

PROGRAMME EVALUATION

UNDP Life

*“Working towards sustainable community development
through local-local dialogue, stakeholder participation
and partnership building”*

- Final Report -



Karl A. Anderson
Winston W. E. Anderson
Consultants
2005 January

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background -----	1
Objectives of the Programme Evaluation -----	2
The Programme Evaluation -----	3
Project Design	
Project Outputs and Outcomes	
Implementation and Management Issues	
Partnership Building	
Capacity and Institutional Building	
UNDP Contribution	
Lessons Learned/Best Practices and their Use in Advocacy	
Institutional Arrangements -----	4
The Main Activities of UNDP Life -----	5
Procedures and Methodologies in the Design of Project Components -----	5
UNDP Life Methodologies -----	10
Case Study: Portmore Gardens Sanitation Project (Box 1) -----	11
Case Study: Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Protection Protect (Box 2) -	13
Some Favourable Consequences -----	14
Some Favourable Consequences -----	16
Results against Objectives -----	17
Promoting Community Participation in Policies/Programmes -----	17
Scaling-up and Mainstreaming the UNDP Life Process -----	19
Transitioning the Life Project into a Sustainable Organisation -----	22
Case Study: Ensuring the Institutionalisation of UNDP Life (Box 3) -----	24
External Factors Influencing Outcomes -----	26

Gaps for Consideration by Global Life in Future Project -----	27
Implementation and Management Issues -----	27
Partnership Building -----	28
Capacity and Institutional Building -----	29
UNDP Contribution and the Role of the PIOJ-----	29
UNDP Life's Core Competencies -----	31
Lessons Learnt and Use of Results in Learning and Advocacy -----	32
Recommendations Emanating from this Evaluation -----	35

Appendices

Appendix 1:	Research Questions/Interview Schedule -----	37
Appendix 2:	Guide to Focus Group Discussions -----	38
Appendix 3:	UNDP LIFE Projects -----	40
Appendix 4:	Focus Areas/Sector Allocation -----	46
Appendix 5:	Documents Consulted -----	47
Appendix 6:	Persons Met/Consulted and Meetings Held -----	48

List of Tables

Table 1:	Mobilisation of Financial Resources and Technical Assistance for Capacity Building and Community Advocacy -----	18
Table 2:	Institutionalisation/Transitioning Projects/Studies -----	22
Table 3:	UNDP Life Fee-Based Services as at the end of 2003 -----	23

Acronyms

CBO:	Community-Based Organisation
CIDA:	Canadian International Development Agency
COPE:	Centre for Pre-micro Enterprise
CPTC:	Creative Production and Training Centre
CVSS:	Council for Voluntary Social Services
EFJ:	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica
IAF:	Inter-American Foundation
JPS:	Jamaica Public Service
JSIF:	Jamaica Social Investment Fund
KPI:	Key Performance Indicators
KRC:	Kingston Restoration Company
KSAC:	Kingston and St. Andrew Corporation
LIFE:	Local Initiative Facility for the (Urban) Environment
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding
MWH:	Ministry of Water and Housing
NC:	National Coordinator
NEPA:	Natural Environment Planning Agency
NWC:	National Water Commission
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSWMA:	National Solid Waste Management Authority
NWC:	National Water Commission
NSC:	National Steering Committee
PACT:	Peoples Action for Community Transformation
PDAC:	Parish Development Assistance Committee
PEPA:	Portland Environmental Protection Agency
PIOJ:	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PLA:	Participatory Learning and Action
SDC:	Social Development Commission
SWTC:	Social Welfare Training Centre
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS:	United Nations Office for Project Services

Executive Summary¹

The UNDP Life programme seeks to highlight and stimulate improvements in environmental health and awareness, sanitation and improved livelihood by communities taking ownership of the process in their own interest. This it seeks to do through a catalyzing process of participatory local governance where both desired outputs and outcomes are influenced in this manner. Consequently, the extent to which marginalized communities are themselves brought into the mainstream of activities to improve their quality of living, reduce poverty and generate sustainable livelihoods, while encouraging greater participation and gender involvement in development activities, are important indicators².

The objective of the current process evaluation is to examine a number of issues related to project activities and inputs, outputs and outcomes related to Life's key overarching objectives as well as those related specifically to Phases 3 and 4 which are the main purpose of this evaluation. It also seeks to identify key lessons learned and "best practices" as well as solicit recommendations for the future. The approach to the evaluation involved a review of broad parameters intended to provide answers to the evaluation objectives as follows.

- **Inputs:** project design, implementation and management, UNDP contribution and partnership *building*;
- **Outputs/Outcomes:** Partnerships *built*, capacity building/institutional strengthening, results and achievements against overarching objectives ("upstream, downstream, upstream issues");
- **Lessons Learned/Best Practices;** and
- **Recommendations:** For future support and interventions.

(A) INPUT (PROCESSES)

The overall design inputs (processes, methodology, stakeholder participation, for instance) were faithfully followed in the projects benefiting from UNDP Life's intervention in terms of small-scale grants provision, promoting dialogue, developing capacity and linking project and policy initiatives at the local and national levels. This involved using techniques such as local-local dialogue/brainstorming and issues clarification with community residents themselves, meaningful stakeholder participation and partnership building around established consensus. In some situations, the use of a catalyst project and key stakeholder fora were pursued with good effect.

¹ This is the Executive Summary as it relates to the Report presented on 2004 November 26. A small amount of additional work is planned for the Final Report which will also incorporate comments from the NSC members. As the final Executive Summary is usually the last part of the report to be written, this draft presented here is quite likely to be changed by the time of the Final Report.

² No indicators were identified in the TOR to this evaluation though indicators do exist in terms of the Life Methodology

Generally, women were more prominent in community activities and it was felt that greater efforts should be pursued to attract more men in community organizations. There were nevertheless benefits from the “women imbalance” in through greater stability and continuity of community efforts.

With respect to project synergies which could be obtained from complementarity of the several project components scattered across many projects, these were restricted in light of a number of constraints. These included too many projects, insufficient integration and an inadequate number of core secretariat staff. In the vast majority of cases, the results of UNDP Life’s intervention in communities were found to be positive and beneficial to the communities. The distinct UNDP Life methodology of up-streaming/mainstreaming, down-streaming and up-streaming achieved limited success in a number of significant instances. While considerable success was achieved in consolidating activities in the down-stream stage, the level of success at up-streaming enjoyed less success. These were related to the fact that the fundamental basis for achieving success was predicated on advances made in local government reform and the greater devolution of responsibility at the local community level. Success has been very limited in this regard. Some success was obtained in respect of the sanitation project with the Water and Housing Ministry, in work with CIDA’s Enhancing Civil Society Project, while other cases were more robust: Drewsland Sanitation and Portmore Sanitation projects, the work of the UNDP and PIOJ in conceivably drawing on UNDP Life methodologies in their programmes. Both the Drewsland and Portmore Gardens projects were cited by the Ministry of Water and Housing as project capable of being documented and replicated as models for urban settlement projects in poor, marginalized communities. It is conceivable that these projects were modeled in the establishment of government’s Operation Pride programme.

In implementation and management, there were generally positive impacts on projects. The association with PACT was considered very positive. The National Coordinator was very accessible and was a tremendous influence on UNDP Life’s operations, success and accessibility to communities and individual residents. These positive effects were mitigated by a number of factors, which if addressed, could result in more significant benefits from UNDP Life intervention. Some of these were within the domain of UNDP Life. The concerns involved: limited staff in the secretariat, inadequate documentation in house and at the project level and the need for “key performance indicators” to assess achievement. On the “down” side, long term sustainability of the LIFE impact could however be affected by the over-reliance and vulnerability exposure from the fact that “Life is perceived as Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Grant as Life”. Early indication from the launch of LIFE has confirmed that LIFE recognizes the importance of broadening the skill base of its operations to put itself in a position to take advantage of projected increase inflows contingent on its new status as a Non Governmental Organisation (NGO).

The use of the UNDP name brought considerable “goodwill” and was the basis on which “*several doors were opened*”. Without that name, UNDP Life would have found it far more difficult to enter particular communities. Beyond that, however, the level of UNDP involvement and “up-fronting” has tended to decline over the recent phases. The

organization, however, continues to provide essential administrative backstopping to Life³.

The capacity of UNDP Life to contribute to partnership/capacity building was based on its comparative advantage. This was evident in its ability to mobilize communities, have communities take ownership of their own development and leverage resources for community development and benefit. Some good examples offered were Rae Town, Boone Hall and Portmore Gardens and Cave Island in which, at different times, agencies such as the National Water Commission, the Water and Housing Ministry, the Jamaica Public Service Company, the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica, private sector firms, the Social Welfare Training Centre, the Registrar of Companies, the Canadian International Development Agency and the United States Agency for International Development and other partners were incorporated into collective action on behalf of the communities. UNDP Life was therefore true to its stated mandate of catalyzing a process of community engagement by bringing partners to the table with community groups in seeking to achieve the objectives of the project.

(B) OUTPUTS/OUTCOMES

Partnerships *built* and communities strengthened were desired outcomes of the LIFE methodology. Engaging community players as a means to building partnerships for sustainable community development and ownership was a very successful strategy employed in keeping with UNDP Life methodology. Important partnerships were built in projects such as in Rae Town, Portmore Gardens and Boone Hall. The capacity of community residents was also strengthened to effect better implementation through training, exposure to and working alongside partners brought to the development process by UNDP Life. Community ownership and greater sustainability were desirable outcomes.

While some success was achieved in reviewing the specific objectives of the current phases, more could have been achieved through working with more local government reform bodies despite the failure of the reform process to achieve what was originally intended. Key partners and programme possibilities were identified with whom UNDP Life could have worked effectively based on the Core Competencies which it brought to the table. This could also be supported by more documentation of the UNDP Life methodology which could assist in creating a better understanding, among potential partners including development agencies, of how UNDP Life operated.

In placing the achievement of specific outputs and outcomes under this project, in a proper context, the limited quantum of financial resources and technical resources used to achieve those outputs and outcomes must be taken into consideration. This stands to the credit of the project and its management.

³ Financial support in providing the salary of the National Coordinator is recognized as well as other funding support by the UNDP.

(C) LESSONS LEARNED

1. Working with the Solid Waste Management Authority, a specially created and functioning Local Government Authority, provided a robust opportunity for more effective application of the UNDP Life methodology;
2. LIFE may have attempted too many projects in this phase, thereby leading to a dilution of some of its impact. A more integrated approach/programmatic approach may have produced more meaningful results, given the connectedness of the various problems facing target communities;
3. Initial ground work in communities was invaluable to understanding the issues involved and in interpreting the needs of the communities while ensuring LIFE was accessible at all times to community members or organizations. This created a sense of UNDP Life being “at one with the communities”;
4. Though not novel, sustainability was likely to be assured if all community stakeholders were involved from the inception of planning and conceptualization;
5. UNDP Life has substantially lost potential benefits of documentation of what was initially considered a “unique methodology” but this must not deter it from commencing the process now as a mechanism for increasing sustainability;
6. At the individual project level, a number of specific lessons were identified.

(D) RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Improved documentation to highlight LIFE processes and methodology of community engagement;
2. Reduced vulnerability of UNDP Life by deliberately broadening the Secretariat structure and aggressively moving to increase the level of resources to support increased activity;
3. UNDP Global Life could support LIFE in acquiring the necessary competence to support the fostering of increased livelihood in poor marginalized communities through funding support to areas where the alternative to sustainable livelihood is a life of crime and violence;
4. Engagement of a wider range of project skills and competences, including the employment of a part-time fundraiser on a performance incentive basis;
5. Increased focus on Institutionalisation of Life processes and mainstreaming into policy at higher levels.
6. The adoption of a more integrated, programmatic approach with continued emphasis on partnership building and engagement of communities in a manner to gain greater synergies from addressing community concerns and issues which have a great deal of commonality;
7. Fostering the continued participation of both the UNDP and the Planning Institution of Jamaica constitutes a very workable mechanism in which UNDP Life’s methodology and community engagement can be mainstreamed in projects undertaken by these partners. This should be actively pursued

Introduction and Background

The Local Initiative Facility for (Urban) Environment (LIFE) project is an initiative launched by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) following the Earth Summit/Agenda 21 in 1992 in Rio Janeiro. Jamaica was one of ten countries in which the project was piloted to address urban environment problems affecting the poor. An explorative mission to Jamaica in 1993 by the UN LIFE Global Coordinator resulted in the establishment of a Preparatory Commission which organized a National Consultation to launch the LIFE programme in Jamaica, establish a National Selection Committee (NSC) and select a National Coordinator (NC) in 1994.

LIFE utilizes a participatory methodology with all its stakeholders, including government, private sector, civil society, donors and communities, in its pursuit of sustainable human development and urban renewal. In particular, communities were an integral participant in determining what needs were to be addressed, how these were to be addressed as well as priorities that were to be focused on. An important component of the participatory model is the National Selection Committee (NSC), charged with the selection of community/project beneficiaries, in an equitable manner. The range of interventions by UNDP Life includes mobilisation of marginalised communities, community development and human settlements, capacity building, facilitating water supply provision and general infrastructure developments, enhancing governance at the local and policy levels, child survival and importantly, sanitation and environmental protection.

