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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

 Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety is a project which was launched in the parishes of St Catherine (in both the St Catherine Parish Council and the Portmore Municipality), St Mary, Clarendon, Trelawny, Manchester, St Elizabeth and Westmoreland. Note that the parishes of St Elizabeth and Westmoreland were not part of the original pilot but were added later in the project implementation phase. The project is funded by the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) with a time span for implementation ranging from May 2011 to December 31, 2013. The DGTTF is a fund operated by the UNDP. The implementing partner is the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development (MLG). Other institutions supporting implementation include the Ministry of National Security (MNS), the UNDP, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) and the Social Development Commission (SDC).

The project’s main thrust is that improving local governance in the areas of security and safety through the strengthening of capacities of local institutions. This includes: [a] the development of capacities in local authorities and civil society organizations, [b] the establishment of parish safety committees (PSCs) and [c] the development of instruments to be used by the PSCs. The project’s major objectives were:

1. Strengthened civil society participation in local governance and;
2. The establishment of coordinated local civil society and state responses to crime and violence.

Its defined outputs were:

1. Development of local authorities and civil society organizations’ capacity to promote and secure participatory local governance in citizen security and;
2. Development of local authority level mechanism under the Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy

The project evaluation was set up to address the entire project from inception to completion using methodologies such as desk reviews. These reviews examined secondary information such as project design and implementation documents, baseline reports, reports from local authorities and parish development committees (PDCs), course outlines and TORs which provided guidelines for various aspects of the project. Direct interviews and discussions with key project stakeholders were also done. These were done to inform the requirements of the evaluation TOR which required identification of: [a] project outputs and whether or not stated outputs were achieved, [b] impact of outputs on outcomes, [c] results and transformational changes, [d] the effectiveness of partnership strategies, [e] the project impacts and their sustainability and [f] the effectiveness of gender equality and mainstreaming in project design and execution.

With respect to findings the project design was overall satisfactory to the majority of stakeholders. Most stakeholders who assisted in project set up and implementation believed that their roles were clear at the outset. Assessment of the project timeline also shows that throughout the implementation process all major stakeholders made significant attempts to stick to the overall project concept and achieved this to a great extent. Approximately 89 per cent of stakeholders stated that the concept was good and saw no major flaws in the design. Of those who had any reservations at all (11 per cent) they stated that the project should have had an additional component dealing with community strengthening and also a defined functional position (in the local authority) dealing with safety and security. Assessment of the results framework and related documents in project design show that design also required a more expanded monitoring and evaluation framework showing a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework and an objective scheme regarding the measurement (of progress) targets and indicators.

The implementation scheme for the project was accepted by major stakeholders with the co-ordination shown by the Project Board, Stakeholder Committee and Project Management Unit. This was especially with respect to sensitization and communication to project stakeholders. Implementation however experienced challenges with respect to: [a] time and logistic scheduling due to the fact that the parish selection was in different geographical areas, [b] the time schedule with respect to the parish council calendar, [c] lack of full buy in by some major players in the early stages of the project, [d] local and general elections over the project period, [e] the rotation of staff at relevant local institutions and [f] varying technical abilities of participating stakeholders.

The set outputs on the project have been achieved with respect to the fact that local authorities overall have improved capacity over baseline with respect to a more participatory approach to local governance. In addition mechanisms are now in place to channel resources to crime prevention and community safety. In addition at least one additional output has been achieved which was not set out under the project – the parish safety and security handbook. One concern expressed, with respect to output delivery, by stakeholders is the fact that, some believed, more time needed to be provided in the delivery process to training. These respondents believed training programmes were too short.

The project has also impacted positively on all parishes where overall capabilities to deal with safety and security has improved. This has been evidenced by the fact that:

1. There is now a structure in place for all major players to have a unified vision and focus with respect to safety and security at the local and community level. This did not exist before.
2. There is an organizational reorientation within the various local authorities in dealing with matter of safety and security as a response to the entrenchment of the PSC in parish councils (and the Portmore municipality). This is evidenced by accommodation to a change in the modus operandi of meetings, and defined strategies (inclusive of the feedback of partners) in dealing with safety and security
3. There has been human resource development and a significant knowledge transfers in safety and security matters (inclusive of safety auditing, urban crime and violence, monitoring and evaluation etc.) directly attributable to the project.

There are also issues of concern with respect to capacity throughout the various parishes. For instance the PSC has created an overlap with respect to safety and security priorities in at least one parish - Clarendon. This parish had committees which dealt with related issues before the PSC was set up. At least two of the project parishes are not having meetings as scheduled - this is a cause for concern. Finally the delivery systems and response mechanisms are not yet fully mobilized and adopted due to the short time frame since project delivery. This warrants the need for continued monitoring.

With respect to the contribution of the project to national outcomes; there are clear linkages as evidenced by defined steps to increase local governance. These are major goals and outcomes set out in UNDAF, CPAP and the Vision 2030 Jamaica Development Plan. However with respect to a sustained reduction in violence and social injustice there is yet no proof that this has occurred or if the levels existing are attributable to the success or failure of this project. This is due mainly to the fact that the time period has been too short, since project implementation, to judge this.

With respect to best practices and lesson learnt, it is recommended that on future projects of this nature structured sensitization sessions be part and parcel of project design and implementation. In addition a structured and consistent internal and external communication system is vital if the project outputs are to be achieved. As the project is now transferred from the direct support of the UNDP to that of local organizations (i.e. Ministry of Local Government and Community Development and respective local authorities) issues with respect to sustainability become important. There must now be stronger links between the parish safety committees and relevant central government programmes where some parish committees (of central agencies) become subcommittees of the parish safety committee. In addition there is the need for a still stronger link with civil society organizations where community and development area plans have stronger links with the PSCs. There is also the need for relevant programmes and projects emanating from the public sector modernization and local government reform programmes to be under the aegis of the PSCs.

Critical recommendations emanating from the exercise include:

* Putting in more formal arrangements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding) between local authorities and central government agencies, to ensure critical data on safety and security is provided to the respective local authorities. This will improve the overall decision making process.
* The promotion of strategies to decrease net loss of technical skills from local authorities through staff rotation. This includes orientation programmes and longer term alliances with training institutions.
* Linking project design with existing or new programmes aimed at existing communities, this is even more important in volatile communities.
* The continuation of the PMU in the post project scenario to assist in the monitoring and evaluation process as currently progress by parish is uneven.
* Ensure that training programmes reflect the varying abilities of stakeholders
* There must be a built in system for advocacy for local government reform to assist sustainability of the project.

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

The Jamaican society has experienced not just high crime rates but also other issues related to safety in local communities. According to statistics from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) the annual homicide rate for Jamaica (per 100,000) averaged 45.5 annually between the years 1995 – 2011.

It is important to note that homicides and major crimes are not the only challenges faced by the nation with respect to safety and security. At the community level there are other issues which require attention. These include but are not limited to; provision of care for the vulnerable and disabled, child and spousal abuse, the design and form of the physical environment. The need to sustainably provide services to mitigate and/or even eliminate these challenges at the local level speaks directly to the need to improve the capacity of local governance systems.

There have been numerous efforts by the Jamaican Government to address the issue of security and safety at the local level in the past. These are evidenced by programmes such as the Community Renewal Programme (CRP)[[1]](#footnote-2) and the National Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy (NCPCSS).[[2]](#footnote-3) Notwithstanding such efforts, the capacity of local governance structures and systems is still a challenge facing local authorities in dealing with this issue.

Consequently the UNDP and the Government of Jamaica (GoJ) has recognized the need for a project to address these issues. Hence the formulation of the **Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety** **Project.**  This is an initiative that espouses a citizen-based approach to developing sustainable strategies that focus on improved partnerships between civil society, local authorities, and central state agencies; to prevent and mitigate the effects of crime and violence levels. The project’s major objectives are:

* Strengthened civil society participation in local governance
* Establishment of coordinated local civil society and state responses to crime and violence

There are also defined outputs which should emanate from the Project, viz:

* Development of local authorities’ and civil society organizations’ capacity to promote and secure participatory local governance
* Development of local authority level mechanism/s under the Community Renewal Programme and the Crime Prevention & Community Safety Strategy

The project is funded by the Democratic Governance Thematic Trust Fund (DGTTF) with a time span for implementation ranging from May 2011 to December 31, 2013. It is important to note that the DGTTF used funds remaining from a previous project to fund the Capacity Assessment and Scoping Mission Reports of 2011. This assisted in providing savings for the project which were then used to expand the assessment phase from the pilot parishes to all parishes island wide. The project had originally been scheduled to end in March 2013 but increased funding from the UNDP to expand work in other parishes created the extension in deadline.

The implementing partner is the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development (MLG). The responsible parties supporting implementation are the Ministry of National Security (MNS), the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) and the Social Development Commission (SDC). It is at this juncture in the project life cycle that the promoters and other stakeholders desire a thorough evaluation of the project and its impacts.

## 1.2 Evaluation Objectives and Deliverables

The evaluation will address the entire project from inception to completion and 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 is expected to 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 and;
* How effective equality and gender mainstreaming have been incorporated in the design and execution.

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 make a presentation to UNDP programme staff and project stakeholders on the draft evaluation report, prior to finalisation.

## 1.3 Constraints

The major constraint to the evaluation process has been to getting appointments to interview beneficiary institutions and their representatives island wide. There was one parish in which there were no interviews done at all (St Elizabeth). In addition it was particularly difficult to get parish council personnel for interviews. This created a challenge to some aspects of the original methodology i.e. the focus group approach. Another challenge was that of the change in personnel in beneficiary stakeholder institutions. This created problems with respect to comparisons in the analysis as in some cases persons with whom discussions were held were not a part of the project from start up. In many cases current interviewees tried to assist in this regard by perusing past files their respective organizations which had been created at baseline. This however although helpful did not always provide the qualitative information which would have been collected from the actual person who had participated in the early stage of the project.

# 2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

## 2.1 Review of Existing Studies/Available Literature

This included the following:

1. Project Evaluation Terms of Reference
2. UNDP related country reports and Jamaica’s performance on World Bank Governance Indicators (WGI).
3. National ‘parent’ documents which have assisted in project preparation – e.g. Report on the National Crime and Safety Strategy, Vision 2030 Gender Sector Plan, the National Security Policy and the National Policy for Gender Equality and the Vision 2030 Development Plan.
4. Perusal of documents related to directly project design and implementation such as:
	1. The Project Document,
	2. Scoping Mission Report (UNDP Regional Team),
	3. Capacity Assessment Reports (done by the UNDP Regional Team and the SDC),
	4. Capacity Assessment Report by the Ministry of National Security,
	5. Terms of References for the setting up of Project Board and the Stakeholder Committee,
	6. Terms of References for operational modalities of PSCs,
	7. Operational Handbook On Parish Partnerships,
	8. Profile of training received such as the Urban Crime and Violence Prevention Course,
	9. Projected annual work plans and extended work plans,
	10. Project personnel and stakeholder listings,
	11. Quarterly Project Reports submitted to UNDP as well as DGTTF
5. Review of information from local planning authorities and PDCs inclusive of meeting minutes, community forum reports, parish safety plans and audits, strategic plans for fundraising, etc.
6. Review of best practice reports and international case studies (e.g. New Zealand) based on similar projects world wide

## 2.2 Primary Data Collection and Stakeholder Engagement Strategies

Primary data collection included face to face interviews with the following:

1. Representatives of the project office.
2. The UNDP Project Staff.
3. Institutional/enabling stakeholders – these are institutions who were critical in providing or facilitating technical or related support [**Section 3.1.7**] to the project over the design and implementation periods e.g. The UNDP Project Team, MNS, PIOJ, MLG, SDC, there were interviews with eight (8) such people from five (5) institutions.
4. Beneficiary institutions/stakeholders - these are the local institutions and their representatives which received direct training and other technical support under the project (i.e. the PDC, SDC field staff, and the parish council personnel and other NGO and CBO personnel). With respect to beneficiary institutions, the aim was to ensure that, at a minimum, at least two representatives from each parish (e.g. the council secretary manager and a PDC representative who was involved from the project inception). There were interviews with twelve (12) such people who were PSC representatives from seven (7) local authorities.
5. Use of case studies – two parish case studies was selected. (St Mary and the Portmore Municipality). Case studies were used to highlight the all round level of adaptation to the requirements of the project in two respective areas. One showing a significant level of success and the other where adoption of project strategies has been difficult.

