

RIU

# Policy reforms lead to improved livelihoods

## Validated RNRRS Output.

New guidelines show how to promote integrated pro-poor natural resource management, supporting sustainable traditional and alternative livelihoods, in the coastal zones of the Caribbean. Previously, there was a large gap between existing policy and its implementation, and these guidelines aim to help fill this gap. The central point is collaboration and partnerships among key stakeholders to carry out activities to cut poverty through better livelihoods for the poor. Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST) is an example of a framework within which natural resource based livelihood options—fishing, farming, agro-processing and tourism—are considered. The guidelines are in use in Belize and Grenada. In St. Lucia, the Heritage Tourism Programme used the findings to validate some of their own priorities.

Project Ref: **NRSP10:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **University of West Indies, 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:

[Crop farmers](#), [Livestock farmers](#), [Fishers](#), [Forest-dependent poor](#),

**NRSP10****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.*

**“Together let us make it happen”**

**“Guidelines for Collaboration and Partnerships among Stakeholders to Mainstream Sustainable Livelihoods Policy Support for Marginalised (“poor”) Communities in the Caribbean”**

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

**DFID: Natural Resources Systems Programme (NRSP) – Central Research Department funding. Managed by HTSPE Limited.**

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.

**DFID R8325. Sustainable Economic Unit(SEDU), Faculty of Social Sciences, St. Augustine Campus, University of the West Indies. Institutional partners included The St. Lucia Heritage Programme (SLHP), the Coastal Zone Management Authority (CZMA –Belize), Belize Enterprise for Sustainable Technology (BEST), Agency for Rural Transformation (ART – Grenada), Grenada Community Development Agency (GRENCODA).**

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 project R8325, Policy Relevant Knowledge on Feasible Alternative Natural Resource Based Strategies for Enhancing Livelihoods, sought to develop, validate and promote mechanisms towards the implementation in the coastal zones of the Caribbean, of integrated pro-poor natural resource management which supports traditional as well as alternative livelihood strategies that are sustainable. The main hypothesis of R8325 was that a significant gap exists between the existing, sustainable livelihoods policy framework and its implementation in the Caribbean coastal areas. Further, that this gap can be filled through targeted uptake, by policymakers, policy implementers and the impacted communities, of a collaborative programme of appropriate policy implementation reforms.**

**R8325 sought to enhance policy-relevant knowledge on how to fill this gap, by facilitating policy makers and policy implementers, as well as other stakeholders, to buy-in to a process of analysis and action to effect sustained change in policies supportive to the livelihood strategies of marginal, natural resource users in Caribbean coastal areas.**

**Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST) policy was identified as a frame within which both traditional and alternative sustainable, natural resource based livelihood options –including fishing, farming, agro-processing, hospitality related trades, and their inter-relationships – could effectively be considered.**

**The project sought to bring centre stage the process of collaboration and partnerships among key stakeholders to implement concrete activities which support poverty eradication through the livelihood practices of the poor. The project therefore sought to field- test the hypothesis that the gap between policy intent and practice could be filled by actually facilitating activities, which brought together policy makers-in the public and private sector- and communities.**

**The testing of the hypothesis was undertaken in three main steps. First, the project disseminated the research findings of R8135 to policymakers, policy implementers and communities, to validate the findings of R8135 and achieve sustained buy-in to the closing of policy implementation gaps identified. The main methodology for this was a series of field visits with presentations on the project, workshops and face-to-face meetings.**

**Second, the project team worked with stakeholders to identify specific, prioritised initiatives to be tested during the period of the project.**

**The third step involved the engagement of these stakeholders in a process of policy analysis and action, focused on specific activities in the initial study communities together; with testing of the validity and applicability of findings against an identified community in Grenada. The latter was effected by Hurricane Ivan in November, 2004 but the project was able to resume activities in Grenada in early 2005. The output of this third step are the Guidelines for similar efforts to make 'It' happen.**

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 Please specify
			X	X	

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

**Community Based Sustainable Tourism (CBST) arose from the linking of ecologically and economically sustainable production at the community level with the main tourism market. CBST is characterized by the following features:**

- **its products are produced for sale in the tourist market;**
- **it utilizes the human and natural resources at the community level in the production of its products;**
- **these resources are controlled and managed by the community in a way that balances ecological sustainability with economic viability.**

**The model of CBST with which we worked with therefore identified a number of community based livelihood strategies that produced products that have the potential to be vended in the tourism market**

**but are constrained by the factors identified above; factors that normally accompany the efforts of poor people to produce goods and services. Removing these constraints will in effect mainstream significant proportions of the population that now exist on the social and economic fringes of our societies. The marginalization of our human resources provides a breeding ground for the full range of social maladies and pathologies that currently plague these societies.**

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

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillsides	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting
					x		

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

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing
						x

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.

