



ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION

JAMAICA



HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiveness
AN DEVELOPMENT responsiveness NATIONAL OW
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP effectiveness COORDINATION
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiveness
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION



ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS **JAMAICA**
EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION

REPORTS PUBLISHED UNDER THE ADR SERIES

Afghanistan	Colombia	Jamaica	Serbia
Argentina	Republic of the Congo	Jordan	Seychelles
Bangladesh	Ecuador	Lao PDR	Somalia
Barbados and OECS	Egypt	Maldives	Sudan
Benin	El Salvador	Mongolia	Syrian Arab Republic
Bhutan	Ethiopia	Montenegro	Tajikistan
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Georgia	Mozambique	Turkey
Botswana	Ghana	Nicaragua	Uganda
Bulgaria	Guatemala	Nigeria	Ukraine
Burkina Faso	Guyana	Peru	Uzbekistan
Cambodia	Honduras	Philippines	Viet Nam
Chile	India	Rwanda	Yemen
China	Indonesia	Senegal	Zambia

ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS: EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION – JAMAICA

Copyright © UNDP 2011, all rights reserved.
Manufactured in the United States of America. Printed on recycled paper.

The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme, its Executive Board or the United Nations Member States. This is an independent publication by the UNDP Evaluation Office.

Editing: Sanjay Upadhya
Graphic design: Suazion, Inc. (NY, suazion.com)
Cover images provided by UNDP Jamaica.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation was conducted by the UNDP Evaluation Office with the assistance of an independent evaluation team. The team was led by David Todd and comprised the following specialists: Neville Duncan, Aldrie Henry-Lee, David Lee, Lloyd Waller and Michael Witter. Fumika Ouchi oversaw the evaluation process as the task manager at the Evaluation Office. The Evaluation Office would like to thank the entire evaluation team for their dedication and hard work throughout the exercise.

From the outset, the UNDP country office in Jamaica as well as the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean were closely involved in all phases of the evaluation. The country office senior management, Minh H. Pham, UN Resident Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative, and Akiko Fujii, Deputy Resident Representative, extended their full and utmost commitment to the successful completion of the evaluation. They also ensured that the evaluation team received all necessary assistance, particularly during its fieldwork. Carla Khammar, Programme Advisor and the evaluation focal point at the Regional Bureau, provided valuable guidance and support from headquarters at every critical juncture to ensure the smooth proceeding and transition of various phases. This evaluation benefited significantly from their leadership, wisdom and sense of achieving common goals.

As with all UNDP Assessment of Development Results, the partnership and collaboration with the national stakeholders is indispensable. The Evaluation Office would like to extend its sincere gratitude to all individuals and partners representing the government, civil society organizations,

donors and development partners in Jamaica who participated in this process. In particular, we would like to thank Gladstone Hutchinson, Director-General of the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), as well as Barbara Scott, Director, and Andrea Sheppard-Stewart, Manager of PIOJ Multilateral Technical Cooperation. The PIOJ is the main government coordinating counterpart of UNDP, which supported the evaluation from the start. We thank them for their active engagement and guidance throughout the exercise as the key interlocutor on behalf of the government.

The ADR was conducted together with the GEF Country Portfolio Study, where the same consultants were used for the two studies on the energy and environment portfolio in the country. This has promoted critical synergy on the topic and we thank GEF for joining forces.

This evaluation would not have been possible without tireless efforts and contributions of many staff members at both the country office and the Evaluation Office. Country office staff, including programme managers, project staff and operations related staff, assisted the evaluation team with its day-to-day activities through provision of reference material, information, and logistical and administrative support. At the Evaluation Office, Oscar Garcia, Michael Reynolds and Ana Rosa Monteiro Soares, provided comments to the draft report. Denis Benn, external quality assurance advisor, also provided valuable feedback. Florencia Tateossian, Elizabeth de Leon Jones and Caroline Monyi provided research and logistical support. Anish Pradhan and Marina Blinova assisted in the editing and publication process, with the help of an external editor, Sanjay Upadhyaya.

FOREWORD

This is the report of an independent country-level evaluation called the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in Jamaica, conducted by the Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The evaluation examines the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP support and its contributions to the country's development.

The present ADR for Jamaica focused on results achieved in the two country programme cycles, 2002-2006 and 2007-2011, with a particular emphasis on the period since the last ADR completed in 2004. It assessed UNDP interventions under a diverse range of thematic programmes, including poverty reduction, governance, energy and environment, and disaster risk reduction, with a view to learning from its own practices and providing a set of forward-looking recommendations. The evaluation was expected to assist the UNDP country office and its partners in their continuous efforts to improve the country programmes.

Since it began operation in the mid-1970s, UNDP Jamaica has striven to work closely with the Government of Jamaica and its national counterparts to improve the people's lives in Jamaica. During the period under review, the country was faced with an array of external and internal challenges, including mounting national debt, slow economic growth with high unemployment among youth, soaring rates of crime and violence, and a series of natural disasters. However, as reflected in the previous ADR, the UNDP country office itself had also long been handicapped by a number of internal management

issues that affected the smooth functioning of the office and delivery of programme interventions.

Results from the present ADR indicate that the country office has clearly turned the corner. In the past few years, rigorous measures were introduced by the country office to rebuild trust and partnerships with the government and development partners as well as to strengthen the capacity of staff. Interviews with various stakeholders suggested that UNDP Jamaica has now been recognized as a responsive entity that has relevant country programmes that are in alignment of national priorities, with a group of highly dedicated staff.

The evaluation suggests that the work of UNDP Jamaica needs to continue on various fronts, including strategic prioritization of programmes, further exploration of ways to efficiently implement its programme interventions and to ensure their sustainability, increased collaboration with other UN partners when delivering programmes, and promotion of gender and other UN values through its interventions.

I hope that this ADR will be used to reflect on many lessons learned, and to prompt further dialogue widely among national stakeholders and development partners with a common goal of human development in the country.



Saraswathi Menon
Director, Evaluation Office

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations	v
Executive Summary	vii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1 Rationale	1
1.2 Purpose and Scope	1
1.3 Evaluation Questions, Evaluability and Methodology	2
1.4 The Evaluation Process	4
1.5 Limits of the Assessment	5
1.6 Coordination with the GEF Country Portfolio Study	6
Chapter 2. Development Challenges and National Strategies	7
2.1 Key Features of Jamaica	7
2.2 Challenges to Governance	7
2.3 Financial, Economic and Poverty-Related Challenges	11
2.4 Challenges in the Environment and Energy Sector	13
2.5 Challenges in the Area of Disaster Management	14
2.6 The Overall National Response to Development Challenges: National Development Planning	15
2.7 International Development Cooperation	15
Chapter 3. UNDP's Response and Strategies	16
3.1 The Evolution of UNDP's Country Programme Strategy	16
3.2 Coordination with the UN System	16
3.3 UNDP's Programmes and Office Organization	19
3.4 Country Office Management	20
3.5 Regional Support	21
Chapter 4. Contribution to Development Results	23
4.1 Poverty Reduction	23
4.2 Democratic Governance	27
4.3 Environment and Energy	32
4.4 Disaster Risk Reduction Activities	43
4.5 Gender and Human Rights	44
4.6 Portfolio Response to ADR 2004	46
Chapter 5. UNDP's Strategic Positioning	48
5.1 Strategic Relevance	48
5.2 Contribution to UN Values	49
5.3 Strategic Partnerships	50
5.4 Responsiveness	50

Chapter 6. Conclusions and Recommendations	52
6.1 Conclusions	52
6.2 Recommendations	54
Annexes	56
Annex 1. Terms of Reference	56
Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix	63
Annex 3. Documents Consulted	66
Annex 4. People Contacted	73
Tables	
Table 1. UNDP Jamaica Country Office Overview	19
Table 2. Programme Expenditure by Practice Area	20
Table 3. Resources Allocated by UNDP Country Office to Thematic Areas by Programming Cycle	20
Table 4. Poverty Reduction Projects (as of November 2010)	23
Table 5. Democratic Governance Projects (as of November 2010)	27
Table 6. Democratic Governance Projects (2004-2007)	28
Table 7. Environment and Energy and Disaster Management Projects (as of October 2010)	33
Boxes	
Box 1. Key Features of the Jamaican State	8

