

CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE  
(CANARI)

**PRINCIPLES OF PARTICIPATION  
AND CO-MANAGEMENT:  
A WORKSHOP FOR RESOURCE  
MANAGEMENT PROFESSIONALS**

November 1996 (St. Lucia) and April 1997  
(Trinidad)

Final Document

December 1998

**CANARI Technical Report N° 254**

## Introduction

Since 1992 the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) has conducted a series of training courses on participatory and collaborative natural resource management. These have been aimed at technical and managerial staff from a range of backgrounds and have proved to be both popular and informative. This document serves to record the main features of the workshop that was organised in two one-week modules during November 1996 (St. Lucia) and April 1997 (Trinidad).

The workshop was designed to facilitate advanced learning, through an in-depth review of theories and concepts, the sharing of experience and the collective development of methods and guidelines for improved practice. It targeted senior resource management professionals from governmental and non-governmental organisations from across the region and attracted 16 participants (listed at Appendix A).

The workshop was made possible through financial support from the Commonwealth Foundation; the Ford Foundation; the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; the United Nations Environment Programme; and the United Kingdom Government's Department for International Development - Caribbean (formerly the British Development Division in the Caribbean). In addition the Government of Trinidad and Tobago's Forestry Division provided essential logistical support both before and during the second part of the workshop.

At this stage this document is only being circulated to those who participated in the workshop. However, given the productive nature of those two weeks and the valuable material generated by similar events organised by CANARI, the Institute will be producing a publication as part of its "Guidelines Series". This will draw on the growing body of experiences, cases and methods related to participatory and collaborative natural resource management in the region.

The immediate feedback from that workshop was extremely positive, and now CANARI is looking to evaluate the impacts of the event over the longer term. Participants are therefore asked to take time to answer the questions overleaf and return their responses to the Institute as soon as is convenient. This feedback will also help CANARI to improve the form and content of future events.

Vijay Krishnarayan  
November 1998

**Questionnaire for participants in CANARI workshop "Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals"  
(November 1996 and April/May 1997)**

1) Have your responsibilities or position at work changed since the workshop? Please describe.

---

---

---

2) Have you been able to use the learning gained at the workshop? If yes please describe how, if not please describe some of the difficulties you may have encountered.

---

---

---

3) What (if any) have been the impacts of the workshop on your institution, sector or country? Please describe.

---

---

---

4) What ongoing support (if any) could CANARI provide to help you make better use of what you learned?

---

---

---

5) What (if any) further training would you like to see CANARI provide? \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

6) If you are still involved in natural resource management, how would you assess the prospects for participatory and collaborative approaches a) in your institution and b) in your country?

---

---

---

---

7) Have you kept in touch with other workshop participants? Yes/No If yes what is the nature of the contact:  
 formal work-related     informal work-related     informal

8) Please use this space for any other comments or suggestions that you might have

---

---

---

---

---

Name .....

Organisation .....

**Please fax to Vijay at CANARI on 758 454 5188. Thank you for taking the time to help with this.**

## Section 1

### Natural resource management regimes

Management in the context of natural resources refers to the explicit or implicit rules that determine the rate at which the resource is depleted and regenerates. Once rules are applied then management exists and those that are applying the rules are the managers. Management is therefore not a modern concept but one that has existed for as long as natural resources have been exploited. The principal management regimes are outlined in Table 1.

Management Regime	Responses associated with regime
Open access	Free for all, no regulation
Private	Property rights asserted
Public	Laws enforced
Communal	Self regulatory

**Table 1 Principal types of natural resource management regime and associated responses**

An important consideration that often emerges during planning processes is that people who have ownership rights may not be responsible for management, and that managers will not always have rights of ownership. The relationship between ownership, tenure and management regime is a dynamic one that can be modified by a range of factors that will include: changes in the nature and intensity of the use of the resource; the introduction of new stakeholders; changes in legislation; and changes in the aspirations of local communities.

Each of the regimes will have their strengths and weaknesses. For example, where immediate action is needed, a prompt public sector response will be called for. A private sector regime would come into its own when fiscal incentives or penalties are the main policy tools used to manage a resource.

Participatory management is not a panacea and may or may not be appropriate in all circumstances. What can be said is that participatory processes can help to determine the extent to which participation features in a management response. Recent trends in public policy such as deregulation and calls for increasing dialogue between the state and civil society (for example by those looking at new models of governance) have provided the opportunity to explore approaches that involve the community to varying degrees.

