Workshop Report

Managing Protected Areas in Times of Change: Leadership in Governance

Workshop Organized by the
IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas - Caribbean

In cooperation with

The Trust for Sustainable Livelihoods and IUCN/US

With the support of

The US National Park Service

Hosted by the Government of Anguilla

14-17th November 2006

Table of Contents

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

1

Acknowledgement:

Citation:

The Trust For Sustainable Livelihoods. (2007). Workshop Report: Managing protected areas in times of change - leadership in governance. WCPA-Caribbean and The Trust For Sustainable Livelihoods, Curepe, Trinidad and Tobago. 29pp.

Available From:

The Trust For Sustainable Livelihoods
23 Mc Inroy Street
Curepe
Trinidad and Tobago

Email: info@sustrust.org
Web: www.sustrust.org

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

2

Introduction

During 14-17th November, 2006 a workshop entitled: Managing Protected Areas in Times of Change: Threats, Opportunities, Leadership in the Eastern Caribbean, was held in Anguilla. The workshop was organised by the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) – Caribbean, in collaboration with the Trust For Sustainable Livelihoods (SUSTRUST) and IUCN/US, and with support from the US National Park Service.

Rationale

Protected area programmes in the Caribbean region have not been given sufficient attention to the issue of governance. In essence, governance is the interactions among institutions, processes and traditions that determine how power is exercised, how decisions are taken on issues of public and private concern, and how citizens or other stakeholders get attention to their opinions.

At the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Programme of Work on Protected Areas agreed to by all Parties, included Programme Element 2: Governance, Participation, Equity and Benefit Sharing. There were 11 actions identified for State Parties under this element with targets to be achieved by the year 2008. The daily challenges encountered by protected areas managers are often related to governance issues. Protected areas managers and administrators have the responsibility to ensure that all or most of the governance instruments and powers are favourable for effective management. In this context, effective leadership will help to provide a supportive environment for improving governance of protected areas in the Caribbean and assist in discharging national obligations under the CBD.

Objectives of the Workshop

1. To help participants better understand the role of governance in effective protected areas management
2. To improve participants understanding of the various aspects of leadership in protected areas management.
3. To enhance leadership in ongoing protected area management and identify ways to support and promote this process.
4. To better integrate the Principles of Good Governance and explore the recognition of different governance types of protected areas.
5. To identify information resources that will be necessary to empower stakeholders to engage in charting the future of protected areas

management in times of increased social, economic, and environmental change, and particularly climate change.

Participating Countries

The workshop was targeted to Heads of Departments and Agencies responsible for terrestrial and marine protected areas in the Eastern Caribbean. Participants were from Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, British Virgin Islands, St Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, Grenada and St Vincent and the Grenadines. **Appendix 1** contains the list of participants.

Methodology

The workshop proceeded from the premise that there were significant achievements in parks and protected area management in the insular Caribbean in recent years. The participants were in part, responsible for these achievements, which provided the basis for creating a culture of success essential to further capacity building. A training goal for this workshop was to create a culture of achievement by engaging leaders to identify the elements for success, and to develop the enabling environment, for nurturing success.

The workshop started with a visioning exercise, in which participants considered an ideal situation 5 years hence. Small-group and plenary discussion helped to develop a consensus vision of protected area management that will serve as the foundation for the action planning sessions that followed.

Each participant was asked to prepare and present a brief situation analysis of the critical aspects of governance (**Appendix 2**), including:

- The existing protected area governance situation (Who is involved? Who holds the decision-making authority and responsibility? Who is accountable to whom? What structures, institutions and relationships are concerned? How do they function?)
- The protected area governance goals (What are the values, principles, approaches and goals underlying the system? Can those be better served by an improved governance system?)
- The desirable changes in protected area governance (What needs to be modified for the PA governance system to function more effectively and efficiently? Who can take action? How? With whose help? With what resources?)
- The strengths and weaknesses of existing protected areas management arrangements, and the opportunities and threats to these protected areas, especially from climate change.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

4

- The possibilities of other governance types (private/public partnerships, private protected areas, and community conserved areas, etc)

The second and third days of the workshop reviewed the governance aspects based upon the vision and situation analysis, identifying strengths and weaknesses, constraints and challenges that participants have faced in protected area management. Participants reflected on lessons learnt or lessons that should have been learnt from their prior experiences and identified strategies for overcoming obstacles. Elements of leadership skill training, including communication skills, and facilitation skills were interwoven with the sessions.

The fourth and final day was spent on the discussion of the need for and elements of a capacity-building program that could be developed, using tools such as interactive training modules. Additionally, participants considered the elements of success and the role of the peer network in reinforcing success in the region.

List of Key Presentations and Interactive Sessions

- Potential climate change impacts on protected areas in the Caribbean.

- Introduction to governance and the role of governance in protected areas management.

- Problem diagnosis using real examples from the region and lessons learnt.

- Stakeholder engagement – how to involve stakeholders in developing and implementing required action for protected area management.

- Leadership in the context of knowledge management and knowledge transmission.

