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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) Jamaica Country Office initiated its Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project in 2002, following a series of consultations throughout the country and internationally. With the project having run for three years, and the UNDP investigating the possibility of initiating a new Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme, the Country Office considered it an opportune time to evaluate the Civic Dialogue Project. Therefore an evaluation team was commissioned to research and develop a report between October 18 and November 14, 2005.

Evaluation Methodology and Report Design

The evaluation consisted of a two-week data collection period, running October 18-31, followed by two weeks for writing and analysis. It included of a process review, to assess the overall design and effectiveness of the project, and a client survey, looking at the level of satisfaction and impact on those involved with the project.

The results of these two components have been integrated into this full report, including the following chapters:

- Chapter I: Project Context and Situational Analysis
- Chapter II: Project Conceptualisation, Design, and Implementation
- Chapter III: Project Impact
- Chapter IV: Overall Findings
- Chapter V: Recommendations

Project Context and Situational Analysis

Jamaica has a population of approximately 2.6 million people and is a country endowed with a wealth of natural resources, and a people who are known worldwide for their creative and enterprising spirit. Despite low levels of economic growth over many years, Jamaica has had good social indicators and, according to the World Bank\(^1\), has made substantial progress in poverty reduction since it began monitoring living conditions in 1988.

While there are such positives however, Jamaica nonetheless faces enormous socio-economic and political challenges, which threaten to undermine its gains and plunge the country into deep crisis. Its designation as a middle-income country masks underlying challenges including low economic output, high levels of crime, violence and social alienation, and staggeringly high debt to GDP ratios.

---

The information presented above suggests that while Jamaica may be at a crossroad, the options for its future direction are at least three-fold – to remain on the current path indefinitely, descend into an abyss of social disorder or consciously turning to a path of change, renewal and sustainable development. Critical interventions are therefore needed to ensure the country makes effective choices for the future.

**Project Conceptualisation, Design, and Implementation**

This project was designed to use the Civic Scenario Model, one that has been used in countries such as South Africa and Guatemala to help leaders from across existing divides engage in dialogue to develop a common vision for their future. Using this model, the Civic Dialogue Project has defined its desired outcome as “a vibrant culture of democratic governance that guarantees political participation, poverty reduction and social equity.” It also has six intended outputs, which include:

1. Increased and improved civic dialogue process
2. Learning History of the Project produced
3. Targeted research papers produced in support of the process
4. Leadership capacity for all dialogue participants strengthened
5. Nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process
6. Policy/Strategy Formulation and other upstream activities

Between July 2002 and January 2004, the project engaged thirty-six leaders from a broad cross section of the country in a series of five workshops to develop a set of scenarios for their future. These scenarios were then used as a tool for spreading dialogue to build a national vision, throughout the country.

The scenario development workshops took place mostly as planned, producing not only four scenarios for how the country might develop, but also laying the groundwork for the rest of the project through the formation of a project Secretariat and Steering Committee. The project also commissioned a Social Marketing Plan to guide future engagements. Since February of 2004, the project has held dialogue engagements with a range of stakeholders throughout the country.

However, there were several factors that weakened the project’s implementation. They included insufficient analysis of the difference between Jamaica and other countries that had used the Civic Scenario Model when designing expected outcomes, inadequate planning at different phases of the project, and a questionable conceptual approach to engaging communities. In addition, the project was challenged by a shift from dialogue to community service provision activities. This resulted in a rapidly increasing workload that fell largely on a Secretariat that had not been specifically hired to run dialogue engagements, and difficulty mobilising funding to support the project.

**Project Impact**

---

2 Ibid. Pg. 18
Through the course of its activities, the project has directly engaged nearly 7000 people from across Jamaica. This has included the original Leadership Forum, as well as three segments of the population as a whole, which this report has identified as Governance Actors, Organisational Actors, and Community Actors. The majority of these people have participated in scenario based dialogue sessions, with a total of 38% participating in more than one event, and 10% being repeatedly engaged in the project.\(^4\)

Using a dialogue evaluation framework and a social capital framework, the evaluation has assessed the impact of the project at each phase of engagement. Through all of these engagements, the two groups most impacted were the Leadership Forum and the community groups with whom the project most deeply engaged. The Leadership Forum scenario process was the most systematic dialogue process in the project, and it resulted in changed perceptions, improved relationships and a common vision for Jamaica, embodied by the scenarios produced. The process also created new social capital among members that would not otherwise have been in contact. The community groups with whom the project engaged benefited through practical support the Secretariat provided them to address needs they had identified. These interactions also generated strong social capital, particularly embodied in the formation of the Kingston and St. Andrew Action Forum, representing 40 communities.

The project has also engaged with a range of Governance and Organisational Actors, but has not succeeded in translating these into policy level impact, or formalised strategic partnerships. That, in combination with the fact that the communities the project has deeply engaged with have been located only in Kingston & St. Andrew, means that the project has failed to achieve a national impact. In addition, the lack of a clear strategy for engagement and monitoring and evaluation has meant that the impact that has been achieved has been largely unplanned.

**Overall Findings**

Through the evaluation, a number of key themes emerged. These include:

- A consensus among people interviewed about the project’s potential to impact critical challenges in Jamaica, contrasted by highly divergent perceptions of the project’s achievement of that potential to date. This divide has been between those that have emphasized the value of the project’s current achievements, particularly in providing services and building social capital; and those that feel the project has drifted from its original objectives.

- That despite the effective use of the Civic Scenario Model within the Leadership Forum, an overall weak conceptualisation and design of the project has led to a drift in project scope away from proactively promoting a national vision. Insufficient consideration of how the model fits into the Jamaican context, a vague initial project design, and a lack of rigour in planning and executing the

\(^4\) Data and classification by level of engagement provided up the Civic Dialogue Secretariat. Segmentation done by the evaluation team.
engagement phases caused the project to become reactive to its environment, and disproportionately focussed at the community level.

- That project implementation, while driven by a highly dedicated Secretariat, has been weakened by gaps in participation, strategic planning, and appropriate skills. Because the Secretariat was initially formed to support the Leadership Forum in implementing the project, it was not prepared for the burden of driving the process, particularly as its activities moved to the community level.

- The project has produced some significant impacts within the Leadership Forum and at the community level, but has had difficulty influencing decision makers and other key national actors.

- A lack of effective monitoring and evaluation has weakened the project’s capacity for quality control and made it difficult to prove the impacts it has achieved.

- The project has had a number of learning experiences since it was launched that have yet to be fully examined for the use of policy makers, development workers, and other dialogue practitioners.

Overall, the project has had a mixed record of achievement against its original outputs. It has run a successful scenario design process that produced a meaningful impact among its participants, and was supported by research activities and the development of a Project History. Thus in the scenario design period of the project, it did achieve outputs 1 through 3 (increased an improved civic dialogue process, learning history produced, and targeted research papers produced). Since it began the engagement phases, however, the project has not used a systematic approach to dialogue within communities. It has also not succeeded in effectively communicating the dialogue process nationally, and has failed to produce a substantive impact on policy formulation. Thus output 4 (leadership capacity strengthened for all dialogue participants) has been achieved in the limited number of communities that were deeply engaged in the project and outputs 5 and 6 (nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process, policy/strategy formulation) have largely not been achieved.

Despite these failures, however, the project has demonstrated a capacity to develop social capital across party, class, and gender lines. Particularly given Jamaica’s on-going local government reforms and the upcoming release of a national security strategy, this capacity means the project has a real potential to have a broader impact in the future. Achieving that potential, however, will require some significant changes in the project.

**Recommendations**

The evaluation therefore recommends that the project:

1. **Redefine its objectives and strategy for achieving them.** Based on the project’s strengths and weaknesses to date, its future objectives should include a more explicit aim of building social capital; a direct focus on strengthening on-going
government reform efforts in the areas of local government and security; and a shift towards capacity building to strengthen existing communication processes in Jamaica rather than directly running its own dialogues.

2. **Solidify its organisational structure and strengthen delivery capacity by bringing in new skills.** This requires clarifying the roles of each of the groups involved in the project, clearly placing the project as one component of a larger Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme, and repositioning the project as nationally, rather than directly executed.

3. **Build into its activities a culture of reflection and lesson learning.** This requires the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems, the holding of periodic monitoring and evaluation meetings that engage a range of stakeholders, and a more concerted effort to write about and capture lessons learned.

4. **Implement a time-bound process for institutionalising the project as a Nationally Executed Project.** This should include a self-assessment and transition-planning period that is supported by an outside facilitator and solicits broad participation. It should then be followed by an implementation period, which culminates within a year with the project becoming nationally executed.
INTRODUCTION

Background

The United Nations Development Programme’s (UNDP) Jamaica Country Office initiated its Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project (from now referred to as the “Civic Dialogue Project,” or “the project”) in 2002, following a series of consultations throughout the country and internationally. Based on the Civic Scenario Model, that has previously been used in countries such as South Africa and Guatemala, the project was intended to respond to a perception that the country was at a “crossroads” by initiating a process to help stakeholders develop a new vision for Jamaica. Since its inception, the project has convened a cross-section of Jamaicans to dialogue, first forming a Leadership Forum of thirty-six people to develop a set of scenarios for the country’s future and then through a series of engagements across the country. These engagements have led to a range of activities, the emergence of a new group, the Kingston and St. Andrew Action Forum, and recently a public project launch event held in July of 2005.

With the project currently having run for three years, and the UNDP investigating the possibility of initiating a new Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme, the Country Office considered it an opportune time to evaluate the Civic Dialogue Project. The objectives of the evaluation as stated in the terms of reference were to:

- Examine the extent to which the objectives of the Project have been met to date.
- Examine whether participants have developed an effective capacity for dialogue at each phase of the process and identify the capacity gaps that need to be strengthened
- Examine the levels of ownership developed through the dialogue
- Examine the impact of the Pilot Phase of the Project on the communities that have been exposed to the dialogue and on the lives of those that have been involved in the process.
- Assess the entry points for a broader Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme.
- Recommend a strategy for implementing phase II under the framework of the Community Transformation and Peace Building (CTPB)\(^5\)

This report details the evaluation team’s findings.

Evaluation Methodology and Report Design

The evaluation consisted of a two-week data collection period, October 18-31, followed by two weeks for writing and analysis. Data collection techniques have consisted of a full review of project documentation; analysis of project promotional material, both by

\(^5\) See Annexure A for the full Terms of Reference
the evaluation team and through a focus group that it ran; analysis of project participation, output, and financial statistics, individual interviews with over fifty people involved in the project, and group interviews with several bodies involved in the project. The evaluation has consisted of a process review, meant to assess the overall design and effectiveness of the project, with a purpose of making suggestions for the future implementation of the project. It has also included a client survey, looking at the level of satisfaction of and impact on those involved with the project.

The results of these two components have been integrated into this full report, including the following chapters:

**Chapter I: Project Context and Situational Analysis**- This chapter introduces the Jamaican context where this project has been implemented, identifying key trends and challenges for the country. In doing so, it provides a basis for understanding approaches, perspectives, successes and challenges throughout the project.

**Chapter II: Project Conceptualisation, Design, and Implementation**- This chapter presents a number of the findings under the process review, describing how it was initially designed, how it unfolded, and what decisions were made in response to environmental challenges. It also explains the institutional framework in which the project has been placed, showing how that has impacted the project’s evolution. Finally, it describes some of the overall implementation issues that affected the project.

**Chapter III: Project Impact**- This chapter primarily focuses on the results of the client survey, discussing the impact of the project. In doing so, it proposes a number of approaches to examining impact in this project, provides a segmentation of the clients impacted, and then presents the impact achieved for each client segment.

**Chapter IV: Overall Findings**- This chapter summarises the ultimate findings of the evaluation, providing concluding thoughts on both the process and client components. In doing so, it attempts to frame the final recommendations of the evaluation team.

**Chapter V: Recommendations**- This chapter provides a set of steps for how the project can improve itself going forward. In doing so, it provides recommendations for how the project can fit within a larger Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme.

---

6 See Annexures B and C for a full list of people interviewed and documentation reviewed.
CHAPTER I: PROJECT CONTEXT AND SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

As will be discussed further in the project design chapter, the Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project is based on a Civic Scenario Project model. It was introduced to Jamaica on the premise that the success of scenario planning process in creating a major transformation in situations of crisis in South Africa in 1991-1992 and Guatemala 1997-2001; would also succeed in creating a major shift in Jamaica, which was thought to be in a “pre-crisis” situation. Particular issues it hoped to address, while trying to create a vision for Jamaica included crime and violence, unemployment, and corruption.

An evaluation of the Civic Dialogue Project in Jamaica must therefore be placed within the context of the specificities of the social, economic, political and cultural realities of the country, as a prerequisite for understanding the project’s intended effect and impact.

Situational Analysis

Jamaica has a population of approximately 2.6 million people and is a country endowed with a wealth of natural resources, and a people who are known worldwide for their creative and enterprising spirit. With an area of 11,244 square kilometres, it is the third largest island in the Caribbean after Cuba and Hispaniola. It is ranked as a middle income country with medium levels of human development as measured by the UNDP Human Development Index.7

Despite low levels of economic growth over many years, Jamaica has had good social indicators particularly as these relate to, inter alia, life expectancy (73 at birth), adult literacy (79.9 percent) primary and secondary school enrolment (high 90s) and immunization (over 90% ages 6-59 months and over 80% ages 1-4 years+).8

According to the World Bank9 Jamaica has made substantial progress in poverty reduction since it began monitoring living conditions in 1988. And, according to the Bank, between 1989 and 2001, Jamaica’s poverty headcount ratio declined from 30.5 percent to 16.8 percent. By 2004 the ratio had fallen to 16.1 percent (PIOJ 2004)10

There have been improvements too in the institutions for and practice of democratic governance with the passage of key legislation with respect to, among other things, Access To Information, anti-corruption in the public sector, significant electoral reform, the creation of the offices of Public Defender and Political Ombudsman. There has also

---

7 The UNDP Human Development Report 2004 ranked Jamaica as 79 out of 177.
been a deepening of participation in decision-making through multi-stakeholder consultations and the creation of bodies such as the Parish Development Committees that emerged as part of the Reform of Local Government, and which are in some instances being effective.

While there are such positives, Jamaica nonetheless faces enormous socio-economic and political challenges, which threaten to undermine its gains and plunge the country into deep crisis. Its designation as a middle income country masks underlying challenges including low economic output, high levels of crime, violence and social alienation and staggeringly high debt to GDP ratios.

Jamaica’s *Medium Term Socioeconomic Policy Framework 2004-2007* (2004)\(^\text{11}\) indicates that debt payment as statutory expenditure is a first charge on the budget and, with two-thirds of the country’s debt being domestic, domestic interest rate payment was 34% of the government’s total expenditures and 54% of tax revenues for the period April-October 2003. Foreign debt interest payment was approximately 60% of GDP due to exchange rate levels. These levels of interest payments severely constrain funds to meet national development needs - provide and maintain social and physical infrastructure and to afford some basic goods and services. Growth has been slow and sluggish at best.

**B. Real GDP Growth 1994 – 2003 (Percent)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: PIOJ; Medium Term Socioeconomic Policy Framework 2004-2007; 2004; p13*

Meanwhile, Jamaica’s designation as a middle income country has meant losses in access to, and reduced flows in, Overseas Development Assistance (ODA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ODA flows to Jamaica (US$ million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Country Evaluation : Assessment of Development Results- Jamaica; UNDP*\(^\text{12}\)

Like other small island, developing states, Jamaica is vulnerable to natural disasters – most frequently hurricanes, and has experienced over the past fourteen years, repeated episodes of severe flooding causing damage to infrastructure and crops. Jamaica has

---

\(^{11}\) PIOJ; *Medium Term Socioeconomic Policy Framework 2004-2007*; 2004; p17

\(^{12}\) UNDP; *Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results- Jamaica*; 2004; p 21
been hit by hurricanes of varying intensity between 1998 and 2005 along with other tropical depressions and storms this has resulted in significant flooding and severe infrastructural damage - setting back a number of areas of the economy. Besides the negative impact on the economy, these disasters often disrupt educational institutions for weeks, destabilise households particularly among the rural and urban poor, and wreak havoc on the environment already stressed by deforestation and coastal water pollution.

The economy of Jamaica is also vulnerable to external shocks and developments globally. Characterized as open, import dependent and vulnerable, the economy is largely dependent on tourism, bauxite mining, agriculture, light manufacturing, and an expanding service sector for its mainstay. Developments such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11, rising oil prices, radical changes in sugar and banana regimes with trading partners in the European Union, and WTO rulings with respect to quotas and other preferential arrangements threaten Jamaica’s economy and have resulted in significant job losses, particularly in the agricultural sector.

Among the most pressing challenges Jamaica faces however, is the high incidence of crime and violence. As youth, particularly young males, become disenchanted and alienated, so have antisocial activities increased. The World Bank report *Jamaica – The Road To Sustained Growth (2003)*\(^{13}\) indicates that crime is costing Jamaica at least 4 percent of its GDP, including lost production, health expenses, and public and private spending on security. According to the report, poor employment prospects, and a high crime rate, have encouraged high rates of migration, though the figures have been trending downwards due to tighter immigration procedures and policies, particularly in the United States and the UK.

It has therefore been a difficult and delicate balancing act for the governments and people of Jamaica, to recognise and sustain the pockets of progress in political, economic and social indicators, while holding at bay, a rising tide of social disconnection and alienation.

**Erosion of Social Capital**

Political tribalism, crime and violence, the psycho-social pressures of urbanisation and high density housing; a historical legacy of social stratification based on class, skin colour/shade, as well as significant gender inequalities; have contributed to an erosion in social capital - the networks, norms and trust between individuals, communities, community level social organizations and households, that facilitate mutually beneficial cooperation.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\)“Jamaica The Road To Sustained Growth; Country Economic Memorandum”; World Bank Report No.26088-JM; Latin American and Caribbean Region, December 4, 2003

Internecine “warfare” is common between and within communities separated initially by political allegiances and more recently by gangs, which control and fiercely defend turf. With a State in retreat following years of low social spending, demonstrations and road blocks have become commonplace as citizens try to get needed services from a seemingly distant and slow-moving state. Periodically, there is widespread public protest and rioting.

**THE JAMAICA GLEANER – APRIL 20, 1999**

**Nation unites in protest**

* Burning debris on Olympic Way in St. Andrew - Rudolph Brown

* This bulldozer was involved in the cleaning-up process along Mountain View Avenue in St. Andrew - Junior Dowie

**THE STREETS** of Jamaica were filled with rage yesterday as protest against the hike in gas prices turned ugly resulting in roadblocks, fires, looting and vandalism.

