**CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE**

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

CANARI

**REPORT ON CARIBBEAN COMPONENT OF IIED'S *USER GUIDE TO EFFECTIVE TOOLS AND METHODS FOR INTEGRATING ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT***

<u>Part I</u>

## 1. Introduction

This report summarises feedback from about 70 Caribbean people who were interviewed and surveyed between November 2007 and April 2008 to assess Caribbean interest in, and opinions on the content of, a proposed User Guide to effective approaches (tools, tactics, methods) for integrating environmental considerations into all aspects of development decision-making ("environmental mainstreaming").

The User Guide project is being coordinated at the global level by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). IIED identified the need for a User Guide because a wide variety of tools, tactics and methods for environmental mainstreaming exists but there is little independent guidance as to which are appropriate and under what circumstances. There was also concern that too many tools were being 'pushed' by external interests and little was known about whether other more culturally relevant approaches had been successfully used.

In order to produce a Guide that is relevant to a wide range of potential and actual users, input was sought from a variety of countries, sectors and user types, with the survey form available on IIED's website[1] providing the basis for inputs, discussion and the identification of relevant case studies. Current participating regions/countries are Caribbean (Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago); Chile; Ghana; India; Kenya; Phillipines; Rwanda; South Africa and selected countries in Central-Southern Europe.

It is envisaged that the User Guide will provide an overview of a small selection (approximately 30) of the approaches to environmental mainstreaming that users have found most effective and in which contexts. In addition to providing short profiles of the selected approaches, the Guide will use case studies to examine the factors that influence the selection and effectiveness of the most appropriate approach, e.g.:
* what are the environmental management challenges or tasks for which a particular approach has proven most effective?
* what is the broader context in which the environmental mainstreaming is taking place and how does this affect the selection of the approach?
* who is involved - users, stakeholders and institutions? And how does this affect the selection of the approach?
* how can tools, tactics and methods be most effectively applied?

However, this approach will be reviewed and validated by the project steering committee in the light of the findings of the country surveys.

The Caribbean component was coordinated by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI). CANARI also has a representative on the international steering committee which comprises both

---

[1] This survey is the one that was developed in January 2008 by consensus of the global steering committee. Prior to that, the original version had been incrementally modified by CANARI to respond to concerns of those interviewed. Results from the different focus groups are therefore not directly comparable but have been incorporated into the most appropriate section in Part 2.

potential users of the Guide and the donors and governmental and non-governmental agencies that support them, including those involved in conducting the surveys.

CANARI is an independent regional non-profit organisation whose mission is to promote equitable participation and effective collaboration in managing the natural resources critical to development.  Over the past 20 years CANARI has developed a thorough knowledge of issues in the insular Caribbean relating to sustainable and participatory natural resource management, rural livelihoods and associated sectors such as tourism and agriculture. The findings of its research and analysis in these fields have been disseminated throughout the region through publications, its website www.canari.org, technical assistance and training.

As it was not possible within the time and budget to conduct surveys in all the islands of the Caribbean, CANARI selected three countries for the initial survey phase -Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago.  However, it is intended that a wider regional meeting will be held to validate the findings and to solicit input from other islands in the Caribbean.


## 2.  Methodology and evolution of methodology

The main approach to getting feedback in the Caribbean was through **half-day sectoral focus groups[2]**, facilitated by senior CANARI staff and rapporteured either by another staff member or an in-country consultant.  Focus groups were selected as the most cost-effective approach in a region where responses to questionnaires sent by mail or email is usually poor but collective oral discussion and analysis  is usually productive and collective analysis is richer than individual input. The focus groups proved to be an excellent strategy for identifying the wide range of approaches being used and in what context, and for stimulating debate about drivers, constraints and gaps**.**   The focus groups were complemented by a few individual interviews and follow-up phone calls.

The following were identified by CANARI as the **main groups of actual or potential users of environmental mainstreaming tools** in the participating countries:

- o **the private sector**: invitations were sent to representatives from the main areas of economic activity (energy, construction, manufacturing, tourism) and the consultancy firms that are contracted to carry out environmental mainstreaming processes such as impact assessments and public consultations;

- o **civil society organisations (CSOs):** where possible invitations were sent to a diverse range of non-governmental and community-based organisations, some with a specific environmental mandate and others with a more general developmental focus (e.g. YMCA).  However, in Barbados, the coordinator/facilitator could only identify a few CSOs which he felt had the capacity and/or experience to participate in the focus group discussion and survey;

- o **government agencies** involved in environmental protection, natural resource management (e.g. forestry, fisheries, water resource management agencies), physical planning, social and community development, land settlement;

- o **academics** were also invited, either to the private sector or the civil society focus group session, depending on whether the focus was primarily on their consultancy or their outreach/capacity building role.

In the case of the private sector in Barbados and Jamaica, an intermediary such as a Chamber of Commerce or trade association, helped with the selection of the proposed invitees.

The focus groups followed a common pattern:
- o introduction to CANARI and overview of the project;
- o discussion of what "environmental mainstreaming" means and the extent to which either the concept or the practice exists in the country/region;

---

[2] With the exception of the Tobago meeting where all sectors were consulted together.

- brainstorming of approaches to environmental mainstreaming which participants had used or seen used in the country.  (In the first three focus groups the tools were then categorised into the various categories then listed on the survey but this was abandoned when the survey form was revised.);
- individual completion of the survey form;
- feedback on the process of completing the survey and any thoughts this had stimulated;
- discussion, to the extent possible within the remaining time, of drivers, constraints, gaps and the examples which participants had cited of personal involvement in environmental mainstreaming processes.

The survey form was modified a number of times by CANARI in response to early feedback that:
- participants were unwilling to fill out the form as they did not feel they had the authority to do so on behalf of their organisations (first meeting with Trinidad government sector);
- the form was repetitive and ambiguous and did not really provide an opportunity to address the complexities of when and why a particular tool may be useful or not.

The form was subsequently modified more comprehensively following the global steering committee meeting in January 2008.  The revised format resulted in richer and more detailed responses but has also made direct comparisons between the feedback from earlier and later sessions a bit more difficult.

CANARI then produced a report of each meeting for circulation to the participants (Appendices 1-10).

Although relatively successful in terms of the quality of the debate and of participants' inputs, the exercise to date (mobilising participants, facilitation and rapporteuring, collecting inputs and following up with participants, analysis and synthesis of the inputs) has been much more time-intensive that CANARI had anticipated in its original proposal and has precluded follow-up with all participants who cited interesting case studies or examples.  However, it is hoped that some of these gaps can be plugged during the national follow-up meetings.

**3.  Turnout**
Turnout was varied as shown in Table 1 below.  In all cases, the initial rate of response to the invitation was poor and considerable effort was expended on following up with potential invitees, particularly in Trinidad and Tobago where CANARI has its head office.  Except in the case of the Tobago, the Trinidad civil society and the Barbados government meetings, representation from the broader development sector (e.g., social development, community development, poverty reduction, rural development) was poor.   This tends to validate the perception which emerged from all the focus groups (see Section 4 Findings) that "environmental mainstreaming" is still being driven almost entirely by the environmental sector and has not really been internalised into national or sectoral strategic and operational planning or programme implementation

**Table 1**

| COUNTRY | Private sector | | Civil society | | Government | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Invited | Attended | Invited | Attended | Invited | Attended |
| **Barbados** | 11 | 1 | 6 | 9* | 34 | 11 |
| **Jamaica** | 20 | 6 | 15 | 3 | 44 | 6 |
| **Trinidad** | 34 | 16 | 25 | 9 | 20 | 5 |
| | **All sectors** | | | | | |
| **Tobago** | 36 | 12 | | | | |

* Four people from the same youth organisation attended.

**4.  Findings**

a.  General

There was broad consensus from all the groups that:

i. **the term "environmental mainstreaming" is not widely used in the Caribbean**. Although individual interpretations varied slightly (see Part 2), they broadly fell under one or both of the following:

- the way environmental issues are brought to the attention of decision makers; and
- the way environmental considerations are incorporated into decision making.

ii. although there is **increasing recognition of the need for environmental mainstreaming,** and this is reflected in policy and legislation, **it is not a widespread "world view",** particularly at the level of the political directorate and "the general public". **Lack of political will** consistently appeared as one of the major constraints to effective environmental mainstreaming while **values of** individuals and companies were amongst the most frequently cited drivers.

iii. for environmental mainstreaming to be effective, respondents thought much more effort was needed in the following areas:

- **convincing politicians** to see effective environmental/natural resource management as an integral part of, rather than a barrier to, economic and social development. In the words of one participant from Jamaica, "*the view that 'environmentalists' are 'anti-development' too often prevents meaningful engagement even before the specific facts and issues are discussed*";
- **public education and awareness** (linked both to changing practice and to building the constituency of potential advocates);
- **improving the cohesiveness and capacity of civil society to act as effective advocates and lobbyists.** Stakeholder demands, advocacy, lobbying and protests consistently emerged among the top 5 approaches cited by participants from all sectors but civil society was particularly self-critical of its failure to form effective coalitions, except occasionally in response to a crisis. Few solutions to this were posited however and there was often a sense that it was someone else's fault (e.g. 'the elite NGOs)**;**
- **improving** (often but not always correlated with formalising) **institutional linkages between different agencies and sectors;**
- **building technical capacity** for environmental mainstreaming processes (see vii below)
- **improving access to information / sharing of information / organisation of information (e.g. common databases)**

iv. most environmental mainstreaming contexts demand **a mix of approaches/tools rather than a single tool**, usually a technical tool (such as an EIA or GIS mapping) in conjunction with participatory processes. At the level of an individual agency or organisation, it is important to employ **a mix of strategic** (e.g. visioning, strategic plans) and **operational approaches** (budgets, annual work plans) both as internal guidance and as a means of getting buy-in from other agencies such as Ministries of Finance;

v. **effective process** – and in particular consultative processes and stakeholder participation in planning, implementation, monitoring and enforcement – **is the most important factor in determining the long-term success** of environmental mainstreaming initiatives;

vi. **the availability of relevant data and information in a format that can be understood by all stakeholders is essential but rare in the Caribbean context**. Data constraints cited include:

- **failure to collect on a consistent long-term basis relevant data** at the appropriate geographic or demographic scale;
- **inaccessibility of data**, either as a matter of protocol (e.g. data collected under a paid consultancy) or, more frequently, as a result of unwillingness to share and "turfism";

- **data presented in formats that are incomprehensible to those who are ostensibly 'consulted',** a particularly common complaint from civil society in relation to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs).

vii. in all three countries, there is **insufficient, or insufficiently skilled, human resource capacity**, notably in the following areas:

- **ability to conduct high quality impact assessments.** EIAs are now used for most medium or large scale physical developments but there is a widespread perception that the quality is poor, including in some of the groups that contained consultants who work on EIAs.
- **collection, storage and analysis of spatial data,** particularly GIS and participatory GIS;
- **conflict management**
- **facilitation of participatory and consultative processes**: while both internationally-driven processes (e.g. those relating to multi-lateral environmental agreements, poverty reduction strategies) and national policies and legislation increasingly require consultation of stakeholders, there is little recognition that this demands rigorous tools such as stakeholder analysis, adequate time and funding for building capacity or hiring appropriately-trained facilitators;

While most Caribbean islands have an inherent human resource capacity problem as a result of their small populations, it was felt to be particularly acute in relation to environmental mainstreaming where there is insufficient capacity to effectively meet even the statutory requirements let alone the more proactive actions needed.  Consultants often work in islands other than the one they are resident in and foreign companies or individuals are also hired but this can cause problems as a result of inadequate understanding of the culture and context.


b. <u>When, where, why and how environmental mainstreaming is taking place in the Caribbean</u>

In terms of context, **physical development planning** emerged as by far the most prevalent area in which participants perceived environmental mainstreaming to be taking place, albeit in many cases inadequately.  Other contexts cited frequently were

- development of national strategic or sectoral or agency or company plans
- restoration of degraded built or natural environment
- school or public education and awareness programmes
- meeting standards, often voluntarily (e.g. tourism 'Green Globe' standards, ISO 14000).


The areas most frequently cited as examples of conscious environmental mainstreaming were:

i. **the strengthening of legislation and or standards/guidelines in relation to the use of EIAs and other impact assessments for physical development projects**.  Trinidad and Tobago appears to have the most advanced legislation and codes of conduct for its Certificates of Environmental Clearance (CECs) and EIAs (which normally include a social impact assessment [SIA] component).  However, participants in Jamaica and Barbados also cited progress in this direction.