- Understanding the learning process to influence change.

- Integrating the Principles of Good Governance and exploring the recognition of different governance types of protected areas.

- Mobilizing for a proactive response to selected management challenges and plan of action to support leaders.

- Identification of additional training and networking needs.

Facilitators at the workshop were: Floyd Homer (WCPA-Caribbean and SUSTRUST), Kishore Lal (SUSTRUST) and John Waugh (IUCN-US).

All presentations, including those of the participants are available at:

http://www.sustrust.org/recent_and_news/workshop/leadership_in_
governance_of_protected_areas_workshop.html

Key Results of the Workshop

A.   Problems and Problem-Solving

Problem perception

Participants identified and discussed obstacles to achieving their objectives as protected area managers.

The problems that were identified were classified as problems in knowledge, problems in empowerment, and problems in governance.

Knowledge-related problems
- Difficulty of getting reliable information
- Changing traditions

Social problems
- Stakeholders do not cooperate
- Encroachment or inappropriate use of park resources
- Lack of administrative support
- Lack of support from leadership
- Lack of human resources
- Lack of clarity in intent
- Lack of trust from the community
- Lack of trust from the government
- Absence of coordination

Political problems
- Inadequate, unclear, or inappropriate rules
- Lack of authority

Most problems identified were related to interpersonal relations.

Participants were then asked to look at the specific environmental challenges they were facing. They identified the following as typical challenges:

Biodiversity
- Collapse of fish stocks
- Species overuse
- Land degradation due to development
- Limited options to manage at appropriate (ecosystem) scale
- Anchor damage
- Poor fishing practice

Climate related problems:
- Sea level rise
- Erosion of coastlines and steep slopes
- Forest fires
- Adverse weather

Pollution and waste:
- Water quality
- Solid waste
- Emissions

In addition, the lack of data and knowledge, denial of problems, failure to convince decision makers, and lack of institutional mandate were identified as overriding challenges in meeting their protected area mission.

Root causes

The workshop reviewed the problems that they had identified. Participants were asked to try to find underlying causes to their management challenges. These were organized according to issues related to knowledge, empowerment, and governance.

Knowledge
- Short-term gains are favoured over long-term benefits
- Lack of awareness
- Lack of understanding by managers of what motivates people
- Fear of change
- Differing cultures
- Lack of confidence by decision-makers in protected areas as a tool to solve their problems
- Cynicism

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

7

Empowerment
- Lack of incentives or adverse incentives
- Unwillingness to rock the boat
- No buy-in or ownership on the part of stakeholders
- Lack the tools for engagement

Governance
- Donor-driven priorities
- Commons are undervalued
- Lack of a shared vision within the institutions
- Emphasis on outputs rather than outcomes
- Partisan divisions within society

In addition, participants noted an overriding problem...*egos get in the way.*

How can we compete?

Managers expressed frustration in their difficulty in competing with well-entrenched financial interests in development decisions. To address this, they concluded, they needed to:
- Work at the ground level and build support for conservation with stakeholder groups
- Education
- Develop guidelines for sustainable development

Potential Solutions

The workshop participants were asked to identify their preferred solutions to address the challenges. Suggestions included:

- Learn from experiences in public health
- Understand how people get information
- Know the characteristics of target audiences
- Develop marketing strategies
- Users should pay for benefits – the beneficiaries of the services provided by protected areas, especially resorts, should partner with the protected area managers to maintain the integrity of their destinations
- Managers should reach out to the faith-based community

Participants also reviewed the tools available to address the challenges identified. Two key questions discussed were:

- How do you move from awareness to *change* in behaviour?
and
- How do you measure success? (and success for whom?)

Moving to the Next Level

The group identified some key tools necessary to move to the next level:
- Adaptive management
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Better outreach strategies

Participants recommended that outreach strategies include the following features:
- Stop treating people in conflict with your mission as obstacles and start treating them as people with legitimate perspectives.
- Give greater effort to understand their perspectives
- Identify common ground with stakeholders
    - Open up a dialog process
    - Learn who are the leaders – the ones trusted by the other stakeholders
    - Be transparent
    - Earn their trust
- Ensure the clarity of our own vision
- Present our message in compelling ways
- Continually reinforce messages
- Demonstrate of the process
- Dedicate resources in the budget for partnership building
- Develop practical problem solving skills

How we get help: networking

The workshop reviewed the strategies and the resources available to protected area managers in the Caribbean to assist in problem solving. Participants most commonly identified the sources for advice and information. These include their peers, the networks they developed at university, and the use of the internet (Googling). They most commonly engage their networks via telephone. Some use services such a Skype for conference calling and file exchange. They generally **disapproved** of list-servs as a networking tool.

The workshop discussed how WCPA in the Caribbean could facilitate knowledge development. We reviewed PALNet (IUCN's Protected Area Learning Network). **The best way to support improvements in protected areas in the Caribbean** was follow-on training sessions to reinforce the messages and widen the network, and to have specific country activities to reinforce multi-stakeholder collaboration on the protected area agenda.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

10

B. Key concerns with regard to communities, equity and protected areas.

1. Do you mostly deal with conservation policy? Is your area of reference broad (international, regional, or national), encompassing one or more systems of protected areas?