**90 arrested in day-long protests**

Glenroy Sinclair, Staff Reporter

* This was the scene off Spanish Town Road in the vicinity of the Passport Office yesterday morning. - Rudolph Brown

Many might ask then, what keeps Jamaica back from sustained social upheaval and anarchy? How is it that while the atmosphere in the country might get tense and charged with anger, fear and anxiety, for much of the time people still go about their daily lives as usual?

Though anyone looking on at the events of April 1999 would be right in thinking that Jamaica was or is on the verge of a social explosion of a magnitude and type that would severely cripple the country’s future; it is instructive that, some six years later, things remain much the same. At the same time as there are dire circumstances, there are a multitude of factors that keep the seemingly ‘inevitable’ at bay and which give rise to the phenomenon of multiple ‘worlds’ co-existing. This situation results in significant differences in people’s sense of urgency, and their willingness and capacity to be agents of change.

The Paradox: Social Alienation Alongside High levels of Social Organization and Interventions in Jamaica

A key ingredient in the glue that holds Jamaica’s fragile social fabric together has been the long-standing and deep tradition of voluntary service and mutual aid. The Jamaica Human Development Report 2000 in outlining the role of civil society, indicates that;

The voluntary sector has been active in Jamaica since immediately after emancipation… it has played an important, albeit changing role in the society, as the functions and responsibilities of the State have changed. Two traditions of voluntary action have guided civil society since the 19th century; a welfare tradition…and the tradition of self-help…”

The JHDR notes that surveys conducted by the Association of Development Agencies, the PIOJ and the Social Development Commission (SDC) indicate that there are between 200-300 NGOs and between 1800 and 3,000 community based organisations. There are groups meeting the needs of children, women, youth, males, the elderly, groups providing services in education and training, health, recreation, employment, disaster response, peace building and justice. There are citizens’ associations, community development councils and neighbourhood watch groups.

On the negative side, in some of the most marginalized, politically homogenous communities, the state has been replaced by the largess and protection of the Don (local strong men or gang leaders) who like legitimate civil society groups, provides for a myriad of needs of people, thus ensuring strong community support even while they are feared. These situations however, represent a small minority of Jamaican communities, as for the most part, communities depend on the majority of honest and hardworking people who help each other to survive.

The JHDR 2000 points out that;

15 Jamaica Human Development Report; PIOJ-UNDP; 2002; p114
...in tackling challenges facing the society, it is recognised that the existence of active networks among civil society organizations can make a major contribution to the promotion of human development. Civic networks also facilitate the political, economic and social collaboration essential to effective governance. The range of groups...bring people together around common concerns, providing mechanisms to contribute to an improved quality of life at both the community and national levels.(p114-115)

The efforts of the people and governments in Jamaica have been supported by corporate philanthropy and by the huge inflows of support from Jamaicans living abroad whose remittances serve families and wider communities. Internal remittances (urban to rural, visiting relatives) and external remittances are a significant factor in Jamaicans’ survival. Indeed, external remittances are the ‘flip side’ of the brain drain effect of migration. According to the World Bank\(^\text{16}\), between 1995 and 2001 private remittance inflows to Jamaica grew at an average rate of nearly 8 percent per annum in US dollars, due in part to the rapid growth in remittance companies offering an efficient and secure means of transferring money to Jamaica.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Postal System</th>
<th>Financial System</th>
<th>Remittance Companies</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>178.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>612.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>408.0</td>
<td>228.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>652.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>387.3</td>
<td>253.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>661.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>370.2</td>
<td>283.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>677.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>334.6</td>
<td>453.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>814.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>372.5</td>
<td>566.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>965.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bank Of Jamaica

Also supporting the process has been International Development Partners (IDPs), some of which, like UNDP, have been in Jamaica since the 1960s. Both the Government of Jamaica and Civil Society Organizations have received funding and technical assistance for carrying out projects related to areas such as HIV/AIDS, health – including adolescent reproductive health, gender and development, hurricane recovery efforts, environmental preservation, roads, water, sanitation, violence reduction and peace building, poverty reduction and social safety nets, legal reform, community development, training and employment. Among the projects that have been implemented in the last ten years, and the IDPs supporting them, are the following.

**Selected IDPs & Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IADB   | Citizens’ Security and Justice Programme  
Parish Infrastructure Development Program  
Kingston Urban Renewal Project (KURP)  
Kingston Water and Sanitation Programme  
National Irrigation Development |

\(^\text{16}\) World Bank; “Growth and Poverty Reduction in Jamaica”; p45 as at website http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/LAC/LAC.nsf/0/12c128ba971c348a85256e0400684eb9/$FILE/Ch1%204Dé2011%20Gray%20Cover.pdf
Aside from meeting physical, social and economic needs, there have also been initiatives that address relationships, values and attitudes, and creating a personal and/or community vision. Such initiatives include

- Partners For Peace – a group comprised of leaders from a number of urban, inner-city communities
- Jamaica Chamber of Commerce Inner-City Leadership Committee
- Transformation Jamaica – a network of professionals and community leaders providing transformational leadership and visioning workshops for community groups
- Change From Within – a programme implemented in schools, in collaboration with the University of the West Indies

To be added to these are the many other efforts of agencies such as the Jamaica Social Investment Fund and the Social Development Commission, faith-based groups and other state and non-state actors. These activities serve as a support base for persons at the micro level and also for the government as it struggles to afford to meet development needs after meeting debt obligations.

It is still the case that the many initiatives taking place island-wide – whether by government, IDPs and/or civil society, are discrete activities and the many actors often are unaware of each other and of what each is doing. The need for collaboration and partnerships is becoming better recognised and among IDPs, Government agencies and NGOs there are increasing efforts to forge linkages to enable more far-reaching and sustainable results and impact.
It can be said that the many initiatives to address social, economic, physical and political development in Jamaica create an enabling environment for a project that seeks to foster a national vision and to be a catalyst for the actions needed to realise that vision, assuming that such a project linked closely with existing actors.

But, there are too, some factors that can hinder the realisation of such goals, many of which were identified as challenges to this project in the evaluation process. These include:

- **High levels of cynicism** – Jamaicans from all walks of life are cynical about the future and the possibility for lasting change. While much is taking place that seek to make a difference in people’s lives, change is slow and many initiatives have fallen far short of their objectives. This has contributed to a sense of futility and to a kind of ‘consultation fatigue’. Also, disappointment in the quality of political representation has resulted in deep disaffection with the political process.

- **Dependency Syndrome** – One of the results of a political culture of patronage has been a strong tendency towards dependence among citizens especially among those who live in poor and vulnerable communities. There has developed a ‘learned helplessness’ in which there is an expectation of ‘being done ‘for’ by the powers that be. In such situations there is little experience of mobilising one’s own individual and community assets (and limited awareness of having assets) and little experience with community cooperation and self-help.

- **A culture of blame** – A central theme in discussions about the national condition is that of blame and this blame is usually directed at some entity other than self. Few take responsibility for what is and for creating what could be.

- **Desire for instant gratification** – Perhaps as a result of the extent of need and of the high levels of awareness about living standards of developed countries, there is, especially among the youth, little patience with the slow-moving and painstaking approach to achieving an improved quality of life.

**Implications for Transforming the Current Context**

The information presented above suggests that while Jamaica may be at a crossroad, the options for its future direction are at least three-fold: to remain on the current path indefinitely, descend into an abyss of social disorder or consciously turning to a path of change, renewal and sustainable development.

These multiple futures result from the fact that alongside the acute challenges are other realities and differences in experiences of Jamaicans due to such factors as class position, urban as opposed to rural life, and so on. Sustained and coordinated attention to critical types of interventions could bring about the much desired sustainable future.

---

17These issues were discussed repeatedly in individual interviews. They were also raised during the evaluation team’s meeting with the Steering Committee, 27/10/2005. They are also referenced in the project history: Tacito Nobre. “Civic Dialogue Governance Project, Jamaica: Project History”. December 2003. Pg. 10 – 11.
as there already exists much of the requisite skills, knowledge, activities and strategies to enable such an outcome. Critical interventions and approaches are needed to

- Close the gaps between the different worlds and remove the barriers that have come to prevent Jamaicans from different walks of life from getting to know, appreciate and support each other
- Foster collaboration and bring together initiatives that have similar objectives and goals for impacting human, social, economic, political and/or community development, for the purposes of collaboration, sharing of lessons and pooling of resources
- Support and promote self-help initiatives
- Build on existing efforts so that they are strengthened and expanded
- Inspire and galvanise a national movement for change

This evaluation identifies the extent to which the Civic Dialogue Project has been and/or is able to be a catalyst for positive national change.
CHAPTER II: PROJECT CONCEPTUALISATION, DESIGN, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Having looked at the overall Jamaican context in which the Civic Dialogue project was placed, it is possible to examine more specifically the project as it was designed and implemented.

This chapter will discuss the conceptual development of this project and trace how it evolved over time. In doing so, it will describe the Civic Scenario model employed by the project, discussing case studies where it has previously been used. It will then compare the Jamaican context to those case studies as it traces the project through four distinct phases. Before closing, it will describe some crosscutting implementation issues that have affected the project. Finally, it will provide some overall conclusions about project design, discussing how design issues contributed to the project results.

The Civic Scenario Model

This project was designed to use the Civic Scenario Model, developed by Generon Consulting, Inc. and based on corporate scenario planning techniques. According to Generon Consulting:

*The purpose of a civic scenario project is to build the leadership to change the course of a country’s history. A group of influential leaders—a microcosm of the society, representing all the principal stakeholders—work together to uncover what has happened, is happening, might happen, and should happen in their country, and what they must do—what they cannot not do—to enact that vision. Through a structured process of action and reflection, with each other and with other societal leaders, they build the shared understanding and commitment necessary to bring forth a better future.*

---

19 Ibid, 4-5.
The Board of Directors in turn forms a Leadership Forum, consisting of 25 influential persons, possessing the capacity to create change and representing a broad cross section of the society. These members of the Leadership Forum participate in the project on an unofficial basis, and through a series of four workshops, develop potential scenarios for their country’s future. Between and after these workshops, the Leadership Forum is also the group responsible for taking action on the ideas generated.20

The Board also hires a full time Executive Director who leads a Professional Secretariat to support the project. The ED and Secretariat are responsible for supporting the Leadership Forum in its work through administrative support, communication and social marketing, and producing a project history. The primary driver of action, however, is the Leadership Forum.21

The Civic Scenario Process and its Impact Theory

According to Generon: “The primary, direct way in which the project creates changes in the future of the country is through the changes in thinking and acting of the members of the Leadership Forum. The broader, indirect impact is through the influence of these members in turn on the much larger circles of other formal and informal societal leaders with whom they talk and act. The project’s contributions to the country’s ideas, visions, commitments, relationships, and strategies ripple out through the work of the Leadership Forum between and beyond the workshops.”22

The Leadership Forum is prepared to take action through a series of four multi-day, residential workshops that take place over the course of approximately 7-8 months. During these workshops, participants from a range of stakeholder groups explore their own diverging perceptions of their country and its future. In doing so, they work to develop a common “systematic understanding of the current and emerging reality of the country”.23 From this understanding they “construct 2-4 scenarios as to how the future might unfold, including a vision as to how it should unfold.”24

These scenarios, including the ideal vision, frame for the participants what actions should be taken and where. It is their responsibility, in the final workshop, to develop a plan for spreading their ideas throughout their country. In past projects, Leadership Forum members have worked to create action through their own circles of influence and provide a larger vision to the country through publication of the ideas developed. In some project sites, they have also tried to spread the dialogue itself, by training additional facilitators to replicate the scenario process at the community level.25

20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Ibid. 6.
24 Ibid.
25 Kahane, Adam. “Civic Scenarios as a Tool for Making History”, 2001. Pg. 9
**Previous Case Studies as a Project Template**

According to the Civic Dialogue Project History, the inspiration for the project came from a meeting held by UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean in July of 2001. The Resident Representative for the Jamaica country office at the time attended that meeting and was inspired by the presentation of the Civic Scenario Model, including case studies from South Africa, Columbia, and Guatemala.26 Because these case studies provided a template for the project as it was designed for Jamaica, it is important to highlight at least some of these prior examples to reveal some of the assumptions of the Civic Dialogue Project.

The Mont Fleur Dialogue took place in South Africa in a critical period of crisis and transition for that country, 1991-92. Following almost fifteen years of armed struggle in communities throughout the country, South Africa had begun a process of opening, bringing to an end the previously existing Apartheid system and moving towards a fully inclusive democracy. Surrounding the dialogue was a series of historical events, such as the unbanning of the African National Congress; the release of Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners; the repealing of apartheid laws that kept racial groups separate; and the commencement of negotiations for a new constitution. At the same time, the period between 1991 and 1994 was also among the most violent period in the struggle, when supporters of all relevant parties attempted to assert their claims by force on the street.27

At this moment of heightened political awareness and mobilisation, South Africans across conflict lines were aware of ongoing and irreversible societal change. They also knew that if the transition went well, they had much to gain, but that if it went poorly, there was much they could potentially lose. The result was a period of intense insecurity, when many individual actors took drastic and sometimes violent action to protect their interests. Similarly, it was a time of widespread and ongoing dialogue and action.

Within this context, the Mont Fleur Dialogue was well timed to play a key role in shaping policy maker’s vision of the country’s future. The result was a process that supported the ongoing negotiations by helping parties to agree on critical economic issues that would determine the future of the country. The Leadership Forum, themselves a group of younger leaders, were well positioned to share their ideas and get buy in from their constituents.

Vision Guatemala took place from 1997 to 2001 during a post-crisis transition period. In the previous year, 1996, the country had completed a ten-year peace negotiation that brought to an end a forty-four year civil war. At such a juncture, the country was also highly conscious of its future and mobilized to take action.

---

The project therefore brought together a group of forty-four leaders, representing “academics, business and community leaders, former guerrillas and military officers, human rights activists, journalists, indigenous people, national and local politicians, clergy trade unionists, and young people.”

This group represented a broad cross-section of the country and provided one of a number of spaces for Guatemalans to talk about their future and the needs for the future.

The visions produced by the group came at a time when the country was managing the transitional period and so had an opportunity to impact those institutions being formed. This included: “the emergence of two presidential candidates from among the team; influence on four national election campaigns…, contribution to a constitutional amendment campaign, a national anti-poverty program, …and reform of the core curriculum of the country’s second largest university.” Like in South Africa, these impacts were created through a series of presentations and workshops for leadership. Yet furthermore, given the existing need for on-going dialogue at the local level, the project also trained a group of 60 “dialogue multipliers” to take the dialogue to the local level.

Like the Mont Fleur Dialogue, the Vision Guatemala project was well timed to have an impact on the country where it was being used. Though in a post-crisis situation, Guatemala, like South Africa was in a transitional period. For this reason, leaders throughout the country were also open to new ideas, and institutions were being formed to shape the future.

These contextual points are important to look at because they set the stage for the previous projects’ successes. They also highlight a critical difference between those two projects and the Civic Dialogue Project in Jamaica. Unlike the previously mentioned Civic Scenario project, the Civic Dialogue in Jamaica has taken place within a pre-crisis setting, where signs of a crisis have been present, but full awareness of the impending crisis and mobilisation around it does not exist.

In that way, the context in which this project was designed is more similar to that of Destinos Colombia, which took place between 1996 and 1999. This project was only one of its kind taking place in Colombia at the time and while driven by a recognition of need for change, did not coincide with any larger scale transitions in the country. Within that context, the dialogue did achieve some meaningful impacts among the group of forty-three people assembled, and also led to broader discussion in the country as a whole, but did not create the same widely recognized impacts as those in South Africa and Guatemala.

29 Ibid. Pg. 2
30 Ibid.
Project Design and Evolution

Understanding the existing models on which the Jamaica Civic Dialogue Project was based, it is critical to examine how the project was designed to meet Jamaica’s needs and how it evolved over time. Examination of documents and a series of interviews suggest that this project has evolved through approximately four phases. They include:

The Pre-Project Investigation and Design Phase—Which began in July 2001 when the UNDP first began thinking of Civic Scenarios as a project model and ran until January 2003 when the first scenario design workshop was held.

The Scenario Design Phase—Which began in January 2003, with the second Leadership Forum workshop and continued until January 2004 when the scenarios were finalised.

The Initial Engagement Phase—Which began in January 2004 as the Leadership Forum started to share its scenarios with the rest of Jamaican society and ended around August 2004 when a decision was taken to focus the project more heavily in communities.

The Deeper Engagement Phase—Which has continued since August 2004 and has featured a more concerted effort to deepen dialogue and support within communities in the Kingston and St. Andrew area.

Each of these phases featured different types of activities, different actors, and in many respects different core objectives. The analysis of project effectiveness and impact included later in this report will require a clear sense of how the project was structured during its history. This section will therefore provide a description and evaluation of how it has evolved.

The Pre-Project Investigation and Design Phase

As indicated both in the Project History document and interviews conducted by the evaluation team, the initial project design phase was largely driven by the office of the UNDP Resident Representative. During this period a number of decisions were made about the project, which impacted its design and implementation throughout the period. In particular it is critical to discuss:

- The decision that a Civic Dialogue project would be an effective intervention in Jamaica.
- The development of the initial project document, including the project objectives.
- The overall structure of the initiative as a Directly Executed Project (DEX).

Choosing Civic Dialogue for Jamaica

The Civic Dialogue emerged as a potential intervention at UNDP from a general sense that Jamaica as a country was in decline. The original project proposal states that: “Despite deep democratic roots and overall gains in several socio-economic indicators, there is a gradual weakening of both the foundations and the structures of democratic
In addition to a number of indicators of decline cited in the project proposal, the project history also describes rising concern about public disturbances, particularly in July 2001. Another key event cited as a particular concern was the Gas Riots that took place in 1999 and created widespread disorder.

In addition to a number of specific needs, the conclusion among those initiating the project was that a fundamental gap in Jamaica was due in part to a lack of a common national vision for where the country should go. The Civic Scenario Model appeared an ideal approach to building this needed vision because of its consensus building approach and pre-existing track record. With that in mind, UNDP undertook a period of consultation, which included a November, 2001 visit by Adam Kahane of Generon Consulting. These meetings consisted of both a presentation of Generon’s Civic Scenario Model and a mapping of existing needs to determine the project’s potential entry points. In these sessions, participants’ expressions of a need for change in Jamaica suggested to the project designers that the Civic Scenario Model would be useful.

There were, however, some reservations in spite of which, the designers decided to proceed. These reservations included a concern from many stakeholders consulted, that the Civic Dialogue Project would simply be another example of talk without action. More direct was a concern that a project of this kind did not offer tangible outputs. Finally, there were reservations expressed that a project of such a political nature would be initiated and implemented by UNDP. There were questions raised as to whether such a project fit within the organization’s mandate.

