AGROFORESTRY AND PLANT PROPAGATION IN THE NORTHERN PACIFIC:
Report on a Sub-regional Workshop Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia, 26-30 November 2007

R. R. Thaman
Faculty of Islands and Oceans
The University of the South Pacific
Suva, Fiji Islands
January 2008

1 INTRODUCTION

This constitutes my report on the Sub-regional Workshop on Agroforestry and Plant Propagation in the Northern Pacific held in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia from 26 to 30 November 2007. It includes: 1) a brief summary of the workshop program; 2) some of the materials presented or developed during the workshop; 3) an evaluation of the workshop based on an questionnaires completed by participants; and, 4) brief findings and recommendations arising out of the workshop.

2 SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP

The workshop was organized by Ms. Eva Gonnermann and Mr. Cenon Padolina of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and funded by the SPC, SPC Land Resources Division, GTZ and CIM. I served as one of the workshop facilitators and resource persons. The content of the workshop included: 1) an overview of the workshop purposes and processes (R. Thaman), 2) presentation of country reports, 3) review and assessment of traditional agroforestry systems in small island countries (R. Thaman), 4) formulating and developing strategies for sustainable agroforestry systems in small islands (R. Thaman), 4) the role of food and nutrition in agroforestry systems (L. Engelberger), 5) integrated farming systems and cropping practices (S. Halavatau), 6) principles and techniques of plant propagation (P. Warburton), 7) short sessions on soil nutrient deficiency, plant diseases and mulching (S. Halavatau), and 7) one major one-day fieldtrip to selected agricultural and agroforestry sites and the coastal vegetation (mangroves and coastal forest) in the area of Nan Madol, the ruins of a center of ancient cultural development in Pohnpei and major tourist attraction. The daily sessions were reviewed and the synthesis of the workshop were carried out by E. Gonnermann, C. Padolina, P. Warburton, S. Halavatau and M. Seniloli. I was unable to attend the final closing session of the Workshop as I had to return to Fiji to submit my final grades for assessment at The University of the South Pacific.

An evening, which included a traditional kava ceremony and feast, was hosted by one of the local communities. This gave the participants better insight into the cultural and spiritual importance of the local AF system and the depth of local traditional knowledge and respect for traditional community leadership.

There were over 20 participants, all from Micronesian countries and territories: Palau, the Northern Marianas, Guam, Yap, Chuuk, Pohnpei and Kosrae in the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. The participants selected from Kiribati, Tuvalu and Tokelau were unable to attend due to travel and visa difficulties.

For the workshop the following materials were prepared, handed out and discussed as a basis for the sessions on the review and assessment of traditional agroforestry systems and the formulation and development of sustainable agroforestry systems for atolls and other small islands. They are included as Appendices I-Ix (electronically) and included: 1) a 12-page handout on concepts and information related to the protection and development of atoll agroforestry systems in the Pacific Islands (Appendix I); 2) a 36-

page "Annotated checklist of important Pacific Island agroforestry species for atolls and small low-lying islands and coastal areas (cultivated and wild tree, shrub or tree-like perennial species of widespread or considerable local economic, cultural, and ecological importance, or showing some potential in pacific island rural and urban multi-species agroforestry systems in the atolls, small low-lying islands and coastal areas of the tropical Pacific Ocean)(Appendix II); 3) a 3-page checklist of trees and shrubs for atolls and small islands (Appendix III; appended separately because it is in Microsoft Excel format); 4) long and short versions of a "community-based atoll, small island and coastal agroforestry and biodiversity survey questionnaire" to be used as a basis for community assessments of local agroforestry systems and agroforestry biodiversity (Appendices V and VI); 5) a copy of an article on "Trees outside forests as a foundation for sustainable development in the Small Island Developing States of the Pacific Ocean" from the *The International Forestry Review*, December 2002 (Appendix VII); 6) "Guidelines and Guiding Questions for the Workshop", which were distributed on the end of the first day" (Appendix VII); 7) sample answers to the practice exercise on the agroforestry survey questionnaires (Appendix VIII); and 8) a copy of the workshop evaluation questionnaire administered to the participants on the last day of the workshop (Appendix IX).