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

4H	Jamaican Youth Organization (Offshoot of American Parent Body, originally stood for Head, Heart, Hands, Health)
ACP-EU	African, Caribbean, Pacific-European Union
ADR	Assessment of Development Results
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ATLAS	UNDP Enterprise Resource Planning System
BOP	Balance of payments
CARIBCAN	Caribbean-Canada Trade Agreement
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDC	Community Development Committee
CFC	Chlorofluorocarbons
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CITO	Central Information Technology Office
CLG	Centre for Leadership and Governance
COP	Conference of the Parties
CoP	Community of Practice
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSME	Caribbean Single Market and Economy
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
E&E	Environment and Energy
EC	European Commission
ERC	Evaluation Resource Centre
EU	European Union
EVI	Environmental Vulnerability Index
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GoJ	Government of Jamaica
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
HCFC	Hydro chlorofluorocarbons
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IDB	Inter American Development Bank
ICT	Information and communication technology
IDP	International development partner
IFI	International financial institution
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IWCAM	Integrating Water and Coastal Area Management
JLP	Jamaica Labour Party
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MNS	Ministry of National Security
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOE	Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture
MOFPS	Ministry of Finance and Public Service

MOJ	Ministry of Justice
MTF	Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework
NDM	National Democratic Movement
NEPA	National Environment and Planning Agency
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NHDR	National Human Development Report
ODA	Official Development Assistance
ODPEM	Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PCJ	Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PNP	People's National Party
PRSP	Public Sector Reform Programme
PSOJ	Private Sector Organization of Jamaica
RADA	Rural Agricultural Development Agency
RBLAC	Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean of UNDP
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCF	Regional Cooperation Framework
RCS	Resident Coordinator System
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
RR	Resident Representative
SALISES	Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies
SDC	Social Development Commission
SDNP	Sustainable Development Network Programme
SGP	Small Grants Programme (GEF)
SIDS	Small island developing states
SOE	State of the Environment
SRC	Scientific Research Council
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
STATIN	Statistical Institute of Jamaica
TOR	Terms of Reference
TRAC	Target for Resource Assignments from the Core
UN	United Nations
UNAIDS	Joint UN Programme for HIV/AIDS
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNRC	United Nations Resident Coordinator
UPP	United People's Party
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UWI	University of the West Indies
WB	World Bank
WCDG	Western Caribbean Donors' Group
WTO	World Trade Organization

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Jamaica is a small island developing state located in the Caribbean, with a population of 2.8 million in 2010 and a GDP per capita of US\$8,400. Its main sources of income are tourism and bauxite. Classified as an upper middle-income country, Jamaica is in demographic transition with declining trends in both mortality and fertility. The country faces many development challenges, including persistent budget deficits, high external debt, declining income, increasing poverty, environmental vulnerability, political instability and high levels of violence.

In response to these challenges, the country has embarked on its first long-term development plan, Vision 2030 Jamaica: National Development Plan, with a view to transforming the country from a middle-income developing country to a developed country by 2030. Four strategic goals are: (1) A society empowered to achieve its fullest potential; (2) A secure, cohesive, orderly and just society; (3) A prosperous economy; and (4) Development in harmony with the natural environment. Vision 2030 is being implemented in a series of three-year policy frameworks, referred to as the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (MTF).

Early in the decade, bilateral donors were substantial international development partners (IDPs), but their contribution began to decline in 2005. By 2007, multilaterals made a much larger contribution. The UN in general and UNDP specifically are very small players in financial terms. In assessing the contribution of UNDP in this ADR, it is therefore important to highlight that expectations should not be too high and that UNDP can be seen as a 'niche player' in the country's overall international development landscape.

The UNDP Evaluation Office introduced the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in 2001 as a systematic means of assessing the development results achieved in countries receiving support from UNDP. This is the second ADR conducted in Jamaica, the first having been completed in 2004. It covers the period from 2002 to 2010, which includes two Country Programme Document periods, from 2002 to 2006 and from 2007 to 2011. However, most attention is paid to the period since the last ADR and particularly to the period of the current Country Programme Document.

The Jamaica ADR methodology is consistent with the main directions indicated in the ADR Method Manual and used a variety of evaluation methods. These included a review of public and internal documents such as completed evaluations, audits and reviews; face-to-face interviews with partners in government, parastatal bodies, civil society, international development partners, as well as UNDP staff both at the country office and the headquarters; and field visits. The opportunities for field-level verification of results were limited. This was because, first, many projects were at early stages of implementation or had not started. Second, many activities fell into the category of 'enabling', capacity building or policy support and were not intended to have discernable field-level outcomes, or at least not in the short to medium term. Third, numbers of direct beneficiaries were often small in 'pilots' or demonstrations and locations were dispersed.

The ADR was conducted in parallel with a Country Portfolio Study of the Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). This gave advantages in terms of personnel, since the team leader and environment specialist were the same for both studies. For national stakeholders, it meant that GEF-supported activities implemented by UNDP could be covered in one

set of interviews rather than two. In terms of study results, the GEF study gave a broader perspective on issues raised with regard to the UNDP-implemented activities, enabling some separation of effects particular to UNDP from those that also affected other GEF implementing agencies.

UNDP IN JAMAICA

For the 2002-2006 period, the CPD focused on three programme areas, namely poverty reduction, improved governance, and environment and energy. There was also a small programme of disaster risk reduction activities. For the next CPD, 2007-2011, UNDP assistance focussed on three key national priorities, namely, HIV/AIDS; environment and poverty; and justice, peace and security. This country programme had two primary areas of focus – crisis prevention and management, and energy and environmental security – through which poverty, governance, E&E-related programming inputs and assistance are being delivered.

In Jamaica, the UNDP Resident Coordinator (RC) has an important role in helping to coordinate the interests and activities of the international development partners, both within the UNCT and outside it. This role becomes critical in the event of national disasters, which occur with some regularity in the form of hurricanes and tropical storms, where direct damage and flood destruction are often very substantial. The RC is also seen to have a key coordinating role in the international response to civil security issues, which have been prominent in recent years in the country; and where the UN values and political neutrality are recognized as giving it a unique capacity to provide leadership.

The Country Programme Documents for the two periods responded well to Government of Jamaica (GoJ) priorities outlined in various national strategic documents and frameworks. The emphasis on poverty reduction and justice, peace and security begun in the earlier CPD was somewhat strengthened during the later programme. This was due to the creation of

separate units for poverty and governance, whereas the two had previously been combined. However, the resources to enable the two functions to operate effectively are still not available, so that the poverty function, in particular, does not yet have a fully viable programme. The emphasis on HIV/AIDS of the CPD 2002-2006, which had been relevant when the programme was devised, did not materialize and gradually faded from the priorities of the country office.

Poverty Reduction: Five projects were included in the ADR cohort. All of the projects were relevant to Jamaica's anti-poverty strategies, as outlined in Vision 2030 and the Medium Term Plan. UNDP's stated outcome of this portfolio of projects, 'reduction in the incidence of poverty', was directly supported by only one of the five projects, covering rural youth employment, an important focus of government policies. Three of the other four projects offered support for public policy. The final project, Support for the National Statistical System, is intended to strengthen the GoJ in the areas of policy-making and project and programme monitoring.

In terms of efficiency, projects were affected by delays, sometimes considerable. The two main reasons for these were: delays in the granting of permission to open special bank accounts to receive project funds and difficulties in recruiting consultants or getting studies completed.

Since only one project, Response to the Economic Crisis, was completed in the ADR period, it is difficult to assess the overall effectiveness of this portfolio. That project is viewed as effective in terms of meeting its direct goals, since it made a valuable contribution in enabling the government to ease the difficulties it faced in servicing the national debt repayments. The two projects that are well underway are both judged effective within the perspective of their goals. However, both have primarily contributed to 'upstream' activities, such as studies and development of policy documents and their contribution to poverty reduction cannot be realistically assessed.

The current UNDP country office leadership and programme staff are positively regarded by development partners in the field of poverty. The UNDP Jamaica office is recognized as flexible, facilitating, cooperative, supportive, in tune with the needs of the GoJ, and efficient. The sustainability of the results of the projects targeting the GoJ's capacity for managing the economy, implementing the MDGs and formulating and monitoring social policy depends on how well the gains from these projects are maintained and enhanced by the GoJ's management of its fiscal resources, and the extent to which any increased funds are used for poverty reduction purposes. Clearly, there is considerable scope for UNDP to increase its support for poverty-related activities in the country.

Democratic Governance: The democratic governance projects have been highly responsive to national priorities, both in terms of the government's long-term strategies of Vision 2030 and, even more particularly, in response to various national crises.