Notwithstanding these concerns, many of which would be raised again as the project was implemented, UNDP chose to continue. The needs expressed, convinced the project designers that Jamaica was at a “crossroads” and would need a new vision to properly proceed. Based on that, UNDP held a meeting with a group of eight experts in May of 2001 to develop a project document.

The Development of the Project Proposal and Objectives

The project proposal submitted in July of 2002 and finalised that December, included a budget of USD 3.5 Million, and provided a general outline for the project. It stated that the overall project purpose was to “help influential leaders make dramatic, creative shifts in perception to break the deep-seated, complex patterns of behaviour that sustain the current reality, hindering growth and development in Jamaica.” It further defined its desired outcome as “a vibrant culture of democratic governance that guarantees political...”
participation, poverty reduction and social equity.\textsuperscript{38} The outputs of the project were defined as:

1. Increased and improved civic dialogue process
2. Learning History of the Project produced
3. Targeted research papers produced in support of the process.
4. Leadership capacity for all dialogue participants strengthened
5. Nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process
6. Policy/Strategy Formulation and other upstream activities\textsuperscript{39}

These outputs clearly focussed the project on both conducting a well run and documented civic scenario process (outputs 1-4), and on having a national level impact through broad communication and interaction with policy makers (outputs 5-6). The document, however, did not provide a detailed list of activities supporting them in the second phase, or clearly measurable indicators of achievement for either of the phases. Their overall generality, combined with a lack of clear measures would later create challenges in keeping the project focussed and mobilising funding for its targeted budget.

At the time of its preparation, reservations about the project document were raised. PIOJ in particular was concerned that the proposal’s outputs were not clearly defined, and though the document described activities, it did not clearly state to what end those activities would be carried out and how they tied directly to impact.\textsuperscript{40} The IDP’s named as donors for the engagement phase also questioned how well that phase was planned—the proposal had allocated USD 2.9 Million to those activities without actually saying what they would be.

The Overall Structure of the Initiative

By the time the project proposal was finalised and an agreement signed with PIOJ in, December of 2002, some critical choices had been made about the project that would impact its ultimate development. Perhaps the most important of these was the decision that the Civic Dialogue would be run by UNDP as a Directly Executed Project (DEX). By all accounts the choice to structure the project as a DEX is unique because most projects run by UNDP and other IDPs have been run by local organisations and are Nationally Executed (NEX).

According to the staff at PIOJ, Jamaica as a middle income country generally has the capacity necessary to run projects through local organisations and they could only identify one other project in the previous ten years that had been conducted as a DEX. Within the NEX structure, the foreign organisation provides funding and management, while the local organisation implements the project, and PIOJ does the monitoring and evaluation. Staff from PIOJ therefore felt concerned from the beginning that because

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid. Pg. 18
\textsuperscript{39} “Progress Report to December 2004”, UNDP, April, 2005. Pg. 2.
\textsuperscript{40} Interview with Andre Sheppard-Stewart, Simone Laurence Norton, Pauline Knight, and Sharon McDonald. Conducted by the Evaluation Team at the offices of the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), 10/25/05.
UNDP was running the project directly there were not clear enough mechanisms for accountability. Particularly, PIOJ felt excluded from its usual monitoring and evaluation role for the project, a concern raised even in relation to this evaluation, as one initiated by UNDP rather than through an objective outsider.\(^{41}\)

UNDP, nonetheless, chose to run the project as a DEX because of its concern that the Civic Dialogue uniquely needed to be viewed as neutral within Jamaican society. Initial consultations had suggested that within the highly polarised Jamaican context there were few organisations that could convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue without people questioning the agenda. It was therefore felt that the neutral banner of the United Nations would be the most legitimate one under which to place the project.

This choice impacted on the way the project was initially structured to run. The scenario design phase was largely structured along the lines of Generon’s Civic Scenario model. The project was designed to have a Leadership Forum that would represent a full cross-section of Jamaica and take forward the process in the country; a Board of Directors, for this project called a Steering Committee to guide activities; an Executive Coordinator to ensure coordination of implementation supported by a Secretariat; and a Project Historian to capture the events as they unfolded.

However, unlike the model as it had been used in other places, this project’s *Passionate Advocate* was the UNDP. This in combination, with the fact that the project would be a DEX, raised questions about the legitimacy of a Steering Committee formed by UNDP and whether the process would therefore be truly locally owned. For this reason, it was decided that the Leadership Forum would be created first and that from them a Steering Committee would be nominated at their workshop together. They would then take over the leadership of the project.\(^{42}\) This created a channel for local ownership, however, the fact that the Steering Committee did not play a role in forming the project should be acknowledged as a difference from the Civic Scenario Model’s usual design. These differences would play out as the project evolved.

*The Scenario Design Phase*

Prior to the initiation of the scenario design process at a three-day workshop in January 2003, the Leadership Forum had already met for a one-day workshop focussed on crime and violence in July of 2002. This workshop was not a part of the usual scenario process and was primarily intended to maintain a level of momentum for the project, as its launch had been delayed by national elections. Although it raised a range of issues and got the Leadership Forum talking, it did not lead to any significant actions or initiatives.\(^{43}\) The real efforts of the Leadership Forum took place throughout the year 2003 and consisted primarily of the development of the civic scenarios and the preparation for engagement with the country as a whole.

\(^{41}\) Interview with PIOJ, 10/25/05.


\(^{43}\) Ibid. Pg. 12 – 19.
This phase of the project articulated the intended vision for Jamaica that would later be shared through engagements with the larger society. It was also the period in which the larger engagement process was to be designed. Critical components of this phase that are relevant to the evaluation include:

- The dialogue that took place within the Leadership Forum to design a vision for Jamaica.
- Decisions made during this period about how to engage with the country as a whole.
- The activities of the Steering Committee to lay the groundwork for the later initiative.

The Leadership Forum Dialogue

Through the course of the evaluation, the team met approximately one third of the Leadership Forum, as well as the local facilitator that led the scenario discussions and the Executive Coordinator and Project Historian, who observed the process. By all accounts, the scenario design process was an “extraordinary” experience for those involved, and one that produced its intended outputs of a set of potential scenarios for the country, and improved relationships among the participants. Critically, these results were achieved in the midst of serious disagreement among the Leadership Forum members about what the answers should be. The Project History, as well as individual members of the Leadership Forum and the process facilitator confirmed that the discussions were often heated but that their results did ultimately reflect a consensus.

The Leadership Forum consists of thirty-six people from a broad range of backgrounds. The Forum features a large number of well-known figures from government, such as the President of the Court of Appeals, the Director General of the PIOJ, and members of the military and police; it contains well known political figures from both the ruling People’s National Party (PNP) and opposition Jamaica Labour Party (JLP); it also consists of high profile leaders from civil society, business, and church; finally it contains less well known but nonetheless influential community and youth leaders. While some forum members have expressed regret at a lack of participation by top political leaders, all were quick to emphasize to the evaluation team that the Leadership Forum represents a gathering of people far more diverse than is normally encountered in Jamaica.

The Leadership Forum’s task was to consider the potential choices Jamaica could make about its future and develop a set of scenarios that reflected the potential outcomes of different directions. In addition, it was charged with agreeing on a strategy for communicating those scenarios to the country as a whole and later to implement it. The scenarios developed predicted three potential negative outcomes and one positive one. They were:

---

44 See Appendix II for a full list of those interviewed.
45 A full accounting of the impacts among the Leadership Forum will be presented in Chapter V.
1. **Sitting on the One One Coco**: This represents a situation in which the problems remain constant from year to year and there is limited participation by people in decision-making.

2. **Paradise Lost**: In this case, social and economic variables worsen, the country is led by unscrupulous characters, and trust and respect between the state and civil society deteriorates to the point of a failed state.

3. **Nose Mus’ Run**: This scenario depicts a society in which the control of crime and violence is the number one priority and resources are diverted from other social services. Initially, the society responds positively to the reduced incidence of crime & violence however, the situation deteriorates as citizens become increasingly frustrated and state ends up in a state of chaos and civil unrest.

4. **Get Up Stand Up**: This is the positive scenario, in which Jamaicans have a common vision and there is unity among the public sector, private sector and civil society. Respect, trust, empowerment and consensus in decision-making become key features at all levels in society and there is national growth to everyone’s benefit.  

These scenarios were then developed into a set of materials that could be used to present them to the public. The materials included, a pamphlet, a written document telling their story, and a video.

**Decisions About How to Engage With Jamaica**

In addition to significant debate about the content of the scenarios, the discussions also contained serious reflection about how they should be used. A major question was whether the purpose of the dialogue would be to promote the scenarios and in particular, “Get Up Stand Up” as a vision for Jamaica, or to use them as a tool to get people thinking about their own vision. Another question seriously discussed was what the projects relationship should be with action—should the project aim to lead action projects in communities or simply catalyse community activity. An additional question was the role of the Leadership Forum and how it would be viewed by existing power structures—if the group is to promote a vision for Jamaica how could it maintain a neutral profile amid political actors. A final key question was what the strategy should be for communicating with the rest of the country. Evidence from the Project History and interviews with Leadership Forum members suggests that though these questions were discussed, a clear and comprehensive strategy did not develop from the discussions.

- On the use of the scenarios, the Leadership Forum agreed that the scenarios would be presented to community stakeholders as a vision, but also used as a way to elicit discussion on what they would need to do to realize such a vision. The hope was that the scenarios would motivate people to take action under the principles.

---

47 See project histories.
of “Get Up Stand Up.” This approach would shape the way subsequent engagements were run.

- In terms of action, it was agreed that action projects would need to be generated from the communities themselves rather than developed by the Leadership Forum and that the Forum’s role would be to support and catalyse but not implement activities run by the community. These principles meant that supporting community level activity would be a part of future engagements.

- In terms of the Leadership Forum’s role, it was agreed that the leadership forum had responsibility to spread the dialogue in the circles where they operate and to ensure that the process continues to expand. This principle would drive many of the initial engagements conducted after the scenario design phase.

- As far as the engagement strategy, the Leadership Forum suggested at its April/May 2003 workshop that a social marketing plan be developed to support the project. This was completed in November 2003 and provides a broad set of objectives for engagement, lists the groups to be engaged, and lists a set of techniques that can be used, matching them to individual objectives and target groups.

However, the social marketing plan does not provide a strategic prioritisation or work plan for implementing the activities and made few content suggestions about how to conduct the different types of engagements. In the absence of other in depth planning activities, this meant that the project did not develop a clear strategy during the scenario design phase.

The Steering Committee Laying the Project’s Groundwork

Though not equipped with a clear implementation plan, during this period of the project, the Steering Committee was quite active, holding 13 meetings between February 2003 and January 2004. These meetings focussed primarily on ensuring that the activities necessary for the establishment of the project were implemented. Quite generally, this included the hiring of the Executive Coordinator and establishment of the Secretariat, the development of the scenarios into stories and a video, and the planning of the Mountain View Action Project, including the “Bring Back the Love” soccer match. Like the Leadership Forum as a whole, these meetings featured lively discussions about both the content and mechanics of the project.

49 Ibid. Pgs. 6 – 8.
50 “The Fifth Workshop”, Project History. Pg. 7.
The Initial Engagement Phase

By January 2004 as the engagement phase began, the Leadership Forum had produced its scenarios and overseen their development into a video presentation, a Steering Committee and Secretariat had been set up to manage the project, and there was high level of enthusiasm about the dialogue experience. There was, however, uncertainty about what the project’s engagement strategy. In evaluation interviews, several members of the Leadership Forum commented that they did not have a clear sense at that time of how the project would move forward.

What was clear, however, was that like previous Civic Scenario projects held in other parts of the world, the Leadership Forum was responsible for spreading knowledge about the scenarios throughout their own circles. The initial engagement phase therefore consisted primarily of the Leadership Forum working through the Secretariat to conduct presentations throughout the country. In describing this phase of the project, this evaluation will discuss:

- The breadth of engagements held.
- The varying types of reactions to the scenario presentation by different groups engaged.
- The growing role that the Secretariat took relative to the Leadership Forum within this phase of the project.

Broadly Targeted Engagements

During this initial presentation phase, the scenarios were introduced at over 50 engagements throughout the island. Including participants from a broad cross section of the country, such as politicians, business people, NGO workers, and communities, these events were largely organised by members of the Leadership Forum within their own circles of influence. In this way, the project engaged a large number of people, but without criteria or a set of targets for doing so. The engagements, as they were run, consisted primarily of presentation and discussion of the scenarios, followed by a brainstorming of next steps. As will be discussed later, this limited approach to engagements led to varying results among participants.

Varying Traction from Different Levels of Jamaica

While the impact of these engagements will be discussed further in chapter III of this evaluation, it is important to note here that willingness to act on the scenarios varied greatly, depending on the audience. Because the project did not have clear objectives in this phase of the engagement and did not have a consistent approach to the engagement itself there was a large spectrum of perceptions created amongst the audience. This lack of clarity on what could be expected from the project resulted in substantial variations in peoples levels of satisfaction with the project, making it impossible to effectively gauge client satisfaction in a clear and quantifiable manner. Generally speaking, a greater sense

of urgency was felt among poorer and more community-based audiences, while policy makers and people less directly affected by societal problems tended to be more critical and not pursue further follow ups. The Project Historian, for example described an engagement she helped set up with academics as focused on analysing the scenarios but not creating any larger buy-in to take action towards a vision. The presentation to Parliament on June 15, 2004 also elicited a general support for the process but not a specific call for follow up action at the policy level.

These varying levels of interest can be accounted for by general characteristics of the project’s conceptualisation and design. First, given the Civic Scenario Model’s previous development in countries in the midst of transition, it assumed that the audiences for the scenarios produced would collectively recognise impending change and therefore have a sense of urgency around finding new answers for the future. As described earlier, Jamaica at the time of these engagements and currently is in a pre-crisis phase, where specific sectors of the population feel the need for change, but there is not a unified sense of urgency or recognition of instability. As a result, the scenarios did not reach a uniformly receptive audience with the will to make a positive difference, as would have been present in other countries where the process was used.

Second, the project’s conceptual model for dialogue did not extend beyond the presentation and discussion of the scenario videos. This model will be discussed later, but the absence of a clear sense of direction for each individual engagement meant that there was no obvious way to carry forward engagement with individual groups. If participants at individual engagements suggested follow up activities, they would be carried out, but there was little pre-planned and executed follow up for engagements. This meant that particularly people at the level to influence national policy were not engaged in a sustained way.

The Growing Role of the Secretariat

Though it was planned that the Leadership Forum and Steering Committee would take the lead role in driving activities during the engagement phase, it was widely acknowledged during evaluation interviews that the Secretariat took an increasingly central role. According to those interviewed, this was due to a busy schedule among members of the Leadership Forum who continued to participate on a volunteer basis. However it was also likely due to a fast growing workload in that period, which was not planned for or managed effectively.

The scenario presentation engagements were at first largely planned and scheduled by members of the Leadership Forum, interested in carrying discussion to their own communities. However, most of the sessions were not actually facilitated by the Leadership Forum members, but rather by the Executive Coordinator. The role of the Secretariat grew further as word about the project spread and requests for additional sessions were made by people who had heard of the process and wanted to bring it to

---

53 Interview with Aldrie Henry-Lee. Conducted by the evaluation team at the UNDP office. 10/24/05.
54 Interview with Noel Watson. Conducted by the evaluation team and the UNDP office. 10/21-22/05.
their own communities. These requests were increasingly handed off to the Secretariat to respond to and so it gradually took over the role of engaging with Jamaicans about the scenarios.

*The Deeper Engagement Phase*

A change in UNDP Country Office leadership, in July 2004, brought with it recognition that the Civic Dialogue Project was facing substantial challenges. Among them was a lack of clarity about what the project should be trying to accomplish, both among project leadership and UNDP; a public perception that the project was driven by UNDP, rather than Jamaicans; an inability to source additional funding to support the project; and continuing tensions with PIOJ about project planning and accountability. Believing that the Civic Dialogue Project still had the potential to make a significant contribution and apparently seeing a pragmatic need to preserve what had been considered the office’s flagship project, UNDP chose to support it and help resolve some of its problems. Support for the project included the provision of TRAC funding as an interim measure until funds could be raised, encouragement that the project intensify its efforts in communities where it was working, and a shifting of greater responsibility to the Steering Committee.

Since August 2004, the project has intensified within the Kingston and St. Andrew area, particularly working with inner city communities. Without a doubt, this phase of the project has represented a significant deepening of engagement in local communities, and out of that engagement some tangible results. Despite a refocusing of efforts, there are, however, no documented changes in project objectives or desired outputs and there was no specific work plan or activity based budget. This lack of clear conceptual planning appears to be the reason for some of the criticism the evaluators heard during interviews that the project was largely “demand driven”, single “event based”, and lacking in serious follow up to those groups that did not immediately express an interest.

In discussing the project model used during this phase, this evaluation will describe:
- The project’s approach to continuing dialogue engagements.
- The growing role the project took in supporting community level initiatives.

**Dialogue Engagements**

During this period the Civic Dialogue Project continued its outreach efforts, primarily to groups throughout the Kingston and St. Andrew area. These engagements were generally demand driven as communities learned of the project and requested engagements. The project continued not to have criteria for proactively seeking out engagements and did not
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55 The project was referred to as the office’s flagship by several people interviewed by the team, it is also mentioned in the Country Office evaluation: Muhith, A.M.A., Michael Reynolds, Denis Benn, and Ruth Abraham. “Country Evaluation: Assessment of Development Results Jamaica”. UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, NY. Pg. 44.

56 Interview with Juan Carlos Espinola. Conducted by the evaluation team at the UNDP office. 10/28/05.
The group turned down requests that it received.\footnote{Interview with Noel Watson. 10/21-22/05. Interview with Celia Champagnie. Conducted by the evaluation team at the UNDP office. 10/27/05.} Therefore, the groups that it initially engaged tended to be those that were already interested in the project and already had some level of organization.

The engagements themselves were conducted along a similar format and the project did not develop a model for dialogue that extended beyond the first engagement. Interest levels of communities and the next steps being determined by the group were key determinants of follow up from those initial meetings.\footnote{Ibid.} According to interviews with Secretariat staff and observation of three dialogue engagements, the process for facilitating dialogue meetings consists of the following steps:

1. The facilitator introduces the project to the group, explaining:
   - The origins and objectives of the Civic Dialogue Project
   - The purpose and history of the scenarios
   - The objectives and plan for the meeting
2. The facilitator shows the scenario video, stopping it between scenarios to provide time for discussion about each one’s implication for the country.
3. The facilitator leads a discussion about what it would mean to “Get Up Stand Up”:
   - The group is asked to talk about what they are doing or can do to promote this scenario.
   - The facilitator also asks the group how the project can support their efforts and offers assistance.
4. The next steps for the meeting are consolidated and a follow up strategy is discussed.

