



Review of National and Local Area Planning Methodologies in the Eastern Caribbean

Final Report, June 2019

Ancil Kirk
Bryce Julyan
Joanna Raynold

LIST OF ACRONYMS

BVI	British Virgin Island
CAP	Commonwealth Association of Planners
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CNULM	Caribbean Network for Urban and Land Management
CPA	Caribbean Planners Association
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
GCCA	Global Climate Change Alliance
NGO	Non-governmental Organizations
NPDP	National Physical Development Plan
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
SID	Small Island Developing States
SLM	Sustainable land Management
TOR	Terms of Reference

Table of Contents

LIST OF ACRONYMS	1
LIST OF FIGURES	3
FOREWORD	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1.0 INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 Background	9
1.2 The Key Objectives of CAP/CPA Review	13
2.0 OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
2.1 OECS General Planning Methodology and Terms of Reference	14
2.2 Advice to Governments of BVI and Dominica for Improvement of Projects	15
2.3 Recommendations for Improved Methodologies	18
2.4 Summary of the Key Recommendations	22
2.5 Civil Society Participation	23
2.5.1 OECS General Planning Methodology and TOR	23
2.5.2 Review of the Civic Engagement Processes Already Undertaken	25
2.5.3 Recommendations for Improved Civil Society Engagement	25
3.0 CONCLUSIONS	29
WORKS AND DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	31
APPENDIXES	32
A. Review Team	32
B. Schedule of Activities by Expert Panel	33
C. Schedule of Meetings.....	34
D. OECS Workshop	35
E. Summary Report Of OECS Land Use Planning Methodology Review Workshop	37

LIST OF FIGURES

1. High School damaged in Tortola, BVI, after Hurricane Irma, 2017.....	7
2. Damaged marina buildings and ferry, Road Town, Tortola, BVI, 2017.....	7
3. Damaged marina buildings and ferry, Road Town, Tortola, BVI, 2017.....	7
4. Damaged dwellings in Tortola, BVI after Hurricane Irma, 2017.....	8
5. Damaged dwellings in Tortola, BVI after Hurricane Irma, 2017.....	8
6. Devastating impact on coastal housing, Roseau, Dominica.....	8
7. Devastating impact on coastal housing, Roseau, Dominica.....	8
8. Bridge damaged by debris flows from Hurricane Maria in 2017, Roseau, Dominica.....	8
9. Damage along watercourses due to debris flow post-Hurricane Maria 2017, Roseau, Dominica.....	9

FOREWORD

In September 2017 the Caribbean region was severely devastated by two hurricanes - Storm Maria closely followed by Storm Irma. These category 5 hurricanes were among the worst ever experienced in the region and caused many deaths and widespread devastation and destruction across the Caribbean.

The Region was fortunate in having developed in 2016 specific Disaster Risk Reduction methodologies for national and local area land use planning through the work of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. However, as emergency disaster relief was being undertaken in the wake of storms Maria and Irma questions were asked about how effective these approaches were and whether as their usage became more widespread to what degree they would help strengthen resilience and minimize impacts in the case of any future natural disasters and extreme weather events including hurricanes.

The increasingly devastating impact of natural disasters on people and property which is being experienced across the Commonwealth, has been acknowledged at the highest levels including at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) in 2018 in London. At this meeting Heads recognized the importance of being properly prepared for future natural disasters and encouraged collaboration across international organizations and agencies, to support member countries that suffer severe impacts from natural disasters. In particular Heads encouraged support including appropriate funding mechanisms for small states and small islands to mitigate, reduce and recover from natural disasters.

This study was extremely timely and whilst recognizing the great strengths of the planning and land use methodologies in place, it has identified areas where improvements would be beneficial to secure improved resilience in the future. The study was carried out in the context of the Caribbean and Storms Irma and Maria but also drew on experience from the Pacific region. The study conclusions are relevant across many other parts of the Commonwealth especially those areas with similar characteristics and challenges such as small islands in the Pacific and elsewhere.

CAP looks forward to building on this work to further demonstrate the critical role of planning in helping secure a more resilient future for Commonwealth citizens especially those vulnerable to natural disasters and extreme weather events.

Finally, CAP is hugely grateful to the Commonwealth Foundation for funding this study and to Dr Asad Mohammed and Dr Perry Polar who helped develop and manage the project. Also many thanks to Dr Ancil Kirk, Bryce Julian and Joanna Arthurton who executed the project; to the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States who hosted the closing regional workshop and to all those involved in carrying out the study and producing this report.

Clive Harridge

Secretary-General

Commonwealth Association of Planners

Review of National and Local Area Planning Methodologies in the Eastern Caribbean

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) territories are extremely vulnerable to natural hazards and the impacts of climate change. As a region the OECS has recognized the need to take integrated action to effectively and efficiently manage its natural resources to achieve environmental sustainability and sustainable development. The development of generic methodologies for the preparation of National and Local Area Land Use Plans for the region, is framed within the context of the European Union funded “Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) project on Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Sustainable land Management (SLM) in the Eastern Caribbean”. These methodologies are currently being implemented at the national level in the British Virgin Islands (BVI), and at the local level (i.e. the Greater Marigot area) in Dominica.

