

LAUNCH WORKSHOP FOR THE PROJECT:

"Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean"

REPORT

Regency Hotel, Hadfield Street, Georgetown, Guyana
July 27th – 28th, 2017



Funded by the European Union

Report prepared by: Ashanta Osborne Moses (Consultant)

Table Of Contents

SECTION 1.0: WORKSHOP OVERVIEW	1
1.1 OBJECTIVES	1
1.2 WORKSHOP MATERIALS	1
SECTION 2.0: WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS	1
2.1 KEY QUESTIONS FROM STAKEHOLDERS FOLLOWING PRESENTATIONS	1
2.2 WORKING GROUP SESSION 1: ESTABLISHING A COMMON UNDERSTANDING OF THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT	4
SECTION 3.0: NEXT STEPS AND ACTION PLANNING	7
3.1 WORKING GROUP SESSION 2: HARVESTING THE DIVERSE VIEWS AND PERSPECTIVES OF STAKEHOLDERS	7
SECTION 4.0: WORKSHOP EVALUATIONS, AND CONCLUSION	10
4.1 WORKSHOP EVALUATION RESULTS	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
4.2 CONCLUSION	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
APPENDIX A: WORKSHOP AGENDA	12
APPENDIX B: STAKEHOLDER INVITEE LIST	16
APPENDIX C: WORKSHOP EVALUATION	17
LIST OF ANNEXES	25

Introduction

The EU funded project *“Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean”* started in January 2017. The ultimate goal of the project is to significantly enhance governance and protection of marine and coastal resources of Guyana and Suriname. It is intended that this will be achieved through collaborative processes with all ocean stakeholders, improved knowledge of the coastal and marine environment, and enhanced capacity of key stakeholders. The project also hopes to enable substantial progress towards achieving the Aichi targets 4, 6, 10, 11, and 14 under the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD).

This four-year project is funded by the EU and covers the coastal and marine areas of Suriname and Guyana. The project will be implemented through a partnership between WWF Guianas, Guyana’s Protected Areas Commission (PAC), Green Heritage Fund Suriname (GHFS), and Nature Conservation Division (NCD) of the Suriname Forest Service (Dienst ’s Lands Bosbeheer/ Natuurbeheer in Suriname).

A Launch Workshop was held from 27-28 July 2017 at the Regency Hotel in Georgetown Guyana. Participants included representatives from Government, State Agencies, Private Sector, Community Members, Non-governmental Organizations, and Academia. The objective of the workshop was to bring together all project stakeholders and to provide an overview of the project, the project area, its objectives and activities, and to discuss the potential role of the different stakeholders with respect to Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).

Throughout the workshop, stakeholders were asked to think holistically about what Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) meant to them in the context of their: engagement and involvement in that space; experience and historical knowledge; unique value add to the MSP process; and critical observations in various regards to the project purpose.

This report contains information that was presented to stakeholders, heavily focused on examples, experiences, research, and successful practices. It also summarizes workshop discussions and catalogs the diverse viewpoints of stakeholders. This report serves to provide a record of the event and a tool that provides information from key stakeholders for reflection and analysis in the planning and decision making process going forward with the implementation of the project.

Section 1.0: Workshop Overview

1.1 Objectives

The objectives of the workshop were to:

- Engage stakeholders to provide clarity on the project
- Provide a forum for knowledge sharing on the topic of marine governance and protection
- Explore potential roles of the different stakeholders, and
- Garner and discuss stakeholder inputs into the project.

1.2 Workshop Materials

Several documents were developed to conduct and evaluate the workshop.

- **Workshop Agenda:** In an effort to create a space within which stakeholders would have maximum time to discuss, share, and provide feedback, the agenda was significantly revised. Specifically, PowerPoint presentations were made more concise, plenary discussion sessions were added to facilitate feedback and questions, small group discussions were designed and included to create space for input, and visual media was used to complement information shared. The workshop agenda is included in **Appendix A**.
- **Stakeholder List:** A list of all invited workshop Stakeholders is included in **Appendix B**.
- **Workshop Evaluation:** Participants were asked to evaluate the value and facilitation of the workshop. The evaluation form is included in **Appendix c**.

Section 2.0: Workshop Discussions

This section summarizes the discussions at the *“Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean”*. The following sections were developed using participant input, discussions, and recorded notes, which can be found in **Appendix D**.

