

# Promoting the use of research in coastal resource management

RIU

## Validated RNRRS Output.

A communication strategy to promote integrated and equitable (pro-poor) coastal resource management and development is responding to the needs of different stakeholder groups. It's vital to transfer the lessons, methods and tools gained from field experience and research projects in ways that influence policies and practice. The process used in this multi-stakeholder strategy focuses on the identification, testing and dissemination of a series of products (like policy briefs, presentations, posters, websites, courses) and pathways (like meetings, community events, ministerial briefings), each tailored to the different needs of the different stakeholders. The strategy was developed in the Caribbean and although until now it is only used in the region, the experience gained is applicable in similar locations around the world.

Project Ref: **NRSP07:**

Topic: **7. Spreading the Word: Knowledge Management & Dissemination**

Lead Organisation: **CANARI, Trinidad**

Source: **Natural Resources Systems Programme**

---

## Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Current Promotion](#), [Impacts On Poverty](#), [Environmental Impact](#),

---

## Description

## Research into Use

NR International  
Park House  
Bradbourne Lane  
Aylesford  
Kent  
ME20 6SN  
UK

## Geographical regions included:

[Caribbean](#),

## Target Audiences for this content:

[Fishers](#),

**NRSP07****A. Description of the research output(s)**

1. *Working title of output or cluster of outputs.*

*In addition, you are free to suggest a shorter more imaginative working title/acronym of 20 words or less.*

**Communication and advocacy for pro-poor coastal resource management and development**

2. *Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable.*

This is a cluster of outputs coming primarily from a research project on Institutional arrangements for coastal management in the Caribbean that was carried out by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) and other partners, under the auspices of the Land Water Interface (LWI) component of the Natural Resources Systems Programme (NRSP), within the framework of the Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy (RNRRS) of the UK Department for International Development (DFID).

The outputs also include lessons, methods and approaches derived from the overall experience of CANARI in the area of communication and advocacy for pro-poor coastal resource management and development in the Caribbean region over the past two decades. This work has been supported by a wide range of funding sources, including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the European Union, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and Hivos.

3. *Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate)) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities.*

The main DFID-funded project that has generated this cluster of outputs is project R8317, which was implemented by CANARI in collaboration with the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA) and MRAG Ltd.

Project R8317 built on the outputs of four previous NRSP-sponsored projects in the Caribbean, namely:

- “building consensus among stakeholders” (lead: University of East Anglia; project number: R7348);
- “institutional and technical options for improving coastal livelihoods” (lead: CANARI; project number: R7559);
- “institutional arrangements for Caribbean Marine Protected Areas and opportunities for pro-poor management” (lead: MRAG; project number: R7976); and
- “requirements for developing successful co-management” (lead: CCA; project number: R8134).

4. *Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced? (max. 400 words).*

*This requires a clear and concise description of the output(s) and the problem the output(s) aimed to address.*

*Please incorporate and highlight (in bold) key words that would/could be used to select your output when held in a database.*

The main output is a **communication strategy** that includes a range of **communication products** and **pathways** to promote **integrated and equitable (pro-poor) coastal resource management and development**. The output also includes the **process** used in developing a **multi-stakeholder** strategy, focussing on the identification, testing and dissemination of products and pathways to ensure that the lessons, methods and tools gained from field experience and research projects are communicated in ways that influence policies and practice.

The direct outputs relevant to this new initiative are:

- *Coastal Management to Improve Livelihoods: A regional communication strategy for policy and institutional change* (produced by project R8317). This strategy comprises:
  - § A set of messages and tools derived from research on coastal area management and livelihoods in the Caribbean;
  - § A “toolbox” of communication products and materials;
  - § Guidance on:
    - identifying, assessing the communication needs of, and reaching target audiences,
    - optimising the impact of communication products on attitudes, behaviours, practices, institutional arrangements and policy,
    - measuring the effectiveness of the strategy’s activities;
- A broad strategic plan for promoting participatory resource management for sustainable livelihoods in the Caribbean (CANARI’s own strategic plan and communications strategy)
  - A set of tested communication products, including:
    - **Policy briefs**
    - **Posters**
    - **Case studies** (in text, slide presentations and posters)
    - PowerPoint presentations
    - **Guidelines**
    - **Training modules** for academic teaching and training of professional managers and other stakeholders
    - Other academic teaching materials (slide presentations, lecture notes and adapted case studies)
    - **Websites**
  - Practical experience in the design and use of communication pathways, including:
    - One-on-one informal communication
    - Presentation to meetings and other events
    - **Community-based events**
    - **Training workshops**
    - **Stakeholder meetings and seminars**
    - **Field trips/site visits**
    - **Press briefings**
    - **Ministerial briefings**
    - **Multi-sectoral policy briefings**
  - A Research Agenda for future work on integrated and equitable natural resource management in

the Caribbean coastal zone.