**Value can be added to the output of R8325 by drawing from and comparing with outputs of other relevant DFID projects and honing the presentation of best practices and guidelines. The tabulation below presents the underlying comparisons across Projects.**

	Project Rxxxxx	Communication Strategy	Dissemination Products	Validation Processes	Collaboration Strategy	Guidelines
1.	R8325	Developed and shared with a range of regional partners to build awareness and identity potential for partnerships and alliances.	Phase 1 report and findings; Hypothesis for R8325; Policy Briefs; Power-point presentations	Workshops targeting all levels of Stakeholders; Promotion of the CBST model approach in bridging policy / implementation gaps identified.	Participation of all stakeholders in the planning/ implementation of a "do-able" activity in each community	Guidelines for collaboration / partnerships in mainstreaming of SL policy support for marginalized communities

2	R7797		<i>Database on LWI in the wider Caribbean Community</i>		<i>Interactions among all stakeholders at all levels</i>	<i>Recommendations to DFID and all stakeholders on future researchable problems</i>
3	R7037		<i>Reports on typology of NR research projects and outputs and promotion pathways</i>			<i>Best practices on devising an appropriate communication strategy</i>
4	R6800					<i>Guidelines on stakeholder analysis, dissemination pathways and participatory approaches. Guidelines on mainstreaming gender and micro-finance</i>
5	R8317	<i>Strategy developed in collaboration with key partners</i>		<i>Uptake of 1) policy messages 2) co-management tools for training NR users and managers 3) tools and methods for coastal zone management 4) Regional research agenda on NR in coastal zones</i>		<i>Guidelines for developing methods and indicators for assessing effectiveness of products re institutional arrangements and policies for pro-poor coastal management.</i>
6	R8134		<i>Newsletters, e-mails etc; research framework</i>	<i>Research framework (widely accepted for use) was successfully used for institutional activities</i>		<i>Guidelines document and slides widely promoted</i>

7	R8492		<p><i>Identification of good practices re implementing communication plans.</i></p> <p><i>Promotion of framework for management, monitoring and evaluation of communication plan.</i></p>			
8	R7559		<p><i>New and improved technologies, approaches and arrangements</i></p>		<p><i>Participation in management by local resource users; increased involvement of local organizations in NR governance and new partnerships</i></p>	<p><i>Lessons and conclusions relevant and applicable to coastal management regionally and worldwide</i></p>
9	R8364	<p><i>Strategy successfully promoted to regional audiences</i></p>	<p><i>Policy briefs based on materials from R7668</i></p>			

## 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**).

**Validation of the research output was pursued at two levels – firstly at the level of the hypothesis put forward based on the findings of R8135 and secondly at the level of testing the alternative strategies developed for addressing the implementation gaps identified in the hypothesis.**

***Validating the Hypothesis:*** As part of a series of Field Visits, meetings and workshops were arranged in the original case study countries, St Lucia and Belize, as well as in Grenada which was the country chosen to demonstrate the wider validity and transferability of the findings and the applicability of the proposed responses: i.e. for scaling up the research findings.

***The visits were scheduled in close proximity, allowing a clear sense of those issues which found resonance with stakeholders in the countries visited; as well as allowing the team to caucus on the way forward – based on the responses to the findings, hypothesis and case model.***

***In each of the countries, meetings were scheduled at the senior policy level (with Ministers of Government or their senior representatives); as well as the senior policy making/implementation level (directors or departments, heads of statutory and private agencies); the intermediary level (including major non-government organizations); and the community level. In some instances, the team was able to split up, increasing the number of stakeholders covered.***

***Workshops were also arranged, for a mix of relevant participants, most of them policy implementers and intermediaries; at which presentations were balanced with working groups to engage participants in prioritizing issues raised and helping to identify do-able activities within the timeframe of the project.***

***Testing the Alternative Strategies:*** The project team worked with stakeholders to identify specific, prioritised initiatives to be tested during the period of the project. These stakeholders were engaged in a process of policy analysis and action which focused on specific activities in the initial study communities; with the decision to test the validity and applicability of findings against an identified community in Grenada. This was affected by Hurricane Ivan in November, 2004 but the project was able to resume activities in Grenada in early 2005. Regrettably, Grenada also was hit by hurricane Emily on July 15, 2005.

