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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Introduction to the Building of Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities

The central concern of the ‘Building Civil Society Capacity to support Good Governance by Local Authorities’ project, was the prudent use of public funds by Local Authorities, especially in the face of plans by the Government of Jamaica (GOJ) to “hand over significant autonomy to local authorities by the end of 2010.1” This impending development pointed to the need for greater, active participation of civil society and public institutions at the local level to monitor public expenditure in efforts toward anti-corruption.

The project was therefore designed to be in congruence with and supportive of measures in Jamaica to combat corruption. Some of these were:

- The note in “Vision 2030” that “There is need for stronger corporate governance frameworks within the public sector institutions as well as strengthening of anti-corruption and ethics mechanisms”2
- Jamaica as a signatory to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) since March 5, 2008 with a commitment to “…establish and promote effective practices aimed at the prevention of corruption” and in particular to “endeavour to ensure that transparency and accountability in matters of public finance are promoted”3.

The Project was scheduled for implementation over the period June 01, 2010 through December 31, 2011. However, a no-cost extension of the project assistance completion date (PACD) was granted to March 31, 2012, which would allow for the implementation of elements of the project that were delayed by unforeseen national and local occurrences external to the project.

---

1 UNDP (2010.04.26) Project Document: Building Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities. Pg1
2 National Development Plan of Jamaica ch 3, National Outcome #6. P111
The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office, commissioned the evaluation. This was done in accordance with the provisions in the Project Document and in conformity with a requirement of the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) evaluation, lessons learned and knowledge management framework for the conduct of an end of project, independent evaluation. The DGTTF, which funded the Project, required that an independent end of project evaluation be undertaken. The Democratic Governance Unit of the UNDP was responsible for the overall oversight of the project and therefore the evaluation.

A1 Project Objectives and Scope:

The overall Project Objective was “to contribute to the enhanced capacity of government to create a safe and secure Jamaica through capacity building support for effective management and monitoring of community development plans that will facilitate delivery of a broad range of services to target communities”4. This would be achieved through:

1. Assessment of the capacity of Parish Development Committees (PDCs) and of the level of participation of PDCs in Local Public Accounts Committees (LPACS).
2. Design and implementation of programmes to develop the capacity of PDCS in financial transparency and accountability
3. Design of communication strategy and training of NAPDEC members in advocacy and communication.
4. Holding of consultations on a draft policy and legislation for local government financing and management.
5. Drafting instructions for the Local Government Financing and Financial Management Act to be revised and made ready for submission.
6. The conduct of initial and final content analysis of media coverage of local authority activities in print and broadcast media.
8. Production of syllabus and training manual in coverage of Local Government and local public expenditure.

---

The specific objectives which related to broader UN Programme goals were:

UNDAF Outcome 5: By 2011, increased capacity of government and targeted communities to attain a more peaceful, secure and just society.

Expected CPAP Outcome(s) 5.1: Improved governance and enhanced sectoral and inter-sectoral response to social injustice, instability and insecurity.

Expected CPAP Output 5.1.2 Enhanced transparency and participation in resource allocation processes for the attainment of national development goals

Beneficiaries of the project were targeted nationwide through NAPDEC and its membership, the PDCs in all 14 parishes and municipalities. Other beneficiaries included members of the LPACs, in the various parishes, Social Development Commission (SDC) staff members and media professionals.

The project had three components, with components one (1) and (3) three focused on capacity building and component (2) two on legislative drafting. Component 1 entailed the use of evidence from organizational assessments to develop and deliver a programme to build capacity of NAPDEC and PDCs to more effectively support good governance by local authorities. Component 2 included a review of existing policy and drafting legislative instructions and bring the policy as close as possible to enactment. This would improve the existing legal framework to adequately define corruption and strengthen the monitoring and enforcement of anti-corruption laws. Component 3 was to deliver training to improve investigative capacity of media professionals and to institute an ongoing mechanism for media capacity building.

B. Type and Scope of the Evaluation:

This is an end of project; summative evaluation conducted nearing the end of programme implementation by an independent evaluator in a participative manner. In accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the exercise, the evaluation covered all activities that were undertaken from project inception to completion.
B1 Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation:

The **purpose** of the evaluation, as stipulated in the TOR, was to fulfill the requirements of the DGTTF evaluation, lessons learned and knowledge management framework which required an end of project evaluation to be conducted for all projects.

The **Objective** of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of project design, project implementation processes and measures employed to achieve project objectives. It was to also document processes, lessons learned/best practices, sustainability strategies and recommend action that could help to improve the further process of project implementation and achievement of project objectives.

C. Summary of Principal Findings

C.1 Project designs, outputs and activities

The project was well designed with solid internal and external logic and linkages among the various elements that would assure easy interpretation and implementation. The strategies for addressing the issues identified were appropriate.

Similarly, the partnership strategies provided for effective complementary relationships with other similar local and international initiatives’. At least two targets in the PDC capacity building outputs were set beyond the achievable limits of the project given the realities on the ground at the start of the project. Adjusting those after the findings of the capacity assessments would have been useful.

C.2 Project implementation

Efforts were made to implement the project in a timely manner and in accordance with approved work plans but there were factors beyond the control of the project that militated against staying consistently within the planned time limits.
The socio-political landscape within which the project was located was in and of itself more inimical than helpful to the successful implementation of the project. As such the implementing partner, responsible parties, the Project Board and other stakeholders must be commended for achievements over the life of the project.

The quarterly reports, annual work plans and annual reports were prepared and submitted as required. The Project Board meeting at the end of 2011 did not take place until March 2, 2012 so the annual report for 2011 was reviewed just then.

C.3 Implementing Partner
The Centre for Leadership and Governance (CLG) was an apposite selection to lead the management and implementation processes under the project. The Project Coordinator had influences in the media and in the governance circle to have made a difference especially with the proposal to revise legislative policy and formulate drafting instructions for legislation. Added to that was the leader's capacity, in keeping with his position at the university, to work comfortably with the faculties and departments at the University of the West Indies Mona that had a key role in the implementation of the project.

C.4 Implementation approaches
The approach to implementing the project was found to be participatory, promoting ownership and oriented toward capacity building. NAPDEC and, the SDC (which usually provided technical support to NAPDEC) were integral to the collection of data on capacity assessment of PDCs and in the analysis of the data. NAPDEC was also critically involved in mobilizing its members for participation in the capacity building workshops and the completion of their communication strategies. There is a note in the project reports about the delay in completing the capacity building strategy but one may wish to look at some of it as a part of the learning curve and development of NAPDEC for future initiatives.

C.5 Responsible Parties (SDC, CARIMAC, NAPDEC and DLG)
The responsible parties were strategically located to benefit from and make contributions not only during the project implementation phase but years beyond the project assistance.
completion date. They therefore could not be excluded from the project even if other parties were considered. They all seemed to have made important contributions to the implementation process in keeping with the design management arrangements (See page 26 of the Project Document).

C.6 Capacity building efforts

As the project document stipulated an evidence-based mechanism was employed to build capacities at NAPDEC and among the PDCs in preparation of communication plans, on how to more effectively work with the media, in networking with complementary institutions and initiatives and some of these are being and will be applied by the responsible parties in their daily operations. The capacity of media professionals was also improved toward more effective coverage of operations of local authorities. However the ability of PDCs to develop capacity to effectively support good governance in future will depend on other critical factors that if left unattended will limit their capacity so to do.