While the content of the strategy outlined above may be project specific, the approach and tools that were developed are transferable to other similar environments and contexts.

The main problem these outputs aim to address can be expressed in three broad research questions:

- what are the most effective ways to communicate research results to promote integrated and equitable (pro-poor) resource management and development in the coastal zone?
- what processes can be used to involve stakeholders in designing communication strategies and ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the pathways and products used?
- what communication tools and methods are available, and how should they be employed to suit specific target audiences, issues and conditions?

5. What is the type of output(s) being described here?

Please tick one or more of the following options.

| Product | Technology | Service | Process or Methodology | Policy | Other<br>Please specify   |
|---------|------------|---------|------------------------|--------|---|
| x       |            | x       | x                      |        | Comprehensive strategy that includes products, technologies, services and processes for influencing policy and practice |

6. What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other commodities, if so, please comment

The production system that these outputs focus on is the land water interface, in the context of small island developing states and regions. The main commodities, services and ecosystems that are included in these production systems include:

- fish and other living marine resources with economic value (e.g. molluscs, seaweeds and sea urchins)
- coastal ecosystems of high natural productivity (mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs)
- tourism sites and attractions, and related tourism services and infrastructures
- coastal landscapes and spaces that support a range of activity and uses that are socially, economically, culturally and environmentally important

The main economic and social sectors concerned are:

- coastal artisanal fisheries
- coastal aquaculture
- tourism
- coastal settlements and communications

- conflicts and other relationships between these uses and sectors

This output can be applied to other commodities, because it offers lessons, methods and templates for the design of communication strategies and activities that are replicable in all production systems. The experience gained in developing and implementing communication and advocacy activities for coastal management and development in the Caribbean are particularly applicable to contexts and locations where:

- direct and indirect use of natural resources forms a major component of local livelihood strategies
- there are multiple stakeholders with varied resource use strategies
- common property resources are important and open-access conditions exist
- conflicts and competitions between resource uses and users exist, and they affect the livelihoods of people and the sustainability of the natural resource base

**7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?**

Please tick one or more of the following options.

Leave blank if not applicable

| <b>Semi-Arid</b> | <b>High potential</b> | <b>Hillsides</b> | <b>Forest-Agriculture</b> | <b>Peri-urban</b> | <b>Land water</b> | <b>Tropical moist forest</b> | <b>Cross-cutting</b> |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
|                  |                       |                  |                           |                   | <b>x</b>          |                              | <b>x</b>             |

**8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?**

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

| <b>Smallholder rainfed humid</b> | <b>Irrigated</b> | <b>Wetland rice based</b> | <b>Smallholder rainfed highland</b> | <b>Smallholder rainfed dry/cold</b> | <b>Dualistic</b> | <b>Coastal artisanal fishing</b> |
|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>x</b>                         |                  |                           |                                     |                                     |                  | <b>x</b>                         |

**9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (max. 300 words).**

Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

By engaging and targeting a wide range of stakeholders - including policy makers, management agencies and resource users - in dialogue about integrated and equitable (pro-poor) coastal management that supports coastal livelihoods, the outputs have shown how to deliver new knowledge that enables poor people who are largely dependent on the natural resource base to improve their livelihoods, while equipping other actors (policy makers, entrepreneurs, professional managers) with the awareness, attitudes, knowledge and tools they need to support pro-poor coastal management and development. The project thus illustrates how one can achieve real and lasting improvement in the contribution of coastal management to livelihoods through a coordinated and sustained effort from a wide range of partners, both in the area of uptake promotion and in terms of further

research.

It would be valuable if this set of outputs could be clustered with the research outputs from a number of other sources, including:

- other NRSP-sponsored projects that have been implemented in the Caribbean in recent years, especially R8325
- other RNRRS-sponsored projects that focused on the development and testing of communication strategies, such as R8349, R8363, R8381 and R8428.

