



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

BANGLADESH

INTEGRATED PROTECTED AREA CO-MANAGEMENT (IPAC)

Small Research Grants Writeshop Report: Rural livelihoods and
protected landscapes:
Co-management in the wetlands and forests of Bangladesh.

May 30, 2010 (draft)

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

INTEGRATED PROTECTED AREA CO-MANAGEMENT (IPAC)

Small Research Grants Writeshop Report: Rural livelihoods
and protected landscapes:
Co-management in the wetlands and forests of Bangladesh

USAID Contract N° EPP-I-00-06-00007-00
Order No: EPP-I-01-06-00007-00

May 30, 2010 (draft)

Submitted to:
USAID/Bangladesh

Submitted By:



International Resources Group (IRG)
With subcontractors:

WWF-USA, dTS, East-West Center
Environmental Law Institute, Epler-Wood International
The WorldFish Center, CIPD, CNRS, CODEC
BELA, Asiatic M&C, Oasis Transformation
Module Architects, IUB/JU

Background

Government of Bangladesh and USAID have approved the Integrated Protected Area Co-management project (5 June 2008 to 4 June 2013) with a view to conserve natural resources in 26 wetland and forest areas and to improve livelihoods of dependent communities under a collaborative management approach. Earlier, USAID funded two projects, namely Management of Aquatic Ecosystems through Community Husbandry (MACH, 1998-2008) and Nishorgo Support Project (NSP, 2003-2008) to lay the foundation of natural resources conservation through co-management in the country. These pilot projects were implemented by the Department of Fisheries (DoF) and Forest Department (FD) respectively. The simple declaration of various categories of Protected Areas (such as National Parks, Wildlife Sanctuaries and Game Reserves managed by the Forest Department, wetland and fisheries sanctuaries established with the assistance of Department of Fisheries, and Ecologically Critical Areas declared by the Department of Environment) has not been sufficient in Bangladesh to stop the steady loss of biodiversity, principally because people living in and around these areas have few alternatives to continued extraction and use of resources in these Protected Areas. In addition, in some cases, local communities have also perceived Protected Areas to be a direct threat to their own livelihoods and to their own claims to ownership and use rights of these lands. Without the active involvement of local people, and increased economic incentives for their collaboration in conservation and more sustainable patterns of resource use, there is little chance for success of Protected Areas initiatives. To be successful, Bangladesh must develop and scale up sustainable approaches to co-management of protected areas that take into account existing socio-economic incentives and benefit distribution and prevailing ecological conditions as well as policy, legal and governance frameworks.

Co-management or collaborative management involves two or more social actors negotiating, defining and guaranteeing amongst themselves a fair share of the management functions, entitlements and responsibilities for a given territory, area or set of natural resources. The co-management approach has been a fundamental recommendation of the past two World Parks Congresses, and is actively advocated at the international level by the IUCN, and supported in Bangladesh by the policies and programs of the Ministry of Environment and Forests and Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock. Over the past decades, several pilot approaches and models for community based NRM and PA co-management have been designed and tested in Bangladesh, with encouraging results.

In IPAC there is a provision for awarding 'Small Research Grants' to support field research for improved knowledge and understanding of the impact of various approaches of co-management initiatives on rural livelihoods and natural resource conservation within the IPAC targeted areas.

Research Questions

The research questions were included: What benefits (natural products) do rural people derive from wetlands and forests and what services do they provide in return? What are the market dynamics, market trends and potential opportunities for strengthening the value chains of these products? Who benefits from the production and marketing of these products and in what ways? What commercially viable providers might be engaged in efforts aimed at strengthening these specific value chains? What linkages exist or could be developed between these products / value chains and conservation of the targeted Protected Area? What economic incentives exist or could be developed to encourage the conservation, sustainable use and improved management of these natural resources associated with local livelihoods? What has been or is likely to be the impact of co-management on the livelihoods of women, the rural poor, and ethnic minorities? What is the impact of ecotourism in these areas? What are the points of contention between key stakeholders over existing or

potential resource use patterns? Are local institutions capable of supporting innovation and experimentation in resource management systems?

Researchers were invited to analyze questions surrounding Protected Areas and rural livelihoods, and to explore strategies for conserving resources while improving the livelihoods of rural peoples. Research results and final papers will support the Government Departments in refining and improving co-management approaches and in developing appropriate management plans and policies.