A project was undertaken to review and validate the regional methodologies and the implications of the recent hurricanes on the ensuing land use planning exercises in the BVI and Dominica. The project was jointly undertaken by the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP), the Caribbean Planners Association (CPA), and the Caribbean Network for Urban and Land management (CNULM) and funded by the Commonwealth Foundation. This report documents the review team’s observations, findings and recommendations. These are summarized below:

- In developing national planning frameworks, the OECS methodology acknowledges a Disaster Risk Management approach to integrating land use with natural hazard mapping. An integrated planning approach that manages the inherent conflicts between development or land use and actual (or potential) natural hazards including extreme events is essential.
- Education and awareness across business, cultural and public (civil society) needs to accompany plan-making, to break down perceptions that land use planning is a bureaucratic, regulatory hurdle rather than a critical resource management process.
- At a general level the methodology should be enhanced by parallel education programmes about the value of land use planning and the core principles of sustainable development, to promote wider understanding.

- Good mapping is an essential first step to inform plans, and policy must reflect evidence of risk. This must be backed up by adequate monitoring and to be effective, enforcement must be consistent and sufficiently resourced.
- The methodology should include specific reference to the blue environment and blue infrastructure

Basic conclusions relating to the civic engagement component of the process are also summarized in the report.

- There is a need for the formal incorporation of civil society engagement in the planning methodology proposed.
- It is impractical for the aforementioned methodology to prescribe a generic approach to civic engagement.
- Civil engagement requires both communication and consultation strategies.
- The process must involve a wide range of consultative approaches that facilitate and/or promote participation and inclusion.
- The importance of spatial planning must be a key message of the communication strategy.
- Effective civic engagement requires adequate budgetary support.
- Different levels of the spatial planning (e.g. local area planning vs. national planning) require different scales of civic engagement.

A generic approach to civic engagement is not practical, however improvements to the process could be shaped by the recommendation to incorporate the following key requirements as a mandatory component of the Terms of Reference for future Planning assignments:

- An agreed mechanism for client validation of the engagement process to be utilized.
- Engagement (i.e. communication and consultation) at all levels of the planning process; Civil society interaction processes need balance (diversity in gender, age and ethnicity). Cultural or indigenous perspectives need to be acknowledged and integrated. Informality also needs to be recognized and considered.

- Use of local knowledge for the development of the engagement and communications strategy.
- The submission of evidence that meaningful engagement has taken place (i.e. through a formal documentation process / reporting of activities).

Implementing the recommendations included in the report form the main conclusion of this review. In the course of the review some further questions have arisen that are worth recording here. These could form the basis of future initiatives (perhaps at a broader level) to form potential guidance. These are summarized below:

- How to support National Governments with critical limitations in institutional capacity for data collection and analysis; and, at a regional level, how to best collect, analyze and map data to have it quickly available after natural disasters?
- How to better harmonize policies and laws supporting the planning and environmental aspirations in a region including better integration of culture and heritage, local economic development needs and (particularly for island and coastal nations) the blue economy?
- How to improve the location, form and design of settlements and expansion of urban areas to make them both more livable and more resilient to climate change and natural disasters?
- How to build awareness and educate civil society, communities and leaders of the value of planning to ensure “buy-in” and “self-regulation” as well as effective enforcement, to support the plans and outcomes sought?

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) territories are extremely vulnerable to natural hazards and the impacts of climate change. As a region the OECS has recognized the need to take integrated action to effectively and efficiently manage its natural resources. This is critical if environmental sustainability and general sustainable development are to be achieved in the OECS countries. The development of generic methodologies for the preparation of National and Local Area Land Use Plans for the territories of the region, is framed within the context of the European Union funded “Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) project on Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Sustainable land Management (SLM) in the Eastern Caribbean”. This project is part of the efforts of the OECS to promote proper land use planning in its territories. The OECS sought, among other things, to achieve long-term protection of the natural assets within countries of the OECS and provide environmental sustainability to the region. These methodologies are currently being implemented at the national level in the British Virgin Islands (BVI), and at the local level (i.e. the Greater Marigot area) in Dominica.

Following the devastation and destruction caused by the 2017 hurricane season, the Commonwealth Foundation through grant funding, facilitated a project to review and validate the regional methodologies and the implications of the recent hurricane season on the ensuing land use planning exercises in BVI and Dominica. Figures 1 to 9 show some of the devastation caused by the hurricane in parts of the territories of BVI and Dominica, and which were still evident in October/November 2018.



Figure 1: High School damaged in Tortola, BVI, after Hurricane Irma, 2017. Courtesy Bryce Julyan



Figures 2 & 3: Damaged marina buildings and ferry, Road Town, Tortola, BVI, after Hurricane Irma, 2017. Courtesy Bryce Julyan



Figures 4 & 5: Damaged dwellings in Tortola, BVI after Hurricane Irma, 2017. Courtesy Bryce Julyan



Figures 6 & 7: Devastating impact on coastal housing, Roseau, Dominica. Courtesy Bryce Julyan



Figure 8: Bridge damaged by debris flows from Hurricane Maria in 2017, Roseau, Dominica. Courtesy Bryce Julyan



Figure 9: Damage along watercourses due to debris flow post-Hurricane Maria 2017, Roseau, Dominica. Courtesy Bryce Julyan

While the methodologies may have been relevant conceptually, it was important to determine their practical relevance in light of the reality in the OECS territories of imminence of disaster due to natural hazards. The project was a joint effort of the Commonwealth Association of Planners (CAP), the Caribbean Planners Association (CPA), and the Caribbean Network for Urban and Land management (CNULM).

The fieldwork and preparation of this final project report was undertaken by a team of three planning professionals from the Commonwealth. The review team consisted of the following planners:

- Ms. Joanna Raynold Arthurton: Consultant; former Permanent Secretary, Department of Physical Planning, Saint Lucia; Founding President of the Saint Lucia Institute of Land Use Planners (SLILUP).
- Dr. Ancil Kirk: Director (Ag.), Town and Country Planning Division, Trinidad and Tobago; Former Vice President of the Trinidad and Tobago Society of Planners (TTSP).
- Mr. Bryce Julyan: Consultant; Fellow of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI), Immediate Past President of the NZPI; Commonwealth Association of Planners, Vice President (NZ).