The requirement for an EIA usually relates to a proposed physical development project of a significant size.  A government agency (such as the Environmental Management Authority (EMA) in Trinidad or the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) in Jamaica draws up the Terms of Reference and makes the final decision as to the granting of the CEC or equivalent.  The private developer or government agency leading the project then contracts consultants (typically specialist consultancy firms who put together a consortium of their own staff and independent consultants) to collect and present the data in the public consultations.

ii. **the development of other legislation and policies** that support environmental mainstreaming.  For example, Jamaica is developing a **new Act that combines planning and environmental**

5

**management** and is in the process of adopting an **SEA policy** which "*will require all relevant policies that are developed or revised to address environmental impacts*". Jamaica is also drafting a **policy relating to the divestment of government land** which includes environmental considerations. Both Jamaica and Trinidad also have a statutory requirement for **rehabilitation of quarried/mined out lands**.

iii.  the development by the relevant government agency of **National Environmental Plans, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Sustainable Land Management Plans** etc. These are often externally-stimulated through MEAs or donors such as UNDP GEF but were nevertheless generally regarded as useful, particularly if the consultative processes had been well conducted, although a couple of participants felt that there had been unnecessary duplication of effort. Some participants highlighted the fact that the initial motivation for undertaking these was often the availability of funding and consequently the political commitment to implement the plans may be weak or absent once the money has been spent. In Trinidad and Tobago, although there was some scepticism about the intrinsic value of the plans, it was noted that they had led to the development by the EMA of the **Environmental Sensitive Areas (ESA)** and **Environmentally Sensitive Species Rules (ESS)**, which have been effectively applied, notably in moving forward protected areas planning and management. Participants in Tobago also noted that the declaration of the Buccoo Reef ESA had been used as a strategic tool to *"force environmental considerations"* into a proposed adjacent development

iv.  **national strategic planning processes** such as the Vision 2020 process in Trinidad and Tobago or the Barbadian Prime Minister's commitment to "Greening the Economy". Opinions varied widely, however, as to whether these reflected a real political commitment to change, with Barbadians more sanguine than Trinidadians. Several Trinidad and Tobago participants who had been involved in the multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder consultative process relating to the environmental component of Vision 2020 expressed disappointment that the final Vision 2020 document reflected so little of their input.

v.  integration of environmental issues into **national school curricula**, notably in Jamaica where environmental issues have been *"incorporated throughout the curriculum for Grades 1-9"*

vi.  adoption by businesses of **international standards**, with **ISO 14000** being the most frequently mentioned. It was noted that this has a knock-on effect since it demands similar standards throughout the supply chain.

vii.  **legal challenges:** although there have been relatively few of these to date in the Caribbean, they were seen by participants, and particularly civil society participants, to have great potential. In a landmark case in Jamaica in 2006, a high court judge ruled in favour of Northern Jamaica Conservation Association (NJCA), Jamaica Environment Trust (JET) and four individuals in a Judicial Review case concerning the granting of an environmental permit for part of a planned 1,918-room hotel in Runaway Bay. Trinidad also has an Environmental Commission which acts as the court for legal challenges and the process has been used on at least one occasion (unsuccessfully) by a civil society organisation to object to the granting to an energy company of a Certificate of Environmental Clearance.

viii.  **lobbying** and **advocacy**, mainly by civil society and the general public. It was suggested by some participants that lobbying could be opportunistic, e.g. seizing the opportunity presented by meeting a Minister or other decision-maker at a social or official event to raise a particular environmental issue or matter. It was noted that such opportunities may not present enough time to have quality discussions but may pave the way for arranging a meeting specifically to address the issue in question. It was noted by several participants in each country that advocacy tends to be reactive rather than proactive. Reasons cited included:

o  the fact that lack of funding and human resources make it difficult for NGOs to continually investigate and research environmental issues so that they are in a position to take early action; and

- the failure of civil society organisations to effectively pool their resources on a consistent basis. All the surveyed countries appeared to suffer from divisiveness within civil society; in Trinidad this was described by one participant as "*a scism between the newer, mainly community-based organisations and an older 'elite'*".
- civil society is not effectively using the media to highlight important environmental issues (sometimes also perceived as *"media disinterest"* in the environment.

Other examples of conscious environmental mainstreaming which were noted by specific countries, sectors or individuals were:

- the DFID-funded **Jamaica Social Evaluation** which produced two progress reports that included environmental indicators;
- the introduction of **Green Procurement Guidelines** in central government policy (Jamaica);
- **national reports** such as  the State of the Environment Report, Environmental Statistical Report and sector-focused reports (e.g. mining) and their availability on the National Environment and Planning Agency (Jamaica);
- **data-sharing Memoranda of Understanding** (MOUs) between the Water Resources Agency and other government agencies with a role in water protection to set a framework for sharing of information and to have consensus on roles and functions of each agency to prevent overlap and duplication (Jamaica);
- **Cabinet Office Code of Consultation** (Jamaica)

A couple of "**voluntary" examples of environmental mainstreaming** were also cited:

- Arawak Cement in Barbados cited its voluntary adoption of the more stringent Trinidad standards and requirements with regard to EIAs.

- Multinational companies in Trinidad indicated that they often apply more rigorous standards than those required nationally as a result of their company's global policies.

Overall however, in spite of this evidence of considerable progress in terms of conscious environmental mainstreaming, the prevailing perception in all the consultations was that progress towards environmental mainstreaming was too slow (see Constraints in Part 2 for more further explanation of the reasons).

c. <u>Most popular approaches to and tools for environmental mainstreaming</u>
In the focus group brainstorming sessions on approaches to environmental mainstreaming participants were encouraged to conceptualise "tools" fairly broadly.  This was helpful in identifying the many different ways in which it is possible to foster environmental mainstreaming and stimulated interesting debate on what actually makes a particular approach effective or otherwise.  However, it may make it more difficult for the steering committee and User Guide authors to identify and select clearly defined 'tools' for inclusion in the User Guide.

For example, when participants were required by the survey to analyse in more depth what they do and which tools they find most useful, it was not always clear whether the tools and approaches they selected were those that were most useful for environmental mainstreaming or simply those which they found most helpful in carrying out their organisation's overall mandate.  There was also sometimes a disparity between the tools that they identified as effective in the section on *Matching the approach to the task at hand* and those that they chose as *The five approaches to environmental mainstreaming that you find most useful in your work and that would like to see included in a User Guide.*  The analysis that follows of the 'most useful tools' is not a statistical analysis but a synthesis and summary of what emerged from both the surveys and the focus group discussions.

The original classification of tools under the headings of *Information/Assessment;; Deliberation/ Engagement; Planning and Organising; Management/Monitoring*; and *Other* was found to be confusing by both facilitators and participants and was abandoned after the revision of the survey form.  Any categorisation of the tools is somewhat arbitrary, particularly as they are often used in tandem (and this was identified as an essential ingredient of success), but for the purposes of analysing those which emerged as consistent favourites, we have chosen to divide them into three broad categories: *process-orientated approaches; technical tools;* and *legislative and policy approaches*.

i. <u>Process oriented tools</u>

**Involving stakeholders in all aspects and at all stages of environmental mainstreaming** emerged consistently as the most critical success factor, both from representatives of the organisations that typically initiate and facilitate such processes (government, private sector, consultants) and those who felt themselves to be representatives of the wider stakeholder base (civil society).  Participants argued for example that *"feedback from stakeholders results in better decision-making, promotes compliance"* or*" [it] applies valuable ecosystem knowledge components at comparatively low cost. [This] makes decision-making more relevant"* or it "*gets information, increases awareness, facilitates discourse and transparency".*

Participants cited specific approaches that are not unique to environmental mainstreaming but which one might usefully include as tools in the proposed User Guide, such as:
- stakeholder analysis;
- participatory mapping;
- collective or community visioning;
- conflict management;
- facilitating effective multi-stakeholder processes.

However, they also alluded to other equally necessary skills and approaches that are much broader and therefore might lend themselves better to case studies and/or introductory discussion of the role that they play in effective environmental mainstreaming:
- participatory policy processes;
- partnership building;
- strategic alliances;
- volunteer mobilisation.

Participants from all sectors consistently identified ***stakeholder demands*** as a key driver and **lobbying, advocacy and protests** as key tools.  However, although a number of interesting case studies of lobbying or protest emerged (Pear Tree Bottom [Jamaica],Toco Port, Aluminium Smelter [Trinidad and Tobago]), the perceived potential of these tools seemed to be greater than their actual use.  This may explain why so many participants would like to learn from a User Guide about how to lobby and communicate more effectively.  Guidance on how to effectively sensitise and influence politicians was specifically highlighted by both civil society and government technical staff (e.g. "*How do I speak in language that influences a senior politician rather than him thinking 'who's this little boy trying to tell me the leader what to do'"*). Improved relations with the media was also highlighted by civil society.

**Multi-agency committees/interagency collaboration**
All countries and sectors identified the weakness of governmental inter-agency collaboration as a significant barrier to environmental mainstreaming, although there appeared to be more (formal and informal) interaction in Jamaica, Barbados and Tobago than in Trinidad.  It was also noted that there are still too few instances of formal institutions which effectively involve government, private sector and civil society in decision-making.   The **creation of multi-agency committees** was therefore seen as an important tool and a number of examples were cited (e.g. ESA Management Committees, Trinidad)

Participants noted that they could be particularly useful if they *"induce private sector participation"* or *"help put environmental considerations in context with other issues (e.g. health, economics etc.)"*. However, there were also caveats about the political nature of many of the appointments, particularly to State Boards, and the fact that so many of the committees were 'advisory' only.

Again, as an approach, this may be too context- and culture-specific to be easily addressed in a User Guide, but case studies could be useful as could analysis of the factors that contribute to the effective functioning of such institutions (e.g. transparent appointments, clear terms of reference, relevant competencies etc.)

### Data sharing and accessibility protocols, databases.
As noted above, the availability of relevant data consistently emerged as a constraint and consequently databases, data sharing protocols etc. were frequently cited as useful tools. However, since the inaccessibility of data was perceived to be primarily an issue of unwillingess to cede or share power, it is questionable to what extent guidance on effective database management or case studies of data sharing protocols would actually resolve the current problem in the Caribbean.

### Public education and awareness
There was a widespread perception, particularly amongst civil society participants, that more public education and awareness would lead to more effective environmental mainstreaming. A number of examples of programmes were cited, including those in schools. Education about civic rights and roles is seen as a priority in Tobago. However, some participants noted that there is currently insufficient monitoring and evaluation of longer-term outcomes to assess the effectiveness of these strategies.


ii.  Technical tools

**Impact assessments** were the most frequently cited with **EIAs** by far the most prevalent. Comparatively few participants cited personal involvement in **SIAs** or **Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs),** though the latter were described by one Jamaican participant as more effective because they *"get beyond a project-specific focus and narrow-based decision-making".*

There is therefore interest in having all three types of impact assessment described in a User Guide. However, in order to be useful, the guidance would also need to address the many criticisms levied against current EIA practices in the Caribbean, which relate mainly to process, lack of capacity, and enforcement (see Box 1 below). One suggestion that has been made in Trinidad, for example, is that the EMA should develop and fund a pool of consultants who would be available free of charge to communities who need technical help to understand the EIAs presented to them for comment. It would be interesting to know if there are case studies elsewhere of initiatives of this kind.

### Box 1: Criticisms of current EIA processes in the Caribbean

In Trinidad in particular participants were sceptical about the effectiveness of EIAs which were described by some civil society participants as *"greenwashing"* and "*designed to hoodwink communities"*. Public consultations were viewed as merely a formality without any real consultation taking place. It was felt that information was hidden from the people either by deliberate omission of environmental issues or by conveying information in maps and charts that was not comprehensible to most people and/or inaccurate *("maps lie"*).. It was also felt that too few consultations were required under the EIA rules and that these were sometimes *"deliberately held at inconvenient times"* (e.g. Carnival or Christmas or simply the wrong time of day), so that many people were unable or unwilling to attend. The Trinidad and Tobago EIA process itself was described as "*too cumbersome and not easily understandable by the general population*".

The private sector in Trinidad also concurred that consultations were not properly undertaken and that consultants were not required to produce information that could be analysed effectively by community members. It was felt that more effort needs to go into building consensus on the terms of reference for

EIAs.  Consultants were described as '*selling*' a particular position rather than genuinely '*consulting*'. Moreover, while the number of public consultations had increased, meaningful and genuine participation was thought to remain rare, fuelling the widespread perception that the outcome of the consultation is already *'a done deal'* for the government and developers. It was suggested that mechanisms for genuine participation could and should be improved, notably by incorporating sufficient time and funding in project plans, although this is likely to be resisted by developers who already see the CEC requirements as over-onerous.

Other weaknesses that were highlighted were the poor quality of many EIAs, the lack of qualified people to conduct or critique them and, above all, the fact that the implementation of the agreed EIA conditions is inadequately monitored or enforced, which ultimately renders the whole process pointless.

Another criticism of EIAs was that they are often implemented piecemeal rather than being conducted for an entire area, which means that a developer gets permission for a series of individual developments without the cumulative impact being assessed.

EIAs produce a high volume of data and there needs to be some form of screening process.  Also, the data generated under EIAs is not stored in an accessible and easily searchable format, which can lead to duplication and lack of transparency.

**Risk assessments** were also mentioned quite frequently as useful tools, particularly by the private sector, but few of the case studies or examples provide insights into how and when these are being applied.

**Economic tools** were mentioned frequently although those cited as being widely used, particularly in the government sector, fell mainly into the area of **budgeting** and **cost-benefit analysis**.  However, **economic valuation of environmental goods and services** emerged as a tool which is not currently being widely used but which all participants would like to know more about and see profiled in the Guide. Another area of expressed interest is the effective use of **economic incentives** (e.g. tax breaks, incentives, payments for environmental services).  It was noted that perverse incentives are still in place, for example in relation to agricultural incentives which support pesticide use.

Tools which highlight the **spatial context** of environmental damage/benefits were considered by government and the private sector to be extremely useful in communicating environmental messages. Maps, aerial photographs and GIS images, for example, "*can be understood by everyone regardless of literacy levels and education*". While civil society broadly concurred, it was noted that more emphasis needs to be placed on tools and methods that facilitate the engagement of stakeholders in the data collection process not just in the review or analysis of data collected by others.  The Guide should therefore focus as much as possible on accessible and affordable approaches to collecting and analysing spatial data. In Tobago civil society organisations were trained and given GIS equipment but still don't use it because of capacity issues .

**Environmental quality monitoring and standards, e.g. ISO 14000** were cited by a number of the private sector respondents as a tool for effective environmental mainstreaming both within the organisation and beyond.  Existing **business supply-chains** were seen as tools to mainstream environmental considerations where industries insist that contractors comply with high environmental standards.
However, in the Trinidad discussion participants thought that **variable standards** were necessary for different sized companies because small and medium enterprises often do not have the resources to meet the standards or requirements of large multinational corporations.

**Environmental modelling** was also highlighted for its use in predicting future outcomes but few examples were cited.

iii. Legislative and policy approaches

**Legal and regulatory frameworks** were considered extremely important, particularly where there is also a mechanism for **legal challenges** but their effectiveness is severely constrained by the:

- slow and difficult process required to enact new legislation where there are gaps in existing laws and regulations;

- overlapping and contradictory legislation and policies;

- lack of implementation (e.g. regulations not enacted in timely fashion) and weak enforcement of environmental laws.

While some examples of specific policies were provided (see 4b and Part 2), participants again identified the process by which the policy was developed as the most important factor.  There is a growing commitment by governments to develop policies in a consultative fashion but the effectiveness of the practice varies widely.

d. Indigenous or locally-developed tools

Few examples were provided of indigenous or locally-developed tools and those that were cited were very context- or culture-specific (e.g. the Rasta cultural practices that preceded the development of the Fondes Amandes Community Reforestation Project).  However, it was clear from the discussions that participants are very conscious of the fact that externally-developed tools are not always appropriate for a Caribbean or small island context, particularly if they are resource intensive or assume the support of the political directorate.  Consequently, where possible, they adapt them as they go along and many participants noted ways in which they would approach a similar task slightly differently in future – almost always by increasing the upfront consultation and involvement of stakeholders.