The Integrated Protected Area Co-management (IPAC) Project funded by USAID, with support from the East West Center (Honolulu, Hawaii) and the WorldFish Center (Bangladesh and South Asia Office, Dhaka) provided 12 research grants in 2009-2010 to support six months of field research on the impact of co-management initiatives on rural livelihoods in the five cluster where support is being provided by the IPAC project. Project awardees conducted research on topics such as: What benefits (natural products) do rural people derive from wetlands and forests and what services do they provide in return? What are the market dynamics, market trends and potential opportunities for strengthening the value chains of these products? What economic incentives exist or could be developed to encourage the conservation, sustainable use and improved management of these natural resources associated with local livelihoods? In January and February 2010 project awardees have completed an intensive four-week workshop where they analyzed their results and prepared publishable papers.

The applied research small grants were provided lump-sum fellowship funding to cover travel to and from the field, food and lodging in the field, and a small field per diem for researchers. Researchers were take part in a 4 week intensive writing workshop during which final case study research reports was prepared. Researchers' particulars and topic is given in table 1.

Table 1. Research grants awardees particulars and research topic

SL	Name of applicant	Designation	Workplace	Study Location/ Cluster	Topic
1	Afrin Akter	Programme Co-coordinator	DoE, Dhaka	Mokosh Beel, Kaliakoir Upazilla, Gazipur District Central Cluster	People's perceptions of environmental pollution in Mokosh Beel, Bangladesh
2	Fatima tuz Zohora	District Forest Officer	FD, Management Plan Division, Mohakhali, Dhaka	Sundarban Reserve Forest-Satkhira Range Sundarban Cluster	Non-timber Forest Products and related livelihood in the Sundarban
3	Mahmudah Rokhsena Sultana	Assistant Conservator of Forest	Development Planning Unit, Bana Bhaban, Agargaon, Dhaka	Chunarughat, Sylhet Cluster	Impacts of co-management activities on livelihoods in Satchari National Park
4	Md. Abdur Rahman	Assistant Conservator of Forest	FD, Cox's Bazar South Forest Division	Teknaf Game Reserve Southeastern Cluster	Do the Tanchangya cause deforestation? Will they participate in forest conservation?
5	Md. Zahidur Rahman Miah	Assistant Conservator of Forest	FD, Kaptai, CHT South Forest Division, Rangamati	Chittagong Hill Tracts	Livelihoods of forest-dependent people in Kaptai National park
6	Rokeya Begum	Assistant Conservator of Forest	FD, Completed Forestry Sector Project, Mohakhali, Dhaka	Modhupur Central Cluster	Local people's Livelihoods and their Involvement in Management of Madhupur National Park, Bangladesh

7	Bishwajit Kumar Dev	Fisheries Extension Officer	DoF, Matshya Bhaban, Dhaka	Hail Haor, Srimongal, Sylhet Cluster	Livelihoods of Fishers: MACH versus non-MACH in Baikka beel, Bangladesh.
8	Masud Ara Momi	Upazila Fisheries Officer	DoF, Matsya Bhaban, Dhaka	Turag-Bangshi River, Central Cluster	Socio-economic benefits for resource user groups through the co-management in Alua Beel
9	Md. Aminul Haque	Upazila Fisheries Officer	DoF, Jhenagati, Sherpur	Kongsha-Malijhee, Jhenaigati, Sherpur Central Cluster	Fish-market chain and fishers' incomes in Sherpur District, Bangladesh
10	Md. Khalekuzzaman Sarker	Upazila Fisheries Officer	DoF, Raninagar, Naogaon	Shamnagar & Monshiganj, Sundarban	Fisher livelihoods in the Sunderbans.
11	Suriya Ferdous	Completed Masters from JU	Jahingirnagar University, Savar	Kaptai National Park	Indigenous People's perceptions of Climate Change in Kaptai National Park
12	Md. Al Mamun Hasan	M.Sc Student	Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University, Gazipur	Madhupur and Bhawal National Parks Central Cluster	Role of forest product on the livelihood security of the people living in and around the Madhupur forest, Bangabandhu University, Gazipur

Note: Md. Al Mamun Hasan **could not attend** in the writeshop due to his final examination.

Detail schedule of the writeshop is given in appendix 1. The overall schedules of this writeshop were:

- Week 1: Participants have completed their problem statement, case study outline/framework and started 'fleshing out' main body of case study – all according to their intended audience and purpose of their work.
- Week 2: Participants have completed a first draft of their work ready for review.
- Week 3: Review of first draft and completion of second draft with abstract.
- Week 4: Presentation of completed final papers and development of action plans and/or follow up support.