The team undertook the review during the period October 29th and November 4th, 2108 in the BVI and Dominica. The three key project components were:

- i) a review of existing documents
- ii) field visits to the BVI and Dominica
- iii) participation in a sub-regional review workshop following the field visits.

The field visits were intended to examine the changed physical environment following the 2017 hurricane season, and to hold discussions with relevant stakeholders including professionals, state officials, and civil society.

The sub-regional workshop was co-organized by the OECS as a dialogue among partners in the region, to review the initial generic methodologies guided by the lessons learnt during the implementation of the methodologies following the 2017 hurricanes; and to make any recommendations for the tweaking, amending, or redirecting of the methodologies.

Preliminary findings of the review undertaken by the CAP/CPA team were presented at the workshop in St Lucia, where the findings were validated and the discussions used in finalizing the report.

1.2 The Key Objectives of CAP/CPA Review

The objectives of the review exercise were:

- 1) To advise the Governments of BVI and Dominica on ways to improve the projects being implemented based upon changing conditions in the islands, the impacts of the 2017 hurricane season, and a review of the existing methodology.
- 2) To advise the Governments and consultants regarding the improvement of Civil Society participation in the planning process.
- 3) To advise the OECS on possible amendments to the initial methodologies that were developed.

The team's observations and recommendations relative to the three objectives are presented in the following section. Observations and recommendations regarding objectives 1) and 3) are presented under the following broad headings:

- OECS General Planning Methodology and Terms of Reference (TOR);
- Advice to Governments of BVI and Dominica for Improvement of Projects;
- Recommendations for improved methodologies.

Findings and recommendations related to objective 2) are presented separately, also under three broad headings:

- OECS General Planning Methodology and TOR;

- Review of the Civic Engagement Processes Already Undertaken;
- Recommendations for Improved Civil Society Engagement.

2.0 OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 OECS General Planning Methodology and Terms of Reference

The following observations are based on the Review Team's review of the generic planning methodologies for preparing national and local area land use plans in the OECS territories.

- 1) Importantly, the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the National Physical Development Plan (NPDP) for the BVI and the Local Area Plan for Dominica, placed the intended output within a Disaster Risk Management (DRM) conceptual framework. The DRM approach highlights the importance of considering the climate change risks that individuals and human settlements face, and the vulnerability of the environment to those risks, when making land use policy decisions. These decisions will consider environmental impact and the level of risk that is acceptable. Therefore, in light of vulnerability of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) to the impacts of climate change and to a variety of natural phenomena; and in view of the need for sustainable land management, a DRM framework is critical and must be maintained. Climate change and its effects must be seen and treated as a land use planning issue.
- 2) Overall, the methodologies were relatively adequate to facilitate land use planning in both territories, within the context of Disaster Risk Management (DRM). Efforts in the methodology to mainstream DRM and Climate Change Adaptation, are consistent with the trend in developing countries. In the two territories planning professionals and state personnel agreed that the methodologies were quite capable of capturing the issues relevant to resilience and climate change.
- 3) Additionally, the methodologies acknowledged the need for monitoring and evaluation, as well as plan implementation. These are often weak aspects of land use planning.
- 4) Further, the general methodologies allowed for contextualizing the TOR to make the methodologies relevant to the specific islands. In Dominica the watershed-led approach

appears appropriate for the island given the topography of the island, which is steep and has many watercourses. High rainfall events can create risks of severe flooding which can destroy or significantly damage development, productive land and crops, as well as impacting environmental habitats.

- 5) Although some elements took on greater significance than others, the effects of the hurricanes seemed to revalidate the methodologies and re-emphasize the issues in the Terms of Reference (TOR).

2.2 Advice to Governments of BVI and Dominica for Improvement of Projects

The following advice is offered for improvements of the existing projects in BVI and Dominica.

As the TOR rightly highlighted, a DRM framework requires good quality mapping for effective and comprehensive land use analysis and policy recommendations. This includes land cover maps, land capability maps, land use maps. The extent to which the capacity to produce quality mapping is available or can be made available in the islands, could not be fully determined. Data availability and general analytical capacity vary by territory. It was noted that in the BVI access to data was limited for the smaller islands. Dominica appeared to have substantial mapping informing the plan making process. However, the rigor of application and enforcement appeared inconsistent. For example, high-risk areas such as flood plains were identified and mapped, but development restriction were not always enforced. In the BVI a commendable approach was the shared use of GIS mapping shared across government departments. Governments and their relevant agencies must remain committed to the process and invest in the relevant human and other resources. This ensures that the requisite data and mapping are available, so relevant analyses can be done to develop the plans, as well as to ensure the implementation and enforcement of all plan requirements.

The legislative requirements for plan making in each OECS territory would influence the extent of success in plan implementation at the national and local levels. While there are some commonalities, legal requirements for plan making also vary from island to island. In the case of BVI, the NPDP will facilitate the preparation of sub-national local area plans. In Dominica, the

Government must ensure that the National Plan is available or substantively updated to facilitate preparation of sub-national local area plans. A planning framework is more effective when required under legislation. Where discretion exists in the framework or legislation, regarding the requirement to have or make plans, a potential barrier to achieving effective and sustainable outcomes is created. For instance, retaining a ministerial discretion as to whether or not a framework is prepared, means there may be significant gaps or inconsistencies in achieving a comprehensive and effective planning framework. Generally, governments must ensure the legislative framework facilitates proper implementation of the plan making process, facilitated by robust planning methodologies.