## 2.3 Stakeholder Interviewing

Direct discussions with all major stakeholders was the overall approach taken using a standard set of interview questions. Note that this did not materialize in all cases and adjustments had to be done inclusive of telephone interviews. This was due mainly to the scheduling and accessibility constraints over the evaluation period. Notwithstanding this, the aim in this exercise was to speak to all major enabling institutions and beneficiary institutions in all parishes. There have been a total of twenty (20) individuals with whom discussions have been held (eight from enabling institutions, 12 from beneficiary institutions. All project parishes except that of the parish of St Elizabeth had a representative with whom discussions were held.

Note that an open questionnaire approach does not work based on the intricacies of the project.[[3]](#footnote-4) In addition the data collection process involved only stakeholders and stakeholder institutions who were either a part of the process as beneficiaries or enablers. For primary data collection some detailed discussions sessions (lasting approximately 1.5 – 2 hours) with stakeholders have taken place.

### 2.3.1 Typical Questions/Discussions Points for Enabling Stakeholders

Questions for the stakeholder institutions that were critical at the project design and implementation stage in the provision of technical assistance and oversight had discussions centred on:

* What was their respective role(s) on the project?
* Were roles and functions of stakeholders made clear?
* What will be required from your organization to assist in project sustainability?
* Were outputs achieved?
* What were the partnership strategies adopted and were they effective?
* What has the impact been on national outcomes?
* Sustainability concerns

Such discussion points were arrived at after gleaning existing project related literature (inclusive of the project document which stated the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder and the evaluation TOR).

### 2.3.2 Typical Questions/Discussion Points for Beneficiary Institutions

Similarly with respect to stakeholders from beneficiary institutions, questions and discussions centred on:

* level of satisfaction and achievement of outputs and the respective delivery systems
* The impacts to date on daily operations and also the project overall
* The current composition and level of functionality of the respective PSCs
* The current partnership strategies and level of effectiveness
* Examination of the level of marked improvements/declines on aspects of the local authority since baseline
* The level of sensitivity to gender equality attached to output delivery in the project implementation process
* Sustainability concerns

## 2.4 Data Analyses

Throughout this project the major effort is to improve capacities in local authorities. At the outset it is therefore important to define the term ‘capacity’ as applied here. The UNDPs formal definition of capacity development is “the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time.”[[4]](#footnote-5) In the context of this project it therefore refers to the wide range of capabilities, knowledge and resource requirements needed by individuals and organizations to make local planning authorities effective in implementing safety and security at the local level. These capabilities are inclusive of:

1. Governance and Leadership Levels
2. Corporate and/or Programme Strategies
3. Delivery of Programmes
4. Accountability
5. Internal Organizational Operation and Management
6. Resource Development

These (1-5 above) arise from changes in the quality of human resources, technology (or techniques) organizational culture and (re)orientation. Note that to measure each an assessment of the resources provided by the project and the direct change(s) from baseline. In short what value added was created from the ‘with project’ vs. the ‘without project’ scenarios. For example the project provided improved techniques in assessment of safety at the local level. This was a result of training in safety audits for PSC members. Disussions with stakeholders, perusal of documents (safety audit training, actual safety audits, parish plans, meeting minutes etc.) would show number of people trained, the improved techniques provided and how the PC and PSC had to accommodate such changes. In addition, how did each create a change in [1]-[5] above.

The analytical framework will examine if and/or how these changes have occurred from baseline to present.

### 2.4.1 Qualitative Analyses

Qualitative analyses techniques consisted of:

* **Narratives and Case Study Approaches** – direct feedback from beneficiaries with respect to the impact of the programme was used as a tool to provide direct evidence of the role of the Project in improving (or not improving) local governance and enhancing community and citizen participation in local security issues. This is an attempt to give a holistic view of the changes that have occurred (e.g. overall knowledge base, organizational structures and processes, the modus operandi for programme delivery, etc). In addition this approach zeroes in on the actual use of tools imparted (e.g safety audit and monitoring and evaluation training, the required modus operandi of respective PSCs, etc.), participation levels and governance in local authorities with regard to community safety and security. Note that this approach became prominent in the analysis due to the fact that the focus group approach became infeasible.
* **Situational and SWOT Analyses** – this technique examined the current environment within which the Project exists over the implementation period. This informed the significance of exogenous variables in the environment and their impact on the progress of the Project. In addition to providing information on the enabling environment within which the project sits it also informs the stakeholders with respect to the sustainability of the Project in going forward.
* **Simple Check Listings and Notation** – these are used as a comparison technique in the matching of targets vs. actual achievements and also baseline information on capacity vs. changes from baseline.
* **Flowcharting** – this technique was applied to, major steps in the process to achieve project outputs.

### 2.4.2 Quantitative Analyses

The major techniques include:

* **Simple Financial Analyses** – these will be centred on techniques to assess of the US$255,000.00 that was slated for the project and its impact over the three years. Assessment will be done with respect to variations in periodic funds use of funds, expenditure-allocation ratios, inflation/devaluation impact (if any), etc.
* **Simple Statistical Analyses** – these will include the employment of comparison techniques, dispersion techniques and simple descriptive statistics (mean averages etc)

## 2.5 Presentation of Results

Reports will be presented in various formats such as:

* Power Point presentations – there will be at least one presentation formally to stakeholders of the Draft Evaluation Report
* Graphs and Tables
* Written Reports – there will be at least three (3) written reports which will be submitted as deliverables

# 3.0 SITUATION AND SWOT ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECT ENVIRONMENT

## 3.1 Situational Analyses

### 3.1.1 Jamaica’s International Governance Rankings

Based on the World Bank’s World Governance Indicators (WGI), Jamaica’s ranking for the six (6) major indicators[[5]](#footnote-6) show it mid to low percentiles - see **Chart 1** below. This is significantly lower than its developed country counterparts who are consistently ranked in high percentiles (i.e. 80 per cent and above). Based on this information overall governance in Jamaica requires improvement if it is to achieve world standards. From 1998 to 2012 its average rank with respect to Voice and Accountability is 63.99, Political Stability and the Absence of Violence 39.02, Government Effectiveness 60.62, Regulatory Quality 59.74, Rule of Law 39.36 and Control of Corruption 43.44.

### 3.1.2 Demographic Profile of Project Parishes

The project study involved the parishes of St Mary, Trelawny, Manchester, St Elizabeth, Westmoreland, St Catherine, and Clarendon. Note that Westmoreland and St Elizabeth were not original pilot parishes but became a part of the project in 2012. This is quite a significant proportion of the Jamaican population being approximately 1.3 million people (47.44 per cent of total). The population breakdown is shown in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Population Statistics of Pilot Parishes

| **Particulars**  | **Population** | **Percentage of National Population** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Jamaica | 2,709,200 | 100 |
| St Catherine*(Portmore)[[6]](#footnote-7)* | 501,700*(182,000)* | 18.5*(6.7)* |
| Clarendon | 248,100 | 9.2 |
| Manchester | 192,200 | 7.2 |
|  St Elizabeth | 152,100  | 5.6  |
| Trelawny | 76,100 | 2.8 |
| St Mary | 115,100 | 4.2 |
| Total Pilot Parishes | 1,285,300 |  |

**Source: ESSJ 2012**

### 3.1.3 Crime and Safety Situation

Jamaica, although a small country, has significant crime problems. According to statistics from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) the annual homicide rate for Jamaica (per 100,000) averaged 45.5 annually between the years 1995 – 2011. Crime data on the project parishes show that the annual incidences of serious crimes are on average 43.17 per cent of the national total. Profiles of serious and violent crimes by parish are shown below in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Incidences of Serious and Violent Crimes in Pilot Parishes (2012)

| **Parish** | **Murder** | **Shootings** | **Rape** | **Robbery** | **Break-In** | **Larceny** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Island wide | 1,133 | 1,346 | 815 | 3,077 | 3,491 | 388 |
| St Catherine*(St Catherine South[[7]](#footnote-8))* | 300*(125)* | 333*(159)* | 129*(62 )* | 510*(255)* | 565*(294)* | 35*(20)* |
| Clarendon | 77 | 96 | 37 | 154 | 256 | 19 |
| Westmoreland | 62 | 72 | 70 | 144 | 170 | 16 |
| Manchester  | 32 | 49 | 33 | 183 | 327 | 17 |
|  St Elizabeth | 26 | 31 | 32 | 98 | 181 | 17 |
| Trelawny | 19 | 25 | 17 | 49 | 150 | 20 |
| St Mary | 23 | 19 | 15 | 48 | 79 | 16 |
| **Total Pilot Parishes** | **539** | **625** | **333** | **1186** | **1728** | **140** |

**Source: Jamaica Constabulary Force 2012**

### 3.1.4 Socio-economy

Jamaica is predominantly a mixed economy with a heavy reliance on services. Its major economic sectors are agriculture, tourism, manufacturing, mining, financial and insurance services. This is however a country with a high debt burden where debt is over 130 per cent of GDP. As a result resources are scarce at all levels – especially in the public sector. Based on official statistics (PIOJ 2012) almost 50 per cent of every public dollar budgeted annually goes to debt servicing. This creates a significant resource constraint for the country and impacts at all levels with respect to the provision of social services and implementation of projects.

This must be taken in context with the fact that there has been little or no growth over the past decade and there exists an overall level of unemployment of 12.6 per cent (PIOJ 2012) and an incidence of poverty being at least 16.7 per cent (JSLC 2009). The current public sector budget alone is one replete with deficits on its fiscal and recurrent balances. The project is also being executed by one of the ministries with one of the smallest ministerial budgets. The Ministry of Local Government and Community Development’s estimated budget for the 2011-12 year was $3.8 billion this is out of a total budget of over $500 billion for the period (MoFP 2013).

### 3.1.5 The Development Agenda and Project Outcomes

The project has been linked from the design stage (Project Document pp.1) with the UNDAF and CPAP (2007-11) outcomes and also the national development agenda (Vision 2030 Jamaica Plan) for Jamaica. The linked outcomes are:

1. **UNDAF Outcome 5** - By 2011 increased capacity of government and targeted communities to attain a more peaceful secure and just society
2. **Expected CPAP Outcomes** – i) improved governance and enhanced sectoral response to social injustice instability and insecurity, iii) a sustained reduction of violence and social injustice in targeted communities
3. **Expected CPAP Outputs** – 5.3.1 Improved capacity of government in programming, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation; 5.3.2 Strengthened capacity of community stakeholders to support community policing and protection

With respect to the national development agenda the project is linked to national goals and outcomes under the Vision 2030 Jamaica National Development Plan, *viz*:

1. **Goal 2** – the Jamaican society is secure, cohesive and just. This goal is linked to National Outcomes 5 (Security and Safety) and National Outcome 6 (Effective Governance).

### 3.1.6 Local Government Reform

Jamaica’s political organization is a two tiered system of central and local government. The structure of local government is organized mainly around parishes. For the 14 parishes there are councils elected by to administer local authorities. It is important to note that the parishes of Kingston and St Andrew were amalgamated in 1923 to form the municipality of the Kingston and St Andrew Corporation (KSAC). Note also that in the parish of St Catherine there are *de facto* two local authorities. First the St Catherine Parish Council and second the Portmore municipality for the township of Portmore which was granted municipality status in 2003 All these local authorities are linked to central government through the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development.