3 WORKSHOP EVALUATION AND FINDINGS

The following findings related to the Sub-regional Workshop on Agroforestry and Plant Propagation in the Northern Pacific held in Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia from 26 to 30 November 2007 are based on an evaluation questionnaire competed by 17 participants, informal feedback from participants and resource persons during the workshop and my own personal assessment.

The responses to the workshop evaluation questionnaire (Appendix VII) clearly reflect the diversity of the backgrounds, interests and responsibilities of the participants who ranged from technical personnel to political and section leaders who generally have greater concern for overall sustainability and planning within the agriculture, forestry and environmental sectors. The wide range of concepts, knowledge and skills covered was, thus, appropriate but allowed only limited time for in-depth focus on individual components of the course. As a result, some groups indicated receiving greatest benefit from the technical aspects, such as learning how to compost, marcot, bud and graft, prepare seedlings for nurseries and outplanting, identification of nutrient deficiency and disease symptoms, etc. , whereas others seemed to gain more from the more philosophical and planning aspects related to the importance and identification of appropriate forests, trees and agroforestry systems and how one would plan for the protection and enrichment of their respective agroforestry systems (Tables 1 to 8).

3.1 Positive Aspects of the Workshop

The analysis of the course evaluation responses to aspects of the workshop that participants liked best and least (Tables 1 and 2) showed that there were many aspects that were favourable and some shortcomings. The participants generally praised the high quality of the

resource personnel and their technical expertise and welcomed the emphasis on gaining a better understanding of traditional Pacific Island agroforestry (AF) systems and their component trees and associated arboreal biodiversity. They valued sharing their experiences with other Pacific Islanders via both the country presentations and formal and informal discussions both within and outside the formal workshop. They also enjoyed the fieldtrip, but may have wanted to spend more time looking at traditional Pohnpeian AF systems and trees rather than visiting operational and experimental farms, which some of the local participants had already visited a number of times. There seemed to also be a desire to spend more time with local communities in the field and in their agroforestry systems and for more hands-on experience.

Table 1. Analysis of responses to the question about the three things participants liked best about the workshop?

Responses	**Total (x/17)**
Quality of trainers/resource personnel	7
Focus on Pacific Island AF systems	7
Sharing experiences with other PIs	5
Food and refreshment	4
Fieldtrip	4
Propagation techniques	3
Country presentations	2
Depth of knowledge of presenters	2
Useful topics/subject material	2
Fieldtrip to traditional AF systems	1
Meeting on the PIs	1
Focus on important species around the world	1
Hands-on grafting	1
Composting	1
Seedling preparation	1
Nutrient deficiency	1
Preservation and enrichment of PIAF	1
Meeting with local chiefs/leaders/communities	1
Good accommodation	1
Concept of biodiversity	1
Concept of capital	1
Techniques that work in other countries	1
Workshop met objectives	1
Nursery management	1
Soil preparation	1
Working with other Micronesians	1
Happy to be in the workshop	1
Subject detail	1
Workshop venue	1

Discussion of information	1
Good coordination	1
Hands-on experience	1

3.2 Shortcomings

Among the shortcomings of the workshop was concern over the variable quality of the country presentations. There were some very good presentations that showed that some countries had already implemented broad-based and well-thought-out agroforestry protection and development programs at both the national and community levels. Other, however, had only limited progress to report. The reports were mainly Powerpoint presentations and not distributed as papers, which could be compiled and distributed to the participants. There was also concern over attendance by some participants and unequal participation in discussion.

There was concern over the length and number of different presentation on different topics and the lack of time for discussion and practical work to allow for students to focus on and master or learn given concepts or techniques. There was also concern over the use by some presenters, without explanation or definition, of language or concepts that were unfamiliar to some of the participants.