However, when participants were asked in the survey whether a tool was locally or externally developed, they almost always chose 'local', even though the basic tool or approach was in reality often developed and used elsewhere.  This perhaps implies that what has become indigenous in the Caribbean is the ability to adapt or 'creolise' approaches developed and/or imposed by external agencies in such a way that they become useful to the local context.  However, it must also be noted that not all tools fare so well, and several participants noted the phenomenon of toolkits "sitting on shelves", either because they did not seem relevant or because inadequate effort and funding had been invested in building the capacity to use them.

**5. Conclusions and recommendations**
a) User Guide

In general, it did not appear that people were consciously or systematically assessing a range of tools in order to determine which would be most appropriate to the specific context.  Selection appeared to be based primarily on:

- legislative (e.g. EIAs) or business/market requirements (e.g. standards);

- the user's familiarity and comfort with the tool (i.e. a preference for the known over the unknown and untested). Although the cost in time or resources did not clearly emerge as a key factor it may be a factor in determining what people are comfortable with;

- promotion of and funding by external agencies (e.g. donors, MEAs) of a particular approach (e.g. national biodiversity strategy and action plans; national environmental plans, national plans for sustainable land management).

Participants varied in the extent to which they were enthusiastic about the idea of a User Guide.  Some thought it would be very helpful, particularly in relation to tools such as economic valuation of

environmental goods and services for which they saw potential but did not adequately understand. The idea of case studies of culturally relevant 'best practices' was also widely endorsed.

However, it is equally clear that the perceived barriers to environmental mainstreaming in the Caribbean relate primarily to factors, such as the need for an enabling framework of policies and legislation, and better enforcement, which would not be addressed by the User Guide as currently conceptualised. Some participants therefore thought that its utility would be limited and there would be "*a danger of it ending up on shelf"*.

CANARI therefore endorses IIED's suggestion that there should be further discussion on the focus and content of the Guide. The Caribbean input would indicate that the profiling of tools should be retained but that there should be greater emphasis than originally envisaged on:
- analysis of the factors that create an enabling environment for environmental mainstreaming and the cultural and other barriers to achieving this;
- contexts that provide opportunities for environmental mainstreaming;
- process- and communication-oriented tools;
- case studies, notably ones that are relevant to small island states.

b) Other next steps
CANARI and IIED have agreed to hold follow-up meetings both at the national level (i.e. a meeting in Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados) and one at the regional level. The survey data is currently weak in that it does not adequately reflect the views of those perceived to be "unconverted" to environmental mainstreaming since it proved difficult to attract the broader development constituency to the focus group meetings. It will therefore be important to allow sufficient mobilisation time to try to attract participants from these sectors to the national follow-up meetings. These meetings should also be planned and held after consensus has been built at the global level on the revised content of the User Guide.

The regional meeting would be the final step in the Caribbean project, designed both to validate the overall findings and get input from countries not previously consulted. It would also provide an opportunity to involve locally-based donor agencies, who have expressed considerable interest in the User Guide since they are concerned both about the slow pace of environmental mainstreaming and the fact that so many of the donor-sponsored "toolkits" sit unused on shelves. Once a timeframe has been agreed with IIED, CANARI will explore the potential of holding the regional meeting in conjunction with an existing regional meeting to maximise participation.


## PART 2: DETAILED ANALYSIS OF SURVEY FOCUS GROUP RESPONSES

6. **Definitions**
   a. Environmental mainstreaming
   - As noted above, the term itself is not widely used but was related by participants to expressions that are used in the Caribbean such as *"greening"* development or the economy or "*a joined up approach"* to development. Most of the definitions provided fell within the definitions adopted by the project e.g:
     - *"the process by which environmental considerations are brought to bear in a whole system approach to social and economic development decision-making process"* (This respondent noted that she felt this was the wrong focus since "*it implies that 'environment' is at margins, whereas there should be good policy making processes incorporated in a sustainable development framework"*).
     - "*incorporating environmental issues within standard planning and operating procedures of organisations, government and individuals"*

- *the incorporation of environmental considerations to ensure these considerations are central in decision making; and the filtration of these values through all levels of society.*

Others defined it more in an organizational or institutional context, e.g.

- *pulling together of organisations to address environmental concerns, identify threats to the environment, and jointly implement measures to effect sustainable development island-wide;*
- *collating of materials and resources in such a way that data is easily accessible to the relevant persons or entities;*
- *defining the role and position of environmental performance in the overall organisation*.

b. Tools

In general, participants' initial response to the concept of "tools" was to cite formal technical tools such as EIAs, GIS, economic valuation etc. However, once consensus was built that the discussion should include the full gamut of approaches that are used for environmental mainstreaming, participants rapidly contributed to an extensive list of tools that are actually used and deemed valuable (see individual focus group reports at Appendix 1-10)

## 7. Conscious efforts towards mainstreaming

The majority of these are synthesised in Part 1 of this report but are listed here in more detail and by country (in no particular order of importance). It should be noted that the surveys administered in the early stages of the project did not specifically ask the question about environmental mainstreaming efforts at the national level which may have skewed the results, particularly in the case of Barbados where the question was not asked of the public sector and the private sector and civil society consultations were small. However, even in the later version of the survey, a surprisingly high number of respondents did not answer this question or put 'none'.

### *Jamaica*

- standardisation/guidelines for preparation of EIAs;
- strengthening of legislation: new Act that combines planning and environmental management;
- EIA processes and attempts to secure public participation/comment on them;
- national curricula: Grades 1-9 include environmental issues throughout;
- introduction of national SEA policy that requires all applicable policies being developed or revised to address environmental impacts;
- DFID-funded Jamaica Social Evaluation produced two progress reports including environmental indicators;
- Introduction of Green Procurement Guidelines in central government policy;
- Reports: State of the Environment, Environmental Statistical Report – sector focused, e.g. last one mining; annual Jamaica National Environmental action Plan reports on actions taken (JNEAP), all available on NEPA website;
- Data MOUs between Water Resources Agency and all other government agencies involved in water protection to set a framework for sharing of information and to have consensus on roles and functions of each agency to prevent overlapping;
- land use is encouraged for best results – not just economic and social but environmental as well
- drafting of government land divestment policy including environmental considerations through policy analysis, visioning, monitoring and evaluation (the success of this was attributed to multi-stakeholder participation);
- statutory requirement for rehabilitation of mined out lands;
- Cabinet Office Code of Consultation.

### *Trinidad and Tobago*

- requirement for major developments to have a Certificate of Environmental Clearance (CEC) and EIA including social impact component;

- incorporation of public consultation into EIA process;
- Vision 2020 national strategic plan with environmental component;
- national environmental plans such as the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, National Environmental Plan;
- Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) and Environmentally Sensitive Species Rules;
- public education programmes via the Forestry Division and Environmental Management Authority;
- development of new Forest and Protected Areas policies, including sectoral and public consultative processes;
- becoming signatories to multi-lateral environmental agreements;
- increasing government commitment to public consultation on all new policies (although it was also noted by others that there had been none on the new Quarry Policy or on the decision no longer to require smaller quarry operators to apply for a CEC, a retrograde step for the environment);
- increasing recognition of the value of and institutional arrangements for civil society participation in natural resource management (e.g. ESA Management Committees);
- NGO lobbying and awareness raising, through channels such as radio programmes, newspaper columns, newsletters, petitions, internet, public consultations etc.;
- environmental education in schools;
- *Sustainable Seafood Awareness Campaign*, an initiative of The Travel Foundation in Tobago.

### *Barbados*
- Surveys of resource users' perceptions of coral reef health and valuation of coastal resources;
- Commitment of the then Prime Minister to "greening the economy";
- Environmental mainstreaming within organisations, e.g.
  - National Trust has environmental subcommittee that checks all projects before submission to its Council
  - Arawak cement certified to ISO 14000 though not legally required; HSE issues given top priority at all meetings held throughout the group. In the absence of local environmental regulations, Trinidad legislation is used for guidance when monitoring activities are being carried out.

### *Regional*
- Caribbean Tourism Organisation recently completed a final draft of its "Regional Policy Framework for More Sustainable Tourism Development in the Caribbean" which has identified environment as one of the key thematic areas. Environmental issues are also integrated into areas related to health and safety, security, disaster risk mgt, climate change etc.;
- Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies, University of the West Indies, Cave Hill, Barbados, though its environmental curriculum, which attracts students from throughout the region, but particularly through its outreach programme (demand driven);

**8. Drivers**
  **a) Personal**
  - Most participants who responded to this question in the revised survey selected **personal values** as one of the top 3 drivers.
  - The next three most popular responses were:
    - **actual or potential environmental events;**
    - **risk assessment;**
    - **legislation, regulations and requirement.**
  - Several participants also selected **company/business plans/objectives;**
  - Other drivers selected by at least one participant were **organisational values, international commitments, donor conditions, traditional/cultural**

Drivers identified under 'Other'
- o "***visibility of impacts of poor decision making***"
- o "***personal understanding that non-action on environment and sustainability issues can be detrimental, irreversible and long lastingly damaging to global environment***"

### b) <u>Organisational</u>

Two drivers emerged as clear leaders and were selected by participants in all sectors:

- **Legislation/statutory requirements;**
- **Organisational values.**

Three other drivers were widely selected (in this order) and again there was a fair amount of consistency across the sectors

- **Stakeholder demands**
- **Company plans**
- **Actual or potential environmental events and issues** (hurricanes, pollution, deforestation, global climate change, flooding, storms, landslides)

After that, participants selected in the following order:

- **International commitments**
- **Risk management**
- **Donor or lender conditions:** although this was relatively low in the list of drivers, several of the programmes mentioned as national examples of environmental mainstreaming are externally funded and therefore presumably influenced by donors e.g. ENACT Jamaica (CIDA), JAPEV (DFID) .

It was also noted by participants in Trinidad that commitments to international conventions, combined with access to funding (*"we are beggars"*) is driving the national agenda, e.g. *"[otherwise] we would not be discussing protected areas or endangered species".* However they, and several other participants, noted that because signature of these conventions is driven by the desire for money, they do not necessarily reflect real 'internalisation' or commitment at national level.

Only a couple of people mentioned in this context (as opposed to personal values):

- **Personal values**
- **Traditional/cultural reasons**

Participants in the Trinidad NGO focus group identified the following as the most important drivers:

- **Leadership**
- **Management**
- **Capacity**
- **Policy**
- **Political will**
- **Openness, transparency, accountability**

Other drivers mentioned were:
- **market demands** can be a driver through, for example, eco-friendly business opportunities and energy-efficient technologies." **International certifications** such as Green Globe were also considered drivers for eco-friendly businesses. New market schemes such as the **carbon credit schemes** and **carbon offsetting schemes** were seen as having the potential to be strong drivers in the region";
- **availability of data evidencing environmental damage;**

15

- **national plans/strategies** (e.g. Vision 2020, NBSAP);
- *"the fact that the environment can have a significant effect on the quality of life that citizens of a country are subjected to makes it literally impossible to ignore the environment when making strategic development decisions.*"
- **tourism** [as the main economic driver] forces the government and tourism sector to protect environment
- **trends**: *"the fact that all other countries are doing it";*
- the **Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change project** was perceived *"to have done good work but to need revitalising".*

- Participants from the private sector felt that the **private sector** could act as a strong driver in mainstreaming environmental considerations. This included regulations and requirements of companies/businesses (Trinidad and Barbados) and the higher standards of large multinational companies entering the country (Trinidad)

## 9. Constraints

The discussion of the constraints was usually one of the most lively aspects of the focus groups, with the following emerging as the three major constraints both in discussion and in the survey:

- **Lack of political will,** combined with the perceived excessive power of politicians in decision-making, clearly emerged as the major constraint. This was attributed in the focus groups primarily to:
  - o the lack of a long-term mindset, e.g*. development planning is constrained by the life cycle of political parties - lack of long-term view and related impacts of poor medium-long term planning"* or *"there is a mismatch between the development (long-term) policy-framework and the (short-term) political process. Decision-making needs to be taken out of the political realm. In the current situation, politicians and Members of Parliament have an inordinate influence over local level decision-making, with the effect that narrow and short-term political motives often take precedence over broad interests and long-term well-being. Lower-level decision-making should be elevated and facilitated by ministers. Empowered local governance would lead to better decision-making and governance."* (Jamaica)

  - o a sense that environmental considerations and environmentalists hinder social and economic development;
  - o lack of awareness of the relevance of environmental considerations to development planning.

  Other aspects that were mentioned were:
  - o limited practical knowledge of what the issues are facing manufacturing and feasible solutions to addressing them;
  - o varying objectives where personal preferences take precedence over national preferences;
  - o "*decision-making processes are often narrow both in terms of the people who influence the processes and make the decisions and the starting assumptions. In many cases where stakeholders are brought in to participate in decision-making they are the wrong people and stakeholder participation processes are sometimes manipulated. Tools can be and are manipulated as well. All too often the starting point is a restricted set of assumptions and a question designed to reach a predetermined answer".*

- o *"a lack of responsibility by government to acknowledge the importance of environment and its infiltration into every aspect of life. Without leadership and acknowledgement from above, the people will not have a 'yardstick' or feel they have to learn to make changes to their existence".*

- **Lack of or insufficient data/information:** comments included:
  - o *"The perceived* [lack of] *importance given to the proper collection, management and analysis of environmental and related data across sectors to support decision-making"*;
  - o *"There is a recognition of a need to use these [spatial data] tools but not enough emphasis on putting systems and resources in place to make it happen;*
  - o *"The big problem is data availability across the entities and this is a people issue, i.,e providing access to data".* Others described this constraint as the maintenance of [individual departmental] power bases which hinders the sharing and integration of data;
  - o information is not available for Convention reporting
  - o When making planning decisions there is a need for data in order to use the appropriate tools, but Jamaica and the entire Caribbean region suffer from lack of data and information for policy and decision-making. However, having access to good data does not address the fundamental shortcomings of the policy process and does not guarantee good outcomes. There are several examples of the government making disastrous decisions even after having access to information and data (extracted from Jamaica private sector report);
  - o the Trinidad private sector also alluded to the lack of data, in particular of baseline environmental data. Participants also noted that research is hindered by human resource weaknesses as well as the absence of a legal framework requiring the sharing of data conducted in country by foreign researchers.
  - o poor access to information (including poor sharing of information among government agencies) were also seen as major barriers to environmental mainstreaming.