With regard to efficiency, there has been consistent difficulty in getting local partners to meet their reporting obligations in a timely manner and in accordance with UNDP procedures. The effect of this deficiency has been to retard the progress of projects since committed funds cannot be advanced to partners until each pre-established requirement has been met. The UNDP country office responded to this adverse situation by developing processes to encourage compliance and by brokering agreement with its partners on more effective enforcement mechanisms. In the short to medium term, UNDP has addressed the issue by requiring NGOs to bid competitively with other applicants for project support.

UNDP projects seem to have gradually acquired more focus in the period since 2007. The programme has built on previous country office work in the governance field and has reached the point where the main challenges now concerns ways of cementing, expanding and replicating or taking to higher levels the governance policy

commitment; achieving technical gains in building greater capacity; and achieving consistent accountability from local partners.

Environment and Energy: The E&E portfolio for the UNDP country office contains sixteen projects (including in disaster management) that were active, particularly during the later years of the period under review (2002–2010). All project activities were in line with development goals outlined by the GoJ in the Medium Term Framework, as well as with Vision 2030 Goal Number 4, 'development in harmony with nature'. They were therefore relevant to national needs. The project activities also contributed to UN values in Jamaica as evidenced through supporting the development of policies, Laws and several UN Conventions and Protocols.

By far the largest contributor to the E&E portfolio in terms of funds is the GEF and the few larger projects are financed from this source. Otherwise, there is a broad spectrum of small activities, rather than a cohesive programme.

It cannot be said that the E&E portfolio has operated efficiently. Many projects have experienced some form of delay, which frustrates partners and may reduce effectiveness, since projects often have to take short cuts to try to get back on schedule. Most of the challenges to efficiency cannot be directly addressed by the E&E programme staff. Few projects seem to avoid contracting delays, because of limited national and regional availability of qualified environmental expertise, as well as administrative hold-ups.

Overall, the ADR effectiveness assessment of the environment portfolio is that several projects have produced results that may contribute to the sectoral outcome of 'integrated land, coastal zones, and water and energy management practices improved'. UNDP's main contributions to the outcome have been through its support for capacity development and policy-making, partnership building, awareness raising and piloting innovative approaches that inform policy and are in principle replicable.

Inter-agency collaboration in this area within the UNCT was found to be at a low level. UNCT meetings do not appear to focus on inter-agency collaboration or joint implementation in this sector. Outside of the UNDAF exercise there seems to be little discussion or information sharing on programme matters. The UNEP-Regional Coordination Unit, which is located in Kingston, is currently not formally made aware of UNDP country office programmes or vice versa, although this occurs at the informal level through programme officers.

Indicators linked to the E&E outcomes and outputs were found to be highly detailed and quantifiable. In view of the absence of baselines and of systematic monitoring data, any evaluation exercise would be largely dependent on stakeholder perceptions and secondary data analysis. Even if more realistic indicators were utilized, it is doubtful whether the mechanisms and resources needed to verify them would be available. Urgent attention should be given in future UNDP and UNCT planning exercises to developing only a few key indicators, which can be collected within the resources available.

For sustainability and replication of the benefits of E&E initiatives to be viable, substantial follow-up actions are needed to expand their outcomes, demonstration value and policy effect. However, the ADR found that, outside of the immediate circles involved with UNDP E&E activities, they are not well known.

Sustainability of results in this area need not be restricted to continuation of what has already been done. Adaptation to climate change presents itself as a major area of opportunity for UNDP in Jamaica.

Disaster Risk Reduction: The intended outcome of activities in this area is: 'national capacity enhanced to reduce the risk of natural and human-induced hazards'. However, to date, the programme has been too small to make any serious contribution towards this result. In collaboration with the UK Department for International Development (DFID), UNDP implemented a

programme of school roof repairs late in 2007, following damage inflicted by Hurricane Dean. It also committed TRAC funds to conduct damage assessment, relief work and prepare a recovery plan. In 2008, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR) funds were used for early recovery and damage assessment work following Tropical Storm Gustav.

National bodies and UNDP developed these projects jointly. They were all satisfactorily completed and were assessed as effective, within the limitations imposed by small budgets and the lack of continuity in the country office's approach to disaster management.

The disaster risk reduction concepts developed by these projects were an important input into the development of approaches towards watershed management to reduce flood damage, particularly in urban areas such as the Hope River Catchment. However, institutional stakeholders contacted did not recall the contribution of UNDP to these projects, indicating that the results of the intervention have not been adequately followed up or publicized.

Overall, the team found that the disaster management portfolio (currently described only in terms of disaster risk reduction) needs to be more fully developed, not just with emergency response activities but also to assist with national disaster preparedness needs (such as capacity building and equipment).

UN Values and Cross-Cutting Themes: Gender and human rights are UN values, which are expected to be mainstreamed throughout the work of UNDP and may also be addressed through targeted projects or programmes. The projects completed by UNDP from 2002 to 2010, were relevant to national priorities in gender and human rights.

Overall, it was found that UNDP's approach to gender has not been effective. On human rights, some important, but small, interventions have been effective within their limited objectives.

CONCLUSIONS

PROGRAMMING AND PERFORMANCE

Conclusion 1: Regarding the relevance of its activities, the UNDP Jamaica programme has performed well, particularly in responding to changing national priorities.

Most of its activities can be clearly located within the National Development Plan: Vision 2030 and the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework of the government. In the environment and energy field, UNDP assistance has helped the country prepare for and meet a substantial set of commitments made under international agreements and conventions, and has contributed to the development of a national energy policy.

Conclusion 2: The programme in governance has been substantive, particularly in responding to urgent issues in the areas of peace, security and justice.

Support from the UNDP governance function is well regarded, and the country office has built effectively on its advantages as seen by international and national partners and has delivered results, despite limited resources. However, the programme could benefit from a Flexible Funding Facility similar to that available to the poverty programme.

Conclusion 3: The area of poverty reduction has made relevant and valuable interventions, but has so far received limited resources in the country programme.

Other IDPs see scope for UNDP to play a larger role in this area, particularly in leading the coordination of support to Jamaica's efforts to meet its targets for poverty-focused MDGs.

Conclusion 4: With regard to the energy and environment portfolio, UNDP has provided valuable support to the government and other partners to strengthen environmental management in the country.

The support provided by the UNDP specialists is well regarded among implementation partners. Assistance to policy formulation in the energy

sector has been valuable and is acknowledged in the policy documents. Activities in the portfolio have been broadly effective, although results are restricted by the absence of a clear focus or strategy in the sector. Although this is currently the largest UNDP Jamaica portfolio, it is not well known among IDPs. Linkages between UNDP environment activities and those of other international stakeholders are weak, even where those activities can be seen as building on or related to those of UNDP. Coordination between UNDP and UNEP is inadequate and there is no effective UNCT strategy to maximize activities and results in this operational area, which could have been expected from the UNDAF process.

Conclusion 5: The UNDP Environment and Energy Unit has provided consistent support to the Global Environment Facility portfolio in Jamaica.

By virtue of its in-country expertise housed in the country office, UNDP has provided the most consistent support among the GEF implementing agencies in Jamaica. Together with local partners, it has implemented enabling activities for capacity development and is now moving into full-scale environmental projects.

Conclusion 6: The related area of disaster management is one in which UNDP has made a valuable contribution in terms of response, policy formation and disaster risk reduction.

Although substantive results have been delivered in this sector, and the support from the (part-time) specialist is appreciated, it has suffered from severe under-resourcing, both in terms of personnel and core funding to develop activities.

Conclusion 7: Overall, UNDP project outcomes have in large part been delivered.

However, in many cases the initiatives have been small in comparison with the scale of issues being addressed and of a pilot, demonstration or catalytic nature. Given the financial constraints under which UNDP Jamaica operates, the scope for the country office to expand its operations is likely to remain limited. Furthermore, the resources available to the GoJ are also very constrained.

The ultimate results of UNDP efforts will largely depend on the extent to which the approaches, which it has helped to develop, are adopted by other stakeholders and taken forward in time and scale. The programme during this ADR period has set in motion a number of developmental approaches, which may over time produce substantial results. This situation reiterates the importance of promoting the broadest possible awareness of the outcomes to which UNDP Jamaica has contributed.

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

Conclusion 8: Overall, the UNDP country office has been successful in establishing strategic positions in its areas of activity, in respect of both government priorities and the broader IDP landscape.