Overview of the writeshop

Under the overall strategic goal of the Integrated Protected Area Co-management (IPAC) project, the writeshop cover the following two key objectives:

- To analyze questions surrounding Protected Areas and rural livelihoods, and to explore strategies for conserving resources while improving the livelihoods of rural peoples.
- To support the Government Departments in refining and improving co-management approaches and in developing appropriate management plans and policies.

Eleven papers in this writeshop **covered** the rural livelihoods and protected landscapes: co-management in the wetlands and forests of Bangladesh. **One** paper **focused** on the environment, five papers **focused** on the forests, four papers **focused** on the wetlands and one paper **focused** on the climate change.

Afrin Akter evaluates the people's perceptions of the environmental pollution in Mokosh Beel, She concluded that the Government of Bangladesh declared the study area Gazipur (forest type: Sal forest; 5,022 ha Area) as a Protected Area (PA), Bhawal National Park (is a

protected forest area) in the year 1982 in respect to address the preservation and conservation issues of its natural resources. Nineteen areas are declared as PA till date. A Government order signed to formalize recognizing the co-management structure at five Protected Forest Areas of the country in the year 2006. In order to secure the natural resource-based livelihood while improving the socio-economic well-being of rural communities and protection of the valuable natural resources and the associated with natural beauty of Bangladesh's wetland and forests, a USAID funded project IPAC (implementing period: 2008-2013) is being implemented through the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) and Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoFL). The technical implementing agencies of the Government are Forest Department (FD), Department of Fisheries (DoF) and DoE. Carryover of the two Successful completion of MACH project from the DoF and NISHORGO project from the Forest Department will be mainstreamed through IPAC project. The study area which covered the Turag-Bangshi Site is the central cluster of the IPAC clusters within its five clusters.

Fatima tuz Zohora examines the non-timber forest products and related livelihood in the Sundarban. She concluded that non timber forest products play an important role in the livelihood of the local people. They use *golpata* and *goran* for building, and *goran* also for cooking their food. Honey is a great source of nutrition. By selling the collected product harvesters maintain their family needs. They complete one harvesting trip and wait for the next one.

Mahmudah Roksen Sultana assesses the impact of co-management activities on livelihoods in Satchari National Park. She concluded that the study has described the impacts of AIG activities associated with the co-management in Satchari NP. The assessment also compared the livelihoods and forest dependency patterns of FUG members to non-FUG members (people within the communities that are not members of a Forest User Group). The study examined the creation of alternative income generation opportunities can reduce forest dependency of local people. In the case of occupation, only 5% of FUGs were involved in forest resources extraction whereas 49% of non FUGs were engaged in forestry related activities. There is an order of magnitude difference in forest dependent income between FUG members and non-members alternative income generation opportunities have changed the attitude of FUGs-their occupation from forestry-related activities to other profession and also reducing their forest dependency.

Md. Abdur Rahman explores the deforestation cause and participation of Tanchangya (Ethnic community) in forest conservation. Rahman concluded that the role and value of forest resources in supporting livelihoods of the poor has been widely recognized. Tanchangya people depend on forest for shelter and land, forest serves as safety net during lean period. They are involved in forest conversion due to lack of no other alternatives. Tanchangya people have remained out of periphery of government support system and rural power structure- this made them marginal in perpetuity. The attitude and practice of educated people (eight years of schooling) are compatible with forest conservation. Participation of Tanchangya people can not be ensured merely by awareness development. Both long term efforts to empower them (updating forest villagers' certificate, forest village mapping, participatory forestry, in core area, NTFP restoration in core area, privileged representation in local government)) and short tem efforts to remove key livelihood issues (establishment of government primary school, water conservation; training on vegetables gardening, cow rearing, vocational training, availability of fertilizer) are required.

Md. Zahidur Rahman Miah assesses the livelihoods of forest-dependent people in Kaptai National park. He concluded that the majority of people in Bangchhari are still dependent on swidden. People of Bangchhari are fully dependent on KNP for shelter, fodder and fuel wood. As the FD reduces the amount of land it manages under plantations, it also reduces the amount available for swiddening making the livelihoods of Bangchhari villagers less sustainable. This has caused growing conflict between the FD and Banchari villagers. Some households can meet their rice needs from cultivating their low lying paddy fields; these

people would like to cultivate several crops per year. Villagers without access to low lying paddy fields cannot maintain their livelihoods.