C.7 Project Board

The project board was well constituted with the appropriate mechanisms for making decisions. They met regularly, were committed to the process and carried out their responsibilities well.

C.8 Synergistic relationships

Good internal relationships were established among the CLG, NAPDEC, the PDC and other agencies represented on the project board. NAPDEC would have also strengthened its relationship with the PDCs and there would also be an ongoing relationship with CARIMAC in the implementation of the course in transparency and accountability of local authorities. However, the project missed an opportunity to concert the media professionals with NAPDEC and the PDC during the capacity building sessions. Both NAPDEC and the PAJ expressed the view that that was a good opportunity that was missed.

Synergistic relationship being established with external, regional or international entities was made possible during the Anti Corruption Day observation events in Jamaica as it brought together representatives from the UNDP, Transparency International and other groups with responsible parties on the project.
C.9 Risks
Some of the anticipated risks carried in the project document did not occur although they were well thought out. There was one natural disaster that delayed visits to a few parishes to collect data for the PDC capacity development. But there were also socio-political risks (section 5 above) that affected meetings and in particular action on the legal reforms element of the project that were beyond prediction. That they had some negative impact on the project is not deniable.

C.10 Unexpected outcome
The use of the capacity building training material by the Association of Local Government Authorities (ALGA) to train local government officers was a positive outcome that was not envisioned either during the design nor early implementation of the project.

A website for NAPDEC that is currently under development is a useful innovation under the project that will support sustainability.

The involvement of stakeholders including NAPDEC and the PDC in the UN Anti Corruption Day observation though alluded to in the partnership strategies was not anticipated.

The adjustment of the Annual Work Plan by the Project Board and the use of the remaining funding balance on the project to collaborate with the National Debates Commission (JDC) and to support the debate among Parish Councilors from the two major political parties and the training of the journalist just prior to the local government elections in the project extension phase was not anticipated. It was however, a very timely and apt intervention.

C.11 Transformation effect
Transformation effect speaks to fundamental changes in form, behavior and/or attitudes as a result of some form of stimulus, action or activity. It often has to do with experiences in particular situations which are so impactful or sustained over time as to bring about changes in function or both structure and function. There is nothing under this project that seemed to fit that situation. The impending course by CARIMAC could contribute to some changes but there would have to be quite some other fundamental changes for NAPDEC, the PDC and their relationship with the Parish Councils to speak of transformation.
D RECOMMENDATIONS

D.1 Legislative Reform:

NAPDEC needs to pursue a strategy of lobbying and advocacy to have the Local Government Financing and Financial Management Bill (LGFFM) drafted and promulgated through Parliament. This will be useful to their continued effectiveness, as an umbrella group, as the resultant Act, that is expected to include provisions for monitoring and transparency, is in keeping with their mandate. One option for them is to prepare a project proposal and seek funding for the process. Collaborating with the CLG in the process may be mutually beneficial.

D.2 Ministry of Local Government (MLG) Support for PDCs

The DLG (that became the MLG & CD after the December 2011 General elections) has been providing financial and in kind support to the PDCs. Nonetheless, the PDCs still face a major challenge to function effectively especially in carrying out their administrative duties. A way will have to be found to support and sustain needs of the PDCs in this respect. It may be useful to have a limited assessment to determine the best way to focus limited resources.

D.3 Continued Capacity Building for the Media and the PDCs

Despite additional training of the media during the project extension phase prior to the Local Government Elections it will be useful to have further periodic post project training which will re-enforce their capacity to undertake investigative journalism. Further post project capacity building for the PDCs in transparency, accountability and other areas will also be critical to build on the achievements under the project and to improve their capacity to support good governance by local authorities.

D.4 Consensus building among PDC, Local Authorities and LPACs

There is need for post project action to formalize the roles and functions of the LPACs and to engage local authorities together with the PDCs in dialogue to create a better understanding of their role and to enhance mutually acceptable co-existence and effective functioning.
1.0 INTRODUCTION:

This report presents an independent, external summative evaluation of the project 'Building of Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities (The Project). The evaluation was conducted over the period February 1 to March 30, 2012.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Jamaica, commissioned the evaluation, in accordance with the provisions in the Project Document and in conformity with a requirement of the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) evaluation, lessons learning and knowledge management framework for the conduct of an end of project, independent evaluation. The DGTTF funded the project which was executed through the Governance portfolio of the UNDP Jamaica.

The report includes an Executive Summary above, which provides: a synopsis of the project being evaluated, the objectives and scope of the evaluation, key aspects of the evaluation approach and methodology and a summary of main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The ensuing pages cover a description of the project, assessment of project elements such as: design, management, implementation, financial status, sustainability and lessons learned/best practices. It also provides details of the methodology and approaches, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 The Project

The Project was scheduled for implementation over the period June 01, 2010 through December 31, 2011. However, a no-cost extension of the project assistance completion date (PACD) was granted to March 31, 2012, which would allow for the implementation of elements of the project that were delayed by unforeseen national and local occurrences external to the project.

The central concern of the ‘Project, was the prudent use of public funds by Local Authorities, especially in the face of plans by the Government of Jamaica (GOJ) to “hand over significant
autonomy to local authorities by the end of 2010.” This impending development pointed to the need for greater, active participation of civil society and public institutions at the local level to monitor public expenditure in efforts toward anti-corruption.

The project was therefore designed to be in congruence with and supportive of measures in Jamaica to combat corruption. Some of these were:

- The note in “Vision 2030” that “There is need for stronger corporate governance frameworks within the public sector institutions as well as strengthening of anti-corruption and ethics mechanisms”

- Jamaica as a signatory to the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) since March 5, 2008 with a commitment to “...establish and promote effective practices aimed at the prevention of corruption” and in particular to “endeavour to ensure that transparency and accountability in matters of public finance are promoted”

The main strategy proposed to build the required capacities was to improve the technical knowledge and skills of civil society groups such as Parish Development Committees and their umbrella body the National Association of Parish Development Committee (NAPDEC) to assume greater responsibilities in monitoring the transactions of Local Authorities. Another strategy was the drafting of a legislative framework to amend the Parochial Rates and Finance Act 1900 and to bring the new policy as close as possible to enactment prior to the end of the project. Additionally, media professionals would be strengthened in their level of awareness and coverage of the manner in which business was being conducted by Local Authorities.

The proposed implementation approach reflected close partnerships with national and local institutions such as: what was at the start of the project the Department of Local Government (DLG), but as of January 2012 became the Ministry of Local Government (MLG), NAPDEC, the SDC, the PAJ and CARIMAC. Another proposed approach was to create synergies with the anti-corruption activities of other development agencies such as: The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

---

5 National Development Plan of Jamaica ch 3, National Outcome #6. P111
2.1.1 Geographical Coverage of Project and Target Groups:
The project was implemented nationwide as participants were targeted through NAPDEC and its membership in all 14 parishes and municipalities. Members of the LPACs, parish council staff in the various parishes, SDC staff members and media professionals were also targeted.