Since LIFE commenced implementation, there have been four (4) phases: 1 and 2 (1994-1999), 3 (1999-2001) and 4 (2001-2003)¹. LIFE has since inception provided technical assistance and financial grants to over 40 small project initiatives particularly in the area of the environment, with a focus on sanitation, community infrastructure and capacity development among poor, marginalized urban communities in Kingston and St. Andrew, Trelawny, St. James, Clarendon, St. Ann and St. Catherine. The evaluation in 1999 covered the first two phases of the project between its launch in 1994 and the end of Phase 2 in 1998/99. In the first phase, the National Selection Committee (NSC) concentrated on setting policies, establishing and reviewing the Small Scale Projects selection process/criteria, advocating for National and Local Government support, mobilising resources and networking with organisations with similar resources. In the second phase, the NSC concentrated on project reviews, approval and monitoring and issues of sustainability. While noting significant benefits from UNDP Life's activities in the small scale grant programme, in capacity development and in stimulating policy dialogue, the consultant felt that an important positive was the dedication, ownership and leadership provided by the NSC. UNDP Life's administrative and technical support, effective partnerships, community enabling and empowerment were similarly identified. There were, however, areas in need of strengthening: greater "Local Government involvement, improved up-streaming and mainstreaming, sustainability, documentation and dissemination, media coverage and financial reporting"².

¹ Extended to 2005 March.

² JAMAICA: LIFE Programme, National Evaluation Report, prepared by Marlene Fernandes, 1999 September.

The current evaluation will address Phases 3 and 4 (1999 -2001) and (2002 – 2003) respectively and will, *inter alia*, attempt to assess the extent to which UNDP Life has been successful in dealing with the shortcomings identified in the earlier evaluation. These involve the processes of:

1. *scaling-up and mainstreaming the UNDP Life process, achievement and methodology in Jamaica;*
2. *promoting community participation in policies and programmes through consolidated approaches to improving marginalized urban settlement conditions; and*
3. *transitioning the LIFE project in Jamaica into a sustainable organization.*

Objectives of the Programme Evaluation

The specific objectives of the current evaluation of Phases 3 and 4 (1999 – 2003) of the LIFE project are stated hereunder. To:

1. Assess the quality, suitability, effectiveness and relevance of the project activities, processes, methodologies and institutional arrangements. The evaluation will make specific reference to the relevance and use of **partnerships** at various stages;
2. Assess the quality of project inputs;
3. Determine the outcomes related to UNDP Life's key objectives. These include its overarching objectives as well as the objectives set for Phases 3 & 4 of the UNDP/Global LIFE programme in Jamaica. Summarise the major positive and negative outcomes of the project;
4. Assess impacts on the target beneficiaries and national development, assess the sustainability of interventions, methods and processes;
5. Identify lessons learned and best practices; and
6. Develop recommendations for future support and interventions by UNDP by identifying the main outcomes and objectives for a Phase 5 of LIFE, identify key partnerships, partnership strategies, including recommendations to increase the effectiveness, sustainability and potential impact of future interventions.

Programme Evaluation

The programme evaluation exercise uses, as a starting point and focal set of issues, the project objectives as stated in the Terms of Reference. As a consequence, the consultant is expected to review and evaluate a range of issues considered pertinent to achieving the objectives of this evaluation. These are stated hereunder:

- **Project Design:** processes and methodologies, stakeholder participation, gender, environmental impacts and synergies between components;
- **Project Outputs and Outcomes:** the contribution of the project results and outcomes to achievement of the overarching objectives of the phases; as well, determine factors outside the control of project management, government or the UNDP which constrained the outcomes (case studies of beneficiary communities to be done);
- **Implementation and Management Issues:** constraints resulting from programme management or institutional arrangements, the effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of reaching targeted beneficiaries as well as the efficiency of UNDP's contribution and overall institutional sustainability issues;
- **Partnership Building:** assessment of the appropriateness, adequacy, relevance and sustainability of UNDP Life's partnership strategies with key partners at all levels;
- **Capacity/Institutional Building:** The positives of the project in terms of impact, sustainability of results and contribution to capacity development, an evaluation of the approach taken and recommendations to maintain relevance and visibility;
- **UNDP Contribution:** whether UNDP's interventions can be directly linked to the projects outputs and outcomes and identify a potential role for this organization in any future LIFE initiatives/programmes; and
- **Lessons Learned/Best Practices and their use in Advocacy:** These must be viewed in relation to UNDP Life's core competencies and successes in community development and government policy, whether these have been shared or used for advocacy as well as recommendations for documentation of best practices.

Institutional Arrangements

Institutional mechanisms for implementing the UNDP Life Project involve a number of organisations which perform various functions in advancing the objectives of the overall programme. Implementation management is effected through a National Selection Committee with a core Executive Committee with actual day to day administration by a National Coordinator assisted by a very small core staff of 1½ persons³. These committees which comprise the UNDP Life National Coordinator, representatives of NGOs, CBOs, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), the UNDP Country Office, donor agencies and municipal authorities, oversee implementation of the programme, including review and approval of project proposals under a designated chairman to the Executive Committee.

Host Agency Support: Project implementation support was initially provided by a host organisation, the Umbrella Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO), CVSS/United Way which has nurtured the growth of UNDP Life. Recently, UNDP Life entered into its first partnership arrangement, embodied in an MOU with another Umbrella organisation, Peoples Action for Community Transformation (PACT), which specialises in community development and youth at risk programmes. It shares similar approaches and methodologies with PACT which provides accommodation and administrative support services.

Role of the UNDP: The LIFE programme is managed by the UNDP's Management Development and Governance Division (MDGD) through the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) and the local UNDP Country Office. This office provides some funding, project monitoring services and representation at the level of the National Selection Committee (NSC). Funding the position of the National Coordinator has been very critical in lending continuity and support to the UNDP Life project. Funding support is effected by the local office, along with the PIOJ, through TRAC resources.

Role of PIOJ: The PIOJ as executing agency is the principal government agency involved in overseeing management and implementation supervision of the UNDP Life Project through its representation on the principal committees and management of the Tripartite Review Process. Additionally, PIOJ has also provided counterpart funding support to help realise the objectives of programme implementation

Funding Arrangements and Budget: Funding for overall project implementation, over each succeeding two year project phase, has been provided by a combination of sources. This included the Global Fund (circa.US\$25,000 to US\$50,000), PIOJ TRAC Resources (on average around US\$200,000), international support to individual projects and community activities and internally generated funds from the provision of project services. Global Fund resources have shown a declining trend while, increasingly, income earned from the provision of fee-based services have increased (estimated at some 60% of total resources). Resources from the Global Fund/UNDP currently support administrative costs, principally the remuneration of the National Coordinator.

³ This comprised the National Coordinator and a part-time person paid for a limited number of hours each month

The Main Activities of UNDP Life

- Providing **small-scale grants** to NGOs, CBOs and local authorities to improve the environmental conditions in low-income, marginalised settlements;
- **Promoting dialogue**, cooperation and networking between various stakeholders at all levels, such as neighbourhood; community; city; national; regional; inter-regional; and global; to improve urban environmental conditions;
- **Developing the capacity** of stakeholders at all levels for cooperation, dialogue, networking and resource mobilization; and
- **Linking project and policy initiatives** to institutionalize LIFE methodology across various sectors.

In carrying out its activities, UNDP Life pursues a distinctive methodology that is intended to foster “*sustainable community development through local-local dialogue, stakeholder participation and partnership building.*” The success in achieving this objective is often a function of the quality and timeliness of UNDP Life’s inputs and intervention as well as the quality, strength and capacity of community engagement partnership building.

Processes and Methodologies used to design Project Components

The coordination of UNDP Life’s input and community input, from the very early stages of project design through implementation, was important to the ultimate success of community development initiatives. In all cases observed, the initiative for a project emanated from the community. Invariably, the process started with members of the community identifying critical needs or issues to be addressed. Usually, the initial contact was by a community member/social worker, informed citizens, the Member of Parliament, or someone aware of the existence and usefulness of UNDP Life in supporting community initiatives. In several instances, the knowledge of successful UNDP Life interventions was what acted a stimulus to engagement with UNDP Life. This was evidenced by a phone call, a simple letter, a planned visit to the National Coordinator’s office in Kingston, or in a few cases, a structured project proposal. The latter approach was true of more organized groups or entities seeking to attract UNDP Life’s intervention.

In most cases, the formal relationship between the community and UNDP Life started with a simple meeting at the community level, sometimes in a meeting hall or even under a tree. Here, the potential beneficiary community would present to the UNDP Life officer, certain needs for which it sought UNDP Life’s input or intervention. In such a “reconnaissance” meeting, UNDP Life’s officers would seize the opportunity to learn about the community and its problems/issues on a first hand basis by talking with the community members and having a “walk-about” within the area to personally observe the situation. These on-the-spot meetings proved critical to the process of issues-prioritisation at the community level, project selection and design and ultimately project development and implementation. Issues-prioritisation constituted the basis on which decisions relating to the several components of UNDP Life intervention were determined. This was done by involving

communities and representative groups in highlighting principal problems which needed to be addressed by intervention and guidance with UNDP Life. The views of the latter were not imposed on the communities. Rather, UNDP Life contributed to the process of ensuring that community members thought seriously about the relevant components of the proposed intervention in terms of primary and secondary goals as well as the means by which the principal goal and components would both contribute to or be facilitated by subsidiary goals. In short, UNDP Life contributed to the process of ensuring that a community project was logical in its approach to addressing community problems without imposing its own structures on the community. Project components were therefore essentially the decision of the respective communities.

Community Planning/mobilisation: When communities outlined their needs to the UNDP Life Office, it would begin a process of engagement with the community. This process would involve a few meetings, phone calls and site visits, depending on the community, its perceived or expressed needs and the level of its organizational development. This process was found to have satisfied three main objectives.

- (i) *Establish consensus*: To be assured that the needs/problem(s) which have been brought to LIFE are common problems for the community. LIFE would conduct an assessment to determine or evaluate the extent of community involvement in the selection of the project idea(s) being presented;
- (ii) *Brainstorm*: To seek to determine whether the community had spent the time to consider the wide range of issues involved in coming up with their “list” for possible action. This also entailed seeking out possible projects with optimal community benefits, within the constraints of UNDP Life’s possible intervention; and
- (iii) *Prioritise*: To seek, through the utilization of various group moderation techniques, to help the communities in the prioritization of their own problems/issues towards the selection of a workable project. This would involve getting the members of the community to come out to present, discuss and prioritise their needs for which they were seeking UNDP Life’s intervention.

The input of the UNDP Life staff in successfully mobilizing communities around their needs, as identified by the communities themselves, was found to be a particularly strong attribute of the project. This whole process was handled operationally in different ways depending on the location of the meeting, whether facilities available to write or do role playing etc., the level of literacy of the members present and the nature of the project idea itself.

Whatever the technique applied, however, the objective and end result was to:

- Firstly, establish the range of ideas emanating from the community as enjoying community consensus;
- Secondly, serve as a brainstorming session, to interrogate the group as to the possibilities of the existence of any other worthy project ideas, not yet thought of;

- Finally, have the community members themselves, rank the array of competing project ideas, utilizing some structured process of prioritization, to come up with the most important need or project idea to be later developed into a project, *in keeping with UNDP Life's overall country programme objectives and level and scope of possible intervention.*

In some communities, UNDP Life would stage a *catalyst project* to help mobilize the members. This would involve UNDP Life assisting in setting up a simple workday involving as many members of the community as possible to provide a *critical mass* of persons at a forum to discuss the issues being presented. In these cases, UNDP Life would get involved by providing refreshments for the day along with their own participation in the workday and ultimate moderation/mediation of the community meeting. In other cases, the services of a consultant would be engaged to prepare a strategy proposal to bring marginalized communities into a participatory planning development framework⁴ and path to wealth creation

The National Coordinator (NC) and other UNDP Life staff involved in this process of community engagement were consistent in their assessment that the communities demonstrated very high levels of involvement in this process. Though the group of persons initially coming forward to project their communities' ideas was not necessarily large, UNDP Life staff was convinced that persons present usually represented the views of their respective communities and were very often the most vigorous in their participation in the project ranking, prioritization, selection process and general development and implementation activities.

The use of a *catalyst project* was found to have been a very effective means of community mobilization, especially where fairly low levels of community organization existed or where communities may have been politically polarized. *The techniques used here were found to have been effective in generating community awareness, interest and participation around the project idea from its earliest phases and in ensuring appropriate community inputs in the process of project development.*

In some other communities, a single need sometimes emerged for which the intervention or input of UNDP Life was being sought. This was true for example where UNDP Life was contacted to provide targeted assistance to an ongoing programme, for example, the Social Welfare Training Centre (SWTC) at the University of the West Indies (UWI)⁵ or to a specific or immediate issue in an ongoing project (dealing with traumatized children in Western Kingston following the three days of violence in 2002)⁶. *In these cases, the specificity of the need and/or the immediacy of the required intervention by UNDP Life essentially defined the nature and pace of UNDP Life's input and response.* In these and other such cases, the nature of the need and the high level of institutional organization demonstrated by the "community stakeholders" would often propel the process beyond the

⁴ COMMAND

⁵ SWTC exposure to PLA tools and methodology, including community practicum in its working with communities

⁶ Chichibud intervention in Denham Town and Tivoli Gardens

typical consensus building, brainstorming, prioritization process cited above. In one such case, (SWTC 2002) we noted:

- The project to provide a new module, Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) to students in the 4 month Social Work Course which offered them the knowledge and tools to “gain access” to volatile communities selected itself as it was the only need experienced by the SWTC requiring inputs that UNDP Life could supply;
- The project - a new module in the course - was designed in a collaborative way as UNDP Life staff sat with the SWTC staff and listened to their needs;
- UNDP Life explored with the SWTC, ways in which it could help SWTC achieve its objectives;
- UNDP Life collaborated with SWTC in developing and setting up the new module and in leveraging technical expertise for conducting training in the particular module;
- “Community gatekeepers” were accessed and integrated into the learning process in the new module, so that students could acquire new tools and gain access to certain volatile communities reflecting true partnership with beneficiary communities; and
- Past students of SWTC and “gatekeepers” from that initial offering of this new module, were later integrated into the process in subsequent years, to provide continuity, after UNDP Life funding ended.