While the work described in this proforma is based entirely on Caribbean projects, the methods developed and lessons learned in these processes could be directly useful and relevant to other coastal regions of the world. This assumption was successfully tested in May 2006, when one of the project leaders facilitated a regional training course in social communication for coastal resource managers in seven countries of West Africa (as part of an IUCN-sponsored regional programme) and used this framework as the basis for a seven-day participatory training exercise involving 40 participants representing government agencies, non-governmental organisations and leaders of community-based organisations.

## Validation

### **B. Validation of the research output(s)**

#### **10. How were the output(s) validated and who validated them?**

*Please provide brief description of method(s) used and consider application, replication, adaptation and/or adoption in the context of any partner organisation and user groups involved. In addressing the “who” component detail which group(s) did the validation e.g. end users, intermediary organisation, government department, aid organisation, private company etc... This section should also be used to detail, if applicable, to which social group, gender, income category the validation was applied and any increases in productivity observed during validation (**max. 500 words**).*

The overall communication strategy has not yet been formally and systematically validated, because it is so comprehensive that it could only be tested and validated in the context of a regional communication initiative over the medium and long terms. Nevertheless, the recent process used in the formulation of CANARI's own regional strategic plan has allowed the organisation to apply much of the learning gained in R8317 with respect to the formulation of comprehensive communication strategies. The overall framework was also tested and validated in a training exercise held in West Africa in May 2006 (see question 9).

Elements of the strategy were tested and validated in project R8317, which was designed and implemented through four communication experiments. Each experiment was guided by a communication plan that identified the messages, target audiences, products, and pathways to be tested, and the ways in which the effectiveness of outputs would be validated. The plans were implemented by CANARI and its project partners.

The project was innovative because it was based on a belief that products cannot be separated from pathways: the best product will have little value if it is not effectively and strategically disseminated and promoted. Processes of validation thus examined both products and pathways. Validation was carried out through a range of methods that included:

- § participatory evaluations by output recipients through facilitated but unstructured group discussions, either immediately upon dissemination of outputs or several months later;
- § structured interviews with output recipients between 3 and 12 months after dissemination of outputs;
- § questionnaires sent to output recipients or posted on websites used by target audiences between 3 and 12 months after dissemination of outputs;
- § gathering of evidence of uptake through informal discussions, monitoring of requests for materials and downloads from websites, and collection of newspaper articles and official documents.

The table under question 11 below addresses the question of what target groups validated project outputs. With specific reference to people living in poverty, pathways and methods were tested by some of the initial projects that informed R8331, especially project R7559, which used a range of methods. It was based on the understanding that one of the purposes of acquiring and disseminating information at the local level is to create and promote equality in the negotiation process, as this equality requires equality in information. This project has also highlighted the importance of forms and formats in deliberative and participatory planning and management processes, and it has shown how meeting venues, language, attitudes, formats of discussions, arrangements of meeting rooms or the use of informal interaction are all factors that can hinder or promote effective communication.

**11. *Where and when* have the output(s) been validated?**

*Please indicate the places(s) and country(ies), any particular social group targeted and also indicate in which production system and farming system, using the options provided in questions 7 and 8 respectively, above (max 300 words).*

All outputs (communication products and pathways) tested and validated through this project pertain to the Caribbean coastal zone and to related farming systems (smallholder rainfed humid and coastal artisanal fishing). The following tables indicate the specific validation activities undertaken. Table 1 deals with product outputs and Table 2 with pathways or methods.