The local government reform agenda has been on the table since 1993 with the tabling of Ministry Paper 8/93. Reform envisions a strong, vibrant and inclusive local government structure which directly participates in and contributes to community development and improved service delivery. Also proposed is the argument that local government must become more entrenched in the Jamaican Constitution. The process of reform has however been slow.

### 3.1.7 Profile of Support Institutions

For the implementation of the Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety Project the following organizations were critical:

* **Ministry of Local Government and Community Development** (MLG) - this ministry is directly responsible for local government (and local government reform) in Jamaica. Its mission is to provide a sound policy, legal, technical and administrative framework that supports improved service delivery by local authorities and other portfolio agencies. It therefore attempts to advance local governance for the benefit of all citizens. Under this project it was the executing agency providing all the co-ordinating activities and the disbursement of funds to responsible parties.
* **Ministry of National Security** – This ministry is mandated to; [a] facilitate the maintenance of law and order, [b] protect Jamaica against internal and external threats, [c] ensure the safety of Jamaica’s borders and [d] punish and rehabilitate offenders. On this project the MNS through its Crime Prevention and Community Safety Division was to provide technical assistance in the setting up of the Parish Safety Committees. This included the development of a standardized template for both Parish and Community Safety Action Plans. The participation of the MNS also enabled the project to be directly linked to the National Crime Prevention and Safety Strategy.
* **The Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ)** – this is the foremost planning agency of the government with functions inclusive of:
	+ Co-ordination of national development plans and policies for the nation
	+ Providing advice to the government on issues related to socio-economic policy
	+ Provision of technical research support to Cabinet
	+ Monitoring the status of socio-economic performance
	+ Management of external cooperation agreements and programmes

The role of the PIOJ on this project was that of oversight to ensure that outputs and outcomes are aligned with national priorities – especially those stated in the Vision 2030 Jamaica Development Plan and the Community Renewal Programme. The PIOJ is the main interlocutor between the international development agencies and the Government of Jamaica (GoJ) and also to convene and record decision of the MDAs. This was to be achieved through the direct work of its external co-ooperation unit.

* **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) -** this is the United Nations development network which currently operates in 177 countries worldwide. This organization has a long history of working with countries to develop local capacity. Its role on the project is that of technical support, facilitation of funding, monitoring of progress and direct linkages with the primary donor.
* **The Social Development Commission (SDC)** - is the principal community organization agency working with Jamaica’s 783 communities. Its role on the project was the provision of parish profiles for selected authorities and to support the capacity assessment and capacity building process. Note that the provision of parish profiles was not a direct output to beneficiaries but to assist the MNS in the development of instruments for the PSC.
* **Parish Development Committees: (PDCs)** – The PDC is an umbrella structure which brings together the network of community-based organizations, interest groups and agencies that exist and interact within a parish or municipality to determine the scope, character and direction of social, economic, cultural and political life within that jurisdiction, as well as its prospects for sustainable local development. The PDCs are primarily run by volunteers, who are not expected to be active in partisan politics. The membership of PDCs is drawn from the communities in each parish or municipality and is usually comprised of persons already active in community based organisations, including Community Development Committees (CDCs) and Development Area Committees (DACs).

## 3.2 SWOT Analyses

An overall enterprise plan must be done with respect to the current state of the project parishes and local authorities (even after the project has been implemented). This is required to provide feedback not on only what exists but also general recommendations [**Section 6.1**] that must be made to support project sustainability. Note that areas such as threats and weakness in a typical SWOT will inform recommendations for sustainability.

With the setting up of the PSC in the respective parish councils there are some advantages identified such as a greater focus on a poignant local issue by relevant actors and the strengthening of local partnerships. However there are still challenges identified internally such as lack of resources and full commitment in some areas. The external environment such as the slow rate of change in the local government reform programme. This does not however undercut the possible opportunities that PSCs are open to such as contributing to the improving of governance nationally and having direct links with local communities and assisting them in dealing with safety and security issues. A summary list is shown below in Table 3 overleaf.

Table 3 SWOT Analysis of Project Environment

|  | POSITIVE | NEGATIVE |
| --- | --- | --- |
| INTERNAL | **STRENGTHS**1. The existence of dedicated stakeholders who are pushing against the odds to achieve set goals,
2. Generally high attendance rates to PSC meetings,
3. An existing local governance structure with basic support systems,
4. Improved technical knowledge on safety and security
5. Existence of key support institutions which are able to assist in almost every aspect of security and safety at the community level,
6. Civil society members who are aware of the importance of community participation at the local level,
7. Local partnerships that already existed before the project started and have continued.
 | **WEAKNESSES**1. Relatively low governance rankings by world standards,
2. Lack of resources to enact required projects and programmes – including human resources,
3. Relatively high rotation of key staff in the local authority and partnership organizations,
4. An environment of fiscal austerity,
5. Inherent weaknesses still exist in respective local authorities,
6. Lack of full commitment (and sometimes understanding of the issues) by some stakeholders,
7. Time constraints – especially within local authorities.
 |
| EXTERNAL | **OPPORTUNITIES**1. To advance the overall development agenda with respect to governance in Jamaica,
2. To improve local government reform by strengthening the roles and functions and the levels of participation of civil society organizations at the local level,
3. To create a stronger network of agencies working at the local level,
4. To work with communities and those directly affected in achieving solutions to crime and safety issues.
 | **THREATS**1. Continued austerity regime in the economy,
2. Apathy of communities (especially if there are no projects),
3. Improper co-ordination of resources especially from central government,
4. Lack of projects and programmes to support communities and authorities after project close out,
5. Implementation of policies inimical to local government reform in the future,
6. Slow rate of changes in the local government reform programme.
 |

# 4.0 BASELINE DATA ON LOCAL CAPACITY OF PROJECT AREAS

Baseline surveys on the capacity levels of all parishes were carried out in 2011 by the UNDP Regional Team, the SDC and the MNS. This was to examine in detail what existed in local areas with respect to their capabilities to effectively enact safety and security programmes. This ranged from a Scoping Mission Report to actual capacity assessments of all fourteen parishes. Note that the inclusion of the SDC in the process provided an expected output o the project where capacity assessments moved from the five pilot parishes to that of all parishes islandwide.

Perusal of the documents does not show a formal definition of capacity but the concept is very much understood as shown by the investigative techniques used. For instance, capacity development examined three major levels; the environment, the organization and the individual through examination of norms, procedures, frameworks and knowledge and technical skills. This is therefore not a significant variation from that definition stated in **Section 2.4** above.

## 4.1 Survey Methodology

The MNS Survey looked at five parishes and was constructed to examine what exists by way of levels and strength of governance and operational framework; partnership arrangement; management capabilities; effectiveness of consultation/communication strategy, and level of authority. Further to this the method of analysis examined the enabling environment, organizational arrangements and functional and technical capacities. The survey for the MNS was an 11 question survey to at least twelve people (this targeted three or more members of the executive committee of three parishes)[[8]](#footnote-9)

The capacity assessments carried out by the SDC and the UNDP Technical Team looked at all parishes islandwide. Note that it was the UNDP Team that set out the methodology and analyzed for the pilot parishes (i.e. St Mary, Trelawny, St Catherine, Clarendon and Manchester). This methodology was ten applied by the SDC to other nine parishes islandwide. There were in total over 277 participants.

The methodology included a review of background material, focus group discussions, sensitization workshops, and the development of a capacity assessment matrix which included self assessment on the following parameters - .

1. **Institutional Arrangements** – this refers to the ability of each respective organization to enact visioning and strategic planning, to co-ordinate institutional processes and mechanisms, advocate on issues and perform monitoring and evaluation.
2. **Human Resources and Knowledge** – examines career and capacity work plans for functional and technical capacities, understanding standards and best practices, budget management and implementation.
3. **Leadership Development** – the ability to motivate, guide and direct and resource mobilization, negotiation and consensus building.
4. **Financial and Physical Resources** – the ability of the organization to mobilize resource (through a defined strategy) and the existence of contingency planning.
5. **Mutual Accountability** – the existence of a standardized and long term monitoring and evaluation framework, transparency and accountability in all actions.

Self assessment included a five (5) point capacity rating system which ranged from 1 which represented a very low capacity (showing no evidence of capacity) to a high of 5 which represented a very high level of capacity (being fully integrated within the organization)

## 4.2 Overall Capacity Gaps

Findings from the baseline assessment revealed that at the institutional level the survey findings studies highlighted overlapping of roles and an overall lack of co-ordination with respect to safety and security in local authorities. There was the need for a framework which promoted a unified effort and sharing of resources by all major players. At the local level technical support with respect to safety and security was led by central government agencies such as the Jamaica Constabulary Force (JCF) and the Jamaica Fire Brigade. There was policy and institutional support by the MLG, the SDC, the PIOJ and the MNS to the parish councils and the different bodies within the parishes. There was also the PDC which does not have a legal mandate but acted as a monitoring and support body ensuring accountability in the parish council. There are also other CBOs and NGOs who provide support. Notwithstanding this safety and security was not formally entrenched as functional area in local authorities.

Stakeholders at baseline made reference to the existence of parish disaster committees in some councils but according to baseline reports there were some capacity challenges existing here. First they did not cover the full gamut of safety and security, so there existed a problem of scope and second some are not held for half a calendar year.

There are constraints with respect to critical information and data needs to ensure that stakeholders make credible decisions at the local level. This related especially to information that can be garnered from relevant central government agencies. At baseline it was identified that such agencies had in the past been reluctant to provide data as a result of: [a] perceived information sensitivity, [b] costs, [c] the fact that they had no formal obligation to provide such data. This had contributed to constraining local authorities in having the proper information to make decisions on many issues related to safety and security

There was the need to implement or improve mechanisms that promote a ‘bottom up’ approach to informing decision makers in local authority of the relevant priority areas. For instance the prioritized safety and security issues emerging did not always reflect the linkages between the PDC, DAC and CDC. Added to this the need was identified to create mechanisms that triggered systematic solutions to local problems.

There were capacity challenges with respect to resources and resource development in local authorities identified at baseline. There are direct budget disbursements from central government for housekeeping purposes but limited financial and related resources at the Committee level. There was therefore a need to develop resource mobilization strategies (working with key stakeholders) to garner resources in the short medium and long term to improve capacity to solve the challenges of safety and security.

There was the need for human resource development with respect to safety and security issues for not just parish council personnel but related local stakeholders such as the PDC, SDC and related institutions at the local level. The training needs identified at baseline included: [a] technical planning skills, tools and approaches, [b] technical monitoring skills, tools and approaches and [c] data monitoring skills, tools and approaches.

## 4.3 Capacity Gaps by Parish

The findings by parish from the baseline capacity assessment are shown below in **Table 4.** It is important to note that no independent assessment had been done for the Portmore municipality only for St Catherine parish.

Table 4: Baseline Capacity Gaps by Parish

| **PARISH** |  **PRIMARY CAPACITY CHALLENGE HIGHLIGHTED (SELF RATING)** | **CORE ISSUES (SELF RATING)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Clarendon | Mutual Accountability (2.83) | Human resources and knowledge (2.85)Financial and physical planning resources (3.11)Institutional arrangements (3.14)Leadership (3.37) |
| St Catherine | Human resources and knowledge (2.71) | Mutual accountability (2.85)Financial and physical planning resources (3.11) Institutional arrangements (3.18)Leadership (3.42) |
| St Mary | Financial and physical planning resources (2.5) | Mutual accountability (2.58)Human resources and knowledge (2.68)Institutional arrangements (3.05)Leadership (2.79) |
| Manchester | Human resources and knowledge (3.3) | Institutional arrangements (3.51)Institutional arrangements (3.67)Financial and physical planning resources (3.67)Leadership (3.68) |
| Trelawny | Human resources and knowledge (2.5) | Institutional arrangements (2.8)Financial and physical planning resources (2.8)Leadership (2.8)Mutual accountability (2.9) |
| Westmoreland | Human resources and knowledge (2.6) | Mutual accountability (2.85)Financial and physical planning resources (2.85)Institutional arrangement (2.9)Leadership (3.4) |
| St Elizabeth | Financial and physical planning resources (2.85) | Institutional arrangements (3.0)Mutual accountability (3.1)Human resources and knowledge (3.15)Leadership (3.3) |

# 5.0 EVALUATION FINDINGS

## 5.1 Project Concept and Design

Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety is a project which was launched in the parishes of St Catherine (in both the St Catherine Parish Council and the Portmore Municipality), St Mary, Clarendon, Trelawny, Manchester, St Elizabeth and Westmoreland. Note that the parishes of St Elizabeth and Westmoreland were not part of the original pilot but were added later in the project implementation phase. The project was designed with three (3) major components (See **Figure 1** below).



