and Petre Williams-Raynor of Panos Caribbean volunteered to be the presenters. The core problem identified was Panos's challenge of not being able to bring about an increase in media coverage on biodiversity issues, despite in-house expertise and experience in working with the media. Some of the issues related to the challenge, as Panos saw it, included the lack of "sexiness" of biodiversity conservation from the media's perspective, and competing agendas within the

media. A selection of the questions posed by group members and Panos's responses appear in Appendix IV.



Photo 4 Indi Mclymont Lafayette presenting Panos Caribbean's challenge to the group.

This session proved useful to both participants and the presenters. One of the two presenters said the process and reflective questioning were helpful as she had not previously thought about some of the issues that were raised. One presenter admitted to feeling defensive at points and indicated that she felt more open and less criticised when being questioned, as opposed to when she was being given advice.



Photo 5 Petre Williams-Raynor of Panos makes a point during the practice ALG set

Participants found posing reflective questions a bit challenging at first; most people lapsed into a default mode of giving advice and opinions. And in some cases, participants felt a need to frame Panos's experience in terms of their own organisation's experience and relate the issue to themselves. However, over the course of the exercise, the quality of the questions improved as did the ability of the Presenters to engage in reflection during the exercise and provide more interpretive answers. The questioning also gave participants the opportunity to learn more about Panos and to think about the challenges that Panos faces as an NGO that interfaces with the media.

At the end of the session, the Presenters felt the process was insightful and had sparked new ideas and thoughts about how to approach the problem. They agreed to provide feedback to the group at a future (unspecified) date.

6.5 The way forward

Further application of the methodology: Two participants indicated an interest in using the ALG method in their organisations/networks. Wolde Kristos of the Bluefields Fishermen's Cooperative is interested in

having an ALG in Bluefields. Ann Sutton (CCAM/SCSCB) is interested in exploring how the AL methodology could be used with the Fish Sanctuary Network.

The facilitator indicated that she would be willing to support any group's efforts at using the AL methodology and would be prepared to work with them through one AL set cycle.

CSO networking: The need for networking was further highlighted at the end of the meeting.

Panos signalled it would follow up with the groups represented in connection with its communication capacity building project and indicated it could explore using one of its upcoming webinars to discuss CSO capacity building and networking.

Provision of information: The facilitator will circulate by email the PowerPoint presentation on AL and the list of participants.

6.6 Wrap up and closing

Participants felt AL and its reflective questioning method were interesting and offered a different approach to solving problems. A number of participants indicated they would take information about the method back to their organisations (while not committing to attempt to use it.) Some participants noted that forms of "learning while doing" were being used within their organisations, but not necessarily the action learning method with its questioning approach.

The facilitator thanked everyone for their participation and gave special thanks to CANARI volunteers Asha Bobb-Semple and Charmaine Webber.



Appendices

Appendix I List of Participants



CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE

Fernandes Industrial Centre • Administration Building • Eastern Main Rd. • Laventille • Trinidad W.I.
Tel: (868) 626 6062 • Fax: (868) 626 1788 • Email: info@canari.org • Website: www.canari.org

Introduction to Action Learning: Consolidating the Role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Jamaica

Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10

Thursday, 14 February 2013

List of Participants

	Name	Organisation	Title	Email	Telephone
1	Ms. Danielle Andrade	Jamaica Environment Trust (JET)	Legal Director	dandradejet@gmail.com	876.960.3693
2	Mr. Marlon Beale	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust (JCDDT)	Conservation Science Officer	jamaicaconservation@gmail.com	876.385.4696
3	Ms. Donna Blake	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)	Country Representative	dblake@tnc.org	876.577.9001
4	Ms. Asha Bobb-Semple	CANARI	Volunteer Mentor	aibsemple@hotmail.com	876.789.9574