This model for dialogue engagements has two weaknesses that the team observed through its attendance of dialogue sessions and discussions with project participants. First, it lacks a systematic approach to deeper and more analytical dialogue within the communities where it is used. Focussed on a single session and centred around the scenario video presentation, this model is effective at eliciting discussion and drawing out peoples’ sense of problems, but there is little or no analysis of the dynamics that need to be changed. Rather it moves directly to action, a step that brings the project access to community issues but does not lead into or create for the community an incentive for further planned dialogue efforts.

Second, this approach naturally creates very high expectations among communities where the project operates. Especially working in poorer communities, expectations are always difficult to manage. However, the immediate offers of assistance made by the project staff naturally create high expectations from the beginning. This has led to the project taking a rapidly expanding support role for development initiatives in communities.
The Civic Dialogue Supporting Community Initiatives

According to members of the Secretariat, a challenge throughout the engagement phase of the project has been that communities are only willing to participate in dialogue activities if they see tangible benefits coming out of them immediately. Indeed, this sense of the need for action was repeated throughout the evaluation process. The response to this by the project has been a concerted effort to provide assistance to the communities where it is working to support development initiatives. This assistance has included on the one hand facilitative activities, such as networking communities with people or organisations that can help them address their needs or calling meetings to further discuss specific challenges or help resolve conflicts. On the other hand, it has also included much more directly developmental activities, such as writing funding proposals or letters on behalf of communities, organising events such as health or skills fairs, or actually funding specific needs such as the school fees for eleven people from Greenwich Town to receive adult education.

Tangible benefits have certainly come out of these efforts, most notably the formation of the KSA Action Forum, which has in many respects been a space for real dialogue among communities. However, they represent a real shift from the initial focus of the project and one that was not clearly planned for.

Cross Cutting Project Implementation Issues

In addition to examining the process through which the Civic Dialogue Project unfolded, the evaluation team was asked to look at the effectiveness of the “Secretariat, the Steering Committee and the institutional framework in which it is placed.” This chapter has already identified a number of issues related to the effectiveness of implementation, including the overall institutional arrangement of the project, the roles played by different groups in the project, and the model used for facilitating dialogue. Before closing this chapter, it is important delve deeper into management and implementation of the project. In doing so, it will discuss the roles and capacities of the project Secretariat, Steering Committee, and others involved in the project; assess the project’s communication strategy; describe the project’s experiences with resource mobilization and budgeting, discuss the project’s lack of monitoring and evaluation systems, and finally describe the project’s performance on gender equality.

Project Roles and Capacities

As was described earlier, the activities of the Civic Dialogue Project were initially meant to be implemented by the project’s Leadership Forum and with the support of the Secretariat. However, as the engagement phases began, Leadership Forum participation decreased, leaving the burden of implementation on the project Secretariat. Since then, the Secretariat has been responsible for most project activities, though it has consulted with and received guidance from the Steering Committee which meets monthly. A

59 Ibid.
review of the Steering Committee meeting minutes has shown regular discussion of project related activities, though as the party closest to the project, the Secretariat appears to have played a significant role in determining the content of the discussions once the engagement phase began.60

UNDP remains deeply involved with project, with the majority of its funding coming from Thematic Trust and TRAC sources, and the project being housed at the UNDP Country Office. Since the beginning of 2005 the project has fallen under UNDP’s Governance and Poverty Programme, although it is acknowledged that the project continues to have direct involvement by the Resident Representative, who sits as a member of the Steering Committee.61

With the Secretariat driving the major of activities, its important to look at is capacity to deliver the project. The Secretariat currently has five full-time staff members, with varying backgrounds, skills sets and readiness for tasks. Despite the staff’s strong commitment to the project, it has been plagued by capacity constraints, both in terms of workload and skill-sets.

The project was created to deliver scenario-based dialogue options. However, the project has substantially increased its attention to non-dialogue functions required to fulfil community needs identified in the engagements. These activities include correspondence; identifying, establishing and maintaining linkages with resource personnel and/or organizations; communications/media planning and general management. Promises made to communities in the course of the engagement process represent a good example of what has severely stretched the project’s resource capacities, including goodwill. Maintaining provision of such promised inputs has been unsustainable, as the project lacks the capacity in mandate and resources to consistently deliver on these promises. Attempting to complete such activities has also resulted in limiting attention to other given tasks such as data management, monitoring and evaluation/reflection, and project related research.

As far as the staff’s skill-sets, discussion with members of the Secretariat and a review of their CVs has shown that substantial skills do reside within the project. Some of their skills and experiences include business administration, communications technology, computing, customer relationship management, economics, international relations, international trade, law, management consulting, and teaching/lecturing. Current accreditation ranges from experiential through Bachelors of Law and Master’s degrees, to Ph.D. degree.62

Because of this project’s unexpected shift to community level activities, there now exists a disparity between project skills available and those required with the current community-based activities the project has recently been involved with. From an audit of the skills and experience available in the project, the evaluation team feels there is need

61 This was confirmed by interviews with members of UNDP staff, and the project Secretariat.
62 Review of Project Staff CVs.
for increased community development, facilitation, social work and conflict resolution skills. The results of these gaps, according to the evaluation team’s observation of dialogue engagements, interviews, and a review of project documents has been a lack of in-depth analysis during dialogue discussions and a rush towards action. More formalised skills in these areas and a clearer model for on-going dialogue, would have allowed for deeper discussion before setting expectation for action.

Given the project’s past and current activities, other skills seem necessary, although staff has done admirably in trying to learn and manage their needs such as communications and media, and research/project monitoring and evaluation. Despite any capacity issues as identified above, the project seems to have developed a comfortable internal facility of working within the identified communities.

**Marketing and Communication**

Given that one of the project’s key outputs is “Nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process”, developing a clear plan for doing so would be a key component of its implementation. However, there has been visible and reported evidence of weaknesses in marketing and communication activities associated with the project throughout the evaluation. There was originally no clearly separated vision or marketing communication strategy included in the original Project document. This was later addressed through the commissioning and development of a “social marketing plan”. In discussing communication here, the evaluation looks at the challenges associated with shifts in the project’s branding, inconsistencies in the presentation of scenarios and project coverage by the media.

**Project Branding**

At least two names have been utilized by the Project: “Jamaica Vision 21: Secure and Prosperous” and the “Civic Dialogue Project”, the latter being increasingly used within recent engagements whereas the project commenced by using the former. This has likely led to some confusion, as the media coverage viewed by evaluation team reflected this inconsistency.

Also associated with branding has been the project’s level of association with UNDP. The evaluation team has found that although the association with the United Nation has helped the project’s credibility with some participants, particularly at the community level, it has also created suspicions about the project. Amongst politicians and government officials concern has been raised that the UNDP, as an international organisation, has overstepped its mandate by running what could be interpreted as a political project.

**The Project Scenarios and Their Presentation**

The final (extended) version of the scenarios produced on video was a result of technical design and creativity on one side and Leadership Forum monitoring and input on the
other. Around August 2005, an internal decision was made to shorten the length of the scenarios, hence reducing viewing times from 39 minutes to 15 minutes. This latter exercise involved limited technical design and creativity and no further Leadership Forum input into the editing. Certainly, this resulted in briefer introductions to the key concepts amongst communities being engaged, however, the unsupervised editing has raised questions regarding to what extent the message and context of the scenario has changed and if the current version truly reflects the core concepts and more subtle issues found in the 39 minute version.

One clear gap created by editing the original scenarios, has been removal of the “spokesman” who appears between the four scenarios. It is felt that this consistent feature lent increased objectivity within and between the engagement-viewings, thereby facilitating unencumbered feedback upon request. The current format for presentation draws much more on the interest of the particular audience. The current presentations are more flexible to the audience but at the cost of consistency for the project implementation.

Media Coverage

The involvement of the mass media has been regarded as important to the overall planning, and avenues via which to rollout the Project at a national level. There have been differing levels of success, some agencies being more receptive to the concept and their roles than others. Nevertheless, there has been voiced commitment both in formal engagements with the Project, and internally within the Media Association: some of which have translated to reasonable coverage of Project activities over the period. The Secretariat has had the responsibility for content provision and follow-up e.g. via press releases, public service announcements, articles’ preparation, planning and placement.

Resource Mobilisation and Budgeting

As discussed earlier in this chapter, when the project was originally designed, it included a budget for USD 3.5 Million. Within this budget, USD 600,000, would be spent during the initial scenario design phase and provided by UNDP. The additional USD 2.9M, provided by IDPs, was to be spent during the engagement phase. The largest single line item in the second phase, was for “community pilot projects” and without describing those activities in depth, totalled USD 1.68 M. The project, however, was unable to raise that full amount, and total expenditures to date has been closer to USD 650,000. Total expenditures are included below:
Table 2.1 Project Expenditures to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 USD</th>
<th>2003 USD</th>
<th>2004 USD</th>
<th>2005 (Oct.) USD</th>
<th>Total USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Staff</td>
<td>1,125.77</td>
<td>49,224.12</td>
<td>79,535.34</td>
<td>113,760.31</td>
<td>243,645.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Others</td>
<td>14,198.40</td>
<td>76,413.69</td>
<td>4,202.13</td>
<td>478.69</td>
<td>95,292.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Companies</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,869.21</td>
<td>992.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,861.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>14,933.80</td>
<td>5,815.08</td>
<td>14,020.00</td>
<td>2,148.34</td>
<td>36,917.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual &amp; Printing Production Costs</td>
<td>47,466.91</td>
<td>21,969.70</td>
<td>7,829.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,265.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Publication</td>
<td>6,016.82</td>
<td>1,492.65</td>
<td>927.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,437.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
<td>2,763.20</td>
<td>37,544.07</td>
<td>4,380.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,687.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Civic Engagements</td>
<td>5,143.73</td>
<td>46,397.95</td>
<td>26,452.61</td>
<td>12,829.13</td>
<td>90,823.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>18,265.84</td>
<td>2,041.90</td>
<td>16,305.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,613.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Community Support Services</td>
<td>721.88</td>
<td>2,266.93</td>
<td>13,412.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,401.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>557.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,401.70</strong></td>
<td><strong>253,642.98</strong></td>
<td><strong>199,394.54</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,063.43</strong></td>
<td><strong>661,502.65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of this expenditure, UNDP was able to raise approximately USD 76,000 from CIDA and it received another USD 275,000 from the UNDP Thematic Trust Fund for democratic governance projects. However, the remaining amount, just over USD 300,000 has been drawn from UNDP TRAC funding, which the Country Office controls.

These challenges around resource mobilisation raise two concerns. First, they highlight another way that insufficient planning has weakened this project. As mentioned before, the project budget, particularly for the engagement phase, provided little explanation for how funding would be spent. Given the sizable amount that the project was attempting to mobilise, it is therefore not surprising that it did not succeed in doing so. The activity planning and budgeting was insufficient to pass most donors’ requirements. The money that was raised externally from CIDA came out of a smaller discretionary budget.

---
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Another concern is that despite the project being unable to mobilise the funds budgeted for its activities, it went ahead without making an in depth review and adjustment of the project design and budget. This has meant that in particular, the engagement phase of the project has been supported by far less funding then intended, while still working towards outputs intended to be achieved nationally.

Yet this lack of pre-planned budgeting has continued through engagement phase of the project. While expenditure data has been readily available for the evaluation team, it has not been provided with detailed planning documentation for 2004 and 2005. An “Estimated Expenditure for 2005” was provided to the team, however, the document plans for over USD 1 million in expenditure, far greater than project has accessed. The absence of more realistic budget planning means that there has not been a clear a basis for monitoring and controlling project spending. One result of this lack of monitoring, for example, has been that the project Secretariat’s salaries until July 2005 were not linked to Country Office’s pay scales.

Monitoring & Evaluation/Reflection

An absence of structured monitoring and evaluation (M&E), even through regular structured reflection, has been a weakness of the project noted by the UNDP from the inception of the evaluation. Importantly, although not written into the project document, there is fairly substantial reference within the Secretariat’s TORs for an M&E structure. A number of related activities have however, been implemented under the M&E umbrella:

- **Project Historian’s recording/reporting**: These were limited to early LF sessions comprising preliminary dialogue engagements and scenario development: an activity built into the model according to which this current Civic Dialogue Project was developed.
- **Minutes of Meetings**: Detailed documented notes of for the Leadership Forum, Steering Committee and KSA Action Forum sessions.
- **Scenario Engagement Summaries** (written & video-recorded): proceedings of all engagements held to date have been recorded: either in written (Power-point) or video format. Valuable information has been uncovered from these notations, especially as it relates to communities’ perceived needs.
- **Activities’ reporting**: Closely aligned to the above, has been “activities” reporting by the Secretariat, during which proceedings and related activities from engagements and media planning are documented for internal use.
- **“Civic Scenario Perception Test”**: This instrument was developed by the project in the early stages of implementation. It was used to assess audience response to viewing of the scenarios, but administered only during the early stages.

---
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Especially noteworthy is the fact that despite the range of tools being used to capture data, the project has not at regular intervals analysed and reflected on findings. This lack of M&E can account for some of the challenges the project has faced in maintaining a focus on its initial outputs. It should also be noted, that the project’s design as a DEX has limited the possibility for external oversight, since the project is both funded and implemented by UNDP, and the PIOJ has not played its usual M&E role.

**Gender Equality/Integration**

In looking at gender equality in the project, the evaluation notes a disproportionate number of men in leadership positions and participating in events. The Leadership Forum is currently composed of twenty-two men and fourteen women. In addition, the Chair and Vice-Chair are both men, as well as the Executive Coordinator and the Chairman of the KSA Action Forum. However, women do participate actively at all levels of the project. Three of five members of the Secretariat staff are women, and they frequently represent the project at dialogue engagements and in media appearances. In addition, several active members of the Steering Committee are women.

In terms of discussion topics, themes consistently raised at dialogue engagements such as education, unemployment, and corruption have received interest across gender lines. However, the evaluation team did learn that the regular discussion of crime and violence at engagements does tend to elicit stronger engagement from men than women. In addition attendance data of project-sponsored activities, as shown below, indicates greater male participation than female.

| Table 2.2: Participation in Events Held by the Project |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                | 2004|     | 2005|     | 2004|     | 2005|     |
| Events Held                   | 2004|     | 2005|     |
| Skills Fairs                  | 1   | 20  | 11  | 31  | 1   | 30  | 27  | 57  |
| Health Fairs                  | 1   | 8   | 10  | 18  | 1   | 12  | 8   | 20  |
| Conferences Held              | 2   | 112 | 75  | 187 | 2   | 145 | 56  | 201 |
| Sporting Events Organised     |     | 84  | 0   | 84  |     | 72  | 0   | 72  |

Evidence would therefore suggest that while the project certainly has involved women, it has not had a framework or strategy for actively engaging women as specific beneficiaries. This and the fact that the project has no selection criteria for participation has resulted in lower involvement of women in project activities.

---
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Overall Evaluation of the Project Design and Process

It is the finding of the evaluation team that this project’s weak conceptualisation, design and implementation planning ultimately led to a set of activities and outputs that did not match closely with the project’s original intentions. Indeed, the latter phases of the project, while full of activities, were very much lacking in a strategic approach, making it quite reactive to the environment, rather than proactive in attempting to strategically engage carefully identified stakeholders. This began in the project design phase, and carried through the project as different parties built on what was there.

The first area of concern in the planning was a lack of analysis of context—the difference between the Jamaican context and the previous places where the Civic Scenario Model had been used. The fact that Jamaica is not and was not at the time of the project design in a transitional period meant that the audience for the scenario product was not as receptive to the message as they were in South Africa and Guatemala. Recognising this difference should at least have limited expectations for project results and caused the project designers to build in more specific plans for sharing and promoting a national vision.

Based on this initial lack of analysis, a second area of concern was the original project proposal. The proposal included a very general set of outputs that extended beyond the scenario phase, without a clear work plan or set of measurable indicators. This meant that expectations were set for extensive further activity, without clear parameters on how they should extend. Though the scenario design phase was by all accounts a very successful dialogue process, this lack of clarity meant that later in the project the question of whether specific activities fit under the objectives was very much left up to the interpretation of the Secretariat, the Leadership Forum, and the Steering Committee—a challenge made more difficult when the project failed to mobilise its full budget. A more effective project proposal would have focussed simply on generating impact from a successful scenario phase, without leaving the process open for further activities.

The third area of concern was the lack of clear strategic planning by the Leadership Forum for the engagement activities. The project did not develop clear priorities for the engagement period and there was not a clear enough work plan. Also, insufficient consideration was given to the additional tools that might be needed for engagements of this kind, beyond the scenarios developed. The project appeared focussed on creating further dialogue around the country and yet it did not attempt to equip itself with additional models for conducting dialogue. This can be attributed both to a lack of clarity within Leadership Forum about its objectives in holding engagements and a lack of planning by UNDP to ensure outcomes.

Finally, a decision was taken in August of 2004 to intensify activities without clearly rethinking what the objectives of those activities would be, how they would be carried out and under what criteria. This decision was in response to a lack of noticeable results from the initial engagements and has led to significant impacts in specific areas.
However, these impacts were not specifically planned and did not take place at the national and policy level as was suggested in the original outputs (5 and 6).

Each of these phases could have been more effectively managed if the project had set clear milestones for activities, set deadlines for re-evaluating, and refocused the project’s objectives and plans. However, a consistent feature of this project, voiced by several members of the Leadership Forum and the UNDP programme staff, has been a lack of monitoring, evaluation and honest reflection to ensure that it is effectively achieving its objectives.
CHAPTER III: PROJECT IMPACT

The evaluation team has found that the project has engaged a large number of people and groups, and while most of these engagements have not been followed up, it has had a strong impact among the specific communities it has worked with most in depth. The project has also received recognition by the media and political leaders, though there have been challenges getting particularly politicians and policy makers to move past public approval to taking action.

In discussing this project’s impacts, this chapter will first provide an overview of how the team has assessed impact. Then it will categorize the groups engaged by the project and discuss the levels of impact for each. Finally, it will provide an overall assessment of the impacts achieved.

Techniques for Measuring the Impact of Dialogue Processes

Measuring the impact of dialogue processes is difficult for a number of reasons. First, the intended outputs of a dialogue process are often intangible and difficult to quantify. Outputs such as a change in mindset, improved relationships, a greater sense of agency, and the building of social capital are all significant contributors to building social cohesion and promoting development but cannot be easily counted. A second challenge is that causality of impact is very difficult to determine in environments where the dialogue is one of many both positive and negative influences on its target group. It can therefore be difficult to definitively prove that a dialogue contributed to a positive development or that a negative development shows its failure. A third challenge is that because dialogue generally aims to catalyse longer-term processes among target groups the full impact is difficult to measure within a time bound evaluation. Finally, the impact from dialogues are often difficult to fully capture because as open-ended processes, they often create results that were not originally intended.