The ability of the SWTC to continue offering this particular module in the 4 month Social Work course, after UNDP Life’s funding was at an end, albeit on a reduced scale, is seen as evidence of how early collaborations had built foundations for sustainability and institutionalisation of the methodology.

In these cases, the engagement process was more focused on determining whether the requested intervention fitted within UNDP Life’s own programme objectives and whether UNDP Life had the necessary capacity and expertise to provide any meaningful intervention. In each case, the process involved listening to community concerns and working to determine the best modality for UNDP Life’s input and intervention. In such cases, the interaction between UNDP Life and the beneficiary community became more structured.

In the more typical situations, however, the community or association seeking UNDP Life intervention displayed fairly low levels of organizational capacity. There might also have been a number of competing and often not very well thought-out potential project ideas. Such situations involved UNDP Life officers first of all presenting themselves as neutral third-parties engaging community members on an equal and open basis and offering themselves as “*providers of hope*”. This was geared towards helping communities that had demonstrated some level of “*initiative*” in seeking to advance their quality of life and economic and environmental well-being.

These communities generally agreed that the major input brought by UNDP Life at this stage was that of providing “*hope, a new sense of what was possible, and instilling the motivation for them to pursue community action focused on community-identified needs and objectives*”⁷. The second main input identified at this stage by beneficiary communities

⁷ Quote from the Mr. Lattery (Portmore Gardens, echoed in almost the same words by Martha McKnight (Boone Hall Citizens Association) and Beatrice Miller (Majesty Gardens Fishing Development Organisation)

was the *ability of UNDP Life to put hands together with those of other stakeholders in meaningful partnerships*. In essence, the fact that UNDP Life was not a funding organization possessing substantial resources was in itself an advantage. The communities realized from early that the process was not going to be one of outsiders coming to solve their problems through provision of substantial funding resources, but rather themselves working and partnering with groups and organizations outside the communities in finding solutions to community problems and needs. The extent to which UNDP Life was able to leverage the use of the word “*initiative*” was found to have been a deliberate and fairly successful employment of the second word “*Initiative*” in its own name. UNDP Life’s intervention was understood and accepted by the beneficiary communities to be “*facilitatory*”, designed to respond to the community initiatives while ensuring that the communities themselves retained ownership of the project and its processes.

Another effective means encountered in evaluating this engagement and planning phase was UNDP Life’s use of “*Key Stakeholders Forums*”. Here, UNDP Life would organise and bring together, in a community forum, a number of possible partners like the National Water Commission (NWC), Cable and Wireless (C & W), the Jamaica Public Service Company (JPS), the Natural Planning and Environmental Agency (NEPA) and the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ), who would sit down and participate with the community at the project planning stages. This approach to fostering dialogue, cooperation and networking between various stakeholders at all levels, neighborhood and community, to improve the urban environmental, typified activities undertaken in mobilizing communities for effective action. It also introduced these agencies early in project development and design, created the necessary environment for partnership arrangements critical to project success and created the opportunity for them to engage otherwise inaccessible communities⁸ in a non-confrontational manner. *This process of catalysing a project through very small grants and pulling potential partners together was fundamental to UNDP Life interventions in encouraging the sustainable development of community initiatives.*

Depending on the nature and scope of the project and its general physical, environmental and developmental context, UNDP Life invited what it considered appropriate potential *partners* to such stakeholders’ meetings to enhance the quality of the potential interventions while offering new insights and perspectives to community problems and their solutions. This was found to have been a very effective means of initiating the process of partnership building. The substantial technical expertise of these potential partners⁹ was put at the disposal of the community at an early stage before project design was concluded. This has been effective in permitting concerns such as environmental, infra-structural or financing issues to be “put on the table” in the course of finalising project design. This also had the effect of introducing cost saving measures in designing and developing projects conceived by the communities. Essentially this approach enriched project development with technical inputs which the communities could not afford and would otherwise have had to acquire through engagement of consultants at a cost. Qualitative benefits also

⁸ For example, JPS was able to open formal discussions for effecting legal electricity connections

⁹ In addition to those mentioned in the preceding paragraph, there were: NEPA, CIDA, USAID, SDC, NWA, NSWMA, NWC and COPE in various project activities.

accrued to communities. The resulting project documents were of a significantly higher quality than if these inputs were not available.

Once the project idea had been selected, it was necessary to present the proposed activity to UNDP Life in the form of a project proposal in the agreed format. Officers of UNDP Life, through a series of consultations, would seek to capture all the elements of the project while, at all time, ensuring that the community took full ownership of the process. In a series of planning meetings, the idea would be converted into a project with its various components developed.

It was found that operationalising this process was intended to result in building the capacity of the community in project planning and design. UNDP Life, while providing training in the areas of project design, proposal writing and leadership building, did not usurp the communities' stake to ownership of the entire process. Consequently, significant organisational learning also took place inside the community.

In the vast majority of beneficiary communities, a *gender* imbalance in favour of women was evident or reported in terms of persons who were involved in the organization. This also existed at the executive management level of community organisations. Women were dominant in attendance at meetings and participation in community activities. In the case of the Portmore Gardens community, however, the executive was equally balanced with respect to gender. While it generally remained important to incorporate a larger number of men as community members in the operation and management of community projects being developed, the larger number of involved women contributed to greater sustainability of the project organizations.

UNDP Life Methodology: *A Three Stage Process*

- **Upstream:** Catalyzing a national dialogue, developing strategies and gathering wide support from various stakeholders;
- **Downstream:** Ensuring effective and collaborative small projects which address priority environmental problems; promote local-local dialogue, cooperation between local actors and build local capacity; and
- **Upstream:** Exchanging experiences, influencing policies and institutionalizing UNDP Life methodology.

In the vast majority of cases, the results of UNDP Life's intervention in communities were found to be positive and beneficial to the communities. In interviews and focus groups with various beneficiary communities, there were a number of key outcomes which were observed. As the case study of the Portmore Gardens Community demonstrates, the benefits of UNDP Life intervention may be felt long after formal community engagement has ended as shown in *Box 1* overleaf.

Box 1:

Portmore Gardens Community Development Project
(Drainage and Land Settlement)

The Portmore Community Development Project started as a drainage and bridge building project in 1995, intended to improve community access. The community was spontaneously occupied by persons that were not only poor but faced major environmental and health problems from a large drain which passed through the area. In addition, the fact that the residents did not own the land meant there was insecurity of tenure. Started as a drainage and sanitation project, the project was scaled-up to address issues of land tenure and security. The community association, long established, was determined to own the land it occupied. In 1978, the community organisation first had Portmore Gardens declared under the "Community Amenities Act (1977), which provided some protection for the occupants. Once a tract of land is declared under this act, the tenants cannot be evicted. Citizens then commenced developing the infrastructure, first electricity then water supplies. Both of which were successfully pursued after several years of trying. Roads were similarly repaired. In seeking to improve infrastructure facilities, the community leaders engaged political leaders, government agencies, private sector bodies all of whom contributed to the realisation of their dream. They further sought to build on these accomplishments with very determined and foresight full leadership.

The Portmore Gardens Development Limited, a provident society representing the Portmore Gardens Community, was consequently formed in 2002. In partnership with the Ministry of Water and Housing, it successfully negotiated the purchase of the land occupied spontaneously, from the private owners. The provident society mobilized funds from members' savings to the tune of J\$1.3 million as the first deposit on the land purchase. All this was done in a transparent way as all funds were paid directly into a commercial bank account with three receipts being generated; one for the bank, another for the payee and the third for the provident society. The Provident Society while continuing to mobilize members' savings negotiated a bridging loan from the Ministry of Water and Housing a year later, to clear the balance owing on the purchase price as agreed in the time-frame agreed. They continued to honour their financing obligations to the ministry. Subsequently, the first tract of land was purchased from the private owners and fully paid for. Title for the land passed from the previous owners. Community members are now awaiting their individual titles to their individual lots. Pending the completion of certain civil and other infrastructure works, the community should soon receive official recognition as a part of its municipality by the St. Catherine Parish Council.

A critical factor in the success of the community has been strong leadership possessed with a long term vision of strong partnerships and a realization of what is possible to achieve. Some members have been active in this community from the 1970s. The Portmore Gardens experience has been used to inspire the wider community in focusing on what is possible through dialogue and community action. Another lesson has been that success brings success and that self reliance and independence of outside assistance once nourished can bring results which are sustainable long after the assistance has ended.

The Portmore Gardens Community did not receive any grants from UNDP Life during the current review period. There was, however, interaction with UNDP Life in community mobilisation and motivation. The drive to acquire land for settlement and ownership reflected the culture of self reliance guided and learned under the UNDP Life project. Leveraging the funds received from the earlier period, combined with community mobilized funds and working with partners met through UNDP Life¹⁰, the community organization was able to engage professional services necessary to execute their land ownership and settlement objectives, build their own capacity and increase community confidence and ownership for sustainability.

The Portmore Gardens experience was mirrored by experiences in the Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Health Project in the current evaluation phase. The Building Together Citizens Association¹¹ received grants to improve sanitation and drainage, and over time, scaled-up their activities to address issues of security of tenure of their unplanned settlements. With facilitation from UNDP Life, community sensitization and mobilization, partnership arrangements with credit providers, their own resource mobilization as well as purposeful organizing and leadership by the citizen organisation, as well as partnership with the Ministry of Water and Housing, residents are currently in the process of securing land tenure for ministry lands they occupied for several years as squatters and land lease occupants. The citizens association has been leading the advocacy process. UNDP Life provided a grant of US\$25,000 from TRAC resources for a “credit for sanitation”¹² initiative which was managed by COPE and which also facilitated training for community contractors¹³ in low-cost sanitation solutions. UNDP Life facilitated the mobilization of community contributions,¹⁴ encouraged facilitated meetings of the citizens association and has collaborated with the Ministry of Water and Housing as broker and landlord with respect to land allocation leading to the imminent provision of titles.

¹⁰ Government Ministries and agencies as well as private entities: Ministry of Water and Housing, Registrar of Companies, private surveyors and aerial photographers, others in digital mapping. and other

¹¹ The representative association for the Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Protection Project

¹² Approximately 15% - 20% of the revolving credit has been recovered. A grant for sanitation solutions was given to the same/nearby community. If proper documentation existed, this could have provided important lessons for UNDP Life in attempting this new scheme.

¹³ CRDC assistance

¹⁴ An estimated J\$1.6 millions was raised to meet land surveying costs to guide land allocation and allotment.

Box 2:**Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Health Project (Building Together Citizens Association)****Background:**

Drewsland Community Phases 4 & 5, an unplanned housing settlement sited along the Sandy Gully on lands owned by the Ministry of Water and Housing is a poor, inner city, marginalized community with high levels of unemployment especially among youth and females. An average of 8 persons occupied the average household in accommodation suited for no more than two individuals. Crime and violence prone, there were earlier attempts at addressing the problem of dwellings without sanitation facilities by the Dutch funded Urban Health programme through grants to construct sanitary solutions. Little success was achieved. Without sanitary facilities, residents usually collected both human and solid waste in plastic bags which were “parachuted” into the gully. This bred major sanitation and environmental health problems for the community. The results: a pile up of debris in the gully from garbage, human waste, factory waste from a nearby industrial plant which all contributed to a major source of rat infestation. Health problems were aggravated by five smelting operations in the community which use engine oil to smelt iron and aluminium for making items for sustaining their livelihood (pots, figurines, manhole covers) and which emitted noxious fumes in the atmosphere which posed occupational as well as major threats to residents’ health and safety. Attendance at clinics increased markedly from complaints principally for children and the elderly. Through frequent consultations and meetings, the community determined that addressing the sanitation problem through construction of low cost solutions, cleaning the debris from the gully and public education, their sanitation and health problems would be resolved.

The UNDP Life programme, together with CRDC and COPE, evaluated the problem and agreed to experiment with a development approach to provide assistance for sanitation through a revolving, low cost “Credit for Sanitation” lending scheme to the community for on-lending to residents. The community’s role was to access seed funding to initiate activities. From the outset of the initiative to address the sanitation problem, the residents were informed that they were not going to be “a hand-out; the organization from which help was sought would only help if the residents were willing to help themselves”. From early, UNDP Life sought to mobilize community support for the initiative.

The strategies involved UNDP Life in frequent dialogue/meetings with the community and with NGOs working on sanitation and environmental health issues. The frequent community meetings, with minutes and follow-up actions and responsibilities, served to get buy-in at the level of “lane leaders”, who were all informed by appropriate fliers with circulated Agendas (Rats infestation, irregular garbage collection, Sandy Gully cleaning and maintenance, inadequate skips, improper disposal of garbage, few toilets. Secondary data and group discussions were employed to document existing conditions and set targets in the search for the most appropriate solution including pilot testing of “credit for sanitation”. Assistance was provided with formulation of proposals for funding and community animation workshops mounted to build/strengthen participatory local governance, organizational leadership strengthening and capacity for practicing safe waste disposal. Training was also carried out for community personnel in toilet pit construction standards and in developing Bills of Quantities.

Project Activities involved selecting and processing of beneficiaries, materials procurement/selection of builders, construction of 30 sanitary facilities, community health education activities, establishment of cost recovery scheme for leveraging funds and a least cost strategy for project implementation.