As suggested above some participants felt that the visit to the Chinese/government experimental farm was inappropriate, given that many of the participants came from a government agricultural background and were familiar with such initiatives. In fact, on the actual visit, few if any of the participants actually came down to see the experiments and the giant swamp taro (*Cyrtosperma*) and banana and plantain (*Musa*) cultivar collections, which were in a state of serious neglect, with many of the cultivars overgrown with weeds (*Senna alata* shrubs in the case of the *Cyrtosperma* collection). In the case of the banana and plantain collection, many cultivars seem to have disappeared.

There was also concern over poor time management and late starting of some sessions, failure to follow the agenda and the addition of additional presentations. The lengthy breaks for coffee and lunch that took up large amounts of time were also mentioned by a number of participants and contributed to excessive “down time” and lack of continuity of some of the sessions. Other concerns related to the accommodation, insufficient per diems, food etc.

Table 2. Responses to questions about the three (3) things participants did not like about the workshop?

Responses	**Total (x/17)**
Poor preparation/lectures by some participants	4
Insufficient time for practical work	3
No shortcomings/all ok	3
Food	2
Late breaks/lunch too late	2

Lengthy talks	2
Inappropriate language level	2
Limited funding/insufficient per diem	2
Parts of fieldtrip not relevant	2
Sessions too long/boring	2
Somewhat disorganized, agenda not followed	2
Timing	2
Workshop too long	2
Attendance failure	1
Fieldtrip to pilot farm unneeded and late in the afternoon	1
Fieldtrip too long/tiresome	1
Homework	1
Limited space/crowded venue	1
Local people didn’t attend	1
Half of fieldtrip wasted	1
Organizer always late	1
Poor contribution by some participants	1
Poor time management	1
Too much distraction by host	1
Unequal participation	1

3.3 Most Valuable Things or Concepts Learned

In response to the question about the three most valuable things or concepts learned during the workshop, the results are shown in Table 3. As suggested above there seemed to be great interest among the participants in both the actual techniques to maintain and enrich AF systems (e.g., assessing nutrient deficiency, propagation techniques, etc.) and obtaining a better understanding of how to plan and implement programs for the protection and enrichment of existing AF systems and their component trees. Emphasis was also placed on the importance of the protection and dissemination of knowledge of traditional AF systems and component trees and associated plants (e.g., staple food cultivar diversity) and its integration with the best up-to-date modern scientific knowledge (e.g. disease and pest control, soil improvement and propagation and nursery techniques)

The participants also stressed the importance of understanding the common issues and problems shared by island states and the protection and enrichment of their AF systems and trees,

Table 3. Responses to the question about the three most valuable things or concepts learned during the workshop (Note: * indicates that these items have been grouped from responses that basically stressed the importance of these issues. The actual responses have been retained to in the lower parts of the table).

Responses	Total (x/17
*Importance of tree protection and planting	11
*AF as a foundation for sustainable development	8
*Nutrient deficiency	7
*Propagation techniques	6
*Similarity of issues among islands/information sharing between islands	4
*AF, trees and traditional AF and Food systems as capital	4
*Integration/marriage of traditional and modern agroforestry	3
*Importance of Traditional Knowledge	3
New terminology (e.g., agroforestry, biodiversity, ethnobiodiversity)	3
Seeing new species on Pohnpei	2
Trees as bank accounts	2
*Plant disease ID/detection	2
*Ethnobiodiversity	2
Idea of re-knowing and regrowing agroforests	2
Trad AF and knowledge as a basis for sustainable island development	2
Nan Madol and experiencing Pohnpeian culture	2
Affects of diseases	1
Knowledge of chemicals	1
Seeding and budding	1
Importance of healthy local foods	1
Wider understanding and more appropriate definition of AF	1
Plant health and deficiency ID	1
Propagation through grafting	1