However, awareness of the full range of UNDP country office capacities, potential and activities has not reached all relevant stakeholders, despite ‘spinoff’ benefits to the UNDP country office from the activities of the Resident Coordinator. Among IDPs and government agencies, many programme and operational staff have minimal knowledge of the current UNDP programmes and where they are positioned in the sector concerned. This situation reduces opportunities for complementarity and joint working, which has negative implications for UNDP in view of its position as a financially small player in all of its sectors of operation. In particular, the positioning of the portfolios in environment and energy, and disaster management is not widely known.

Conclusion 9: With regard to ‘UN values,’ the effectiveness of positioning has been mixed.

On the one hand, the country office has effectively positioned UNDP with regard to human rights issues through a number of well-focused interventions. On the other hand, a strategic position on gender mainstreaming has not been achieved. More emphasis and resources will be required in this area if any significant contribution is to be made through the country programme operations.

OPERATIONAL MATTERS

Conclusion 10: The planning processes involved in developing the UNDP country programme have been disproportionately large compared to its scale and have not been decisive in terms of shaping activities.

The CPD/CPAP (and UNDAF) procedures show very high costs in senior management and staff time, with relatively little gain in terms of programme quality or coherence. Some important areas, notably environment, energy and disaster management are inadequately included in the plans and documents produced. Others that are included, such as HIV/AIDS, later disappeared from view during implementation of the current CPD/CPAP. Finally, the ADR shows that one of the main advantages of a small player such as UNDP is its ability to respond flexibly to changing national circumstances. The current planning processes do not take account of or contribute towards this.

Conclusion 11: A related conclusion is that the results framework as expressed in the CPAP contains too many targets and indicators.

Furthermore, given the broad absence of baselines and the small scale of many UNDP inputs, most of the indicators would be extremely difficult to measure or interpret. The cost of any serious attempt to do so would be a substantial fraction of the overall programme budget.

Conclusion 12: Despite major progress made during the current CPAP period, the UNDP country office programme is not yet running efficiently.

Neither the UNDP nor the GoJ planning and administrative systems function in a timely manner. Furthermore, many UNDP partners in government, academia and civil society perceive the cost of doing business with UNDP as high. Specifically, procurement and recruitment procedures are very complex and time consuming. On the other hand, the efforts of UNDP country office staff to help partners through the system are widely regarded as helpful and effective,

and the office has little room to manoeuvre within UNDP-wide systems and regulations. An additional relevant conclusion, derived from the parallel study of the GEF Jamaica portfolio, is that all GEF implementing agencies have experienced problems with procurement and recruitment in the region, often leading to substantial operating delays and extensions of project duration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Establish a flexible fund mechanism in the governance area.

One of the strengths of the UNDP country office, as perceived by its development partners in Jamaica, is its ability to respond flexibly and effectively to changing circumstances. In its poverty portfolio, the Strategic Flexible Funding Facility has been invaluable in rapidly providing modest amounts of funds, which have enabled timely implementation of strategic activities, and have sometimes leveraged substantial follow-up. A similar facility for the governance area would enable it to further strengthen its development contribution, within the limited resources available to UNDP.

Recommendation 2: Target young people through the media they use.

The country office should explore the possible additional benefits of programmes using innovative approaches, such as harnessing the communication potential of texting and social networking sites, to engage young people in issues of governance and human rights. The assessment of this potential could draw on the Community of Practice already established to probe experiences with different approaches in the region.

Recommendation 3: Raise the profile of poverty-related activities.

The country office should explore possibilities to raise the profile of its poverty-related activities, with a particular focus on leading the coordination of support to Jamaica's efforts to meet its

targets for poverty-focused MDGs. UNDP's national and international development partners regard it as having a comparative advantage in this area. Specific activities could include improving IDP coordination around support for effective national poverty policy formulation and the development and scaling up (thematically or geographically) of focused interventions to address the most pressing poverty concerns.

Recommendation 4: Raise the profile of environment and energy activities.

The country office should make renewed efforts to raise the profile of its work in the environment and energy sector. Specific measures could include:

- establishing clear and coherent priorities for country office activities in the sector, both from its GEF support and through collaboration with potential new international partners;
- enhancing incorporation of the sector in the UNDAF/CPD/CPAP process;
- seeking appropriate opportunities to collaborate with the UNEP Regional Office for the planning and implementation of national components of regional projects, to assess possibilities for collaboration within the country and to raise the national profile of UNCT in this sector;
- enhancing collaboration with the GEF focal point to increase knowledge and understanding in the country of the possibilities for development and management of a national GEF portfolio, which have emerged as a result of reform processes in the GEF;
- ensuring maximum dissemination of information concerning its activities and achievements in the sector, to a broad audience of national and international stakeholders.

Recommendation 5: Make strenuous attempts to raise additional funds in the disaster management area.

In the disaster management area, the UNDP country office should take all possible measures

to meet the challenges of severe under-resourcing, both in terms of personnel and core funding. It should develop activities that target complementarity with broader environmental initiatives in such areas as adaptation to climate change and watershed management. These measures should build on the results already achieved and address a broad range of disaster management needs, including preparedness, both to strengthen coherence in the country office programme and to open up additional funding possibilities.

Recommendation 6: Ensure that gender issues are systematically and fully addressed.

The country office should clarify, support and enhance the role of the gender focal point to ensure that gender issues are appropriately incorporated in country office activities. As part of this process, it should map out an active role for the country office in support of national efforts to address MDG 3, ‘promoting gender equality and empowering women’. This role could best be developed in collaboration with the broader UNCT, where UNFPA and UN Women in particular have resources and complementary areas of comparative advantage.

Recommendation 7: Effectively disseminate information on UNDP activities and results.

The country office should develop and implement a specific strategy to effectively disseminate information about its current and intended activities, particularly in the areas of environment and energy, and disaster management to targeted stakeholders in international and national bodies.

Recommendation 8: Develop and measure limited set of progress indicators.

Future CPAPs should develop a limited set of indicators, targeted directly at the anticipated contribution of the interventions programmed and with specification of how their baselines and monitoring data will be collected within available resources.

Recommendation 9: Take measures to increase efficiency, particularly of procurement and recruitment.

Given the challenges it faces with procurement and recruitment processes, the country office should explore what additional measures it might take to increase efficiency through, for example, pre-qualifying suppliers and specialist consultants in its main operational areas and calling for specific bids from these pre-established ‘pools’.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 RATIONALE

The UNDP Evaluation Office introduced the Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in 2001 as a systematic means of assessing the contribution of UNDP to the achievement of development results in countries where it operates. The ADR approach and methodology have been refined based on experience and are now supported by a detailed ADR Method Manual and Guidelines.

Each year, the Evaluation Office selects a number of countries (currently 15) to join the ADR cohort and, in 2010, the Jamaica country programme was included. This is the second ADR conducted in the country, the first having been completed in 2004. It covers the period from 2002 to 2010, which includes two Country Programme Document (CPD) periods, from 2002 to 2006 and from 2007 to 2011. More detailed attention is paid to the period since the last ADR (2004) and particularly to the period of the current CPD to date.

As is common with evaluations at the programme level, the ADR has both accountability and lesson-learning objectives.¹ The primary focus of both elements is on the activities and results of the Jamaica country office in its contribution to national development results. Where appropriate, attention is also paid to regional and corporate dimensions of the country programme. At the country level, the assessment is expected to provide inputs into the next United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and country programme cycle. In addition, for corporate- and regional-level thinking, the ADR provides information and evaluation of the results

of the efforts made by a small country office and its programme. These will provide valuable insights on the options to operate effectively in such circumstances, particularly in the case of small island developing states (SIDS), and for middle-income countries (MIC), which may still face substantial challenges in dealing with such issues as poverty, governance, the environment and the contribution they can make towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This evaluation reviews the range of activities and results of UNDP support to the government and people of Jamaica, particularly since 2004. Most activities were developed and supported by the country office, but others were generated as part of regional programmes, particularly in the environmental field and occasionally within global programmes. These formed an important part of the overall support and were also included in the study.

The ADR is not seen as an instrument that evaluates individual projects, but rather places its main emphasis on developing a rounded overview of the effects derived from UNDP's cooperation programme and presence (including advocacy, coordination among UN partners and the broader international development community) and its strategic positioning. The ADR also pays attention to sampling frameworks to develop a representative set of projects for review to contribute to the overview. However, in the case of Jamaica, the overall project portfolio is small and the total number of projects is in the range that would constitute a sample of a larger portfolio. Furthermore, although there are effects from the non-project activities of

¹ Terms of Reference for the ADR are included as Annex 1.

the UNDP country office team, the scope for such effects is severely limited by the small number of staff and their high project-related workloads. The ADR team therefore decided from an early stage that it would need to examine the entire project portfolio in order to be able to develop an accurate understanding of the role and achievements of UNDP. Some impediments to this intention were encountered, as mentioned in Section 1.5 of this report.