In the case of the Civic Dialogue, all of these difficulties are applicable and have no doubt contributed to diverging opinions among people involved with the project about the extent of its achievements. The most effective response to measurement challenges in other settings has been not only to look at whether the intended outputs were achieved, but also to examine carefully the intended process and the actual one as implemented. By tracking the logical chain of events that was predicted to create an impact, it is possible to determine how well those steps were followed and therefore trace what was achieved. However, for this project the lack of three elements: a clear plan; segmentation of the targeted groups; and an in-depth model for dialogue (particularly in the latter phases), made it difficult to trace the chain of events leading to impact. This does not necessarily mean that impacts were not achieved, but rather that they are harder to isolate.

To account as best as possible for the full level of impact achieved by the project, the evaluation team has looked at a range of potential measures and approaches. They include:

- A segmentation of the types of groups engaged by the project.
- An assessment of basic project data (events held, attendance, etc.), provided by the Secretariat to develop a sense of project’s breadth.
- A development of individual case studies that demonstrate the depth of impact.
- A series of group and individual interviews across a wide sample of project participants to gather anecdotal evidence and perceptions of impact.
- Analysis of findings through the lens of different qualitative indicators, particularly social capital.

**Segmentation of Groups Engaged**

Though the project’s ultimate beneficiaries were intended to be the people of Jamaica as a whole, this heterogeneous population clearly consists of a mix of groups, each with their own interests, capacities, and unique ability to play a role in supporting the Civic Dialogue’s overall vision. Recognising that, it should be expected that the project would influence those groups differently and lead to different desired outcomes. The project has indeed had differing outcomes with different segments of Jamaica and discussing impact requires a clearly defined segmentation. The evaluation team identified three key segments that the project has attempted to impact. These include:

**National Governing Actors** - This segment includes elected politicians, appointed decision and policy makers, and leaders of national governmental bodies such as the courts, the military, and the Jamaican Constabulary Force. These groups play a critical role in setting the priorities and direction for the country as a whole. Impacting these groups would provide the resources, energy and moral authority to move the country in a specific direction.

**Organisational Actors** - This broad segment includes corporate, non-governmental, civic (services clubs, etc.), religious, media, and parastatal (Social Development Commission, the Peace Management Initiative, Jamaica Social Investment Fund, etc.) organisations. These groups serve the society through a range of functions and possess the resources and capacity to greatly influence the character of the country. Impacting these groups would create the necessary partnerships and synergies to strengthen and drive a national vision.

**Community Actors** - This segment includes not only the individual communities, but also the organisations and actors that directly influence the quality of life for individuals, such as churches, Community Development Councils (CDCs), local police, and community based organisations (CBOs). This segment is where the benefits of the project’s upstream activities should ultimately be felt. However, actors at this level also have a role to play in achieving the project’s vision, both by working to solve their own problems, and also working with the two other segments to influence policy and identify new solutions.
Assessment of Project Data

The Secretariat has gathered basic data about where, how often, and with whom the project has conducted dialogue sessions. The Secretariat also has information about basic services the project has provided to communities where it has worked. While this information does offer a perspective on the breadth of dialogue activities, does not provide an insight into the quality of dialogue engagements, or their impact on people’s awareness. Fortunately, the information on the number of people engaged can be categorised by segment engaged and level of engagement. The evaluation team has broken up the segments as defined above, and the level of engagement was defined by the Secretariat as follows:

- Deeply engaged – Where the participants have been engaged on several occasions or on one occasion in an in-depth workshop. In some cases, the participants have engaged in community development planning and prioritisation of needs,
- Moderately engaged – Where the participants have been exposed to the scenarios and some follow up activities have taken place as a result.
- Initially engaged – Where the participants have been exposed to the scenarios but no organised follow-up has taken place.73

Based on this definition of levels of engagement, the evaluation team has attempted to sample from each of these levels to gain a sense of what their experience and perception of the project has been.

Case Studies

To provide a sense of the depth of impact from the project, the evaluation team has developed a few specific case studies that illustrate success stories. Though these case studies do not illustrate project impact as a whole, they do provide a means for evaluating how the Civic Dialogue has had impact to date and determining possible ways to broaden and multiply that impact.

Qualitative Individual and Group Interviews

The evaluation team conducted interviews with project implementors and participants at all levels to learn about the project experience and how it has had impact. While not providing hard numbers, or quantification of results, these interviews have presented an in-depth qualitative picture of how the project interacted with and created an impression on participants at different levels. In combination with the case studies and basic quantitative data, the information from these interviews provides a basis for extrapolating an overall picture of impact.

Use of Qualitative Frameworks and Indicators

The qualitative information gathered has been filtered through two frameworks to make the extrapolation of impact more rigorous. Unfortunately, because the project was not originally designed around impacting either of these frameworks, this approach has some limitations—baseline information was not readily available, and the project activities were not structured to impact the indicators included in the frameworks. However, they do provide a valuable point of reference for assessing project achievement.

The first framework is the “Theory of Change” that has been used to evaluate impact in dialogue projects in Southern Africa, using a particular methodology called Sustained Dialogue. This framework breaks down the impact of a dialogue process into three steps, carried out by different parties involved in the dialogue, and provides indicators of impact for each step. They include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Step</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project creates a legitimate space for dialogue.</td>
<td>• The dialogue has convened a true cross-section of the communities concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The participants understand or have agreed on the purpose for dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The participants recognise the space as one in which they can speak freely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dialogue space creates leaders and ideas for change.</td>
<td>• The participants in the dialogue experience a change in personal awareness and perceptions of the challenges discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationships are redefined, built, or improved between participants at the dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New ideas are developed for creating a broader change outside the dialogue room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The participants develop a will to take action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those leaders and ideas create change in their larger community.</td>
<td>• Ideas or plans developed by the dialogue group are enacted in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants in the dialogue play a key role in implementing those ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ideas have an impact on the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second framework is the World Bank’s Social Capital Implementation Framework. The Secretariat reports that a major impact of the project activities is improved social capital within communities, between communities, and between communities and other segments. To discuss social capital, five indicators from the framework were selected:

### Social Capital Implementation Framework

The framework reflects the insights from an extensive body research on social capital and is an attempt to apply social capital to operations.

#### Groups and Networks

Organizational support and network activities are crucial for bridging and linking social capital. Engagements of people to organize themselves and mobilize resources to solve problems of common interest are some of the outputs from groups and networks that enhance or build upon social capital. The effectiveness of groups and networks and the extent to which they can help disseminate information, reduce opportunistic behaviour and facilitate collective decision-making depends upon many aspects of these groups, reflecting their structure, their membership and the way they function.

#### Trust and Solidarity

These informal and subjective elements of interpersonal behaviour shape people’s thoughts and attitudes about interacting with others. When individuals in communities trust each other and the institutions that operate among them, they can easier reach agreements and conduct transactions.

#### Collective Action and Cooperation

The provision of many services requires collective action by a group of individuals. The purposes of collective action may differ widely across communities. In some places, collective action consists primarily of community-organized activities for building and maintaining infrastructure and for providing related public services. In other places, collective action is important for achieving improved governance and accountability, and
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75 Interview with Noel Watson. Conducted by the evaluation team and the UNDP office. 10/21-22/05.

used for example to lobby elected officials to provide more services to the community.

Social Cohesion and Inclusion

Social cohesion manifests in individuals who are willing and able to work together to address common needs, overcome constraints, and consider diverse interests. They are able to resolve differences in a civil, non-confrontational way. Inclusion promotes equal access to opportunities, and removes both formal and informal barriers to participation.

Information and Communication

Information and communication form the crux of social interactions. Downward flows of information from the policy realm and upward flows from the local level are critical components of the development process. Horizontal information flows strengthen capacity by providing civil society a medium for knowledge and idea exchange. Open dialogue fosters a sense of community, while secrecy breeds suspicion and distrust. Enhancing the dissemination of information can break down negative social capital as well as build trust and cohesion.

Assessing the Project’s Impact

In discussing the project’s impact, this report sets out findings for the different phases of the project namely: the Leadership Forum phase of the project; and the engagement phase, looking first at basic overall data on what has been accomplished and then looking more deeply at each segment.

Impact from the Leadership Forum Dialogue

By all accounts, the Leadership Forum process was a powerful experience and successful dialogue for the participants themselves and did lead to some broader impacts and useful products for the project. As discussed earlier, the Leadership Forum dialogue ran through the scenario design phase, beginning in January 2003 and finishing in January 2004. While it has met only twice as a group since then, some members have been active in the project’s Steering Committee and in carrying on projects in their individual spheres. An illustrative example of the Leadership Forum’s impact is demonstrated by the following case study:

**LEON THOMPSON: ONE LIFE TRANSFORMED**

Leon has been a member of staff of the Civic Dialogue Project since September 2004. Before getting involved with the project, first as a member of the Leadership Forum, Leon was a leader in a community that was politically aligned and he was highly
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77 Interview with Leon Thompson. Conducted by the Evaluation Team at the UNDP Office, 10/19/05.
involved with the party that his community supported – the Jamaica Labour Party.

Leon, like others growing up in a political enclave, had learned to be intolerant of and hostile towards persons of a different political outlook. He was not tolerant of anyone who supported the People’s National Party and would even turn his television off if the Prime Minister who belonged to that party was speaking. Leon was unemployed and became involved with local conflicts. He was eventually arrested. “I did not believe I would make it to age 26.” says Leon, and his fatalism was not without foundation as many young men in his community had met an early death due to community violence.

Because of its role in mediating community violence, members of the Peace Management Initiative became involved in Leon’s community and got to know him. It was a member of the PMI who identified Leon as someone to be invited to join the project’s Leadership Forum.

Leon recalls that at first he was confused – he had never encountered such a process before. He was excited by the possibility of working outside of what he describes as his ‘little box’ but he also felt intimidated by the people participating and was highly apprehensive about sitting in a room with prominent members of the PNP. At first, he was angered by the sight of another member of the Leadership Forum, who had run against the leader of the JLP for a seat in parliament. He did not want to sit next to or speak with PNP members. And, he had trouble following the discussions at first.

Nonetheless, Leon stayed with the process and had a profound experience. Participating in the project helped him to see things in a new way, he:

- Realized that he could see issues not only in terms of political agendas but also in terms of what is best for Jamaica
- Learned the value of listening to people
- Became friends with people across party lines and learned to interact with a broader spectrum of people so much so that he has invited Bunny Witter, a fellow Leadership Forum member and well known PNP member, into his community and home
- Made a range of connections across the leadership forum

This has made him a better leader in his community, playing a role in mediating local conflicts and mentoring younger members of his community— he is now seen as a positive role model. Leon was instrumental in mobilizing the community to complete its community centre. This was a big project made easier by the help he received from members of the Leadership Forum- much moral support, financial contributions and links to other influential persons and agencies that were able to help. He felt empowered by the process. Through the project Leon has attended a two-week peace building course at Eastern Mennonite University, USA. Respect for him has grown in his community. He has high hopes for his future life beyond the project as he has acquired new skills and is soon to begin classes to increase his academic qualifications.
This case study illustrates how, as a dialogue, the Leadership Forum phase of the project fits very well the Dialogue Theory of Change and has produced results against nearly all of the indicators. From the perspective of creating a legitimate space for dialogue, the Leadership Forum experience represents a very successful convening of participants. The Leadership Forum contains thirty-five Jamaicans, occupying leadership positions across the social spectrum in Jamaica, and the UNDP Resident Representative. This includes members of both political parties; high level member of government, including the President of the Court of Appeals, the Director General of the PIOJ, and high ranking members of the Jamaican Defence Force and the Jamaican Constabulary Force; leaders of civil society, representing the church, business, NGOs, and academia; and community leaders. Two weaknesses in the group composition have been a lack of participation by high-level political leaders, and a high gender imbalance, with twenty-two out of the current thirty-six members being men. Those two issues aside, the Leadership Forum contains an impressive group of people, occupying influential positions across Jamaica—an assessment shared by virtually everyone the evaluation team spoke with.

In addition, the Leadership Forum as a group did develop an understanding and have a clear sense of the purpose of their dialogue process—to produce a set of scenarios that represent their best predictions about the potential future for Jamaica.

Looking at how the space itself impacted participants, the dialogue had a significant impact on how participants viewed challenges facing the country and their relationships with each other. This change was highlighted in the case study above, but the evaluation team heard very similar stories from other Leadership Forum members it interviewed, describing relationships they formed with people they did not expect. The Leadership Forum also generated a new set of ideas about how to change the country, in the form of scenarios, though as discussed in the project design chapter, there was little effective planning for how to use the scenarios.

Finally, looking at how the participants and their ideas have changed the country requires an examination of the ultimate impact of the scenarios and the implementation plan of the project. These will be discussed below. It is, however, worth pointing out that sufficient ownership was created through the Leadership Forum process to firstly, create a Steering Committee that has met monthly since its inception and secondly, to facilitate a series of engagements organised by participants. There have, however, also been limitations to this ownership, as discussed further in the project design and implementation chapters. Though members of the Leadership Forum have continued to participate in the process, the actual implementation of activities largely shifted over to the Secretariat as the project went into its engagement phase.

Within the framework of building social capital, the Leadership Forum has produced results across each of the indicators. It created a new network of people formerly not in contact with each other, which, over time developed trust, solidarity, and a level of cohesion. This has led to better communication between the sectors represented and collective action, demonstrated both by subsequent engagements, and as shown in the case study above, within the individual communities represented by participants.
Overview of Accomplishments During the Engagement Phase

Before exploring the types of impact the project has created by segment, it is worth taking a look at the overall scale and location of impact. Based on data provided by the Secretariat and segmented by the evaluation team, table 3.1 shows the total number of people engaged by the project.

| Table 3.1: People Directly Touched by Segment and Level of Engagement |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                             | Deeply | Moderately | Initially | Total | % of Total |
| Governance                  | 22     | 72         | 166       | 260   | 4%          |
| Organisational              | 212    | 591        | 1298      | 2101  | 30%         |
| Community                   | 450    | 1310       | 2823      | 4583  | 66%         |
| Total                       | 684    | 1973       | 4287      | 6944  |             |
| % of Total                  | 10%    | 28%        | 62%       |       |             |

This shows that the project has directly made contact with nearly 7000 people. Looking by segment first, the statistics show that the majority of people engaged in the project to date have been in the community segment, with a smaller numbers progressively in the organisational and governance segments. These numbers are not overly surprising, given the relative size of these segments, but they do nonetheless show a heavy weighting of engagement at the community level.

Perhaps more significant is the fact the majority of those directly touched by the project (62%) were only initially engaged, which means that they had only been exposed to the scenarios. This group at most can be expected to understand what the project is about, but is not likely to have undergone the level of change expected of groups at the higher levels of engagement. Looking further, the data shows that the number of people moderately engaged with the project is much smaller as a percentage of the total, but nonetheless larger than those deeply engaged. It is important to note that by definition, the moderately engaged people have all been exposed to the scenarios and engaged in limited follow-ups. However, they have not participated in the project over a sustained period of time. By contrast, the deeply engaged people have not necessarily seen the scenarios, but have engaged the project repeatedly. As will be discussed in depth later this means that they could have participated in activities organised by the project, without actually engaging in actual dialogue.
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78 Data and classification by level of engagement provided up the Civic Dialogue Secretariat. Segmentation done by the evaluation team.
79 Participants could be defined as deeply engaged in the project if they had taken part in project activities subsequent to the initial dialogue engagement in their community.
Finally, to take a closer look, it is worth noting that as a proportion of the entire segment, there have been less governance (8%) actors deeply engaged than organisational (10%) or community actors (10%). This appears to reflect the higher level of interest the project received from community members and efforts to partner with different organisations.

Another important set of statistical information to observe is the number of meetings held. Table 3.2 provides this information through a number of dimensions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segments</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># In Kingston</td>
<td># Outside of Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Public Sector Officials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Mediator Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector (and others)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities</td>
<td>Schools and colleges</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inner City Communities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other rural meetings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While much of the information included here mirrors the information shown in Table 5.1, it is worthwhile to highlight the heavy focus of the project in the Kingston and St. Andrew area. In 2004, nearly 75% and in 2005 virtually all of the engagements have been in Kingston. This heavy Kingston area focus is not surprising, given that the project is based there. However, it reflects heavily on the limited geographical focus of the project’s activities and therefore impact, especially in light of the nation-wide project mandate.

*Impact Among Governance Actors*
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80 Data and classification by type of group provided up the Civic Dialogue Secretariat. Segmentation done by the evaluation team. Number of engagements includes repeated meetings with the same group.
Among the project’s initially planned outputs was, to have been an influence on “Policy/Strategy Formulation and other upstream activities”. Within that area, work with governance actors would have had to have been a critical component of the project’s activities. Overall, the evaluation team has found mixed results among governance actors. On one hand, the Civic Dialogue Project has engaged an impressive array of political leaders and other policy-makers, who have expressed their support for the project. However, at the same time, the evaluation team has seen little evidence that this engagement has resulted in substantive impacts on policy formulation, implementation, or the national political climate.

From the beginning of the project, the UNDP, members of the Steering Committee, and the Executive Coordinator have been particularly diligent in communicating with and consulting Jamaica’s political leadership. The project history lists three meetings with the Prime Minister and four with the Opposition Leader between 2001 and 2004.81 Subsequently, there has been continued engagement with political leadership, with the project making a presentation to eighteen members of parliament in June 2004; requests with meetings being held with the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Education, and Local Government and Community Development; and requests being made by MPs for engagements to take place in their own districts. In addition, the project has been named in numerous public speeches by all sides of the political spectrum, including by the Prime Minister and the Opposition leader’s speeches, the budget speech, and the Governor General’s Throne Speech. Finally, during the project launch in July of 2005, speeches were delivered by a representative of the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, and Governor General all voicing support for the project. The launch was preceded a week earlier by a press conference hosted by the Governor General at King’s House.

These interactions represent a high level of awareness among the country’s political leadership about the project. Clearly, the continuous engagements with leadership demonstrates a willingness to participate. Looking at the Sustained Dialogue Theory of Change, the project therefore appears to have created spaces for engagement.

At the same time, there is little evidence that these engagements have produced a substantive impact on policy or the political climate. A voicing of support for the project, or its objectives, is very different from choosing to act differently because of it. Members of the Leadership Forum interviewed expressed in frustration, that politicians were not only uninspired by the process to change their approach, but also at times appeared to feel politically threatened by the project. Several accounts of the project’s presentation to Parliament, for example described some partisan criticism by MPs, concerned in one case that the scenario video was too critical of government, and in another, that it was implicitly supporting a political party. It is therefore difficult to see how, to date, the dialogue spaces created has changed the perspectives and relationships among political leaders, and from that generated broader action to change the country.