The use of UNDP Life partnerships with stakeholders both within and outside the community constituted a major strategic approach in getting action to address community needs. Meetings were held to allocate responsibilities between all players: Community, UNDP Life, COPE, CRDC (Technical Specifications and quantities for pits)), Community Loans Officer, Public Health Department/Sanitation Committee for determining beneficiaries, Food for the Poor to supply bowls and tanks with fittings at very low cost MPM, the MWH, environmental organizations, local business. Political support was also leveraged as also assistance from the MPM, the JDJ, OPM, parliamentary representatives for gully cleaning, and NEPA who monitored Dairy Industries towards better waste disposal, MPM putting more skips and having more schedules garbage collection, MOH supplying poison for the rodents, and monitoring the sanitation situation and assist with health education. . This process was facilitated by enthusiastic community leadership led by the social worker at the Drewsland Health Clinic which also provided very convenient and accessible meeting space. .

Box 2 continued

Allocation of responsibilities shared between the varying partners ensured proper collaboration. CRDC provided technical evaluation and assisted beneficiary needs analysis, soil conditions and construction advice; NEPA, ECD, KSA Health Department, MWH, KSAC, helped in the assessment of the health hazards from smelting operations, Food for the Poor with provision with low-cost building materials and supplies. Project Management, Implementation and Coordination was provided by the Sanitations Committee. UNDP Life agreement with community January 2, 1999 for US\$25,000 facilitated leveraging of a wide range of sanitation and environmental health issues through cost sharing with the residents on an ability to pay principle while COPE (March 1999) managed J\$700,000 for on-lending through a community loans officer for construction activities.

Successes were achieved by the project. Approximately sixteen (16) sanitary solutions were constructed. The Sandy Gully cleaned. Credit was extended to a number of residents. Problems with rat infestation reversed. There was greater awareness of sanitation and environmental health issues. Unfortunately these positives have been reversed in the last two years. The community has however scaled-up their activities to address issues of security of tenure and land ownership in regularizing tenure in partnership with the MWH as part of solution to sanitation/environmental solutions after vigorous advocacy and community mobilization around land issues. The cost of surveys for titling has been borne by citizens -some J\$ 1.6 mobilised towards these costs. The citizens' organization was responsible for scaling up activities and lead the process of advocacy, mobilized community contributions, facilitated community meetings and was very active in land allocation and the provision of titles by the MWH. Titles are being prepared and a Golden Agers' home established with at a cost of J\$1.3 million with support from the OPM and CIDA/Green Fund (\$400,000) resources. The home providing feeding, medical attention and art and craft for 8 senior citizens.

Hindering factors have been the poor economic situation nationally, continuing high level of unemployment and persistent crime and violence. Important lessons learned included the importance of each one caring for the other, purposeful action can lead to the growth of self esteem, greater self reliance is critical for moving activities forward but external factors and selfish motives can seriously impact on long term sustainability of community initiatives.

The two settlement projects, Portmore Sanitation and Drainage and Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Health, were cited by the Ministry of Water and Housing as interventions worthy of documentation of "best practices" in low-cost settlement and development solutions through community participation¹⁵.

A number of related and positive outcomes for the communities and others have resulted from these experiences.

Some Favourable Consequences

The *three-step approach* to UNDP Life methodology¹⁶ as evidenced in the examples cited, may have had greater influence beyond the communities served. It is to be noted that UNDP Life predated Operation Pride and as such the latter's formation could have been influenced by the process utilized in community action of the type carried out in the two communities. *This could potentially, therefore, be seen as evidence of the Mainstreaming*

¹⁵ While this is so, mechanisms would have to be improved to make the financing/credit components more effective

¹⁶ Upstream-downstream-upstream process

of UNDP Life activities and processes into Policy. Further, where environmental issues are involved, UNDP Life processes have enabled communities to extend their activities and employ techniques of PLA, partnership and local-local dialogue¹⁷ to other areas and issues as well as to provide models for similar type projects in adjoining communities¹⁸.

Intense excitement has emerged among citizens at knowing that their prospect of owning their own land is on the verge of reality:

- Persons in the communities have become more creative/focused at mobilizing funds for land ownership, using gifts/remittances from abroad as direct payment for land purchases, rather than current consumption;
- Organisational learning has also taken place and significant capacity building realized. Community members have benefited greatly from exposure to UNDP Life training;
- Better organized, communities have become more appreciative of the importance and effectiveness of institutional structures and partnerships arrangements for successful, collective community action;
- The expectation of greater security of tenure experienced by community residents has contributed to greater social stability;
- Much evidence of leadership development and organizational learning was observed in many of the communities. This was reflected in the level of documentation, records of attendance of members at general meetings, usually held on specific Sundays monthly, lists of executive members and their responsibilities. In each month, financial record-keeping was supported by original records (bank books, receipts, cheques, invoices, dues collected) and many summary records (bank balances and members' contributions to date) were observed¹⁹.
- The communication skills and the community advocacy skills demonstrated by these communities was also evidence of the organisational learning that had taken place;

In respect of partnerships, the communities have become more focused on collective action, once they began to see some fruits of collective action in collaboration with outside partners. Communities experienced greater than anticipated levels of access to institutions in the Jamaican mainstream society. An important aspect of partnership relationships has been the capacity of UNDP Life to bring important agencies and ministries of government "to the table" with local community representatives and drawing on the strengths and weaknesses of each, bring about a "win-win" situation. Communities are now more willing

¹⁷ Local-local dialogue is the primary tool of UNDP Life programme and processes

¹⁸ Both the Newlands and Naggohead communities have been cited as examples.

¹⁹ This was also evident in other communities: Boone Hall Citizens Association, Majesty Gardens Citizens Associations as well as the Rae Town Fishing Cooperative Society

to utilize the existing structures and institutions in working towards community goals, rather than taking to the streets in demonstrations. This reflects the development of alternative organizational approaches to collective community advocacy and action. If for no other reason, by the forging of partnerships, following UNDP Life's intervention, these communities will never be the same again. They now know that they have real options. Generally, it was found that the quality of UNDP Life input and engagement with communities has had a lasting effect for good in other communities²⁰.

Unfavourable Consequences

With respect to the Portmore Gardens Sanitation and the Drewsland Sanitation and Environment Projects, which had credit components for certain project components, there were some unfavourable aspects.

- Some citizens failed to honour their obligations in a timely manner either because they had different priorities or through simple negligence;
- Others, on hearing that the outstanding balance on the land purchase had been advanced by Government²¹, reneged on their payments claiming that it was their taxes which had been used by Government to pay for the land; or felt that did not have to pay back the credit managed by COPE for constructing sanitary solutions²².

²⁰ Boone Hall, Majesty Gardens, Bosswell Heights (even before the project was approved) and the Rae Fishing Complex

²¹ Portmore Gardens Development Project

²² Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Protection Project.

Results against Objectives

The objectives set for the current phases of the Life Project, as indicated earlier²³, and being mentioned here for emphasis, involve the following goals of the project.

Promoting Community Participation in Policies and Programmes for improving Marginalized Urban Living Conditions through Consolidating Developmental Approaches

Previously marginalized communities have acquired tools of alternative social action. They have developed and demonstrated more socially desirable approaches to collective social action. More than anything else, several of these communities now exude greater hope, an improved sense of self, a posture of community independence rather than dependency and a sense that improvement in their quality of life is possible through their own efforts. They now understand that they can participate in and have an impact on the process of defining their own living circumstances at the local level.

The Rae Town and Boone Hall community projects provide useful examples of the down-streaming process and the effective use of partnership arrangements in catalysing a project. In Rae Town, UNDP Life assisted in bringing together the NWC, EFJ, JPS, NEPA, along with the community and its management, from the initial stages of project planning in Joint Stakeholders meetings. In so doing, the community benefited from having technical expertise available to the local steering committee. In Boone Hall, through the initial UNDP Life project, the citizens' association has gained access to Food for the Poor and PEAP as well as being put in touch with the Social Development Commission.

The results of the Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Protection and Portmore Gardens cases, have definitely advanced the UNDP Life objective of consolidating, up-streaming and mainstreaming the LIFE process. What initially started as a drainage, bridge building and environmental project²⁴ was up-scaled to address broader issues of land tenure and land ownership. Similar initiatives which received funding and other support in the current phase have served to demonstrate Life's intervention/engagement in improving and upgrading settlement conditions in communities such as Bowerbank, Majesty Gardens, Cave Island, Drewsland Sanitation and Housing Settlement and particularly Jeffery Town²⁵. Community organisations in these settlements similarly scaled up their activities to address issues of security of tenure, improvement in housing conditions and livelihood and lay the basis of long term development of their communities. In Majesty Gardens and Bowerbank, UNDP Life intervention/engagement involved documenting a report incorporating both qualitative and quantitative analyses of the project context and

²³ See p.2 to this report for broad goals and objectives set for the evaluation of Phases 3 & 4.

²⁴ An important ingredient that was missing in this aspect was the necessary leadership that could have been provided by NEPA or the ECD of the MOH in fostering sustainable livelihood

²⁵ IAF funds were provided to Jeffrey Town, among others, through the PACT/IAF arrangement for UNDP Life to undertake community assessments and planning to improve the economic well-being of beneficiary communities

background, the implementation process, achievements and impacts in outlining the methodology which could be applied in similar situations.

In furtherance of the goal of planning and implementation of the activities towards sustainable revitalisation of marginalized urban communities through sustainable livelihood, capacity building and advocacy, UNDP Life intervention has also sought to mobilise both technical and financial resources in support of initiatives of community based and non governmental organisations. In this regard, considerable resources from both local and international sources have been accessed.²⁶ During the period of the current evaluation, communities were able to mobilise some US\$184,000 themselves to support their local initiatives for land acquisition, resettlement/ re-location and security of tenure in demonstrated by the citizens' associations in Cave Island, Drewsland and Portmore. Local donor support has also been received to complement community initiatives. In the case of the Jeffery Town and Cave Island projects, assistance has been received from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) to the value of US\$13,000 to support and strengthen viable community enterprises in organisational management to more effectively address local development issues. The Drewsland Citizens Association was granted US\$75,000 from the government's Poverty Eradication Programme to improve drainage as part of the community's sanitation and environmental health project. Grant resources provided from the GOJ/UNDP TRAC Resources also provided valuable financial resources to a number of projects. Resources amounting to US\$138,000 were also provided in this way which facilitated financial support of over US\$75,000 to eight projects as well as technical assistance (TA) to two projects. The seven projects which benefited in this way were as follows:

Table 1: Mobilisation of Financial Resources and Technical Assistance for Capacity Building, Technical Assistance and Community Advocacy

		US\$
▪ Roy Edwards Training Centre:	Computer Skills Training –	4,365.14;
▪ PEPA:	Solid Waste Management, Environmental Education –	9,261.21;
▪ Middleton Farmers Development:	Community Development/Environmental Protection –	3,783.49;
▪ Boone Hall:	Meeting/Training Facility to address community development -	1,966.91;
▪ Papine Development:	Community Development -	21,617.00;
▪ Rae Town Fishing:	Community Dev't, Environment -	10,878;
▪ Majesty Gardens Fishing Org.	Community Development, Environment -	27,946.83; ²⁷
▪ Content and Gibraltar:	St. Catherine Dev't – Water storage, health and sanitation-	TA and US\$35,525 grant ²⁸ ;
▪ Temple Hall District	Bosswell Heights Bridge-	TA

The fruitful partnership arrangement with PACT acting on behalf of UNDP Life has also enabled the latter to secure valuable funding in view of the fact that UNDP Life was a project and did not have the legal capacity to enter into contracts for funding assistance. Through this funding, provided through PACT, UNDP Life was able to secure some

²⁶ Some US\$808,000 has been mobilized in grants in Phase IV alone towards institutional support to local initiatives (Life Global Report/Jamaica Phase IV Country Report, 2003)

²⁷ Project terminated in view of Kingston Harbour Redevelopment Project destroying source of livelihood

²⁸ This comprised a special grant from Global Funds of US\$20,000 and US\$15,525 from UNDP/TRAC resources

US\$347,000 to CBOs to undertake community assessments and planning to improve the economic well-being of some 12 communities such as Papine, Rae Town and Jeffrey Town, among others, to continue the process of consolidation towards environmental livelihood. Additionally, a grant of J\$9.0 million was provided by the EFJ to assist communities in capacity building, training and strengthening of community-based organisations²⁹.

Grants and technical assistance mobilised to support community planning and other initiatives towards revitalisation of previously marginalized communities to achieve some level of sustainable livelihood, capacity strengthening and community advocacy have been very instrumental in UNDP Life's success at securing desirable project outcomes.

Scaling-up and Mainstreaming the LIFE Process, Achievement and Methodology in Jamaica

Mainstreamed approaches to capacity building and community participation have been pursued through partnership, local-local dialogue, community participatory assessments and planning at the community level. By drawing on its experience of consolidated approaches to improving urban settlement conditions, UNDP Life was able to up-stream and mainstream community participatory approaches in its collaborative work in partnerships relationships with other projects. The CIDA financed Enhancing Civil Society Project was one such project. Others have included collaborative work with CIDA's Environmental Action Programme (ENACT).

The mainstreaming of the LIFE methodology has been also advanced through the adaptation and adoption of UNDP Life's processes by development professionals. LIFE was consulted by the World Bank consultants in the process of doing their evaluation of the Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF). UNDP Life's community engagement methodology was looked at favourably for incorporation into JSIF's programmes. Further indications were, that adoption and application of this methodology by these consultants, was not being limited to the JSIF project but has also been applied in community mobilisation where the Bank has been working with NGOs and CBOs in the *Partnership for Development* initiatives.