An examination of traditional production systems in the Caribbean reveals a mix of measures aimed at conserving the resource base, including elements of self regulation and traditional methods of extraction. The mix of experiences and diversity of the resource base in the Caribbean, combined with the interdependent relationship that many still have with the environment, are all conducive to the use of participatory based approaches in the region. The next section looks at the benefits of these approaches for natural resource management.

#### **References and reading**

Berkes, F and M. T. Farvar. 1989. Introduction and overview. Pages 1-18 *in* Berkes, F. (Ed). Common property resources: ecology and community based sustainable development. Bellhaven Press, London.

Ostrom, E. 1990. *Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action*  
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Renard, Y., BB. Walters, and A.H. Smith. 1991. Community-based approaches to conservation and resource management in the Caribbean. Paper presented at the International Congress for the Conservation of Caribbean Bio-diversity, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, 14-17 January 1991.

**Section 2**  
**Participatory approaches -the benefits**

There are two prevailing models of natural resource management: private resources managed by a private owner and publicly owned resources managed by the state. Participation allows for a more sophisticated approach to resource management by mixing options and introducing a broader range of stakeholders into the process (Brown 1995). Participation, in the context of natural resource management, can support and encourage the inclusion of concerned groups in the identification, design, planning, implementation and management of actions aimed at protecting the natural resource and improving the quality of life for local communities.

As well as supporting processes of social inclusion, there is another more overtly political sense in which the word participation is used in the context of sustainable development. It acknowledges the existence of inequality. It addresses the need to redistribute power in decision making processes to groups of people who have traditionally been excluded from the structures and institutions that govern them. These communities may have been excluded for example for reasons of race, gender, culture or geography. A commitment to participation in natural resource management is a commitment to, at the very least, giving voice to their concerns and could entail the delegation of authority to them (Stiefel and Wolfe 1994).

This poses difficult questions for resource managers who are acting from a position of power. Having signed up to participation as defined here, they are committed to giving up some degree of authority. This can be difficult where institutions see themselves as solely responsible for initiating and developing resource management interventions.

There is a strong rationale for making participation an integral part of natural resource management. The two reasons that are most often cited in favour of these approaches are that:

- a) participatory processes subject projects to thorough scrutiny;
- b) projects that include a degree of participation are more likely to achieve their objectives.

While these may or may not be true, in practice there is a host of other benefits that can accrue from participatory practice. These are summarised in Table 2.

<b>Making participation an integral part of management can lead to positive impacts in terms of processes and outputs</b>	<b>The consequences of not including participation in natural resource management</b>
The inclusion of existing, locally based knowledge and techniques can lead to more effective outcomes	Failure to protect the resource because of a lack of support from local people, who perceive it as irrelevant to their experience
It can lead to the development of more durable and sustainable solutions by identifying a broad range of concerns	Communities are not motivated to contribute towards success
It can lead to a sense of ownership and responsibility, making it easier to mobilise local support	Objectives not clearly understood by local communities that are excluded from the development process, resulting in low management impact

Local concerns can be addressed leading to broader social and economic benefits distributed in a more equitable manner	Lack of co-operation between individuals and agencies can result in management dysfunctions
Transferring power can contribute to community development and meet broader social objectives	Failure results in further degradation of the resource and a worse quality of life for local people

**Table 2. The beneficial impacts that participation can have on natural resource management** (from CANARI workshop series: *Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals*, November 1996 and April 1997).

Participation always has a context, which is formed by ecological, historical, social, economic and cultural factors. The region's colonial past, paternalistic governments and badly designed development projects could be said to have damaged the prospects for participation in the Caribbean. However there is a rich tradition of resistance, self help and a strong sense of community (each a response to the history of the Caribbean), which has been shown to provide the basis for many popular (and participatory) movements. The next section shows how participation can help develop management interventions during planning processes.

**References and reading**

Brown, N.A. 1995. Popular participation and empowerment in natural resource management. Paper presented at the Second Commonwealth NGO Forum, Wellington, Aotearoa/New Zealand, 18-23 June 1995. CANARI Communication no.56. 14 pp

Renard, Y. 1994. Participation of affected people in development: the roles of environmental non-governmental organisations. Pages 37-50 *in* Proceedings of the 5th Consultative Meeting with Non-Governmental Organisations in the Caribbean Concerned with Environmental Protection and Conservation of Natural Resources. Inter-American Development Bank, Barbados, May 30-June 1, 1994.