2.1 Key questions from Stakeholders following Presentations

Agenda Item (Presentation)	Specific Question	Response
MSP Planning in the	From a legislative point of	As a starting Point we need to

Caribbean: case studies (Kim, Baldwin, Consultant)	<p>view how do we see the MSP moving forward?</p>	<p>examine the cracks in the system, as to assess what we have and don't have, in order to determine how we will move forward.</p> <p>Part of the process is to review the legislation and the gaps to figure out where we stand.</p>
	<p>Artisanal fishermen make up 90% of the fishing population when compared to industrial. With artisanal fishermen being spread out how do we intend to reach them all? How do we meet their interest? (Because different groups have different wants). This is their livelihood; if they do not catch fish they won't get an income.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Communication Techniques will be discussed as to reach out to everyone, whether it be a seminar at a hotel or just a simple conversation at a rum shop, because the views of the artisanal fisher men and locals are very important as they are able to educate us on things happening every day.</p> <p>NB. Members of Industrial Fishing organizations are not here because they don't need to be</p>
	<p>How will many of the ideas presented help us fishermen in Guyana because we fish in muddy water and there is no diving. In addition, we driftnet and go wherever the tide takes us.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>Ideas and plans are not set in stone; these were just island who had similar issues in terms of lack of research information and a few governance issues that result in governmental collaborations.</p> <p>Based upon the country in this case Guyana, we will determine what steps are needed to be taken all based on the priorities named by sectors and departments i.e., what they are willing to give and take, as to make stakeholders and other participatory members happy without tarnishing the primary</p>

		goals of the MSP.
	<p>In the case of an Oil Spill, do we have an Oil Spill Contingency Plan?</p> <p>-</p>	<p>We had started the protocol and are still working on them, but more data is needed on our biological water life & species who can potentially be harmed.</p> <p>Though the oil comp company had an EIA plan, the Government can develop their national Plan and put it forth to the oil company.</p>
	<p>What would be the capacity building of village councils?</p> <p>-</p>	<p>We first need to determine what do the different stakeholders need and what can be developed.</p> <p>The PAC through the PA Act will be establishing Site Level Committees that would help in management of each Protected Area. This committee (SLC) can help to lead the implementation of the MSP project and determine capacity needs. Process of formalizing the SLCs will commence by end of August.</p>
<p>Participatory 3D Mapping: Example from the Caribbean Region (Kim, Baldwin, Consultant)</p>	<p>The Grenadines took 2 years to complete the project and Guyana I am assuming will take 4 years? Basically it's hard to compare islands to Guyana in terms of size, like the Pedro Bay of Jamaica.</p>	<p>Data collection took one year in The Grenadines and it can in Guyana, it's about manpower and communication.</p> <p>Note-taker Observation 1: people seemed confused because many compared the size of Guyana to Jamaica instead of the size of the Coastline to that of Pedro Bay.</p>

		Note-taker Observation 2: Some people seemed concerned as to whether Guyana is ready for a MSP Zone.
CBD Gap analysis and Legislative Review (Alicia Elias- Roberts Consultant)	Is there an Act that governs the exploitation of animals? Because someone tried to sell a jaguar cub and it was reported but the division did nothing about it. -	Yes. The Wildlife division could not act upon it because they did not have any legal rights to get involved, but new committee had been formed on June 1 st , 2017 and they will be more hands on.
	Would be need to mend the EPA ACT to cover MSP or would a legislation be sufficient.	Existing legislation would be sufficient.

2.2 Working Group Session 1: Establishing a Common Understanding of the Marine Environment

The marine environment is a diverse and dynamic space that serves multiple purposes and is utilized by numerous stakeholders. These uses range from personal livelihoods generation, to conservation, to tourism, to large-scale resource extraction. In such a complex environment effective management is critical; and having a shared or common understanding is key to mitigating the challenges that may present whether they are political, environmental, social, economic, or geographical. In this regard, the breakout session was conducted to answer the following questions:

1. Who should be involved in this Process?
2. What types of uses are happening in marine and coastal areas?
3. What types of information do you have that can be useful for MSP?
4. What are the various geographic areas to be considered for Guyana?