**Table 1. Validation of product outputs**

| Product output | Topic or theme                          | Validation of output |               |  |
|----------------|---|----------------------|---------------|--|
|                |   | Where?               | When?         | What target groups?  |
| Policy briefs  | Integrated CZM for national development | Trinidad             | February 2005 | Government ministers, senior government technical officers, natural resource management institutions |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
|   | Marine protected areas (MPAs) and sustainable coastal livelihoods                                    | Caribbean-wide   | January 2005                                     | Senior government technical officers, natural resource management institutions                                |
|   | Research linking CZM, sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction                                  | Caribbean-wide   | January 2005                                     | Senior policy makers, research institutions, donor agencies   |
| Posters (exhibitions)   | Research priorities linking CZM, sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction                       | Trinidad, St. Lucia and region-wide                        | July 2005  | Donors, civil society groups, researchers, academics, natural resource managers                               |
| Case studies (in text, slide presentations and posters)   | Co-management of coastal resources (fisheries and MPAs)  | Barbados   | July 2004  | Graduate students in natural resource management  |
|   | Impacts of MPAs on local livelihoods   | St. Lucia  | July 2005  | Resource managers, government technical officers  |
| PowerPoint presentations  | Linkages between land-based activities, CZM and coastal livelihoods, and the role of public agencies | Trinidad   | July 2005  | Government technical officers, private sector, community organizations  |
|   | Research priorities linking CZM, sustainable livelihoods and poverty reduction                       | Trinidad   | Emailed July 2005 as meeting had to be cancelled | Corporate resource users (e.g., energy companies)   |
| Guidelines documents  | Co-management of coastal resources   | Barbados<br>Trinidad<br>Jamaica                            | July 2004-Mar 2005                               | University faculty  |
| Training modules  | MPAs and sustainable coastal livelihoods   | Jamaica  | March 2005                                       | Protected area managers, government technical officers fishers, community organizations                       |
| Other academic teaching materials (slide presentations, lecture notes and adapted case studies) | Co-management of coastal resources   | Barbados, Belize, Nicaragua, Caribbean-wide (via Internet) | July 2004-Mar 2005                               | University faculty; graduate students; resource users; coastal community members; resource managers; trainers |
| Websites  | MPAs and sustainable coastal livelihoods   | Caribbean-wide   | 2005   | Marine protected area managers and planners   |

**Table 2. Validation of methods (pathways)**

| Method (pathway)                  | Topic or theme  | Validation of method        |                    |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|
|                                   |   | Where?                      | When?              | What target groups?   |
| One-on-one informal communication | Integration of co-management into natural resource management | Barbados, Jamaica, Trinidad | July 2004-Mar 2005 | University faculty; training institutes, environmental NGOs |



|   | curricula  |                   |                      |  |
|---|--|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| Presentation to meetings and other events | Research needs for integrated CZM and sustainable livelihoods  | Tobago            | June 2005            | Environmental NGOs, Community group, government technical officers, fisherfolk organisation. |
| Community-based events                    | Linkages between land-based activities, CZM and coastal livelihoods, and the role of public agencies | Trinidad          | July 2005            | Representatives of local organizations   |
| Training workshops                        | Integration of co-management into natural resource management curricula                              | Barbados          | July 2004-March 2005 | University faculty   |
|   | MPAs and sustainable coastal livelihoods   | Jamaica           | March 2005           | Protected area managers, government technical officers fishers, community organizations      |
|   | Co-management of natural areas and resources   | Nicaragua, Belize | March 2005           | Local resource users and community members, natural resource managers                        |
| Stakeholder meetings and seminars         | Increasing the benefits of MPAs to fishing communities   | Jamaica           | June 2004            | Fishers, protected area managers   |
| Field trips/site visits                   | MPAs and their relations with fishing communities  | Jamaica           | June 2004            | Fishers, MPA managers, government technical officers   |
|   | Role of public sector agencies in CZM and its relation to coastal livelihoods                        | Trinidad          | July 2005            | Government chief technical officers;   |
| Press briefings                           | CZM and integrated national development  | Trinidad          | June 2004            | Environmental journalists  |
| Ministerial briefings                     | CZM and integrated national development  | Trinidad          | July 2005            | Minister of Environment  |

## Current Situation

### C. Current situation

12. **How and by whom** are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (**max. 250 words**).

Questions 12-14 are addressed in the table below.

13. **Where** are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (**max. 250 words**).