All agencies present, dealt with conservation policy, all agencies mandate was on national PAs with more than one ecosystem types, and one agency indicated it had some international and regional responsibilities.

2. Do you principally, or to a considerable extent, deal with conservation at a landscape/seascape level, possibly concerning one or more official protected areas and/or Community Conserved Areas (CCAs)?

All agencies deal with conservation of either land or seascapes with more than one PA.

3. If you are principally concerned with official protected areas, are those managed with or without the effective involvement of the relevant indigenous and local communities?

Responses ranged from no effective involvement, to low level and occasional participation.

4. If you are principally concerned with areas managed and conserved by indigenous and local communities, are those recognised by the relevant governmental agencies at various levels?

This question was not applicable to all but Barbuda where the Barbuda Council has responsibility for protected areas there.

5. Are there any open conflicts regarding the management decisions relating to official protected areas or CCAs? Are those minor or serious? From whose point of view?

In most cases there were serious conflicts either in the establishment of the PAs or during the use of the PAs, usually from both sides. The Forestry Dept in Grenada and the St Lucia National Trust had no serious conflicts.

6. Are there un-tapped opportunities for collaboration regarding official protected areas and CCAs? On the basis of what (what are the "reasons for hope")?

In most cases there were un-tapped or emerging opportunities for collaboration, based on local changes, legislative mandate and policy.

7. For each relevant site, fundamental insights usually come from history. When was each official protected area and/or CCA established? For what purposes?

Most PAs were established for biodiversity conservation, some PAs also included socio-economic benefits, recreation, development of forest resources and historical conservation.

8. Have the relevant indigenous and local communities recognised and accepted the establishment of the relevant official protected areas? Have they ever acted violently or violated protected area regulations? Conversely, was there any violent imposition over their will and traditional practices?

Local communities have generally recognized and accepted the PAs. In all cases there were violations of the regulations, but no violent imposition over their will and traditional practices.

9. Have governmental agencies recognised and acknowledged the community management of CCAs? Have they ever supported it? Have they violated its basic tenets and rules?

This question was not relevant because there were no community conserved areas established or identified.

10. What vision inspires and informs the official protected area or CCA managers? Does that vision include a place for other social actors? Does it reflect the historical, cultural and social complexities of the context at stake? Does it recognise a plurality of ways to understand and value nature and protect biodiversity, and a plurality of "grounds" (entitlements) on which various parties can ask to be involved in management?

All agencies had a vision or mission that guides management of the PAs and includes a place for other social actors. In most cases the local complexities were recognized in the vision/mission.

11. Are there mechanisms that enable local/traditional and mainstream knowledge and practices to be integrated and used in a complementary and respectful way? For an official protected area, are there mechanisms by

which the local communities are involved in planning, taking decisions, implementing plans, sharing the benefits of conservation, monitoring and evaluating the management result?

There were mechanisms in all cases to enable local knowledge and practices to be integrated and used. In all cases local communities were involved or consulted in aspects of planning. In most cases they were not directly involved in decision making or implementation, however, they all shared in the benefits of conservation. There was limited involvement in monitoring and evaluation.

12. For a CCA, are there contacts between local managers and other social actors, including government agencies? Are specific agreements ever developed? Is the management setting of the protected area or CCA described by anyone as "co-management"?

Not Applicable

13. Are human rights respected in matters relevant to the official protected area or CCA?

All participants said that human rights were respected.

14. Are controversies being dealt with impartially and through the rule of formal and/or customary law?

In all cases, controversies, wherever they arose, were dealt with impartially at departmental or agency level. In most cases there was no need to resort to formal law.

15. Are decisions being taken at the lowest level where capacity is available?

Most participants indicated that the departmental or agency level was the lowest level at which relevant capacity was available.

16. Are there mechanisms to assure transparency and accountability in decision-making regarding the official protected area or CCA?

All participants said that there were mechanisms to assure transparency and accountability.....whether or not these mechanisms were utilised appropriately in all cases were debatable.

17. Are decision makers responsive to the concerns of various concerned parties? Do they value their contributions? Do they seek social consensus?

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

13

In all cases decision makers are responsive to concerns, but the value of these contributions can vary. Social consensus is often sought, in all but one of the countries represented.

18. Are there pluralist governance structures in place, devoted to dialogue and developing negotiated agreements? Are there any other mechanisms to allow the involvement of the relevant parties in the management of the official protected area or CCA?

There were multi-stakeholder governance structures in place and mechanisms to allow involvement of some parties in management in several cases; however, these were not often utilized by some agencies.

19. Who enjoys (most of) the benefits of conservation? Who bears (most of) the costs? Are there mechanisms that assess and ensure an equitable sharing of the benefits and costs of conservation? Are those effective?