In addition to the focus on project activities and results, including long-term effects and sustainability, the ADR assesses the strategic positioning of UNDP in relation to government policies, institutions and activities and those of other international development partners (IDPs). The ADR is not mandated to focus on the internal management systems and processes of the country office, which in the case of Jamaica have already been assessed by a series of audit missions and reports, which are referred to as appropriate in this ADR (e.g., Chapter 3).

1.3 EVALUATION QUESTIONS, EVALUABILITY AND METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND CRITERIA

The ADR covers two sets of questions. The first of these concerns what development results UNDP promoted, contributed towards and delivered. The second explores how UNDP has positioned itself and its activities in the country. The questions and criteria that enable them to be answered are outlined below.

ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

- *Thematic relevance:* To what extent have the objectives of the UNDP programmes been relevant to existing country needs, UNDP's mandate and national strategies? Has UNDP applied the right strategy within the specific political, economic and social context of the country and region? Are the design of the interventions and resources allocated realistic?

- *Effectiveness:* To what extent have the UNDP programmes accomplished their intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? What are the unexpected results it yielded? Should UNDP continue in the same direction or should its main tenets be reviewed for the new cycle?
- *Efficiency:* How well has UNDP used its resources (human and financial) in achieving its contribution? What could be done to ensure a more efficient use of resources in the country/regional context?
- *Sustainability:* To what extent is the UNDP contribution likely to be sustained in the future? Have the benefits of UNDP interventions been owned by national stakeholders after the completion of the interventions? Has an exit strategy been developed?

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

- *Strategic relevance:* To what extent has UNDP leveraged national development strategies with its programmes and strategy? What approaches have been used to increase its relevance in the country? Is there appropriate balance between upstream (policy-level) and downstream (project-level) interventions? To what extent are the resources mobilized adequate? To what extent are long-term development needs likely to be met across the practice areas? What are critical gaps in UNDP programming?
- *Responsiveness:* To what extent has UNDP anticipated and responded to significant changes in the national development context? To what extent has UNDP responded to national long-term development needs? What are the missed opportunities in UNDP programming?
- *Partnerships and coordination:* To what extent has UNDP leveraged partnerships within the UN system, government, regional/international development partners, civil society and the private sector? To what extent has UNDP

coordinated its operational activities with other development partners and stakeholders?

- *Promotion of UN values:* To what extent has UNDP supported national efforts in the achievement of MDGs? To what extent have the UNDP programmes addressed the issues of social and gender equity, as well as the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups?

EVALUABILITY

The evaluability of UNDP activities was initially explored through the creation of an Evaluation Matrix.² This showed that the assessment of development outcomes would entail a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio of the period under evaluation. This includes an assessment of development results achieved and the contribution of UNDP in terms of key interventions; progress in achieving outcomes for the ongoing country programme; factors influencing results (UNDP positioning and capacities, partnerships, policy support); achievements, progress and contribution of UNDP in practice areas (both in policy and advocacy); and analysis of the cross-cutting linkages and their relationship to MDGs and UNDAF.

The evaluation of the strategic positioning of UNDP would need to be undertaken both from the perspective of the organization and of national development priorities. From UNDP's perspective, this would entail a systematic analysis of UNDP niches within the development and policy space in the country. It would also involve the strategies used by UNDP to create and strengthen its position in the country in relation to the core practice areas. From the perspective of development results in the country, the evaluation would examine the policy support and advocacy initiatives of the UNDP programme in relation to priorities and activities of other stakeholders.

An underlying evaluability issue was posed by the small size of the UNDP portfolio in comparison with the inputs of the GoJ and of some other IDPs. This required a cautious approach to the assessment of UNDP contributions. The issue would be addressed through the assembly and triangulation of evidence from a broad variety of sources, enabling construction of a coherent picture of the direct and indirect results of UNDP coordination efforts, strategic and project support.

METHODOLOGY

The Jamaica ADR methodology is consistent with the main directions indicated in the ADR Method Manual. In view of the intention to focus on development results resulting from UNDP projects, activities, coordination and networking, the ADR used a variety of evaluation methods.

The foundation of the evaluation was a detailed review of public and internal documents³, including those from the UNDP country and regional offices, Evaluation Office, Jamaican Government and non-government organizations and other sources. These documents yielded initial data sets, which provided directly relevant information, as well as establishing key questions for follow-up through primary data collection.

After the initial desk review work, UNDP country office staff were interviewed to draw on their understanding and experience of activities, projects, processes, challenges and results. These interviews also enabled finalization of detailed stakeholder maps, mostly sector-specific, but others of broader programmatic contacts such as with the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ).

Based on the stakeholder maps developed, a programme of semi-structured interviews was drawn up with a broad range of partners in government, parastatals, civil society, IDPs and other bodies. These interviews provided the foundation of the evaluative evidence assembled

² See Annex 2.

³ Documents consulted are listed in Annex 3. Many other documents were examined, which are not cited in this report.

by the study team. Limited use was also made of telephone interviews and written inputs.

The ADR team found that the opportunities for field-level verification of results were limited. This was for several reasons. First, some projects were at early stages of implementation or had not started. Second, many activities fell into the category of ‘enabling’, capacity building or policy support and were not intended to have discernable field level outcomes, or at least not in the short to medium term. Third, the numbers of direct beneficiaries were often small in ‘pilots’ or demonstrations and locations were dispersed. Within these limitations, field visits or other direct contacts with intended beneficiaries were undertaken to add to the understanding of results achieved, perceptions of collaborating with UNDP and sustainability of benefits.

Another valuable source of information, mainly used after the ADR team gathered its data, was a set of completed evaluations, audits and reviews. These contained evidence and analysis from sources outside the UNDP country office, which confirmed or complemented documentary and primary data sources.

Triangulation of the data provided a coherent and consistent overview of the issues under review. This was done in several ways. First, evidence from internal documents was compared with that from interviews. Second, the team leader and the national specialists conducted their research largely independently (within an agreed framework) and brought their results and analysis together later in the main mission for comparison. Third, perceptions from within the UNDP country office were systematically compared with those of external stakeholders operating in the same fields. Fourth, ADR findings were compared with those of other external and/or independent sources, including evaluations, audits and reviews.

1.4 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation followed the operational processes defined in the ADR Terms of Reference.⁴ The evaluation process was divided into three phases, each including several steps:

PHASE 1: PREPARATION

Desk review: The Evaluation Office, in consultation with the country office and Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (RBLAC), collected a set of relevant reference documents. The ADR team identified and collected other relevant material for analysis throughout the evaluation.

Stakeholder mapping: A detailed analysis of all direct and indirect stakeholders was prepared by the evaluation team to identify the relationships between various players involved in the UNDP programmes and projects. The mapping included state and civil society stakeholders. This mapping was initiated by the scoping mission and was updated and expanded during the main mission.

Scoping mission: A visit to Jamaica was carried out by the team leader and Evaluation Office task manager between 3 and 9 October 2010 in order to:

- agree with the country office and key stakeholders on the objectives, methodology and processes of the ADR;
- obtain initial stakeholder perspectives on key issues to be examined;
- develop an understanding of UNDP programmes and projects, as well as the operational environment (e.g., country office operations and types of stakeholders involved);
- identify and define the data collection and analysis methods;
- assess the availability of evaluative evidence;
- develop an operational plan with the country office staff, detailing data collection and

⁴ See Annex 1.

analysis methods, potential project site visits, and the availability of logistical and administrative support;

- identify a list of potential national experts who could participate in the evaluation; and
- further identify and collect relevant documents and information.

Inception report and recruitment of consultancy team: Upon completion of the scoping mission, an inception report was prepared by the team leader and accepted by UNDP Evaluation Office. The national consultancy team was selected, approved and contracted. This team consisted of five specialists, covering the areas of poverty, governance, gender and human rights, strategic positioning and environment and energy.

PHASE 2: CONDUCTING THE ADR AND PREPARATION OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

Main data collection mission: The main Jamaica mission took place between 8 and 26 November 2010. The mission collected data in accordance with the evaluation plan outlined in the inception report. Team members conducted interviews with relevant stakeholders and visited selected project sites. At the end of the mission, on 3 December, the evaluation team held a debriefing meeting with UNDP country office and PIOJ staff, to discuss preliminary findings and obtain feedback and clarification from the stakeholders.