2.1.2 Project Objectives and Scope:
The overall Project Objective was “to contribute to the enhanced capacity of government to create a safe and secure Jamaica through capacity building support for effective management and monitoring of community development plans that will facilitate delivery of a broad range of services to target communities”. This would be achieved through:

1. Assessment of the capacity of PDCs and of the level of participation of PDCs LPACS.
2. Design and implementation of programmes to develop the capacity of PDCs in financial transparency and accountability
3. Design of communication strategy and training of NAPDEC members in advocacy and communication.
4. Holding of consultations on a draft policy and legislation for local government financing and management.
5. Drafting instructions for the Local Government Financing and Financial Management Act to be revised and made ready for submission.
6. The conduct of initial and final content analysis of media coverage of local authority activities in print and broadcast media.
8. Production of syllabus and training manual in coverage of Local Government and local public expenditure

2.1.3 The specific objectives which relate to broader UN Programme goals were:
UNDAF Outcome 5: By 2011, increased capacity of government and targeted communities to attain a more peaceful, secure and just society.
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Expected CPAP Outcome(s) 5.1: Improved governance and enhanced sectoral and inter-sectoral response to social injustice, instability and insecurity.

Expected CPAP Output 5.1.2 Enhanced transparency and participation in resource allocation processes for the attainment of national development goals.

PROJECT COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS:
The CLG was the implementing partner for the project and oversight responsibility was vested in a Project Board comprised of membership from five stakeholder organizations, that is: The UNDP, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), the NAPDEC, the (DLG) and the SDC. The first meeting of the Project Board decided to invite the Press Association of Jamaica as observer to its meetings.

Responsible Parties for various components of the project were:
- The Department of Local Government
- The National Association of Parish Development Committees
- Social Development Commission
- The Caribbean Institute of Media and Communication at the University of the West Indies

FIGURE 1 below provides a picture of the structure for management and implementation partnership for the project.
3.0 **TYPE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION:**

This is an End of Project Outcome/Impact evaluation to be conducted at or nearing the end of programme implementation by an independent evaluator in a participative manner. In accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the exercise, the evaluation covered all activities that were undertaken from project inception to completion. In particular the TOR required that the evaluation assess:

- Whether stated outputs were achieved
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving outputs
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project
- The effectiveness of the partnership strategy
- The impact of the project
- The sustainability of the project impact/s
- How effective equality and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the design and execution

3.1 **Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation:**

The **Purpose** of the evaluation, as carried in the TOR, was to fulfill the requirements of the DGTF evaluation, lessons learned and knowledge management framework which stipulated that an end of project evaluation be conducted for all projects.

The **Objective** of the evaluation was to determine the effectiveness of project design, project implementation processes and measures employed to achieve project objectives, document: processes, lessons learned/best practices, sustainability strategies and recommend action that could help to improve the further process of project implementation and achievement of project objectives.

3.2 **Evaluation Criteria**

The assessment took into account the Matrix of Project Elements/Indicators by Analytical Thrust based on indicators of Specificity, Measurability, Achievability, Relevance/Effectiveness, and Timeliness. That included the analysis of elements, such as:
• **Concept & Design:**
Clarity of project issue; if planning strategies are relevant & participatory; measurability & attainability of main objectives; relevance of project activities and implementing strategies, outcomes and indicators to goal; presence and type of strategic planning system.

• **Management and Implementation:**
Actual versus planned delivery of project activities; consistency between definition of target population and population actually served; administrative aspects of project services; interagency relationships and complementary services; efficiency of project including timeliness of logistical support and operations, planning processes and participation, presence and type of strategic planning system, and cost compared to benefits of the project.

• **Output and Impact:**
Percentage of objectives accomplished; actual coverage versus planned coverage; percentage of beneficiaries that have shown improvement/change as a result of interventions; benefits of the programme given the costs and unintended effects/outcomes.

• **Sustainability:**
Mechanisms implemented to achieve sustainability; degree of transfer of programme services to other institutions.

• **Best Practices/Lessons Learned:**
These have been identified recorded in the project report.

### 3.3 Evaluation Questions
Some pertinent and useful questions that were posed in the TOR are listed at item 3 above. Further relevant questions, consistent with those, to which the evaluation responded, are listed under various project headings below:

• **Project Design**
  I. How good and useful were the internal logics of the project (logical framework, links between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives) quality of indicators and relevant breakdown in age and sex, etc?
  II. Was attention paid to external logics, links with other interventions, synergies and economies of scale?
  III. Did the project document provide sufficient guidance on how the project would address relevant gender issues among target groups?
IV. Were project beneficiaries clearly defined?

- **Relevance of the Project Strategy**
  I. Did the project strategy focus on the needs, roles, access to resources and project needs of the target group, and did the target group participate in definition of their own needs?
  II. Did the need of the target group still exist after project close-out?
  III. What was the fit with other national/international development, policies and programmes on women’s safety and inclusion?

- **Project Implementation**
  I. Did the intervention reach the intended target population and were any groups excluded?
  II. Were the delivery strategies sensitive to differing cultural and gender situations?

- **Coordination and Implementation Arrangements**
  I. Did progress reviews provide information on participation rates of the target population?
  II. Was the capacity of the Implementing Partner and Responsible parties adequate in human resources, learning and awareness of the issues that the project sought to address?
  III. Were calendars, work and monitoring plans respected?
  IV. What were the possibilities of replicating elements of the project or models of the intervention?
  V. Were partnerships, networking and collaborative arrangements developed?

- **Performance and Achievements**
  I. To what degree did the project achieve objectives and impact the target groups?
  II. How did the allocated resources compare with the results obtained from the Project?
  III. Did the project contribute to changes in the capacities of civil society groups to support good governance by local authorities?
IV. Were there unexpected effects in development of policies, institutional capacity, gender relations, environment or otherwise that are attributable to the project?

- **Sustainability**
  I. What were the prospects for sustainability of project activities after withdrawal of external support?
  II. What were the extent of ownership and participation in the project institutionally and individually?
  III. What were the possibilities for replicating all or part of the project in other locations or on a larger scale?
  IV. Were there factors that may hinder the sustainability of the project and have participants been sensitized to these factors?

### 4.0 METHODOLOGY & APPROACH

The approach to the evaluation process was consistent with the principles of participant oriented and mixed management techniques. In the first instance the evaluator made enquiries and validated the findings by triangulating the data from multiple sources. In the second instance the process sought to unearth information for decision making where impact, outcomes, input, outputs and processes were the salient foci.