Most of the benefits were enjoyed by: local and foreign visitors, communities, public, utility company. Most of the costs are borne by the government of the PA management agency; in some cases the users bear some cost through a user fee. In most cases there were no mechanisms to assess and ensure equitable sharing of benefits and costs. Where these exist, the effectiveness was unknown.

20. What are the biodiversity and other conservation outcomes of the conservation initiative? Is it clear what is needed to achieve conservation? It is clear where the key problems and opportunities lie?

Outcomes of conservation included: ecological restoration and maintenance, awareness building, community enjoyment, habitat health maintained, increased ecotourism/recreational activities, species recovery, local trade, water production, biodiversity conservation, historical and cultural conservation, water production, fisheries, carbon sink/oxygen production, education, research, and source of medicinal plants. The needs to achieve conservation were clear as well as the key problems and opportunities.

21. Is the legal and policy environment supportive? Are the necessary technical capacities in place?

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

14

In most cases the legal and policy environment was considered inadequate, and required review and upgrading. The necessary technical capacities were also considered inadequate.

On the basis of the answers to the questions above, the key issues and threats standing in the way of enhanced conservation and equity were identified.

KEY ISSUES/THREATS:

a) No effective involvement or low level and occasional participation of local communities in management of official protected areas.

b) Serious conflicts in use of protected areas in most cases.

c) Untapped and emerging opportunities for collaboration.

d) Limited role of local communities/stakeholders in decision making, implementation of management plans, monitoring and evaluation.

e) Mechanisms to allow the involvement of relevant stakeholders in the management of PAs not often utilized or utilised effectively.

f) The government or PA management agency bears most of the costs of the PA.

g) There is a need for the review and upgrade of policy and legislation related to PAs.

C.   What Participants Said They Learnt During the Workshop Session on: Understanding the learning process to influence change.

Reg Murphy
Revisit how you select workers, provide instructions, reinforce methods and approaches already learnt or in process of learning.

Philmore James
Revisit me as an individual and whether my approach to my stakeholders needs to be modified based on each situation.

Farah Mukhida
Taught me the importance of who we are talking to, in terms of personalities and attitudes. We are not learning from using the same approach each time,

especially in terms of how the Trust (Anguilla National Trust) is seen by our stakeholders.

Joseph Simmonds
The issues and approaches covered in the workshop provided clarity, especially understanding what people think, their reality and ideas. I understand the need to get stakeholders involved early in the planning process. Helping people to understand their roles is very important. We need to get sociologists involved, since we need to really understand our stakeholders.

Joseph Smith-Abbott
Try to understand what the other party understands from your communication, especially finding the mechanisms to do this properly, knowing the other party's expectations or perceptions are important.

Brian Johnson
Understanding how to deal with personalities, in getting the work done. The workshop provided us with a process to apply.

Aden Forteau
I am now in a better position to avoid conflicts on the job; very positive approaches explained.

Lavina Alexander
A better understanding of myself, based on the 'comfort-zone' exercise. A better understanding that other people's perception of the same issue may be quite different from mine.

Kenroy Rawlins
Understanding better how to communicate with senior officials, and fishermen with low literacy. How do we decide if we can use what may be considered 'unethical' approaches to achieve the programme objectives e.g. socializing in rumshops during working hours with fishermen in order to get needed information? Building trust and friendship is critical.

Stuart Wynne
Understanding how information is processed by individuals. Understanding the language and culture of the fishermen or target group is critical.

Doren Simmons
Workshop was an eye-opener in terms of managing persons that you supervise. Now I understand that I need to examine myself to see what can be improved in my approach to managing colleagues. Will seek new ways in approaching challenges with colleagues on the job.

Appendix 3 provides some details on the interactive session on Understanding the Learning Process.

APPENDIX 1

List of Participants
Leadership in PA Governance Workshop – Anguilla, November 2006

Country	Name	Agency
Anguilla	Karim Hodge	Dept of Environment
Anguilla	Damien Hughes	Anguilla National Trust
Anguilla	Farah Mukhida	Anguilla National Trust
Anguilla	Stuart Wynne	Dept of Fisheries & Marine Resources
Anguilla	Kenroy Rawlins	Dep. Of Fisheries & Marine Resources
St Lucia	Lavina Alexander	St. Lucia National Trust
British Virgin Islands	Joseph Smith Abbott	BVI National Trust
St Kitts/Nevis	Joseph Simmons	Dept of Fisheries
St Kitts/Nevis	Kaya Freeman	Ocean Foundation
Antigua/Barbuda	Reg Murphy	Nelson Dockyard National Park
Antigua/Barbuda	Philmore James	Fisheries Dept.
St Vincent/Grenadines	Brian Johnson	Forestry Division
St Vincent/Grenadines	Doren Simmons	Office of the Prime Minister
Grenada	Aden Forteau	Forestry & National Parks Division
Grenada	Jerry Mitchell	Fisheries Department
Trinidad &Tobago	Floyd Homer	SUSTRUST
Trinidad & Tobago	Kishore Lal	SUSTRUST
St Croix	Ruth Blyther	The Nature Conservancy
USA	John Waugh	IUCN/US

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

17

Summary of Situational Analyses by Participants

Anguilla – Ms. Farah Mukhida, Anguilla National Trust and Mr. Stuart Wynne, Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources

This presentation gave an overview of existing governance mechanisms in Anguilla.
Anguilla is a small coastal island, with land covering only 91 sq km, but coastal and marine areas encompassing about 85,500 sq km.