Common challenges that planners face (not just in the OECS) include perceptions that planning is a bureaucratic regulatory hurdle, rather than a critical resource management exercise that manages impacts and enables development in a way that provides good outcomes for individuals and communities. Of critical importance for a successful planning framework to be implemented is the obtaining of consistent support and investment at government level and the building of support or at least acceptance, in civil society. If planning appears at times to be de-prioritized and underinvested by Governments this may suggest it is not seen as a critical, essential component to the framework of sustainable development and resilience. However, based on discussions with stakeholders in Dominica, it appears that the de-prioritizing of the Local Area Plan for Marigot, may also have been influenced by the adversarial nature of national and local politics.

Notwithstanding this, acceptance and effective implementation of the methodologies for plan making, require a person or persons who is suitably empowered to champion the efforts. They also require political buy-in and cooperation at the level of national and local politics within the territories. Governments must therefore work to ensure there is political buy-in, political will, leadership, and resources to support and enable successful plan development and implementation; as well as the continuity of the overall process.

Further, government-level support will be important to underline the importance of planning and to highlight to highlight to people, the benefits of work with the land use planners.

Acknowledgement is needed of the value and importance of planning for creating resilient communities and not simply a bureaucratic hurdle to “overcome”. Systems must be seen to be consistent and equitable. Civil society has an important role to play in holding those in influential positions accountable. Inconsistent application of policy or rules undermines the value and authority of the planning system as a tool and it becomes a scapegoat in the event of failure. Public education and enforcement must accompany plan making and administration. This helps to gather support and foster understanding of the value of planning, and the need for an integrated approach that supports environmental, social, cultural and economic outcomes. Land use planning must be taken seriously by Governments. *The regions’ governments must take the lead in advocating land use planning as critical to sustainability and resilience in the islands of the Caribbean.*

It follows therefore that for the methodologies to work, the required institutional capacity must be maintained and strengthened where necessary. Lessons drawn after disasters must be used to help in the maintenance of this institution capacity. This ensures effective implementation, monitoring of development activities, and enforcement of planning regulations. Where plans are adopted these must be backed up by effective enforcement to ensure compliance, and to make the plans effective. Rebuilding following disasters must be undertaken with relevant approvals, to ensure people build back better. Moreover, Planning Agencies must not be marginalized by citizens, government, or politicians. *Instead planning departments must be supported, strengthened, and allowed to do their work; and resources provided to educate citizens to understand and support the need to adhere to the regulatory requirements of the formal planning processes of the territories.*

The peculiarities and uniqueness of each of the island states (whether they are in a group of independent) pose some challenges for the success of the methodologies. A DRM approach requires proper identification, classification, and appreciation of the level of risks and the extent of environmental sensitivity that the islands face. Hence, the methodologies must clearly account for differences in the physical landscape and in the type of hazards to which the islands are vulnerable. *For islands like Dominica and BVI that are highly vulnerable to climate events and*

susceptible to multiple hazards, the planning methodology must facilitate a balancing and prioritizing of the various hazards; and must make provision for a variety of vulnerability maps.

The methodologies must also adequately address the geographical and social fragmentation which is characteristic of the islands in the BVI group, as well as the cultural uniqueness of each of the islands. Although having some commonalities, each island is unique and has unique cultural features. The matter of land tenure and patterns of land ownership is an example. Given the peculiarities of the islands and the need for lands that are appropriate, not enough focus was placed on issues of land tenure/ownership patterns in the methodology. This is critical in the smaller islands of the BVI where families own entire islands, and even in Dominica where most land is privately owned. Challenges arise in land use planning where land tenure creates an obstacle to the sustainable or efficient use of land. This includes cases where substantial majority ownership does not adequately provide for future needs or where it channels replacement land development into vulnerable areas. Similarly where land is scarce even in fragmented ownership, the ability to plan for sustainable development can be compromised as compensation does not replace the cultural or historical association with the land. The methodologies must reflect and cater for these geographical, social, and cultural realities. The Governments will have to consider whether land acquisition by the State, might be appropriate and/or develop alternative compensation models to facilitate key land use planning outcomes in these islands. This must be managed properly since there is the potential for eventual land disputes.

Finally, sustainable mixed-use communities are appropriate and desirable. Hence, government officials and policy makers must appreciate that multiple land uses could co-exist, without any use necessarily impacting another negatively.

2.3 Recommendations for Improved Methodologies

The following recommendations are made for improvements of the methodologies in light of recent weather-related disasters in the OECS territories.

Recommendation 1: The methodologies need to consider and reflect a greater appreciation of island differences not only within the individual OECS territories, but among the island groups of

particular territories, such as the BVI. A source of challenge for the effective implementation of the methodology in the BVI is the multi-island context. The sister islands comprising the BVI are considered to have their unique cultural, social, and physical characteristics and they are not the same in many ways. These differences impacted the stakeholder consultation process, and a proper determination of the appropriate level of planning needed in each sister island.

Recommendation 2: More directive emphasis is required in the methodology on the principle of risk based planning and integrating land use with natural hazards management (including climate events) to avoid or mitigate risk.

Recommendation 3: Greater integration is needed within the methodology between land use planning and post disaster planning and recovery. While not overtly integrated, the two are compatible and better integration could help focus on priorities and avoid any repetition of the poor practices of the past.