#### 4.1 Data collection sources and processes:

The process included a desk review of relevant documents and secondary sources of information. Some documents were: the minutes of the Project Board meetings, quarterly and annual reports on the project, Annual Work Plans on the project, training programmes and schedules, workshop registers, PDC and LPAC assessment instruments and reports, the project paper and the media content analysis report. *(Please see list of documents reviewed at Appendix 1)*

It also entailed consultation with key respondents such as: the project manager and other project personnel, members of the UNDP oversight team, the Chairman and other members of the Project Board, representatives of: PIOJ, SDC, MLG & CD (what was DLG at the start of the
selected number of PDC members and media professionals who participated in the programme were also interviewed. Focus Group discussions were also held with two randomly selected PDCs (St. James and Manchester). Due to unforeseen circumstances, the Portland PDC that was also in the sample, had no attendee at the scheduled session. (Please see list of stakeholders consulted at Appendix 11)

4.2 Evaluation Processes:

Figure II below shows the process to completion of the evaluation exercise. It shows an initial meeting with the relevant UNDP staff, consultations with the Project Management Team at the Department of Local Government, consultations with some of the project Responsible Parties and review of project documents. Those meetings and consultations provided an understanding of the project, delivered project documents for review by the evaluator, informed the preparation of the inception report and assisted with preparation for field visits. The field visits in turn validated some of the information collected from the initial meetings and provided additional information on the performance, results, impact and lessons learned from the project experiences. Those processes allowed for data analyses and the preparation of the first draft report. The draft report will be shared with relevant stakeholders and feedback from all stakeholders will be incorporated in a final report.
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**EVALUATION PROCESS MODEL**

- **Revise Draft Evaluation Report incorporating comments**
- **Complete and Submit Final Report**
- **Share Evaluation Findings with Implementing Partner, Responsible Parties and other stakeholders and obtain Feedback**
- **Analyze Data, Prepare and Submit Draft Report**
- **Conduct Field Missions and Data collection processes**
- **Prepare and Submit Inception Report to UNDP**
- **Follow-up consultations with Implementing Partner and Responsible Parties**
- **Meeting with Implementing Partner Department of Local Government**
- **Review Project Documents**
- **Initial Consultation Meeting with UNDP Governance Advisor and Programme Analyst**
- **Initial Consultation Meeting with Responsible Parties**
5. CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK, CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

During the process of the evaluation different stakeholders and key respondents drew the attention of the evaluator to what they described as unpredictable socio-political events and natural disasters, some of them unprecedented in the history of Jamaica, which occurred over the life of the project.

Those events they said, created major challenges to the smooth implementation of some elements of the project and negatively impacted the achievement of some project goals.

According to them, the process of project management and implementation was intrinsically linked to the socio-political system within the country and the timely achievement of project milestones was susceptible to new developments within the system.

On examination, it is axiomatic that the referred occurrences had the potential to limit or derail the project implementation process, but the question for the evaluation is the degree to which these unanticipated events affected the project.

As such they are presented here and included in the discussion of the various elements of the project. They included:

- A limited State of Emergency imposed on Kingston and St. Andrew on May 23, 2010 and extended in time and geographical location to July 29, 2010 and the Parish of St. Catherine respectively. The ensuing violent confrontation and armed insurgence created some national attention deficits for many planned events. The entire nation gazed at the incident that saw the killing of some 70 persons. Stakeholders from rural parishes, in the focus group discussions, indicated that they were reluctant to come into the corporate area during the state of emergency. The project staff said that calling initial project sensitization meetings was not feasible the early months of project start-up.

- 

---

• An unprecedented, euphemistically titled ‘Dudus-Manatt Commission of Enquiry’, between December 2010 and April 2011 created further attention deficit as the entire governance structure was involved in the hearings and there was national pre-occupation with public media’s daily coverage of the sittings of the commission. This was said to affect Output 2 on the project as legislative discussions and actions were virtually on hold during the period. That situation persisted over 2011 and was exacerbated after August 2011 with the burgeoning governance crises which saw a change of two Prime Ministers, and a national elections campaign that resulted in a change of government and the selection of a third Prime Minister.

• Rains from Tropical Storm Nicole flooded sections of the island on September 29, 2010 leaving more than nine (9) people⁷ dead and again demanded national resources and attention. That event curtailed the completion of the field work to collect data on the PDC capacity, especially in four parishes.

• Then there was the historical change⁸ of three Jamaican Prime Ministers within the last three months of 2011 culminating with a General Election over a year in advance of its due date. The entire population was engrossed in the national discourse surrounding the governance crises into which the country was plunged and the ensuing political campaign leading up to the December 29 General Elections. It is understood that verbal and written communication up to the Prime Ministerial level were placed in abeyance in the face of the governance crises. Another media capacity building workshop that was proposed for late 2011 had to be postponed to January 2012 also, because the agenda of the media was overcrowded with the governance events and election campaign. It is further understood that an agreement with the Project Board that a further consultation meeting of Parish Councilors and Mayors be held could not be done in late 2011 due to the tense political environment.

There were however, other occurrences that created delays in the timely implementation of the project which, are mentioned here:

• The process of data collection on the assessment of the PDCs (as indicated by some respondents) went beyond the projected time, due to flood rains. Further delays occurred during the process of validation of the data collected which required the project management team to go out into the field.

• The delay in the capacity assessment, mentioned in the bullet above, contributed to a delay in the preparation of the capacity development strategy as it was precursory and informative to the development of the strategy.

• Stakeholders’ interviews indicated that there were low and slow responses from most of the parish council representatives to whom the questionnaires were submitted during the assessment of LPACs. Delays in the implementation process resulted from the additional effort and time to collect the data and prepare the report.

• The preparation and submission of communication strategies by the PDCs took much longer than anticipated thereby curtailing further work required for the review of the strategies.

• The Financial Transparency and accountability Workshop in Kingston to build PDC capacity was poorly attended and prompted a reviewed strategy. Instead of having one national workshop one each was held in Mandeville and Ocho Rios.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT ELEMENTS & PROCESSES

6.1 Design of the Project

6.1.1 Clarity and focus of project document

The assessment revealed that the project was well designed with a comprehensive outline of the various elements. It presented, inter alia, a rather succinct but illuminative contextual analysis of the concerns, research findings and dialogue surrounding corruption.
Some of these were: the various forms of corruption, the international conventions against corruption, the status of accountability and transparency in Jamaica, how Transparency International (TI) ranked Jamaica in the Corruption Perception Index (CPI), measures employed by Jamaica to combat corruption, the history, role and challenges, and reforms of local government in Jamaica, the legal framework to address corruption, the role of actors in the fight against corruption such as: the PAC, LPACs, PDCs, NAPDEC, DLG/MLG, CARIMAC and the UNDP.

Members of the Project Board, NAPDEC, representative of: NAPDEC, the PAJ and other key stakeholders responded that the project focused on the appropriate issues and they clearly understood the concept and other elements of the design.

In essence, the project document provided an overview of the extent of the problem to be addressed, who was doing what to address the problems, the gaps, the best strategy to plug gaps within the manageable resources of the project and the responsible parties with a justification for their inclusion.

Notwithstanding the views of stakeholders in general, members of the PDC in one focus group expressed the view that the project could have been more impactful, if it focused on the training of Parish Councilors to improve equity and effectiveness in the allocation the resources of the Local Authorities. According to them, too often the most needy persons and communities receive the least allocation of available goods and services. They also said that the foundation for effective monitoring of parish councils and municipalities, such as properly constituted LPACs and well resourced PDCs, was not currently in place. They further said that, the project as currently designed could not significantly change the existing foundation, hence they have a differing view on the focal area of the project at this time.

The focus groups, like other stakeholders, endorsed the view however, that the building of civil society capacity as outlined by the project document was an effective strategy to support good governance by local authorities.

The overall guidance in how the project would unfold on the ground was provided in the project document through a sample Annual Work Plan (AWP), the management arrangements
that set out the role of major actors in the project such as: the CLG, the DLG, NAPDEC, the Project Board, the SDC, the PDC and the PAJ. Additionally, the document provided a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and an analysis of risks. These latter documents were noted for revision at project start-up to reflect current realities.