**Figure 1 Project Components and Concept**

All enabling stakeholders could state their respective roles on the project and when questioned in detail about their roles and responsibilities[[9]](#footnote-10) the majority of agency representatives stated that their roles and functions on the project were quite clear. This is a major advantage for project design.

Discussions with the project management unit, other stakeholders and perusal of relevant documents (such as progress reports) show that great attempts were made to adhere to the concept laid out above and there were no major variations from this concept in the implementation process. The concept was also well accepted by stakeholders. Discussions show that critique was minor; approximately 89 per cent (16 respondents) stated clearly that the overall concept was good and saw no major flaws in how the project was designed. Of the 11 per cent (2 respondents) who had any reservations at all, their concerns were that there should have been a component that dealt directly with the strengthening of respective communities. This they stated has contributed as a major gap in going forward with respect to project sustainability. In their opinion it would promote and encourage almost immediate community participation and buy in. In addition it would mean closer working relationships with partnership organizations such as the SDC that have the outreach capacity on the ground.

Another perceived drawback with respect to project design was the fact that no major accommodation was put into the structures and processes of each respective parish council to accommodate safety and security. Respondents who critiqued the project concept stated that there should have been a defined post set up to deal specifically with security and safety. This person would be responsible for not just for operations and projects but monitoring the output and outcomes over time. Currently it has to be related to someone’s post or duties being shared between two professionals. This may become important over time especially with respect to project sustainability.

Examination of the monitoring and evaluation framework shows that it needs to be expanded. There is the need for a far more comprehensive framework showing mechanisms for monitoring, schema for interventions. It also needs to show the challenges in monitoring, if any (this must be done per output/activity with associated mitigation measures envisaged at start up). A similar scenario must be set for evaluation where an objective measurement system must be applied to indicators with a related intervention scheme (based on indicator performance ratings). Some amount of monitoring and evaluation did occur on the project but these recommended methods must be part and parcel of the management matrices of the project.

## 5.2 Project Implementation

### 5.2.1 Implementation Arrangements

At the outset no stakeholder has raised any major challenge with respect to the *modus operandi* of implementation. The only major concern raised was the need for two (2) additional staff members at the Project Monitoring Unit (in the MLG) due to the fact that this was an island-wide project.[[10]](#footnote-11) In addition perusal of records and discussions with key stakeholders show that for the project implementation stage a Project Board was set up. Its membership included: the PIOJ, the UNDP, and the Ministry of Local Government. The Board’s mandate was that of assessing overall project performance and expenditure levels and interfacing with the external partner.

There was also a separate Stakeholder Committee which was broader based with respect to membership and also technical oversight. As per the Terms of Reference for this Committee, its responsibilities included but were not limited to:

1. Offering recommendations to the Project Board with respect to the scope of work of the project and its link to other projects of a similar nature
2. Participation in selection of pilot parishes and also management and leadership of PSCs
3. Agreement on a communication strategy for all stakeholders
4. Review of the Safety Plan Template and agree with respect to its form and content

Checks with stakeholders (e.g. MNS, PIOJ and MLG) show that this Committee was quite effective in carrying out the roles highlighted in 1-4 above. Committee Stakeholder meetings were also held bimonthly and discussions with stakeholders (e.g. PIOJ and MLG) and perusal of progress reports show that both Project Board and Committee Stakeholder meetings were held and well attended over the project period.

### 5.2.2 The Project Implementation Timeline

The project period was set at April 2011 – March 2013. The first quarter (April – June 2011) focused on project initiation and set up activities (including an initial Board Meeting of April 2011). It was in this period that the setting up of the Stakeholder Committee was initiated. It was also in this time period that the TOR for the Stakeholder Committee was created and adopted (within the planned time-frame). Note also that for the 2011 year, six (6) stakeholder committee meetings were held. The workshops set for this period (as per 2011 annual Workplan) were not held at this time but in late 2011. This may have been due to the fact that the project office was not yet fully staffed – it was in the July to September period of this year that the Project Co-ordinator and Project Associate were hired.

It was in the second quarter (June 2011) that a scoping mission (from regional headquarters Panama) started work for the capacity assessments. The mission’s research was on Parish Councils, JCF, the PDC and SDC. During this period also the Stakeholder Committee explored possible locations for the PSC – this activity was in line with the planned timeline. Training of beneficiaries was also carried out during this period as sixteen (16) Key stakeholders were sponsored for the three (3) month long World Bank e-Institute’s Urban Crime and Violence Online Workshop.[[11]](#footnote-12)

October – December 2011 focused on completing operational and administrative activities (some of which may have been behind schedule) to ensure the fulfillment of project benchmarks. Capacity assessments were done in this period. The time taken for this may have held up the progress of the capacity development plans for respective local authorities (this was slated for the final quarter of 2011 but done in first quarter 2012).

Draft TORs were being completed during this period for the PSC but they were not fully signed off until 2012 due mainly to the deliberation process at the Committee level. Draft reports were submitted for Clarendon, St Catherine and Manchester (capacity assessment) during November – December 2011. Sensitization workshops began in late 2011 with a total of over 300 persons island-wide. Overall for the 2011 year progress reports show a 65 per cent achievement of activities for the year and 50 per cent of outputs being achieved.

For the year 2012 the completion of the capacity assessments were achieved with the assistance of both the UNDP Panama Regional Team and the SDC. This report was reviewed and circulated to partners. This was used by various authorities in carrying out their capacity development plans for those parish representatives who attended the first technical workshop. There were 20 site visits conducted during this year and there were five (5) stakeholder committee meetings. It was also in this period that two additional parishes requested to be on the pilot phase of the project – St Elizabeth and Westmoreland.

The second training in the World Bank Crime and Violence Prevention Online Course was done at the end of 2012. There were a total of forty (40) persons who were participants.[[12]](#footnote-13) In August and September of 2012 a five (5) day Safety Audit workshop was delivered by the University of Technology. This workshop had fifty (50) participants; representation included Mayors, Secretary Manager, Councilors, representatives from the Parish Development Committees, Portmore Citizens’ Advisory Council, executives of the Island Neighbourhood Watch, Directors of Planning, Disaster Coordinators, Police and SDC Parish Managers. These were originally slated to be quarterly exercises as shown in the annual work plans but due to scheduling constraints these were held during this period. Monitoring and evaluation training for PSC members in relevant parishes was also slated in annual work plans as a quarterly exercise but was done as a one day exercise – on December 5, 2012 (based on annual progress reports).

With respect to Output 2, it was in this year that the decision for the placement of the PSCs in the local authorities was achieved after extensive consultations. It was also agreed during this time period that PSCs must be chaired by the Mayor. The TOR for the Parish Security and Safety Mechanism (PSSM) was also fully accepted during this period. This year also saw the first step in the development of parish safety plans. This started with two technical workshops inclusive of input from the British High Commission who had representatives sharing aspects of the UK experience. Reports from progress reports and direct discussions revealed that participants found this quite helpful. Independent initiative was taken by the Project Team to draft a Parish Safety and Security Handbook and Toolkit. It was also during this period that technical assistance was given at the community level to improve public communication programmes (i.e. making this part and parcel of the PSCs). Achievement levels for outputs and activities were higher than the previous year with progress reports estimating 90 per cent levels of achievement.

For 2013 the first quarter of the implementation process was focused on strengthening the PSCs in each of the pilot parishes. This included technical monitoring and assisting in getting public messages disseminated throughout the project parishes. This continued into the second and third quarters of 2013 where capacity building workshops for St Elizabeth, Portmore, Trelawny, and Westmoreland were done. This was inclusive of planning, co-ordination, content development and deepening the comprehension of the parish safety and security mechanisms and also orienting partners with respect to the Safety and Security Handbook and Toolkit. There were also sessions where discussion were held with PSCs with respect to cost control, resource mobilization, partner identification and finding ‘quick wins’ (this was done for Trelawny, Westmoreland, Clarendon and St Mary).

During the period assistance with the strengthening of the scope of the PSC was also accomplished in some local authorities. This is evidenced by Portmore which being extended to four (4) subcommittees (See Case Study I below**)** and for Westmoreland there was the establishment of the Counseling sub-committee[[13]](#footnote-14) (in conjunction with the CDA). The strengthening process also included the setting up of Community Safety and Security Committees in some local authorities – this is evidenced by the case of the Petersfield Division in Westmoreland with input from local community groups and chairmanship by a local Justice of the Peace. There were also (in conjunction with UTECH) community safety audits and training in St Catherine in areas such as Kitson Town, Dela Vega City, Thompson Pen and the Spanish Town Centre. Achievement levels for outputs and activities showed progress reports estimating an 85 per cent level of overall achievement.

### 5.2.3 Challenges in Implementation

The implementation process had its challenges over the project period. These challenges (as gleaned from discussions and perusal of project progress reports) included but were not limited to:

1. **Time Scheduling** – due to the fact that there were different geographic locations co-ordination of both time and resources was an ever present challenge throughout the project implementation period. Scheduling of meetings had to be cognizant of the sometimes overlapping professional schedules of potential participants.
2. **Logistics** - the synchronization of project implementation activities especially with the time schedule of respective parish councils was a challenge in itself. First, parish councils go on recess in August and this is a downtime. Second parish councils have a 2-3 week period where there are set meetings and therefore scheduling meetings for project activities are quite difficult. Most major stakeholders already have packed schedules and it was difficult to get meetings scheduled during the period. This had a significant impact on project progress over the period of implementation.
3. **Varying Abilities of Participants** - due to the different levels of technical knowledge and exposure of partners with respect to the subject area this created challenges where in some reported cases technical workshops had to be repeated or phased.
4. **Budget Challenges for Councils** - there were initial challenges with respect to the setting up of the PSC in local authorities as some councils saw it as an additional expense as councilors have to be paid a stipend to attend council meetings. Note that this was gleaned from the project reports but was never highlighted as a significant aspect by stakeholders. This may be due to the fact that some present respondents were not at the initial project stages.
5. **Lack of Full Buy In** - There was not full buy-in at the early stages of the project although there was 90 per cent participation of the beneficiary stakeholders[[14]](#footnote-15) reported in Year 1. There were however in this 10 percent of non-participants. These included important players such as councilors who did not fully participate in the sensitization workshops and capacity assessments. This created challenges later on in the implementation cycle as more sensitization had to be done and took up valuable time to implement other aspects of the project.
6. **The looming national elections at the time (December 2011) and follow up local government elections (March 2012)** - sidelined many project activities during the period. In addition there were various national local community events being celebrated in this period which created challenges to implementation
7. **The rotation and re-assignment of key project personnel in the local authorities** - was also critical to not just the continuity but also the knowledge transfer process. Over the period in addition to changes in the administration (councilors and mayors) there were also changes in secretary managers, PDC personnel and SDC parish managers. This significantly affected parishes such as St Mary, Clarendon and St Catherine.