The mainstreaming of the UNDP Life methodology and processes has been also advanced through the activities of members of the National Selection Committee (NSC) acting in other fora where they often utilise the methodology and approaches developed in their "UNDP Life" experiences to the benefit of other programmes. UNDP Life methodology has been applied and has been thought to be impacting policy through the activities of persons like the Chairman of the National Selection Committee acting in several policy-shaping positions in a number of organisations. The Coastal Water Improvement Project (CWIP) is one such example, as also is the Ridge to Reef Project both funded by the USAID.

²⁹ The grant also provided funding assistance in the preparation of the project proposal to support the request to the EFJ

The confidence gained from that encounter with UNDP Life and the very fact of the community having worked with a body such as UNDP Life was thought by President McKnight of the Boone Hall Citizens Association to have given the community organization increased “legitimacy”. This increased acceptance of the local organizations clearly translated into the community benefiting from having greater access to more influential partners. The value of this UNDP Life “stamp of approval” while difficult to isolate and assess, is not to be overlooked. Communities did indicate that the “UNDP” name along with “Life did open doors for them with prospective partners. In the future, some attempt could be made to determine amongst new partners, what impact if any, the knowledge of a community’s earlier or current participation with UNDP Life, had on their decision to partner with specific communities.

The weakness of the approach to mainstreaming the UNDP Life methodology in “standard community intervention” is that in the process of adoption (or adaptation) of what is essentially itself a relatively undocumented process, any element of UNDP Life “branding” could be significantly diluted. The methodology mainstreamed therefore does not lend itself to generating for UNDP Life the level of recognition deserved for its contribution to policy development. Much of this weakness can be attributed to under-documentation and the consequent lack of sufficient association of the intervention and engagement processes specifically with UNDP Life, hence the inability of its management to credibly claim direct ownership of a “unique process” and the mainstreaming benefits that the process may in fact be enjoying even indirectly.

Attempts were also made to upstream and institutionalise UNDP Life’s involvement in participatory local governance framework through support to the Papine Development Area Committee (Papine DAC) which encompasses some 11 communities in West and East Rural St. Andrew. In furtherance of this and similar initiatives, UNDP Life, in strengthening community governance, signed an MOU with the SDC³⁰ to provide technical and financial services to prepare community assessments and prepare a development plan by the University of Technology Urban Planning Unit. The plan involved preparing a community exercise, resource identification, and recommended elements of the proposed development plan. UNDP Life approved a grant of US\$21,617 to catalyse the process, maintain community engagement, strengthen community infrastructure for income generating initiatives while using community tourism as the mode of entry through construction of basic social amenities and facilities and employment generation of tour guides.

One of the assumptions made in up-streaming and mainstreaming UNDP Life processes was that the process of Local Government Reform would have been very vibrant and receptive to UNDP Life interventions. This has not been the case, certainly not near as anticipated. The result is that efforts to build on local level structures have not borne the desired returns. The attempt to significantly influence policy has been limited by the fact that local authorities have not received the necessary powers to sustain the process of

³⁰ The SDC has responsibility for the participatory local governance framework exercised through a hierarchical structure of Parish Development Committees (PDACs), Development Area Committees (DACs) and Community Development Committees (CDCs). UNDP Life engagement was at the level of the DAC.

community participation and to support initiatives aimed at participatory local governance. The forging of relationships between UNDP Life and a number of entities at the local level has been directed towards this objective³¹.

National Sanitation Programme Development: The funding of a planning workshop hosted by UNDP Life in year 2000³² involving persons from government agencies, NGOs, CBOs and other interested persons constituted an excellent opportunity for UNDP Life to institutionalise its methodology and approach in influencing national level policy. The objective of the workshop was to establish a Sanitation Policy Logical Framework and proposals to the EFJ. The proposal was submitted to the EFJ but was declined due to UNDP Life's and the National Sanitation Taskforce's lack of legal capacity to enter into contracts. The registration of "LIFE" may contribute to re-opening dialogue in bringing some coordination to loosely held together entities involved with household excreta disposal.³³ Interest displayed by PAHO, and some new players in this sector, provide an excellent opportunity to re-open this issue. Relationships should be fostered between LIFE, in its new form, and the PDACs through the SDC to bring this aspect of UNDP Life's role to fruition.

³¹ See UNDP Life/PACT partnership, also UNDP Life/SDP/Papine Development Assistance Committee, UNDP Life/CIDA Enhancing Civil Society Project,

³² Funded by UNDP Life at a cost of US\$1,921.49

³³ No single entity is charged with responsibility for household excreta disposal. Involved entities are MOH/Public Health Department, Parish Councils/KSAC, MWH, NWC, NEPA.

Transitioning the LIFE Project in Jamaica into a Sustainable Organisation.

The high level objective of ensuring the sustainability of the UNDP Life project in Jamaica was essentially handled through the successful process of converting UNDP Life into an NGO, “LIFE”³⁴. This was completed by the launch of LIFE (Ltd.) in June 2004, as a separate legal entity having the ability to contract and be contracted for commercial service awards. This is undoubtedly a major accomplishment against stated objectives and outcomes for the current phase of LIFE which is now placed in the position of being able to generate revenues and thereby earn funds to help promote its sustainability in Jamaica³⁵. The institutionalisation/transitioning process was carried out after a number of studies were executed by UNDP Life:

Table 2: Institutionalisation/Transitioning Projects/Studies, 2000/2001

Year 2000:

- Strategic Alignment Workshop:
 - Alignment among participants in critical issues defining UNDP Life’s future; consideration of a number of factors relative to key issues (financial work programmes, locational etc.; activities to be pursued, including timeframe and responsibilities.
- Strategic Work Plan:
 - A work plan for Phase IV implementation, institutionalisation, and sustainability of the UNDP Life project.
- Institutionalisation of UNDP Life:
 - Develop specific activities related to strategies, objectives, and actions emanating from the project evaluation; assign responsibilities and establish timeframes; determine resource requirements and programme budget.³⁶

Year 2001:

- Strategic Planning Exercise:
 - Report on UNDP Life’s Strategic Options.
- Legal Services (Beryl Ennis, Attny. at Law)
 - Legal Framework, Memorandum and Articles of Association

³⁴ First named “LIFE Ltd.”, the limited liability status has been removed

³⁵ One of the objectives and outcomes identified for this phase of the UNDP Life was “Transitioning the UNDP Life project in Jamaica into a sustainable organisation”.

³⁶ Five Year Business Plan completed in 2001 (2002-2006) proposes the following sources of income: Community/Environmental Consulting, Community/Environmental Training, Project Management Fees, Corporate Sponsorship, Fund-Raising, Interest, Donor Funding and Miscellaneous Income

The relationship with PACT has been very important to the transitioning process. After signing the MOU with PACT, UNDP Life was able to perform services for various projects with PACT up-fronting for UNDP Life who did not have the capacity to contract or receive donor funds directly³⁷. The arrangement was also very critical to UNDP Life from another perspective. The MOU with PACT facilitated the provision of accommodation and shared administrative support/overheads to UNDP Life. The extent to which UNDP Life was able to internally generate financial resources since signing the MOU with PACT is indeed an indication of its potential to core capabilities to support programmes after it assumes NGO status as LIFE.³⁸

Table 3: UNDP Life Fee-Based Services: (Status based on available data to end 2003)

Project	Agency	Amount
Boone Hall	Boone Hall Citizens Association	US\$2,083
Monitoring and Management (EFJ)	EFJ	J\$2,163,000
Project Management (EFJ/IAF)	EFJ/IAF	J\$73,000,000
Rae Town (Mangrove Replanting)	NEPA	J\$360,000

³⁷ Where UNDP Life secured donor support funding previously, the contracting was between registered community organizations and the donor organization.

³⁸ UNDP Life actually assumed legal status as an NGO in 2004 June.

▪ **Box 3: LIFE' Case Study:**
Ensuring the Sustainability of "LIFE" in Jamaica.

With the imminence of the end of phase III and IV of UNDP LIFE project in Jamaica, one of the objectives was how to ensure the sustainability of LIFE beyond the end of UNDP funding for LIFE. A consultant was contracted to prepare a business plan designed to articulate and guide the transition of LIFE into a sustainable entity and plot its long term operational sustainability over the period 2002-2006. In this plan, the consultant recommended the setting up of LIFE as a registered non-profit trust, limited by guarantee and exempt from income tax under section 12(h) of the Income Tax Act. LIFE Limited was subsequently established. The consultant's task was to create a plan that would ensure the continuity/sustainability of LIFE beyond the end of UNDP funding by replacing the UNDP's funding with new income sources. Conceptually, this was based on an identification of the core strengths and competencies of the UNDP Life programme and then laying plans for the development of sustainable income streams based on marketing these core competencies. Related to this plan was the design of an Exit Strategy and Close-Out Plan to guide and ensure operational continuity from the end of UNDP Life as a project, through to the emergence of the new LIFE entity.

One aspect of this sustainability strategy was the signing of an MOU with PACT with the specific objectives of sharing rent and maintenance, sharing certain administrative staff and conducting joint marketing and implementation of services, including doing joint project proposals. The process of nurturing the transition process has proved very critical in achieving LIFE's objectives. given PACT's complimentary range of competencies and its favourable positioning within the donor landscape. While most aspects of this partnership worked, there was an underestimation of the staff needs in the above partnership with PACT, so LIFE had to go back to employing staff of its own. This however was in part due to the fact that LIFE already had two new substantial projects on its books, which had put additional pressure on its staff compliment.

The business plan as implemented was very close to what was contained in the document produced by the consultant and LIFE has already started to benefit from this in that it can now tender on projects of a size which hitherto it was unable to as well as those of international donor agencies.

LIFE's sustainability going ahead dependent on:

- 1. Careful and timely succession planning. Regardless of its new legal status, all the operational structure and documentation in place, it is important to have some continuity in key personnel, for another 2-3 years at the operational management and executive management levels;*
- 2. The maintenance of at least two long-term (of 2-3 year duration) projects on its books at all time;*
- 3. Being able to exploit synergies with PACT through networking and marketing, including sharing an internet marketing presence. Careful marketing is required in the peculiar donor market, in which PACT already has a proven track record;*

Box 3 continued

4. *LIFE finding ways to consistently cover its core operating costs since donor funds would not be available for those purposes.*

The strategy to approach building sustainability for LIFE through giving it legal entity status, as recommended in the Business Plan was one of very three alternatives evaluated given LIFE's need to raise funds. The level of funds which could be accessed without legal status, contributed significantly to pursuing LIFE's sustainability strategy in the way it was done.

The LIFE methodology while not being really unique, a demonstration of a very good application of the principles of Local Agenda 21, can be an important tool if documented and disseminated to carry the LIFE process forward. The very fact of the LIFE methodology being utilized now by a number of local entities can be seen as a plus for the mainstreaming objective of UNDP Life. The "UNDP Life methodology" however, is unlikely to become a "tradable commodity" on its own. i.e. sale of books or manuals in the "UNDP Life methodology."

The transitioning of LIFE in Jamaica to legal status has not been replicated in many other countries and is therefore to be seen as a major success story in the sustainability process thus far.

External factors influencing outcomes

Positives:

- Certainly in the communities of Boone Hall, and Drewsland and Cave Island, and Portmore Gardens, one common critical ingredient for success was found to be the existence of strong, highly driven leadership within the community;
- Training in dispute resolution and conflict management received by members of the community in other unrelated programmes/projects was brought positively to bear on the UNDP Life project, especially in crime and violence-prone communities;
- The communities of Drewsland, Portmore Gardens expressed the feeling that their Member of Parliament who was constantly kept abreast of the community's activities, through structured progress reports, was very supportive of the project.

Negatives:

- The UNDP Life-facilitated local community engagement process had to overcome strong skepticism and a dependency syndrome within the beneficiary communities along with a culture characterized by a strong reliance on party political allegiances / mechanisms/ handouts as means of personal progress;
- The failure of the Local Government Reform process to get going in any real way meant that there was little institutional structure into which to link the UNDP Life outputs for sustainability, in keeping with the stated intent;
- Because many UNDP Life interventions were in urban and marginalized low income underdeveloped communities of informal settlers, the level of crime and violence existing therein was an inhibiting factor;
- The lack of security of tenure on occupied tracts of land in some communities (where UNDP Life has intervened, and where land settlement and development were not the reasons for the intervention), has been found to impede the process of implementation of the projects. This was definitely found to be true in the Boone Hall case. These residents have been unable to erect sanitary conveniences or permanent water supply at the Community Centre (15'x12" shed) which UNDP Life funding helped them to construct;
- The relatively low levels of literacy within many of the beneficiary communities reduced the range of methodological options that could be employed in the community engagement and mobilization stages. Additionally, when the time came to document the project proposal in the approved way, UNDP Life staff, in some instances, had to do this almost entirely from verbal inputs from the community members. When the project comes to an end, any documentation once again relies heavily on support from the above persons;
- Insufficient levels of funding: In at least two cases, the very good work started by UNDP Life's intervention (in terms of providing funding to support technical expertise or social intervention resources at the disposal of the beneficiary organizations) was somewhat subsequently compromised by the inability of UNDP Life to sustain the initial levels of support. Through the joint development with UNDP Life of a new module in their four month social work course, the *Social Welfare Training Centre (SWTC)* was able to offer its students new tools in "community entry strategies" in one year (2002). Further funding was not, however,

forthcoming and the programme had to be scaled back. In the volatile communities of Western Kingston, UNDP Life support for *Chichibud* in staging a camp which provided post trauma intervention for children who had experienced the three days of intense shooting in 2002, though well received was not sustained as was needed beyond the first year. Funding constraint of UNDP Life was a limiting factor³⁹.