6.1.2 Internal Logics of the Project Design

The Results and Resources Framework of the project presented outputs, indicators, targets and activities that were inherently linked to ensure the achievement of desired results. Of importance was the inclusion of at least two outputs to each intended outcome and three to four activities to produce each output.

The statement of the indicators, would have met the internationally accepted standard (USAID 1996) of being direct, objective, adequate, quantitative, disaggregated, practical and reliable or being S.M.A.R.T (TWB 2004, 11) that is, specific, measureable, attainable, relevant and time-bound. For instance, one indicator spoke to the number of PDC members attending training and the target for measuring the extent to which that happened, was stated in the project document as, ‘A minimum of 350 PDC members receiving training’. The indicators were therefore seen as being useful in looking at the overall performance of the project.

However, the target for a couple of indicators seemed to have been overambitious. One was ‘A minimum of 350 PDC members receiving training’ and the other was ‘50% increases in active participation in LPACs by PDC members’. Looking at the assessment of the PDCs and LPACs’ operations across the parishes it was dubious that those targets could have been achieved. There was no indication that those two targets were revised during the implementation of the project nor after the capacity assessment which would have revealed that the targets were not achievable.

6.1.3 External Logics of the Project Design

There was a good account, in the Partnership Strategy of the project, of the external local and international entities with which the project would benefit from synergistic relationships. References were made to local institutions such as the DLG, NAPDEC, the PDCs and the SDC. Included also were civil society organizations such as the PAJ, CARIMAC and educational
Institutions such as UTech and NCU. At the international level agencies such as the Canadian International Development agency (CIDA), USAID and the DGTTF funded Caribbean project ‘Transparency and Accountability in Local Government were cited. Collaboration or partnerships with these external agencies would have had the potential to build on prior achievements in relation to good governance and maximizing the resources of the project.

6.1.4 Risks Analysis

The risk factors with the probability of unplanned events occurring and the possible impact on the project:

1. Lack of Political will to take action to validate the authority of PDCs and resistance by Local Authorities to PDCs involvement in LPACs
2. Failure to pass legislation giving PDCs full legal status
3. The holding of Local Government Elections and reduced level of support from the new administration
4. Low participation by PDC members in capacity-development activity
5. Low participation by journalists in capacity development activity.

Those risks were realistic for the design phase of the project but none of them presented a challenge to the project implementation processes.

Noteworthy was the fact that project management, as the design stipulated, reviewed the list of risks and expanded them to include:

- Civil unrest that would create delays in meeting certain project schedules
- Severe weather conditions that would also delay the project implementing processes
- A change in Political Leadership which could have lead to lack of support and affect outcomes and deliverables, and
- A change in governance structure which could affect ‘the work of persons...with regards to...the project’.

Some of those risks were identified near to or at the time of their occurrences, for instance the civil unrest was identified in May 2010 near to the time of the declaration of the state of
emergency. Nevertheless, they compared to the unpredictable occurrences that are listed at section 5 above. All of them occurred but to a much greater dimension than would have been anticipated by the project management team and there can be no doubt that they would have had a negative impact on the project implementation processes and the achievement of project goals.

Finally, during the evaluation process and within the extension phase of the project, there seems to be a paradigm shift in the focus of Local Authorities from a planning toward decentralization under the DLG to what seems to be re-centralization under the MLG&CD under the new Government. How Local Authorities will function under this new regime and the implication for the role of civil society in good governance by local authorities need to be clarified. One notes the NAPDEC, perhaps from its recent experiences under the project, immediately called for a meeting with the new political directorate and hopes that there is an understanding as to future development and the status quo of these civil society groups.

6.1.5  Relevance of the Project Strategy

The summary project strategies as detailed in the project document comprised:

- Partnership with other similar local and international initiatives to complement the work being undertaken under the project (See list under 6.1.3 above)
- Mobilization of additional resources from local and international sources
- Assessment of capacities of responsible parties under the project and implementing a programme to improve the capacities of those parties
- Drawing on existing technical expertise of UNDP in the Panama based Regional Bureau for Latin American and the Caribbean.

There was also an exit strategy which spoke to the role of stakeholders in phasing out and continuing aspects of the project in the post project phase.

The selection of the responsible parties to participate in and benefit from the project was found to be quite appropriate. Discussions with stakeholders who participated in the various workshops indicated that the needs of the target population were paramount in the design and execution of the project. All the parties had vested interests in the success of the project because the interventions had synergistic linkages with their operational mandate. Inherent in
their involvement was potential for a positive spread effect through their sustenance of project developed interventions beyond the close-out of the project. There was evidence in the project that that occurred, for instance, NAPDEC and the PDCs are already utilizing their communication strategies and CARIMAC has committed to incorporating an ongoing training course in the continued improvement in the capacity of civil society groups to support good governance by local authorities.

6.2 Management and Implementation

6.2.1 Project Management

The evaluation indicated that the project was managed in a way to promote participation, capacity development and ownership. The Project Board included key stakeholders and was in a position to facilitate the reviews, discussion, feedback and approval of project plans.

It is commendable that a change of Project Associates in the office of the Implementing Partner for the project seemed to have occurred seamlessly with the project suffering no visible negative impact. On the other hand the Project Associates seemed to have carried a lot of coordinating responsibilities for research activities, such as the assessment of the extent of PDCs involvement in LPACs, in organizing and managing the schedule for workshops and in drafting minutes for the Project Board meetings. Overall, there seemed to have been a good communication process between the Project Leadership and the Project Associates that facilitated the effective functioning of the Project Associates.

The main beneficiaries under the project, NAPDEC and its membership - the PDC were integrally involved in the project implementation processes. Their involvement was particularly noted in mobilizing their membership for training sessions, being a part of the data collection, collation and analysis processes in the capacity assessment of the PDCs and helping to ensure that a number of PDCs completed their communication plans. In discussions with the NAPDEC representatives the view was expressed that they needed to be involved in the project at an earlier stage. However, they were not very clear as to which phase that should be and the evaluation did not find that their involvement was in anyway outside the processes for development assistance such as this project.
6.2.2 The Project Board

The evaluation indicated that the Project Board was structured with an appropriate mix of stakeholders. In particular, the quorum of the CLG, NAPDEC (the main responsible party) and the UNDP representative for decision making was a good one to ensure that the project decision making and implementation processes were not hampered by lack of attendance.

In general board meetings were held in a timely manner, once per quarter, but there was one extended period between January and June 2011 when there was no quarterly meeting. It is understood that the inputs of the board were obtained through the electronic communication system and the project was not negatively impacted. However, some members of the board expressed a preference that that missed quarterly meeting was held as there was nothing better than the opportunity for face to face discourse.

Indications are that board members were committed to the success of the project and took their responsibilities seriously. Notable, was the fact that at the first meeting the chairman expressed a preference for the membership of the board to be kept small so that transactions would not be curtailed by excessive contributions which would not necessarily improve the quality of the decisions taken. The decision, taken at the first meeting of the board, to invite the PAJ as observer at the board meetings was also a good one in the interest of promoting synergistic relations among stakeholders.