Nine working groups participated and delivered the following responses:

Specific Question	Responses	
Who should be involved in this process?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fishermen (Industrial & Artisanal) 2. Shipping Companies 3. Fish Processing Plants 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 33. Protected Areas Commission (PAC) 34. World Wildlife Fund (WWF)

	4. Coast Guard/ Navy	35. European Union (EU)
	5. Guyana River and Sea Defense	36. Regional Democratic Councils (RDC)
	6. Local Transport & Harbour	37. National Democratic Councils (NDC)
	7. Anthropology	38. Guyana National Trust
	8. Telecommunication Companies	39. Guyana Defense Force (GDF)
	9. Ministry of Public Infrastructure	40. Guyana Tourism Authority
	10. Ministry of Foreign Affairs	41. Civil Defense Commission (CDC)
	11. Ministry of Agriculture (Agriculture & Fisheries)	42. CARICOM
	12. Ministry of Indigenous Peoples' Affairs (MOIPA)	43. Wildlife Division
	13. Ministry of Natural Resources/ Petroleum Commission	44. The United Nations Organization for Education, Science and Culture (UNESCO)
	14. Ministry of Education	45. Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society (GMTCS)
	15. Ministry of Health	46. Timber Commerce
	16. Ministry of Finance	47. The National Agriculture Research & Extension Institute (NAREI)- Mangrove Department
	17. Ministry of Legal Affairs	48. Amerindian Peoples Association (APA)
	18. Hydrometeorological Service	49. Guyana Energy Agency
	19. Maritime Administration Department (MARAD)	50. The Media
	20. Guyana Geology and Mines Commission (GGMC)	51. Custom Anti- Narcotics Unit (CANU)
	21. Guyana Forestry Commission (GFC)	52. Resort Owners
	22. Citizens	53. Farmers
	23. Research and Educational Institutions	54. Policy Makers
	24. Centre for the Study of Biological Diversity (CSBD)	55. Wildlife Trappers
	25. The University of Guyana (UG)	56. Field Officers
	26. Law Enforcement Agencies	57. The Guyana Association of Trawler Owners & Seafood Processors (GATO&SP)
	27. The Department of Environment (DoE)	58. Conservation International Guyana
	28. Office of Climate Change (OCC)	
	29. Environmental Protection	

	Agency (EPA) 30. Department of Fisheries 31. WCMC 32. Department of Fisheries	(CI- Guyana) 59. Guyana Oil & Gas Association 60. Community Groups 61. Guyana Revenue Authority (GRA) 62. Guyana Water Incorporate (GWI)- Waste Water Department 63. Non- Governmental Organizations (National & International)
What types of uses are happening in marine and coastal areas?	1. Fishing (Artisanal & Industrial) 2. Transportation 3. Tourism 4. Recreation 5. Research 6. Religious Functions/ Activities 7. Oil Exploration 8. Mariculture 9. Submarine Cables (Communication) 10. Protected Areas 11. Conservation 12. Diving 13. Agriculture 14. Housing 15. Hunting (sea turtles) 16. Sand & Shell Mining 17. Bee keeping 18. Infrastructure Development (squatting) 19. Sea birds & nesting 20. Wildlife trapping 21. Farming 22. Commercial Building	
What types of information do you have that can be useful for marine spatial planning?	1. Local/ traditional Knowledge 2. Best Practices 3. Spatial Data 4. SBPA Data 5. Squatting Zone 6. Non-netting Zone 7. Biodiversity Data 8. Marine turtle Date	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Transportation Routes 10. Underwater Culture Heritage Data 11. Fishery Department Data (Marine Stock Data) 12. Vessel Lists 13. Coastal Site Maps 14. Tidal Information 15. Hydrographic Data
<p>What are the various geographic areas to be considered for Guyana?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shell Beach 2. The river mouth (3 main rivers) 3. Mangrove Areas 4. Within 3-20 fathoms of water 5. EEZ 6. Territorial Sea Continental Shelf 7. High Seas 8. Shorelines 9. Landmass (coastal zone) 10. Maritime Boundaries 11. SBPA 12. Coastal Areas 13. Sea Defense 14. Offshore 15. Coastal Boundaries within the Fishing Regions (Regions 1-6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Waini to Pomeroon • 2: Pomeroon to Essequibo • 3: Essequibo to Mahaica • 4: Mahaica to Berbice • 5: Berbice to #61

Section 3.0: MSP – Moving Forward

3.1 Working Group Session 2: Harvesting the Diverse views and perspectives of Stakeholders

During the final session of the workshop, emphasis was placed on providing clarity on the project and gathering information from stakeholders during the initial engagement. To accomplish this, the substantive part of the agenda concluded with a final working group session that asked stakeholders to think critically about what had been presented to them and to identify potential challenges, methods of engagement, and gaps as it relates to the topics covered.