Protection easier than rebuilding	1
AF as a foundation to health of land, shores, rivers and next generations	1
Importance of "champions"	1
Definition of sustainable development	1
Calculation of CN ratio	1
Importance of mangroves	1
Importance of monitoring and inventorying existing AF before lost	1
Importance of seed selection	1
Composting	1
Activity planning/Importance of AF planning	1
Improved nursery practices	1
Importance of trees to rivers, coasts and the sea	1
Jokes/humour	1
Learning AF history of other PIs	1
Importance of tailoring AF to each individual island/situation	1
Importance of species selection for different land uses and AF Zones	1
Managing a tree nursery	1
Planting, protecting and learning about trees	1
Importance of hands-on experience	1

3.4 Things Not Learned

In response to the question what they had hoped to learn but didn't, the results are shown in Table 4. Six of the participants said that there were no shortcomings. The main responses from those who indicated shortcomings focused on a desire to learn more about native plants, important AF species and their propagation. Others wanted more information on how to actually plan and implement a sustainable AF system, given increasing population, and needs and the deterioration of traditional agricultural and food systems.

These included their desire to learn more about AF planning and zoning, appropriate AF innovations, new species and cultivars, crop rotation within AF systems and how to promote AF system development and develop AF action plans. Other areas of interest included the effects of weeds, soils, composting, soil-enriching species, etc. pruning and trimming, integration of livestock in to AF systems, learning more about scientific names and how we can implement programs to stop food imports and achieve greater levels of food self-reliance.

Table 4. Responses of 17 participants to the question about the three (3) main things they had hoped to learn, but did not learn.

Responses	**Total (x/17**
None/No shortcomings	6
Native species propagation	2
Names of native plants	2
Effects of weeds	1

Crop rotations in AF	1
AF innovations	1
AF zoning	1
How to promote our own AF	1
How to stop food imports	1
More about scientific names	1
More detail on soils, pruning and trimming	1
Information about native plants	1
More about cash crops in other countries	1
New species/cultivars	1
Technology	1
More on AF planning/AF action plans	1
Integration of livestock into AF	1
Making and applying compost	1
More on AF species	1
Soil enriching species	1

3.5 Development of Agroforestry Plans

In response to whether the participants thought they could make a plan to improve the AF systems in their country nine (15) participants said they could and the remaining three (3) participants did not answer the question.

In response to that those things that they thought they could do for themselves and those things that they would need outside technical or financial assistance, the results are shown in Tables 5 and 6. Only nine participants filled in these questions.

Those things that they thought they could carry out themselves focused mainly on actions that they could take with local communities or on their own farms. These included working with and educating local communities and youth and conducting surveys to determine community needs for AF development. Other activities included setting up demonstration trials and community nurseries, gene banks, identifying and collecting threatened species and cultivars, collecting information on native tree propagation and diversification and planting of trees on cropland and developing intercropping and multistorey tree gardens.

Table 5. Responses of 9 out of 17 participants in terms of three (3) things that they could do for themselves without outside financial and technical assistance.

Responses	Total (x/9
Work with/educate local interested communities	3
Set up demonstration fields/AF trials	2
Involve/teach/focus on our youth/children	2
Inform/convince communities of importance of maintaining traditional AF	2
Establish community nurseries	1
Start at home in my own AF system	1
Plant trees on cropland	1
Identify plantation crop combinations	1
Develop multistorey tree gardens	1
Perfect gene banks	1
Diversify species in AF systems	1
Diversify plantings in houseyard gardens	1
Compost making	1
Conduct survey to determine community needs for tree species	1
ID and collect AF species and cultivars that are rare	1
Develop and implement an AF action plan	1
Collect information on native tree propagation	1

Activities or things for which they said they would require financial or technical assistance on included production of sufficient planting materials, working with schools and youths, carrying out research, mounting education programs, documentation of AF techniques and technical, assistance to teach field, propagation, nursery techniques, plus a wide range of needs for money for research, education, transportation, tools and machinery, laboratory equipment, etc. and the

importation of exotic planting materials. The fact that some of the same things that some people said that they could do themselves are the same for which others required help, again, indicates the wide range of interests and expertise in the participants.

Table 6. Responses of 9 out of 17 participants in terms of three (3) things that they would need financial or technical assistance to do.