- **Lack of human capacity with the right skills:** for example:
  - o the lack of trained professionals in participatory processes and communication was widely identified as a constraint.
  - o all countries and sectors identified weaknesses in the capacity to produce, process and analyse EIA data;
  - o the private sector in Trinidad perceived that there was a shortage of specific skills and expertise in the country, partly due to the failure of the education system to produce sufficiently qualified candidates, and partly due to the attraction of the energy sector in drawing-in these skilled personnel. State agencies in particular were seen as having a severe shortage of skilled personnel. Moreover, where skilled and knowledgeable persons were installed in government departments their skills and knowledge were not institutionalised and are therefore lost when an individual leaves.

Although a few participants selected the other constraints on the survey form, the following appeared much more frequently:

- **Lack of collaboration** at various levels, e.g.
  - o the absence of consistent inter-sectoral collaboration and planning at the national level and/or the absence or weakness of integrated institutions;
  - o the lack of effective cooperation between civil society organisations in all countries. "*This means that consistent advocacy and lobby efforts of environment issues are near impossible".* Some participants suggested the need for a civil society body recognised by

the government as representative but it was also noted that such umbrella bodies were themselves often perceived to be divisive and ineffective;

  o *"the stand off/hostility between some NGOs and government agencies responsible for environment* (an NGO perspective

  o *"Not enough will for all to work together for the one good. Too much disparity, division and divisiveness".*

- **Institutional constraints:** this was particularly noted in Trindad where, for example, the private sector expressed it as follows:

  o there were few institutional mechanisms in the country to encourage environmentally friendly development. One example of this is the lack of independent technical/academic advice at the decision-making level which allows pro-[physical] development groups and individuals to have excessive influence. A shortage of mechanisms for transparency and accountability contributes to the perception that environmental concerns are ignored and increases the opportunities for corruption.

  o there was a shortage of institutional mechanisms for the public to engage on environmental issues. One example cited was the lack of mechanisms for campaigners to engage with politicians and the difficultly in retaining independent campaigners without them being co-opted by partisan groups.

  o the imbalance in capacity between civil society and the heavy industries operating in Trinidad and Tobago also reduces opportunities for environmental mainstreaming. The industries have experienced and sophisticated industry lobbying strategies, thereby placing government agencies and civil society at a disadvantage. The cause of this power imbalance was suggested as a weakness in government and civil society capacity to engage and communicate, a lack of access to information, and a lack of institutional mechanisms to facilitate powerful networks and forums;

  In Jamaica, the following were noted:

  o the incomplete merger of Boards of the three agencies that came together as the National Environment and Planning Authority (NEPA) in Jamaica contributes to a fragmented decision-making process;

  o outdated development and planning policies (e.g. Development orders up to 30 years old).

- **Lack of common vision/values:** again the private sector in Trinidad particularly identified that

  o values within society were constraints since environmental considerations were not generally within the 'consciousness' of the population;

  o education was lacking as messages linking environmental protection and quality of life were not effectively made;

  o one participant also discussed the segmentation of values in society along economic lines – i.e. those than can afford to consider the environment and the poor, who cannot. However, other participants felt that the people of Trinidad and Tobago simply do not value the environment as economic development is prioritised and highly prized.

- **Lack of funding** was perceived to be a constraint mainly by civil society. Participants in the Trinidad focus group also felt that there was competition for funding of environmental mainstreaming activities, with elite agencies such as the UN often competing for the same funds as NGOs and national governments. It was also noted that the environmental funding mechanism, the Green Fund, enacted by the government in 2000, has yet to be operationalised.

- **Corruption** was rarely selected in the surveys although the Jamaica private sector report notes that *"corruption in decision-making is commonplace; decisions are not based on what is appropriate or best, but often on what serves or provides economic gain for a small group. A*

*fundamental lack of respect for each other influences decision-making: class interests override national interest.”*

- Other identified constraints were:
  - The absence of an up-to-date land use plan (Trinidad)
  - environmental issues only get onto the agenda when there is a crisis or an issue that affects a wide sector of the general public;
  - environmental issues which NGOs want to get into the public domain often get lost in the hype and promotion of national entertainment activities (Barbados NGOs)
  - In Barbados environment issues are not perceived to be life or death issues and therefore there seems to be the perception that the environment is not critical for basic survival needs.

In summary, although the **awareness of the range of tools** or **insufficient tools for the cultural context** were considered by some to be constraints, they were felt to pale into insignificance in comparison with the absence of political commitment and appropriate institutional and policy frameworks for environmental mainstreaming. One participant also noted "*the approach for me is not the problem but the **timeframe and the participation is a major problem**. The process is slow and participation is low from other agencies.”*

**10. Approaches people are dissatisfied by**
Most participants left this section blank but a few expressed dissatisfaction with **“legal”** or “**policy approaches”**, largely because of the failure to implement and enforce.

**11. Matching the approach to the task at hand**
Participants provided a wide range of examples of what they considered to be successful approaches to environmental mainstreaming, most of which related to:

- **physical planning** using tools such as *EIAs, SIAs, SEAs, GIS, economic valuation, cost-benefit analysis in combination with participatory/consultative processes;* where these were deemed to have been only partially successful, this was usually because there had been no systematic stakeholder analysis and/or stakeholders were involved too late in the process;
- **development of national or sectoral plans or policies;**
- **civil society lobbying and advocacy,** e.g via email and the Internet; media coverage and newspaper articles; stakeholder meetings;
- **conflict management**, e.g. resolving a dispute in the fishing industry;
- **environmental public awareness and education**
- **environmental standards and certification**

The potential case studies listed provide more detailed information on some of the initiatives cited by participants.

**12. Potential case studies**
The suggestions below for case studies (in no particular order) represent a selection of those that participants either deemed successful or from which lessons were learned about how the approach could be more successfully applied in future. The majority of them exemplify the use of multiple tools. CANARI has not had the time to explore them in detail but could do so in conjunction with the proposed round of national feedback meetings. These meetings could also be used to identify other case studies in countries where the early version of the survey failed to address the need for case studies.

  a. **Pear Tree Bottom judicial review case** (Jamaica) using *legal challenge* and *the Access to Information Act*. Extract from Jamaica Sustainable Development Network website reporting on the case:

*In a landmark case for Jamaica's environmental movement, high court judge Justice Bryan Sykes has ruled in favour of Northern Jamaica Conservation Association (NJCA), Jamaica Environment Trust (JET) and four individuals in the Judicial Review case concerning the granting of an environmental permit for part of the planned 1,918-room Bahia Principe hotel in Runaway Bay.*

*On Tuesday, May 16th Justice Sykes quashed the environmental permit granted to Hoteles Jamaica Piero Limited (HOJAPI) for Phase One of the hotel and ordered that the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) reconsider the application for the project.*

*He ruled that NEPA and the Natural Resources Conservation Authority (NRCA) had not complied with the legal requirements of the decision-making process and had therefore acted unfairly in granting the environmental permit.*

*However, in response to a request from the NRCA lawyers, the judge agreed to a 21-day stay on the revocation of the permit to allow the Respondents to prepare an appeal if they so choose.*

*In delivering his judgement, Justice Sykes found that NEPA had failed to consider all of the relevant environmental information, including a critical marine ecology report that was missing from the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). He said that given the undisputed high ecological value of the resources of Pear Tree Bottom, the absence of the marine ecology report was of "tremendous significance" to the decision-making process which the court was being asked to examine.*

*The judge agreed with the Applicants that the public consultation process had been flawed and that NEPA and the NRCA had failed to respond to the legitimate concerns and expectations of stakeholders. He found that NRCA had acted unfairly, stating that "unfairness is an abuse of power." "The difficulty for me," he said, "was that it was known to both NEPA and NRCA that the EIA was incomplete. How can you consult without giving the public full, complete and accurate information?"*

*Justice Sykes pointed out another serious flaw in the consultation process: the fact that NEPA and the NRCA had ignored the recommendations of the Water Resources Authority (WRA), another government agency with which they were required to consult, before issuing the permit on July 26, 2005.*

*The WRA had communicated to the NRCA that they found the proposed sewage disposal method, deep well injection, completely unsatisfactory and that the EIA failed to specify an acceptable method for sewage treatment for the hotel. The WRA also recommended increasing the set-back requirements for the hotel in light of the recent Asian tsunami experience. The judge said he could find no reason why the advice of the WRA had not been considered.*

*The judge was extremely critical of the EIA, describing it as "really poor." He pointed out serious deficiencies in the empirical work which NEPA itself had recognised, especially where environmental data were required to be assessed over time, such as water quality. He found that there had been insufficient field assessment of the flora and fauna, reliance on old, outdated information and on anonymous and unverifiable sources, and no evidence that the EIA had actually assessed the coral reefs or the potential impact of the development on them.*

*In the opinion of the judge, the defective EIA had important implications for the monitoring programme: "How can you monitor what you don't know is there?" he asked.*

*With respect to the Respondents' claim that a delay in filing the suit might have affected the rights of third parties, namely the developers, the judge found that there had been no undue delay in the filing of the suit within 10 weeks of the issuance of the permit, given the burdensome task of the Applicants to present a clear case based on detailed evidence. He commented that the suit was brought by two non-profit organisations, which were "not awash with funds" and which needed to consult their Boards and seek costly legal advice before proceeding. Furthermore, the judge said that no evidence had been presented to the court indicating prejudice to a third party or that*

*quashing the permit would be detrimental to good public administration. "No-one can say that adhering to the rule of law is bad public administration," he said.*

*Under the NRCA Act, the NRCA is mandated to "take such steps as are necessary for the effective management of the physical environment of Jamaica so as to ensure the conservation, protection and proper use of its natural resources." Justice Sykes commented that given the importance of protecting the environment, decision-making in cases such as this should attract a high degree of scrutiny and that he had no choice but to give precedence to the rule of law.*

The hotel was eventually permitted to go ahead but under revised conditions.

b. **Legal challenge** has more recently been used in Jamaica in an ongoing case where the consultants responsible for the **Environmental Impact Assessment** (EIA) of the proposed Dolphin Cove facility in Hanover have filed a lawsuit against the NGO Jamaica Environment Trust (JET), claiming defamation and demanding that a review of the EIA be removed from the JET website.  A personal communication from JET notes "*This is the reality of the barriers to citizens really participating in public processes.  First, the documents are generally only available on a website - leaves out most people.  Then, they might be presented at a public meeting in language and terms incomprehensible to most.  Then, if you do comment, as JET routinely does, you run the risk of a lawsuit!  (So called SLAPP - Strategic Litigation against Public Participation...)   Most groups are way too intimidated to risk that and do not have the financial resources to pay lawyers anyway.*"

c. **Sustainable seafood awareness campaign:** an example of the use of a range of **public awareness-building tools** (e.g. meetings and consultations; posters, promotional T-shirts, wallet cards) by an **organisation *that integrates government, civil society and private sector perspective*s,** Travel Foundation Tobago.  Travel Foundation Tobago is also an example of the **"creolisation of externally-driven approaches"** since it is an outcome of an initiative from Travel Foundation UK that has spawned the local body, which aims to become autonomous.

d. Incorporation of environmental management and education requirements into **National Standards for primary and secondary schools** within Jamaica Ministry of Education, whereby schools are evaluated based on their performance against **indicators** and requirements in the standards,. This involved **intersectoral planning/**engagement between relevant experts: e.g. the National Environmental Education Committee and Ministry of Environment worked together

e. **Environmental certification of small hotels** in Jamaica using **environmental audits** and **certification requiring third party verification**.  Successful because of involvement of all levels of management and staff and public recognition (staff by management; management by industry). A failure in long-term succession planning in that the initial certification was funded by donor under which hotels received free technical assistance and final certification.  Rate of recertification at their own cost has been very low. A mechanism was needed to secure greater long-term buy-in.

f. **Moving squatters from an environmentally hazardous to safe area** (Ministry of Agriculture, Lands Division, Jamaica): through a combination of **policy analysis, legal tools, participation and citizen action.**  The initiative was deemed to be only partially successful because it was "*stymied by lack of funding".*

g. A number of initiatives from the Jamaica Forestry Department, Jamaica including granting to a bauxite company of temporary access to a forest reserve to mine ore using **economic and financial analysis of natural resources; legal agreement** to govern entry, use and exit from site and consistent **monitoring and evaluation** of entire process. Agreement reached for them to pay for the resources that would be removed as well as putting the land back in a position to accommodate forest cover after mining.  An outcome was that the bauxite company "*recognised that the removal of tree cover necessitated it being replaced in another area".*

h. **Development of a resource valuation method** for the coastal zone for use by decision makers (Barbados) – still evaluating results

i. **Voluntary compensation agreement** [Finder Caribbean Ltd, a foreign-owned company based in Jamaica]: *used to establish informal approval and CBO participation in monitoring operations, active participation in operations and monitoring outcomes with penalties for breaches*.

j. Application of **ISO 14000** and use of **EIAs** (to higher standard than required nationally) by Arawak Cement, Barbados in the contexts of "*changing agricultural lands to quarry lands; changing of fuel source used to fire the kiln operations; management of the environmental impacts of the operation in a structured way*".

k. **National strategic planning processes** (e.g. Vision 2020, Trinidad; National Strategic Plan of Barbados 2006-2025): the nature and effectiveness in terms of long-term outcomes of the *participatory/consultative process*.

l. **Consultation on climate change** [Caribbean Youth Environmental Network]: *participation , visioning, economic and financial assessment.*

m. **Participatory policy development:** e.g. Trinidad forest and Protected Areas policy; CTO Tourism policy.

n. **Participatory management planning for protected areas**, e.g. Aripo Savannas, Trinidad; Centre Hills, Montserrat.

o. the DFID-funded **Jamaica Social Evaluation** which produced two progress reports that included *environmental indicators*. These reports gave a record of how Jamaica was progressing against 7 indicators and to see how these indicators stacked up against the Millennium Development Goals by looking at Jamaica's welfare holistically. The first report was produced in 2003 and is available at the Cabinet Office website; the second report is now being printed. With respect to the first report the government prepared published responses to these goals.

p. the introduction of **Green Procurement Guidelines** in central government policy (Jamaica);

q. the use of a priest as the facilitator of discussions on EIAs and development issues to overcome the previous perception of bias.