Anguilla has a Protected Area Network comprised of the following:
- 5 Marine Parks–Little Bay, Shoal-Bay Island Harbour, Sandy Island, Prickly Pear and Dog Island.
- 3 Terrestrial Protected Areas– East End Pond Conservation Area, Big Spring Heritage Site and Fountain Cavern National Park

The Marine Parks Act was enacted in 1982 and was followed by the Marine Parks Regulations (1993), Fisheries Protection Act (1986) and Cruising Permit Act (1980). The purposes of these Acts included diversity preservation, enhancement of natural beauty, public enjoyment and scientific research. With respect to issues of roles, responsibilities and accountability in Marine Parks governance, there were designations and responsibilities identified from the government level to the employee level, as well as future goals and further avenues for governance.

Land was also purchased directly by the Anguilla National Trust (ANT) and designated a protected area. The ANT is supported by the Anguilla National Trust Act (revised 2000), Anguilla National Trust Regulations (revised 2000) and resolutions passed by the Anguilla National Council. The major goals of ANT are the promotion of permanent preservation of land fertility and historical and archaeological integrity of buildings and other land areas, maintaining lands as open and public spaces for recreational enjoyment, while maintaining diversity richness and ecological integrity.

There are plans to further improve Protected Areas effectiveness and efficiency through the drafting of a Protected Areas Act, improved interdepartmental communication, long term planning and support and multi-disciplinary aid agency research initiatives. There are also plans to ensure that all stakeholders contribute to protected areas management, through initiatives such as public awareness, education, stewardship and cooperation and collaboration between all parties involved with the resources.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

18

Finally, the presentation outlined scenarios for practical governance distinguishing between realistic and idealistic governance. The latter involving co-management of Anguilla's resources between NGOs (ANT) and government and the former calling for co-management between government, NGOS and community.

Antigua/Barbuda – Dr. Reg Murphy, Nelson Dockyard National Park and Mr. Philmore James, Dept of Fisheries.

Antigua and Barbuda are small islands with an abundance of coral reef structures, sandy beaches, mangroves and sea grass beds. They also host a wealth of historical, cultural and natural monuments; all requiring management and protection.

Similarly to the other islands the structure of existing PA management is unclear. There are several agencies involved, which are mandated by different pieces of legislation. The foci of the agencies are quite different and scattered and collaboration and cooperation between agencies are quite weak.

In light of this informal structure, there are several goals for PA management, which includes the following:
- ⮞ Management for Sustainability of Resources including preservation, protection, management and development of the natural physical and ecological resources and the historical and cultural heritage
- ⮞ Monitoring including Data Management
- ⮞ Aesthetics and Public Enjoyment
- ⮞ Scientific Study and Research

The presentation also mentioned the changes desired in PA management, these included:
- ⮞ Need for a PA Capacity Assessment and Development
- ⮞ Development of a Workable National Policy Framework for PA
- ⮞ Establish a Centralized / Coordinating Institution for PA
- ⮞ Develop a Funding Mechanism for PA

In terms of strengths of the systems, legislation in support of PA exists, but the weaknesses mirrors many of the ones highlighted by the other countries such as; piecemeal legislation, lack of agency capacity, inadequate mobilization and monitoring systems and budgets lack allocation for PA management. The threats were also similar to the ones previously mentioned, with attention paid to man made problems such as grass and bush fires, agriculture and housing development and of course tourism coastal development.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

19

British Virgin Islands – Mr. Joseph Smith Abbott, BVI National Trust

PA management falls under various government ministries. However, the presentation focused on the National Parks Trust, which is governed by the National Parks Act No 4 of 2006. The basis of the Act calls for public engagement in PA management.

There is a Board responsible for the activities of the National Parks and comprises membership from representatives from the major BVI islands, the business community, experts and a director. The Board holds the decision making authority and responsible and is accountable to the Minister of Natural resources and Labour. There are also formal co-management arrangements between marine industry members through the Marine Conservation Programme. There is also provision in the Act to develop an advising Scientific Committee to assist on PA management. The Act also empowers the Trust to create International Protected Areas as Transboundary Protected Areas, Biosphere Reserves or World Heritage Sites. The Act also sets procedures for standards of conduct and principles to achieve the goals and values of PA management guidelines. The Act also sets restrictions about modification and states clearly that governance must be worked out in system-wide, strategic management plans. These plans are required for the PAs and will involve public sector and civil society engagement.

The presentations points out that it is too early in the process to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the current PA management strategies under the Act, but it is hoped the systematic planning and formalization of reporting relationships and responsibilities will foster better management.