Responses	Total (x/9)
Producing enough planting materials	2
Working with schools and youths	2
$ for research	1
Collaborating agencies	1
Education/ extended	1
Documentation of AF Techniques	1
Technical assistance	1
Pruning and trimming techniques	1
Funding to import exotic fruit plants to enrich local agroforests	1
Nursery establishment	1
Laboratory equipment	1
Field machinery	1
Information on native seed propagation	1
More information on soil type/fertility	1
Transportation	1

3.6 Nature of Proposed Sustainable Agroforestry Development Projects

Fourteen (14) participants indicated they thought they could implement a sustainable AF initiative in their country. The titles and objectives of these projects are listed in Table 7 below. As can be seen the projects fall into four main categories, all of which reflect the objectives of the workshop. Projects 1-5 fall into the category of agroforestry and tree protection and planting as a means of environmental and biodiversity protection and sustainable use. Projects 6 – 8 clearly fall into the category of the protection and enrichment of agroforestry systems, whereas 9-11 are more focused on the technical aspects of propagation, nursery development and the application of the technical aspects of the workshop. Projects 12 to 14 are more focused on learning and awareness and the documentation and teaching of knowledge of AF systems as a basis for the conservation and development of AF systems as a basis for sustainable development.

It is encouraging to see that all the proposed projects incorporated many of the concepts and technologies addressed in the workshop. As was the case with the evaluation and comments on the workshop the projects that were suggested for implementation also reflected the wide interests of the participants and the wide coverage of topics addressed by the workshop, and the diversity of organizational and political structures in the different islands.

Table 7. Titles and objectives of proposed sustainable agroforestry development projects suggested by 14 participants.

Project Titles	Objectives
1. Grow-low sakau (kava) cultivation and production of seedlings	Encourage people to reduce deforestation for kava cultivation in the upper watershed area and to encourage designation of these areas as forest reserves.
2. Tolofofo Bay Reforestation	Reduce land-based and coastal erosion
3. Coastal Forest Protection and Replanting	To protect coastal areas from erosion and to protect the AF system
4. Forest Conservation in Chuuk	Conserve 10 acres of forest land and to conserve endemic species
5. Tree Planting in Landslide Areas, Pehlong, Pohnpei	Replant native trees in open areas.
6. Preservation and Conservation of Medicinal and Endemic Plants in UFO and Planting of Food Crop among Trees	Conservation of traditional plants for the benefit of future generations.
7. Sovonana (?) Project	Reforestation and Agroforestry
8. Agroforestry Rehabilitation	Replant multi-storey trees to have new crops available to farmers
9. Plant propagation and nursery development.	To gain knowledge of vegetative propagation practices for use in nursery development.
10. Planting Project	Application of knowledge from the workshop to prepare soil and compost, collection of seeds and planting materials
11. Community Nursery	To produce planting materials for use by communities to support food production, nutrition and food security and income
12. Establishment of and AF Learning Center.	Create an AF learning site for students at the College of Micronesia in FSM.
13. Protection and Documentation of Traditional Knowledge	To revive and make the public aware of the critical importance of traditional knowledge and to use modern scientific principles to explain the advantages of Appropriate traditional techniques as a basis for sustainable AF development.
14. Agroforestry Farm	Education people on AF technology

In terms of project activities, some of which over lap, these included:

1. Encouragement of lowland planting and the provision of kava planting material.
2. Planting strategic coastal and upland watershed plants.
3. Propagation, nursery and planting.
4. Implement forest conservation.
5. Identify native tree species and plant them in landslide areas.
6. Expand nursery and assist all communities on the island to keep their AF system intact.
7. Soil collection and improvement, planting, watering, weeding, selection, root pruning, and distribution of plants.
8. Empower local communities to develop AF farms on their own land.
9. Work with landowners and communities to promote and teach plant propagation to ensure that they are capable of replanting their own AF systems
10. Plan the project and nursery, crop and species selection, preparation of planting materials in nursery and management and maintenance.
11. Increase the numbers, success rate and quality of seedlings produced in nurseries.
12. Work with agricultural instructor and students to clear site, collect planting materials and maintain and evaluate the success.
13. Survey and documents traditional AF methods and technologies. Use scientific methods to develop educational materials that incorporate traditional knowledge.
14. Preparation of planting materials and planting.