## 13. Five most useful approaches to be included in User Guide.
There is little to add to what is outlined in Part 1, Section 4 c above.

## 14. Other tools which should be included in User Guide
As noted in Part 1, **economic valuation of environmental goods and services** was the most frequently cited. Also **environmental accounting** and the effective use of **economic incentives** (e.g. tax breaks, incentives, payments for environmental services).

## 15. No useful tools or existing tools need to be refined.
The main comments under this section related to the ineffectivness of policies that are not implemented or legislation that is not enforced. Other things that were mentioned here, though not perhaps strictly tools, were the need for :

o **Influencing the polticial directorate;**

o **physical development and land use plans and a spatial planning framework;**

o **common and appropriate language** as a prerequisite for **developing a common world view;**

o **technical & financial support to small and medium sized companies and to communities;**

o **effective monitoring and outcome mapping** on a consistent basis with the limited financial and human resources available in most SIDS;

o **Screening tools** to process the high volumes of data generated by EIAs.

## 16. Criteria for ranking tools

Most participants selected most of the criteria although cost and time were selected less than the rest which is surprising considering they were cited by many as constraints. Other suggested criteria included

- whether the tool adaptive (e.g. to local culture) and pplicability of the tool to all countries (i.e. local contexts);
- outcome compared to cost;
- income impact on lower income groups
- quality of life impact

**APPENDIX 1: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

<div align="center">

**"Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into**

**Development Decision-Making in the Caribbean"**

**Focus group with government stakeholders**

*Thursday 8th November 2007, 9:00 a.m.-11:30 a.m.*

*Forestry Division, Long Circular Road, St. James, Trinidad*

*NOTE OF MEETING*

</div>

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of the meeting

The focus group session was held with government agencies in Trinidad and Tobago to discuss effective tools and approaches for integrating environmental considerations into social, economic and physical development decision-making ('environmental mainstreaming').

The findings of the focus group will feed into an international research project which is analysing the tools and methods currently used for environmental mainstreaming with a view to producing a User Guide profiling those found to be most useful by key stakeholders. The project is being coordinated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), with the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) leading the Caribbean component.

Several stakeholder focus groups will be held in Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados and Jamaica to elicit stakeholder perspectives and a regional report will be prepared by March 2008. The User Guide will be produced in 2009.

### 1.2 Participants

Five state agencies from Trinidad and Tobago were represented:

- Environment Unit, Ministry of Works and Transport

- Environmental Management Authority (EMA)

- Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources

- Institute of Marine Affairs (IMA)

- Ministry of Planning and Development

See Appendix 1 for list of participants, who were all technical staff of the agencies. The turnout was less than expected as over 20 organisations were initially invited, and there was no participation at all from the social sector.

The workshop was facilitated by Nicole Leotaud from CANARI and Steve Bass from IIED. Alicia Aquing from CANARI served as rapporteur.

### 1.3 Process

The agenda is attached as Appendix 2. After a brief background to and context for the global project presented by Steve Bass and a review of the Caribbean component presented by Nicole Leotaud, participants discussed what is meant by 'environmental mainstreaming' and 'tools' and brainstormed a list of tools being used in Trinidad and Tobago. Participants were then asked to individually complete questionnaires, but except for IMA they all took the questionnaires back to their organisations for input

<div align="center">1</div>

from their colleagues.  The EMA indicated that they would also like CANARI to have a follow-up focus group with key personnel in their organisation.

The individual completion or review of questionnaires was followed by a plenary discussion on drivers, facilitating factors, constraints, challenges and gaps in the application of tools to environmental mainstreaming.  Participants were asked to identify the key tools applied in specific cases where attempts were made (with varying degrees of success) to mainstream environmental issues into development initiatives, namely: illegal rice cultivation in the Nariva Swamp, the proposed Toco Port development, and the proposed aluminium smelter in south-east Trinidad.  A summary of key discussion points is given below.  These are grouped under key headings used in the questionnaire.

## 2. Definition of key terms and concepts

The two main concepts were defined at the outset as:

### Environmental Mainstreaming

This was agreed to include both:

   (a)  the way environmental issues are brought to the attention of decision makers; and

   (b)  the way environmental considerations are incorporated into decision making.

### Tools

Tools were considered to include the wide range of instruments, methods, frameworks or tactics used to carry out these processes.

## 3. Listing and ranking of tools identified

Participants brainstormed the tools used by their various organisations and in the wider Trinidad and Tobago context (see list in Appendix 3).  Although no specific attempt was made in the meeting to rank these, or to classify them into different categories being used in the research project (i.e. information tools, deliberative tools and tools for engaging, and planning and organising tools), specific tools highlighted in the plenary discussions are listed below (distinguished in bold in the Appendix).  When asked in plenary to identify the key tools used in specific cases, the overwhelming feeling was that public outcry and lobbying were the most effective tools.

   1)  Lobbying
   2)  Public outcry
   3)  EIAs
   4)  Informal partnerships / social networking
   5)  Databases – Environmental Statistics Compendium
   6)  Indicators
   7)  Economic valuation
   8)  Policies
   9)  Multi-lateral environmental agreements

Although the Government's Vision 2020 plan to guide national development was noted as including a specific area on "investing in sound infrastructure and the environment" it was not clearly highlighted as a key tool for environmental mainstreaming.

## 4. Drivers and facilitating factors

**APPENDIX 1: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

There was consensus that Trinidad and Tobago had the proper legislative framework, an enabling socio-political environment, and appropriate technological capacity in place for environmental mainstreaming. However, it was emphasised that this needs to be properly implemented.

Requirements under international conventions were also seen to be very significant drivers, especially in the case of fisheries management.

## 5. Constraints

In the national context many participants felt that the environment was viewed as a barrier to development by the Government and major developers. Environmental mainstreaming was not seen to be a national priority with clear enabling policies and strategies so that a diffuse, uncoordinated and reactionary approach was usually taken. There are multiple stakeholders involved in the process but no one driver.

Further, participants opined that there was a gap between technical and political decision-makers and technical organisations, the general public and communities were not involved in final decision making. Thus even although agencies exist that are mandated with environmental management they have very little leverage in final decision making.

Another significant challenge to environmental mainstreaming by government Ministries is that there is no clear policy mandate for Ministries to use environmental tools in their operations and decision making. As such there is a lack of funding. If tools are used in the various Ministries, it is usually based on individual initiatives.

Poor transparency and access to information (including poor sharing of information among government agencies) were also seen as major barriers to environmental mainstreaming, although it was felt that this is somewhat improving. A lack of information on available tools was also identified as a concern.

The absence of a harmonised legislative framework and enactment of up to date legislation (for example for implementation of international obligations) were also noted as major barriers. This is further exacerbated by generally poor enforcement of existing legislation.

## 6. Tools and approaches used (formal and informal)

### 6.1 Informal tools

Most individuals admitted that they had adopted informal approaches to environmental mainstreaming. For example, whilst some of their organisations had official standards and codes of practice, others had none but had informal standards that were being applied.

### 6.2 Effective tools

**Public outcry** was seen as the most important tool used in the three case studies discussed. Although **lobbying** was identified as an effective tool, it was noted that this was not part of Caribbean culture and that **informal partnerships** and **social networking** was often used instead.

Creative use of international linkages and requirements under multi-lateral environmental agreements was seen as very important. This has been effectively used by the Fisheries Division to promote the use of Turtle Exclusion Devices (TEDs) on trawlers.

**Economic valuation** and the use of **indicators** were seen as useful tools that were not used enough.

### 6.3 Tools where improvement is needed

**EIAs** were viewed as being "rubber stamped" or only good on paper and not in practice. The process was felt to be corrupted and the business lobby against proper **environmental accounting** and application of EIA principles was seen as being significant.

**APPENDIX 1: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

It was felt that there is inadequate capacity for effective stakeholder participation in the EIA review process.  In this regard, several initiatives were noted:

- An important innovation in the EIA process being explored by the EMA that was discussed is the use of independent technical consultants to advise communities seeking to comment on a technical EIA.  This was seen as being an effective innovation to make the EIA consultation process more equitable.

- A private sector energy company, bpTT, had provided funding for training non-governmental and community-based organisations in understanding the EIA process.

- The EMA also successfully built capacity in non-governmental organisations and community stakeholders in the Alutrint EIA process, where they recommended the establishment of a body to act as the go-between for the community and the consultant/applicant for the project.

In general, it was felt that the **consultation** process needs to be more clearly defined so that stakeholders are involved early in planning and in policy making.

The language used for environmental **lobbying** was felt to be too technical government and other stakeholders and that issues should be communicated at a level and language that they can understand.

## 7. Gaps

The feeling was that environmental mainstreaming has not been looked at in a comprehensive way and needs to be considered at the national level for policy making.  The response to environmental issues was viewed as reactionary.

It was noted that there is no independent civil society 'watch dog' to monitor Government's activities and ensure accountability.  One area where this is a problem is in the issuing of development permits, where it appears that Ministries are allowed to have less stringent requirements and standards than the private sector.

Tools that can have greater potential application in Trinidad and Tobago were identified as follows.

- **Economic valuation** was viewed as a powerful tool that was not being used enough and that there is a gap between translating the technical information to monetary figures and how it relates to people's lives.

- The need to develop comprehensive and accessible **databases** of information related to environment and development was emphasised and the Environmental Statistics Compendium and the United National Development Programme (UNDP) national socio-economic database were initiatives mentioned in this regard.

- There could be stronger ties with international groups and initiatives to strengthen the effectiveness of **lobbying**.

## 8. Next steps

Next steps were agreed to be:

- CANARI to hold follow-up meetings with agencies who indicated that they would like wider input into questionnaires and/or further discussion on specific initiatives.

CANARI to feedback results of research to participants, possibly through circulation of meeting reports and/or further stakeholder meetings.

# APPENDIX 1: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS

## Appendix 1: List of participants

| Name | Organisation |
|---|---|
| Raana Jagpersad | Ministry of Works and Transport – Environment Unit |
| Risha Alleyne | Environmental Management Authority (EMA) |
| Lara Ferreira | Fisheries Division |
| Asif Khan | Fisheries Division |
| Paul Gabbadon | Institute of Marine Affairs (IMA) |
| June Williams | Ministry of Planning and Development |

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**


**"Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into Development Decision-Making in the Caribbean"**


<u>**Focus group with private sector and academia**</u>

*Friday 14 March 2008, 8:30 a.m.- 12.00 noon BHP Billiton Building, Port of Spain, Trinidad & Tobago*


*NOTE OF MEETING*


## 1. Introduction

### *1.1 Purpose of the meeting*
Persons drawn from the private sector and academia in Trinidad and Tobago were invited to attend a focus group session to discuss effective tools and approaches for integrating environmental considerations into social, economic and physical development decision-making ('environmental mainstreaming').

The findings of the focus group will feed into an international research project which is analysing the tools and methods currently used for environmental mainstreaming with a view to producing a User Guide profiling those found to be most useful by key stakeholders. The project is being coordinated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), with the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) leading the Caribbean component.

Several stakeholder focus groups will be held in Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados and Jamaica to elicit stakeholder perspectives and a regional report will be prepared by March 2008. The User Guide will be produced in 2009.

### *1.2 Participants*

There was good representation from the two main universities of Trinidad & Tobago, the University of the West Indies and University of Trinidad & Tobago.

Representatives were present from the energy sector, the Trinidad and Tobago Chambers of Commerce and Industry, the engineering sector, and an environmental consultancy.

One questionnaire was returned from a private sector consultancy without having attended the workshop.

See Appendix 1 for list of participants. The turnout was good with 16 persons attending and discussions were lively and informative.

The workshop was facilitated by Sarah McIntosh from CANARI and Sarika Maharaj from the Cropper Foundation. Alex McCaffery served as rapporteur.

### *1.3 Process*

The agenda is attached as Appendix 2. After a brief background to the global project and a review of the Caribbean component by Sarah McIntosh, participants discussed what is meant by 'environmental mainstreaming' and brainstormed a list of tools being used in Trinidad and Tobago. Participants were then asked to individually complete questionnaires.

The individual completion of questionnaires was followed by a plenary discussion on drivers, facilitating factors, constraints, challenges and gaps in the application of tools to environmental mainstreaming. In individual written questionnaires participants were asked to identify the key tools applied in specific cases

1

where attempts were made (with varying degrees of success) to mainstream environmental issues into development initiatives.  A summary of key discussion points and main findings from the questionnaires is given below.  These are grouped under key headings used in the questionnaire.

## 2. Definition of Environmental Mainstreaming

Participants indicated that the term 'environmental mainstreaming' was not familiar and was not used in the country. Therefore a clear definition was sought.

The term environmental mainstreaming was understood as:

> (c) the incorporation of environmental considerations to ensure these considerations are central in decision making; and

> (d) the filtration of these values through all levels of society.

## 3. Listing and ranking of tools identified

Participants brainstormed a list of tools (see list in Appendix 3).  No attempts were made to rank the tools, or classify them (i.e. technical tool, information tools, planning tool etc) however, in the plenary session participants were asked to highlight which tools were particularly useful (distinguished in bold in the Appendix). These are listed below in no particular order of importance:

1. **Economic Instruments e.g. taxes/incentives**

2. **Cost benefit analysis**

3. **Legal and regulatory instruments**

4. **Spatial planning framework**

5. **Consultation**

6. **Common value systems**

7. **Integrated institutional arrangements**

8. **Public protest**

9. **Participatory mapping/traditional knowledge**

10. **Common and appropriate language**

11. **Technical & financial support to small & medium sized companies and to communities.**

12. **Open communication and dialogue, particularly with decision makers**

13. **Cross sector networking.**

### *3.1 Effective tools*

Several examples of **industry standards** driving a rise of environmental standards were highlighted, for example where multinational corporations with high standards enter a country and help to raise local standards. **Benchmarking**, adapting standards from overseas to the local context, was regarded as a useful tool within industry.

**Variable standards** were considered necessary for different sized companies are needed because mall and medium enterprises often do not have the resources to meet the standards or requirements of large multinational corporations.

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

Existing **business supply-chains** are tools to mainstream environmental consideration where industries insist that contractors comply with high environmental standards.

Tools which highlight the **spatial context** of environmental damage/benefits were considered extremely useful in communicating environmental messages. Maps, aerial photographs and GIS images for example can be understood by everyone regardless of literacy levels and education. Environmental **modelling** was also highlighted for its use in predicting future outcomes.