Recommendation 4: The methodology should emphasize the post-disaster reality that island-specific assumptions about population dynamics may have to rely on proxy data in many cases. The hurricanes affected socioeconomic dynamics and sociocultural elements within communities. The age composition of some communities has changed as some people left for other parts of the island and even more migrated to other countries. Population sizes were also reduced and it is now more difficult to determine the population for which planning must be done.

Recommendation 5: The methodologies must address more directly, the issues of socio-economic and sociocultural resilience. Greater focus is needed on critical post disaster issues that impact socio-economic and cultural recovery. These include issues such as post-disaster impacts on employment, fisheries, agriculture and wild life habitat; local economic development during post disaster recovery; as well as the matters of crime and security. The methodologies must also include components that ensure key historical and cultural elements are maintained. It was reported that in post-hurricane BVI, historical and cultural features were being lost slowly. However, redevelopment after a disaster should identify and retain cultural elements, where it

is appropriate to remain consistent with the past, while emphasizing the need for greater resilience in the future.

Recommendation 6: The issue of informality needs to have a more significant focus in the methodologies. Informal human settlements are also affected by natural hazards. Activities of the informal sector such as squatting for both residential and agricultural purposes, impact the environment and are often vulnerable since they are usually located in risk areas e.g. flood plains.

Recommendation 7: The methodologies must help the indigenous populations within the various territories to become more resilient. The needs of indigenous populations within the islands must be factored into the methodologies as they can easily be forgotten since they often reside by themselves within their own communities. In Dominica, it was concluded that such communities are also impacted by natural hazards.

Recommendation 8: The methodologies must help to facilitate the return of residents to their former villages and areas of residence, after a weather or climate-related disaster; as well as the possible relocation of these persons. It was reported that after Tropical Storm Erika, which affected the island of Dominica on August 27, 2015, entire villages and houses were abandoned. Returning plans are therefore required to ensure an organized return of persons after a disaster, where it is appropriate to do so. It cannot be simply assumed that people would return and resume their lives after a disaster. Arrangements must be made for instance, for financial assistance to homeowners especially where insurance cover was not provided; for procedures for dealing with abandoned properties; and for assistance to small business owners. Effective relocation plans must also be associated with the returning plans to assist residents as required.

Recommendation 9: The methodologies must promote a balance between fulfilling the requirements of a detailed comprehensive master planning process and the use of less time-consuming rapid assessment methods. The timeframe provided for the detailed master planning process in the methodologies may not be adequate. Notwithstanding this, in light of the immediacy of and potential for natural disasters in the OECS territories, the detailed time-consuming master plan approach may not actually be appropriate. The process would need to

be abridged and allow for more rapid assessments and other appropriate, less time-consuming approaches and methods.

Recommendation 10: The methodologies must include the use of the sea in its discussion on infrastructure for transportation and commerce. The matter of the blue infrastructure is absent from consideration in the methodologies. This is a major deficiency given the reality of islands surrounded by water and the risks to land based infrastructure, following a disaster.

Recommendation 11: The methodology for local area planning must facilitate greater integration of adjacent areas. In Dominica, for instance, because of the similarities in the physical characteristics and the relative sizes of areas in the island, it may be better to treat adjacent areas in an integrated way when developing a local area plan. Action area plans may then be developed for smaller areas. Integration in the planning framework and the encouragement of cross boundary collaboration, will help to focus on issues and overcome other influences that can create inconsistencies across district boundaries.

Recommendation 12: The TOR must support sustainable mixed-use communities where appropriate. Hence, the methodology should promote mixed-use outcomes as possible, and potentially desirable in some circumstances.

Recommendation 13: The methodology identifies the value and importance of mapping, but greater emphasis is needed to ensure that the links between mapping and policy and between policy and enforcement, are clearer and given equal emphasis. Bringing “climate effects” awareness into the methodologies is critical. Mapping efficiently identifies the land’s appropriateness for development and the level of risks that exists. Good mapping is necessary to ensure identification and consideration of potential natural hazards (e.g. high-risk flood or inundation areas); but such mapping should integrate across districts.

Recommendation 14: The planning framework should clearly highlight and ensure effective implementation, monitoring, and enforcement is carried out, to enable the planned outcomes to be achieved. The methodology must emphasise very clearly that where plans are adopted, these must be backed up by effective and consistent enforcement to help ensure compliance. Also,

resourcing and investment need to accompany the planning process. This is best accompanied by a strong education programme that brings civil society, business and citizenry along the journey and embeds ownership of the process and outcomes.

Recommendation 15: The methodologies should reflect greater appreciation of island differences and peculiarities.

2.4 Summary of the Key Recommendations

The key recommendations are summarized below. The methodology must:

- Reflect a greater appreciation of island differences not only among countries of the OECS but among islands within a given territory (i.e. BVI);
- Emphasize the principle of risk based planning and integrating land use with natural hazards management;
- Reflect greater integration between land use planning and post disaster planning and recovery;
- Emphasize the post-disaster reliance on proxy data regarding island-specific assumptions about population dynamics;
- Address more directly the issues of socio-economic and sociocultural resilience;
- Give greater focus to the treatment of informality;
- Address the needs of indigenous communities;
- Facilitate the provision of returning and relocation plans;
- Promote a balance between the use of less time-consuming rapid assessments approaches, and the fulfillment of the key requirements of more detailed master planning;
- Include considerations related to the blue economy and blue infrastructure;
- Promote more integration of adjacent areas in the execution of local area planning;

- Place greater emphasis on the links between mapping and policy and between policy and enforcement;
- Ensure effective implementation, monitoring and enforcement to enable the achievement of planned outcomes.