Stiefel, M and M. Wolfe. 1994. An inquiry into participation. Pages 3-11 *in* Stiefel, M. and M. Wolfe. A voice for the excluded: popular participation in development, utopia or necessity. Zed Books, London.

Vivian, J.M. 1991. Greening at the grassroots: people's participation in sustainable development. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Discussion Paper 22, Geneva, Switzerland.

### **Section 3**

#### **Identifying stakeholders -towards a participatory planning process**

If the arguments in favour of participation are accepted, the next step must be to look at practical ways in which the process can be used to improve natural resource management. The benefits that participatory approaches can yield are most apparent when they are adopted from the outset. One of the first opportunities that a manager will get to work in a participatory way is during the planning of an intervention, where research is called for and information gathered. By applying participation to the planning process it is possible to demonstrate its application at other stages. For example the principles of transparency, inclusion, good communications and constant review are all as applicable to implementation as they are to planning.

#### ***Problems with conventional approaches***

Established methods of gathering information and doing research have a number of shortcomings and are often undertaken in a way that is incompatible with a participatory ethos. From the outset they can exclude and appear to be the domain of experts. In practice managers trying to apply research done through conventional means sometimes find it unusable. Reasons for this include:

- irrelevance (where the research is more academic than applied);
- cost (the cost of either getting the results of research or testing those results can often be prohibitive);
- accessibility (the results are often located outside the region or reside with researchers not readily accessible).

#### ***Participatory research***

The discipline of participatory research is gaining acceptance. Practitioners have suggested that the following principles should guide work done in this way:

- try to reach as broad a cross section of the target population as possible;
- involve communities in research design and data collection;
- feed the results of the research back to the community in an open way;
- respect community values, customs and social mores.

It should be recognised that some training and briefing may be needed to ensure that for example data are collected in a consistent manner. This training could form part of a broader package of community capacity building and developing local ownership of a natural resource management programme.

#### ***Information gathering***

There are a number of methods that can be used to gather information for participatory planning. These can be mixed so that a sample of both collective and individual opinions are canvassed. Some of the tools for use with individuals include interviews and surveys. These can be done using the telephone, mail or by going house to house if resources allow. To get a feeling for group opinions, public meetings and cultural events (e.g. community theatre) can be used. For larger meetings it should be borne in mind that only the voices of a few will be heard. Additional steps need to be taken to make sure that a broad spectrum of views is aired. Working with smaller groups that focus on one or two specific aspects may be appropriate. These methods should be supplemented with additional information from other sources, which can provide a useful context. Local television, radio or newspapers may have run features on issues that could have helped form or reflect popular opinion.

### **Stakeholder analysis**

One of the most important tasks for a manager is the identification of the various groups with an interest in the resource. A stakeholder has been defined as “any party with an actual or potential interest in the economic, social or cultural use of a resource”, with interests being further defined as “use of”, “influence over”, “dependence on”, “benefits from” and “responsible for” (from CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals November 1996 and April 1997). There are drawbacks to this approach. The most obvious of these is that it assumes that the world is organised in groups. This is not always the case, for example in areas where households may be isolated or where resources are being used by people working alone.

Clearly it is not practical to view everyone as a stakeholder. Managers may find it useful to develop hierarchies of stakeholders. This is because not all the people affected by changes in the way that a resource is managed are direct stakeholders but some will be, most obviously those who derive their living from the mangrove, fishery, forest or waterfall. The relationship that stakeholders have with the resource can be defined under three headings; rights, responsibilities and interests (See Table 3). These three criteria can help clarify the ways in which a group relates to a natural resource management issue.

<b>Stakeholders can be said to have rights to a resource if they . . .</b>	<b>Stakeholders have responsibility for a resource if they...</b>	<b>Stakeholders have an interest in the resource if they...</b>
have a traditional link with it (either economic, cultural or social)	undertake actions that change the nature of it	have a cultural attachment to it
depend on it for their livelihood or well being	derive economic benefits from it	derive some enjoyment from it
own the land or access to it	are formally or informally managing it	are actively involved in its conservation
have been conferred rights via some legal mandate	have a statutory responsibility	have an intellectual association with it (e.g. through study)

**Table 3 Stakeholder rights, responsibilities and interests** (from CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals, November 1996 and April 1997).