**Multi-disciplinary approaches** to data gathering and research, particularly **participatory data gathering**, was regarded as an effective means of environmental mainstreaming.

**Economic instruments,** in particular, **cost benefit analysis**, were highlighted as useful tools that were insufficiently used, while perverse incentive remain in place.

**Legal and regulatory frameworks** were considered as extremely important for setting laws and guiding behaviour.

### 3.2 Tools where improvement is needed

**Best practice** examples were considered less helpful than the use of standards, as best practices are often highly context specific and are not always easily adapted at the local level. Problems with applying standards from elsewhere were also identified as sometimes inappropriate for use in the local context. The danger of relying only on industry standards was also highlighted as, even when these standards are met, they may not be sufficient to protect the environment.

A weakness was identified in the use of **EIAs**, that consultations were not properly undertaken and that the consultants were not required to produce information that could effectively be analysed by community members. Consultants were too often seen to be 'selling' rather than genuinely 'consulting'.

Moreover, while the number of **public consultations** had increased, meaningful and genuine **participation** was thought to remain rare, with the perception that the object of the consultation is already 'a done deal' for the government and developers. Mechanisms for genuine participation need to be enhanced, including incorporating time and funding in project plans to for allow this.

While **Legal and regulatory frameworks** were important tools, lack of implementation and enforcement of environmental laws was regarded as a problem. In addition, there exists a slow and difficult process to enact new legislation where there are gaps in existing laws and regulations.

### 4. Drivers and facilitating factors

Discussions during the plenary session indicated a strong sentiment that the private sector could act as a strong driver in mainstreaming environmental considerations. This included regulations and requirements of companies/businesses and the higher standards of large multinational companies entering the country.

Market demands were identified as a driver through, for example, eco-friendly business opportunities and energy-efficient technologies. International certifications such as Green Globe were also drivers for eco-friendly businesses, although this was considered a stronger force elsewhere in the Caribbean. New market schemes such as the carbon credit schemes and carbon offsetting schemes were seen as having the potential to be strong drivers in the region.

Personal values were identified by almost all participants in the questionnaires as a strong driver.

Governmental legislation, regulation and requirements were highlighted as important drivers, as were international commitments and financing institutions (e.g. IMF/World Bank).

The production of data demonstrating environmental damage can be a strong driver for change when combined with strong communication initiatives promoting awareness.

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

Educators and the education system were also considered a main driver and the importance of incorporating the environment into curricula was emphasied.

Additional drivers raised in discussions or questionnaires were:

- The risks of environmental impacts such as floods, climate change, land slides etc.

- personal values,

- organisational culture/mandate

- Stakeholders and public demand/ environmental activism

- Risk management

- Traditional/cultural values

- Conditions imposed by a donor or lender

- Achievable targets specific to local contexts (e.g. Vision 2020 in Trinidad & Tobago)

### 5. Constraints

The major constraint raised by participants was a lack of political will to mainstream environmental concerns and it was perceived that the environment is generally regarded as an 'obstacle' to development without awareness of the potential of integrating both aims. A lack of funding was also mentioned however, most participants felt that capacity constraints were more important than funding constraints.

**Human resources constraints -**

Problems in human resources was discussed at length at this cut across several areas. There was regarded to be a shortage of specific skills and expertise in the country, partly due to the failure of the education system to produce sufficiently qualified candidates, and partly due to the attraction of the energy sector in drawing-in these skilled personnel. State agencies in particular were seen as having a severe shortage of skilled personnel. Moreover, where skilled and knowledgeable persons are installed in government departments their skills and knowledge are not institutionalised and is therefore lost when an individual leaves.

**Institutional constraints -**

There were seen to be few institutional mechanisms in the country to encourage environmentally friendly development. One example of this is the lack of independence and technical/academic advice at the decision-making level which allows pro-development groups and individuals to have excessive influence. A shortage of mechanisms for transparency and accountability contributes to the perception that environmental concerns are ignored and increases the opportunities for corruption.

A shortage of institutional mechanisms for the public to engage on environmental issues were identified. One example provided was the lack of mechanisms for campaigners to engage with politicians and the difficultly in retaining independent campaigners without them being co-opted by partisan groups.

The imbalance in capacity between civil society and the heavy industries operating in Trinidad and Tobago also reduces opportunities for environmental mainstreaming. The industries have experienced and sophisticated industry lobbying strategies, thereby placing government agencies and civil society at a disadvantage. The cause of this power imbalance was suggested as weakness in government and civil society capacity to engage and communicate, a lack of access to information and a lack of institutional mechanisms to facilitate networks and forums with power.

**Information and research -**

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

There was seen to be a lack of data, in particular of baseline environmental data. Human resources weaknesses contribute to the shortage of research, in addition to a lack of a legal framework requiring the sharing of data conducted in country by foreign researchers.

Poor access to information (including poor sharing of information among government agencies) were also seen as major barriers to environmental mainstreaming.

**Values -**

Values within society were identifies as a constraints as environmental considerations were not felt generally to be within the 'consciousness' of the population. Education was seen to be lacking as messages linking environmental protection and quality of life were not effectively made. One participant also discussed the segmentation of values in society along economic lines – i.e. those than can afford to consider the environment and the poor, who cannot

However, some participants felt that the people of Trinidad and Tobago simply do not value the environment as economic development is prioritised and highly prized.

**Planning -**

Many participants considered there to be a lack of understanding and awareness of the relevance of environmental issues in development planning. Furthermore, the impact of incremental development was considered an additional constraint to environmentally friendly planning. It was noted that poverty is often the driver for this type of incremental development.

**Tools –**

A lack of available and context specific tools and insufficient awareness of the range of tools available were identified in questionnaires as strong constraints to environmental mainstreaming.

**6. Gaps in tools and capacity**

More tools are required for mainstreaming in the local context to change the value systems of local people.

- Screening tools needed to process the high volumes of data generated by EIAs.
- Scoping exercises to establish consensus on TOR for EIAs
- National frameworks for long-term data collection programmes and data storage should be developed.
- Establish baseline environmental data
- Gaps in the capacity to process and analyse EIA data.
- Communication strategies appropriate to target audiences, e.g. lay person, private sector, technical persons etc.

**7. Ranking of tools**

Almost all participants though the ranking of tools would be useful on the following criteria:

- Ease of use
- Extent of skills, training and qualification required to use the tool
- The cost
- The time required

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

- How understandable the tools are to primary stakeholders

- The extent to which the approach requires data, fieldworks etc.

- Robustness

- Level of impact in helping progress towards sustainable development

Additional suggestions of criteria were for:

- Applicability of the tool to all countries (i.e. local contexts)

- Income impact on lower income groups

- Quality of life impact

## 8. Next steps

Next steps were agreed to be:

- CANARI to hold follow-up meetings with agencies who indicated that they would like wider input into questionnaires and/or further discussion on specific initiatives.

- CANARI to feedback results of research to participants, possibly through circulation of meeting reports and/or further stakeholder meetings.

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

**Appendix 1: List of participants**

| Name | Organisation |
|---|---|
| Dr Thackwray Driver | South Trinidad Chamber of Industry & Commerce |
| Tamara Dwarka | Engineering Dynamics, & Trinidad Hotels, Restaurants and Tourism Association |
| Dr Rachel Williams | University of Trinidad & Tobago |
| Dr Cindy Chandool | University of Trinidad & Tobago |
| Mr Robert Superville | ETEK |
| Dr Grace Sirgu Charran | University of the West Indies |
| Dr Everson Peters | University of the West Indies |
| Dr Asad Mohammed | University of the West Indies |
| Andy Ramdhan | Point Lisas Nitrogen Ltd. |
| Dr Steven Freeman | Applied Marine Sciences Ltd |
| Arryl Mohammed | Petrotrin |
| Francine Carvalho-Moodoo | Industrial Plant Services Ltd. |
| Lyandra Ramsamooj | Industrial Plant Services Ltd. |
| David A Simmons | Simmons & Associates |
| Abiola McCree | The Natural Gas Company of Trinidad & Tobago Ltd |
| Angelique Balbosa-Philip | East Port of Spain Development Company |
| *Anjanie Manboadh | Lee Young & Partners |

\* returned questionnaires but not present at workshop.

**Appendix 2: Agenda**

**"Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into Development Decision-Making in the Caribbean"**

<u>**Focus group with private sector stakeholder**</u>
*Friday 14 March 2008, 8:30 a.m.- 12.00 noon*
*BHP Billiton Building, Port of Spain, Trinidad*

*DRAFT AGENDA*

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 – 9:30 a.m. | Welcome, introductions and overview of project |
| 9:30 – 9:50 a.m. | Development of a working definition of key terms and concepts – environmental mainstreaming, tools |
| 9:50 – 10:20 a.m. | |
| 10:20 – 11:20 a.m. | Individual completion of questionnaire<br><br> Listing and ranking tools identified<br><br>Discussion on strengths of tools, enabling factors, and barriers<br><br>Discussion on gaps and capacity building needed |
| 11:20 – 11:30 a.m. | Wrap-up and next steps |

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

**Appendix 3: List of tools identified**

1. **Economic Instruments e.g taxes/incentives**
2. **Cost benefit analysis**
3. **Planning development e.g. of towns, buildings & infrastructure**
4. Economic valuation
5. Community participation and education
6. Benchmarking
7. Best practice
8. Policy
9. International standards
10. Terms of reference
11. **Legal and regulatory instruments**
12. Common customary standards not set by law
13. Meetings
14. Variable standards for different types of organisation e.g large multinational vs. small independent
15. Certificate of Environmental Clearance (CEC) - guidelines on how a development should proceed in an environmentally responsible way.
16. Monitoring
17. International standards e.g. ISO 14001-
18. Educational curricula
19. Aerial photography
20. Participation
21. **Consultation**
22. **Common value systems**
23. Corporate policies, particularly from multinational corporations
24. **Integrated institutional arrangements**
25. Enforcement
26. **Public protest**
27. Politics
28. Stakeholder analysis
29. **Participatory mapping/traditional knowledge**
30. GIS
31. Environmental Modelling
32. Imagery
33. Mechanisms for transparency and accountability

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

34. Institutional standards

35. Information databases

36. A multidisciplinary approach

37. Public education

38. Conflict resolution

39. Energy audits

40. Spatial planning framework

41. Gender analysis

42. Governance arrangements

**43. Common and appropriate language**

44. Assessments

**45. Technical & financial support to small & medium sized companies and to communities.**

**46. Open communication and dialogue, particularly with decision makers**

47. Email

48. Corporate Social Responsibility Plans

49. **Cross sector networking**.

50. Supply chain management

51. Social impact assessment (SIA)

52. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

53. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

54. Cumulative Impact Assessment

55. Vulnerability assessments

56. Audience specific communication methods

57. Champions/advocates/leaders.

58. Performance targets that are real and attainable

**APPENDIX 2: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TRINIDAD PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

**Appendix 4: Examples of environmental mainstreaming**

1. Developing legal and institutional frameworks for integrated solid waste management.
2. Supply chain management – setting up an energy sector system to improve health safety and environment (HSE) performance in small and medium enterprises.
3. Mapping corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Trinidad and Tobago using policy analysis - examining company's CSR policies.
4. Developing a plan for the conservation of an environmentally sensitive area.
5. Development of supply chain methodology around health and safety and environment (HSE)
6. Assisting smaller businesses to improve HSE standards to allow them to do business with energy sector companies
7. Development of a framework for environmental management
8. Develop systems and services for energy efficiency
9. Develop structured environmental programmes e.g. MSc Environmental Science.
10. Organisational paper and waste reduction
11. Implementing industry standards, governmental regulations and international protocols.
12. Promote environmental awareness among employees.
13. Involvement in community awareness raising
14. Inclusion of environmental and social impacts on engineering curriculum at tertiary level.
15. Developing solutions for flooding in local town.
16. Participate in committees that environmental objectives
17. Involvement in education to schools and children
18. Development of community planning tools
19. Financing of capacity development in low income communities
20. Regularisation of informal development in hillside areas
21. Community development planning exercise
22. Community action on new industrial development (unsuccessful due to lack of accountability of developer, lack of community cohesion and lack of resources)
23. Planning for urban rehabilitation using a participatory approach.
24. Review of national planning standards, unsuccessful due to lack of input from public.
25. Introducing new tools to improve data on marine/coastal environment.
26. Development & implementation of a strategic impact assessment methodology for the Environmental Management Authority, using training, stakeholder involvement and technical demonstrations. Unsuccessful due to cost and lack of political will.
27. Conducting research on environmentally sensitive areas
28. Research on species and environmental good to provide data for policy and planning.

**APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS**

To follow

**APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS**

**"Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into**
**Development Decision-Making in the Caribbean"**
<u>**Focus group with Tobago stakeholders**</u>
*Tuesday 15th April, 2008, 10:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.*
*Botanic Gardens Conference Room, Scarborough, Tobago*

*NOTE OF MEETING*

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Purpose of the meeting

The focus group session was held with stakeholders from key government agencies and civil society organisations in Tobago to discuss effective tools and approaches for integrating environmental considerations into social, economic and physical development decision-making ('environmental mainstreaming').

The Department of Natural Resources and the Environment (DRNE) in the Division of Agriculture, Marine Affairs and Marketing of the Tobago House of Assembly (THA) partnered with CANARI on this initiative.

The findings of the focus group will feed into an international research project which is analysing the tools and methods currently used for environmental mainstreaming with a view to producing a User Guide profiling those found to be most useful by key stakeholders. The project is being coordinated by the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), with the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) leading the Caribbean component.

Several stakeholder focus groups will be held in Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados and Jamaica to elicit stakeholder perspectives and a status report will be prepared in April 2008. National consultations will be held in the three project countries in May/June and a regional consultation will be held in June 2008 to inform the final report on findings and recommendations from the Caribbean. This will be fed into the global project through the International Stakeholder Panel. The User Guide will be produced in 2009.

### 1.2 Participants

Twelve representatives of civil society and government from Tobago were represented (see Appendix 1). The list of invitees is attached as Appendix 2.

The workshop was facilitated by Nicole Leotaud from CANARI and Nadia Mohammed from the Environmental Management Authority.

### 1.3 Process

The agenda is attached as Appendix 3. After the welcome from William Trim of the DRNE and introductions, Nicole gave a brief overview of the Caribbean component of this global project.

**APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS**

Nadia then facilitated a brainstorming and discussion on what is meant by 'environmental mainstreaming' and 'tools' and what tools were being used in Tobago. Reference was made to several specific case studies of environmental mainstreaming in Tobago, namely:

- Conflict between fisherfolk and the private land owner at Pigeon Point, which eventually involved mediation by the THA;

- Private hotel development at Golden Grove, which involved use of a Certificate for Environmental Clearance (CEC) (a development permit issued by the EMA) and designation of the Buccoo Reef/Bon Accord Complex as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA);

- Proposed port development at Charlotteville, first for an industrial port and currently for a port to be used for cruise ships;

- used oil disposal, recycling and reuse programme;

- construction of sea walls for protection of private property on Turtle Beach.

Participants were then asked to individually complete questionnaires. Some participants requested blank questionnaires be emailed for circulation.

The individual completion or review of questionnaires was followed by a plenary discussion on drivers, facilitating factors, constraints, challenges and gaps in the application of tools to environmental mainstreaming. A summary of key discussion points is given below. These are grouped under key headings used in the questionnaire.

## 2. Definition of key terms and concepts

The two main concepts were defined at the outset as:

**Environmental Mainstreaming:** This was agreed to include both:

(e) the way environmental issues are brought to the attention of decision makers; and

(f) the way environmental considerations are incorporated into decision making.

**Tools:** Tools were considered to include the wide range of instruments, methods, frameworks or tactics used to carry out these processes.

## 3. Listing and ranking of tools identified

Participants brainstormed the tools used by their various organisations and in the wider Tobago context (see list in Appendix 4).

## 4. Drivers / facilitating factors

There was little discussion under this topic but it was recognised that personal will and an active civil society played an important role.

## 5. Barriers / constraints

Barriers and constraints identified in the discussions included:

- Government's lack of respect for public and civil society
- Lack of space for the "voice" of the public in development decision-making
- Perception of vested interests hindering communication
- Lack of community spirit or community cohesion
- The gap between technocrats and policy makers in government
- Political will
- Lack of accountability
- Power (economic, social and political) inequities in decision-making
- Organisations not sharing information
- Partisan politics
- Lack of funding and manpower

## 6. Tools and approaches used (formal and informal)

Although there was consensus on the tools identified, civil society generally emphasised tools for education and public awareness and citizen action, collaboration and partnerships, information, monitoring, and enforcement and accountability, including legal action.

Government agencies brought forward technical tools such as Environmental Impact Assessment and plans.

There was strong consensus on the importance of tools to facilitate four basic areas:

- Public education and awareness: Under this theme, there was discussion of targeting all levels, including senior policy makers. However, emphasis was placed on "the man on the street", especially the youth and up to 40 years who were felt to be uninvolved and disengaged. Emphasising direct impact on individual livelihoods was felt to be a critical strategy to reach the public and key stakeholders.
- Empowerment of citizens: It was felt that there is a gap between what the government wants and what the people want. Basic civic rights were felt to be very important to empower citizens to be able to have a "voice" in decision-making: *Government needs to inform people – not just 'it is a done deal'"*. This also recognises the importance of having access to information on which to base decisions.
- Convincing policy makers: Various strategies were identified to be able to communicate environmental mainstreaming messages to policy makers: education, protest, petitions, use of economic cost-benefit information, and legal action.

- Ensuring accountability:  This included through monitoring and enforcement of laws and taking legal action.  How to ensure that government is doing what it is supposed to do was a particular concern. *"Rules are made but nobody obeys these rules... it slips through the cracks"* and *"who is going to oversee and make sure that people do what they are supposed to do"*

In terms of tools where improvement is needed the following specific issues were identified:

- Geographic Information System (GIS) is a potentially powerful tool but (1) is not accessible to most people and (2) even where there has been some training there are still capacity issues barring use.  GIS needs to be more accessible.

- Laws are not being enforced

- Security of data is an issue for information management

- EIAs are too technical to be understood by most people

The lack of implementation of the Green Fund as a financial mechanism established under the Environmental Management Act was flagged as an issue.

## 7. Gaps

Participants felt that tools were needed to address the following areas:

- How to be proactive versus reactive – especially where areas are so sensitive that damage will be extreme and irreversible?

- Action is often taken too late, when development has already taken place and damage may be irreversible.

- Enabling the participation of people in the development decision-making process: *"People don't understand the process and can recognise if the process is being followed... need to break it down."*  It was felt that citizens don't know their rights and procedures for making their voice heard.  Environment Tobago is considering development of a citizen's manual to guide on how individuals can take action.

- There is a gap between what government wants and what the people want - government and citizens need to work together.

- How to involve local people in a village?

- How to address where there are lots of little things that will add up?  For example sea walls from private houses that are built along beaches.

- Stories of both success and failures can be used to learn from.

- How to educate to change behaviour and foster spirit of national pride?

## 7. Capacity building needed

Areas for capacity building that were identified included:

- GIS
- Personal commitment and responsibility *"People will talk but not take action... hope that someone else will do it... not take responsibility"*
- Information
- Technical advice on EIAs
- Civic rights education
- Legal advice

### 8. Next steps

Next steps were noted as:

- CANARI to circulate notes of meeting and email surveys to those who requested it.
- CANARI to coordinate national stakeholder meeting to analyse findings, with funding for the participation of 8 stakeholders from Tobago.
- CANARI to coordinate regional stakeholder meeting, with representatives from civil society and government in Trinidad & Tobago to attend.

# APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS

## Appendix 1: List of participants

**Ms. Tanya Clovis**
**President**
Save our Sea Turtles
125 Blackrock Main Road
Blackrock
Tobago
Tel: 868 357 2862
Fax:
Email: info@sos-tobago.org

**Mr. Oscar Braithwaite**
Department of Agriculture
Tobago House of Assembly
Kendal's Farm School
Tobago
Tel: 868 660 4395
Fax: 868 660 4395
Email: obraff@yahoo.com

**Barry Lovelace**
**Environment , Education and**
**Communications Officer**
Buccoo Reef Trust
Cowie's Building
Auchenskeoch Road
Carnbee
Tobago
Tel: 868 635 2000
Fax: 868 639 7333
Email: b.lovelace@buccooreef.org

**Ms. Patricia Turpin**
President
Environment Tobago
11 Cuyler Street
Scarborough
Tobago
Tel: 868 660 7462
Fax: 868 660 7467
Email: envirtob@tstt.net.tt

**Hema Singh**
**Administrative Officer**
Environment Tobago

**Patricia Turpin**
**Director**
Tobago Hotel and Tourism Association
Auchenskeoch Road
Carnbee
Tobago
Tel: 868 639 9543
Fax: 868 639 9543
Email: tthtatob@tstt.net.tt

**Mr. William Trim**
Forestry Department
Tobago House of Assembly
P.O. Box 5566
Scarborough
Tobago
Tel: 868 660 7636
Fax: 868 639 5232
Email: trim20031@yahoo.co.uk

# APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS

**Mr. Selwyn Davis**
Forester
Department of Natural Resources and the
Environment
Tobago House of Assembly
Highmoore Centre
Wilson Road
Scarborough
Tobago
Tel: 868 660 7636
Fax: 868 639 5232
Email: davobago@hotmail.com

**Ms. Karen R Thomas**
**Mr, Curtis Archie – 868 705 9531**
**Ms. Melissa Mills**
Email: melsiamills@hotmail.com
Community Development and Culture
Tobago House of Assembly
#29 Bacolet Street
Scarborough
Tobago
Tel: 868 639 4818
Fax: 868 639 1044
Email: mocean7@hotmail.com

**Bruce Campbell**
Buccoo Village Council
Shirvan Road
Buccoo
Tobago
Tel: 868 660 8595
Fax: 868 660 8595
Email: bluebasin@hotmail.com

**Ms. Rosemarie Thomas**
**Project Manager**
Tobago Travel Foundation
LP 159
Black Rock
Scarborough
Tobago
Tel: 868 635 0032
Fax: 868 635 0032
Email: tftobago@tstt.net.tt

# APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS

## Appendix 2: List of invitees

| ORGANISATION/NAME | | FIRST NAME | LAST NAME | JOB TITLE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Land Mangement, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Horace | Achille | |
| Sustainable Development Council | Mr. | Kamau | Akili | Vice President |
| Charlotteville Village Council | Mr. | Dave | Alleyne | President |
| Policy Research & Development Institute | Mr. | Bobby | Andrews | Development Analyst |
| Tobago Handicraft Producers | Mr. | Jomo | Anika | |
| National Reforestation and Watershed Rehabilitation Programme, Tobago | Mr. | Clarence | Bacchus | Head |
| Community Development, Tobago House of Assembly | Ms. | Irene | Beache | |
| Division of Community Development and Culture, Tobago House of Assembly | Hon. | Wendell | Berkley | Assistant Secretary |
| Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Tobago House of Assembly | Ms. | Neila | Bobb-Prescott | Director |
| Division of Tourism, Transportation Enterprise Development and Settlements | Ms. | Gail | Bradshaw | Research and Development Officer |
| Department of Agriculture, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Oscar | Braithwaite | |
| Tobago Youth Council | Mr. | Huey | Cadette | |
| Department of Marine Resources and Fisheries, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Erol | Caesar | Director |
| Division of Youth Affairs and Sports | Councillor | Tracy | Davidson | Assistant Secretary |
| Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Selwyn | Davis | Forester |
| Speyside Village Council | Mr. | Jephthah | Davis | |
| Buccoo Reef Trust | Dr. | Owen | Day | |
| Mason Hall Police Youth Group | Corporal | | Edwards | |
| Newton George Nature Tours | Mr. | Newton | George | |
| Roxborough Police Youth Group | Mr. | Collis | Hazel | |
| Tobago Tourguide Association | Mr. | Darren | Henry | |

## APPENDIX 3: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mason Hall Village Council | Ms. | Cynthia | James | |
| Tobago Travel Foundation | Mr. | Chris | James | Chair |
| Blue Waters Inn | Mr. | Duane | Kenny | Manager |
| Land Mangement, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Jefferson | Laptiste | |
| Buccoo Village Council | Mr. | Reginald | Phillips | President |
| Division of Agriculture, Marine Affarirs and Marketing, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Raye | Sandy | Administrator |
| Division of Agriculture Marine Affairs and the Environment | Hon. | Hilton | Sandy | Secretary |
| Division of Tourism, Transportation Enterprise Development and Settlements, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | Sumant | Singh | Director |
| Division of Health & Social Services, Tobago House of Assembly | | | | Secretary |
| DNRE, Tobago House of Assembly | Mr. | William | Trim | Forester |
| Environment Tobago | Mrs. | Patricia | Turpin | President |
| Division of Tourism, Transportation, Enterprise Development & Settlements Labour and Co-operatives | Assemblyman | Oswald | Williams | Assistant Secretary |
| Division of Tourism, Transportation, Enterprise Development & Settlements Labour and Co-operatives | Hon. | Neil | Wilson | Secretary |
| Bird Watchers Restaurant & Glass Botton Boat Tours | Mr. | Frank | Woodsworth | Owner |
| Tobago branch of Hotel and Tourism Association | Mrs | Pat | Turpin | Director |
| Save Our Sea Turtles (SOS) Tobago | Ms. | Tanya | Clovis | President |

**APPENDIX 4: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS**

**Appendix 3: Agenda**

# "Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into Development Decision-Making
# in the Caribbean"

*April 15th 2008, 10.00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.*
*Botanic Station Conference Room, Scarborough*

*DRAFT AGENDA*

| | |
|---|---|
| 10:00 – 10:30 a.m. | Welcome & introductions |
| 10:30 – 11:30 a.m. | Development of a working definition of key terms and concepts |
| | Identification of tools |
| 11:30 – 12:00 a.m. | Individual completion of questionnaire |
| 12:00 – 1:00 p.m. | Lunch |
| 1:00 – 1:45 p.m. | Ranking tools identified |
| | Discussion on strengths of tools, enabling factors, and barriers |
| | Discussion on gaps and capacity building needed |
| 1:45 – 2:00 p.m. | Wrap-up and next steps |

# APPENDIX 4: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH TOBAGO STAKEHOLDERS

## Appendix 4: List of tools identified

Tools identified as a priority are highlighted in bold. Some tools are grouped.

| Tools identified by government agencies | Tools identified by civil society |
|---|---|
| **Education / communication** | **Education** |
| **Extension work** | **Internet** |
| **Information** | **Education of senior policy makers / politicians (Secretaries in THA)** |
| **Monitoring – get baseline data and compare** | **Educational posters on environmental impacts of development** |
| **Collect field data (e.g. water samples)** | **Awareness campaign** |
| **Database – accessible to many stakeholders** | **Radio programmes** |
| | **Mascot in education programmes** |
| **Laws** | **Newspaper articles** |
| Requirements on development permit | **Use of visuals – movies, posters – and follow-up with verbal** |
| Environmental impact assessment | **Use media** |
| Social impact assessment | **Go to communities (rum shops, churches, markets)** |
| Use of technology | Civil society coming together |
| Plans / planning | Protest |
| Public hearings | Petition |
| Collaboration between government agencies | Negotiation / mediation |
| Stakeholder consultations – integrated planning | Lobby to put pressure on government |
| Fines | Terms of reference |
| Guidelines | Submit photographic evidence to government authority |
| | Submit written comments to government authority |
| | **Laws** |
| | **Legal injunction – Environmental Court** |
| | Economic valuation |
| | Tourism certification (e.g. Green Globe) |
| | Eco-labelling (Tobago is "Clean, Green and Serene") |
| | Designation of protected area |
| | Partnerships – local and international |
| | Financial incentives |
| | GIS |
| | Guidelines – "How to do…" manual for citizens to take action on environmental issues |

**"Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into**

**Development Decision-Making in the Caribbean"**

<u>**Focus group with private sector stakeholders**</u>

*Thursday, 10 January 2008*
*2.00 – 5.00 p.m.*

*UWI Institute for Sustainable Development*
*Kingston, Jamaica*

## 1.      Introduction
### 1.1     Background to the project

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) has been convening focus group discussions in selected Caribbean countries as part of a global project with the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) entitled, "Tools and Approaches for Integrating Environmental Decision-Making in the Caribbean."  The project aims to develop a user-driven tool kit or guide to support environmental mainstreaming. Its premise is that environmental mainstreaming capacity will be much stronger if stakeholders have access to information that enables them to select the appropriate tools and methods to inform decision-making.