2.5 Civil Society Participation

The following observations relate to advising the Governments and consultants regarding the improving of Civil Society participation in the planning process. This component of the report focuses on the documentation of the team's findings and recommendations as it relates to the following key undertakings required in support of improved civil society engagement in the planning processes being reviewed:

- 1) Review of the OECS general methodology and Terms of Reference (TOR) for the ongoing planning exercise;
- 2) Review of documentation and processes already undertaken;
- 3) Engagement and dialogue with civil society at the country levels;
- 4) Recommendations to improve civil society engagement in the ongoing exercises and in the general methodology.

The team's findings and recommendations are presented under the following three broad headings:

- OECS General Planning Methodology and TOR;
- Review of the Civic Engagement Processes Already Undertaken;
- Recommendations for Improved Civil Society Engagement.

2.5.1 OECS General Planning Methodology and TOR

The team examined the TOR for the preparation of a Local Area Plan for the Greater Marigot Community in Dominica; and for National Land Use Plans and maps for the British Virgin Islands

(BVI) and Saint Lucia. While these TOR demonstrate clear recognition of the need for civil society engagement in these planning processes, the general OECS methodology makes no reference to civil society engagement. In light of the foregoing, the team recommends the formal incorporation of civil society engagement in the planning methodology proposed.

One of the main features of the OECS general planning methodology is the description and/or definition of key planning terms and processes. In keeping with this approach, the team recommends inclusion of definitions for “civil society” and “civil engagement” in the enhanced version of the OECS general planning methodology. The following definitions are offered for consideration:

“Civil society ... refers to a wide array of organizations: community groups, non-governmental organizations [NGOs], labour unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations; and foundations.”
(World Bank)

“Civic engagement is the participation of private actors in the public sphere, conducted through direct and indirect interactions of civil society organizations and citizens-at-large with government, multilateral institutions and business establishments to influence decision making or pursue common goals.” (Peter Levine, 2012)

While the above referenced TOR indicate clear recognition of the need for civil society engagement, the requirements are limited to a listing of specific stakeholder groups to be consulted. Given, inter alia, the different planning requirements of the various OECS territories (e.g. the need for local area plans vs. national plans); and the unique socio-cultural characteristics of each country, it is not practical for the methodology to prescribe a generic approach to civic engagement. In recognition of the foregoing, participants of the Regional Land Use Planning Methodology Review Workshop¹ proposed some key requirements that should be made a mandatory component of future TOR, as a means of ensuring that civic engagement is an integral

¹ Refers to the Regional Land Use Planning Methodology Review Workshop hosted by the OECS Commission in Saint Lucia on the 27 and 28 November 2018.

part of the planning process; that it is meaningful and meets the requirements and approval of the client. The provisions proposed are as follows:

- 1) An agreed mechanism for client validation of the engagement process to be utilized;
- 2) Engagement (i.e. communication and consultation) at all levels of the planning process;
- 3) Use of local knowledge for the development of the engagement and communications strategy;
- 4) The submission of evidence that meaningful engagement has taken place (i.e. through a formal documentation process / reporting of activities).

2.5.2 Review of the Civic Engagement Processes Already Undertaken

The observations and comments presented in this section of the report are based on the consultations that the team convened with various members of civil society in Dominica and the BVI during the field visits of 29 October to 2 November 2018; and on information garnered from the above referenced TOR and other project reports for the two planning processes under review.

Dominica - the civic engagement process for the preparation of the Local Area Plan for the Greater Marigot Community in Dominica is centered on the conduct of public meetings in the target community. The client ministry indicated that budgetary constraints hindered the employment of a more varied approach. To date only one of three public meetings have been convened, as the planning process has been suspended.

The meetings were strategically planned to facilitate information flows concerning inter alia, the study objectives, concerns and expectations of the local community, the presentation of the project deliverables (i.e. the situational analysis report and the draft local area plan); and to seek the community's approval of the same. Another key area of focus is the promotion of a participatory approach to the planning process.

The sole reliance on public meetings does not make for effective civic engagement. The "one size fits all" approach is not appropriate in any context. Members of civil society are not a

homogeneous group. They have different needs and ways of processing information; and are not all readily available for consultation. In light of the foregoing and for the purposes of efficiency, a range of methodologies must be employed during any consultative process. The process must be easily adaptable to the needs of the different members / groups of civil society. The individuals consulted offered the following proposals for making the process more inclusive and effective:

- 1) Use of more targeted approaches such as focus group meetings;
- 2) An engagement and communications strategy that includes special provision for youth engagement, as the youth are key members of civil society;
- 3) Broad based consultation aimed at reaching a wider cross section of civil society e.g. grass roots individual and/or organizations and everyday people;
- 4) Scheduling of consultations at times and venues that are convenient for the participants being targeted;
- 5) Tangible forms of engagement e.g. use of models and visuals that help the communication process;
- 6) Training for the representatives of civil society organizations, to make effective delivery of information to their membership. The consultative process should commence with an initial engagement with community / group leaders who will then sensitize and prepare their membership for consultation. The engagement with group leaders should not be to the exclusion of others.
- 7) While it is appropriate to first seek the understanding and possible “buy in” of community / group leaders, community engagement must follow directly as it is important that everyone hears the same message. A simple message and questions should be taken directly to communities so that engagement is not *just* with leaders.
- 8) Long term notification of the intended engagement process is required to allow sufficient time for sensitization and preparation for consultation;

- 9) Keep the language and the dialogue of the consultation process simple, with clear messages and avoiding jargon;
- 10) Focus on the impacts and benefits to the community and individuals.