	Name	Organisation	Title	Email	Telephone
5	Mr. Jonathan Gosse	Oracabessa Foundation	Executive Director	obessafndn.island@cwjamaica.com	876.975.3393 (O) 876.470.8139 (C)
6	Ms. Collett Grant	Dolphin Head LFMC	Chairman	collettgrant@yahoo.com	876.846.7534 876.364.6699
7	Mr. Wolde Kristos	Bluefields Bay Friendly Fishermen's Cooperative	President	wolde99@yahoo.com	876.421.7499
8	Ms. Indi McLymont Lafayette	Panos Caribbean	Country Coordinator (Jamaica)	indidlk@yahoo.com	876.852.8763
9	Ms. Michelle McNaught	CARIBSAVE Partnership	National Coordinator	michelle.mcnaught@caribsave.org michelle.mcnaught@gmail.com	876.414.6770
10	Ms. Britney Mullings	Trelawny Town Maroons, Accompong State	Community Administrative Assistant	mullingsbritney@yahoo.com	876.388.3522
11	Mr. Andreas Oberli	National Arboretum Foundation	Plant Conservationist	naf-hope@cwjamaica.com	876.445.8755
12	Ms. Ingrid Parchment	Caribbean Coastal Area Management (C-CAM) Foundation	Executive Director	iparchment@yahoo.com	876.383.2184
13	Ms. Allison Rangolan McFarlane	Forest Conservation Fund/Environmental Foundation of Jamaica		allison.mcfarlane@efj.org.jm	876.960.6744(O) 876.451.0944(C)
14	Ms. Althea Reid	Negril Area Environmental Protection Trust	Head (Acting) Ranger	althea.reid83@gmail.com nept_negril@yahoo.com	876.883-4009

	Name	Organisation	Title	Email	Telephone
15	Ms. Norma Rowe-Edwards	Trelawny Town Maroons, Accompong State	Deputy Colonel	rowe_edwards@live.com	876.573.6575
16	Mr. Michael Schwartz	Windsor Research Centre		windsor@cwjamaica.com	876.361.4659
17	Ms. Keisha Spencer	Negril Area Environmental Protection Trust	Programme Coordinator	nept_negril@yahoo.com	876.957-3636
18	Ms. Ann Sutton	Society for the Conservation and Study of Caribbean Birds(SCSCB)		asutton@cwjamaica.com	876.877.7335
19	Mr. Phillip Thompson	Bull Bay LFMC and National LFMC	Project Manager – BBLFMC Coordinator – National LFMC	envogreen2000@yahoo.com	876.373.7270
20	Ms. Charmaine Webber	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica	Programme Coordinator (CANARI-Volunteer Mentor)	cwebber@efj.org.jm	876.960.6744
21	Ms. Lorna Williams	Cockpit Country LFMC	Chairman (North-CCLFMC) Secretary (CCLFMC)	northlfmc@gmail.com	876.853.3253
22	Ms. Petre Williams-Raynor	Panos Caribbean	Senior Programme Officer	petre.raynor@gmail.com	876.276.9717
CANARI					
	Ms. Nicole Brown	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute	Associate	nabrown@btinternet.com	876.818.4285

Name	Organisation	Title	Email	Telephone
	(CANARI)			

Appendix II Workshop Agenda



CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE

Fernandes Industrial Centre • Administration Building • Eastern Main Rd. • Laventille • Trinidad W.I.
Tel: (868) 626 6062 • Fax: (868) 626 1788 • Email: info@canari.org • Website: www.canari.org

Introduction to Action Learning: Consolidating the Role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) for the Conservation of Biodiversity in Jamaica

**Hotel Four Seasons
18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10**

Thursday, 14 February 2013

Provisional Agenda

09.30 – 10.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Registration and Coffee
10.00 – 10.45	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and Overview of the Meeting (Plenary)• Participant Introductions
10.45 – 12.15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction to the ALG Methodology (Plenary)• Role of CSOs in Biodiversity Conservation: Issues and Challenges• Identification of AL Sets
12.15 – 13.00	LUNCH
13.00 – 14.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• AL Sets: Practical Session (Small Group Activity)
14.00 – 15.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Feedback on Sets (Plenary)• Way Forward and Evaluation

Appendix III Summary of Evaluation Results

**Introduction to Action Learning: Consolidating the Role of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) for the
Conservation of Biodiversity in Jamaica
Hotel Four Seasons**