***Draft Guidelines on a sustainable livelihoods approach to poverty eradication which could be used by stakeholders in the policy arena in the Caribbean (and potentially elsewhere) were developed drawing on the findings of the overall study. These Guidelines were corroborated by reference to the activities through which they were generated and were validated through presentation to a range of regional stakeholders and their feedback weretaken into account in the finalization of the Guidelines.***

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).***

***The targeted social groups were persons living in poverty and dependent on natural resources in the land-water interface in two communities in St. Lucia (Anse-la-Raye and Praslin) and Belize(Hopkins and Sarteneja) together with two adjoining communities in Grenada(Soubise and Maquise). As noted the production system of focus was the land water interface and coastal artisanal fishing.***

***The Guidelines were presented at five(5) regional workshops together with six (6) regional Conferences:***

### **Project-specific Workshops**

**1. To a range of stakeholders from St. Lucia and representatives from St. Vincent, Grenada and Dominica and Belize at a two-day end of project workshop in St. Lucia (July 27-28);**

**(2) To a similar range of stakeholders in Barbados; Antigua (with representation from St. Kitts), Jamaica and Belize at workshops on September 9, 10, 13 and 16, respectively.**

### **Conferences**

**1. Regional Conference on July 29, 2005 organised by the St. Lucia Marine Management Authority (SMMA) to mark its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary;**

**2. October 20, 2005: UWI St. Augustine Symposium on poverty research organized by the Department of Behavioral Science.**

**3. October 24-25, 2005 at SEDU Annual Conference in Trinidad and Tobago with a range of regional representatives including from Guyana, Suriname, Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados, St. Lucia, Dominica, Antigua, St. Kitts, Jamaica and Belize.**

**4. 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Development Conference of the Eastern Caribbean Bank (ECCB), Dec 1-2, 2005 with regional and international participants including from DFID, Barbados, European Commission, International Monetary Fund.**

**(5). 8<sup>th</sup> Caribbean Tourism Organisation's Sustainable Tourism Conference. April 25-29, 2006. Puerto Rico.**

**(6). Regional Land Management Conference, Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI). Sept 14-16, 2006. St. Lucia.**

---

### **Current Situation**

#### **C. Current situation**

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

**The outputs are being used as inputs into policy making decisions at least for the specific communities included in the study and also, possibly for extension to other communities. Output also has been included in teaching and presentations to regional and international conferences The users are Governments and international agencies providing livelihoods support together with.**



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**).

**The results have been used by the UNDP in Belize to support livelihood activities in one of the surveyed communities (Sarteneja). The Grenada Government also has used the work to develop alternative uses for existing coastal housing in Soubise. In St. Lucia the Heritage Tourism Programme used the findings to validate some of their own priorities and to take forward initiatives suggested.**

**The output also is being used in academic teaching at the University of the West Indies and also in terms of papers presented at regional and international conferences.**

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

**It is difficult to fully determine the extent of useage. However, as indicated in terms of Questions 13 there was uptake by both governments and international agencies in the larger countries and communities.**

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 facts of success? (**max 350 words**).

**The major programmes which exist regionally are in terms of poverty reduction/mitigation efforts together with a disparate range of sectoral initiatives in regional governments. In Grenada, the Ministries of Finance and Tourism have assisted with the promotion and adoption of the outputs proposed. The Grenada Cabinet has recently appointed a Human Settlement Task Force to oversee the implementation of the Soubise/Marquis project. The Task Force is headed by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Finance**

**In St. Lucia originally the Heritage Tourism Project and the Ministry of Tourism in which it has been located have been involved. The Heritage Tourism project has noted the benefits of the regular meetings designed within the SEDU project to monitor impacts and assess strategies for uptake. Further details on these are provided in 16.**

**In Belize the UNDP and the NGO-BEST- have taken the projects output on board.**

**The dissemination of the findings also has generated interest in representatives of these organisations who participated in the workshops that were held in Barbados, St. Lucia, Antigua, Jamaica, Belize and Trinidad and Tobago. It is one of the Caribbean Tourism Organisation's representatives present at the Barbados workshop, for example, who invited SEDU to present at its 8<sup>th</sup> Conference on Sustainable tourism.**

**Civil society representatives also participated in these meetings and welcomed both the findings and dissemination material to support their own advocacy and capacity building initiatives.**

**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**).

**Grenada**

**A contract has been awarded to a private contractor to develop the physical infrastructure of the Soubis/ Maquis site. Work is to get started in the last quarter of the year from relocation to commencement in the first quarter of 2007. The Chinese will be constructing the houses as part of its grant contribution to the Government and people of Grenada. A means test was conducted on the persons to be relocated to determine the extent to which they can contribute to their relocation. At the same time the community has organized itself into a community group as part of the conditions of the project.**