British Virgin Islands - the civic engagement process for the preparation of a National Land Use Plan and maps for the BVI is based on a National Engagement and Communications Strategy involving a comprehensive process of consultation and communication. The consultation process involves engagement activities designed to foster two-way dialogue, information-sharing, and consensus building, through face-to-face interactions with a national steering committee; a stakeholder working group; the public (i.e. citizens at large) and through the use of a public opinion survey.

The communications component of the strategy comprises engagement activities that are designed to reach out to as many interested persons and organizations as possible. The engagement activities include a logo branding strategy, the use of radio, television and newspaper advertisements, radio talk shows, information dissemination through a website and You Tube (i.e. the Government of BVI YouTube channel); and the use of other forms of social media such as email, Facebook and Twitter.

The approach demonstrates a clear understanding that stakeholders / civil society is not a homogeneous group; that the geographical and social fragmentation which is characteristic of the BVI island group requires nontraditional approaches; and that each of the islands which comprise the BVI grouping has its unique cultural characteristics and vulnerabilities, which must be considered in the engagement process. In that regard, the National Engagement and Communications strategy is specifically targeted to meet the needs of each of the four main islands (i.e. Tortola, Anegada, Josh Vandyke and Virgin Gorda). For example, in support of this approach, special budgetary provision was made to ensure the scheduling of community meetings on days and at times that were convenient to the different island communities. The process also involved the use of varying consultative approaches, including town hall meetings, focus group sessions and one on one meetings.

2.5.3 Recommendations for Improved Civil Society Engagement.

Having completed the various tasks required for the review of the OECS general planning methodology, the team makes the following basic recommendations as it relates to the civic engagement component of the process:

Recommendation 1: There must be the formal incorporation of civil society engagement in the planning methodology proposed.

Recommendation 2: It is impractical for the aforementioned methodology to prescribe a generic approach to civic engagement - “one size does not fit all”. It should however, set guiding principles for an approach that is adaptable and flexible to local contexts.

Recommendation 3: Civil engagement requires both communication and consultation strategies. There is a fundamental difference between the two processes and as such the activities of each process must be clearly differentiated.

Recommendation 4: The process must involve a wide range of consultative approaches that facilitate and promote participation and inclusion. The process must be easily adaptable to the needs of the different members or groups of civil society; and should acknowledge and include the youth and indigenous communities.

Recommendation 5: There is need for a communication strategy that aims at changing the mindset of people, that planning is just a regulatory and bureaucratic hurdle to be overcome. A key message of the communication strategy must surround the importance of planning and the need to build understanding and educate civil society on the value of planning. Further, the strategy must generate acceptance of everyone’s responsibility as ‘stewards’ for next generation.

Recommendation 6: Effective and meaningful civic engagement requires adequate budgetary support and realistic and appropriate time frames. For example, where there is geographic dispersion such as small island groups, the methodology should specify the need for sufficient time and budget to facilitate local participation, as this is critical for a meaningful and effective program.

Recommendation 7: The different levels of the Planning (e.g. local area planning vs. national planning) require different scales of civic engagement.

Recommendation 8: The consultative process should commence with an initial engagement with community or group leaders who will then sensitize and prepare their membership for consultation. The engagement with group leaders should not be to the exclusion of others. While it is appropriate to first seek the understanding and possible “buy in” of community and group leaders, community engagement must follow directly as it is important that everyone hears the same message. A simple message and questions should be taken directly to communities so that engagement is not *just* with leaders.

Recommendation 9: While it is impractical for the aforementioned methodology to prescribe a generic approach to civic engagement, improvements to the process could be shaped by the recommendation to incorporate the following key requirements as a mandatory component of the TOR for future Planning assignments:

- a) An agreed mechanism for client validation of the engagement process to be utilized;
- b) Engagement (i.e. communication and consultation) at all levels of the planning process;
- c) Use of local knowledge for the development of the engagement and communications strategy;
- d) The submission of evidence that meaningful engagement has taken place (i.e. through a formal documentation process / reporting of activities).

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

The impact of Hurricanes Irma and Maria in 2017 cannot be overlooked in terms of the devastation wrought and disruption these events have caused, based on the review team’s perceptions of BVI and Dominica. It is a general observation that similar events are likely to occur in the future and potentially with more frequency, and more disastrous consequences. However, with the passage of time there is the possibility that things will go back to ‘business as usual’ and development will continue without change or consideration of the risks. This must not be

allowed to happen, in light of the reality of climate change and its impacts, and the potential for significant devastation due to natural hazards in the OECS territories.

To help improve the natural resource base resilience to the impacts of climate change and promote sustainable development, the general methodologies which were developed for preparing National and Local Area land use Plans, and are being piloted at the national level in the British Virgin Islands (BVI), and at the local level in Dominica, must be amended or supplemented as recommended above. This would be to the benefit of the BVI and Dominica but also to the other OECS territories in which the methodologies are to be ultimately implemented.

In the course of the review some further questions have arisen that are worth recording here. These could form the basis of future initiatives (perhaps at a broader level) to form potential guidance. These are summarized below:

- How to support National Governments with critical limitations in institutional capacity for data collection and analysis; and at a regional level, how to best collect, analyze and map data to have it quickly available after natural disasters?
- How to better harmonize policies and laws supporting the planning and environmental aspirations in a region; including better integration of culture and heritage, local economic development needs and (particularly for island and coastal nations) the blue economy?
- How to improve the location, form and design of settlements and expansion of urban areas to make them both more livable and more resilient to climate change and natural disasters?
- How to build awareness and educate civil society, communities and leaders of the value of planning to ensure “buy-in” and “self-regulation” as well as effective enforcement, to support the plans and outcomes sought?