14. What is the scale of current use? Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading (max 250 words).

Questions 12-14 are addressed in the following table.

| Product or method                                       | Use of the outputs  |   |  |   |
|---|---|---|--|---|
|   | By whom?  | How?  | Where  | Scale of use  |
| Policy briefs   | Senior policy makers, natural resource management institutions, senior government technical officers, consultants   | Source of policy advice as needed/in development of new policies  | All countries of the region  | Not known   |
| Posters (exhibitions)                                   | Donor agencies, natural resource management institutions, universities and other research institutes, NGOs.   | Basis for developing a research agenda for future work.<br><br>Understanding the factors of success and challenges of the Negril MPA and application of lessons learned to other MPAs   | All countries of the region<br><br>Jamaica, Belize, Tobago                 | Posters frequently visible in offices visited by CANARI staff |
| Case studies (in text, slide presentations and posters) | Faculty and graduate students in universities<br><br>Resource managers, government technical officers, consultants, NGOs<br><br>Donor agencies, NGOs including CANARI | Source for teaching materials or research theses<br><br>Source of ideas and lessons learned for the conceptualisation and design of innovative pro-poor coastal livelihoods strategies<br><br>Basis for development of collaborative MPA research project | Worldwide<br><br>All countries of the region<br><br>OECS/Trinidad & Tobago | Not known   |
| PowerPoint presentations                                | Not re-used to date but potential for further use within CANARI and university outreach programmes throughout the region  |   |  |   |

|   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Guidelines documents  | University faculty  | Teaching and outreach   | Barbados<br>Wider Caribbean             | Not known                                    |
| Training modules  | Not re-used to date but potential within CANARI and UNEP workshops  |   |   |  |
| Other academic teaching materials (slide presentations, lecture notes and adapted case studies) | University faculty  | Teaching  | Barbados<br>Caribbean wide via Internet | Not known                                    |
| R8317 project webpages  | Not known   | Not known   | Worldwide                               | Materials downloaded frequently from website |
| Presentation of coastal livelihoods research agenda to meetings and other events                | CANARI, faculty on the three University of the West Indies campuses | Basis for discussion on greater collaboration between regional universities and other research institutes on developing an integrated research agenda on pro-poor coastal livelihoods | Barbados<br>Trinidad<br>Jamaica         |  |

15. *In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key factors of success? (max 350 words).*

For research and advocacy on coastal management and livelihoods to have an impact on poverty reduction and sustainable development, it needs to produce and disseminate information that can change attitudes, behaviours, practices and policies. That information must be provided to the right audiences in forms they can use. Before considering how information should be packaged, the following questions need to be considered and answered:

- a. What kinds of changes are desired?
- b. What factors influence change in the target audience, either negatively or positively?
- c. What messages or tools can result in or support those changes?
- d. Who exactly needs to receive these messages and tools?
- e. When is it most appropriate to deliver a particular message or to use a particular tool?

Uptake is a gradual and iterative process. A single product or intervention is unlikely to achieve a desired change; multiple tools, strategically sequenced for reinforcement, are generally needed. Follow-up communication or activities a few months after delivery can also reinforce messages while assessing and measuring impacts.

Such strategies imply the need for collaboration among a range of actors at multiple levels (e.g., local, national, regional), and networks and regional institutions can become key factors of success in capacity development and promotion. The collaborators who were involved in disseminating the outputs of this project included regional resource management technical and advocacy institutions; universities; environmental NGOs and CBOs; governmental ministries and technical agencies; environmental departments of private sector corporations; and journalists. The outputs described here could be usefully shared with other global regions through regional academic and research institutions, civil society networks and organisations, and inter-governmental bodies.

Because understanding about coastal management and livelihoods is still partial and evolving, a key factor in the success of communication products is the extent to which they are flexible and adaptable and allow audiences to bring their own experience into them. Process and experience outputs such as seminars, field trips, study tours, and guided discussions are particularly useful for:

- § bringing people with different ideas and perspectives together;
- § creating a shared understanding among stakeholders;
- § contributing to the general level of knowledge on the subject;
- § engaging audiences unlikely to be reached by written and video materials, e-mail discussion groups, or the Internet.

---

## Current Promotion

### **D. Current promotion/uptake pathways**

16. **Where** is promotion currently taking place? Please indicate for each country specified detail what promotion is taking place, by whom and indicate the scale of current promotion (**max 200 words**).

17. What are the current barriers preventing or slowing the adoption of the output(s)? Cover here institutional issues, those relating to policy, marketing, infrastructure, social exclusion etc. (**max 200 words**).

Table 3 following Q18 indicates the main barriers identified through the project and approaches that were effectively used in overcoming them.

Other barriers have to do with conventional assumptions regarding communication effectiveness. The process of validating outputs suggested that many products may be more “deliverer-dependent” than commonly believed, for example, training materials may not be used unless they come with a trainer. Most often, message uptake requires face-to-face meetings and discussions, and uptake of tools and approaches requires hands-on training and instructions for use. While remote dissemination of products may work for specific groups of stakeholders, it is unlikely to be universally effective.