### 5.2.4 Level of Achievement of Outputs

There are two defined outputs from the project, viz:

1. Development of local authorities and civil society organizations’ capacity to promote and secure participatory local governance in citizen security and;
2. Development of local authority level mechanism under the Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy

All outputs have been achieved on the project. It is also important to note that the project produced at least one additional output which was not originally set out. This is the creation of a handbook for safety and security by the MLG. Discussion with stakeholders showed a general satisfaction with project outputs by all. Investigation of the major annual targets under each output (through direct discussions with secondary and beneficiary stakeholders) showed the following:

Table 5: Output Matrix.

| **OUPUT**  | **INDICATOR** | **TARGET YEAR** | **COMMENT ON PROGRESS TO ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGET** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OUTPUT 1**: **Development of local authorities’ and civil society organizations’ capacity to promote and secure participatory local governance in citizen security** |  |  |  |
| **OUTPUT TARGETS** |  |  |  |
| * Project Stakeholder Committee meets quarterly
 | Frequency of Meetings | Year 1 | This output was achieved. This was set up and implemented within the planned timeframe and meetings have been held as scheduled. This is evidenced by discussions with stakeholders and perusal of the related TOR and periodic progress reports. There were no major obstacles to progress |
| * Capacity Assessment of Targeted Parish Councils
 | Number of parish councils assessed | Year 1 | Output was achieved. Fully completed in Feb-March of 2012. This went over schedule as stated in progress reports. This was related to issues such as planning of meeting dates and instrument design. Note however that instead of the five original parishes all fourteen now have capacity assessment plans.  |
| * Capacity building plan addressing gaps in parish councils fully developed
 | Percentage completion of capacity building plan | Year 1 | This was completed but not done on time due to the fact that a major pre-cursor the capacity assessment had been late. This document was seen. |
| * Public messages about establishment of PSCs disseminated in all selected local authorities
 | Number of parishes/ municipalities in which public messages about establishment of PSC are disseminated | Year 2 | These were achieved. Coming out of this was a best practice – the setting up of public messages sub-committees on implementation.  |
| * 75% of targeted parish councils and PDCs trained in monitoring and evaluation of local initiatives
 | % of parish councils and PDCs trained in monitoring and evaluation of local initiatives | Year 2 |  All parish councils spoken to date stated that they had members attending training sessions. Further perusal of attendance listings provided by the PMU show representatives (a minimum of 3-4) attending. |
| * 75% of Parish Safety Committee members enrolled in urban violence on-line course
 | % of Parish Safety Committee members enrolled in urban violence on-line course | Year 2 | There were two training sessions in both 2011 and 2012. All target parishes had a representative – target surpassed. Note also that at the start of the project the 75 per cent target was surpassed but over time the size of the PSC membership has expanded in many areas.  |
| * 75% of Parish Safety Committee members enrolled in Safety Audit training at UTECH
 | - % of Parish Safety Coordinators enrolled in Safety Audit training at UTECH | Year 2 | Achieved. But safety audit training had to be shortened and was behind target date (was supposed to be in all quarters in Year 2) as it was held in August – September 2012. This was due to scheduling problems of stakeholders.However all parishes interviewed have shown a safety audit therefore capacity has been increased. |
| **OUTPUT 2: Development of local authority level mechanism under the Crime Prevention & Community Safety Branch** |  |  |  |
| **OUTPUT TARGETS** |  |  |  |
| * Rules for operation of parish safety committees developed
 | - % completion of rules for operation of parish safety committees | Year 1 | Capacity assessment had been carried out by MNS in the pilot parishes in December 2011. This was slightly behind (against annual work plans) due to the timing of precursors such as sensitization sessions. Document seen.  |
| * Elected officials and PDC executives from all targeted local authorities participating in sensitization sessions on establishment of PSCs
 | # of targeted parishes/ municipalities whose elected officials and PDCs participate in sensitization sessions on establishment of PSCs | Year 1 | This was achieved as shown in progress reports and discussions with stakeholders. There were challenges due in part to lack of buy in from elected officials which put not just this output but related outputs beyond schedule |
| * Consultations completed for development of parish safety plan template in targeted local authorities
 | % completion of rules for operation of parish safety committees | Year 1 | Achieved for all parishes interviewed (note that no interviews or visits were done in St Elizabeth). TORs were completed but not fully signed off for the period. Deliberations were still continuing on placement of the PSC. |
| * Standardized parish safety plan Template fully developed
 | - # of local authorities holding consultations for development of parish safety plans | Year 1 | Achieved for all parishes interviewed. The standard template has been viewed. This was behind schedule due to precursors such as training and the TOR sign offs. However all target parishes achieved this output but in Year 2. |
| * 75% of PSCs members attend meetings on a regular basis
 | % attendance at PSCs meetings | Year 2 | The attendance levels as presently reported are not the challenge as all respondents state that they have over 75 per cent attendance. Frequency of meetings in some areas is more of a concern in going forward. |
| * Parish safety plans fully aligned with Vision 2030
 | Level of alignment of the parish safety plans with Vision 2030. | Year 2 | Achieved. Design instruments e.g. PSC ToRs, Vision 2030 development plan outcomes and strategies, progress reports, etc and discussions with the PIOJ representative showed that all parish plans were fully aligned with the national development agenda.Note that not all parishes had a standalone safety plan as some were part of the safety audit report. examination of reports (e.g.Manchester, St Mary, Clarendon, Portmore, Westmoreland[[15]](#endnote-2)) showed that in the steps there was alignment with Vision 2030 goals such as:* Citizen participation
* Equity and
* Transparency and;
* Strengthening the capacity of communities to participate in creating a safe society
 |
| * 75% of parish safety committee members trained in the use of the parish safety plan template
 | % completion of parish safety plan template. | Year 2 | This was achieved for all parishes. Note that training was done in two ways offsite set up by the PMU and also PMU facilitating training at the various local authorities. All PSC members at the time of the project were trained.  |

In addition to discussions with stakeholders other evidence of accomplishment of these outputs are; [a] minutes of meetings, [b] actual reports (both from the project office and some local authorities), [c] progress reports, [d] Terms of References, and [e] flyers and other notices e.g. showing public relations/communications campaigns

### 5.2.5 Critical Factors Contributing to or Inhibiting Output Achievement

Assessment of the major factors which contributed to or inhibited output achievements are:

1. **Contributing Factors**
2. **Relationships already existed before the Project –** all beneficiary stakeholders stated that there already existed a network of stakeholders, at the local level, before the project came on stream. More than half of the stakeholders interviewed state that this was a critical factor in achieving project successes. This was particularly so in parishes such as Manchester and St Mary.
3. **Good Project Design and a Framework for Implementation** – the existence of defined targets outputs and components, an involved board, stakeholder committees, consistency in annual and quarterly work plans, etc. assisted in the delivery of outputs throughout the project life. Note also that there was a committed and dedicated project management staff (for instance the project manager was not fully seconded from his post but still delivered with respect to activities and outputs).
4. **Inhibiting Factors**
5. **Unforeseen Circumstances** - the excess time spent on sensitization sessions and also the challenges in getting clear schedules for participants in planned training sessions forced training times to be coalesced into shorter periods. On the one hand the time spent on sensitization was necessary to get buy-in but on the other hand it shortened valuable required for training and related outputs. This may have impacted in the views stated above where some respondents believed that the time taken for training was too short
6. **Lack of Full Participation and Buy In** - the full participation and buy in of all stakeholders was not always given especially by those within some parish councils in the early implementation stages of the project. This was an inhibitor to the provision of outputs such as training and setting up of committees as stated in discussion with project management personnel, project beneficiaries and perusal of progress reports. It is still a challenge in at least one parish. In discussions with a major player the with respect to the reasons for the slow rate of adoption of the project the reason given is that of a busy time schedule.
7. **The Pace of the Local Government Reform Process** – reform is geared towards autonomy and decentralization for all local authorities island wide but the pace at which this has been done has held back initiatives such as the PSC. More potent legislative changes (e.g. reform of the Local Government Act), the power to raise capital, the promotion of greater accountability, transparency and citizen participation in the decision making process are all allies to this project. As the reform agenda gathers pace this will improve the projects sustainability chances, first improve the enabling environment where there is legality in co-opting resources and there will be improvement in service delivery which are current constraints being faced by stakeholders.

### 5.2.6 Partnership Strategies and Their Effectiveness

All stakeholders spoke in positive terms with respect to partnership strategies in discussions. Sixty six percent (8 respondents) of beneficiary stakeholders stated that this was also due to existing partnerships at the local level. Perusal of project literature and discussions with participants show that there were some critical partnership strategies which prevailed throughout the project viz:

1. Having a systematic process in partnership identification. This meant finding out what local and community needs were and finding the partners who could directly assist. This was seen as an effective strategy in all local authorities and at the project level.
2. Having a sound communication system to partners at the project level and also built in the respective PSCs.
3. Recognition of existing (both formal and informal) partnership linkages. Use of existing links made buy in quite easy. This was very effective especially in discussions with local authorities such as the Portmore, St Mary and Manchester.
4. Adjusting of time schedules for activities based on partner availability. This may have retarded project scheduling but in the long run created lasting relationships.
5. Partners had a voice in decision making which inherently reflects a strengthening of capacity (especially in areas such as mutual accountability) and overall governance. This is evidenced by the perusal of minutes of meetings provided by local authorities. They were therefore part and parcel of attempts at finding solutions to problems.

Based on evidence of 1-5 above partnership strategies used under the project can be deemed quite effective as discussions with stakeholders show only one partner having challenges with respect to expected roles and functions.

### 5.2.7 Sensitivity Levels to Gender Equality

When queried regarding gender equality as a tool for implementation of, and adaptation by the project; respondents stated that they did not openly make decisions with respect to gender but the major pressing issues related to safety and security at the local level. However perusal of baseline documents, planning and safety audits, meeting minutes, safety plan terms of references, the standard handbook for practitioners, the national gender policy and related documents showed gender mainstreaming occurred in the entire project process.

For instance at baseline there was a gender group set up in breakout sessions (for the UNDP and SDC capacity assessments) to give relevant feedback on capacity issues. There were also high levels of participation by women at the baseline phase (approximately 40 per cent overall) of the project.

Throughout implementation the project deliverables also ensured mainstreaming and sensitivity. This is exemplified by the examination of the outputs e.g. content of training courses. For instance the World Bank e-institute’s Urban Crime and Violence Prevention Course examined relevant issues such as prevention of violence against women at the intra family level, youth and school based violence prevention. Added to this is the whole issue of gender in safety and security prioritization by local authorities. This is reflected in plans and safety audits of PSC where some highlight priority in gender based crimes such as rape and domestic violence - these are key priority issues in parishes such as Manchester. Also examination of the makeup of subcommittees in some areas e.g. the Portmore municipality, showed subcommittees with gender related themes such as parenting and child behaviour.

### 5.2.8 Project Effectiveness

Project effectiveness has been measured from three (3) major standpoints; the efficiency in which the project budget was utilized, time usage and feedback on the quality of outputs.

1. **Project Cost and Budget Utilization**: based on the information provided for every dollar of project funds approved in a given year there was an overall 57 per cent chance it would be fully utilized. For the year 2011 only approximately 40 per cent of the budget was utilized; this was increased to 75 per cent in the 2012 year. For the 2013 year to date this is approximately 60 per cent. It is important to note that with respect to Chart 2 below the figures for the year 2013 are only up the third quarter as final quarter figures have not yet been reported.
2. **Time Usage**: examination of progress reports show that in most years there was not a full achievement of outputs with the reasons as shown above [**Sections 5.2.3-5.2.5**]. Based on assessment of progress reports, for the three year time span of the project there was an accomplishment level of approximately 80 per cent overall.
3. **Stakeholder Feedback on the Quality of Output**: The types of outputs delivered on the project were varied. Ranging from having quarterly stakeholder committee meetings, to development of parish safety plans and also training. With respect to the quality of output emanating from the project the majority of respondents stated that they were satisfied with the outputs generated. This means they were satisfied with items such as the safety plans, capacity building plans, public messages, etc. The only concerns were centred mostly on the training aspect of the project (e.g., the quality of the trainers selected). Only one individual (5 per cent of respondents) actual stated that many trainers did not know much about the subject area in some training sessions attended. Another concern was that of the institution selected to provide the safety audit training; it was thought that it focused too much on physical planning aspects of safety and security. They believed safety and security had greater scope. Two (2) Respondents also believed that the time taken for training was much too short based on the content and volume of material involved.