Stakeholders were challenged to think about three core questions pertinent to the implementation of the MSP project:

- What are potential challenges and conflicts?
- What kind of participatory and communication tools should be used in a Marine Spatial Planning Process?
- Besides the areas discussed during the workshop, what additional topic/issues should be considered?

The objective of this exercise was to brainstorm ideas as it relates to the three questions posed by the implementing partners (WWF and PAC). The questions were particularly framed to harvest the unique views and perspectives of stakeholders as it relates to the intended project. It is anticipated that the input from the discussions will be used to further inform the process of the MSP project planning. The following are the responses grouped according to the general headings they fall under:

What are potential challenges and conflicts?

Governance	Information management	Stakeholder engagement	Management
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political will and enforcement • Outdated legislation • Overlapping policies • Transparency • Corruption/lack of good governance • Political differences/interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate baseline data and data collection • Validating information • Sharing information/lack of communication • Lack of sensitization/awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries, tourism involvement • Fishing ground conflicts • Weak follow-up • Lack of local technical capacity/human resources/level of education and adaptability • Lack of community/stakeholder full involvement/gathering local knowledge • Full involvement of government and NGOs • Prioritizing stakeholders • Stakeholders conflicts such as conservation vs extractive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil exploration source of potential conflict • Government approvals • Funding and other resources • Geography of the area to map

- industries; fisheries
vs tourism and
locals vs industries
- Language barriers

What kind of participatory and communication tools should be used in a Marine Spatial Planning Process?

Electronic and Print Media	Surveys and Documentation	Community and Institutional Outreach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails • Media /social media Newsletters • Newspaper publications • Posters • Brochures/flyers • Videos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KAP survey to determine knowledge attitude and practice of coastal communities towards Coastal environment • Workshops • Focus groups • Reports • Maps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community meetings/national consultations • Art/drama/music shows • Involvement of young children (essays and art competition) • Science fairs • Guest lectures • Tourism education via tourism guide • Inclusion of MSP in school curriculum

Besides the areas discussed during the workshop, what additional topics/issues should be considered?

Strategic Planning	Environmental impact	Governance
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of fisheries department • Communities along protected areas • Public awareness and engagement • Considering coastal processes • Contingency plan for oil and gas • Alternatives to supplement restrictions • Use of traditional 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution from extractive industries and farm • Pollution management and enforcement of related laws • Waste water dumping into the oceans • Effects of mining activities on rivers and marine life • Climate change considerations on biodiversity • Because of erosion and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The way of life – economic, social, cultural • SWOT analysis • Political will • Funding • Border issues/trans-boundary issues

- knowledge
- Capacity building
- depositional cycles turtle
- population would increase

Section 4.0: Conclusion

Throughout the workshop, stakeholders gained a better understanding of the project: "Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname." They were asked to fully commit to the process over the two days and their participation was commendable. Though at times content heavy, it was clear that presenters – at all times – captured the undivided attention of stakeholders; and this could be attributed to a genuine interest and ownership of the topics being covered as the issue of MSP in various ways impacted each individual (and/or agency represented) in a significant way.

An analysis of the workshop agenda and its objectives indicate that the expected outcomes of the activity were accomplished upon review of the workshop evaluation results. Notably, the overall feedback was positive and constructive in its critique.