Gaps for Consideration by Global UNDP Life in the Future

An area that could benefit from increased UNDP Global support has been identified as the provision of available resources to assist UNDP Life in addressing the very critical issue of support to economic livelihood in the communities in which UNDP Life operated. Marginalised communities, with little hope of alternatives, must be provided with the necessary support to encourage economic opportunities for the poor. The quantum and level of resources would need to be negotiated.

Implementation and Management Issues

The capacity of UNDP Life in Jamaica to engage communities and develop projects was significantly impacted by the limited complement of staff available to the local programme at the level of the programme office. The manifestations of this were seen in terms of the levels of evaluation and documentation which the local office could attempt on a per project basis. The documentation and circulation of the UNDP Life Methodology was also not at the level one would expect. The level of funding available for the Jamaican operations of UNDP Life simply could not be leveraged any further to provide more administrative resources. The National Coordinator (NC) was technical director, administrator, facilitator of community mobilisation and was accessible to deal with issues raised at the individual community level. It is remarkable that so much was achieved by UNDP Life through the work of the NC along with resources of an additional person on a part-time basis. In the words of the National Coordinator, “*some things were simply just done halfway*”.

The arrangement whereby UNOPS continued to use another umbrella NGO to host the UNDP Life project has served to somewhat mitigated the limitations faced by UNDP Life in the above regard. This effectively involved a partnership UNDP Life struck with Peoples Action for Community Transformation (PACT). This arrangement allowed UNDP Life to share office space, as well as some office equipment and administrative support. Additionally, PACT and UNDP Life collaborated on a number of projects on the operational and tactical levels. PACT would, as the project required, direct communities to UNDP Life to utilise its expertise in the community mobilization stage of some of PACT's own projects to generate income. Further, as a means of circumventing UNDP Life's lack of legal entity status prior to the Institutionalisation of LIFE, UNDP Life would route project proposals for funding through PACT.

³⁹ The view was expressed by the National Coordinator that, in hindsight, it might have been more effective for UNDP Life to have invested in fewer, larger projects

A weakness identified in the management structure and operations of the UNDP Life Office was the extremely high reliance on the National Coordinator (NC). In much of the interface with the communities, “UNDP Life was Mrs. Grant and Mrs. Grant was LIFE”. Although this was a clear indication of the NC’s high level of motivation and commitment to the process, it also meant that the success of the LIFE process in Jamaica could become even more heavily dependent on the personal qualities of the National Coordinator unless a broadening of the structure of LIFE was effected by increasing capacity of core operational staff.

There was no evidence of a set of well articulated and documented Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) against which the success or otherwise of UNDP Life’s interventions in communities could be appraised, whether overall or on a per project basis.

The issue of protection of the livelihood of communities has been one that calls for more attention. It is important that the approach to UNDP Life intervention must constantly seek to mobilize communities to improve the economic base of marginalized communities. UNDP Life engagement must involve creation of alternative development strategies or placing incipient small businesses on firmer footing. Majesty Gardens, plagued with high levels of unemployment, represents one community in which new initiatives must be fostered to lead the community away from the scourge of violence and crime and to new vistas of hope⁴⁰. Similarly, major problems exist with residents of the community of Drewsland in trying to eke out an economic base and provide a livelihood for youths in the area⁴¹. In a walk around the community inspecting the operation of the “old engine oil smelters”, the consultant heard a youth comment: “Me no like wha a gwan. If dem want stop this operation.... If tief dem wan me tief”. The attempts at placing the operation on an environmentally safe basis, unfortunately, was not carried through because some important stakeholders and providers of technical assistance in the design of the chimney stacks, as well as donor support, was not brought to a conclusion⁴².

Partnership Building

The work of UNDP Life in Jamaica in pulling outside resources to the table in the service of communities is regarded as one of the strong points of the programme especially in view of the catalytic effect this has had on the process of partnership building. The use, for example, of “stakeholders’ fora” within the beneficiary communities from very early in the community’s planning process was found to be an effective and efficient mechanism for bringing together resources for partnership and capacity building. Additionally, it provided a robust opportunity for *documentation* of an important element in the process of community engagement which could be replicated, to good effect, elsewhere.

⁴⁰ The attempt to stimulate fishing industry development is commendable.

⁴¹ Reference is made to the five smelting operations which are a source of major environmental pollution, creating significant health hazards, but which provide a livelihood for a few youths.

⁴² A number of partners attempted to contribute to rectifying the problem: CIDA, NEPA, MOH/ECD, Alcan Aluminium, Dairy Industries, a major cheese-making facility in the immediate area and UNDP Life, among others

UNDP Life activities, in this regard, were found to be directed at presenting the communities with technical assistance and guidance from the planning stages in an effort to ensure them the best opportunity to use their resources in the most cost effective manner, while at the same time retaining ownership of the process. This type of partnership was found to have contributed significantly to community confidence levels, as well as to their organisational and technical learning.

The partnerships forged between the communities and agencies of government provided technical assistance as well as access to the mainstream “establishment”, while offering, among other things, familiarity with official processes. Those partnerships struck with the private commercial, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), International Organisations, local agencies (EFJ), other internationally funded projects tended to offer primarily technical assistance and funding⁴³. Partnership arrangements have already been mentioned in respect to UNDP Life/CWIP and UNDP/CIDA projects. The latter involved incorporating various UNDP Life tools and methodologies for building capacity, social capital and sustained community development in programme delivery⁴⁴. The former involved UNDP Life-based tools of community building and local community-based organisations in monitoring waste disposal which negatively impact on coastal waters and the local tourism industry.

In other instances, partnerships have been struck with government entities. For instance the SDC MOU involved UNDP Life assisting in the planning and development of the Papine Development Area mentioned earlier. In this instance, a grant was allocated to catalyse the project to support infrastructure development and income generating activities.

Capacity/Institutional Building

UNDP Life's comparative advantage in Jamaica is its ability to mobilize communities, build their capacity to take ownership of their development and mobilize resources to leverage the contributions of donors, partners, government agencies, the communities themselves and others.

Significant organisational learning and capacity building were demonstrated throughout the contacts with the beneficiary communities. Communities were found to be much better placed and prepared to take on their own challenges, than prior to UNDP Life's intervention. An intuitive performance indicator of the extent to which UNDP Life's intervention created sustainable impacts is the extent to which communities engaged by UNDP Life can be weaned of its continued support.

UNDP Contribution and the Role of PIOJ

UNDP's contribution to various communities throughout Jamaica can be credibly linked to some of the outcomes from UNDP Life's projects. This derives from the contribution and part played by the UNDP on behalf of UNDP Life. This is as a direct result of the fact that

⁴³ Funding is however provided to the relevant community organization once this entity is registered as an NGO

⁴⁴ CIDA Enhancing Civil Society Project in St. Mary and Trelawny

UNDP Life is an extension of the UNDP Country Office with a focal point representation on the NSC, involvement in the Tripartite Review Process involving UNDP Life, the PIOJ and the UNDP Country Office. In this way, the UNDP was involved with issues such as monitoring and evaluation of outputs/outcomes, and generally providing guidance to the National Coordinator who reports to the UNDP focal point. The fact that UNDP Life was a product of the UNDP meant that through the various activities mentioned above, the UNDP Focal point made important contributions to the UNDP Life programme despite some concerns expressed later.⁴⁵

A major contribution provided by the UNDP to the UNDP Life project was the provision of the remuneration of the National Coordinator. This had the effect of lending stability to the project as it did not have to contend with that issue with the result that the incumbent could direct full attention to ensuring UNDP Life processes and methodology were aggressively pursued in community engagement. The selection/involvement of the various UNDP country representatives has played a crucial role in the effectiveness of the NSC, the NC and the project in general. *That aside, in recent years, changes at both the Resident Coordinator and programme officers/focal point levels demonstrating varying levels of commitment and effort towards the programme's policy influence, continuity and sustainability have reportedly adversely affected project performance. At the highest levels, this was reflected in situations such as where Project reports from the UNDP Life office were passed through to the UNDP Resident Coordinator, but feedback was not readily obtained. Frequent changes of the focal point have not brought a sense of continuity to UNDP support to the UNDP Life project.*

The available evidence suggests that the role of the UNDP local office in the local intervention process was primarily regarded as significant in the administrative realm: providing funding and transportation support. Notwithstanding this, the UNDP name constituted a powerful instrument in assisting UNDP Life to gain access to communities in general. The UNDP name attracted considerable “goodwill” and contributed significantly to project successes by allowing UNDP Life’s to more effectively engage communities.

Community mobilisation: The very fact that many of the programmes even got off the ground at the local level was in a big way directly linked to the community engagement activities spearheaded by the UNDP Life staff. The very innovative methodologies utilised by the UNDP Life team in first of all negotiating entry into some communities while retaining their credibility and then being effective in pulling the community together around the selected project was commendable. An important contribution of the UNDP country office to documentation has been the funding of the UN Social Capital documentary which featured the contribution of the UNDP Life project to the building of social capital as an important aspect of the up-streaming activities of the project.

For the purpose of programme evaluation, the UNDP/PIOJ country office has allocated US\$8,000 from the UNDP budget to carry out the current evaluation exercise. This activity has been spear-headed by the Resident Coordinator of UNDP who has exercised control through the UNDP focal point

⁴⁵ See comments in succeeding paragraph regarding frequent changes, inter alia, of focal point staff

The Planning Institute of Jamaica: The PIOJ facilitated the development of the *GOJ/UNDP Support to UNDP Life Project* by channelling grants to communities for sustainable development⁴⁶. While financing has been an important contribution, the technical input of the Institute has been of greater value. UNDP Life has been the interface between PIOJ, representing the Government of Jamaica and the international donor community. Through the GOJ/UNDP financed project, PIOJ has been able to provide a monitoring function, and to have more control over the committed resources through project selection, and implementation and to make technical inputs into procurement processes for services⁴⁷. A project selected for financing by the National Selection Committee is usually further subjected to internal appraisal by PIOJ before a decision is made to include it in the portfolio of projects financed by the GOJ/UNDP funds. In this way, PIOJ has ensured fulfilment of its mandate to ensure that sound sustainable development projects, consistent with Government's development priorities, are supported. PIOJ has also helped UNDP Life to develop an appreciation for the reporting requirements of Governments and funding agencies in assisting communities.

The UNDP Life Project has sought to make project preparation and reporting a more simplified process for communities which usually lack the capacity to write elaborate project documents. While this has been helpful for increasing the number of projects put forward, pertinent bits of information which help to determine sustainability are sometimes not included. The NSC has provided PIOJ the opportunity to solicit such information and to emphasize issues to be considered in determining sustainability. In this way, the capacity of the UNDP Life Project has been built. PIOJ has given the Government's endorsement to UNDP Life in its transition to an NGO Hosting the launch of LIFE as an NGO at the offices of the PIOJ was a signal to the external agencies, and to the public in general, that the Government considered UNDP Life a credible organization.

While no specific examples can be cited, it is conceivable that the involvement of both the UNDP⁴⁸ and the PIOJ in the Tripartite Process of monitoring and evaluation, as well as in other direct ways such as through membership on the National Selection Committee would allow both entities to model aspects of UNDP Life tools and methodologies in their programmes at the community levels. We anticipate that a model will emerge whereby the up-streaming- down-streaming- up-streaming methodology will become mainstreamed and Government's development policies will be informed by the work of CBOs/NGO as a result of engagement of the UNDP Life process in dealing with problems of inner-city marginalized communities.

⁴⁶ UNDP through the PIOJ allocated US\$138,000 to UNDP Life for the government's National Poverty Eradication Programme (NPEP), specifically for community projects, capacity building and to help in its transition process. These funds were to be managed by the project.

⁴⁷ Formulation of Terms of Reference for studies and general procurement of services, including the conduct of interviews etc

⁴⁸ The UNDP's Civic Dialogue project utilises the methodology of dialogue among and between communities and community members in arriving at consensus. The intent is similarly to use this dialogue to inform policy level actions. A consultation is planned for 2005 January 30 involving some 60 communities across the island to "dialogue" on issues of concern to arrive at a consensus towards influencing higher level policy.

UNDP Life's Core Competencies:

UNDP Life was perhaps best seen at work at the level of its community mobilisation and capacity building through training. It has also demonstrated a high level of success at pulling together partnerships between the beneficiary communities and other outside agencies. A major deficiency has been the area of lack of documentation. This was one of the main findings of a PIOJ led Tripartite Review. This experience has been evident to the consultants in the course of their field investigations as well. The development of a UNDP Life manual with carefully documented activities and processes would be an asset. Such a manual would contain a range of well documented cases of UNDP Life's engagement in selected communities, utilising a multimedia approach. LIFE Jamaica needs to draw on the goodwill it has developed over the phases of the LIFE Programme to market itself as having the experience and capacity to implement local initiatives for government and international partners.

In a society plagued with "turfism", a neutral player, and one that can speak to all partners, is a valuable asset. The National Selection Committee of UNDP Life which has a multi-stakeholder character made up of Government, Private Sector, Civil Society, International Development Partners, and Community Representatives, coupled with the professionalism and neutrality of its Programme Managers, positions it as the forum on which genuine partnerships can be built. The NSC not only epitomises neutrality through its composition, but fosters partnership among its stakeholders, influence in policy-making, and ensured the interest of all stakeholders are protected in the interest of development. Additionally, this novel approach through partnerships, and drawing on UNDP Life's neutrality, could continue to ensure mainstreaming of the "LIFE" methodology in development programmes.