In terms of project partners, these included a wide range of entities. The list reflects the need for cross-sectorial and interdisciplinary partnerships when dealing with the cross-cutting issues related to environmental protection, agroforestry and agricultural development and food, nutrition and health security-related issues.

1. NGOs, forestry, government and community land grant colleges
2. Environmental agencies and engineering (?).
3. COM/FSM, Forestry, Agriculture, Selected elders from communities.
4. local communities, Yap Women's Associations, Agriculture, Yap Institute of Natural Science, US Forestry Service
5. NGOs, State Government, municipal government
6. Community groups, urban communities
7. WUTMI/women's groups, local government, College of the Marshall Islands, Youth to Youth, other government agencies (e.g., RND, DSAP, Public Works, Tourism)
8. NGOs
9. All agencies and leaders working in the areas of agriculture and conservation.
10. Agriculture, forestry, SPC, NRCS, CSP, Island Food Community of Pohnpei, CES Land Grant.
11. Div. of Forestry, Land Grand Com, USDA-NRCS and local communities.
12. DSAP, EPA, Agriculture, CCS, Youth Association, resource owners and other stakeholders, municipal government

In terms of technical support needed, the answers included:

1. manpower/labour/staff and planting/nursery material
2. Staff with knowledge on vegetative plant production and care relevant for AF.
3. Approximately $1500.
4. Both technical and financial support.
5. $700
6. For urban community project
7. Consultants from SPC, FAO, DSAP and $$$
8. Project evaluation, maintenance and conservation
9. Support from SPC, FAO, USDA, Forestry
10. Have local technical expertise but will need money to run project.
11. Technical and Resource person and funding
12. Selection of appropriate native tree species and funding for replanting project.
13. Expertise on plant diseases, soils and mineral deficiencies and financial assistance to assist women to learn proper budding, marcotting, weed and other techniques.

3.7 Suggestions for Improving Workshops in the Future

As can be seen from the suggestions for improving such workshops in Table 8, they reflect some of the same concerns expressed in Table 2. Prominent was the need for more hands-on work, fewer talks, more focus on fewer topics, use of more appropriate and less technical language, and probably more practical, community-based work involving local farmers and agroforesters. The participants clearly wanted to know more about, and to discuss in more depth, local and/or native plants, economic plants, nitrogen, nursery techniques, etc., some of which are possibly best done, at least partially, in a field situation.

Although unclear to the intent, more funding was wanted by some, possibly to carry out follow-up activities arising out of the workshop. There was also a suggestion that there needed to be better communication prior to the workshop in order to better prepare the participants.

Table 8. Responses by 17 participants for improving these kinds of workshop in the future

Response	**Total (x)/16**
More funding/money for projects/more DSA	4
Better organization	4
More practical/hands on exercises	4
Talk with local people/local participation/practical work on-the-farm	4
Shorter talks	2
More on native plants on different islands	2
More specific information about AF	2
Better accommodation/choice	2
Use less technical terms	1
Names of native plants	1
More on economic crops	1
More preparation time	1

More communication before workshop	1
Better island venue relevant to topics	1
Better management	1
More on sustainability	1
More focus (?)	1
Include project based research	1
Public education	1
Planning for the future	1
More about nitrogen	1
More about nursery techniques	1
More on pests and diseases	1
More workshops	1
New techniques	1
Shortage of time	1
Equal participation in discussions	1
Hold and annual workshop	1
Inform people ahead of time	1
Good nothing wrong	1

4 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATONS

Overall, I believe the workshop was successful in achieving most of its objectives, although the focus was possibly too broad and the time too short. Major findings and recommendations are as follows:

- The quality of participants was, generally, very good, with some participants clearly having a keen interest in most of the topics and already possessing considerable expertise in many areas and already had significant involvement in the promotion of sustainable agroforestry in their countries.