Based on the overall evolution of the process, especially honing in on the interaction among stakeholders, the specific feedback provided, and the wealth of information gathered over the two days, there are a few common indicators which when analyzed formed the basis of the following conclusions and/or recommendations. These are:

- There is a wealth of knowledge and historical information available among stakeholders. Harnessed effectively through ongoing 'meaningful' engagement, will bring the project closer to the stakeholders with the most impact on the overall goal. When communities, institutions, and other entities feel truly a part of a process, and see their own interests and 'agendas' considered and incorporated, they are more likely to engage in a constructive way.
- There is high expectation that efforts will be made to continue meaningful engagement with stakeholders. Reflecting on the specific methods identified during the groups discussions, the implementing partners must consider aligning their traditional methods of engagement with those expressed/requested by stakeholders. Consideration must also be made to ensure that engagement methods are appropriate to the specific stakeholder groups.
- Efforts must be placed on convening targeted stakeholder groups focus group discussions to better unpack the specific realities, capacities, challenges, and expectations of each group. This establishes a better understanding of how they can be most effectively engaged.
- There is need for robust communication strategy that includes both interpersonal interactions and targeted IEC. Special emphasis could also be placed on those key influential stakeholders (e.g. government, state agencies, advocacy groups, etc.) to continuously

provide information and address their concerns so as to preempt the possibilities of conflicting agendas and/or messages in the marine environment space.

- Responsibility for achieving the results must be equally shared among all stakeholders. These responsibilities must be discussed and agreed to from the inception of project implementation – since it is already designed – and all efforts must be made on the part of the implementing agencies to ensure that the necessary information, tools, and resources are made available for effective and efficient participation of all stakeholders. Conducting thorough stakeholder assessments, and analyzing the unique value-add of each to the success of the project can accomplish understanding this dynamic.

In closing, Mrs. Grant from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs¹ made some remarks, which bears significant influence on the implementation of the project. She mentioned that at the opening session the PAC's Commissioner said that there is no commitment but as we go through the document a clause of implementation is mentioned which did not receive the input of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She went on to state that caution must be taken when we proceed in the implementation of the project. One of the main concerns of the project is the clause that speaks to the designating of the zone as a protected area. However, this designation must be a decision of the government because it involves the coast, the sovereign territory of Guyana.

Mrs. Grant also stressed the point that caution must be taken if we are contemplating the implementation of this project. The possible implications of some of the undertakings of the project must also be assessed. She recommended that in going forward there is more need for meaningful and structural collaboration with all the relevant agencies such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Guyana Geology and Mines Commission, Department of Fisheries and other agencies to be taken on board before we implement this project.

Guyana does not have any difficulties with the Aichi targets or with actions to safeguard the marine environment. The general objective of the protection and conservation of the marine environment are in the expectations of the SDGs and CBD and the recent Ocean's Convention of which Guyana is a signatory.

What the foreign affairs is concerned with is the designation of our space. She went on to make some recommendations for way forward, which were:

- To review of the implementation
- Interagency to review the document and its information

¹ Conclusion remarks from the Min. of Foreign Affairs taken from workshop report submitted by participant from the Protected Areas Commission (Annex I)

Appendix A: Workshop Agenda

Agenda 2-day PROJECT LAUNCH WORKSHOP on EU Marine Spatial Planning Project GUYANA				
Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean				
The workshop will provide clarity on the what, when, where, how and who of the Marine Spatial Planning Project to the wider stakeholder group. Key topics associated with the project will be covered, including what is MSP, where is the subject area and what do we find there, what are examples from the region, and who is doing what. Also we will cover the results that the project has to achieve and do a role-play using an IOC-UNESCO example.				
DAY ONE				
No. Seq	Agenda Topic	Timeline	DURATION	Who
1	Video Presentation	2:58 mins	09:00-10:10 1 hour, 10 mins	
	Opening and Welcome to the Workshop - Setting the stage for the two days...	5 mins		Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
3	Opening Remarks by WWF Guianas - An overview of the project and objectives	10 mins		Aiesha Williams, Country Manager, WWF Guianas, Guyana
4	Why Marine Spatial Planning: - Overview Sustainable Development Goals and Aichi targets	10 mins		Odacy Davis, Dpt. Commissioner, Protected Areas Commission
5	Why Marine Spatial Planning: Marine Spatial Planning and Eco-system Based Management Concepts in the global agenda	15 mins		Hanneke Vanlavieren, Oceans Coordinator, WWF Guianas
6	Special Remarks - Protected Areas Commission	7 mins		Denise Fraser, Commissioner, Protected Areas Commission

“Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean”