Lessons Learned and Use of Results in Learning and Advocacy:

Sustainability is often fostered where experiences are properly documented to ensure appropriate methodology and likely problems to be encountered. In this way, important lessons can be learned which can act as a template for similar projects with hopefully few modifications to ensure adoption or adaptability. This is especially true where a somewhat unique process and methodology in community empowerment is involved. The fact is that the documentation of the processes followed by UNDP Life, in a proper and exhaustive manner, has not been sufficiently done.

One consequence of this is the fact mentioned earlier that UNDP Life does not have a recognised set of records⁴⁹ which formally set out the "UNDP Life methodology" in a way that could lay any claim to uniqueness. It must, however, be recognised that what may have started as a "unique" UNDP Life methodology is now being "mainstreamed" by CBOs and NGO in mobilising communities. UNDP Life Jamaica used to speak of its unique niche.

⁴⁹ A major criticism arising from the Tripartite Review in year 2003 was the lack of adequate documentation and dissemination of UNDP Life processes and methodologies in community mobilization in a manner to inform policy

Today, the approaches and methodologies used by UNDP Life have been adopted as the norm.

Close working relations with National Solid Waste Management Authority (NSWMA), for example, have been identified as an integral path to success in the sanitation project. The devolution of power to local authorities has opened new opportunities for UNDP Life to work directly with these authorities. Concepts developed under UNDP Life have the potential to be scaled-up to a higher level. By developing proposals together with local communities and other local partners for scaling up of UNDP Life methodologies, the project has offered opportunities for donors to invest in projects based on methodologies rooted in the realities on the ground. Unfortunately, attempts to develop a national sanitation framework and policy were frustrated by a combination of entities of government with different mandates and the fact that UNDP Life did not have contracting capacity. This is a clear justification for LIFE to now assume NGO status.

Despite successful outcomes noted in the course of this evaluation, UNDP Life may have attempted too many projects in this phase, thereby diluting its overall impact. In hindsight, a focus on fewer projects with a deeper, more integrated, multi-sector approach to dealing with broader “community” engagements could have led to more substantive results that could be easily demonstrated. Several communities within reach of one another have similar needs which could be addressed such as to gain synergies from engaging adjoining communities. UNDP Life could therefore have benefited from use of its resources more effectively and efficiently, in a less segmented approach, given the inter-connectedness of the various problems facing target communities. One approach could have been to target a cluster of communities which have similar problems and thereby gain some synergies and economies from UNDP Life intervention rather splintering assistance in several small interventions. This is especially important in view of the very limited core staff available to UNDP Life to manage and monitor its portfolio, many communities of which have identical problems⁵⁰.

Generally, throughout the UNDP Life experience, it was found that initial ground work in communities was invaluable to understanding the issues involved and in interpreting the needs of the communities. Further, sustainability at project initiatives was likely to be assured if all community stakeholders were involved from the inception of planning and conceptualisation. Being accessible at all times to community members or organisations created a sense of UNDP Life being “at one with the communities”.

The results of UNDP Life’s successes can best be communicated by actually demonstrating the success story through actual experiences. Communities want to see practical demonstrations of what can be achieved through community action. The successes of Portmore Gardens have been effectively communicated by the President Latterly through organised visits between communities. Whenever one community project comes to a successful end, UNDP Life would ensure that it organised some ceremony of sort at which

⁵⁰ The KRC example of the DFID financed Jones Town and surrounding communities could provide some useful insights in this approach

event other communities currently engaged with LIFE would be invited to share in the “dream-come- reality”. This has been proved to be very effective.

Looking specifically at individual projects, there were a number of lessons to be drawn from successes at project implementation and the use of UNDP Life processes and methodology.

- Strong advocacy supported by purposeful leadership committed to see the process through to completion is a valuable asset for project sustainability;⁵¹
- The ability for citizens to look beyond the short-term benefits to a longer term vision proved critical in securing “buy-in” by communities in the process of long term development;⁵²
- UNDP Life intervention must not only address the core issues identified by the communities but must equally in all situations deals with the issues of the protection of livelihood⁵³.
- Strong organisational capacity is required to help communities interface with valuable partners in government and the donor community to ensure that efforts at community mobilisation which is a long term process is carried out to the end to ensure sustainability⁵⁴.
- The importance of UNDP Life facilitation and hand-holding, in providing knowledge of the role of government entities and developing strategies to approach outside partners is critical to success;
- UNDP Life must develop methodologies to deal with the slow pace of implementation of local government reform. UNDP Life’s institutionalisation should increase the leverage at its disposal to address this issue;⁵⁵
- Water and sanitation issues are inescapably intertwined with longer-term issues of security of tenure and the desire for community residents to own a house, however, basic. Communities that have followed this route have been able to build capacity in planning, partnerships, advocacy, resource mobilisation while experiencing considerable organisational learning.⁵⁶
- While attempts have been made to undertake some documentation of UNDP Life’s approaches to capacity building, partnership building, local-local dialogue, community participation, planning, including the use of “stakeholders’ fora”, there is need for greater documentation and dissemination of these approaches This would facilitate their replication, scaling-up of the UNDP Life approach, processes and methodology..

⁵¹ Portmore Citizens Association, Building Together Citizens Association (Drewsland Community), Cave Island Citizens Association, Rae Town Fishing Development Cooperative

⁵² Cave Island, Majesty Gardens, Drewsland

⁵³ Majesty Gardens and Drewsland

⁵⁴ Several examples of partnerships have been cited: NWC, JPS, NWC, NWA, SDC, CIDA, to name a few.

⁵⁵ UNDP Life partnership with PACT was one example before incorporation of LIFE. Other strategies now are opened up in creating partnerships in encouraging and advocating for greater power to local authorities in ensuring community mobilisation

⁵⁶ Portmore Gardens, Cave Island, Drewsland and Bower Bank are cited as examples

Recommendations Emanating from This Evaluation

1. A major consideration in ensuring sustainability of the UNDP Life methodology and processes of community engagement is improved documentation of both success and failures. Efforts must be made to improve the level of documentation at both the project and central level;
2. UNDP Life's image and prominence is inextricably linked with the excellent work carried out by the current National Coordinator. To communities, "Mrs. Grant is UNDP Life, UNDP Life is Mrs. Grant". There is an inherent vulnerability in this scenario. This must be overcome by deliberately broadening the Secretariat structure through a process of engaging more full-time and "part-time" operatives to champion particular projects by leveraging resources for community support to projects. It is hoped that now that LIFE exists, this will be made easier as it will be able to increase its bidding for projects as well as attract new funding from sources, including the international donor community, that would previously not be accessible;
3. Life should now focus on mobilizing financial resources, now that it is an NGO, including the possible engagement of a professional fundraiser to help achieve the purpose of increasing resources to leverage greater community development. This operative, the fundraiser, should be engaged in a manner which rewards the incumbent on the basis of performance as and when needed.
4. Institutionalisation of Life processes and mainstreaming into policy at higher levels has not been as successful as was anticipated. Some successes have been achieved. Life needs to draw more fully on the comparative advantage derived from the composition of its National Steering Committee and Executive Board to ensure greater mainstreaming of its processes and activities into policy. It is now timely to draw on greater corporate involvement and international development partners who can be attracted by LIFE's knowledge of conditions on the ground in their programmes and activities;
5. A further Phase 5 support to LIFE is recommended. This should focus on the important aspect of support to policy-level work which needs to be consolidated. Administrative and logistical support should continue to be provided to lend greater stability to the LIFE programme. Further, this process should be facilitated by financial support to appropriate and improved documentation of LIFE's processes and methodologies. This should complement existing resources unspent and still available from the line item for documentation to bring about a greater focus on this element of programme sustainability;
6. Several of UNDP Life's activities have been too narrowly defined within communities in which it has worked. This relates to the point mentioned earlier that UNDP Life may have benefited from engaging fewer projects and individual communities across a wider range of related communities that face almost identical issues. The result has often been that completion of activities often leads to the need for follow-up work in the same communities. LIFE needs to pursue a more strategic, broad-based and integrated approach in the areas in which it intervenes. In this way, LIFE should focus on a smaller number of individual communities, but working more effectively by gaining synergies from engagement of different communities

until the capacity constraints imposed by the limited number of core staff has been addressed.

Research Questions/Interview Schedule

1. How relevant is the programme to the development priorities of the country?
2. Has the programme achieved its principal/overarching objectives and outcomes in reaching marginalized communities? What factors contributed to success or failure?
3. Did project selection reflect community participation in conceptualization, design and development?
4. Were project resources, including UNDP's input, effectively used to produce project outputs and in a timely manner?
5. Was there "true" partnership with Life management? Were the views of partners accommodated and respected? What factors accounted for successful partnership?
6. Has there been genuine Capacity Building/Institutional Strengthening of communities?
7. Has the UNDP added value through its intervention? Is there a real role for UNDP in future programmes?
8. What were the lessons learned? What has worked and what "Best Practices" can be identified and can be replicated? What were the weak areas? What, if any, are the policy implications flowing from these lessons?
9. On the basis of the above, can a further "phase" be justified? What form should this take? Is sustainability sought via Life Ltd as a registered NGO the preferred option and mechanism to pursue?
10. What are the existing levels of documentation with regards to the project selection, design and actual operational methodology (project implementation)? Examine/evaluate.
11. Were there any other factors which may have influenced the success or failure of the projects?

Guide to Focus Group Discussions

WARM-UP EXERCISE: Welcome participants; Introductions; Talk about impact from Ivan. (personal & project) Discuss purpose of Focus Group; frank Answers. Assure them of confidentiality; permission for tape recording),

1. **Project identification/description:** name; where located; key area of focus; main objectives/desired outcomes/start and finish date.
2. **Project Selection:** How was project conceived or selected? How involved was community in determining which project was put forward? Were there any competing projects? (the issue of prioritisation) What was role of Community vs. role of UNDP Life Selection Committee in project selection? What was the interaction like between communities and UNDP Life? What was male/female involvement in the project at the community level?
3. **Project Design:** What was influence of community vs. UNDP Life's office in determining what the project looked like? Was respect shown both directions? (the community to UNDP Life, UNDP Life to the community?)
4. **Documentation:** What level of documentation was required by the UNDP Life office for approval of this project? Who did it? Was it too much/too little? What was the timeframe like for approval?
5. **Implementation process:** Describe the process of actual implementation of project! (step by step). Approval; leveraging funding support; work commencement; reporting of community to UNDP Life office; (including accounting information; work in progress; involvement of community-male vs. female contribution) What were the inputs from UNDP Life? Did you value these inputs? Were they efficiently utilized? Has the UNDP added value through its intervention?
6. **Other Participants:** Were there any other Institutional partners/agencies on this project? Who? What did they do?
7. **Evaluation of Partnership(s) in the project:** How well did partnerships work on this project? What were the contributing factors? What effect has it had on the community's range of contacts/possible partners?
8. **Evaluation of results vs Objectives:** How would you describe the results achieved from this project? How has community benefited? Have you achieved what you set out to do? If yes, what were main contributing factors? If not, what were main challenges? What have been the main Outcomes from the project? How is the community different now, compared to prior to the project?
9. **Main Learning Points:** Best practices; worst practices; how could it have been improved? What would you have done differently? Did any unrelated circumstances (circumstances outside of the scope of the project) affect the success/failure of the project? If so what were these?

10. Overall Satisfaction with Project and results: Final comments on

results /outcomes / benefits to community. (Quantitative on scale of 1 to 10?)

11. **Follow-up projects:** Has community done any follow-up projects/any other projects since the UNDP Life project? Are there any projects in the making? Has the association with UNDP Life helped/hindered your community in any way in making other contacts/partnerships/opening any doors? If so, describe what has happened.