### 5.2.9 Level of Achievement of Project Objective(s)

There are two major objectives which the project has set out to achieve, viz:

1. Strengthened civil society participation in local governance
2. Establishment of coordinated local civil society and state responses to crime and violence

With respect to strengthened civil society participation there is some evidence of this; as shown at the PSCs where issues are now being highlighted and prioritized by a more broad based set of actors than was done previously. Examples of this are shown in **Table 6** below.

Table 6: Summary of Major Issues and Concerns by Local Authority

| **PARISH COUNCIL/****MUNICPALITY** | **MAJOR ISSUES REGARDING SAFETY AND SECURITY** | **PSC MEMBERSHIP** | **COMMENTS/CONCERNS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| St Catherine | Crime and violenceGang cultures | Parish Council, JCF, Education, Chamber of Commerce, SDC, NGOs and CBOs, MLG, MNS, MLSS*Meetings once per month* | At least 80 per cent attendance. Issue of getting into the troubled communities a challenge as projects are needed to do this. |
| Portmore Municipality | Parenting and Child Behaviour, Public education, Infrastructure, Vending (especially at schools) | JCF, NYCD, SDC, Fire Brigade, MOH, MOE, Principals Association, Ministers Fraternal | Sub-committees formed attendance not an issue. Projects needed. |
| Clarendon |  Infrastructure and safety (e.g. pedestrian crossings, overhanging trees, school safety and transportation street lighting, drains etc.)Crime and violence | Fire Brigade, JPS, NWC, SDC, NWA, NSWMA, MLSS, PDC, JCF.Meetings are once per month. | At least 80 per cent attendance. Challenge of overlap as similar issues are being discussed with an existing committee e.g. parish disaster. Human capacity a challenge. |
| Manchester  | Domestic violence, break-ins, bushing of lots, robberies and incidents of rape | Parish Council, JCF, SDC, PDC, CDA, MNS, Office of the Custos*Meetings are every other month – sometimes more often* | Meetings are well attended (sometimes 100 per cent). partnerships to date are quite effective |
| St Elizabeth  | n.a | n.a | n.a |
| Westmoreland | Police action in dealing with demonstrationsCrimeProviding for the Disabled and handicapped | Parish Council, SDC, Fire Dept, JCF, JPSCo, Water Commission, CDA, Chamber of Commerce*Meets once per month every first Tuesday* | Attendance is good. Concern that the same things are discussed but the major drawback is that of resources so this may create a fall off in attendance over time. |
| St Mary | Communication and infrastructureCrimeCreating safe areas | Parish Council, PDC, JCF, JDF, JPSCo, Custos (Co-Chairs), JAS, MLSS, Health Dept, JCDC, Chamber of Commerce | Meetings were originally set for bimonthly periods but a meeting has not been held since august 2013. Personnel challenges here |
| Trelawny | Community development rehabilitation e.g. aesthetic development projects (such as adopt a street programmes)Promotion of community pride | Parish Council, PDC, Fire Brigade, JCF, MOH, MOE, NGOs, CDA, CBOs, Chamber of Commerce*Meetings are slated monthly – every first Monday* | Meetings have not been held as regularly as required and the prioritization process with respect to issues have not been fully accomplished. |

**Source: Project Evaluation – Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety (2013)**

With respect to the establishment of a co-ordinated local civil society and state responses, mechanisms have been put in place in the PSCs and these in recent time have been tested. This has been evidenced by recent challenges in Westmoreland where the PSC has responded with the setting up of community wide committees to deal with issues related to safety and security. One can then say that in some areas objectives are being met.

### 5.2.10 Level of Contribution to Outcomes

The project has been linked from the design stage (Project Document pp.1) with the UNDAF and CPAP (2007-11) outcomes for Jamaica these are:

1. **UNDAF Outcome 5** - By 2011 increased capacity of government and targeted communities to attain a more peaceful secure and just society
2. **Expected CPAP Outcomes[[16]](#footnote-16)** – i) improved governance and enhanced sectoral response to social injustice instability and insecurity, iii) a sustained reduction of violence and social injustice in targeted communities
3. **Expected CPAP Outputs** – 5.3.1 Improved capacity of government in programming, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation[[17]](#footnote-17); 5.3.2 Strengthened capacity of community stakeholders to support community policing and protection

With respect to the national development agenda the project is linked to national goals and outcomes under the Vision 2030 Jamaica National Development Plan, *viz*:

1. Goal 2 – the Jamaican society is secure, cohesive and just. This goal is linked to National Outcomes 5 (Security and Safety) and National Outcome 6 (Effective Governance).

When queried the response by enabling stakeholders with respect to impact on national outcomes the general feedback was that it was still too early to expect a marked change in linked outcomes. Independent assessment however with respect to the contribution (to date) of the project to relevant outcomes as highlighted above, the findings to date show that:

1. With respect to UNDAF Outcome 5, defined steps have been taken in the pilot parishes to increase the capacity of local governance to assist targeted communities
2. There has been a contribution to improving some aspect of governance especially voice and accountability and the effectiveness of government. However there is no proof of a contribution to a sustained reduction in violence and social injustice. This is due mainly to two factors. First, it is too short a time to see the impact of this and, second, there are other programmes at work at the national and local levels. Even if there were reductions it would be difficult to attribute these only to this project.
3. There are improved all-round capacities (as a result of training, awareness and overall human resource development) at the community level to create interventions on matters of safety and security – when compared to baseline levels [**Section 4.0**]. For instance governance has improved where it has become more broad based (through improved strategic relationships, greater monitoring and evaluation of operations and overall greater mutual accountability in some authorities) and it has also created a solution oriented approach to a local issue through the creation of the PSC (evidence of an improved strategic vision). This has not only contributed to UNDAF outcomes but also Vision 2030’s national outcome of effective governance.

## 5.3 Project Impact and Sustainability

### 5.3.1 Impacts

1. The project has had a significant impact on the major beneficiary organizations. The added committee (PSC) first required set meetings (this therefore puts a system in place which never existed before). This is now a legal aspect of council which also never existed before. In addition this committee had to establish (whether formally or informally) links to related committees. Decisions made at the committee level also had to reflect findings from the safety audits, the community development committees or data from partner agencies (who may also be committee members). There is therefore not just a change in structure but attitudinal changes. This is attributed wholly to the project.
2. There are now more recognized links with local and central government. Local authorities are now aware of the need to take the initiative to link with central government agencies for assistance. This is evidenced by the existence of agencies such as the MOE, MOH, CDA, JCF, Fire Brigade and other central government agencies which are on most PSCs.
3. The project has made existing structures within parishes more functional where meetings of the CDCs, DACs and PDCs now have an added purpose as they directly collect information to inform the PDC. This in turn informs the PSC. This process is quite evident in parishes such as St Mary. The perception of the parish councils seems to have changed since the inception of the PSCs in many areas. For instance in stakeholders state that early discussions with local police in areas such as Clarendon they were reluctant with respect to being a part of the PSC. This was due to the fact that their overall perception of the Councils was very low. However over time after participation in sensitization programmes this perception has changed. This is also evident in St Catherine where the police is a full participant in the process and in the present drive with respect to the sexual abuse prevention campaign (inclusive of district forums), they state that there is a 26 per cent reduction in crime in January to June 2013 and that the setting up of the PSC was a significant contributor. Note that this may not be wholly attributable to the project but other ongoing police neighborhood watch programmes in the area.

There is now a broader understanding of the issues as discussions now force stakeholders to prioritize and come to consensus. This was alluded to by 42 per cent (5) of beneficiary stakeholders. This is democracy at work in local areas. An important national issue is now local; not just with respect to occurrence but to the search for solutions participation, accountability and responsibility.

### 5.3.2 Sustainability

When queried about the issue of sustainability of the project there are concerns especially with respect to beneficiary stakeholders. Perusal of implementation documents and discussions with stakeholders and observations show the following which are potential drawbacks to project sustainability. These include but are not limited to:

1. **Change of Personnel** - in almost 50 per cent of local authorities there has been some change/rotation of personnel. This ranges from parish council and SDC personnel being transferred to other parishes and/or individuals trained have either moved on or are overseas doing training. Some PDCs have also had changes in personnel. This already has created challenges in the early stages of the project where knowledge transfer has not been able to impact the project long enough. This is most apparent in parishes such as St Mary where the Secretary Manager has moved on and another planner has gone overseas to study.
2. **Greater Co-ordination with Programmes and Projects** – 79 per cent of stakeholders with whom discussions have been held believe that there must be a greater co-ordination with existing projects and programmes which are relevant to safety and security at the local level. Some stakeholders speak to existing projects such as the Citizen Security and Justice Programme and organizations such as the Jamaica Social Investment Fund (JSIF) which does significant work at the community level.
3. **Lack of Resources** – this is a universal challenge and expressed by all local authorities and other stakeholders interviewed. They state that the major issues have been identified and even solutions have been laid out but the major constraint is in most cases financial.
4. **Working Closer with the MLG&CD**: for there to be sustainability after project handover 53 per cent of respondents state that working closely with the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development is very important. Some respondents state specifically that there must be more direct links to the existing local government reform initiative (through organizations such as the OPM and the PIOJ).
5. **Stronger and More Direct Links to Central Government**: there must be stronger systemic linkages to relevant central government agencies. For instance stakeholder discussions show that organizations such as the CDA have national and local committees related to issues such as child safety. At the parish level these must have direct linkages to the PSC. These have been evidenced in case studies such as those shown in countries such as New Zealand
6. **Addressing Unequal Levels of Achievement:**  progress reports show the trend of unequal levels of achievement by respective local authorities must be addressed if the project is to be a sustainable aspect of local government reform. This will mean borrowing best practices from local authorities which are progressing and also stronger monitoring mechanisms by the MLG.
7. **Institutionalizing the Process in Local Authorities:** at the technical level there must be posts or a post which is wholly responsible for safety and security
8. **Budgeting Process:** 16 per cent (3) of stakeholders want to see a more informed budgeting process (in local authorities) which is bottom up.
9. **Commitment:** there are still cases in local authorities where the commitment levels are not as required. This is a major threat to the sustainability of the project.
10. **Greater legislative and policy input –** there is the need for a legislation which compels key MDAs to be proactively involved in the operations and functions of the PSCs. There have been reports where PSC members state that they are still not getting the required assistance from some agencies.
11. **Ensuring the PSC is linked with other Committees:** safety and security is universally important and this must be demonstrated at the local authority level where it informs other committees and vice versa. This will mean having stronger links at the parish council with the PSC and other committees.

Each parish’s progress to date and also those with sustainability concerns are shown below in the parish results table.