6.3. Summary of Implementation of Objectives, Outputs, Planned Activities and Results

Tables 1 to III overleaf provide an overview of the degree to which the project performed in the context of its objectives, output, activity results and actions to achieve outputs.
### Table 1
Summary of Objectives, Outputs, Planned Activities and Results

| UNDAF Outcome: 5.1 By 2011, increased capacity of government and targeted communities attain a more peaceful, secure and just society. |
|---|---|---|
| **Output 1:** Capacities of Parish Development Councils (PDCs) developed to ensure financial transparency and accountability of parish councils and municipalities |
| **Intended Outputs** | **Planned Activities** | **State of Achievement** |
| 1.1 PDC’s capacity assessed | The records show that activity was implemented with good support from NAPDEC and SDC. |
| 1.2 PDC members participation in LPACs measured | This activity was undertaken as indicated by report dated June 2011. |
| 1.3 Design and implementation of capacity building strategy | This was undertaken with one workshop in two workshops in Kingston, one in Mandeville and another in Ocho Rios. It is understood that poor attendance at the PDC Transparency and Accountability workshop in Kingston prompted a second workshop in Kingston and one in Ocho Rios. |
| 1.4 Design of communication strategies | The assessment indicated that this activity was undertaken with the delivery of communication training and some eight (8) PDCs completed and begun to use their own communication strategies. |

**Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Targets</strong></th>
<th><strong>Degree of Achievements</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of 350 PDC members receiving training</td>
<td>This target was missed by a great deal and is one of the targets considered to have been overambitious and should have been revised early in the life of the project. The records showed that 198 PDC members received training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% increase in active participation in LPACs by PDC members</td>
<td>Like the target above this one needed revision early in the project. Based on the analysis of the PDC attendance at LPAC meetings, there was fairly good attendance by the PDCs wherever the meetings were held but the last meetings in all parishes were held during the third quarter of 2010. (project year June to May). As far as was observed the project did not contribute to any increase of attendance and this does not seem to be a future possibility as a feature of project intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% of PDCs formulating public communication strategies</td>
<td>This indicator was exceeded as some eight (8) PDCs have completed their communication strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11
**Summary of Objectives, Outputs, Planned Activities and Result (Cont’d)**

#### Related CP outcome: 5.1: Improved governance and enhanced sectoral and inter-sectoral response to social injustice, instability and insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENDED OUTPUTS</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>STATE OF ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and legislation relating to local government financial management developed</td>
<td>2.1 Consultations held on draft policy legislation for local government financing and financial management</td>
<td>Apart from the Project Manager making contacts up to the Prime Ministerial level and the holding of a special Project Meeting with key stakeholders, the consultations for this output did not get off the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Drafting instructions for Local Government Financing and Financial Management Act revised and ready for submission</td>
<td>This activity was not undertaken. Please see section 5 for further information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Degree of Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft policy for local government financing prepared</td>
<td>This target was not achieved and the efforts to get it off the ground did not yield any appreciable result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drafting Instructions prepared</td>
<td>This was not achieved as it was contingent on the completion of the target immediately above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 50 participants in consultations</td>
<td>Again, this consultation, which was related to the immediate two above, was not undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 111
Summary of Objectives, Outputs Planned Activities and Result (Cont’d)

**Related CP outcome: 5.1.2: Improved transparency and enhanced sectoral and inter-sectoral response to social injustice, instability and insecurity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENDED OUTPUTS</th>
<th>PLANNED ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>STATE OF ACHIEVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of Media developed to improve public awareness of local authorities’ use of funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Initial content analysis of media coverage of local authority activities in print and broadcast media</td>
<td>That activity was undertaken and the report seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Media capacity training designed and delivered</td>
<td>That training was delivered but a planned further training to involve a broader spectrum of media was not held prior to the project extension phase. However, the Project Board modified the Annual Work Plan during the project extension phase and used the remaining project funds to hold another media capacity building workshop over the period March 16 – 18 in Mandeville. The materials developed under the project were utilized for the training and the first impact of that training session should be felt in the media coverage of Local Government Elections that are scheduled to be held on March 26, 2012. The Project Board also provided support to the Debates Commission in staging Local Government Elections Debates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Production of Syllabus and Training Manual in coverage of Local Government and local public expenditure</td>
<td>The training manual and the syllabus are not yet completed. They are currently being finalized under contract with CARIMAC. It is understood that a draft was done, but CARIMAC was asked to do further work which is not yet finished. Indications are that they will be completed and ready for use by the end of March 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Final content analysis of media coverage of local authority activities in print media</td>
<td>There is no indication that there was this other media content analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Degree of Achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of media houses represented at training</td>
<td>This target seemed to have been met at the national level but only partially so at the local level. The records showed that at the National level there were: Power 106, PBC Jamaica, the Gleaner, the Jamaica Observer, Nationwide News Network, and the Jamaica Information Service (JIS). However at the local level there were: Roots 96.1 FM, The News and a freelance journalist. Noted omission from the list which was mentioned in the Project Board report was Television Jamaica (TVJ), CVM and Jamaica News Network (JNN). Since there was a media training session, during the project extension phase, the target may have been fully met, but efforts to obtain the attendance register to verify this were unsuccessful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of media training institutions providing on-going training in local government</td>
<td>An arrangement is in place for this target to be implemented in the post project phase. CARIMAC has indicated that they have committed to both offer the course as a first for the summer of 2012 and/or it will be incorporated in their curriculum for September 2012 and the ensuing years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 **Project Processes**

This section provides a SWOT analysis of the implementation processes. It is presented under the headings: what went well, what did not go so well, what have been the opportunities and what have been the threats. In large measure, the submissions below reflect stakeholders’ responses during the evaluation and what emerged from triangulation of the data.

6.4.1 **What went well:**

- Respondents indicated that the meetings with the PDCs for the assessment went very well.
- The capacity building workshops, except for the PDC financial transparency and accountability session in Kingston, also went very well. According to the media representatives the ‘training for the media was spot-on’. The media professionals in attendance said they had a better idea of how to report on local government issues and in particular how to analyze financial reports.
- The training and resource materials were of a high quality such that it is understood that the Association of Local Government Agencies (ALGA) has incorporated it into their training programme with Parish Counselors.
- The assessment of LPACs, although delayed, provided useful information on the level of participation of PDCS in LPACs and on the status of the LPACs.
- The newspaper supplements were good and so was the collaboration of the project with UNDP in the observance of Anti-Corruption Day.
- The contractual agreement with CARIMAC was of high and extendable value to the project stakeholders, especially the PDCs, LPACs and parish councilors.
- The Project Board provided excellent support and oversight of project implementation.
- Air time that PDCs receive on the Jamaica Speaks Radio Programme was useful for their advocacy and communication strategy.
6.4.2 What did not go so well:

- Efforts to implement the legislative outputs of the project did not produce desired results. No one could locate the prior draft policy document that was submitted to Cabinet.
- Not being able to concert Parish councilors and Mayors for a critical consultation meeting on the relationship with PDCS and LPACS.
- Not being able to organize the second media training and especially to include representatives from western Jamaica who mostly did not attend the capacity building workshop.
- Not concerting media professionals with NAPDEC and PDC members during the capacity building sessions.

6.4.3 Opportunities

- Networking with other agencies and institutions through workshops, the Project Board and other fora augured well for the future operations of NAPDEC and the PDC.
- To be able to conduct the assessment of the PDC which NAPDEC considered but never had the resources to implement.
- Laying the foundation for future development in the technical capabilities of responsible parties to support good governance by local authorities.
- NAPDEC and its membership, the PDCs being able to actively participate the assessment and capacity building of their organizations.