**18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10
Thursday, 14 February 2013
Workshop Evaluation Summary**

1. How well did the workshop meet your expectation?

Exceeded	Fully met	Did not meet	Total
1	18	1	20
5%	90%	5%	100%

2. How relevant was the workshop topic to your work/organisation?

Relevant	Not relevant	Total
19	1	20
95%	5%	100%

3. What is the most important or valuable thing that you learned from this workshop?

About the process/tool

- *“How the action learning process works and what are the expected outcomes of the process. Also learnt was the value of poignant questions which aid the action learning process.”*
- *“Changing ways of thinking about possible solutions to issues.”*
- *“Action learning is not just a participatory session.”*
- *“Action learning can assist with introspective problem-solving.”*
- *“The need to recondition one’s mind and thinking. Not just about giving advice.”*
- *“The most valuable thing that I have learned is about action learning, by solving problem, working and*

Value of Questioning

- *“Asking questions is a good way of mentoring. Not necessarily of decision-making.”*
- *“That finding solutions lay/rest with first asking good questions that allow for reflection.”*
- *“Asking good questions.”*
- *“The impact of having questions being asked in the problem-solving process rather getting advice.”*
- *“The questioning section of the practical exercise.”*
- *“That an approach of questioning could help someone arrive at a solution that they had not thought of without the use of giving advice.”*

communicating with partners. Working with other networking agencies was very important, get across networking agencies to work with us and to advertise our program."

- *"The role of presenter was clearly identified and opens a new strategy to be used in my community."*
- *"An additional tool and method of approaching learning and problem solving which may be applicable for specific issues/situations/personalities."*
- *"That no one person can make some decision, also that working in environment [on environmental issues] you have to be ready for questions."*

About the process/tool (continued)

- *"Collaboration, consultation and sharing of ideas are all very important to building organisation."*
- *"That as organisations we sometimes need to do some kind of internal review of our activities/awareness and approach to how to do things and what we do. This is an important method of the re-training/restructuring as the information will be very helpful in going forward."*
- *"A new technique to address issues."*
- *"Better using the out-of-the-box approach."*

- *"Effective questioning to bring ideas out of persons and groups."*

Representation/participation

- *"The excellent turn-out and participation from so many NGO."s*

4. What was least valuable about this workshop?

<p>Insufficient discussion on biodiversity conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The actual use of ALG for a topic related to biodiversity wasn’t fully distilled and discussed.”</i> • <i>“Not much discussion on biodiversity.”</i> • <i>“CBD was not sufficiently addressed.”</i> 	<p>Length of sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Session of issues and challenges could have been shorter and more targeted. Issues were very general.”</i>
<p>Insufficient practical sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Not enough practical demonstrations.”</i> 	<p>Networking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“The opportunity to network with participants in this workshop.”</i> [Response likely inadvertently written into the wrong slot.]
<p>Nothing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nothing really stands out as not valuable</i> 	

5. Will you apply anything learnt today in your work? If yes what? If no, why not?

Yes	No	No response	Total
18	1	1	20
90%	5%	5%	100%

- *“No. But I shall use it for mentoring which is not strictly my “work”.”*
- *“Yes. Asking good questions.”*
- *“Yes. Questioning process – Identification of ALG roles.*
- *“Yes. Questioning to bring fresh perspectives on solutions.*
- *“Yes. The proper questions to ask. To learn to ask appropriate and relevant questions to assist with the decision making process.”*
- *“Yes. Thinking outside the box. Focus on listening.”*
- *“Yes. The questioning methodology.”*
- *“Yes. Looking at the way in resolving problems by asking the questions and getting answers from members.”*

- “Yes. Effective questioning in our meetings, workshops and one-to-one talks.”
- “Yes. Possibly on community group meetings or settings within the community buffer zone of the Blue & John Crow Mountains National Park.”
- “Yes. Apply to network and strengthening same.”
- “Yes. I would implement the activity that was used before the start of the meeting which was all about listening to each other without communicating with the person. Also action learning is something that I would discuss among my peers and club members.”
- “Yes. Changing my way of thinking as it relates to my seeking information and listening.”
- “Yes. Reframing problem solving in question format as appeared to be the traditional provision of advice and suggestions may be applicable within the organisation for grantees and members as well. To be discussed and determined by everyday applicability exists.”
- “Yes. Action learning could be useful for management meetings on strategic planning sessions. I will raise with my CEO.”
- “Yes. Everything. I would like to get your PowerPoint presentation. naf-hope@cwjamaica.com.”
- “Yes. Some of the discussion pointers were very useful for my work.”