- One positive aspect of the workshop that could have been capitalised on more was the expertise and experience among the participants, some of whom freely shared their knowledge and experience in the workshop.
- The workshop was successful in heightening awareness among participants of the importance of maintaining and enriching diversified agroforestry systems as a basis for sustainable island development.

- Participants showed considerable interest in, and improved understanding of, the links between trees, agroforestry and integrated farming systems and environmental protection, economic sustainability, food and health security and the integrity of their rich island cultures.

- They also showed great interest in, and appreciation of, the need for some new species to enrich their already rich agroforestry heritages.

- They understood and wanted to know more about better detection and control of soil nutrient deficiencies, pests and diseases and appreciated the need for improved soil conservation practices in the face of increasing island population, declining soil fertility, increasing incidences of diseases and pests, increasing commercialization of agriculture and changing aspirations of the younger generation.

- Participants gained theoretical and practical knowledge about, and demonstrated how they might initiate, agroforestry initiatives in their countries and the types of technologies and tree species that could be applied to a multi-species, multi-ecosystem approach to agroforestry development on islands.

- They, almost universally, expressed the critical need, in their suggested programs, for more knowledge and assistance with the identification, propagation, nursery care, and post-planting care of the most suitable species and cultivars for multi-species, multi-ecosystem AF development.

- They understood the critical role they can play in the recording and application of local indigenous and traditional knowledge to AF development and the roles they must play in working with and raising awareness among local communities.

- Considerable importance was placed on the role that they though they could and must play in informing local communities and youth about the importance of traditional agroforestry.

- There was expressed desire for more information, research and assistance on the propagation of native tree species, which have often been neglected in institutional agroforestry, agricultural and forestry initiatives.

- There are many financial, infrastructural and technical problems that need to be sorted out in order to implement and sustain such activities. These include transportation, propagation of seeds, research the development, and most importantly maintenance of germ plasm/cultivar collections.

- There is a need for more research and dissemination of information on the propagation of important native and cultural species of hard-to-establish trees, soil analysis, nursery establishment, etc.

- Probably too wide a focus and not enough time focusing on a number of main topics so that participants have a chance to understand, discuss and give feed back on the topics, do exercises, fieldwork, etc. In short, there were a lot of sessions, long periods, and little time to digest, time for working groups, etc.

- In future courses, it would probably be better to limit the number of topics or have breakout “focus” groups during the second half of the workshop to allow participants to focus on those topic and skills that are most appropriate for their respective interests and responsibilities. Have more hand-on and working group sections where

the participants can master the understanding, and apply some of the concepts and techniques covered in the workshop.

- The fieldtrip also probably covered too much in a short time. It could be possible to have a more practical fieldtrip that allowed more time to focus on what is actually being done by farmers/agroforesters in the field and carry out analyses or inventories, rather than merely visiting and walking though area with limited stops to allow participants to analyse what they see and learn about the individual trees, crops, problems and hear from local communities rather than course resource people and local technical person. Set work or assignments could be linked to the objectives of the fieldtrips.

- Allow less time for coffee and lunch breaks in order to maximize limited time available to cover the course material (Could have coffee in the venue and continue work!).

- Probably a need to try to include more female participants given the critical role that women play in traditional and modern agricultural, food and health system development.

Acknowledgements

Finally, I wish to thank the SPC Forests and Trees Programme of the SPC Land Resources Division for including me in the resource team for this workshop. I found Pohnpei, the workshop, fellow resource persons, the participants and in particular the people and local communities of Pohnpei who shared their knowledge and time and hosted us to a traditional "agroforestry-based" sakau (kava) ceremony and feast all contributed to a wonderful learning experience. I sincerely wish to thank them all. Overall the workshop was excellent, sincerely I hope that the participants have been empowered to protect and improve their existing agroforestry systems, and I hope that this report will lead to even better workshops in the future!

Vinaka Vakalevu and Kasehlelie

Randy Thaman
Suva
January 2008