Rokeya Begum examines the local people's livelihoods and their involvement in management of Madhupur National Park, Bangladesh. She concluded that protected areas play an important role in the conservation of forests, the maintenance of biological diversity, and the protection of ecosystem services. But when local people are dependent on the forests within protected areas, it is important that they are actively involved in forest management. Local communities living near and within the national parks often have important and long-standing relationships with these areas. In many places in the world, forest resources are important for people's livelihoods and their cultural survival (Khattak et al. 2002). The primary purpose of this study has been to learn about the livelihoods of local people living in Madhupur National Park and better understand their dependency on the park's forests as well as their past and present involvement in the management of MNP's forest resources.

Bishwajit Kumar Dev assesses the livelihoods of fishers: MACH versus no-MACH in Baikka Beel, Bangladesh. He concluded that future management and development plans for Baikka Beel and Hail Haor need to be geared towards improving the socio-economic condition of local people while also conserving and restoring the environment upon which the fisheries (and the fishers) depend. The **beels** adjacent to fishing communities are very important components of this region's ecosystem. There are several fisher groups in Baikka Beel traditionally engage in fishing as their full time occupation. This study's results found that the livelihoods of MACH fishers are better than non-MACH fishers, and according to some indicators far better. The findings show that there are differences between MACH and non-MACH fishers regarding resource use, access to AIGAs, socioeconomic status, and social perspectives. Development activities appeared to have a considerable impact on people's livelihoods and fishing practices. This study's results showed that the MACH participants were doing better in terms of income, assets, and food security. The problems faced by the traditional fishing communities throughout the country are more or less similar to those in Baikka Beel. To make a positive impact on the socioeconomic conditions of fishers, it is essential that living standards, health and sanitary conditions, housing conditions, children's education, and credit availability are all improved and that there are an increased number of alternative employment and income-generating activities for fishers during the off season. Moreover, fishers will benefit from trainings and technical support through different government and non-government organizations. This study is encouraging because it suggests that MACH fishers' livelihoods have improved as the result of initiatives and activities supported by the Bangladeshi government, semi-government, NGOs, Upazila administration, local government agencies, and the self-initiative of communities. Thus, with careful planning, institutional development and community co-management of natural resources can make a positive impact on local livelihoods.

Masud Ara Momi examines the socio-economic benefits for resource user groups through the co-management in Alua Beel. She concluded that fisheries co-management helps ensure active participation of the beneficiary group of fishers and good governance in open water bodies. This management technique can improve local livelihoods and increase the income of poor fishers by providing access rights and introducing better fisheries management strategies. The study also concluded that without active involvement of users in co-management activities, Alua Beel cannot achieve its goals of promoting conservation and improved livelihoods.

Md. Aminul Haque assesses the fish-market chain and fishers' incomes in Sherpur district, Bangladesh. He concluded that fishers have lack bargaining power and middlemen control the fish-market chain. Fishers are the poorest member of the fish-market chain with the lowest annual incomes. The main constraints they face are a lack of bargaining power and access to market information. *Arotgars* and *paikars* have the highest incomes and economic

status and hence benefit the most from the existing market chain. *Beparies* hold an intermediate position while retailers are only slightly better off than fishers. Fishers have not been able to maintain, let alone improve, their comparative economic over the years. The main problem is that the existing fish-market chain is fully controlled by the private sector and government supervision is poor. Fishers' incomes are not only limited by their position in the market chain but also by the fact that fish resources are declining. As a result their daily catch has been reduced. The small size of their catch, the distance to the market, and the lack of facilities for preserving fish, limits fishers to selling their fish to nearby *paikars* at lower prices than they would obtain at a market.

Md. Khalequzzam Sarker examines the livelihoods in the Sundarbans. Khalequzzaman concluded that the present study has identified the livelihoods of the fishermen, fisher women and shrimp enclosure owners in the western region of the Sundarbans. The study found that both male and female fishers live with poverty and do not reach their daily basic requirements. They are also exploited and oppressed by shrimp enclosure owners. This survey also provided a good understanding of the major livelihood assets (human, financial, natural and social) of the fishers. In general, poverty remains a major obstacle to poor fishers' ability to gain and maintain access to critical livelihood assets. Poor stakeholders stated declining income from fishing due to recent cyclones, and low rate of savings amongst poor households in fishers reflects that people probably cannot improve their living standards given their current situation. The study also conclude that fisher livelihoods could improve if policy makers focus on the actual problems in this: the lack of alternative income generating activities in the banned season; dadon (money lending) and the elite capture of resources; and seriously lacking infrastructure for health and sanitation especially in cyclones.