8	Special Remarks	10 mins		Ndibi Schwiers, Director, Department of Environment, Ministry Of The Presidency
Video Presentation		5 mins		
9	Close of Opening Ceremony and Announcement of Morning Break	6 mins		Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
10:10 - 10:30	VIDEO AND REFRESHMENTS BREAK			
10	Approach of the Project	20 mins	10:30 - 12:30 1 hour, 10 mins	Aiesha Williams and Odacy Davis
11	Video Presentation	10 mins		
12	MSP planning in the Caribbean: case studies	50 mins		Kim Baldwin, Consultant
13	Plenary Discussion: Q&A Segment	20 mins		All
12:30 - 13:30	Video Presentations	LUNCH		
14	Establishing a Common Understanding of the Marine Environments: Break-out Session	50 mins	13:30 - 15:15 1 hour, 45 mins	Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
15	Video Presentation	3:43 mins		
	Participatory 3D Mapping: Example from the Caribbean Region	35 mins		Kim Baldwin, Consultant
16	Plenary Discussion: Q&A Segment	15 mins		

“Promoting Integrated and Participatory Ocean Governance in Guyana and Suriname: the Eastern Gate to the Caribbean”

17	Wrap up of the 1st day	15 mins		Odacy Davis
15:15 - 15:30	Video Presentations	VIDEO AND AFTERNOON TEA		
DAY TWO				
18	Video			
	Opening of 2nd day with summary of 1st day and overview of 2nd day	10 mins	09:00-12:00 3 hours	Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
12	CBD Gap analysis and Legislative Review	30 mins		Alicia Roberts, Consultant
19	Marine Spatial Planning Exercise	120 mins		Monique Poole, Director, Green Heritage Fund Suriname
20	Feedback on MSP Exercise	20 mins		All
WORKING BREAK				
DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATION FORM				
12:00 - 13:00	Video Presentations	LUNCH		
	The Sea of Guyana and Suriname	30 mins	1 Hour, 50 minutes	Dr. Marijke N. de Boer
21	Open Dialogue: <i>Harvesting the diverse views and perspectives of Stakeholders</i>	60 mins		Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
22	Workshop Evaluation	5 mins		All

23	Wrap up of the workshop and closing of the workshop			
	- Take Aways and Closing Remarks by PAC	5 mins		Odacy Davis, Dpt. Commissioner, Protected Areas Commission
	- Take Aways and Closing Remarks by WWF	5 mins		Aiesha Williams, Country Manager, WWF Guianas, Guyana
	Thanks and Closing of the Workshop	5 mins		Ashanta Osborne Moses, Workshop Facilitator
14:50 - 15:00	VIDEO AND AFTERNOON TEA			

Appendix B: Stakeholder Participant List

Appendix C: Workshop Evaluation

Workshop Evaluation Form

Date: _____

Please rate the following items on a scale from 1 to 5 by circling the appropriate number: 1=Strongly Disagree (SD); 2 = Disagree (D); 3 = Not Sure (NS); 4 = Agree (A); 5 = Strongly Agree (SA).

Questions	Scores					Comments
1. The workshop was well organized	1	2	3	4	5	
2. The agenda was well structured	1	2	3	4	5	
3. The presentations were informative and easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5	
4. The Presenters spoke clearly	1	2	3	4	5	
5. The Presenters demonstrated comprehensive knowledge of subject matter	1	2	3	4	5	
6. The exercise session on Marine Spatial Planning was useful	1	2	3	4	5	
7. There was enough room for questions, interactions and discussions	1	2	3	4	5	
8. The workshop venue was comfortable and	1	2	3	4	5	

well-kept					
9. I gained a good understanding of the project and the expected results	1	2	3	4	5
10. I understand fully my role in the successful execution of this project	1	2	3	4	5

11. What is your overall perception of the usefulness of the Workshop?

12. What was the most valuable aspect of the workshop?

13. What session (s) did you find most useful/informative and relevant to your role in Marine Spatial Planning?

14. What things could have been done differently to improve the workshop?

15. After having attended this workshop, how do you see yourself contributing to the EU Marine Spatial Planning Project?

16. What additional training, resources, information would you need that would build your capacity?

17. Do you have any additional Comments or Suggestions?

List of Annexes

Annex I: Report submitted by PAC personnel presenting concise reflections on the workshop from a technical perspective.

Annex II: List of Videos presented during the course of the two days demonstrating examples of MSP in various contexts.

Annex III (a-g): Copies of Presentations made during Workshop