Stakeholders needed to be more involved in the PA decision-making process, but it was unclear as to how to achieve this effectively. The National Parks Act actually prescribes the manner in which stakeholders are to be included in the decision making process through their management plans.

Private/public partnerships and private conservation areas are possible within the context of the new Act. Awareness building activities are required to sensitise landowners with critical natural and cultural assets of the new opportunities and benefits to be afforded by the management approaches related to conservation agreements.

Grenada – Mr. Aden Forteau, Forestry & National Parks Division

The presentation highlighted over five types of forests totalling 71362.6 ha. There are about 11 protected areas in Grenada including: Mt. St. Catherine

Forest Reserve, Grand Etang Forest Reserve and Perseverance Dove Sanctuary. Currently the terrestrial protected areas in Grenada are governed by the Forestry and National Parks Department of the Ministry of Agriculture, with the exception of the Lagoon Park Protected area.

In terms of accountability and reporting relationships, there were clear personnel designations, with the Minister of Agriculture being the highest level, followed by the Ministry's Permanent Secretary, the Chief Forestry Officer and the head of the Conservation Unit.

The presentation outlined the desired changes in protected area governance in Grenada. These included: increased administrative support, greater community involvement, increased awareness and increased capacity development, better income generating opportunities for rural communities, greater collaboration with stakeholders and student involvement.

The presentation also highlighted the strengths, weaknesses and threats involved with protected area management in Grenada. The strengths include the legal protection of the resource and the willingness of stakeholders to manage the protected areas. The weaknesses mentioned were limited resources for effective management and uncertainty about biodiversity status. The threats were named as natural disasters, lack of an enabling environment and biodiversity loss.

In terms of opportunities for improved governance, the following were identified: greater stakeholder involvement, greater avenues for financial resources, more areas to be protected, research, donor assistance, information and the media assistance. The presenter also stressed the need for resources to encourage stakeholder empowerment in the forms of public education, community meetings, community involvement and stakeholder involvement in decision-making.

The presenter concluded by saying that the protection of the forested areas must remain in the hand of the Ministry, but stakeholders should and must be involved in a participatory manner.

Grenada – Marine Protected Areas Programme – Mr. Jerry J Mitchell, Fisheries Department.

This presentation gave an overview of the Marine Protected Areas (MPA) situation in Grenada.

There was MPA legislation enacted in 2001 for Woburn/Clarkes Court Bay and Molinere/Beausejour Marine Protected Area and there were 2 other proposed

areas at Grand Anse and Sandy Island/Oyster Bed protected areas. There Marine Protected Areas Management Committee responsible for overall guidance on MPA management.

The presentation also highlighted the major goals for PAs in Grenada and these included:
- legislative reviews
- gap analyses
- sourcing external funding
- stakeholders identification and consultation
- zoning

 The aims for 2007 are to source more funding and embark on more training.

St. Kitts/Nevis – Mr Joseph Simmons, Dept of Fisheries

There are no legally established MPAs in St Kitts and Nevis. Several attempts were made to establish marine protected areas in Sandy Point dive sites and in Nevis over the past 15 years. In 1998 there was a Management Plan for Marine Protected Areas in St. Kitts. The plan was developed, areas mapped and got verbal acceptance, but there was no real follow-up by the respective government agencies.

There are some pieces of existing legislation including the National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act (NCEPA) No. 5 for National Parks and the Fisheries Act No. 4 of 1984, which provides for fishing priority areas and marine reserves. In 2006, the Ministry of Tourism put forward an initiative and developed a task force from the Fisheries Department. The taskforce prepared the Terms of Reference (TOR) and sought technical assistance from the CORAL Alliance and Ocean Foundation.

St. Lucia – Ms. Lavina Alexander, St Lucia National Trust

Currently there is a mix of multi-stakeholder and single entity management on the island. However, the decision making process is controlled by the Government of St Lucia and the responsibility of the protected area is defined in the legislation or in the Cabinet's decision when designating a site.

The strengths were similar to that of the other islands mentioned including the system of PA management and increased efforts to involve stakeholders. However, the weaknesses seemed to outweigh the strengths. Fragmented legal policies, lack of operational guidelines, poor political and public support, capacity

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

22

deficiencies and improper management techniques were all listed as weaknesses. These were augmented by threats such as coastal development, increased population and resource demand, and invasive species. The presentation also gave opportunities for increasing strengths and managing the weaknesses. These included: increased communication, partnership formation, and project initiatives, among others.

The presentation also identified some desirable changes in current PA management; such as the need for a more formalized management system, which is backed by firm legal frameworks and accountability channels.

The goal for PA governance is a system, which encourages dialogue among all stakeholders and ensures that decisions are made based on precise information and resource access. The system should also enforce capacity development and enforce adequate legislative instruments and of course is flexible and can adapt to changes.