There are a number of methods that practitioners use to identify stakeholders. These include:

- defining the social, economic, ecological and cultural uses of a resource, and then identifying the groups or communities impacted by those functions;
- adopting an agreed definition of the word stakeholder at the outset and then using it as a test against the various groups that have a relationship with the resource;
- looking at the conflicts that have arisen in the past surrounding the exploitation of the resource and then using those players as a starting point for future management strategies.

If the stakeholder identification is done effectively, problems later on can be avoided. It can also help managers to:

- understand the different levels at which people engage with natural resource management;
- identify the parties that are key to successful implementation;
- avoid overlooking issues and concerns that reflect community priorities;
- identify areas of potential conflict;
- reconcile parties that have different and perhaps conflicting interests;
- address underlying problems and concerns.

There is no blueprint for identifying interested parties. Involving the stakeholders themselves in the process of identifying new and emerging groups is one method that can be used. The quality of stakeholder identification can also be improved if the manager adopts analytical techniques such as trying to identify sub-groups (whose views maybe harder to elicit) within larger groups. It is important to recognise the dynamism of stakeholders. They may experience changes of opinion or leadership and new stakeholders may emerge. Managers need to be alert to these changes and feed them into the management process.

#### *The Soufriere Marine Management Area*

*The town of Soufriere is located on the west coast of St. Lucia. Nearly 4,000 people live there, earning a living from the coastal and marine resources. The town was previously dependent on cocoa, citrus, bananas and coconuts, but in the late 1970s the price of these commodities fell. Farming now serves local demand rather than the export market. The coastal area around Soufriere has always been an important fishing zone with 100 full time and 50 part time resident fishers in the area. Over the past 20 years Soufriere has become one of St Lucia's premier tourist destinations because of the variety of attractions, which include diving and yachting as well as volcanic features, forests and waterfalls.*

*Competition for use of coastal resources gradually intensified between fishers and recreational users. This manifested itself in a number of conflicts, notably between dive operators and pot fishers over reef areas and between seine fishers and yacht owners moored along fishing beaches. Meanwhile the resource base was being degraded as a result of over-fishing, reef destruction from indiscriminate anchoring and land based pollution. A management solution was called for that would rationalise different interests and move towards the sustainable use of the resource base.*

*The Soufriere Marine Management Area (SMMA) was officially launched in July 1995 with powers devolved from the Government of St Lucia, on the basis of an agreement between the major stakeholders. It uses fisheries legislation to manage the area in a sustainable way while raising revenue through charging recreational users fees to cover the costs of the SMMA, which employs a manager and four rangers, who patrol the area.*

*A stakeholder analysis was instrumental in identifying issues and interested parties during the planning stages of the development of the SMMA. Some conflicts arise in the area periodically, but these are inherent when rights to previously freely available resources are regulated. On reflection many feel that the early stakeholder analysis did not go far enough in exploring the various sub-groups that were crowded out by those that were most effective in getting their concerns prioritised. The experience of that exercise proved that it was easy to identify groups that wanted to be a part of the process but much harder to do so for those who did not see it as worthwhile or perceived it as a threat.*

The next section focuses on a participatory approach to resource management that is based on the principle of collaboration. Collaborative management (or co-management), combines a commitment to community participation with the concept of partnership between the institutions best placed to manage resources. It is a regime that offers a way of working that allows for a mix of ownership and management regimes. It also recognises that both resource users and institutions (e.g. government departments) are essential actors in the search for management solutions.

***References and reading***

Brown, N.A. 1997. Devolution of authority over the management of natural resources: the Soufriere Marine Management Area, St. Lucia. Caribbean Centre for Development Administration and the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute. 21 pp.

## Section 5

### Collaborative management -what it is and how it can work

Collaborative management, or co-management, is based on the concept of partnership. It starts from the premise that resources are sometimes best protected by an alliance of stakeholders. That partnership is bounded by physical, functional, legal and institutional parameters and uses a management regime that works to agreed procedures and priorities. Co-management therefore represents a progression of participation from consultation exercises to the active involvement of stakeholders in the management of a natural resource

Although co-management allows for the inclusion of different stakeholders, the most common types of partnership are those constructed between the government and a non-governmental organisation (e.g. to manage a park or protected area).

Community-based organisations that represent resource users or other stakeholders are also involved in collaborative initiatives. Experience in the region has shown that resource users are most effective in managing natural resources when this is part of a joint effort with a management institution. An example of the way that such an arrangement can work is shown in the box below. However, this cannot be defined formally as co-management as there is no formal agreement between the parties that defines their rights and responsibilities. A suggested co-management agreement based on experiences from the region is attached at Appendix B.