Suriya Ferdous evaluates the indigenous people's perceptions of Climate Change in Kaptai National Park areas. Suriya concluded that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has confirmed that global climate change is already happening. The IPCC's report states that the determining factors of social and biophysical vulnerability of indigenous and traditional peoples are not well understood and require further investigation globally (IPCC 2007). Bangladesh has been particularly impacted in the South by climate and weather phenomenon that have devastated our coastal livelihoods. This paper brings to attention the views on environmental changes associated with climatic variables expressed by the indigenous people living in Kaptai National Park.

Md. Al Mamun Hasan could not attend the writeshop due to his MSc final examination.

Power point presentations of all eleven awardees are given in appendix 2.

Current status of research papers:

The eleven papers are under editing process at the East West Center in Hawaii and Jefferson and his team already completed editing of few papers. The WorldFish Center is coordinating the development of final papers for publication.

Appendix 1:

East-West Center/Integrated Protected Area Co-management (IPAC) Project

Small Research Grants Program

Writershop on “Rural livelihoods and protected landscapes: Co-management in the wetlands and forests of Bangladesh”

Agenda

Location: Infinity Solutions, 151/6 Green Road (3rd Floor), Dhaka

Dates: January 17 to February 11, 2010

Facilitators: Jefferson Fox, M. G. Mustafa, Shimona Quazi, and Wendy Miles

Week 1

Objective of Week 1: Participants have completed their problem statement, case study outline/framework and started ‘fleshing out’ main body of case study – all according to their intended audience and purpose of their work.

Day 1: Sunday 17 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Welcoming address	- Bob Winterbottom
9:15	Program Logistics	- Presentation on logistical arrangements (SQ)
9:45	Participants and Facilitators Introductions	- Exercise RECOFTC Training Material (17-18)
10:30	Break	
11:00	Expectations and Norms	- Exercise RECOFTC Training Material (23-24)
11:30	Course Aims, Content and Flow	Jeff Fox
12:00	Lunch	
2:00	<i>Reading Seminar 1--Co-Management and Protected Areas</i>	Caron, C.M. 1995. The role of NTFP in household food procurement strategies: Profile of a Sri Lankan village. <i>Agroforestry Systems</i> 32: 99-117.- Presentation by Jeff Fox
4:40	Daily Feedback	- Evaluation session
5:00	Finish	

Comments:

- **Morning** is dedicated to settling participants in and making sure they understand the structure and process for the next 4 weeks. Also ensure all logistical matters are taken care off.
- **Afternoon:** Jeff Fox to provide broad overview of major themes/trend in thematic area of ‘Co Management in Protected areas’. This is to be followed by the introduction of one key paper and analysis of writing style, i.e. audience, structure, references, style of writing.

Day 2: Monday 18 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 1	
9:15	The writing process – stages of development in a case study	Exercise - RECOFTC Training Material (p 37-39)
10:30	Break	
10:50	Thesis statement (or guiding idea), audience and purpose.	Exercise – RECOFTC Training Material (pg 40-41). - Group to share ideas through exercise
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Developing a main message	Exercise – RECOFTC training Material (pg 69 – 79)
3:30	Independent work -	
4:45	Daily feedback	- Evaluation Session Plan
5:00	Finish	

Comments:

- **Morning:** Group activities to explore understanding of process and sharing of ideas/purpose of their writing.
- **Afternoon:** The first afternoon that would be free for participants to start their own writing. From now on the program would develop into a more relaxed format of group work/discussion in the morning and independent study in the afternoon.

Day 3: Tuesday 19 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 2	
9:15	Branching out the main message	Exercise – RECOFTC Training material (pg 80-82)
10:30	Break	
10:50	Developing the case study outline	Exercise – RECOFTC Training material (pg 83-85)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	<i>Reading Seminar 2</i>	
3:30	Independent work -	
4:45	Feedback	- Evaluation session plan
5:00	End of day	

Comments:

- **Morning:** By the end of the morning of Day 3 participants should have their thesis/problem statement written, the purpose/aim of their case study, an idea of their audience and the main body of their case study outlined. This is a probably an ambitious goal, but at least we would have a good idea of what stage the participants are at.