St Vincent/Grenadines – Brian R. Johnson, Forestry Division

There is no single system of PA management in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, instead there are several categories of PA management, which are highlighted in various pieces of legislation and administered by separate agencies. These agencies include the St. Vincent and Grenadines National Trust, which falls under the Ministry of Urban Development, Culture, Labour and Electoral matters; the Fisheries Division, which falls under the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and the Forestry Department, which also falls under the Ministry of Agriculture. There are also the National Parks, Rivers and Beaches Authority, which falls under the Ministry if Tourism, Youth and Sports; The Physical Planning Unit, which reports to the Ministry of Finance and Planning and the Central Water and Sewerage Authority. Under each is a series of responsibilities, reporting relationships and legislation. Relatively new to the system are the Ministry of Health and Environment, which houses the National Environmental Advisory Board.

St. Vincent and the Grenadines hopes to address the complex current system by establishing a defined and operating system of PA management. Work has started on this system with the main goals being: a clear policy on PA, an effective management system, a well informed public, coordination, community initiative, research, cost recovery and standards. Currently there are two projects, which are working towards these goals. The first is the three year Tourism Development Project that will establish the National Parks Authority and the system of National Parks was expected to be initiated by February 2007.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

23

Secondly in 2005, the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Nature Conservancy, The University of the West Indies and the Rare Center for Tropical Conservation to collaborate in implementing a Program of Work for Protected Areas in the country.

These two projects will strengthen PA management. The weaknesses and opportunities are similar to that of the other countries. This presentation also focused training needs and called for training and formal education systems to reflect the importance of the environment to development.

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

24

APPENDIX 3

Understanding the Learning Process to Influence Change

This presentation attempted to show the participants how an understanding of the ways in which people learn will empower them to become better change agents.

It opened with an explanation of the relationship between our perception of the world and our comfort zone. When people experience a stressful experience, their reaction may be one or more of the following:

- Motivation to change by accommodating the new information and reorganizing knowledge, skills and attitudes so as to reach their desired comfort zone.
- No motivation to change because they:
  - o Ignore the discomfort by pretending it has not happened (putting you head under the sand).
  - o Interpret the action which caused the stress, in creative ways to rationalize acceptance of the situation (don't rock the boat!).
  - o Deny any discomfort with the rationalization that life is unfair but the nature of adulthood is to accept bad luck and move on... (Macho men don't cry!)
  - o Enjoy of the discomfort (enjoyment of being a victim and the attendant sympathy it may generate from peers and other parties).

If we desire to change others we must ensure that:
- The unmotivated become motivated in the first instance.
- The motivated people understand the change required as envisioned by us.

To deal with both of these we must understand how a message gets form you to others.
- When you formulate an idea, it is in your head in your frame of reference.
  - o You have made many assumptions which may not be obvious to others without your background or experience. E.g. "My golden apple tree in my backyard is above average height." To someone accustomed to the dwarf variety this may be interpreted as being about 3-4 meters, but to those only familiar with the traditional variety, it may mean 15-20 meters!
  - o Understand that the observer can only receive the information in his/her frame of reference. *Always try to put yourself into the micro-culture of the other party and be careful to explain any assumptions you may have made. Avoid thinking the*

> The problem is **NOT** the other person it's **YOU!**

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

25

***other person is stupid!* The problem is NOT the other person it's you!**

- Between your thoughts and arrival at the other person the ideas may become distorted by:
  - The technology of communication.
    - Writing / drawing may have become corrupted in for example in typing or word processing.
    - Speech may become distorted by background noise and/or accent, speech impediments etc.
    - You may not say or write what you were thinking (make a mistake in expressing your thoughts)
    - Body language may distort the spoken message

The problem is **NOT** the other person it's **Communication Technology!**

  - Understand that <u>the observer can only interpret the message received which is not necessarily what you intended</u>. ***Have the person discuss their interpretation of the task with you or sit in where the person leads a discussion with others.***
  - The information arriving at the person sense organs (eyes etc.) is distorted as it goes to the brain by
    - A defective sense organ (e.g. sight or hearing challenged and/or nerve damage / disease).
    - The person's fear of you (stress)
    - Legal drugs (like alcohol) and medications, as well as, illegal drugs.
    - Physical difficulty in reading / hearing the message (conference is in a noisy environment or printout, writing is not very legible.

The problem is the other person!

The problem is you!

  - Understand that <u>the observer can only interpret the message received by his / her brain</u>.
    - ***Have the person discuss their interpretation of the task with you or sit in where the person leads a discussion with others.***
    - ***Deal with others in a friendly yet professional manner. Personal insults and anger are inappropriate and counter productive. Be relaxed and approachable.***
    - ***Make sure all employees are familiar with the department's drug policy. Agitate for changes in the drug policy if it is inadequate.***
    - ***Prepare professional documents and use professional demeanour in conferencing (oral communication) which should be done away from distractions.***

Some exercises were done on perception and how information becomes distorted when we communicate.

A short discussion was done on comfort zones and participants reflected on how they react when displaced from their comfort zones.

A discussion on some of the causes of Unhappiness:
Inability to change the Zone because in the situation:
- Some are powerless.
- Some are financially unable.
- Some enjoy being unhappy.