Co-management as a regime is not universally applicable, but it can be adapted for use in public, private and communal ownership situations. It can help where:

- a) stakeholder commitment is essential for the protection of the resource;
- b) access to the resource is vital to the continued well being of a local community; and
- c) the resources at the disposal of an institution working alone cannot assure effective management.

**The protection of Leatherback turtles in Matura, North East Trinidad.**

The first records of Leatherback turtles nesting on the north east coast of Trinidad date back to the 17<sup>th</sup> Century. The Mafura Beach in Toco is now synonymous with these graceful creatures. There has been a considerable amount of research done on the turtles, most of which started in the 1960s. Some of the first studies revealed the threat to the turtles posed by poachers, who hunt them for their shells and meat.

The government's Forestry Division made attempts to protect the turtles throughout the 1980s. Legislation was put in place to protect the Leatherbacks, but the Division was hampered in its efforts to implement the law. For example fisheries statutes made provision for a six month open season, when turtle killing was permitted.

Poaching was outlawed in 1990, but the practice continued. A permit system was introduced by the Division for people wanting to use the beaches. A programme of consultation was initiated before undertaking an environmental education campaign on the need to protect turtles. During the course of community meetings a number of concerns that had more to do with the neglect of Toco than with turtles were raised by local people

Out of this series of events, a community-based organisation was established in Matura to secure access to training for guides that would be needed to make the permit system work. This group (called the Nature Seekers) has gone from strength to strength.

The number of permits issued for the beach is limited to 100. This figure has been set as the carrying capacity of the beach at Matura, which is zoned for research and recreation. The group places a high degree of emphasis on the collection of data and this has helped to establish their credibility with governmental agencies and potential sponsors. Every night two members from Nature Seekers patrol the beach, recording data, monitoring permits and sometimes performing midwifery duties for nesting turtles. These patrollers also serve as guides, briefing visitors as they come on to the beach.

The permits cost \$5 TT and are issued by the Nature Seekers. The government collects the monies for the permits and then pays the group every six months. Nature Seekers have been supported to some extent by the private sector who have provided help in kind (e.g. radio equipment, uniforms, tee-shirts, letterheads and rechargeable torch lights). The group supplements the income it receives from the government by selling tee-shirts, but it is under-resourced and costs far outweigh receipts. Each Nature Seeker pays a membership fee of \$30 TT per year to the group.

The group is looking to improve its networking with other NGOs and the way it markets itself. They want to expand their operations to generate more income. This could lead to members becoming involved in bird watching tours, bed and breakfast accommodation and selling local arts and crafts.

When asked about their success, Nature Seekers point to their fierce commitment to the protection of the Leatherbacks and the strong group identity that members share. They are now seen as a model for other community-based organisations. The group acknowledges that it still has more to do, but through its actions and the support of the Forestry Division, the Matura experience has demonstrated that joint action can achieve management objectives.

Natural resource managers from the Caribbean (CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals November 1996 and April 1997) developed a detailed list of 18 elements that could feature in a co-management agreement. These are listed on the right hand column of Table 4 and reflect the vast number of variables that can make or break a collaborative arrangement. The policy needs for co-management are summarised under the six headings in the column on the left.

Policy needs for co-management	Features of co-management that can help meet desired policy goals
<p>Equity: There should be equality based on mutual respect between the partners in determining the processes as well as the product of the co-management agreement. This implies recognition that all are not equal. Inequities need to be addressed by investing in bringing the demands and aspirations of marginalised groups to the fore.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equity between partners in determining the balance of power within a collaborative arrangement at any given time</li> <li>• Gender sensitivity</li> <li>• Sensitivity to the needs of disadvantaged groups</li> <li>• Engendering of pride and confidence, leading to empowerment</li> <li>• Capacity building for all partners</li> </ul>
<p>Transparency: All parties should operate openly, keeping each other as well as constituents informed. This should result in a clear definition of the terms of the agreement and the expectations of each party.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability for the products of the agreement</li> <li>• Transparency in the process of negotiating the agreement</li> <li>• Clear understanding of roles and responsibilities</li> <li>• Clear channels of communication and networking</li> </ul>
<p>Mutuality: There should be a shared vision and commitment through words and actions to the achievement of agreed goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mutual respect</li> <li>• Mutual understanding of goals and expectations</li> <li>• Shared vision</li> <li>• Shared responsibility</li> <li>• Active participation of all partners</li> </ul>
<p>Authority: The parties to a co-management agreement should have the necessary mandate to be included in the partnership. This refers equally to government departments, non-governmental organisations and community based organisations. The mandate can take the form of legislation or a community endorsement, but it is an important prerequisite for an agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legitimacy of the partners to participate in the agreement</li> </ul>
<p>Learning: There should be a commitment to learning from the experience gained throughout the co-management process. This will mean building in monitoring mechanisms and programmed reviews. These should provide the opportunity to assess the progress being made through the agreement and to analyse lessons from conflicts that may have arisen.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous evaluation</li> <li>• Positive use of conflict to achieve objectives</li> </ul>
<p>Conservation: Co-management is a means to an end. Although the processes are important and wider social, cultural and economic objectives may be included, a co-management agreement should be based on a commitment to the enhancement of the natural resource in question.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhancement/conservation of the resource</li> </ul>