Closing: Thanks Respondents

UNDP Life's Projects in Phases 3 & 4 (Status as at 2002 March)

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Durat- Ion	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
	Skills Training/Capacity Building						
1999	(i) Social Welfare Training Centre	Social Welfare Training Centre (SWTC)	4 months	2,459.41	2,459.41	Exposure to Participatory Panning tools and methodology	53 beneficiaries exposed to tools and methodology
2000	(ii) Social Welfare Training Centre	SWTC/ UWI Extra Mural	4 months	5,859.56	5,859.56	Training in PLA methodology, including community practicum in its working with community component of training for regional social work practitioners.	Skills acquisition; research materials & equipment acquired by SWTC; capacity building of SWTC to contribute to PLA methodology training in communities; exposure of community leaders to methodology in building community participation in their activities
1999	(iii) Bowerbank Decanting Centre	Windward Courts Provident Society	1 month	3,124.32	3,124.32	Hosting of community workshop in needs analysis of the community and development preparation of short and long term action plan with complementary partnership strategy	Documentation of community action plan
2000	(iv) Life Case Study	Bower Bank	8.5 days	2,693.70	2,693.70	Collection, collation and analysis of data	Report incorporating quantitative and qualitative analysis of the project context and background, the implementation process and achievements and impacts of the project
2002	(v) Boone Hall, St. Andrew	Boone Hall Citizens Association	6 months	2,420.90	1,966.91	Citizens Association refurbishing of meeting shed for continued use of meetings/training purposes	Meetings/training facility; consensus on community development initiative to address sanitation, environment health and security; institutionalization of community development plan
2002	(vi) Roy Edwards Training Centre	North Street United Church	3 months	25,531.91	4,365.14	Establishment of sustainable IT Training facility for urban youths; assist church bring IT facility into operation and be delivery point for IT Training	Start up of training programme in 2002; training facility in place with capacity to train at least 350 students annually
	(6)			<u>42,089.80</u>	<u>20,469.04</u>		

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Durat- Ion	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
	Community Development/Human Settlement						
1999	(i) Habitat for Humanity	Majesty Gardens	14 days	4,057..97	4,057..97	To expose participants to the tools of Participatory development	53 participants exposed to the methodology of participatory planning and development
1999	(ii) COMMAND	COMMAND	N/A	3,425.56	3,425.56	Services of consultant to prepare strategy proposal to bring marginalized communities into participatory development framework and a path to wealth creation	Recommended model of development for marginalized communities clearly indicating policy, programme, legal, sectoral framework and linkages required to marginalized communities into sustainable development framework
2003	(iii) Papine , St. Andrew	Papine Development Area Committee (PDAC)	1 year	34,653..00	21,617..00	Support to development of community tourism through construction of basic social amenities and facilities to accommodate proposed tourism activities for the Papine area	Healthier community for residents; employment generation for community inhabitants; as tour guide solutions for efforts in community tourism
2000	(iv) Life Case Study	Jeffrey Town	N/A	3,177..91	3,177..91	Collection, collation and analysis of data	Report incorporating qualitative and quantitative analyses of the project context and background; implementation process; and achievements and impact of the project
2003	(v) Temple Hall District, St. Andrew	Boswell Heights Citizens Association, NWA, SDC	N/A	N/A	Technical Assistance	Resource mobilization to construct foot bridge to accommodate passage of residents across the Wag Water along the Temple Hall Main Rd.	Provision of easy access for residents from main road to community
2000	(vi) Life Case Study	Majesty Gardens	8 days	2,820..82	2,820..82	Collection, collation and analysis of data	Report incorporating qualitative and quantitative analyses of the project context and background; implementation process; and achievements and impact of the project
2002	(vii) Cave Island	Cave Island Provident Society	1 year	25,000..00	25,000..00	Provident society in collaboration with NHDC to put infrastructure for sewerage treatment facility for site.	Settlement development planning to accommodate Cave Island squatters among others; planning of sewerage treatment

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Duration	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
2001	(viii) Middleton Farmers	Middleton Farmers Development Society	6 months	4,879..74	3,783.49	Relocation site for squatters/Provident Society members of Cave island Preservation/improvement of existing open-air facility used for community assembly-type activities; pavement of the Courtyard to make it more functional for community use	facility for proposed development; provision of affordable low income service lots for the Cave Island Provident Society members among others Retaining wall construction (30' by 10'); paved courtyard of the cultural centre; Venue for community-assembly type activities, including meetings
2001	(ix) Majesty Gardens CBO	Majesty Gardens Fishing Development Organisation	18 months	33,055.56	27,946..83	Thirteen (13) fishermen to repair 3 of their fishing vessels and add 10 new vessels to replace small and run-down units	Improved fishing capacity (13 (16' vessels)added to fleet and 1 engine; improved storage capacity (20 CU/FT deep freeze); improved marketing and business management through female assisted sales force & establishment of Fishing Development Organisation (100lb scale owned by the organization; members contribution scheme in place; CBO participating as wholesale buyer.;
2000	(x) Creative Production and TC	COMMAND, Greater Montego Bay Development Company		8,840..00	8,840..00	Documentary video of communities facing the challenges of urban management and development	Visual aided documentary by the Life Jamaica on issues, challenges and recommendations in the promotion of community participation toward the improvement of urban living conditions
	(10)			<u>119,910.56</u>	<u>100,669.58</u>		
	Sanitation/Environment Protection						
1999	(i) St. James Sanitation	COMMAND	N/A	25,461.54	25,461.54	Setting up of management for equipment pool; acquisition of equipment and tools; sanitation and environmental education	Equipment pool providing sustainable technical assistance services to low income households particularly to Provident Society members in St. James
2000	(ii) National Sanitation Task Force Workshop	Persons from government agencies, NGOs, CBOs	5 days	1,921.48	1,921.48	Hosting of planning sessions for the sanitation Policy Logical Framework and proposals to the EFJ	A National Sanitation Framework and Policy Proposal submitted to the EFJ

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Duration	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
2003	(iii) Content and Gibraltar, St. Ann	St. Catherine Development Agency (SCDA), NWC, WRA, MWH	1 year	69,564.00	35,525.00	Improvement to health, nutrition, and sanitation conditions of older persons living in targeted communities in St. Catherine	Construction/installation of plastic tanks for water storage; backyard gardening; environmental education and personal hygienic awareness
2001	(iv) PEPA	Portland Parish Development	10 months	65,717.00	9,261.21	Address garbage collection and clean drains an integral part of the road system of the town usually containing unsightly garbage	Advocacy for more scheduled and adequate garbage collection; advocacy for provision of more receptacles; mini-clean-up of designated communities; environmental education and planning with emphasis on solid waste management etc.
2003	(v) Rae Town Fishing Village	Rae Town Fishing Cooperative Society Ltd, NEPA, NWSMA, NWC, EFJ	1 year	18,188.00	10,878.00	Reduction of environmental threats to Coop's plans for diversifying beach activities to include entertainment with restaurant facility. Project will also provide face-lift to fishing facility and upgrade management capacity to sustain fishing as major source of income to community	Face-lift to fishing complex to make it more customer-friendly and environmentally safe; pursuit of value-added activity to include sale of fish; improved sanitation and environment health practices
1999	(vi) Drewsland Sanitation Project	Building Together Citizens Association	1 year	49,213.89	25,000.00	Improvement of environmental conditions by construction of basic sanitary facilities for dwellings; cleaning of Sandy Gully and provision of environmental education and proper health practices	Construction of 30 sanitary facilities to complement shelter solution; increased sanitary awareness; training of persons to observe recommended standards for construction of safe sanitary facilities; comprehensive solution to address sanitation problems in the community
	(6)			<u>230,065.91</u>	<u>108,047.23</u>		
	Institutionalisation of LIFE						

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Duration	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
	(i) Life Strategic Alignment Workshop	Members of Life NSC and stakeholders	3 days	1,043.58	1,043.58	Hosting of Decision Workshop to review the following documents to arrive at frame of reference within which to discern Life's future positioning (i) Strategic Options towards Sustainability (1999 November); (ii) Jamaica Life report, 1999; (iii) Global Life Report, 1999 (iv) Life Phase IV Proposal	Alignment among participants on the critical issues that define Life's future; Consideration of a set of factors relative to the key issues (financial, work programmes, locational etc); schedule of activities to be pursued, including timeframe and responsibilities
	(ii) Life Community Organisation Workshop	Representatives of 20 community organizations benefiting from Life's projects	3 days	1,972.23	1,972.23	Hosting of workshop to forge/strengthen partnerships between agencies established to support community development with which Life has worked over the years	Community representatives expected to identify resources needed for long term development; resources available and names; build a network of contacts in community with similar goals; identify immediate action steps to enable community to realize its vision of development and lay the groundwork for long term partnerships with other communities and agencies
	(iii) Life Strategic Work Plan	Members of Life's National Selection Committee and Partners	3.5 days	1,112.25	1,112.25	Develop specific activities relative to the strategies, objectives and actions emanating from the programme evaluation; assign responsibilities and establish timeframes; determine resource requirements and prepare budget	A work plan toward Phase IV implementation, institutionalization and sustainability of the Life Project
	(iv) Project Development Services and Associates	UNDP Life	8 weeks	5,573.39	5,573.39	Self sufficiency plan	Self sufficiency plan: Executive Summary; Introduction and background; Project Description; Plan for Sustainable Income Generation; marketing Plan; Capacity Analysis, including Critical Success factors; 5 Year Financial Plan based on Sustainable Income and Conclusions
	(v) Beryl Ennis (Attny. At Law)...pending	UNDP Life	6 weeks	2,426.61	2,426.61	Work related to providing the legal framework/Memorandum and Articles of Association within which	Legal Framework/ Memorandum and Articles of Association

Year	Project Name	Organisations Involved	Duration	Total Cost (\$)	LIFE Grant (\$)	Description	Key Results
	(vi) LIFE Strategic Planning Exercise	Members of Life National Selection Committee	1 day	1,621.62	1,621.62	the organization will carry out its mandate within the Jamaican Company Law	Report on Life's Strategic Options
	(vii) Evaluation of UNDP Life	UNDP Life		8,000.00	8,000.00		
	(6)			<u>22,749.68</u>	<u>22,749.68</u>		
	Child Survival/Trauma Intervention (i) Chichibud Ltd	Chichibud Ltd	3 days	5,481.26	2,104.80	Setting up of camp to engage 300 children in activities of art and craft, dance, drama, gardening, counseling and a field trip to help children to deal with stress associated with the trauma experienced	Production of art and craft work that may be used to assess the level of training among the children; interaction with persons both within and outside the immediate area who are willing and capable of showing care and to be part of a team to continue to work with the children; the camp will help the children to feel energized and ready to begin a new school year
	(1)			<u>5,481.26</u>	<u>5,481.26</u>		
	Total----- (29			<u>420,297.21</u>	<u>250,216.79</u>		

FOCUS AREA/SECTOR ALLOCATION

Training/Capacity Building

Capacity Building/Empowerment
Training/Capacity Building
Capacity Building/Empowerment
Training/Restoration of Training Facility
Computer Skills Training

Community Development

Community Development
Comm. Social & Economic Development, Water Management
Water Safety/Community Access Human Settlement (TA)
Comm. Development / Human Settlement, Land Acquisition
Comm. Development / Sustainable Livelihood, Community / Environment Protection

Sanitation

Sanitation Policy and Framework
Health, Nutrition, Sanitation/Residents
Solid Waste/Environmental Protection
Solid Waste / Environment. Management & Community Economic Enterprise
Drewsland Sanitation and Environmental Protection Project

Institutionalisation of Life

Institutionalisation of Life
Sustainability/Institutionalisation of Life
Sustainability/Institutionalisation of Life
Institutionalisation of Life

Child Survival/Trauma Intervention

ChiChibud Ltd

Appendix 5

Documents Consulted

Brochures, Documents on ChiChibud Ltd.: A Jamaican Educational NGO;

Business Plan for UNDP Life programme (2001 August) prepared by Project Development Services Associates Ltd.;

Jamaica: Life Programme – National Evaluation Report., 1999 September by Marlene Fernandes;

Life Brochures: Empowering Communities for a Better Life

Life Global Programme: Strengthening Participatory Local Governance

Phase IV Global Progress Report, May 2001 – November 2003. Prepared for the 2003 GAC Meeting – LIFE/DDG/BDP/UNDP

Life Global Programme: Strengthening Participatory Local Governance
Phase IV Country Report, May 2001 – November 2003. Prepared for the 2003 GAC Meeting – LIFE/DDG/BDP/UNDP

Life Project Matrix as at 2002 March 25

Project Proposal Summary: Institutionalisation and Sustainability of Life

Project Document: UNDP-Jam/97/004/A/01/99 – Support to Life Programme

Report on Technical Assistance to UNDP Life programme, Jamaica, prepared by Caribbean Technological Consultant Network Services Ltd/CDB (Richard Lumsden study)
Report of Terminal Tripartite Meeting: 2002 March 26 for period 1999 December – 2002 December

Small Scale Projects: Analytical Case Studies (Guide to Case Study Preparation)

Fact Sheet: LIFE – Services available to support Local Initiatives;

The Role of Civil Society CBOs/NGOs in Decentralised Governance in Asian
Review of Public Administration, Vol. xii, No. 1 (January –June 2000) by Grant, Shelia.

UNDP Life Project Update to UNOPS for period June 2002 to December 2002. Prepared for National Project Selection Committee and Project Secretariat (2003 June 30);

Workshop Report, Strategy Alignment prepared by Caribbean Applied Technological Centre (CATC), Richard Lumsden

Miscellaneous Internet Documents

Appendix 6

Persons Met/Consulted and Meetings Held

Members of the Steering Committee

- Mr. Trevor Spence, Chairman
- Dr. David Smith, UNDP
- Mrs. Winsome Wilkins, CVSS/UWJ
- Mrs. Shelia Grant, National Coordinator, LIFE
- Mrs. Simone Lawrence-Norton, PIOJ
- Mr. Albert Daley, (formerly EFJ)
- Mrs. Winsome Townsend, NEPA
- Ms. Velva Lawrence, (formerly Life)
- Mrs. Shelia Nicholson, PACT
- Mrs. Karen McDonald Gayle, USAID
- Mr. Ian Gage, MW& H

Beneficiaries

- Ms. Marva McKnight, Boone hall Citizens Association
- Richard Lumsden, Consultant (Institutionalisation of Life)
- Mrs. Rebecca Tortella, ChiChibud Ltd
- Mr. Glenroy Lattery, Portmore Gardens Community Association
- Mr. Lincoln Williams, Social Welfare Training Centre (SWTC)

Focus Group Members

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| ▪ Mrs. Maudlin Buttler | Secretary, Bosswell Heights Citizens Association |
| ▪ Mr. Noel Ellis | VP, Bosswell Heights Citizens Association |
| ▪ Ms. Beatrice Miller | Majesty Gardens Fishing Development Organisation |
| ▪ Mr. Wayne Bernard | VP, Majesty Gardens Fishing Development Org. |
| ▪ Mr. Newton LeeSingh | Chairman – Rae Town Fishing Cooperative |
| ▪ Mr. Vincent Gordon | Secretary/Manager– Rae Town Fishing Cooperative |

Others

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| ▪ Dr. Noel Watson | Project Coordinator, UNDP Civic Dialogue Project |
|-------------------|--|