The projects that generated these outputs (and especially R7559 which focuses on local processes and institutional arrangements) have also confirmed the need for deliberate methods and efforts to include those who are normally excluded. While the literature on deliberative and inclusionary processes places much emphasis on events, i.e. citizen’s juries, workshops, or focus groups, the experience of project R7559 yielded important caveats in this regard. First, events cannot be fully inclusive, and they inevitably exclude some people on the basis of social status, culture, sex, age or abilities; and second, beyond the events, there are many other factors of inclusion and effectiveness of deliberation, such as transparency, legitimacy, and information dissemination.

18. What changes are needed to remove/reduce these barriers to adoption? This section could be used to identify perceived capacity related issues (**max 200 words**).

**Table 3. Approaches to reducing barriers to uptake**

| Target group          | Main barriers to uptake   | Approaches for overcoming barriers   |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Policy-makers         | Getting their attention: lack of time may preclude face-to-face meetings and prevent them from reading much of the material they receive. | Try reaching them through intermediaries who have access to them.  |
|                       |   | Keep messages succinct: a two page briefing is better than four pages; one page is even better.  |
|                       |   | Provide them with examples of tangible benefits, even from other countries or regions.   |
|                       |   | Make liberal use of illustrations, diagrams and graphics in material and in presentation.  |
|                       |   | Be prepared to make oral presentations or have discussions as opposed to more formal presentations with visual aids.   |
| Senior technocrats    | Getting them to consider issues and problems in non-traditional ways.   | Field trips for this audience can both bring the complexity of issues to life and generate cross-sectoral dialogue.  |
| Teachers and trainers | Are often unwilling or uncomfortable presenting material they feel they lack expertise in.  | Providing training materials and guidance on using them may not always be enough; it is sometimes also necessary to provide a co-trainer until comfort levels improve. |
|                       |   | Because most students and trainees are interested in practical application, provide materials with examples and case studies rather than simply theory.                |
| Journalists           | Accommodating their schedules and deadlines.  | Provide background material and direct them to sources with relevant information: case studies and examples are very helpful.  |
|                       |   | Present the message you want them to send clearly and specifically, but accept that they will convey it in their own way.  |
| Researchers           | Collaborating with other disciplines, linking with the field and accepting new notions and approaches.                                    | Create opportunistic partnerships between researchers and field practitioners, and involve researchers in policy processes.  |

|                             |   |   |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
|                             |   | Provide case studies and examples of inter-disciplinary work. |
| Poor coastal resource users | Creating communication environments that are easily accessible and in which they feel comfortable and welcome to contribute |   |

19. *What lessons have you learnt about the best ways to get the outputs used by the largest number of poor people? (max 300 words).*

The first lesson, as the table above illustrates, is that effective communication requires a range of products and pathways tailored to the various audiences being targeted. A deliberate strategy is therefore required to ensure that the most appropriate products and pathways are used at the most appropriate time for the relevant audiences.

Secondly, poor coastal resource users are interested in outputs that can contribute to the success of their livelihood strategies. These can include scientific information, new resource uses, improved technologies, or lessons applicable to their own experience. The level of uptake depends on the extent to which outputs are introduced in ways that allow people to absorb, question, challenge, test, and adapt them to meet their own needs. Products or technologies that are merely introduced, however forcefully, are unlikely to be widely adopted.

Thirdly, people's understanding and acceptance of information is filtered through their attitudes towards and relationships with the source of that information. It is therefore necessary to understand the underlying dynamics of message delivery, which are affected by such factors as the professional, class, gender, political and other social relations between the messenger and the target audience. The use of intermediaries, including "opinion leaders" within target groups, is often an effective method of message delivery, as it can reinforce the power of the message through the credibility of the messenger. But it is important to:

§ understand the different levels of power relations between messenger and receiver, and choose messengers with care;

§ assess the messenger's own "stakes" in the issues being communicated, and understand that these affect the way s/he will convey the message as well as how it will be received by its audience;

§ realise that intermediaries may cease to be effective messengers if their own stakes or involvement in an issue change.