Table 7: Parish Project Results (Comparison to Baseline)

| **PARISH COUNCIL/MUNICIPALITY** | **SUMMARY OF BASELINE SCENARIO** | **MAIN PROJECT SUCESSESS** | **MAJOR CHALLENGES** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| St Catherine Parish Council | * Unavailability of financial resources
* Human resources and knowledge a major challenge
 | * Improved knowledge base
* Greater accountability
* Leadership has coalesced around a major issue – i.e. crime and violence
* A strategic vision exists
 | * Programme delivery (volatile communities and lack of resources)
* Sustainability a concern due to the nature of the communities the local authority has to deal with.
* Delivery systems promoted by the project are not yet fully engaged due to the short time period since project inception
 |
| Portmore Municipality | * Safety and security was not a priority goal (various aspects were shared among committees)
* There was a general lack of training and knowledge with respect to safety and security
* No major resources dedicated to relevant technical and operational areas
 | * Improved knowledge base
* Clear and focused vision
* Committed partners
* Accountability
* Improved techniques, organizational re(orientation) to accommodate the project.
* authority must be seen as a best practice
 | * Human capacity challenges still exist
* Resources for monitoring and services delivery not yet fully developed
 |
| Clarendon Parish Council | * Relatively high leadership rating
* Mutual accountability a challenge
* Human resources and knowledge a major capacity gap
* Relatively low ratings for transparency and stakeholder engagement
 | * Improved knowledge[[18]](#footnote-18) base
* Functional PSC exists
* Co-operative and committed partners with accountability being a major aspect of operations (improvement from baseline here)
* Top management buy in
* Service delivery occurring as a result of the project (through linkages with other committees)
 | * Overlap (other committees were already set up which discuss similar issues). This can create fragmentation and hamper the strategic vision – a concern here.
* Human resource capacity seen as still a major challenge
* Technical and functional knowledge loss (transfers and retirement of staff has occurred)
 |
| Manchester Parish Council | * Relatively high capacity ratings overall
* Financial and physical resources, human resources and mutual accountability seen as capacity challenges
 | * A more focused approach to an existing challenge
* Improved knowledge base
* Strong leadership at all levels
* Improved partnerships (good partnerships already existed) but this improved accountability from baseline
* Excellent promotion and facilitation of information flows throughout the parish
* Presently expanding the members of the PSC
* Parish must be seen as a best practice
 | * Service delivery not yet fully developed due to resource constraints
* Human resources capacity constraints
 |
| St Elizabeth Parish Council | na | Na | na |
| Westmoreland Parish Council | * Human resources and knowledge had greatest capacity gap
* institutional arrangement was a priority issue
* good leadership
 | * Increased knowledge base (improvement from baseline)
* Safety and security issues prioritized (strategic vision in place)
* Improved broad based local participation (mutual accountability)
* Increased overall knowledge
* Has started the process of self financing (done at project implementation)
 | * Work still needs to be done in the use of mechanisms with respect to service delivery
* Concern that meetings are being held but more still needs to be done with respect to projects and programmes.
 |
| Trelawny Parish Council | * Human resources and knowledge the major challenge
* Mutual accountability a major challenge
 | * Knowledge base
* Strategic focus on an issue
 | * Meetings not being held as required
* Sustainability concern
 |
| St Mary Parish Council | * Financial and physical resources a major challenge
* Human resources and knowledge a priority issue
* Mutual accountability a priority issue
 | * strategic vision
* existence of a partnerships
* a resource mobilization and project delivery system was being devised
* advocacy (PDC)
* information flows and a bottom up approach
* availability of funding (alleviates the original challenge to some extent)
 | * Meetings not being held as required
* Sustainability concern
* Political leadership buy in still required
* Human resource/knowledge loss at critical stage of the project
 |

## 5.4 Best Practices and Lessons Learnt

In the evaluation of the project there are some best practices which can be recommended for adoption in similar future projects, these include:

1. Structured sensitization sessions for all stakeholders in the early stages of the project. This must be estimated and built into project design. It has two impacts, first it creates buy in at the initial stages and assists in sustainable partnerships and second it relieves unexpected pressures on other project deliverables.
2. The overall design and implementation scheme can be copied to a great extent for future projects. This includes the functions of the Project Board, Stakeholder Committee and their links to the Project Management Unit.
3. Consistent and timely external and internal communication systems. The project must also have a built in public relations aspect both at the enabling level (that is project management and board levels) and also the local authority level to promote perfect dissemination of information. This is invaluable in stimulating interest and buy-in at all levels and it also provides the project with added momentum.
4. Use of the committee/subcommittee approach. Note that in the prioritization process local authorities such as the Portmore Municipality have broken their PSC into sub-committees where their major issues related to security and safety are managed. This creates greater focus than the alternative where all priority issues are tabled at one committee.
5. The creation of standard handbooks to guide other localities. Although not an expected output this is critical to the setting of standards for present and future practitioners.

There are certain lessons that must be taken from this exercise, viz:

1. Having an expanded role for certain organizations (such as the SDC) to encourage and ensure at one end community involvement and at the other the direct provision of information to inform the planning process.
2. Ensuring that project planning and project scheduling is more cognizant of the schedules existing in local planning authorities. When this is built into the overall project plan more realistic schedules can be set.
3. Greater care being taken regarding the choice of some institutions as in some cases their mandates and/or scope did not fulfill the requirements for some outputs e.g. some stakeholders stated that the safety audits could have been done at another institution or the use of another institution to supplement the work of UTECH.

## 5.5 Field Case Studies

The project outputs have been achieved but the impact of the project has varied by local authority. This is highlighted in the two following case studies. In this method of analysis positive scenarios (where project outputs have been easily adapted) are compared to areas where this has not occurred as effectively. The examples look at the issues raised by each authority at baseline and the progress made to date and the capacity issues which are still of concern.

#### CASE STUDY I – PORTMORE MUNICIPALITY

Portmore is the largest dormitory town in the English speaking Caribbean. According to the 2011 population census it has a resident population of 182,000 people who live in 39 neighborhoods and districts. Being part of the parish of St Catherine, the St Catherine Parish Council was the seat of local governance. It however it was granted municipality status in 2003 with an elected mayor and councilors. For the parish of St Catherine at baseline participants stated human resources and knowledge as their primary challenges and accountability being another core issue.

The municipality has been a full participant in the Project since its inception and the (late) mayor Mr. George Lee was a champion, for not just this project, but local governance in particular. As a result leadership and advocacy was a positive from a capacity standpoint and acceptance of the project was relatively easy here. This is evidenced by active participation of council members in meetings (as seen in meeting minutes and progress reports perused) and the PSC launch in November 25, 2012. The municipality had high attendance rates to all major training sessions and also had members who were top performers worldwide in the World Bank online course.

The PSC for the municipality comprises over 30 persons who are drawn from a wide cross section inclusive of the PDC and the Parish Council but also the MOE, JCF, SDC, Fire Brigade, NYCD, MOH, private sector representatives, Principals Association and Ministers Fraternal. This promotes not just information flows and technical guidance but also transparency and agreement on priority issues.

Members wanted a meeting on the last Thursday in every month but this was not possible due to the fact that there are time and capacity constraints within the municipality (for example having a secretariat dedicated to such meetings). As a result meetings will be bi-monthly for now. There are no challenges with respect to attendance as this is always 80 per cent and above inclusive of councilors. The only major challenge with respect to attendance is that of CDA and MOE officials who have to split time between the municipality and the St Catherine Parish Council.

The municipality also followed the major steps in the development of the PSC as shown in progress reports inclusive of community forum reports, meeting minutes, safety plans, etc.). This is evidenced for example by its safety audit report and PSC deliberations which showed the following security and safety challenges in the municipality as shown below:

1. Visibility challenges – e.g. overgrown trees, high boundary walls (especially at schools) poor night lighting, zinc fences as dangerous barriers, etc.
2. Open lots which are overgrown and also incomplete construction and abandoned or derelict buildings which can become root causes for crime
3. Lack of proper maintenance of infrastructure – i.e. drains left uncovered, broken water pipes, down utility wires, unmaintained fire hydrants,
4. Stray animals – which are an strong challenges to public health
5. Garbage disposal – uncovered receptacles, garbage in drains and burning of garbage being a cultural pattern in the municipality
6. Communication challenges between the citizenry and police and inactive citizen groups
7. Distance of vehicles from parking areas which has given rise to high incidents of vehicle theft
8. Narrow pathways which preclude emergency vehicles

Deliberations from information garnered in these audits at both the technical level and also deliberations in committee provided the following solutions.

1. First it has been agreed that with the myriad of issues facing the council one single committee could not adequately cover their scope. As a result four (4) subcommittees have been formed. These are: Parenting and Child Behaviour, Infrastructure, School Vending and Public Education. These sub-committees comprise average 6-10 persons. Meetings are scheduled to inform the bimonthly PSC meeting. Again the challenge is that of internal capacity as some meetings cannot be held due to lack of a dedicated secretariat. Human resource constraints are still an existing challenge.
2. A prioritizing of challenges and solutions in short, medium and long term. These solutions include; greater enforcement of regulations, installation of street signs, land tenure regularization, removal of outdated street furniture, installation of street signs, etc.

Notwithstanding this the municipality representatives state that there are resource challenges as although solutions have been identified there is the need to carry out projects to solve many of the problems highlighted. In addition with respect to technical responsibility for safety and security this is currently shared between planning and disaster co-ordination. At least one additional professional is required to be formally trained to execute and monitor programmes related to this area.

When queried with respect to the achievement of project outcomes the municipality representatives state that although they have achieved many of the project outputs it is far too early to start speaking about achievement of project outcomes. First they state that there is no significant reduction in crime that can be directly attributed to the setting up of the PSC and second the bulk of the safety plans have not yet been fully operationalized. What they basically state is that the project has had the major impact of a change in attitude not just at the municipality level but though other local actors.

In summary this local authority has followed all the steps in the setting up of a PSC. It has also adjusted its internal governance and management structure to accommodate the project requirements. It has also identified and prioritized the challenges in going forward. This is a result of strong leadership and governance (some of which had existed before project start up), a sharper strategic focus on the issues of safety and security (created by the project), strategic relationships have been more broad based and have improved (also contributed to by the project). Other capacity challenges that exist will take time to be overcome. This includes service delivery and resource development but these will be platformed on the progress made in the aforementioned areas and these augers well for the future of safety and security at this municipality.

#### CASE STUDY II – ST MARY PARISH COUNCIL

St Mary is a north-eastern parish of Jamaica with a population of 115,100 people. It is one of the smaller parishes in the country having a size of 610 square kilometers. The recognized local authority is the parish council with its twelve (12) councilors and mayor. The primary challenge with respect to capacity identified at baseline was that of financial and physical resources. Other priority core issues expressed were leadership and mutual accountability.

Discussions with stakeholders show that the parish quickly adopted the process which was required to set up the PSC and all major stakeholders, especially civil society, were quick to come on board. It was also expressed that St Mary was one of the leading parishes throughout the project implementation stage to adapt to the requirements of the project. The PSC comprises the SDC, PDC, Chamber of Commerce, JCF, Fire Brigade, JAS (RADA), JDF, MLSS, MOH, JCDC, the Custos Co-chairs and all councilors are members. Meetings were originally scheduled on a bimonthly basis and were going according to plan in the early phases. The priority areas which were agreed upon were:

1. Reduction in murders in the parish
2. Extension of local governance mechanism in the parish through greater work of the CDCs
3. Strengthening the relationship between the police and the citizenry
4. Improvement in infrastructure to increase safety and security

When queried about their existing partnership strategy respondents state that there was no difficulty in getting civil society on board. This was due to the fact that most of the major partners had close relationships with each other before (especially through the PDC). Information regarding the safety and security needs for the parish was also garnered though a system already adopted by the PDC where community development plans informed development area plans and these issues were brought to council by the PDC. At the PSC there was an agreement on the strategy of ‘quick wins’ where projects were identified, these projects included:

1. The repairs to the bridge at Heywood Hall
2. The installation of solar lights at Tryall
3. Installation of rails on the Sandside footbridge
4. Focus on short term fundraising projects

The repairs to the Heywood Hall Bridge have been accomplished in 2013 but other short and medium term plans have not been on schedule. This is mainly due to the fact that the PSC has not been having regular meetings, with the last meeting being August/September 2013. In addition to this there have been changes in personnel with the rotation of the secretary/manager and also one planner who was a key player at the start of the project is now away on study leave overseas. All this has created a challenge where local partners from civil society have been interested in contributing to the process (some even willing to assist in providing funding and related support) but are unable to do so as there is no strong endorsement by the council. It has also hampered access to needed short term funding from multi-lateral donors as there must be deliberations and sign-off at the level of the local authority before these can be accessed. In discussions with the parish mayor and the PDC head there is an agreement that the PSC has lost some momentum and the mayor has given assurances that this will be corrected with a meeting scheduled for November 2013.