Data analysis and reporting: The evaluation team conducted data analysis based on all information collected and prepared a draft evaluation report. The team leader ensured that key findings inputs from the team members were included in the report and submitted the draft ADR report to the Evaluation Office task manager.

Review of the draft report and finalization of the report: The draft report was submitted for factual

corrections and feedback by key client groups, including the government, UNDP country office and RBLAC. It was also subject to an external review, prior to the submission of the report to the country office and the Regional Bureau, for quality assurance.

1.5 LIMITS OF THE ASSESSMENT

Following the scoping mission, discussions were held between the ADR team, the country office, UNDP Evaluation Office and the regional bureau in New York. These discussions determined that the Jamaica ADR should focus exclusively on the portfolio in that country, and should not include activities in other countries that have received occasional assistance from the Jamaica country office.

A limitation was imposed on the study by the substantial changes of staffing at managerial and programme levels in the country office in 2007 and 2008. The loss of institutional memory, combined with uncertainty concerning the filing and archiving system before this time, means that many project files prior to 2007 appear lost to the system. Thus, a complete archive for the entire ADR period from 2002 to 2010 could not be assembled. Since neither adequate documentation nor firsthand knowledge of these earlier projects was present, they could not meaningfully be included in the study. The main focus of the review is therefore on the current country programme cycle (2007-2011). A list of projects to be included in the ADR was agreed between the UNDP country office, UNDP Evaluation Office, RBLAC and the ADR team in October 2010 and was broadly adhered to (although a small number of projects was added). This gave a total of eight projects in governance, five in the poverty field and 16 in environment and energy, including disaster management.

1.6 COORDINATION WITH THE GEF COUNTRY PORTFOLIO STUDY

The ADR was conducted in parallel with a Country Portfolio Study of the Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). This gave advantages in terms of personnel, since the team leader and environment specialist were the same for both studies. For national stakeholders, it meant that GEF-supported activities implemented by UNDP could be covered in one set of interviews rather than two. In terms of study results, the GEF study gave a broader perspective on issues raised with regard to the UNDP-implemented activities, enabling some separation of effects particular to UNDP from those, which also affected other GEF implementing agencies.

Chapter 2

DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL STRATEGIES

2.1 KEY FEATURES OF JAMAICA

Jamaica is a small island developing state, with a land area of 10,991 square kilometres. It is located in the western Caribbean Sea, about 145 kilometres south of Cuba and 191 kilometres west of Hispaniola. The inland area is mountainous, and is surrounded by coastal plains. The climate is tropical, mainly hot and humid, but is more temperate in the highlands. The island lies in the Atlantic Ocean hurricane belt and has been subject to significant damage and loss of life from a succession of hurricanes and tropical storms.

The estimated population of Jamaica in July 2010 was 2,847,232, at a density of 252 people per square kilometre. The country is in demographic transition as reflected in declining trends in both mortality and fertility. The annual rate of population growth since 1998 has been about 0.65 percent and is well within the target population of 3 million for the year 2020 contained in the National Population Policy. Just over half the population is in urban areas, with some 650,000 in the capital, Kingston. Other major urban areas include Spanish Town, Portmore, May Pen, Mandeville and Montego Bay.

Jamaica is classified by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as an upper middle-income country, with an estimated 2010 GDP per capita of US\$8,400. The Gini coefficient, at 37.9, reflects a medium level of economic inequality. While the lowest 10 percent of households consumed 2.1 percent of GDP, the highest 10 percent of households used 36 percent. The Human Development Index is 0.688, which places Jamaica 80th in the world, in the middle ranks. The labour force in 2009 was some 1.3 million, with an estimated unemployment rate of 14.5 percent.

Jamaica is a major player in the regional economy and was one of the founder members of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME). The country has an active private sector, although the government still has substantial economic holdings, which it is gradually divesting. Key sectors of economic activity include mining (particularly bauxite and alumina), tourism, manufacturing, financial and insurance services and agriculture. Foreign exchange earnings are dependent on tourism (with around 1.5 million arrivals per annum) and mining exports. Another important factor is remittances from Jamaicans living abroad, which account for 15 percent of GDP. Until 2007, the economy was growing rapidly, assisted by structural reforms aimed at financial liberalization. However, the world economic downturn has adversely affected the country and both mining and tourism revenues have substantially declined.

2.2 CHALLENGES TO GOVERNANCE

Key features of the political establishment are shown in Box 1.

In the last general elections, held in 2007, the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) took over as the governing party from the People's National Party (PNP), which had been in power for the previous 18 years. The changeover of government after nearly two decades was followed by the replacement of many officers in public institutions, who held positions that were supposedly protected from political intervention by the constitution. After this, the Public Service Commission quickly lost the confidence of the Prime Minister and its entire membership was asked to resign and did. This commission

Box 1. Key Features of the Jamaican State

Independence	1962
Head of state	Queen Elizabeth II, represented by the governor-general, who is appointed on the recommendation of the Jamaican prime minister
The executive	Prime minister, chosen from the majority party in the House of Representatives, heads a cabinet of not fewer than 11 members
National legislature	Bicameral: 60-member House of Representatives (the lower house) directly elected for a five-year term; 21-member Senate (the upper house), appointed for the same concurrent term by the governor-general, with 13 seats allocated on the advice of the prime minister and eight on the advice of the leader of the opposition
Legal system	UK-style judicial system leading to the Supreme Court at the apex; the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the UK is currently the final court of appeal
National elections	September 2007; the next national election can be held at any time up to September 2012
National government	The Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) holds 32 seats in the lower house; the People's National Party (PNP) holds 28 seats
Main political organizations	Government: JLP Opposition: PNP; National Democratic Movement (NDM); United People's Party (UPP)

deals with appointments to, promotions in and retirement and dismissals from the public service of Jamaica. These events led to instability in the country's governance system. At the level of local governance, there is also a need for increased capacity and transparency.

Popular support for the political system has been eroded by numerous incidents interpreted as the misuse of public resources for private purposes by agents of the state, a succession of allegations of bribery and the perceived practices of party nepotism. There are serious issues of corruption, transparency and openness, which have undermined attempts to achieve good governance in Jamaica. In the 2010 International Corruption Perceptions Index, Jamaica ranked 83rd of the 178 countries measured, with a score of 3.3 on a scale from 10 (highly clean) to 0 (highly corrupt).

The country suffers from considerable labour unrest in the public sector over pay and work conditions for the police, nurses, doctors and other members of the public sector. This situation has been exacerbated by the spending restrictions recently agreed to with the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This has been seen as

evidence of the government breaking promises made to public-sector employees in an earlier memorandum.

In addition to these challenges from within the political system, a number of external factors posed difficulties for effective governance. These included substantial damage from hurricanes and other natural events; the financial crisis in the United States (from 2007); the protracted and controversial procedures around the request for extradition to the United States of an alleged drug exporter; followed by police/military incursions into the barricaded community where he was thought to be located, which left at least 73 citizens dead.

THE NATIONAL RESPONSE: PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The government has responded to challenges in the governance area through the Jamaican Public Sector Reform Programme (PSRP). This has had some achievements, including the creation of executive agencies and an improvement in the number of qualified technical staff. But the national bureaucracy is still far from resembling

a results-focused modern system. The recent agreement with the IMF requires a reduction in the size and further reform of the public sector, through the Public Sector Master Rationalization Plan. While this is intended to lead to a leaner and more effective public sector, the consultation stage is long and final recommendations are not expected for another two years.

The PSRP has so far retained the existing ministerial structures (which are many for a country the size of Jamaica), but it has redistributed the coverage of portfolios among ministries, as well as privatizing services and creating public corporations. As a side effect of this process, the government has laid off workers on the rationale of achieving greater efficiencies through consolidation of tasks. Although the preamble to the PRSP states broad goals, its actual proposals focus more on cost-cutting measures than on the construction of a public administration that is productive, effective and transparent. The Jamaican public sector now has more qualified personnel in a wide variety of disciplines than at any other time in its history. An important element of the reform process should therefore be to get full value out of this body of persons, justifying their call upon the financial resources of the state. A further key element would be an emphasis on joined-up governance and effective inter-ministerial management of complex projects and programmes.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS CHALLENGES

The national security situation represents another major area of concern in the governance area. This is characterized by high rates of murder and other violent crimes, police killings, abuses of rights of citizens and of prisoners, and the extreme slowness of the justice system, which is overloaded with a backlog of cases. A 2004 World Bank report on Jamaica estimated expenditures

on security at around 4.4 percent of GDP, with 1.3 percent of GDP expended on private security.