Engagements with MPs have, however, led to requests for the project to work in their constituencies, to support practical projects. One MP from Central Kingston, for example, has worked fairly closely with the project to run activities in his area. However, all of these activities have been at the community rather than governance level. In addition, both of the MPs interviewed by the evaluation team, while expressing appreciation for the Civic Dialogue’s involvement in their community, felt that the project did not follow up enough to have a meaningful practical impact.82

The fact that these engagements have built personal support for the project, and has led to community level activities, does suggest some impacts in terms of social capital generation. These activities have contributed to building and strengthening of networks between and among governance actors and people at the community level. They have also provided additional channels for providing information and communication, as demonstrated for example by the personal development workshop that was held in October, 2004 and brought together 140 participants from across nine communities and a number of different agencies.83

Yet beyond political leadership, the project has been very effective at gaining the support of high-level leaders in other areas of government. Expressions of strong personal support for the project’s vision came from the President of the Court of Appeals, the Director General of the PIOJ, and leadership in the Jamaican Defence Force—all of whom participated in the Leadership Forum dialogue. However, in none of these cases has that individual support been translated into widespread organisational participation.

**Impact Among Organisational Actors**

A widely acknowledged critical success factor for this project has been the degree to which it could integrate with, create synergies among, and promote an overall direction for the variety of organisations, institutions, and initiatives functioning in Jamaica. Success in doing this would at least carve out a unique role for the Civic Dialogue Project within development efforts in Jamaica and potentially create new levels of cooperation and joint action. At the same time, failure to achieve integration would risk the project becoming duplicative of already existing initiatives, and also failing to achieve its full potential.

Overall the evaluation team has found mixed results on the project’s impact among organisational actors. On the one hand, the project has engaged a wide range of institutions in Jamaica and very effectively linked them to community actors at key moments in the project. On the other hand, the project has had much greater difficulty creating strategic partnerships with major organisations—a gap that has certainly decreased the breadth of project impact.
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82 Interview with Patrick Harris. Conducted by the evaluation team by phone. 25/10/05. Interview with St. Aubyn Bartlett. Conducted by the evaluation team by phone. 26/10/05.
The organisational actors that the project engaged with cut across a wide range of sectors and influence a number of different aspects of life in Jamaica. Major types of organisations the project has engaged with include media, NGOs, business groups, the church, and parastatals. Interaction with the media has included some dialogue engagements\(^{84}\) but has mostly come about through media coverage. The project has gotten fairly significant coverage through dedicated television documentaries discussing the project, and TV, radio and print news stories reporting on individual events of the project.

Engagement with NGOs has largely been supported by membership of significant directors in the project’s Leadership Forum, including Jamaicans for Justice and the Dispute Resolution Foundation. The same has been true of its interactions with the business community, church leadership, and academic communities, with all of whom the project has run dialogue engagements.

The project has more proactively worked to engage with state supported institutions such as the Social Development Commission (SDC), Parish Development Committees (PDC), and the Peace Management Initiative (PMI). With very similar target groups and the resources and mandate to work nationally, SDC is a very logical partner for the project to work with. The Civic Dialogue recognised this and began discussing potential linkages with them during the scenario design phase of the project. In addition, the project has been very careful to involve community workers from SDC in their local projects and have worked extensively with constituent Community Development Councils (CDCs). While, the project has held dialogue engagements with four PDCs around the country, these have not led to deeper engagement or cooperation. Finally, with extensive involvement with community level conflict, the Civic Dialogue Project has very effectively provided linkages between communities in need of interventions and the PMI.

In looking at these engagements, the evaluation team has noted a number of examples of cooperation, but no clearly defined strategic partnerships around achieving objectives beyond individual communities. Given the project’s desired outputs to impact policy and communicate scenario-based dialogue nationally, the development of partnerships with other institutions would be a clear sign that the project was achieving buy-in to its vision. It would also be a critical step towards disseminating that vision nationally.

The most common reason given during interviews for why these partnerships have not taken place has been a lack of strategic follow up. The most notable statements along these lines came in the evaluation team’s group interview at SDC. The group, which represented SDC at local, regional, and national levels pinpointed exactly when they first engaged with the project, saying that Civic Dialogue had wanted to partner. However, partnerships did not develop beyond the initial partnership discussion, due to what SDC felt was a lack of follow up by the project to put something structured in place to create a well thought through basis for cooperation.\(^ {85}\)
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\(^{84}\) For example, with the Editor in Chief of *The Gleaner*, Oliver Clark.

\(^{85}\) Group interview with Richard Billings, Courtney Brown, Andrea McCarthy, and Terry Ranglin. Conducted by the evaluation team at the SDC offices on Camp Road. 26/10/05.
Despite these criticisms, the project has nonetheless created some level of relationship with the broad range of groups above. Though the SDC discussed the lack of strategic efforts to engage with them, they did express their willingness and desire to partner with the project in the future, provided a mutually beneficial basis for cooperation was developed. It is important to underline this sense of potential for future partnership, because it is one that was broadly expressed by stakeholders throughout the evaluation. This networking and communication is important, even if it has not yet had the level of depth to produce action in a consistent way. It is also clear that the engagement with organisational actors have also enabled better linkages between those institutions and the community groups that the project worked with, promoting increased networking and communication, and providing a basis for collective action and cooperation among those groups.

So in terms of social capital, the project has produced some results in working with organisational actors, if not at the level desired. However, given the nature of organisational actors, the evaluation team finds it difficult to evaluate these efforts in terms of a dialogue framework. There have been dialogue engagements run with these groups, which have supported subsequent cooperation, however, the evaluation team believes organisational actors are more properly viewed as potential partners than as participants. The lack of clarity in this definition, and therefore a partnership development strategy, appears a reason for mixed results with this client segment.

**Impact Among Community Actors**

As clearly demonstrated by both the number of people engaged and number of engagements held, this project has focussed the majority of its efforts during the engagement phase at the community level and among local actors, particularly in the Kingston area. Overall the team has found that the greatest levels of impact produced by project have been through its on-going interactions with organisations and actors at the community level by supporting local initiatives, working to help communities resolve internal conflicts, and building social capital among communities and with larger institutions in Jamaica. This recognition, is tempered, however, by the fact that the number of communities benefiting from deeper engagement is relatively small compared to the total number of communities the project has touched, and that in supporting these communities the project has drifted beyond its original focus on promoting dialogue into activities that more resemble service delivery.

According to the Secretariat, the project has deeply engaged eight community groups. These include the CDCs for Greenwich Town, Western Kingston, Hannah Town, Tivoli Gardens, Fletcher’s Land, Mountain View and Denham Town, as well as the Duhaney Park Community. Of these communities, perhaps the best example of deep engagement has been with the Greenwich Town CDC. The case study below provides their story in greater depth.

---
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THE GREENWICH TOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL
(CDC)
AN EXAMPLE OF BEING DEEPLY ENGAGED WITH THE CIVIC
DIALOGUE PROJECT 87

The Greenwich Town Community Development Council was formed in 2000 following an outbreak of violence in the community in which 17 persons were killed. Citizens organised a march for peace and later formed the CDC under the guidance of a key leader in the community, Godfrey Lothian. The CDC brings together local NGOs and CBOs, churches, schools, the fishing cooperative and businesses in the area.

Lothian had long been engaged in community development serving as President of the community’s football league for 25 years. He had been involved in other important initiatives and was known in community development circles. Since the formation of the CDC, Greenwich Town has had support from various agencies including the Peace Management Initiative (PMI) the Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF) and the community relations division of the police force.

As a well-known community leader, Lothian was invited to join the Leadership Forum of the Civic Dialogue Project and though he missed becoming a member because of his absence from the final in a series of workshops, he continued to be deeply involved in the project. He invited the project to make a presentation to his community in July 2004.

By then the CDC had had specific action plans and with Lothian’s strong advocacy and leadership, the Civic Dialogue project has supported the CDC in its community activities providing the following types of assistance

- Administrative assistance with and prizes for the community’s health fair and skills expo
- Scholarships to community members for evening classes at the High school in the community
- Scholarships for 20 persons who will be attending classes in mediation, communication skills etc at the International University of the Caribbean
- On-going administrative and secretarial services to the CDC
- Assistance to enable Lothian’s attendance of a course at Eastern Mennonite University in Virginia to learn peace building strategies and about restorative justice.

This case study demonstrates a few common points of the project’s focussed work and impact in local communities. The project has generally worked in communities where existing strong leaders have been already working to promote development. These leaders have in turn invited the project into the community and proactively identified areas in which the Civic Dialogue can provide support. In Tivoli Gardens, this has included support in planning and developing a community survey to better understand

87 Case study based on interviews with the Civic Dialogue Secretariat, Godfrey Lothian, and the Greenwich Town CDC.
development needs. In Fletchers Land, this has included support in creating a regular competition among “corner crews” (who clean up and beautify their corner of the community) as a way of keeping youth occupied and presenting an alternative to violence. Some basic statistics on community results from community level support by the project include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3: Participation in Events Held by the Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events Held</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills Fairs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Fairs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conferences Held</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sporting Events Organised</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the project’s Executive Coordinator, the power of the Civic Dialogue approach in these communities has been the open-ended way in which they ran engagements. Rather than telling communities what they should do, project staff has simply listened for local needs and provided support accordingly. This approach has built trust between community leaders and the Civic Dialogue, enabling the project to play a deeper role in supporting communities, by convening meetings to discuss community level conflicts and providing entry points for other actors like PMI. It is also felt that the project created an environment more conducive to law enforcement, by enabling better communication between community and police about crime. Another significant success has been through linking communities to the Registrar General’s Department to conduct birth registration drives for children. As a result of these drives, 514 children have been registered for birth certificates, making them eligible to receive social benefits.

These activities speak to the project’s role in creating social capital by building trust, promoting communication, and supporting collective action. These impacts have further been multiplied by the development of the Kingston and St. Andrews (KSA) Action Forum. Consisting of leaders across political party lines from forty inner city communities in Kingston, the Action Forum emerged with the support of the Civic Dialogue Project and its activities include community development, advocacy, and cross-community communication. Included below is a case study describing the KSA Action Forum.

88 Interview with Paul Napier. Conducted by the Evaluation Team by telephone. 31/10/05.
89 Interview with Ionie Worms. Conducted by the Evaluation Team by telephone. 28/10/05.
90 Data provided by the Civic Dialogue Secretariat.
91 Interview with Noel Watson. Conducted by the evaluation team and the UNDP office. 10/21-22/05.
92 Data provided by the Civic Dialogue Secretariat.
THE KINGSTON & ST. ANDREW ACTION FORUM

While there are other committees that bring together representatives of different inner-city communities in Kingston, none is as large or as diverse as the Kingston & St. Andrew Action Forum. The KSA Action Forum was initiated by Godfrey Lothian who called together a small number of leaders from other communities to discuss the possibilities of collaboration. They soon discovered that they shared similar community concerns like crime and violence, and underdevelopment.

They continued to meet, and Lothian requested the use of meeting space at the UNDP. The space and administrative support were provided as well as contacts to other communities. Since the groups’ first meeting at the UNDP on November 29, 2004, it has continued as an independent body being closely associated with and supported by the Civic Dialogue Project.

There are currently representatives from 40 communities extending to Spanish Town in St. Catherine and Port Royal in Eastern Kingston. The communities are supportive of both political parties and through their involvement in the Forum members have developed new trust and friendships across party lines – a development the members say none had conceived of as possible before. The group has implemented the following with strong administrative support from the Civic Dialogue Secretariat

- A conference of inner-city communities
- Support to conflict mediation across communities
- A submission on the budget presentation of the Minister of Finance and a press conference to highlight their recommendations for a percentage of the consumption tax to be used for community development
- Regular features of communities on two radio stations
- A skills and trade fair
- The development of a project for organising of regular talent show at the Ward Theatre in downtown Kingston to generate funding and support inner city renewal

In the main, members of the Forum report that the greatest impact on themselves personally relate to

- Change in their attitude towards persons of a different political persuasion
- Feeling empowered and self-determined

Forum members describe themselves as the community intellectuals, and the Forum as the alternative parliament.

The KSA Action Forum represents a potentially very effective coming together of energy, enthusiasm, and ideas that could provide another model for activities across the country. Claiming to represent communities with a total population of 600,000, the Forum has been a valuable place to share skills and to engage informally with policy makers. A professor that has since become the Representative of the World Bank in Jamaica, provided training to the group in preparation for their budget initiative and expressed a feeling that the KSA Action Forum could play very productive role by channelling community views into the policy debate.

---

93 Case study based on interviews with the Civic Dialogue Secretariat, Godfrey Lothian, and the KSA Action Forum.
94 Interview with Wayne Henry. Conducted by the evaluation team at the World Bank offices. 27/10/05.
Putting this positive picture into perspective, however, it should be noted that these higher impact relationships have taken place in a relatively small number of communities as compared to how many have participated in dialogue sessions. This reflects how resource intensive this level of engagement can be, but it also means that the majority of groups engaged have had insufficient follow up to produce lasting results.

A second concern with these impacts mentioned, has been the degree to which, in achieving them, the Secretariat has been drawn into activities that resemble service delivery far more than dialogue. In working with communities, the project has provided extensive support, such as writing letters or project proposals on behalf of community members, organising meetings for them, and even funding school fees for people entering adult education.

| Table 3.4: Involvement in Adult Education Programmes Supported by the Project95 |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|
|                                 | 2004  | 2005  |
|                                 | Men   | Women | Men   | Women |
| Community members enrolled in adult education programmes | 11    | 40    | 20    | 20    |
| Community members funded for adult education programmes   | 0     | 0     | 4     | 7     |

Evaluating these activities against the Sustained Dialogue Theory of Change reveals gaps in how dialogue has taken place. First, in terms of creating a space, the initial engagements in most of these communities have been driven by groups inviting the Civic Dialogue to present, rather than the active efforts of the project, using a specific criteria to initiate dialogue. While this certainly has meant that the project has been welcomed in the communities where it works, it also means that the project has not played a role in shaping who it works with initially. In addition, it means that the project has entered communities without having proactively set expectations for the engagements, which risks participants projecting their own agenda on engagements. In terms of creating ideas and leaders for change, the model that the process has used in communities has drawn out ideas very quickly, which have resulted in actions taken to improve communities. However, the project’s immediate willingness to support and help enact these ideas has meant that communities have not had time to develop new perspectives or relationships, which inhibits full ownership and responsibility for taking action.

It can, however, be argued that the project’s current model of beginning with action, has in places like Greenwich town ultimately led to the engagement of a broader set of local stakeholders, and through the process of working together changes in perspectives and relationships. Yet this approach creates three concerns. First, as described in the design

95 Ibid.
and implementation chapter, there are serious questions as to whether these services were intended activities of the project and whether the Secretariat is the most effective group to be implementing them. Engaging in community development activities is not necessarily the most strategic use of funds or staff time, when one considers the project’s initially planned outputs and the fact that other organisations in Jamaica exist for the purpose of providing similar services.

Second, such intense service delivery creates confusion about the project’s purpose and indeed the nature of dialogue. When asked about the project’s purpose, the Greenwich Town CDC responded that it was about supporting community development. When asked further about the scenarios, community members asked for a reminder of what the video was about and then said it was a nice starting point for the work. The provision of services builds high expectations for the project’s on-going role, which not only creates sustainability questions for the project, but also creates obstacles for other initiatives that may try to work with the same communities.

A third concern is the question of sustainability for communities. On the one hand, the fact that the project has largely worked with already existing organisations suggests that they will continue beyond the Civic Dialogue’s engagement with them. This means that knowledge and capacity remain in communities. On the other hand, given the large degree to which the project has done organising on the communities’ behalf, there are questions as to how much capacity has been passed on. Regardless, it is clear that the project is playing a service delivery role in those communities that will not be there in the long term. Furthermore, the KSA Action Forum, for all of its strengths depends heavily on administrative support from the project Secretariat. The Secretariat has done much of the organising behind the Forum’s activities and provides the space where it meets. The project has begun the process of getting the KSA Action Forum registered as a benevolent society, but there is need for much more transfer of skills and capabilities to make its activities self-sustaining.

**Overall Evaluation of Project Impact**

In summarising the impact this project has produced, it appears that the most substantive developments have been through the Leadership Forum scenario design process and activities among community actors. The Leadership Forum’s dialogue was an effective social capital generating exercise and a true dialogue that has changed the relationships and perspectives of participants and created lasting benefits for the involved individuals and in some cases the groups they come from. The community level activities have also produced some substantial tangible benefits for local people along with some significant linkages with other groups in the community. The creation of the Kingston and St. Andrew Action Forum is a good example of this and one that has the potential to produce even greater results in the future.

---

96 Group interview with the Greenwich Town CDC. Conducted by the evaluation team in Greenwich Town. 25/10/05.
Beyond these two significant areas of impact, the project has also held engagements with a significant number of groups at all levels of Jamaican society. The results of these engagements have been mixed, with some people feeling that Civic Dialogues engagements to date have been too superficial and lacking in follow up. However, overall, these engagements appear to have broadened the project’s profile and created the sense that it has a potential to do more.

Two important limitations need to be identified. The first is that beyond the Leadership Forum process, very little true and systematic dialogue appears to have actually taken place as a result of this project. There have been a large number of scenario engagements, and there has clearly been a large amount of informal and unstructured discussion that has taken place around community engagements. However, individual scenario engagements, largely involving a two-hour presentation and discussion of the scenarios, cannot alone create a lasting impact on targeted communities. One success regularly claimed by project staff and Steering Committee during the evaluation has been that every group engaged to date has “bought into the Get Up Stand Up Vision for Jamaica.” Having viewed both the fifteen and thirty-nine minute versions of the scenario video, having attended three initial dialogue engagements, and having conducted its own focus group with the shorter version of the video, the evaluation team believes that people’s support for the “Get Up Stand Up” scenario is inevitable given the negative images of the other scenarios and does not constitute a significant change in mind set. From the feedback the team has received and from watching the video itself, the viewers appear to be offered simply a choice between three unattractive options and one attractive one—an option that almost any viewer would naturally accept. A true change in mindset and therefore actions can only really be achieved through a sustained process of interaction and dialogue, and most people who have viewed the scenarios have not engaged in that.

As for the communities where the project has been most deeply engaged, the lack of a clear model for on-going dialogue makes it very difficult to measure or clearly articulate how perspectives and relationships have been changed. A large number of anecdotal examples suggest that these changes have taken place to some degree, but given the project’s strong community development tendencies, it would appear that these impacts are emerging more as a part of service delivery activities than a planned process of dialogue.