In summary with the assistance of the project St Mary has made credible attempts to overcome the initial main challenge of financial and physical resources, with some degree of success. There are still current challenges linked to leadership, mutual accountability and human resource capacities. The situation for the St Mary Parish Council therefore one which is of concern with respect to the forward movement of the project. First although there is a formal set up of a PSC within the governance structure this has not been functional over almost half of the 2013 year. The strategic vision and internal management of the project has been carried to a great extent by the PDC and not the full council and PSC. This vision has been correctly informed through a ‘bottom up’ approach and there are cases where resource development and service delivery could have been achieved but the lack of buy in with the governance structure has created bottlenecks. This has also hampered and can jeopardized strategic relationships forged.

# 6.0 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS

## 6.1 Recommendations

* Capacity assessment must in future include detailed organizational audits of local authorities to support the capacity assessment that was done on parishes. This is a more objective way of assessing capacity and audits will be done at site against international best practices. This will require input from the MLG and the UNDP
* The promotion of strategies to decrease knowledge loss through staff rotation at the local level. This is evident not just through the parish council but also other critical organizations such as the SDC. The parish council (with the assistance of the MLG) must promote in the short term (6 month – 1 year) orientation programmes for new staff with respect to safety and security. In the medium term (1-2 years) continuing programmes must be a part of the strategy for sustainability where alliances with training organizations such as UTECH and MIND will be formed to make related training (as provided under the project) open to technical staff.
* The provision of timely and consistent data related to crime and safety to all PSCs. This means a stronger role for the PDC in garnering information from their development area committees and also their community development committees. It also means formal arrangements with relevant central government agencies e.g. the police to provide relevant data. This must be done in the short term (six months to one year from project closeout) and must be facilitated by the MLG.
* Project design in future must be linked to existing or new projects/programmes. This is part and parcel of the local culture of some communities – especially volatile ones. Project funders and the MLG must play a role here. This is a short term solution but it has the potential to provide momentum to the project and get early stakeholder buy in.
* Project design in future must be cognizant of the challenges of staff shortages in the various local authorities both in the PMU and also local authorities. The former required two (2) more positions and also a dedicated position for the PMU head. At the local authority level a defined functional position to carry out safety and security in parish councils was missing. The new position must be created to alleviate the constraints reported by project parishes. This is the role of the MLG and the respective parish councils.
* The continuation of the PMU but in a more expanded capacity i.e. monitoring and evaluation. Incorporated in this must be the recommended performance framework [**Section 5.1**] and also monitoring of the capacity gaps as stated in the baseline [**Section 4.3**] by parish to continuously assess improvements. This must be carried out by the MLG with support from the UNDP. This is also very important to areas where full adoption of the project has not yet been achieved.
* A meritocracy must be put in place where there are strong sanctions for breaches this must be part of at least the medium term strategy of the MLG and the local government reform programme. There must be strong action against those authorities which are not holding PSC meetings and the promotion or reward of those who are adopting project best practices.
* There must be room for advocacy in the project with respect to improving the enabling environment for the PSCs through an increased pace in the local government reform process. This will require support from the MNS, the PIOJ and the MLG.
* Project implementation in future must be cognizant of the challenges with respect to geography, time scheduling and logistics. This will require knowledge of the detailed schedules of local authorities and the parishes selected for pilots. This may mean selecting parishes in similar geographic regions and setting up training and sensitization sessions at certain times of the year. This will be the role of stakeholders such as the MLG and UNDP.
* Project implementation must also examine the varying abilities of beneficiary stakeholders. This may mean more structured training at the functional level e.g. training programmes in safety and security for parish council staff and similar but separate training for NGO and CBO members. This reduces the risk of retraining. There can also a system where simpler courses become prerequisites for more arcane ones. This promotes equity and the possibilities for upward mobility in an important field.
* The uneven levels of progress among local authorities must give rise to strategies that promote knowledge transfer across parish councils. This may range from national PSC conferences to site visits by PSC members to other parishes who are dealing with similar local challenges in more effective way. This must be facilitated by the MLG.
* There must be an outcome evaluation on the project to assess whether the resources expended are creating positive changes to national outcomes. It is recommended that these be done at least two years after project close out.

## 6.2 Conclusions

The Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety Project is now approaching its close out stage. At this juncture one can say that the project has achieved the outputs targeted. In addition project stakeholders have even taken the initiative to achieve an output which was not even set in the project design process, i.e. the design of a project safety and security handbook and toolkit. Notwithstanding the challenges to implementation (e.g. time scheduling, varying levels of awareness and technical abilities by partners, shortened time period for training stakeholders, etc) the project has been effective. The project objectives have been achieved as there is a broader based level of participation as evidenced by the constituents of PSCs and there are set mechanisms imparted to local authorities with respect to local responses to crime and violence.

With respect to the achievement of project outcomes these have not yet been achieved in a sustainable way. It will take time and a full change in mindset and traditional approaches in government and other institutions before these can be achieved. The project has however shown tangible impacts as evidenced by changes in operations in some local authorities to accommodate the workings of the PSC, a culture of responsibility with respect to finding solutions for safety and security at the local level.
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APPENDICES

Table 8: Interviews

| **STAKEHOLDER AGENCY** | **CONTACT PERSONS (FUNCTIONAL AREA)** |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Ministry of Local Government
 | Mr. Robert Hill (Project Manager)Ms Tanisha Cunningham |
| 1. Ministry of National Security
 | Mr. Courtney Brown (Director Crime Prevention and Community Safety)Ms Keisha Wright |
| 1. Planning Institute of Jamaica
 | Ms Delores Wade (Project Economist, Multilateral Technical Co-operation Unit) |
| 1. Social Development Commission
 | Mrs. Sherine Francis (Director Governance)Mrs. Tisha Ewen-Smith (Strategic and Corporate Planning Co-ordinator) |
| 1. The Parish of Trelawny
 | Mrs. Carla Bingham-Ledgister (PRO Trelawny PDC) |
| 1. The Parish of Westmoreland
 |  Mr. Pius Lacan |
|  Mrs. Opal Beharie (Secretary Manager Parish Council) |
| 1. St Parish of St Catherine
 |  Mr. Michael Morris (Secretary Manager Parish Council)Mr. Earl Hyde (PDC Chairman) |
| 1. Portmore Municipality
 | Ms Kerry Chambers (Chief Administrative Officer)Mrs. Phillipa Edmund-Ricketts (Disaster Co-ordinator) |
| 1. St Mary Parish
 | Mrs. Dorrel HartleyMayor Levan Freeman |
| 1. UNDP
 | Mrs. Itziar GonzalezMs. Shelly TrimMs. Novia McKeyMr. Upul Ranaweera |
| 1. The Parish of Clarendon
 | Ms Eleanor Coombs Parish Council  |
| 1. The Parish of Manchester
 | Ms Beverly Booth (SDC Parish Manager)Mrs. Angela Edwards (PDC Manager) |

**Source: Project Evaluation – Enhancing Civil Society Participation in Local Governance for Community Safety (2013)**

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS - QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION POINTS

| **QUESTION/DISCUSSION POINT** | **TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS** | **RESPONSES** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What are your overall views of the project? (stakeholder are reminded about the project here and views are tabled) | 20 respondents | All views are generally positive as respondents state that they believe the project achieved what it was set out to do. |
| Were your roles made clear on the project? (This was check listed at the interview, against the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder stated in the project document)  |  (MLDG/PMU, UNDP, SDC, MNS, PIOJ) – 8 respondents |  6 (75 per cent) persons stated that they were quite clear. 2 were not so sure (this was from one institution) |
| What is the impact of the project on linked national outcomes? |  7 respondents | All stakeholders agree that more time is required before outcomes can be effectively assessed.  |
| Do you have any concerns about how the project was designed? | All stakeholders ( 20 respondents) | 16 stakeholders ( approx. 80 per cent) had no issues at all with project design1 (5 per cent) could not comment (was not there at design stage)3 (15 per cent) were generally okay with design but raised a few issues.Note that some comments are from individuals who were not there at the design stage but gave feedback based on either from perusing documents or feedback from others. |
| Do you have any concerns about how the project was implemented? | All stakeholders ( 20 respondents) | No respondent had major concerns. 4 respondents (20 per cent) stated that **in addition** they would have wanted to see defined projects implemented at the community level. |
| Were the outputs achieved? (a checklist of the outputs were on hand when this question was asked of stakeholders ) | All stakeholders (20) respondents | All stakeholders believed all outputs were achieved about two stakeholders stated that the parish profiles by SDC were not provided. In reviewing the list this was incorrect as this was not a slated output.3 individuals (17 per cent) highlighted concerns about project quality. Two of these were concerned about the short time frame for training (11 per cent) and 2 also stated that the quality of training |
| What were the partnership strategies adopted?i.e. provision of key roles to stakeholders at the enabling level and the outreach to a wide cross section of beneficiary stakeholders at the local levelDo you think these strategies were effective | All stakeholders (20) respondents | All stakeholders believed that the partnership strategies adopted under the project were effective. Note however that most beneficiary stakeholders (8) stated that partnerships had already existed before so with the onset of the project the learning curve was not difficult. |
| How has gender impacted on the decision making aspects under the project? | 19 stakeholders | All stakeholders stated that gender was not a major factor with respect to them making decisions. They added that they believed that women had a voice under the project  |
| What have the impacts of the project been on the daily operations of your organization? | 12 stakeholders | All respondents state that there have been changes in daily operations to accommodate the workings of the PSC. There was also a greater drive for consensus 5 respondents (42 per cent)An added workload – all respondents |
| What are the concerns regarding project sustainability | 19 stakeholders | Stakeholders had varying views on this viz* Change of personnel a challenge and human resource constraints – 9 (47 per cent)
* Projects from the PSC must be aligned with relevant national projects 15 (78 per cent)
* Lack of resources – all respondents (100 per cent)
* Working closer with the MLG is required – 10 (53 per cent)
* Greater bottom up approach – 3 (16 per cent)
 |

1. This is a framework bourne out of the PIOJ that attempted to harness the capacities of the state, civil society to achieve transformation in the most vulnerable and volatile communities. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This has been formulated by the Ministry of National Security and the UNDP and focuses directly on employed strategies based on community safety [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. First the project scope had to cover both enabling stakeholders and beneficiary stakeholders and many stakeholders were not there from the inception of the project so numerous questions on a questionnaire would have been blank. In addition open discussions enabled participants to more comfortably air views and issues tabled. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Supporting Capacity Development – the UNDP Approach. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The six indicators are:

Voice and Accountability – perceptions regarding freedom of expression and association, freedom to select ones government a free media etc.

Political Stability and the Absence of Violence – perceptions of the government being overthrown or destabilized by politically motivated violence and terrorism

Government Effectiveness – perceptions about the

Regulatory Quality – perceptions of government regarding promotion of private sector development

Rule of Law – the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. This represent the population of Portmore calculated at the last national census (2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The Portmore municipality is a part of the St Catherine South Police Division [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Note that this assessment looked at previous attempts to set up crime prevention committees at the parish level and it was found that of the five pilot parishes St Mary and Manchester’s committees were found to be dormant and defunct respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The project document shows the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder this was checklisted in discussions. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Checks with stakeholders showed that the PMU head was not on full secondment from his substantive post. This may have created another challenge with respect to resources allocated to the project. There were however no major negative impacts shown with respect to project delivery. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Participants included representatives from parish councils, PDCs, the JCF, SDC and the MLG [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. This included mayors from May Pen and Mandeville and secretary managers and representatives from MNS, JCF, PDCs and MLG. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Civil society participants and local authority personnel [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. At final report St Catherine and Trelawny were about to send plans and audits so these were not seen although they state that they had these. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
16. This outcome was included in the project performance framework as an intended outcome [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. An outcome indicator in the project performance framework table. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. This represents the specialized techniques imparted with respect to safety and security as shown in the content of courses and also the setting up of mechanisms e.g. safety templates. Normally becomes more evident in proof of use on the job. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)