**Table 4 Policy objectives and characteristics of co-management** (from CANARI workshop series: *Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals*, November 1996 and April 1997).

The process of participation, negotiation and dialogue will inevitably mean that co-management agreements change, depending on local circumstances. This section has aimed to define some of the features of co-management and demonstrate how it can work. The next section sets out the roles that the principal actors can play in participatory and collaborative resource management and outlines some of the policy implications of this approach.

***References and reading***

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. 1996. Collaborative management of protected areas: tailoring the approach to the context: issues in social policy. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

Renard, Y. 1991. Institutional challenges for community-based management in the Caribbean UNESCO, Nature and Resources 27(4): 4-9.

**Section 6**  
**Making co-management work - actors and policies**

The establishment of a viable co-management arrangement relies on a formal partnership between two principal actors: the body with statutory responsibility for the management of the resource (usually the government) and a managing institution (usually an NGO). In this section, the roles of those players in making co-management work are explored as well as the policies that need to be addressed.

**Government departments**

The primary party that successful co-management is dependent on is the authority originally responsible for the natural resource. Typically this will be a government department (for example with responsibility for fisheries or forestry) which may be broken into divisions that could include a wildlife or conservation section. As the agents usually vested with the authority to manage the resource, most moves towards co-management are initiated by these departments (although this does not have to be the case). The roles of these institutions can be grouped under three headings.

- Leadership: government departments are best placed to initiate policy discussions on co-management, by virtue of their real or perceived authority.
- Planning and coordination: there are instances in co-management (for example in the early stages of implementing an agreement) when it is still appropriate for a government department to take on these functions, although one of the ultimate objectives of a co-management agreement could be to share these responsibilities with NGOs/CBOs.
- Enforcement: this is a traditional role for governments and one that they are best placed to play, especially where communities are unwilling to act as the policing agent for an agreement (e.g. where it may spark intra community conflicts).

The strengths, weaknesses and needs of government departments in co-management are listed in Table 5.

<b>Government departments strengths in co-management</b>	<b>Government departments weaknesses in co-management</b>	<b>Government departments needs for co-management</b>
authority vested by statute or legislation	lack of experience of working with community groups	more effective channels of communication with communities
commitment to the management of the resource within the department	poor coordination between departments	more cross departmental working
accountable to elected representatives	short term vision driven by parliamentary time frames	acceptance of co-management across party political divides

**Table 5 Strengths, weaknesses and needs of governmental departments in co-management** (from CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals, November 1996 and April 1997).

### **Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBOs)**

There are a growing number of instances where NGOs have been delegated management responsibilities for natural resources (e.g. in parks or protected areas). Community-based Organisations (CBO) can also be a party to co-management arrangements (as in the case of the Nature Seekers in Matura). The roles that NGOs/CBOs can play in co-management can be grouped in three main categories.

- Formulating policies and plans: these institutions can broaden the debate about management options by bringing new perspectives and insights that would otherwise have been overlooked by technicians. This is most apparent when they work at policy forums or technical meetings but it can also happen indirectly through informal channels and lobbying.
- Implementation: The most visible aspect of natural resource management is often the field work and activities. This is where many NGOs/CBOs come into their own because of their specialist knowledge and proximity to the resource. Groups can help conduct research and monitoring, for example by collecting data which can reinforce management responsibilities. More controversially NGOs/CBOs can take on responsibility for enforcement. This can be especially difficult in community settings where personal ties form an important part of everyday life.
- Advocacy: NGOs/CBOs sometimes articulate the views of the people who have the most direct interest in the management of the resource. Often the communities that they work with or represent will have been excluded or marginalised from the established decision making process. This voice can help to build community concerns and aspirations into the management of the resource. In addition, the most powerful advocates for co-management as a way of working are often the members of these groups. They will therefore also have a role in convincing others of the merits of co-management.