6. What would prevent you from applying /or make it difficult for you to apply what you learnt today in your work?

<p>Identifying a peer group to work with</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Finding peers. Also I think I would prefer to ask my peers advice directly rather than have them “beat around the bush” asking questions.” • “Not being in charge of an NGO anymore, but will apply in organisation I participate in.” 	<p>Anticipated limited buy-in/interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “No buy-in from organisation’s CEO, staff, etc.” • “Lack of participation from/by CSOs.” • “Lack of willingness or low level of interest in the new tool, alongside the plethora of tools in use already.”
<p>Time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Time.” • “The lack of time to implement will make it difficult to apply the things learnt.” • “Time –limited availability.” 	<p>Knowledge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Not all the knowledge that I need. Time was too short.” • “Difficult – a new concept. Difficult to apply if others [in] group are not familiar with the concept or difficult to have proper outcome if participants do not implement too properly.”
<p>Limitations of the tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The nature of the problem given that this methodology won’t fit all situations.” 	<p>No barriers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Nothing.” • “Nothing that cannot be addressed.” • “Nothing.”

- “Finances.”

7. How could the workshop be improved?

More time / More practical application

- “More time.”
- “A little more time would have allowed a more thorough practical session
- Time ran out but a few more practical examples would have been good.”
- “2 days to do more of the simulations.”
- “Less preamble.”
- “Too much time was spent on explaining what AL is and not enough time for a practical demonstration.”
- “More practice using ALG.”
- “Small group process in the implementing of this model.”

Different location

- “The workshop was overall ok. In terms of improvement, maybe it could be held in a different location such that less time would be spent in travelling and a part of two sessions can be held subsequently.”
- “Close[r] location.”

Nothing

- “No particular recommendation.”

More workshops

- “Having it again.”
- “By sourcing funds to continue facilitating workshops of the same nature.”

8. Would you like to be part of an Action Learning Group or Set in follow up to this workshop?

Yes	No	No response	Total
17	2	1	20
85%	10%	5%	100%

9. Please use the space below for any other comments or feedback you would like to share with the organizers.

- “Looking forward to contact list of CSOs in attendance at the session.”
- “The facilitator was well informed about the subject matter and therefore kept the focus of the material as was necessary.”
- “Good job! Thank you!”

- *“Please circulate your PowerPoint presentation and notes as usual including the books about questioning that Jon Gosse mentioned may also be useful.”*
- *“It was time well-spent. I learnt a lot and will implement some of what I learnt.”*
- *“It is always nice working with CANARI. Looking forward to greater things in the future.”*

Appendix IV Practice Action Learning Set Questions

Questions:

1. What kind of approach is being contemplated to get the response that is desired?
2. Has Panos used any incentive to as a way of getting the advertisers on board?
3. How does the media gets information from Panos?
4. As a member of society, why can't you get the articles in?
5. Has Panos tried to establish these relationships?
6. How would media coverage be different if the media had information on biodiversity?
7. What are the types of products Panos is using and which are reaching the media?
8. How would you build awareness of media and citizenry?
9. Can Panos provide training for identifying news worthy stories?
10. What are the skills lacking for Panos?
11. Has Panos thought about doing workshops on a regular basis?
12. How does a press release move through a media house from receipt via email or fax to being used for an article/news report?
13. Does the publication of a press release involve all journalists?
14. Do you have a strategy to make friends with Editorial Secretary?
15. Has Panos thought about broadening the scope of its definition of the problem from Journalist to journalistic process?
16. Has Panos thought about organisational behaviour change versus education?