An important sub-issue in the overall decline of governance and civil society in Jamaica is the absence of civic engagement among Jamaican youth, many of whom are uninterested in government and governance. Although some efforts have been made to address the specific needs of youth in civic engagement, these have been very ad hoc. Furthermore, they have not provided a cohesive programme to address the challenges of youth marginalization.

Human rights violations by the police continue to be a matter of great concern, particularly as a large number of people are killed by the police annually.⁵ Official statistics show a record high in 2007 when 272 persons were killed as a result of force used by the police.⁶ Despite the unusually high number of killings, convictions of police officers are extremely rare with contributory factors such as 'flawed investigations, corruption and a failing justice system'.⁷

In response to allegations of systematic human rights abuses by the police and security forces, the government passed a bill in March 2010 establishing the Independent Commission of Investigation. The commission is mandated to investigate actions of the security forces, in response to complaints by national and international human rights groups. Additionally, the Jamaica Constabulary Force is undertaking a process of reform based on recommendations aimed at improving its responsiveness and accountability.

There is a high incidence of sexual violence against women and girls and those in inner-city communities are particularly exposed to gang violence. Sexual crimes against children remain widespread and girls are primarily the victims. Despite efforts to address the problem, there remains a high incidence of violence coupled with

⁵ Approximately 12 percent of all killings are attributed to the police every year.

⁶ 224 persons were killed in 2008 and 253 in 2009.

⁷ <<http://www.amnesty.org/en/region/jamaica>>. Retrieved on 1 December, 2010.

the low clear-up rate for sexual crimes and non-reporting of sexual crimes by victims. Amnesty International⁸ has highlighted concerns in relation to human rights violations by the police; violence against women and girls; attacks against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons; children in custody; and violence in inner-city communities.

There is particular concern that the conditions of juvenile detention facilities seem to be in contravention of international standards. National human rights groups have reported cases in which children were not segregated from adults in correctional centres. In his preliminary findings from his mission to Jamaica (12-21 February 2010), the UN Special Rapporteur on torture reported the continued practice of detaining children and adults together in lock-ups in police stations and some correctional centres. It has also been reported that practices occur contrary to the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice such as detention in overcrowded cells and 'extensive and prolonged' use of 'lockdown' as a punitive measure.

Inner-city communities in Jamaica are marked by disproportionately high levels of physical decay, high unemployment rates and inadequate access to basic services such as water, electricity and housing. Many have been neglected by the state for years and have become 'garrison' communities where gangs use fear and intimidation to control residents and access to the limited available services. There are reports of discrimination and stigmatization of residents of such areas by the police and other public officials.

CHALLENGES TO NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP

Organizations representing the private sector have not participated in national social partnership processes, preferring a direct relationship with the government. The Private Sector Organization of Jamaica (PSOJ) recently published a document on the way forward for Jamaica and is pressing

the government to engage private-sector organizations in dialogue on this vision, separately from the broader social partnership. This PSOJ initiative poses the risk of fragmented governance, dealing separately with special interest groups. This development seems unfortunate, particularly since the Jamaican private sector has been the beneficiary of over 2,000 tax exemptions, unrelated to any formal partnership agreements with the government.

The recent IMF agreement indicates that these exemptions should be drastically reduced, since they account for significant foregone revenues, but have yielded little demonstrated benefit in creating a competitive and productive economy. For example, the World Economic Competitiveness Report for 2010-2011 listed Jamaica with a score of 3.85, a mark of 32 percent and a world rank of 95 with a low grade of F overall in international competitiveness.

The low performance ratings for both the state and the private sectors in Jamaica reinforce the view that a new governance arrangement, setting output targets for both sectors and in partnership with labour unions and other non-state actors, is necessary for economic and social progress in the country. This would suggest that international development partners could usefully concentrate on helping Jamaica's private and public sectors to move towards higher grades in the global indices of competitiveness, which will be necessary if the country is to achieve its development goals.

SUMMARY OF GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES

Jamaica clearly faces significant challenges concerning governance. These include the need to improve the effectiveness of central and local government; ensure law and order; restore confidence in the police and judicial systems; and reduce gender-based discrimination and violence. These pressing needs provide the context for UNDP priorities and activities in its governance-support programme.

⁸ Ibid.

2.3 FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POVERTY-RELATED CHALLENGES

The national economy presents major development challenges. The real growth rate declined from 1.4 percent in 2007, through -0.6 percent in 2008 to -4 percent in 2009.⁹ Remittances, tourism and bauxite account for over 85 percent of foreign exchange. Coupled with reliance on imports, particularly oil, food and consumer goods, this makes the economy extremely vulnerable to external shocks, as currently shown by the initial impact of the global economic crisis. Already, this has contributed to increased inflation, falling remittances, heavily discounted tourism prices to keep market numbers stable and returns from bauxite that have declined sharply, since three of the four bauxite/alumina companies suspended operations in 2009.¹⁰ According to the government's Labour Force reports, there were 14,750 job losses in other sectors from October 2008 to May 2009. These major disruptions to the economy must be placed in the context of a decline in official development assistance due to Jamaica's middle income categorization.

The adverse economic trends have been exacerbated by the long-term problem of Jamaica's heavy indebtedness. In 2007 its debt-to-GDP ratio was 111.3 percent, which was the fourth highest in the world. This had risen to around 140 percent by November 2010. Debt servicing consumed 56.5 percent of the 2009/2010 budget. Faced with this extreme financial adversity, the government made radical responses in an attempt to redress the situation. It concluded a 26-month stand-by structural adjustment agreement with the IMF, which is expected to restructure the financial architecture and restore confidence in the country's long-term prospects, thereby encouraging banking and investment support.

An important additional factor is the high labour market share of the informal sector. Estimated at more than 40 percent of the economy¹¹, this poses significant challenges for the state. From a government perspective, the sector represents substantial under-collection of taxes. From the informal workers' perspective, the absence of legal status means there is no access to many types of loans, no technical support, no participation in the National Insurance Scheme for social security and no access to National Housing Trust loans. If this sector's contribution to the GDP was properly assessed, it is likely that Jamaica's GDP growth may have been considerably underestimated. If it could be incorporated into national financial governance, it could substantially increase state capacity to reduce official debt, while enhancing resources to provide for education, health and other social services and infrastructural development.

The economic and financial situation has adversely affected living standards in the country. After many years of favourable trends, the prevalence of poverty has increased in recent years, from 12.3 percent in 2008 to 16.5 percent in 2010. Slightly more males than females are in poverty. In terms of geographical distribution, males in urban areas and females in rural areas are more susceptible.

According to Jamaica's national report to the UN Economic and Social Council,¹² the country is making good progress towards eight out of its 14 MDG targets for 2015. The achievements are in reduction of absolute poverty (but only until the current global economic crisis affected Jamaica, so this may need to be re-assessed), reduction of malnutrition and hunger, and attainment of universal primary education. However, recent developments since the global

⁹ U.S. Department of State, 'Background Note: Jamaica', Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Washington DC, August 2010.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ See, for example, Inter-American Development Bank, 'The Informal Sector in Jamaica', Economic and Sector Study Series RE3-06-010, Washington DC, 2006.

¹² Government of Jamaica, 'National Report of Jamaica on Millennium Development Goals for the UN Economic and Social Council Annual Ministerial Review', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.

economic downturn show that for poverty, the achievement may be fragile. In the area of education, Jamaica has a problem with quality, which threatens results from the improving coverage. In those target areas where Jamaica is on track – combating HIV/AIDS, halting and reversing the incidence of diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis, access to reproductive health, and provision of safe drinking water and basic sanitation – gains appear more durable, despite remaining challenges.

Jamaica lags in the areas of gender equality and environmental sustainability. On gender equality, the challenges include male under-performance in education and the persistence of a higher rate of unemployment for women, despite their educational gains. To move towards environmental sustainability will require dealing with inefficient energy production and oil dependency, improving protection of biodiversity and habitat, especially coastal areas and, critically, achieving policy coherence so that sector policies are not working at cross purposes.

Where Jamaica is far behind global reduction targets – for child and maternal mortality – it is recognized that this is partly because the country already has comparatively low mortality rates and further gains are mainly dependent on increased financial, technological and human resources.