**Saint Lucia****The Saint Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme**

**(SLHTP) benefited from the DFID R8325 project through regular meetings designed to monitor impacts and assess strategies for uptake. These resulted in three main benefits as described below:**

1. **Contributing to National Tourism Strategy development.**

**The DFID R8235 study identified key gaps between policy and implementation, which were discussed among policy makers in Saint Lucia, including the Minister and the Permanent Secretary of Tourism. These discussions coincided with the conduct of a tourism sector study for Saint Lucia, which confirmed the DFID R8325 findings and made recommendations to mitigate these.**

**The Product Development component of Tourism Sector Strategy makes the following recommendations:**

**Introduction:**

**In order to provide assistance to local communities to improve their capacity to take advantage of the economic opportunities available from the industry the Ministry of Tourism will undertake the following activities:**

- Entrepreneurial support structure**
- Mobilize and strengthen community groups**
- Create opportunities for linkages**
- Skills development**

**10.5.1. Entrepreneurial Support Structure**

**Local community entrepreneurial groups and individuals will be given technical support through the proposed Business Advisory Services team. This team referred to previously in the product development**

**section of this report, will be set up to provide technical support in business development to local entrepreneurs. The technical staff will assist the communities and individuals by providing guidance in all aspects of business operations in order to develop their capacity to take greater advantages of the economic opportunities available within the tourism industry.**

#### **10.5.2. Mobilise Community Groups**

**Assistance will be provided to communities to organize groups so that they can work collectively towards the development of a business venture. An example of this is community members developing and executing a tour of a natural attraction within their community. Existing groups should be strengthened to further develop their abilities. The St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme has had success with working alongside some communities and this approach should be further developed and applied to several other communities island wide.**

#### **10.5.3. Create Opportunities for Linkages**

**In an effort to expand local participation directly and indirectly in tourism, opportunities for linkages have to be identified and promoted within the communities. A study is required to assess the supply and demand gaps. The findings of this research will be publicized among the relevant businesses and communities. The Ministry of Tourism will therefore need to assist and match local communities and entrepreneurs with the businesses that have indicated a need for a particular service or product. The linkages that will be forged will be in industries such as tourism, agriculture and manufacturing.**

#### **10.5.4. Skills Development**

**Skills development opportunities will be made available to the local communities in the form of training and apprenticeship programmes. This will give the community residents opportunities to improve their existing skills to produce better quality products and services.**

## **2. Contributing to the conceptualising of a Sustainable Tourism Product Development Programme.**

**Following on the Tourism Sector Strategy, the Ministry of Tourism in collaboration with the SLHTP, developed a paper to be submitted to Cabinet for the establishment of a Sustainable Tourism Product Development Programme. The specific objectives are to:**

- 1. Build on the achievements and resources of SLHTP and other actors in developing community-based tourism products and services**
- 2. Provide support to the development of community-based events, sites and attractions to communities that have;**
  - Viable products,**
  - A demonstrated level of capacity and**
  - Willingness to lead local processes**
- 3. Promote the branding of individual communities along themes that are consistent with their natural and cultural heritage**
- 4. Link with initiatives to support community-based accommodation**
- 5. Use this project as a process for community empowerment and capacity building**

### 3. Contributing to increased collaboration with the micro-finance sector:

*The gap in identifying and providing suitable financing support for the micro-business community led to the hosting of a credit fair coordinated by SEDU with local support from the SLHTP in collaboration with several private and public micro-lending agencies. This initiative led to the fostering of closer collaboration among the micro-lending agencies; increased knowledge among potential beneficiaries of the services offered by those lending agencies; and actual increased support to several SLHTP projects, notably the weekly Anse-La Raye Fish Friday festival. The project also contributed towards the inclusion of a Business financial support study and action plans for the second phase of the SLHTP as well as for a UNESCO funded YouthPATH project also being co-ordinated by the SLHTP. The study of the financing study led to the following recommendations for a three-prong approach at improving the accessibility to financing:*

#### **Lenders**

- i. Develop soft loan packages, which will involve a moratorium and creative repayment terms.*
- ii. Loans should be so designed with repayment terms taking into consideration the seasonality of the industry.*
- iii. An invoice financing mechanism can be set up with the banks/financial institutions to grant up to 85% of the receivable, pending collection from the supplier.*
- iv. Regular workshops should be held with the major players of the financial sector in order to sensitize them to the various attractions in the heritage tourism sector.*
- v. Visits to the heritage sites by the lenders should be encouraged.*
- vi. The National Insurance Corporation, insurance companies and credit unions should be encouraged to 'give back' to the community by setting aside some funds to re-lend to the heritage tourism sector.*