6.4.4 Threats

- There was no opportunity under the project to reinforce the capacity building strategies that were delivered, especially in the areas of transparency and accountability. If steps are not taken to reinforce the training the capacity built could dissipate.
- All the training could also disappear unless further action is taken to fortify the administrative capacities of PDCs.
- If left unattended the suspicion and role misunderstanding that exist between PDCs and Parish Councils will continue to be antithetical to the capacity of PDCs to effectively function in support of good governance by local authorities.
• The legislative reform which was a key element cited in the project document to strengthen NAPDEC in “its oversight role in the work and functioning of its member PDCS’ did not happen under the project. There is therefore a question mark on the capacity of NAPDEC to effectively carry out its mandate.

• The project’s envisioned devolution of Local Governance to Local Authorities did not occur and instead of the DLG continuing “to exist as a small unit, within the Office of the Prime Minister” there is a re-centralization of Local Governance to the MLG. There is therefore a question of the implication of the new paradigm on the modus operandi of the Local Authorities.

7.0 SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

7.1 Project designs, outputs and activities

The project was well designed with solid internal and external logics and linkages among the various elements that would ensure easy interpretation and implementation. The strategies for addressing the issues identified were appropriate.

Similarly, the partnership strategies provided for effective complementary relationships with other similar initiatives both locally and internationally. At least two targets in the PDC capacity building output were set beyond the achievable limits of the project given the realities on the ground at the start of the project. Adjusting those after the findings of the capacity assessments would have been useful.

7.2 Project implementation

Efforts were made to implement the project in a timely manner and in accordance with approved work plans but there were factors beyond the control of the project that militated against staying consistently within the planned time limits.

The socio-political landscape within which the project was located was in and of itself more inimical than helpful to the successful implementation of the project. As such the implementing partner, responsible parties, the Project Board and other stakeholders must be commended for achievements over the life of the project.
The quarterly reports, annual work plans and annual reports were prepared and submitted, as required. The Project Board meeting at the end of 2011 did not take place until March 2, 2012 so the annual report for 2011 was reviewed just then.

### 7.3 Implementing Partner

The CLG was an apposite selection to lead the management and implementation processes under the project. The Project Coordinator had influences in the media and in the governance circle to have made a difference especially with the proposal to revise legislative policy and formulate drafting instructions for legislation. Added to that was the leader’s capacity, in keeping with his position at the university, to work comfortably with the faculties and departments at the University of the West Indies Mona that had a key role in the implementation of the project.

### 7.4 Implementation approaches

The approach to implementing the project was found to be participatory, promoting ownership and oriented toward capacity building. NAPDEC and the SDC who usually provided technical support to NAPDEC, were integral to the collection of data on capacity assessment of PDCs and in the analysis of the data. NAPDEC was also critically involved in mobilizing its members for participation in the capacity building workshops and the completion of their communication strategies. There is a note in the project reports about the delay in completing the capacity building strategy but one may wish to look at some of it as a part of the learning curve and development of NAPDEC for future initiatives.

### 7.5 Responsible Parties

The responsible parties were strategically located to benefit from and make contributions not only during the project implementation phase but years beyond the project assistance completion date. They therefore could not be excluded from the project even if other parties were considered. They all seemed to have made important contributions to the implementation process in keeping with the design management arrangements (See page 26 of the Project Document).
7.6 Capacity building efforts

As the project document stipulated an evidence-based mechanism was employed to build capacities at NAPDEC and among the PDCs in preparation of communication plans, in how to more effectively work with the media, in networking with complementary institutions and initiatives and some of these are being and will be applied by the responsible parties in the daily operations. The capacity of NAPDAC and its membership the PDCs to fulfill its mission will be further improved as they are slated to receive the inventory of project equipment on the close-out of the project.

The capacity of media professionals was also improved toward more effective coverage of operations of local authorities. However the ability of PDCs to develop capacity to effectively support good governance in future will depend on other critical factors that if left unattended will limit their capacity so to do. These have been mentioned above.

7.7 Project Board

The project board was well constituted with the appropriate mechanisms for making decisions. They met regularly, were committed to the process and carried out their responsibilities well.

7.8 Synergistic relationships

Good internal relationships were established among the CLG, NAPDEC, the PDC and other agencies represented on the project board. NAPDEC would have also strengthened its relationship with the PDCs and there would also be an ongoing relationship with CARIMAC in the implementation of the course in transparency and accountability of local authorities. However, the project missed an opportunity to concert the media professionals with NAPDEC and the PDC during the capacity building sessions. Both NAPDEC and the PAJ expressed the view that that was a good opportunity that was missed.

Synergistic relationship being established with external, regional or international entities was made possible during the Anti Corruption Day observation events in Jamaica as it brought together representatives from the UNDP, Transparency International and other groups with responsible parties on the project.
7.9 Risks
Some of the anticipated risks carried in the project document did not occur although they were well thought out. There was one natural disaster that delayed visits to a few parishes to collect data for the PDC capacity development. But there were socio-political risks (section 5 above) that affected meetings and in particular action on the legal reforms element of the project that were beyond prediction. That they had some negative impact on the project is not deniable.

7.10 Unexpected outcome
The use of the capacity building training material by ALGA to train local government officers was not envisioned either during the design nor early implementation of the project.

A website for NAPDEC that is currently under development is a useful innovation under the project that will support sustainability.

The involvement of stakeholders including NAPDEC and the PDC in the UN Anti Corruption Day observation though alluded to in the partnership strategies, was not anticipated.

The Project Board’s modification of the Work Plan to provide support to the Jamaica Debates Commission in the pre-Local Government Elections Debate was not a planned activity.

After the first month in the project extension phase and with the announcement of Local Government Elections for the end of March, another media training workshop was seen as impractical and impossible. However, the challenges seemed to have been converted to an opportunity and the workshop was successfully executed during the extension phase of the project.

7.11 Transformation effect
Transformation effect speaks to fundamental changes in form, behavior and or attitude as a result of some form of stimulus, action or activity. It often has to do with experiences in particular situations which are so impactful or sustained over time as to bring about changes in function or both structure and function. There is nothing under this project that seemed to fit that situation. The impending course by CARIMAC could contribute to some changes but there
would have to be quite some other fundamental changes for NAPDEC, the PDC and their relationship with the Parish Councils to speak of transformation.

8.0 LESSONS LEARNED

- Perhaps the greatest risks to successful project implementation are the unpredictable ones that emerge during project implementation and of a dimension and dynamism that leave the project administrators powerless in taking steps to mitigate their impact. Project designers may need to begin to include mechanisms in proposals that can be responsive to these unpredictable risks.

- Interventions that seek to address issues in the political arena need to include facilities for strategic consensus building among critical stakeholders in the system to support easier achievement of project goals and increase the potential for sustenance of project initiatives. For instance, building capacities of civil society groups to support good governance by local authorities needs to be undertaken concomitantly with capacity building of local authorities to understand and accept the role of civil society.

- Participatory capacity building presumes a learning curve that may create delays in project implementation and allowances need to be made for slow responses at times and delayed delivery of some project outputs.