Experience shows that NGOs/CBOs are not always equipped with the skills to fulfil these roles. Table 6 lists some of the strengths, weaknesses and needs for NGOs/CBOs in co-management

<b>NGOs/CBOs strengths in co-management</b>	<b>NGOs/CBOs weaknesses in co-management</b>	<b>NGOs/CBOs needs for co-management</b>
unity of purpose	low level of organisation lack of technical management skills	organisational development through technical assistance and training
commitment and enthusiasm	lack of finance	training in fundraising and sign-posting towards sources of funding
in situ practical expertise	overreliance on key members	a larger membership with delegated responsibilities

**Table 6 Strengths, weaknesses and needs of NGOs/CBOs in co-management** (from CANARI workshop series: *Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals*, November 1996 and April 1997).

### ***Intermediary and supporting institutions***

Institutions that are not directly a party to the type of co-management agreements discussed in this document can have an important part to play in helping these arrangements to work. These organisations are often from civil society, but government institutions can also play a part in supporting co-management.

- . Facilitation: where these institutions are seen as “neutral” they can help facilitate the processes that characterise co-management. By acting as an intermediary they can help with negotiations which can otherwise be difficult, especially where rights of access or authority are being allocated.
- . Advocacy: there are instances where intermediaries do not act in a neutral way. By acting as advocates for co-management, they can be very effective in lending weight to those within government that want to work in a collaborative way. These institutions can also help community based organisations about to embark on co-management projects to articulate concerns and demands during the negotiation of agreements.

Intermediaries can contribute positively to the processes that help make co-management arrangements work. However the terms of their involvement should be defined clearly to avoid complicating what is essentially a simple agreement between two parties.

### ***Policy Implications***

Participatory and collaborative management cannot occur in a vacuum. There has to be a policy environment that is conducive to the development of what is a relatively new discipline. This requires a sound understanding of the requirements for effective resource management, which can only come through an ongoing process of policy research and analysis. One immediate problem is the lack of capacity within resource management institutions to undertake this kind of work.

Existing policy is an essential part of the climate that can make or break participatory and collaborative approaches. Most often this will be defined by a piece of legislation (such as a Wildlife Protection Act), which may refer to provisions for delegating authority. This type of legislation can give a mandate for partnership agreements which is essential. In addition, arrangements should be underwritten by clearly drafted agreements that define the roles, rights and responsibilities of the parties involved. All too often the drafting and passing of the legislation is seen as a goal. In fact experience has shown that the negotiation processes between the various parties and the institutional arrangements put in place for the management of the resource are as important as the legislation that underpins collaborative agreements.

In most cases the process of policy development in this field should be participatory. It should be facilitated and allow for shared policy formulation and review. The process should also make provision for managing conflicts that arise between parties. This way of working will pose challenges for some institutions that may not have the necessary skills and experience. Institutions may have to look to external agencies to provide the specialist help they need.

The process of policy development is made more difficult if there are no precedents. There is a need for more examples and case studies from the Caribbean, which government departments and NGOs alike can refer to while they are developing participatory and collaborative strategies. These cases will not only serve the purpose of providing technical information on the mechanics of arrangements, but also serve to affirm the legitimacy of the practice. Some case studies can be obtained from CANARI.

Finally, co-management should result in a materially improved quality of life for the people that rely on the resource. In policy terms this will entail including a broad range of factors and variables in the policy making process. This means that the management of the resource may not always be the primary policy objective, but one among several that reflect community aspirations.

***References and reading***

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. with D. Buchan (eds). 1997. Beyond fences: seeking social sustainability in conservation. Vols I and II, International Union of Nature Conservation. Gland, Switzerland.

Renard, Y. 1991. Institutional challenges for community-based management in the Caribbean. UNESCO, Nature and Resources 27(4): 4-9.

## Conclusion

At the 1996/1997 CANARI workshop and subsequent gatherings of resource management professionals, there has been common agreement that co-management requires a number of variables to succeed. In addition to the need for policies and processes, practitioners have cited the amount of time it takes to develop and implement agreements, as well as the need for participatory skills and methods on the part of institutions involved in co-management.