A second important limitation to this picture of impact has been the unplanned manner in which it has been achieved. The lack of a clear project design and regular monitoring of outputs has already been discussed as a limitation to the project. These can account for two critical shifts in focus that appear in what has been produced by the project. The first has been the largely localised, or community focus of the project activities and impact achieved to date, when the initial project outputs called for a “nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process.” The second has been the more recent introduction of measures for impact based on tangible outputs and social capital. These

have represented attempts, in hindsight, to explain impact that has been achieved, rather than planned for results of project activities.
CHAPTER IV: OVERALL FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

Having examined the context within which the project has operated and will function, the overall model and design for the project, how the project has been implemented and the impact it has achieved, a number of key findings have emerged. These findings provide the basis for evaluating the project against its objectives and making recommendations for strengthening it in the future. This chapter will therefore:

- Summarise key findings of the evaluation described earlier
- Assess the project against its initial objectives, based on its significance to the current context, and in comparison to the resources spent on it

Key Findings of the Evaluation

Having examined all aspects of the project’s development, activities, and impacts the evaluation team calls special attention to a few key themes that have emerged through its evaluation. These include:

- **A consensus among people interviewed about the project’s potential contrasted by highly divergent perceptions of the project’s achievement of that potential to date.** Looking at the Jamaican context today, there is a clear need for projects that promote dialogue across political, class, and gender divides. The evaluation process encountered a nearly universal consensus on this point and the project’s potential to fill that role. However, it also encountered highly divergent perceptions of whether the project was achieving that potential. On one hand a number of people pointed to contributions the project had made in providing services and building social capital. At the same time, a large number of people emphasized the ways in which this project has drifted from its original objectives, appears to be lacking in focus, and has had limited success at the decision-making level.

- **Despite the effective use of the Civic Scenario Model among the Leadership Forum, an overall weak conceptualisation and design of the project has led to scope drift.** The model set the process for what was an effective dialogue among members of the Leadership Forum. However, insufficient consideration of how the model fit into the Jamaican context, a vague initial project design, and a lack of rigour in planning and executing the engagement phases has caused the project to become reactive to its environment, rather than proactive in attempting to create change. This has led the project to place greater focus in areas where it was not intended to work and led to a large amount of activities that did not produce a measurable impact.

- **That project implementation, while driven by a highly dedicated Secretariat, has been weakened by gaps in participation, strategic planning, and appropriate skills.** The Secretariat was initially established to support the Leadership Forum in implementing the project. However, as the Leadership Forum’s involvement in the project decreased, the Secretariat took a much larger role than was initially intended.
This was compounded by the project’s increasing focus at the community level, which required a set of skills that the Secretariat was not hired for. This stretched the project staff in a variety of directions, limiting their ability to focus energy on prioritised impact areas.

- **The project has produced some significant impacts among the Leadership Forum and at the community level, but has had difficulty influencing decision makers and other key national actors.** The areas where it has had impact, particularly the KSA Action Forum offer new models for future project efforts. However, the more localised scope of these impacts combined with the lack of significant impact on actors at other levels suggests the need to reconsider and perhaps develop new models for the project in the future. Its current model has not created broad enough or sustainable impact.

- **A lack of effective monitoring and evaluation has weakened the project’s capacity for quality control and made it difficult to prove the impacts it has achieved.** This has partially been due to a lack of deliberate planning for evaluation, but more importantly it has been a result of the project being implemented as a DEX. Under this arrangement, the PIOJ, which normally monitors projects, has not been able to play its usual role.

- **The project has had a number of learning experiences since it was launched that have yet to be fully examined for the use of policy makers, development workers, and other dialogue practitioners.** The project has been extensively documented but analysis and writing about the information gathered has been limited. A deeper exploration of the lessons learned could provide valuable insights for actors in Jamaica and beyond.

### Assessing the Project

Given all of the information provided, it is possible to provide a final assessment of this project in its current state. In doing so, it is critical to first assess to what degree it has achieved its intended outputs. Having looked at that, this chapter examines the project’s overall significance within the Jamaican context, and based on that, it provides an analysis of its benefits relative to its cost.

**Successes Relative to Intended Outputs**

While the project has certainly promoted its desired outcome of “a vibrant culture of democratic governance that guarantees political participation, poverty reduction and social equity” in its activities, this evaluation has found the scope of where that impact has been achieved limited. The team has found the following achievements against the project’s intended outputs:

---
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1. **Increased and improved civic dialogue process**- The project has run a successful Civic Dialogue process among the Leadership Forum, one that all participants interviewed considered personally transformative. However, the project has not succeeded in turning that experience into a model for replicating similar dialogue among other Jamaicans.

2. **Learning History of the project produced**- A project history has been produced, that tracks its development through August 2004. This history is highly factual in content and was never intended to provide analysis of project activities. Since August 2004, project activities have been documented through meeting reports, video taping of engagements, and Steering Committee minutes. These have not, however, been compiled into a single document.

3. **Targeted research papers produced in support of the process**- While the initial development of the project and scenarios was supported by fairly in-depth research, research has not played a significant role in the engagement phase. There have been some short reflective papers produced but little in-depth research or writing on either critical challenges to the dialogue project or lessons learned.

4. **Leadership capacity for all dialogue participants strengthened**- The project has made some substantial contributions in building the capacity of participants that have been deeply engaged in the project. The Leadership Forum has greatly benefited from its involvement through a broadening of perspectives and training that has taken place. In addition, community leaders have benefited from participation in deliberative processes and new learning opportunities generated by the project. There has been much less capacity developed among those less engaged in the project who to date are the majority of participants in the project.

5. **Nationwide communication of scenario based civic dialogue process**- While the project has received media coverage across the country, and it has held twenty-nine engagements outside of Kingston, it has been a mostly Kingston and St. Andrew focussed project. All of its deepest engagements have taken place in Kingston and the project has not developed a strategy for pushing the project out nationally.

6. **Policy/ Strategy Formulation and other upstream activities**- The project has had some success at creating groups like the KSA Action Forum that can play a role in advocacy. It has also engaged with a wide range of policy makers, including the Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition, and Parliament. However, this has not led to a noticeable impact on policy formulation or implementation.

This evaluation therefore finds a mixed record of achievements to date against the project’s intended outputs. Outputs 1-3 were successfully achieved during the scenario development phase but were not fully achieved through the engagement phases. Output 4
has been achieved among those that have been deeply involved in the project, but not with those that have only attended the scenario engagements. Outputs 5 and 6 have largely not been achieved, despite some notable activity in attempting to address them.

The Project’s Significance

Looking beyond its achievements the project does occupy a potentially significant position with respect to Jamaica’s current challenges and emerging developments. Given high levels of dissatisfaction with and mistrust towards government in the country, this project has shown an ability to link people at the community level to people at other parts of society. This social capital generating function is potentially very valuable because it can lead to both greater input by citizens into policy making and greater capacity by individuals to solve their own problems.

Such a contribution could be quite valuable going forward as Jamaica engages in reforms that will decentralise power to local government and as it launches a new national security strategy. Perspectives provided on the local government reform has suggested that it will be successful only if new structures are both supported and held accountable by active citizens who understand the system and are able to productively advocate for their concerns. Research on the national security strategy has highlighted the fact that one of the strategy’s key components will be strengthening the community’s role in maintaining security through local conflict management and engaging through local policing forums with the JCF.99

The project’s success in creating social capital, particularly as displayed by the creation of the KSA Action Forum, shows that if appropriately matched with the right skills and technical expertise, it can potentially create the types of local level linkages and capacities to strengthen on-going reforms. At the same time, bodies like the KSA Action Forum can have a broader policy impact if appropriately linked to decision makers. The potential for the project to impact policy in this way has been highlighted by a number of government actors and IDPs.

However, the project’s lack of effective focus to date has caused it at times to risk duplicating the activities of existing organisations such as DRF, SDC, and PMI. With a smaller budget and not necessarily the most appropriate skill sets, such drift places the project at risk of losing its relevance. Avoiding this will require careful strategic positioning and better cooperation with existing actors.

Analysis of the Project Cost’s Effectiveness

From the initial set up phase until now the project has drawn on a significant set of resources both within UNDP and beyond. In terms of funding, this has included approximately USD 600,000 provided by UNDP and an additional USD 76,000 provided by CIDA. In addition, the project has drawn on extensive volunteer support from

99 Interview with Mark James. Conducted by the evaluation team at the offices of the Department of International Development (DFID). 28/10/05.
members of the Leadership Forum and participants in the dialogue initiatives. A full accounting of current expenditures to date includes the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Project Expenditures to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services - Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual &amp; Printing Production Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication &amp; Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies &amp; Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops &amp; Civic Engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Community Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project has been a very expensive exercise relative to its achievements to date. This is particularly the case when one considers that more than half of the budget to date had been spent in the less focussed engagement phase. As discussed in the previous chapter, a larger amount of resources were used in 2004 and 2005 conducting engagements that ultimately yielded little sustainable impact.

However, given the potential for elements of this project to play a significant role in the future, there is room to generate more benefits from the already significant investment made in the Civic Dialogue. Doing so, however, will depend on UNDP’s ability to consolidate lessons learned and accomplishments to date and build on them strategically in the future.

100 The project evaluation team has been provided six different estimates of expenditures for 2004. This estimate was selected because it provides the best allocations. It is taken from a presentation made to PIOJ by Noel Watson on 13/5/06.
101 The 2005 data was allocated to the project lines by the evaluation team based on allocation codes provided by UNDP.
CHAPTER V: RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this evaluation some critical steps need to be taken to ensure that the Civic Dialogue For Democratic Governance Project can have a strong and measurable impact in the future. The evaluation team there for makes the following recommendations:

1. Reframe the project’s objectives and strategic approaches to achieving them

The project’s first priority should be to redefine what its objectives will be going forward, and how it will it will work to achieve them. Looking at the strengths and weaknesses of the project to date, the evaluation team believes these new objectives should contain three components:

- **A more explicit focus on building social capital** to create linkages within and among communities, and between them and policy makers. The project’s successes at accomplishing this to date through the KSA Action Forum both show the potential value for doing so and the existence of a model.

- **A focus on strengthening existing government reform efforts in areas of local government and security.** Both of these efforts match with the project’s existing values and would benefit greatly from the building of greater social capital, linkages on the ground, and development of additional channels for citizens to provide policy input. Local organisations and IDP’s interviewed during the evaluation confirmed that the project could productively support these efforts at both levels and expressed support for such a strategic refocusing. In addition, the focus on supporting existing initiatives will help ensure better measurement of impact and sustainability because the project will operating through better institutional linkages.

- **A reframing of the project model to become one offering a tool for transformational dialogue that is integrated into existing or emerging communication processes in Jamaica.** Because the resource and time intensive nature of the project’s engagement approach to date has prevented it from having a broader impact, it should refocus its activities from directly engaging communities, to building the capacity of better placed organisations to take dialogue forward. This does not mean the project should entirely cease its current community level activities, but rather that it should take on more of a capacity building role in how it promotes dialogue in the future.

Making these shifts in the objectives of the project, however, will also require adjustments to the project’s implementation strategy and model. These changes should include:
• **Developing and strengthening partnerships and collaborative processes** for addressing issues at community/inter-community and/or national levels. In becoming a more capacity focused initiative, the project should work with organisations already active around the country to roll out dialogue. However, unlike in the past, such partnerships should be formalised and include a strategic focus and a clear plan of action. Considering the suggested focus on local governance and security, potential partners could include SDC, PDCs, and community liaison components of the Jamaican Constabulary Force.

• **Clearly defining levels to engage with and the objectives of engaging with each of them.** Rather than sharing a generic vision with each level, the project should customise how it engages with them. Common to each level, should be efforts to link them with each other. However, beyond that, the project should develop more specific objectives for each group. These could include:
  - **Governance Actors**- Sharing information gathered in the project and creating linkages to community level processes to impact the government’s approach to policy and implementation.
  - **Organisational Actors**- Integrating the dialogue approach into their work and harnessing their capabilities to strengthen dialogue in communities nationally.
  - **Community Actors**- Providing a space, capacity, and institutional linkages to help communities more thoroughly explore their own challenges, generate solutions, and influence local and national policy.

• **Developing a robust dialogue model** and the relevant skills to deliver the model. This model should include a more sustained period of dialogue where it is used and also deliberately incorporate a transfer of knowledge and capacities (ie. Information on local government, how to obtain development funding, how to work with policy, etc.). Considering the success of the Leadership Forum’s initial workshops, the scenario design model may be an interesting one to replicate. Other more general models, such as the five stage, Sustained Dialogue model\(^2\) may also be useful, so long as the model used provides a conceptual approach to achieving deeper and more effective dialogue over time. Developing, using and rolling out such a model, however, requires strong facilitation and training skills.

• **Establishing activity plans** with clearly defined outcomes and a timeline for achieving them. In doing so, the project should begin with modest initial targets and then work towards broader roll out after initial successes are consolidated and well documented.

2. **Solidifying the project’s organisational structure and strengthening delivery capacity by bringing in new skills**

\(^2\) See Annexure E for a description of this model.
To effectively execute on the redefined strategy, the project will need to clearly define its structure to ensure effective accountability and implementation going forward. Steps towards doing this should include:

- **Clearly defining the roles and relationships of the Secretariat, Steering Committee, Leadership Forum, and the UNDP** - This should include clearer lines of management for the project and therefore clearer responsibilities. In particular, this project should fall within the scope of a larger set of programming to be carried out by UNDP under the Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme. In addition, decisions should be made about whether the Steering Committee and Leadership Forum should be playing an advisory, management, or implementing role going forward.

- **Repositioning the project as nationally executed (NEX)** - This should be done either by spinning it off into its own independent organisation, or by placing the project within an existing institution. Doing so will better ensure long term sustainability of its capacities, improve the project’s chances to obtain additional funding, and address many of the concerns about its profile as a UNDP run project. This transition should only take place, however, once the project has refocused itself for the future.

In addition the project will need to more deliberately develop its capacities. This may require additional training for current staff, or the identification of new people that could bring the necessary skills to the project. Before doing so, the project should carefully consider what capabilities it needs and develop a strategy for developing them. Some additional capacities the evaluation team considers important are:

- **Community development practice** - To provide the project a better understanding of the communities where it is operating and the types of practices necessary to ensure sustainable and community driven results emerge from dialogue processes.

- **Dialogue facilitation** - To ensure that new dialogue models brought into the project are effectively led to produce results over time. Particularly as the project works to share its capacity, it will need credible examples of how its dialogue model has been effectively used in the past.

- **Training techniques** - To ensure that capacity to use dialogue is effectively shared with partners and communities.

- **Communications/social marketing** - To create a more consistent profile for the project, focussed around dialogue, and to ensure that findings from the project are effectively disseminated to policy makers and the country as a whole.

- **Monitoring & evaluation** - To build into the project more internal quality control mechanisms. A stronger capacity for monitoring and evaluation would ensure that in the future the project does not experience the same scope drift that has occurred to date.
3. Build in a culture of reflection and lesson learning

Given highly divergent opinions about the project’s successes to date, it is imperative that the project works to develop a culture of more open reflection and lesson learning in the future. Doing so will ensure both improved project results and better documentation of lessons that can be shared with other stakeholders around the country. Critical steps for building this culture will include:

- **The development and implementation of a clear monitoring and evaluation system**- This system should include key indicators that the project is tracking, and regular milestones for analysing project quality and impact. In addition, there should be clear involvement of external monitors, like PIOJ, to provide an unbiased perspective on project achievements.

- **Holding periodic project monitoring evaluation meetings**- Based on the monitoring and evaluation system, on at least a quarterly basis, the project should pause and reflect on what it has achieved. These reflections should include more than just the Secretariat and Steering Committee, but also some external voices, such as project participants, partner organisations and PIOJ.

- **Generating regular research papers that capture lessons learned**- Given the project’s extensive experience in working with community challenges, it is well placed to influence debates on policy making and development both within Jamaica and beyond. Doing so, however, requires more reflective writing on lessons learned and a concerted effort to share ideas generated with the appropriate parties.

4. Implement a time-bound process for institutionalising the project as a Nationally Executed Project

Given the suggestions above, UNDP will need to develop a plan for consolidating the Civic Dialogue Project and shifting it towards its new focus and institutional structure. To address some of the challenges discussed earlier, the project should be refocused through the following three phases:

**Phase 1: Self-Assessment and Transition-Planning**- Over the next three months the project should pause to streamline and reorient its functions and strengthen project management systems with a clearly declared intention to transition to a NEX. This process to involve the following steps:

a. A pause of current project activities, particularly the holding of new engagements, to prevent the building of further expectations and provide time for deeper reflection.

b. A process of internal reflection, involving all levels of the project (the UNDP Country Office, the Leadership Forum, the Steering Committee, the Secretariat, and the KSA Action Forum), and using the evaluation
report as a starting point. This process should have external facilitators to ensure that it is objective, and that all issues are fully discussed. As this reflection takes place, the project should review its current systems, and undergo a process and financial audit.

c. Based on this reflection, the groups involved should develop a strategic plan with a reframed project objective, new strategies, and clearly defined structures and roles. The project should also plan for communicating with, and getting feedback and buy-in from other key stakeholders it would need to work with.

d. A consultation process with potential partners, including IDPs, PIOJ, and other relevant organisations like SDC. This process should be aimed at gaining substantive feedback on the future of the project and ensuring buy-in going forward.

e. Revisit and revise the strategic plan based on consultation feedback.

Phase 2: Implementation of the Project Plan - Over the following six months the project should refocus its efforts and be established as a component of the broader Conflict Transformation and Peace Building Programme of UNDP; with clear objectives, strategies, activities and expected outcomes.

Phase 3: Transition to NEX - Once the project has refocused within the larger CTPB Programme it should establish a “Hand over” process to house the project in a newly created or existing local entity. This should take place within the next twelve months.
A. BACKGROUND

The project document for the Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project was signed in December 2002 and was scheduled to last for two years. The purpose of the Project was to stimulate a national dialogue amongst Jamaicans from all walks of life in order to develop a shared vision for the country as well as to develop strategies to deal with crime and violence, corruption and unemployment. The Project has had numerous achievements over the period and a valuable and irreversible process is now in motion in which various Jamaicans have participated and wish to continue to contribute towards and which benefits from the highest level of political endorsement. The recent launch of the Project in late June during which commitments to the process were made by the Governor General, a representative of the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, representatives from trade unions, the church, the private sector, civil society organizations, youth, urban and rural communities etc. is testimony to the confidence in the approach and optimism in the Project’s potential.

Based on the achievement of the Project in its Pilot Phase, as well as the enormous yet unrealized potential for generating community and broader participation in the governance of the country, a decision has been taken to extend the Project into a second Phase. This next phase is intended to scale-up the Project by deepening and broadening the dialogue through increasing the capacity of local government and community-based organizations to undertake the dialogue process and ensure its sustainability as a critical part of strengthening participatory governance practices in Jamaica; and by strengthening the policy process to accommodate the results of a broader and deeper community and national dialogue. The next phase is also envisioned to include dialoguing in conflict-prone or warring communities.