Day 4: Wednesday 20 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 3	
9:15	Bibliography and citing exercise	RECOFTC material (pg 98-103)
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work on case study framework	To be completed for presentation on Thursday
5:00	End of day	

Day 5: Thursday 21 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 4	
9:15	Peer assessment of work Exercise.	RECOFTC Training material (pg 111-116)
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

WEEK 2

Objective of Week 2: Participants have completed a first draft of their work ready for review.

Day 6: Sunday 24 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Week 1	
9:15	Peer review of case study outline	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Organizing and Analyzing Information	RECOFTC Training Material (pg 57-68)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 7: Monday 25 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 8	
9:15	<i>Reading Seminar 3 –</i>	Jeff Fox
10:30	Break	
10:50	Writing an introduction and conclusion	RECOFTC Training Material (pg 86-93)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 8: Tuesday 26 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 9	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 9: Wednesday 27 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 9	
9:15	<i>Reading Seminar 4 –</i>	Jeff Fox
10:30	Break	
10:50	Writing and 'packaging' - The first draft - Preparing for presentation in start of week 3)	RECOFTC Training Material (pg 94-95 & 104- 106)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 10: Thursday 28 January

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 9	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Editing the first draft	RECOFTC Training Material (pg107 - 110)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

WEEK 3**Objective of Week 3:** Review of first draft and completion of second draft with abstract.**Day 11: Sunday 31 January**

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Week 2	
9:15	Review of participants first draft	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Review of participants first draft (continued)	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work based on review	
5:00	End of day	

Day 12: Monday 1 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 11	
9:15	<i>Reading 5–</i>	Jeff Fox
10:30	Break	
10:50	Formulating a catchy title	RECOFTC training material (pg 96 – 97)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 13: Tuesday 2 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 12	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Practicing analysis (Optional exercise/session)	RECOFTC training material (pg 130 – 137)
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 14: Wednesday 3 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 13	
9:15	<i>Reading Seminar 6 –</i>	Jeff Fox
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 15: Thursday 4 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 14	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Preparing for second draft presentation – overheads and PowerPoint	To be developed
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Presentations and peer review of draft 2	
5:00	End of day	

WEEK 4

Week 4 Objectives: Presentation of completed final papers and development of action plans and/or follow up support.

Day 16: Sunday 7 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Week 3	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 17: Monday 8 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 16	
9:15	Independent work	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Independent work	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Independent work	
5:00	End of day	

Day 18: Tuesday 9 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 17	
9:15	Presentation of final papers	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Presentation of final papers	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Presentation of final papers	
5:00	End of day	

Day 19: Wednesday 10 February

Time	Session	Resources
9:00	Review of Day 18	
9:15	Presentation of final papers	
10:30	Break	
10:50	Presentation of final papers	
12:00	Lunch	
1:30	Presentation of final papers	
5:00	End of day	

Participants Dates of Importance:

- Thursday 21 January - Completion of case study outline, including problem statement, case study framework and dot points to support main body of case study.
- Sunday 24 January – Presentation of case study outline
- Thursday 28 January – Completion of case study first draft
- Sunday 31 January – Presentation of case study first draft
- Thursday 4 February – Completion and presentation of case study second draft
- Tuesday 9 and Wednesday 10 February – Presentation of final paper.
- Thursday 11 February – Completion of paper, ready for publication.

Day 20: Thursday 11 February

Inaugural Session: 08:30 - 10:30 am

Time	Event	Speaker/presenter
08:30	Registration	
09:00	Guests take their seats	
09:05	Recitation from Holly Quran	
09:10	Address of welcome	Bob Winterbottom CoP, IPAC Project
09:20	Introducing the Programme	Dr. Jefferson Fox East-West Center, USA
09:30	Address by the Special Guest	USAID
09:40	Address by the Special Guest	CCF/Director, FD
09:50	Address by the Special Guest	DG/Director, DoF
10:00	Address by the Special Guest	DG/Director, DoE
10:10	Address by the Chief Guest	JS, IPAC Project Coordinator
10:20	Vote of thanks	William J Collis
10:25	Paper presentation by Research Fellow (Paper 1)	Research Fellow
10:40	Tea Break	Refreshments
11:15	Technical Sessions 11 am to 5 pm	
11:15	Presentation by Fellows: Paper 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	
1:00	Lunch Break	
2:00	Presentation by Researcher: Paper 8, 9, 10, 11	
3:30	Closing Ceremony	Ishtiaque Uddin Ahmed