#### **Site Owners, Investors/Borrower**

- i. Ensure that the projects (proposals, feasibility studies, business plans) are thoroughly researched and prepared and professionally presented to the financial institutions.*
- ii. Financial data must be accurate and provide a true picture of the viability of the project.*
- iii. Site owners/investors must understand the importance of contributing equity in their respective projects.*
- iv. For site owners who have existing businesses, records must be kept and updated at all times.*
- v. A data bank should be developed by site owners. It is therefore critical that HERITAS be mandated to collate the data from the various sites.*
- vi. Site owners must actively align themselves to the large tour operators/ hotels.*
- vii. Formation of clusters within the sector, base on the type of attractions.*
- viii. Site owners should be encouraged to develop a co-operative.*
- ix. There is an urgent need for training for the site owners in marketing, advertising and*

**promotion.****Government**

- i. Continue to provide a fund (grant monies) for assisting with the preparation of proposals and business plans for the development of heritage tourism sites.**
- ii. Government must use moral suasion with the banks with regard to the reduction of interest rates etc for the sector.**
- iii. Encourage community participation**
- iv. Create an environment that is conducive to the development of heritage tourism sites.**
- v. Develop a list of professionals including financial, marketing and environmental experts.**
- vi. Establish a public education programme so that the population will be aware of their heritage and the attractions that have been developed in the sector.**
- vii. Encourage private sector shareholding in some of the new and existing heritage tourism sites.**
- viii. A special fund established by the government and managed by the Saint Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme to assist with the preparation of proposals and projects.**

**Belize****- Sarteneja:**

**Since the SEDU project , the village has been able to secure two (2) projects financed. One by UNDP-GEF Small Grants Programme and one by COMPACT - the first for institutional support and the other for alternative livelihoods development both for a new NGO called SWEET- Sarteneja Eco tourism and Environment Team . These projects will finance activities for SWEET over the next calendar period to about November 2007.**

**-Hopkins:**

**Hopkins is still in the process of developing a project for financing by UN DP \_GED - GP . There have been some problems with the registration of the group and the title and tenure arrangements of the land on which they propose to do the project.**

**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).**

**The process of adopting the outputs can be addressed both in terms of the study countries and the rest of the Caribbean. The key institutional issue in the study country relates to impacting on the actual budgetary process of public policy organisations in term of actual action. The outputs also differ from some of the current policies in that the outputs focus on concrete action rather than more general policies. Relatedly, the emphasis in the outputs on participation by all stakeholders including those living in poverty themselves requires time for acceptance.**

**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).**

*It would be helpful if an international, regional or national organisation persuaded to the approach of the project and its output would be willing to provide financial support for a follow-up set of concrete, do-able activities: particularly those which could impact directly on livelihoods. Further communication of the results and reinforcement of findings to a range of stakeholders also would be useful and SEDU itself already has been doing this as described in Section 11 in terms of post project presentations to a range of Conferences and participants in the region.*

**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 most effective ways are to facilitate concrete, do-able projects in the communities living in poverty based on their recommendations as to both priority concerns and the most appropriate ways to address them. This also needs to be buttressed by having those living in poverty having opportunities to interface with policy makers and implementers in both the public and private sector. In addition, selective capacity and confidence building activities also can contribute.***

***In terms of communicative media a range of approaches are required. First, there is no gainsaying the role of direct face to face communication particularly if this is conducted in an interactive manner and also involves use of multi-media presentations. Policy briefs and Guidelines for practical projects also can be of use.***

***These range of communication forms need to be self-reinforcing and also conducted with some regularity:say 4-5 times per year. The mass media also can be utilised to take the message-particularly of best and perhaps worst practices- to a national and regional community.***

***Ultimately, those living in poverty need to understand the linkage between the power they have as members of the electorate and the need for governance systems in which they have opportunities both for voice and 'hands', as it were, in terms of the ability to impact on both the design and implementation of sustainable livelihood approaches to poverty eradication.(224 WORDS)***

## **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.**

***It is difficult to provide any estimates of direct impacts on poverty. However, the description of follow up activities undertaken since and directly or indirectly linked to the project (as described in Sections 15-16 are suggestive of***

*already evident positive trends.*

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*

*Again, it is difficult at this time-without a post project –tracer study, as it were, to provide any estimates.*

## **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.*

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

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)*