B. OBJECTIVE

To conduct an evaluation of the phase 1 in order to:

- Examine the extent to which the objectives of the Project have been met to date.
- Examine whether participants have developed an effective capacity for dialogue at each phase of the process and identify the capacity gaps that need to be strengthened
- Examine the levels of ownership developed through the dialogue
- Examine the impact of the Pilot Phase of the Project on the communities that have been exposed to the dialogue and on the lives of those that have been involved in the process.
• Assess the entry points for a broader Community Transformation and Peace Building Programme.
• Recommend a strategy for implementing phase II under the framework of the Community Transformation and Peace Building (CTPB) Programme based on weaknesses and strengths of the dialogue process.

C. METHODOLOGY
The design of Civic Dialogue Projects generally rests on three main pillars:

1. Purpose – A multi-stakeholder dialogue aimed at producing consensus and developing a shared vision to the implementation of which each stakeholder commits.

2. Participants – Those involved in the dialogue at various levels e.g. the Steering Committee, the Leadership Forum, community and other dialoguing groups and other stakeholders.

3. Process – This includes forming the Leadership Forum, establishing a Steering Committee, developing realistic civic scenarios, establishing a Project Secretariat, engaging the various microcosms of the society, generating a Project History, providing community planning and empowerment workshops/activities, compiling main themes emanating from the dialogue, officially launching the Project after having produced results on the ground.

The evaluation of the Civic Dialogue Project will involve a two-pronged approach consisting of:
- A Process Review
- A Client Survey

Composition of the Evaluation Team:

➢ In order to assess amongst other things levels of ownership generated by the dialogue a team of three consultants will be fielded: one international team leader who has expertise and in-depth knowledge of civic dialogue processes and experience in programming and evaluation of similar projects - both in terms of process and impact; and two local consultants with experience and a strong background in qualitative socio-economic research in Jamaica, especially as it relates to inner-city communities.
➢ The team leader will be responsible for the overall work/output of the team as well be engaged in both process and client survey
➢ The two local consultants will undertake the client survey at community level as well as the process review.
➢ The team of consultants will work collaboratively on the design and implementation of instruments to ensure that the comprehensive evaluation benefits from the expertise and competencies of all members of the team.
D. SCOPE OF WORK

The evaluation process will take place between 18 October-11 November 2005 and will involve field/desk reviews between 18 -28 October and data analysis and writing 31 October –11 November. The assessment report is to be delivered to the CO on 11 November, 2005 and will be shared with the members of the BCPR/RBLAC/SURF formulation mission as background material prior to their mission in the last week of November. The Evaluation team will finalize the survey process and survey tools in consultation with the UNDP Country Office and the Civic Dialogue Secretariat between 18-20 October during which time the workplan will be finalized. The evaluation will entail the following:

D1. Process Review
The process review will develop findings based mainly on secondary level research involving:

1.1 An examination of activities, internal documents, reports, videos and other tools (sport, workshops, theme song, brochures, visioning exercises) used or produced by the Leadership Forum, other participants in the process and the Project Secretariat.

1.2 An assessment of the appropriateness and cost effectiveness of the Civic Dialogue process.

1.3 A review of the effectiveness of the Civic Dialogue Secretariat, the Steering Committee and the institutional framework in which the project is placed.

1.4 A review of the integration of gender equality/relations within the Civic Dialogue process.

1.5 Identification of specific stages at which the Civic Dialogue process engaged clients and communities.

1.6 An assessment of the selection criteria used in engaging clients in the Civic Dialogue process.

1.7 Identify and categorize the types of clients and institutions engaged in the Civic Dialogue process against their intended role and involvement.

1.8 Review the process of achieving consensus

1.9 Review capacities gained and roles defined in the process of implementation of the consensus

1.10 Assess the degree of ownership gained during the process of dialogue and determine what results can be attributed to this ownership.

1.11 Examine the phases of dialogue and the strategic entry points that can be leveraged for the broader CTPB programme formulation

1.11.1 Determine to what level the dialogue has been taken

1.11.2 Review needs assessments completed and the levels of organization of a core of expert dialogue practitioners,

1.11.3 Establishment of formal and informal partnerships and levels of partnership

1.11.4 Is there a clearly defined education and outreach strategy?

1.11.5 How is the element of trust accommodated in the phases of dialogue and consensus building?

1.11.6 Levels of impact, technical support and training in respect of implementation of consensus.

D2. Client Survey
The client survey will generate findings based mainly on primary research involving
interviews with representatives of community groups, organisations and persons who have been engaged in the dialogue process. The evaluators will:

2.1 Review and finalize a survey sample.
2.2 Conduct a client survey in sample communities involved in the Civic Dialogue phase I.
2.3 Assess level of ownership and impact of dialogue on programme staff, groups engaged in the project and organizations’ awareness of the project.
   2.3.1 How organized are these groups to incite change within the dialogue process?
2.4 Evaluate the soft/non-tangible outcomes of the dialogue.
2.5 Analyze the above outcomes and recommend a matrix that can illustrate the levels of awareness of participants prior to and after the inception of the project, as well review changes in their typical attitudes and actions that demonstrate the level of transformation that has taken place, if any, as a result of the dialogue process.

2.6 Assess the leadership organizations emerging from the Civic Dialogue Project for effectiveness as leadership groups, organizational structure, levels of democracy in decision-making, group cohesiveness, communication, and the active involvement of a wide cross section of people, especially women and youth.
2.7 Assess the facilitators of the Civic Dialogue project in terms of management of the dialogue process with clients, modalities of facilitation and delivery of the components to clients.
2.8 Evaluate the impact of the civic dialogue project overall for levels of community empowerment, community participation, civic action, actions by policy makers or political representatives, actions by individuals and other groups in the society.

E. DELIVERABLES

The key deliverables will be an evaluation report that includes results and findings of the client survey and process review. The analysis will include components such as:

- The level of client satisfaction of the Civic Dialogue phase I.
- An assessment of the appropriateness and cost effectiveness of the process.
- Recommendations for the way forward.
- A listing of the documents, reports, tools, etc examined in the process and persons interviewed.

F. TIME FRAME

The assessment should be completed within a four-week period from mid October to mid November 2005.
ANNEXURE B: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

UNDP Country Office
Mr. Juan Carlos Espinola, UNDP Resident Representative, Member of Steering Committee
Ms. Anne-Marie Ali, Deputy UNDP Resident Representative
Mr. Stephen Rodriques, Programme Specialist, Governance and Peace
Mrs. Michelle Gyles-McDonnough

UNDP Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project Secretariat
Dr. Noel Watson, Executive Coordinator
Ms. Celia Champagnie, Project Officer
Ms. Judith Gallimore, Project Officer
Ms. Anderia Harriott, Administrative Coordinator
Mr. Leon Thompson, Project Officer

Civic Dialogue Leadership Forum
Justice Ian Forte, Chairman of the Steering Committee
Mr. Anthony Freckleton, Vice Chairman of the Steering Committee
Dr. Carolyn Gomes
Mrs. Donna Parchment
Lt. Colonel Daniel Pryce
Mr. Joseph “Bunny” Witter
Ms. Ionie Whorms
Mr. Shae-Tongee Stewart
Dr. Wesley Hughes
Mrs. Janalee Abrikian

Additional Members of the Steering Committee Present at a Meeting the Evaluation Team Led
Rev. Maitland Evans
Ms. Helene Davis-Whyte

Project Support Consultants
Ms. Debra Duperly-Pink, Leadership Forum Facilitator
Mrs. Aldrie Henry-Lee, Project Historian
Mr. Ed Wallace, Producer
Mr. Keino Dawson, Cameraman
Mr. Errol Russell, Cameraman

International Development Partners
Ms. Karen Turner, United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
Ms. Sasha Parke USAID
Ms. Louise Valle, Senior Governance Manager, Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
Ms. Paulette Jude, CIDA
Dr. Wayne Henry, World Bank
Mr. Mark James, Department for International Development (UK)

Planning Institute of Jamaica
Mrs. Pauline Knight, Director, Social and Manpower Planning Division
Mrs. Andrea Sheppard-Stewart, Manager, UN and Special Agencies
Ms. Simone Lawrence-Norton, Senior Project Economist, PIOJ
Ms. Sharon MacDonald Security & Justice/Community Development, PIOJ

Social Development Commission
Mr. Courtney Brown
Mr. Richard Billings
Mr. Terry Ranglin
Ms. Andrea McCarthy

Members of Parliament
Dr. Patrick Harris, MP
St. Aubyn Bartlett, MP

Media Professionals
Ms. Rosamond Brown, General Manager, Roots FM
Mr. Kingsley Stewart, Radio Talk Show Host, Hot 102
Police Officers
Supt. Buddo, Hunts Bay Police Station
Supt. Sinclair, Kingston-Eastern Police Division

Community Leaders
Mr. Godfrey Lothian, Greenwich Town CDC, KSA Action Forum
Mr. Paul Napier, Tivoli Gardens
Mr. Earl Pinto, Seaview Gardens
Dr. Polly Bowes-Howell, Stony Hill Consultative Committee
Mr. Daniel Edmund, Chairman, Fletcher’s Land Benevolent Society
Management

Other Interviews
Mrs. Margeurite Hunte, Micro Enterprise Financing Ltd.
Mr. Neville James, [Head of] Media Association

Mr. Horace Levy, Peace Management Initiative

Group Interviews
Kingston and St. Andrews Action Forum, 27 people in attendance
Greenwich Town CDC, 24 people in attendance
Focus Group Discussion, Conducted by the Evaluation Team on Fifteen Minute version of the Civic Scenario Video, 9 people in attendance

Civic Dialogue Engagements Attended
Universal Centre of Truth, 22/10/05
Cassava Piece Youth Group, 23/10/05
Boulevard Baptist Church, 30/10/05

Other Events attended
Microsoft Computer Training Course Graduation
ANNEXURE C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Civic Dialogue Proposal, Project History, and Reports


Meeting Minutes, Conference Reports, and Presentations


Steering Committee Minutes, May 2003 – August 2005.

**Project Materials**


Project Pamphlet.

Civic Scenario Videos (39 and 15 minute versions).

**Civic Dialogue Internal Documents**


“Summary of the Benefits of the Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Project.”


Terms of Reference for the Civic Dialogue Secretariat. Positions include:

- Executive Coordinator
- Dialogue Officer
- Dialogue Support Assistant
- Dialogue Admin Coordinator
- Dialogue Admin Officer

Curriculum Vitae for the Civic Dialogue Secretariat

“Planning Civic Dialogue Engagements”

"Guidelines for Civic Dialogue Engagements"

**Project Data Gathered**

Number of Participants in Civic Dialogue Events

Civic Dialogue Financial Expenditures, from the following sources:

- Atlas Budget and Expenditure Accounts.

Number of Engagements Held

Number of and Attendance at Health and Skills Fairs

Number of and Attendance at Conferences Held

Number of Children Registered
Number of People Enrolled in and Funded at Adult Education Programs by the Civic Dialogue Project

Civic Dialogue Project Secretariat Salary Data

Template for Civic Scenario Perception Tests

**Project Media Coverage Reviewed**


Evening News Footage on April 23, 2005; April 26, 2005; July 24, 2005.

**Other UNDP Documents**


**Civic Dialogue Documents**


**Other Documents Reviewed**


Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), *Jamaica Survey of Living Conditions – Interim Report*; 2004


PIOJ; *Medium Term Socio-economic Policy Framework 2004-2007*; 2004; p17

*Jamaica The Road To Sustained Growth*; Country Economic Memorandum; World Bank Report No.26088-JM; Latin American and Caribbean Region, December 4, 2003


World Bank; *Growth and Poverty Reduction in Jamaica*; p45 as at website http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/LAC/LAC.nsf/0/12c128ba971c348a85256e0400684cb9/$FILE/Ch1%204Dec03_Gray%20Cover.pdf


### ANNEXURE D: PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **The Pre-Project Investigation and Design Phase:**  
July 2001 – January 2003 | • July 2001—Attendance at a regional UNDP conference where the idea was born.  
• August, 2001—Initial consultations held with leaders from both political parties.  
• September, 2001—A meeting at the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) where some initial concerns were raised about the project.  
• September – October, 2001—Meetings with International Development Partners (IDPs).  
• November, 2001—An initial consultative visit by Adam Kahane in which workshops were held with 60 Jamaicans to discuss the project.  
• May, 2002—The project document is developed.  
• June, 2002—An initial workshop is held on the topic of Crime and Violence.  
• December, 2002—The project document is signed with PIOJ. |
| **The Scenario Design Phase:**  
January 2003 – January 2004 | • January, 2003—The holding of the Second Leadership Forum Workshop over three days, in which scenarios were initially named and the Steering Committee was nominated.  
• February, 2003—The commencement of Steering Committee Meetings where more concrete plans were designed to later run the project.  
• April/May, 2003—The holding of the Third workshop over two days where the civic scenarios were refined and the group began brainstorming how it would engage with the rest of Jamaica. This workshop was also attended by Dr. Noel Watson, who had been selected as the project Executive Coordinator.  
• June, 2003—A Secretariat was officially appointed with Dr. Watson as the Executive Coordinator.  
• October, 2003—The fourth workshop was held over three days, in which the scenarios and the overall role of the project were |
heatedly debated. Around the same time, an action project was launched, featuring a soccer game held in Mountain View
- November, 2003—The project’s social marketing plan was finalised.
- January, 2004—The fifth workshop was held for one day, where the scenarios were finalised.

### The Initial Engagement Phase:
**January 2004 – August 2004**

- January, 2004—Completion of the Leadership Forum workshops and finalisation of the scenario videos.
- February, 2004—Commencement of community engagements and media interviews.
- June, 2004—A video presentation was held in parliament, and a follow up Leadership Forum took place.
- July, 2004—Juan Carlos Espinola arrived in Jamaica as the new Resident Representative.
- August 2004—A decision is made to focus the project on supporting communities where it is already active.

### The Deeper Engagement Phase:
**August 2004 – Present**

- October/November, 2004—The emergence of the Kingston and St. Andrews (KSA) Action Forum.
- October, 2004—A health fair was held in Greenwich Town, signalling deeper involvement in that community. In addition a Personal Development workshop was held for Central Kingston, attended by 140 people.
- March, 2005—A workshop was held for Jamaican professionals to discuss issues of concern to the country and the role professionals could play in addressing them.
- April, 2005—The KSA Action Forum held a press conference to request further government funding in the budget for community development activities.
- June, 2005—The project was officially launched at a ceremony in Emancipation Park, with speeches by the Governor General, a representative of the Prime
Minister, and the Leader of the Opposition. The launch was preceded by a week of press coverage and a press conference held at King’s House.

- July, 2005—The West Kingston Conference was held, in which 58 participants from four communities discussed and prioritised local needs.

- September 2005—The KSA Action Forum launched an effort to raise funding for their work, showcase local talent, and promote urban renewal by organizing the first of a series of shows at the Ward Theatre. This initiative has been highly supported by the Secretariat.
What is Sustained Dialogue?

Sustained Dialogue is a systematic, open-ended process for transforming conflictual relationships within communities over time. SD brings together groups of concerned citizens and community leaders to explore the underlying relationships behind their conflicts and develop strategies to improve them. It is based on hundreds of hours of dialogue experience in communities around the world.

Sustained Dialogue assumes that:

− Within many communities divided by conflict, basic human relationships must be built or repaired before sustainable peace and cooperation can be achieved
− Because the trust necessary to repair relationships develops slowly, dialogues between a fixed group of participants must continue over time
− To make dialogues transformational, members of target communities must control their own process, defining its outputs and how it moves forward
− At the same time, properly trained moderators can direct the dialogue, helping participants reach a point at which they can act together to build cohesion within their larger community

Sustained Dialogue has been conceptualized as five stages:

Groups of between ten and twelve citizens that engage in dialogue over time tend to move through a set of five stages. This progression is not a rigid set of steps, but rather an organic movement from one type of discussion to another. As groups explore their relationships, new problems or ideas will surface that may draw them back to earlier stages of the process. Understanding Sustained Dialogue as a progression of stages is useful, however, because it provides trained moderators with a set of tools to guide discussion, exploring key challenges in the participants’ relationships.

Stage 1- Deciding to engage in dialogue: Prior to convening a dialogue group, initiators will work to:

- Identify a set of well respected individuals within a community who commit to engage in a dialogue process
- Agree with participants upon the purpose and ground rules of the dialogue

Stage 2- Mapping and naming problems and relationships: Once convened, the dialogue group will attempt to:

- Identify an array of problems and relationships among the participants at the table to examine how they impact the community’s real interests
- Share personal experiences with the relationships
- Choose two or three key problems to probe more deeply in the next stage

Stage 3- Setting a direction for change: With the key issues on the table the dialogue group will:
Explore why the problems identified matter to the participants
Probe each problem in depth to reveal the underlying relationships that drive them

**Stage 4- Building scenarios:** Having analyzed the dynamics of the community’s conflict, participants will turn to designing solutions. In order to do this, they will:

- Identify the main obstacles to change within the community
- List the steps required to overcome those obstacles
- Determine who can make those steps
- Order required steps to develop a sequence and to model their interaction
- Consider how the dialogue group can create public recognition that change is happening

**Stage 5- Acting together:** After building scenarios for change, the participants will:

- Decide whether conditions within the community permit implementation of the scenario
- Determine whether capacities exist to carry the scenario through
- Agree on who should take the steps

**Sustained Dialogue produces:**

- **Transformed perspectives** within the dialogue group, allowing participants to think in new ways both individually and collectively. Participants are enabled to understand their community’s conflicts through each other’s eyes. Though this may not create agreement on all issues, but it does enable members of a community to respect each other in new ways.

- **New relationships** within communities that were divided by conflict. These relationships enable community leaders to coordinate efforts to calm tensions across group divisions.

- **Ideas and strategies** to address conflicts and build trusting relationships within the participants’ larger communities. These can be enacted by the group itself, or by individual participants acting within their own segment of the community.

- **Empowered citizen leaders** with knowledge, relationships and inspiration to take what they have learned in their dialogues back to their positions of leadership within their communities.

- **Action.** New perspectives, new relationships, new ideas and strategies, and a new sense of empowerment equips participants with the tools they need to act together to repair their communities. Past Sustained Dialogues have led to participants founding NGOs dedicated to solving the challenges identified in SD meetings, while in other cases, participants have individually coordinated efforts in their own communities, using the ideas and connections generated by the dialogue process.

**Sustained Dialogue is therefore best used to address:**
- Human relationships in communities where conflicts have gone beyond the specific issues that initiated them to erode the basic trust that makes communities function
- Community divisions driven by questions of identity such as race, ethnicity, religion, or cultural group
- Erosion of civil society and civic engagement due to conflict