---

## Impacts On Poverty

### *E. Impacts on poverty to date*

20. *Where have impact studies on poverty in relation to this output or cluster of outputs taken place? This should*

*include any formal poverty impact studies (and it is appreciated that these will not be commonplace) and any less formal studies including any poverty mapping-type or monitoring work which allow for some analysis on impact on poverty to be made. Details of any cost-benefit analyses may also be detailed at this point. Please list studies here.*

The main formal instruments used in the insular Caribbean to assess and measure poverty are the Country Poverty Assessment (CPA) and the Survey of Living Conditions (SLC). Over the past few years, sustained efforts have been deployed in several countries of the region, including all the member countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), to design SLCs and to train local personnel in the conduct of such exercises. In addition, most countries have produced reports and continue to monitor progress on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In Jamaica, the Jamaica Social Policy Evaluation Project (JASPEV) produces regular progress reports on the national social policy goals, which are consistent with and expand on the MDGs. CPAs have been conducted at intervals of approximately 10 years in most countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean, and such exercises have recently been carried out, or are currently being conducted, in several of the countries where communication outputs have been developed, tested, validated and used, including Grenada and Saint Lucia. In Saint Lucia, the site of one of the NRSP-sponsored projects (R7559) was also used by the CPA Team for a more in-depth participatory assessment of poverty at the community level. While these impact studies do not relate specifically to the outputs discussed in this proforma, they are highly relevant to the work proposed here, because they provide baselines and data, as well as case study materials, that can be used in future monitoring and evaluation work.

*21. Based on the evidence in the studies listed above, for each country detail how the poor have benefited from the application and/or adoption of the output(s) (max. 500 words):*

- *What positive impacts on livelihoods have been recorded and over what time period have these impacts been observed? These impacts should be recorded against the capital assets (human, social, natural, physical and, financial) of the livelihoods framework;*
- *For whom i.e. which type of person (gender, poverty group (see glossary for definitions) has there been a positive impact;*
- *Indicate the number of people who have realised a positive impact on their livelihood;*
- *Using whatever appropriate indicator was used detail what was the average percentage increase recorded*

It was not possible to evaluate the above within the project timeframe

---

## Environmental Impact

### **H. Environmental impact**

*24. What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)*

*This could include direct benefits from the application of the technology or policy action with local governments or*

*multinational agencies to create environmentally sound policies or programmes. Any supporting and appropriate evidence can be provided in the form of an annex.*

All outputs of this project aimed at improving the sustainable contribution of natural resources to coastal livelihoods, especially those of poor resource users, through:

- § improving the policy environment for coastal resource management so that it takes better account of the contribution of coastal resources to local livelihoods, and therefore the need to protect and enhance those resources and the ecosystems they depend on;
- § building coastal resource management institutions and practices that are oriented towards such protection and enhancement and that involve local people as full partners; and
- § encouraging research to better understand the environmental and social requirements for sustainable use of natural resources to improve livelihoods.

The experimental activities undertaken to test the effectiveness of project outputs in meeting these aims sought to achieve the following specific impacts:

- § integrating livelihood and poverty reduction dimensions in the national coastal management policies of Trinidad;
- § enhancing the receptivity of natural resource management professionals towards collaborative arrangements that formally involve local resource users in the management of coastal areas and resources;
- § refocusing the objectives of MPA management institutions to include a greater emphasis on involving and providing sustainable benefits to local communities and resource users;
- § alerting Caribbean research institutions to priority research needs related to increasing the sustained contributions of coastal resources to livelihoods, particularly of the poor.

*25. Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words)*

None that we are aware of.

*26. Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of natural disasters and increase their resilience? (max 200 words)*

Caribbean coastal communities have considerable and regular experience of natural disasters, including hurricanes, tropical storms, earthquakes, and volcanoes; as well as other impacts such as trade shocks and climate variations. This environment of uncertainty has generated important lessons in adaptation and resilience for use in addressing future changes and risks, including the current and anticipated effects of climate change. The outputs of this project all are oriented towards increasing the control that coastal communities have over their livelihoods and the natural resources and environmental services upon which those depend, as well as improving the policy environment and support systems for sustainable resource use by poor coastal communities. In these ways, the outputs of the project should assist them to be active and informed participants in the development of strategies and actions to address risk and disaster, while assuring that the risks that they face are recognized and addressed properly by governments and other institutions involved in coastal resource management.