The project development process aims to capture end-user perspectives on the range and effectiveness of tools and methods being used in environmental management decision-making. It also seeks to identify locally developed tools in the project countries as well as those that have been tailored to meet local needs. To this end, CANARI has convened stakeholder focus group meetings in Barbados and the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. This meeting was the first of three focus group discussions slated to take place in Jamaica.

### 1.2     Participants
This meeting targeted representatives of academia and private sector environmental firms. Five of the 20 invitees attended and representation from academia was low - the sole University of the West Indies (UWI) participant was not available for the entire meeting.
Confirmed participant Ms. Eleanor Jones had to cancel at the last minute due to an emergency, but indicated an interest in engaging with the process, should there be opportunities to do so in the future.

**APPENDIX 5**: **REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

Notwithstanding the size of the group, the afternoon's discussions were lively and frank. See Appendix 1 for list of invitees and participants.

The workshop was facilitated by Ms. Nicole Brown, CANARI Associate.  Ms. Marcia Creary was contracted locally to serve as rapporteur.

### 1.3     Process

A copy of the agenda is attached at Appendix 2.

Following a brief introduction and overview of the purpose of the meeting and its objectives, participants were asked to define key terms and concepts in order to come up with a common working definition for the meeting. This exercise was followed by a brainstorming session, during which participants were asked to identify the environmental mainstreaming tools used in Jamaica.

Following the individual completion of the questionnaire, participants were asked to revisit their list of tools and methods, which had been preliminarily categorised by the facilitator and rapporteur in the interest of helping to move the discussions along. At this time, additional tools were added to the original list and some tools were shifted from one category to another or placed in more than one category.  While acknowledging the difficulty of ranking the tools, as their application is situation-specific, participants identified some of the tools they felt were worthy of special mention based on their overall importance to environmental decision-making processes.

The ensuing group discussion was dedicated to identifying enabling factors and barriers to the use of the tools identified. This was followed by a brief discussion on gaps and capacity building needs. At the end of the meeting, participants provided feedback on the questionnaire.

Despite participants' willingness to stay an extra half an hour beyond the scheduled end of the meeting, the post questionnaire discussions did not receive adequate attention due to lack of time.

At the start of the meeting, Professor Tony Clayton informed the group that the Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD) is one of six national teams working on a UNEP-funded project which looks at technical tools for decision making and integrated assessment methodologies. Phase one of the project includes the development, testing, and publication of a technical manual. The manual is currently being field tested and will be completed by late autumn. UNEP will publish the manual at the end of 2008, after which phase two of the project, application, will begin. The research process has yielded a significant amount of information that may be relevant to the IIED undertaking. CANARI may wish to explore with Professor Clayton the possibility of accessing this information.

## 2.     Definition of key terms and concepts

**APPENDIX 5**: **REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

The overriding sentiment of the meeting was that planning and decision making in Jamaica suffer primarily from flawed policy processes, rather than lack of knowledge of the available assessment tools and how to use them. This is not to say there are no gaps in data and information and concerns about how tools are used, but the real need for the country is improved policy-making. In the current context, the value of tools is limited by the policy process, which is constrained by political will, or rather lack thereof. The policy process is driven by economic considerations and narrowly defined interests.

*Environmental mainstreaming* was broadly defined as a process by which environmental considerations are brought to bear in a whole system approach to social and economic development decision-making processes. The importance of needing to effectively communicate the holistic nature of the environment and move away from perceptions of environmental issues as indulgence in "tree-hugging" or strict conservation was raised.

In developing the definition, however, it was suggested that environmental mainstreaming was the wrong point of departure because that plays into and reinforces the general notion that the environment is at the margins and needs to be brought into the general discourse. In fact, what is needed are good policy making processes in a sustainable development framework, where all considerations, including social, environmental, economic ones, are brought to bear.

*Tools* were defined as structured systems used to evaluate what management or other interventions might be necessary. Tools are used to arrive at a particular outcome. The term 'tools' is a broad one that covers a range of applications and methodologies; some tools have sub-tools.


## 3.      Listing and ranking of tools identified

The following tools were identified during the meeting. The activity of highlighting the most important tools (indicated below by an asterisk *) was qualified by the observation that a particular tool's importance or relevance is often situation-specific.

- **Planning/Organising**
Development zoning*
Strategic planning*
Strategic environmental assessments (not used effectively)*
Environmental audits
Environmental impact assessments (EIAs)
Environmental scanning and business continuity
Feasibility studies
Market based instruments
Performance parameters and indicators

Training - particularly of technocrats to make sectoral linkages as well as for behavioural change

- **Information/Assessment**
Applied research*
Environmental scanning and business continuity*
Gap analysis*
GIS*
Resource valuation (not used effectively) *
Academic research
Census

**APPENDIX 5**: **REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

Environmental education
Land use maps*
Oceanographic studies
Public education
Statistical data
Surveys
Water/Air etc quality studies

- **Management/Monitoring**

Legal instruments*
Performance parameters and indicators*
Environmental management plans
Environmental management systems
(Voluntary and mandatory) standards
Institutional framework
Lab testing and analysis
Local area management committees
Mitigative measures
Project management
Professional standards
Testing and measurement

- **Deliberation/Engagement**

(NGO) Advocacy*
Public consultation*
Training*
Consensus building
Decision making trees
Focus groups
Internet and other ICTs
Mass media
Public education

## 4.      Drivers and facilitating factors

Improved local governance and the empowerment of local communities to play a more active role in environmental monitoring and management were identified as two of the conditions that would enable or facilitate the application of tools.  Although there are some good examples of community/stakeholder participation in resource management, most efforts aimed at engaging communities are superficial and exercises in form, at best.

Recent civil society advocacy around environmental issues have helped highlight the relevance and importance of tools for environmental decision-making.

## 5.      Constraints

The primary constraints to environmental mainstreaming in Jamaica and the effective use of environmental assessment tools are the flawed policy and decision-making processes. In the Jamaican context this means that even when technical tools are used, other factors influence decision-making, often with little attention paid to the findings based on application of the tools.

The incomplete merger of boards of the three agencies that came together as the National Environment and Planning Authority (NEPA) contributes to a fragmented decision-making process.

The decision-making process is also hampered by outdated development and planning policies and processes. For example, only one parish has a Development Order (DO) that is less than 10 years old and many have DOs that are 30 years old or older. In many instances, the DOs are not followed. The relationship between Parish Councils and central government is not always clear. Lack of policy coherence has resulted in conflicting and competing policies across sectors, and this also affects environmental decision-making, or contributes to a situation where decisions taken in other sectors have impacts on the environment that are not adequately taken into account.

Decision-making processes are often narrow both in terms of the people who influence the processes and make the decisions and the starting assumptions. In many cases where stakeholders are brought in to participate in decision-making they are the wrong people and stakeholder participation processes are sometimes manipulated. Tools can be and are manipulated as well. All too often the starting point is a restricted set of assumptions and a question designed to reach a predetermined answer.

Corruption in decision-making is commonplace; decisions are not based on what is appropriate or best, but often on what serves or provides economic gain for a small group.  A fundamental lack of respect for each other influences decision-making: class interests override national interest.

There is a mismatch between the development (long-term) policy-framework and the (short-term) political process. Decision-making needs to be taken out of the political realm.  In the current situation, politicians and members of parliament have an inordinate influence over local level decision-making,

with the effect that narrow and short-term political motives often take precedence over broad interests and long-term well-being. Lower-level decision-making should be elevated and facilitated by ministers. Empowered local governance would lead to better decision-making and governance.

## 6.    Tools and approaches used (formal and informal)

Due to a lack of time, this topic was not adequately explored in the discussions. The tools that were considered important are marked with an asterisk in section 3 above.

The use of tools is generally subjective, dictated by the question to be answered.  Consideration for the environment seems to end at the start of development projects and there is no follow through. Tools tend to be used at the start of processes or initiatives and not to measure the medium to long-term impact of projects. Although there is a continuum of tools that can be used throughout, these are generally not taken into consideration. This is something that mainstreaming need to address.

EIAs are commonly used in Jamaica, but it appears that often the act of undertaking an EIA process is considered sufficient, with little regard given to the findings. The shortcomings of EIA processes are often ignored and there is little recognition of the fact that the application of this tool is only part of what is required; if the findings do not inform decision-making, the tool is rendered virtually useless.

Resource valuation and strategic environmental assessments are tools that are not used effectively in the Jamaican context. One of the challenges faced by government agencies and policy makers is determining environmental costs and benefits. There is a need to move away from using descriptive benefits to using numbers in order to have a more convincing basis for making policy and decisions. Although resource evaluation tools can allow for fuller discussions of development issues, they are rarely used when economic considerations are considered paramount.

Development Orders have outlived their usefulness in the Jamaican context and it was suggested that a new planning mechanism is needed.

## 7.    Gaps and barriers

The value of tools is limited by the policy process, which is currently flawed. The choice of tools used in a narrow decision-making process often becomes secondary, as decision-makers often look for evidence in support of their desired outcome or main beliefs. One may have the best information and tools available, but if the planning and policy making processes are flawed, these are not helpful. Outdated legislation also hampers the use and application of tools.

When making planning decisions there is a need for data in order to use the appropriate tools, but Jamaica and the entire Caribbean region suffer from lack of data and information for policy and decision-making. However, having access to good data does not address the fundamental shortcomings of the policy process and does not guarantee good outcomes. There are several examples of the government making disastrous decisions even after having access to information and data.

The use of planning and decision making tools are often seen as the end of the process. There is little recognition that the development process requires the application of a continuum of tools. The

application of planning and decision-making tools is never tested and evaluated. Lack of capacity in the regulatory agency (NEPA) contributes to the limited application of tools.

Except for audits, tools have a loose meaning and limited application if not time-bound.

There is a wide range of economic assessment and environmental assessment tools available, but no laws or regulations governing which should be used. The private sector is resistant to mandatory use of tools.

There is a surfeit in application of tools for reports and studies, but these go on "to stay in a cob-webbed place."

There is the problem of application of technologically inappropriate tools or the use of tools that decision-makers cannot evaluate properly because they do not have the capacity to do so.

Transparency and an educated constituency are part of what is needed to create conditions where there is demand for the use and application of tools for environmental mainstreaming.

## 8.    Other issues

Participants found the questionnaire constraining as it assumed the absence of tools was the critical barrier to environmental mainstreaming, rather than the lack of an adequate decision- and policy-making framework, as they believe is the case. The proposed IIED manual will likely not be widely used and will "end up on a shelf."

It was recommended that CANARI do an audit of the questionnaire to see which questions have been answered and which ones have been left blank with a view to revising the questionnaire on the basis of any trends that may be apparent.

There was concern about overlap between the UNEP initiative and the IIED project.

# APPENDIX 5: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS

## Appendix 1:   Lists of Participants and Invitees

### Participants

1. Mr. David Barrett, Regional Representative, Finder Caribbean Ltd.

2. Mr. Bert Brown, Managing Director, SGS Supervise Jamaica Ltd.
3. Professor Anthony Clayton, Institute of Sustainable Development,  University of the West Indies
4. Ms. Denise Forrest, Principal Consultant, Forrest and Associates

5. Mr. Peter Reeson, Director, Environmental Solutions Ltd.


### Invitees

1. Mr. David Barrett, Regional Representative, Finder Caribbean Ltd.
2. Prof. Anthony Clayton,   Institute of Sustainable Development University of the West Indies
3. Mr. Paul Carroll, Director and Senior Consultant, Technological & Environmental Management Network Limited
4. Ms. Carole Excell, The Carter Centre
5. Ms. Denise Forrest Principal Consultant of Forrest & Associates
6. Ms. Carolyn Hayle, Institute for Sustainable Development, University of the West Indies
7. Ms. Eleanor Jones, Managing Director and Principal Consultant of Environmental Solutions Ltd.
8. Dr. Margaret Jones Williams, Environmental Solutions Ltd.
9. Mr. Franklin McDonald, Coordinator, Institute of Sustainable Development, University of the West Indies
10. Mr. David L McKenzie, Regulatory Compliance Supervisor at Jamaica Flour Mills
11. Mr. Peter H. Reeson, Partner and Director, Environmental Solutions Ltd
12. Ms. Carla Reid, Environmental Superintendent, Alumina Partners of Jamaica.
13. Prof. Edward Robinson, University of the West Indies, Mona
14. Dr. David Smith Assistant Resident Representative, Programme Specialist Environment & Disaster Management , UNDP
15. Mr. David Smith, Smith Warner International
16. Mr. Guy A Symes, The Forest Conservancy
17. Dr Elisabeth Thomas-Hope, Head of Department, Department of Geography and Geology University of the West Indies
18. Dr. Barry A Wade,. Chairman and Consulting Principal,  Environmental Solutions Ltd
19. Dr. Dale Webber, University of the West Indies, Mona
20. Dr. Michael Witter, Senior Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of the West Indies

**APPENDIX 5: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA PRIVATE SECTOR STAKEHOLDERS**

**Appendix 2:    Agenda**

# "Tools for Integrating Environmental Considerations into Development Decision-Making
# in the Caribbean"

*Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD)*
*#3 Gibraltar Camp Way, Mona Campus*
*University of the West Indies, Jamaica*

*AGENDA*

| | |
|---|---|
| 2:00 – 2:30 p.m. | Welcome & introductions |
| 2:30 – 2:50 p.m. | Development of a working definition of key terms and concepts – environmental mainstreaming, tools |
| 2:50 – 3:20 p.m. | Individual completion of questionnaire |
| 3:20 – 4:40 p.m. | Listing and ranking tools identified |
| | Discussion on strengths of tools, enabling factors, and barriers |
| | Discussion on gaps and capacity building needed |
| 4:40 – 5:00 p.m. | Wrap-up and next steps |

## APPENDIX 6: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA CIVIL SOCIETY STAKEHOLDERS

To follow

**APPENDIX 7: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH JAMAICA GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

To                                                                                                        follow

**APPENDIX 8: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH BARBADOS GOVERNMENT STAKEHOLDERS**

To follow

**APPENDIX 10: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH BARBADOS CIVIL SOCIETY**

To follow

**APPENDIX 10: REPORT OF FOCUS GROUP WITH BARBADOS CIVIL SOCIETY**