WORKS AND DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Baptiste, I., & Niles, E. (2017). *Development of local area plan: Greater Marigot, Commonwealth of Dominica, inception report.*

Baptiste, I., & Niles, E. (2017). *Greater Marigot local area plan: Situation analysis report.*

Civil Society Team World Bank. (2007). *Consultations with Civil Society - A source book working document.* Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/CSO/Resources/ConsultationsSourcebook_Feb2007.pdf

Environmental Systems Ltd. (2017). *National land use maps and plans for the British Virgin Islands.*

Environmental Systems Ltd. (2018). *Draft situation analysis report: National land use maps and plans for the British Virgin Islands.*

Interplan. (2016). *Final project report. The design of land cover, land capability and land use plans for the OECS Member States.* For the Commission, Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS).

Levine, P. (2012). *What is the definition of civic engagement?* Retrieved from <https://peterlevine.ws/?p=10357>

APPENDIXES

A. Review Team



L- R Joanna Raynold Arthurton, Ancil Kirk and Bryce Julyan

B. Schedule of Activities by Expert Panel

NO	DATE	AM/PM	ACTIVITY
BVI			
1	Sunday 28 th October		Travel and Preparation for activities in BVI. Field Visit to Virgin Gorda by one review team member
2	Monday 29 th October	AM	Internal meeting to discuss, methodology, desk-top review and draft country report; Attendance at a NPDP Visioning Workshop conducted by consultants and attended by government and civil society representatives.
3	Tuesday 30 th October	AM	Meeting with Chief Planner of BVI and Civil Society representative
		PM	Tortola Field visits
DOMINICA			
4	Wednesday 31 st October	PM	Travel and Preparation for activities in Dominica
5	Thursday 1 st November	AM	Meeting with Government Planner Meeting with Planning Consultant (Marigot Local Area Plan) Field Visits in/around Roseau
		PM	Meeting with Government Agency Officials Meeting with Civil Society Representatives
7	Friday 2 nd November	AM	Field visits in Marigot area Meet with civil society representatives
		PM	Travel to St Lucia
ST LUCIA			
8	Saturday 3 rd November		Rest/ Internal meeting to review mission and scope report
9	Sunday 4 th November		Travel

C. Schedule of Meetings

NO	DATE	AM/PM	MEETINGS	
BVI				
1	Monday 29th October	AM	Meet with Planning Consultants	Consulting Team - NPDP
2	Tuesday 30th October	AM	Meet with Gregory Adams	Chief Planner of BVI
3	Tuesday 30th October	AM	Meet with Ms. Noni Georges	Civil Society representative Virgin Island Environmental Council
4	Tuesday 30th October	PM	Meet with Ms. Angela Burnett	
DOMINICA				
4	Thursday 1 st November	AM	Meeting with Ms. Annie Edwards	Chief Physical Planner
5	Thursday 1 st November		Meeting with Mr. Isaac Baptiste	Planning Consultant (Local Area Plan – Marigot)
5	Thursday 1 st November	PM	Meeting with Government Agency Officials Meeting with Civil Society Representatives	
6	Friday 2 nd November	AM	Field visits in Marigot area Meeting with civil society representatives	Mr. F. Stewart Paris – Contractor Mr Brian Linton – Credit Union Mr. Michael Pascal – Businessman Ms. Jacqueline Pascal – Farmer/Community Activist/Tourism
7				
		PM	Travel to St Lucia	
ST LUCIA				
8	Saturday 3 rd November		Internal meeting	Expert Panel

D. OECS Workshop

B1. Agenda

Day 1	
Time	Activity
8:30am	Opening Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of the OECS Programmes supporting Land use planning and Sustainable Development • CAP/CPA- Objectives of the Commonwealth Review • Objectives of the workshop
9:00am	Background to the OECS programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programmatic aspects and objectives of the OECS programmes • Explanation of the national and local area planning methodologies • Questions/comments from the floor
9:45 – 10:15am	<i>BREAK</i>
10:00am	Review of the generic methodology, TOR, and the initial programme. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Plans BVI • Local Area Plans Dominica • Questions/comments from the floor <p>For each of the two plans the review team will present comments on a) the initial methodologies, b) the specific TORs, c) the process of implementation up to the Hurricane, c) the revised programme (if any) and d) comments from stakeholders and civil society. The objectives of the workshop will be highlighted in the presentations. Feedback and discussions will be encouraged.</p>
12:00pm	<i>LUNCH</i>
01:00pm	Review of other planning exercises in the OECS member states <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of local area planning exercises in the OECS (Steve Kemp) • A panel comprising representatives for each of three countries will discuss the methodology and implementation of the exercises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local Area Plans - SVG ○ Local Area Plans - ANU ○ Local Area Plans- SLU • Questions/comments from the floor
03:00pm	<i>BREAK</i>
03:30	<i>Options for a “layered” approach to sub-national plans - particularly looking at different spatial scales appropriate for community-based plans at one level, and, for example, ridge-to-reef watershed area plans at another.</i>
04:30	Close

Day 2	
Time	Activity
8:30am	Brief overview of the days program
9:00am	Field visit to a nearby area of interest (Pigeon Point)
12:30pm	Lunch
01:30pm	Lessons learnt / Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel to discuss the lessons learnt, CAP/CPA review team, Asad Mohammed, Steve Kemp • Next steps in validating/ updating the regional methodologies • Questions/comments from the floor
04:00	Close

E. Summary Report Of OECS Land Use Planning Methodology Review Workshop