- Capacity building outcomes/impact will be lost if undertaken with a critical unattended vacuum in the structure and effective functioning of an organization. A pre-requisite for effective capacity building therefore requires some arrangements with significant others to address the gaps that are critical to the successful building of capacity. In the case of the PDCs very inept administrative and financial support will significantly limit their ability to perform.

9.0 SUSTAINABILITY
The question of continuation of successful elements of a project often depends on factors such as: i) the value of the activity to be sustained presents opportunities for continuance ii)
deliberate in-process efforts to secure support systems for the future and iii) capabilities to extend or replicate the activities. Elements of the project that meet these criteria included:

- The in-process effort in the “development of special syllabus and training manual on the coverage of local government”. The presence of the syllabus and manual will allow not only CARIMAC, but other institutions in Jamaica to incorporate the training in their educational programmes in the future.
- The experience gained by NAPDEC in the conduct of the capacity assessment of PDCs which will be re-usable for further assessment of their member organizations and they can also apply the technique to assessment of other organizations.
- The training in development and application of communication strategies which has the potential to remain with NAPDEC and its members for some years to come and to generate benefits of visibility, effective advocacy and influence. A communication guide was produced out of the communications workshop and will be useful in informing the production of communication plans for the PDCs.
- The training in more investigative journalism, which should continue to feature in the work of professional journalists for years to come, making a difference in the quality of their reporting.

10 RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 Legislative Reform:

NAPDEC needs to pursue a strategy of lobbying and advocacy to have the policy document completed and drafting of the legislation undertaken and the bill promulgated through Parliament. This will be useful to their continued effectiveness as an umbrella group. One option for them is to prepare a project proposal and seek funding for the process.

10.2 Continued Capacity Building of PDCs

A way will have to be found to support and sustain the administrative needs of the PDCs in order to improve their effectiveness. To this end it may be useful to have a limited assessment to determine the best way to focus limited resources. Despite financial and in kind support by the DLG that became the MLG&CD after the December 2011 General Elections, the PDCs still
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face major challenges to function effectively, especially in carrying out their administrative duties.

NAPDEC as a part of any project at 10.1 above should include further capacity building for the media and the PDCs in transparency, accountability and other critical areas to build on the achievements under the project and improve their capacity to support good governance by local authorities.

10.3 Consensus building among PDC, Local Authorities and LPACs

There is need for post project action to formalize the roles and functions of the LPACs and to engage local authorities together with the PDCs in dialogue to create a better understanding of their role and to enhance mutually acceptable co-existence and effective functioning.

Project Receipts and Disbursements

The report of receipts and disbursements over the life of the project to December 31, 2011 are presented in Table IV below. It shows a programmable budget of US$150,000.00 over the life of the project (LOP). Funding advances to the project however amounted to US$106,797.50 (71%) leaving an undispursed of US$43,202.50. The required burn rate over the LOP was US$8,333 whereas the actual burn rate was US$5933.

**Table IV – Project Receipts and Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Total Budget (US$)</th>
<th>Programmable Budget (US$)</th>
<th>Total Advances to IP (US$)</th>
<th>Total IP Expenditure US$</th>
<th>Remaining Funds (US$) (Prog. Budget minus Total Expenditure US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>US$150,000.00</td>
<td>87,700.00</td>
<td>64,420.91</td>
<td>85,579.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>US$85,579.09</td>
<td>42,490.93</td>
<td>42,376.59</td>
<td>43,202.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>130,190.93</td>
<td>106,797.50</td>
<td>106,797.50</td>
<td>43,202.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Required rate US$ 8333

Total IP Expenditure US$ 106,797.50 (71%) Burn Rate US$5933 per month
Source: University of the West Indies Mona, Project Unit Records 2010 – 2011.
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I. Position Information

Job Title: Consultant - Project Evaluator (National)

Department: Democratic Governance

Activity: Evaluation of Project – Building Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities

Reports to: Governance Advisor

Type of contract: Individual Contractor
II. Background

Project

The title of the project to be evaluated is **Building Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities**. Funded by the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) the project began implementation in June 2010 and is due to be completed by the end of December 2011.

The Government of Jamaica, through the Local Government Reform Process, intends to hand over significant autonomy to local authorities shortly. To ensure that the authorities will handle their expanded powers competently and responsibly, the new institutional model includes a public forum at the local level to examine and assess use of public funds by parish councils and municipalities as well as a civil society body that will function as a key actor in anti-corruption efforts. The project will strengthen the capacity of the civil society and public institutions to provide oversight of public expenditure, at the local level.

The implementing partner is the Centre for Leadership and Governance, University of the West Indies (UWI). The responsible parties, supporting implementation, are the Department of Local Government of the Office of the Prime Minister, the Social Development Commission, and the National Association of Parish Development Committees. Other associated stakeholders are the Press Association of Jamaica and the Caribbean Institute for Media and Communications (CARIMAC), UWI.

The project document is available for review at [http://www.jm.undp.org/node/392](http://www.jm.undp.org/node/392)

Evaluation purpose

Under the DGTTF evaluation, lesson learning and knowledge management framework all projects are required to conduct end of project evaluation. The evaluation report and management report must be completed in time for submission to DGTTF no later than March 1, 2012.
**Evaluation scope and objectives**

The evaluation must address the entire project from inception to completion and should embody a strong results-based orientation.

Based on a desk review of all documents produced by the project and other relevant knowledge products, interviews, focus groups, site visits and other research conducted, the Evaluator will produce an evaluation that will:

- Identify outputs produced by the project
- Elaborate on how outputs have or have not contributed to outcomes, and
- Identify results and transformation changes, if any, that have been produced by the project

The evaluation should assess:

- Whether stated outputs were achieved
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving outputs
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the project
- The effectiveness of the partnership strategy
- The impact of the project
- The sustainability of the project impact/s
- How effective equality and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the design and execution

### III. Deliverables

The Evaluator will produce for approval by UNDP:

- An evaluation inception report
- A draft evaluation report, and
- A final evaluation report with lessons learned and recommendations

The Evaluator will also produce an evaluation brief and facilitate at least briefing event for UNDP and relevant stakeholders.
### IV. Competencies

- Strong analytical and statistical skills
- Excellent oral and written communication skills including ability to engage stakeholders in open discussions

### V. Recruitment Criteria

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education:</strong></td>
<td>Advanced degree, preferably in International Relations, Political Science or Law or other Governance or development related field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience:</strong></td>
<td>▪ Minimum 5 years relevant professional experience in the area of democratic governance, ▪ Minimum 5 years experience in project or programme evaluation in country context. ▪ Knowledge of and experience with UNDP or other donor or developing country governance programmes would be an asset ▪ Experience in project management is considered an asset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Requirements:</strong></td>
<td>Excellent command of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independence</strong></td>
<td>The evaluator must be independent from any organisations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising on any aspect of the project that is the subject of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Ethics</strong></td>
<td>The evaluation must be conducted in line with the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. <a href="http://www.uneval.org/search/undex.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines">www.uneval.org/search/undex.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VI. Submissions

Interested applicants (individuals or companies, are required to submit:

- Evidence of qualifications including resumes and references
- A technical proposal explaining the methodology for conducting the evaluation and containing a detailed work-plan with timelines
- A separate financial proposal including all costs for conducting the evaluation and producing the deliverables