People react in one or more of the following ways when displaced from their comfort zone:
- A Tantrum with incoherent protest. May subside after some time or continue as a "lockout"
- Protest with anger and / or violence. May subside after some time or continue as a "lockout".
- A quiet "Lockout". The person makes a personal decision not to interact in a meaningful way but may give the appearance of cooperation yet there is no intention of accommodating the new situation.
- A direct attack (may be physical and or verbal) on the messenger.
- The attitude that if that is what you want, you will get it, but I will make every effort to make sure it fails...The person may appear to be very cooperative and even appear to take sides with you against critics, but is secreting trying to make you look bad.
- Problem solving, rising to the challenge with an attempt to find solutions. May involve coherent protest.

The following behaviour(s) may indicate discomfort with change:
- Maintenance of Traditions when New Systems or Technologies make activities simpler or more efficient. E.g. written communication must be in own hand writing, and refusal to deal with typed / word processed communication.
- Refusal to learn new technologies. E.g. refusal to "talk to a machine" to leave voice mail.
- Rejection of an entire generation - new styles / music etc.
- Constant reference to "how we do things here...", "long ago everything was better."
- Almost all prejudice...

Exercise to Determine How Participants see Themselves.

Participants reflected on their reactions to displacement from a comfort zone and made a written record of how they think they react when faced with change. They were specifically asked which of the previously disused behaviour they exhibit when faced with a decision handed down to them.
- They wrote their perceptions of themselves.
- Then an authentic exercise was given.
    - They were told that the data gathered in the previous session (which was long, and not something to look forward to repeating) was lost and they were being asked to strategize on methodology to collect the data as quickly as possible so they can return to this presentation.
- They were given time to vent their feelings as freely as possible.
- Their reactions were observed by the presenter and after fifteen minutes they were told that it is just an exercise and the data as not actually lost.
- In pairs they were asked to share with each other their previously written statements about how they think they reacted when faced with a decision handed down to them.
- They pointed out discrepancies between the person perceptions of himself / herself and his / her actual reaction to each other.
- They were encouraged to reflect on this new knowledge.
- Many felt that their self image was very different from that observed by others.

It is only when we face up to the reality that our self image might be a creation which exists only in our own minds, that we can begin the task of marrying how we perceive ourselves with how others see us. Reality, of course, is neither the observer nor our self image, but probably some point in between!

My Comfort Zone is personal and based on:
- Gathering information received through my imperfect senses and Interpreting and making sense of the information to have:
- Perceptions of others (which may be wrong)
- A perception of myself (which may be wrong)

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

28

An exercise brought out the following:
To cause change you must:
- Know Your Target so that you can:
  - Catch and maintain their attention.
  - Convince them that they want to perform the change because they benefit in
    - tangible ways
    - intangible ways
- Understand how they think and learn and what is important to them.

Some exercise and discussion brought out the following about learning:

- Is learning the product? The destination?
- Is learning the process? The journey?
- Consider learning to baking a cake
  - Is learning to be evaluated by the product? I.e. the quality of cake produced. How well he / she can follow instructions and reproduce the result?
  - Or is learning to be evaluated by the process? i.e. how the person understands and modifies the process as he bakes? What kind of baker does he / she become?
- Learning is a difficult and complex process.
- Consider the information you receive through your senses as pieces of a jig saw puzzle that you are trying to assemble to make a coherent picture. Without knowing
  - The final picture, so you don't know if you are correct!
  - How to identify the corner or side pieces!

To Accomplishing Change you must understand that The ONLY person you can change is you!
You can only encourage others to change. They have to make the change.

Strategies and ideas to consider when attempting to make others want to change:
- Get their attention, if you can't get their attention they can't hear the message.
  - People may seem to be attentive but have "locked you out".
  - If you ideas or appearance are too different (i.e. it does not make sense to the other person) you may be dismissed.
  - Know the person you are trying to change so you don't stereotype and hence alienate them.

- Motivate yourself
    - Make the situation as relaxed and fun as possible. You perform better when there is no stress.
    - Be more tolerant and understanding of yourself.
    - Are you your worst critic?
- Your message needs to be clear to the other person
    - People get the message in their frame NOT yours. People are NOT stupid because they see things differently.
    - If you ideas or appearance is too different (i.e. it does not make sense to the other person) you may be dismissed.
    - Know the person so you can fit the information into their frame.
- Deliver message with the understanding
    - People get the message in their frame NOT yours. You attitude may cause them to focus on you rather than the message.
    - People reject ideas that are meaningless to them. They are NOT stupid. Be tolerant. (Remember the jig saw puzzles?)
    - The social/cultural context is as important as the message.
- Evaluate message with the understanding
    - People get the message in their frame NOT yours. Let them also evaluate their learning.
    - Learning is a difficult and complex process. If the person did not get your message, you may need to repackage it.
    - More learning may take place when the activity does not work.

***

Leadership in Governance of PA Report. SUSTRUST 2007

30