Time: resource managers often find themselves having to work within the constraints of projects. The schedules that these include and the task orientated nature of project outputs are anathema to the complex processes that characterise the development of co-management, which are by their very nature difficult to predict. They call for flexible and adaptive management responses that projects are often too rigid to accommodate.

**Capacity building:** Working in a participatory way represents a challenge for many institutions, not least of all because it calls for new techniques and approaches. Capacity building (the processes of improving the abilities of institutions to achieve their mandates as well as gearing up for new ways of working) programmes could include stakeholder analysis, participatory action research, institutional design, financing, communications, assessment and monitoring of impacts and sustainable resource use. NGOs and government departments both have a role to play in providing these services through training, technical assistance, grants, advice and information aimed at improving the capacity for participatory resource management.

The opportunities for adopting participatory approaches to managing natural resources have never been greater. A wide range of institutions is now calling for engagement with stakeholders and working in partnership. CANARI is committed to providing assistance to those working in this field through continued research, analysis and advocacy. The challenge is to make this happen. This report has aimed to record some of the ideas generated by managers from the region, that could help practitioners to achieve participatory goals. It has cautioned against the idea of blueprints, but is premised on a recognition of the need for guidance in what is an emerging and complex field.

Ends.

## Appendix A

### Participants at CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals November 1996/ April 1997

Participant	Affiliation
Nicole Brown	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute
Ruperto Chaparro	University of Puerto Rico Sea Grant College Program
Gillian Cooper	The Environmental Awareness Group
Robyn Cross	National Parks Section, Forestry Division Government of Trinidad and Tobago
Nicolas Drayton	BVI National Parks Trust
Victor F. Gomez V.	Grupo Jaragua Inc.
Alan G. Joseph	Forestry Department, Ministry of Agriculture Government of Grenada
Vijay Krishnarayan	Belize Enterprise for Sustainable Technology
Rosa Lamelas	Centro para la Conservacion y Ecodesarrollo de la Bahia de Samana (CEBSE)
Marie-Ange Louis	Environment Section, Ministry of Planning, Development, and Environment Government of St. Lucia
Susan Otuokon	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
Celeste St. Hill	United Nations Development Programme
Carlton Sambury	Eastern Caribbean Institute for Agriculture and Forestry
Joseph C. Smith	BVI National Parks Trust
Katy Thacker	Negril Coral Reef Preservation Society
Roger Anthony Williams	Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park

**Appendix B**  
**Framework for a suggested co-management agreement**

Sections	Contents
Title	Names of the parties to the agreement Date of the agreement
Preamble	Background/context Philosophy behind the agreement (based on the principles as understood by parties) Objectives and expected outcomes of the agreement
Definition of scope (what are we managing/protecting)	Geographic boundaries Legislation or statute under which the agreement exists Time frame over which resource should be managed Duration of the agreement Biological resource being managed Physical resource being managed
Objectives of the collaborative activity	(Specific/Measurable/Achievable/Resourced/Timed)
Description of the partners to the agreement	Background Mandate Rights Roles Responsibilities
Procedures	Technical management Administration Decision-making Conflict management Review/evaluation and modification Termination of agreement
Provisions for payment of partners	Who gets paid; for what; how much; from where; by whom; when
Legal framework	Laws, statutes, conditions that govern the agreement

*from CANARI workshop series: Principles of Participation and Co-management for Resource Management Professionals November 1996 and April 1997).*

## Caribbean Natural Resources Institute

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) is a regional non-governmental organisation concerned with issues of conservation, environment, and sustainable development in the insular Caribbean.

CANARI's mission is to create avenues for the equitable participation and effective collaboration of Caribbean communities and institutions in managing the use of natural resources critical to development.

The Institute has specific interest and extensive experience in the identification and promotion of participatory and collaborative approaches to natural resource management.

### **Trinidad**

Femandes Industrial Centre  
Eastern Main Road  
Laventille, Trinidad  
Tel.: (868) 626-6062  
Fax: (868) 626-1788  
canari@tsstt.net.tt

### **St. Croix**

P.O. Box 644  
Christiansted, St. Croix  
U.S. Virgin Islands 00821  
Tel.: (340) 773-9854  
Fax: (340) 773-5770  
canari@islands.vi

### **St. Lucia**

P.O. Box VF 383  
Vieux Fort  
St. Lucia  
Tel.: (758) 454-6060  
Fax: (758) 454-5 188  
canari@candw.lc