Perhaps the greatest concern is around the challenges of low standards of urban shelter and communities. The proportion of the urban population living in poor conditions or slums remains unacceptably high. It is noted that monitoring of this situation is inadequate, as the annual national household survey does not measure this, relying instead on UN agencies for information on slippage behind targets. The implications in this area can negatively impact performance on all the other MDGs.

GENDER

Gender is a cross-cutting issue in all aspects of social and economic life in Jamaica; it relates both to poverty and to such governance issues as justice, violence and human rights. Gender roles limit the realization of the full potential of both males and females. Gender equality means that women and men have equal rights, entitlements and opportunities. Equality is rights-based.¹³ The Gender Development Index for Jamaica has not changed through the years but, as many other countries have improved in this area, Jamaica's rank has slid back from 62nd position globally to 81st position. The gender empowerment index introduced in 2010 is 0.638 and places Jamaica 84th globally.

Looking at the main gender issues, women have made considerable progress in Jamaica, but males have fallen behind in the education and health systems and are more susceptible to violence. Males are disproportionately represented in prisons, juvenile centres and other correctional services. They present late for treatment of illness and therefore seek help at a more advanced stage of sickness. Females out-perform males at every level of the educational system. In spite of this, their superior qualifications are not reflected in the labour market, where males have lower unemployment rates, earn higher wages and occupy higher professional and managerial levels.

SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POVERTY-RELATED CHALLENGES

After many years of steady poverty reduction, Jamaica is faced with a sharp reversal of this progress. The reversal is associated with the country's persistent economic decline, unsupportable debt-servicing payments and the more recent effects of the global economic downturn on the mainstays of the economy, such as tourism and mineral extraction. These provide the context within which the current UNDP programme has operated.

¹³ Athill, Catherine, et al, 'Gender and Trade: Action Guide', Commonwealth Secretariat, 2007, p.41.

2.4 CHALLENGES IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY SECTOR

Jamaica's natural environment was categorized in 2005 as being extremely vulnerable, when measured using the Environmental Vulnerability Index (EVI) developed by the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Most SIDS have been determined as being either highly vulnerable or extremely vulnerable using the EVI.

The State of the Environment (SOE) Report 2005 indicated that Jamaica's environment is under threat from various sources and that the main productive sectors of tourism, agriculture, manufacturing, mining and quarrying are heavily dependent on the island's natural resources, such as the beaches, sea, scenic beauty, land, mountains, freshwater and air. The report noted further that there is a strong correlation between the state of the environment and the country's vulnerability to natural hazards. Poor environmental practices, such as improper disposal of solid waste, indiscriminate removal of forest cover, poor land-use practices and squatter housing, tend to exacerbate the effects of these natural disasters. This has become a concern given the increased frequency and intensity of tropical storms associated with climate change.

The long-term degradation of Jamaica's watersheds has resulted in downstream damage, including soil erosion, flooding, loss of homes and lives. This damage, coupled with projected increases in storms and hurricanes associated with climate change, shows that the potential for disasters has increased. Furthermore, land-use planning is done with dated development plans, which are not effectively monitored or enforced. In 2001, the Cabinet established the National Integrated Watershed Management Council to provide a considered approach to watershed issues.

In terms of overall environmental management, progress has been made with regard to the establishment of institutions, the development of

policy, legislation and standards, and the banning or phase-out of harmful substances. However, the lack of resources (financial and human), improper planning for development and the general lack of environmental awareness on the part of the citizenry, manifested in unsustainable consumption patterns and irresponsible environmental practices have hindered effective management of the island's natural resources.

The Policy for the National System of Protected Areas, which is contained in Section 5 of the Natural Resources Conservation Authority Act, describes the protected areas system as having a common underlying foundation of environmental protection purposes, and a standardized approach to planning and management. The goals of the protected areas system are expressed as economic development and environmental conservation. Efforts have been made to update the system plan and begin implementation, including quality control and standards. However, the financial sustainability of protected areas is an issue of concern. Some specific wildlife management programmes have been launched, including for game birds, the American Crocodile and the Jamaican Iguana. Some improvements in these populations have been noted.

Jamaica's energy sector faces a number of challenges. The sector is characterized by an almost complete dependence on imported petroleum (which meets over 90 percent of the nation's energy needs); high rates of energy use; inefficient electricity supply systems; and an inadequate policy and regulatory framework. Due to the energy intensity of the aluminium/bauxite industry in Jamaica, per capita energy consumption is high when compared with most developing countries. Approximately 5 percent of the energy supplies mix comes from renewable sources – 4 percent from hydro and 1 percent from wind.

The major response to energy issues has been the development of Jamaica's National Energy Policy. This supports the national Vision 2030 and provides the enabling environment for the achievement of the national outcome of 'a secure and sustainable energy supply for our country'.

It also provides support for the achievement of another national strategy, namely 'to contribute to the effort to reduce the global rate of climate change'. The energy policy also aims to ensure that linkages are established with other sectors such as agriculture, transport, construction, bauxite, and finance to achieve policy coherence and fulfil the country's energy goals.

The Jamaica National Environment Action Plan, drafted in 1995, has been updated in 1999/2000, 2006 and 2009. It has several strategies on aspects of environmental management in Jamaica, including environmental education, national parks, watershed management and forestry reserves.

There is also a Policy on Environmental Management Systems. The objectives of the policy are to articulate the government's commitment to the promotion and use of Environmental Management Systems, establish the roles of the government and private sector and communities in the use of Environment Management System and to put in place the necessary institutional, regulatory and promotional measures to ensure successful uptake of the system. The policy has undergone public consultation.

In the non-governmental sector, three Environmental Trust Funds have been created through Debt-for-Nature Swaps. These are the Jamaica National Parks Trust Fund (now reported to be non-operational), the Forest Conservation Fund and the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica. Funds from these trusts are granted to NGO and Community-based Organization (CBO) groups for various environmental and child welfare projects across the island.

SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES IN ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Key aspects of the context for UNDP Jamaica's work in the environment and energy sector therefore include: the importance of improving the efficiency of energy use for environmental and economic reasons, and the need to develop effective natural resource management systems, to ensure sustainable use of biodiversity and prevent watershed degradation, which can result

in downstream impacts such as slope destabilization and flooding.

2.5 CHALLENGES IN THE AREA OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT

The Common Country Assessment 2006–2010 identified disaster risk reduction as a major cross-cutting theme, on the basis that sustainable development cannot be achieved unless disaster risk reduction is mainstreamed into development policies, planning and implementation. Critical issues identified in relation to disaster risk reduction included expansion of development (particularly housing) into disaster-prone areas, increasing frequency and destructive capabilities of disaster events (exacerbated by the effects of climate change); the unmanageable costs associated with disaster mitigation, management and redevelopment; the need for extensive capacity building and for improved coordination between local and national levels of the disaster management system, to effectively deal with disasters; and the disproportionate impact of disasters on society's most vulnerable members.

In recognition of the linkages between disaster mitigation and environmental conservation, Jamaica's Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management (ODPEM) was located within the Ministry of Land and Environment. This ministry no longer exists and ODPEM now reports to the Office of the Prime Minister. Furthermore, a national environmental education action plan was formulated to incorporate environmental education into school curricula through to tertiary level. Steps have also been taken to address deforestation, biodiversity loss, watershed destruction and waste management.

SUMMARY OF CHALLENGES IN DISASTER MANAGEMENT

Disaster management, including disaster risk reduction and disaster response, therefore pose substantial challenges to the country in terms of protecting life, property and the economy, providing a range of potential entry points for UNDP support activities.

2.6 THE OVERALL NATIONAL RESPONSE TO DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES: NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

Jamaica has recently embarked on its first long-term development plan, Vision 2030 Jamaica: National Development Plan. Its overarching aim is to transform the country from a middle-income development country to a developed country by 2030. Vision 2030 is built on four strategic goals reflecting the economic, environmental, governance and social areas:¹⁴

Goal 1 - A society empowered to achieve its fullest potential

Goal 2 - A secure, cohesive, orderly and just society

Goal 3 - A prosperous economy

Goal 4 - Development in harmony with the natural environment.

Vision 2030 is being implemented in a series of three-year policy frameworks, referred to as the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (MTF). The country is currently in its first MTF (2009-2012), which addresses a set of priority areas and supporting areas.¹⁵ The six priority areas embrace security and safety; stable macro-economy; strong economic infrastructure; energy, security and efficiency; world-class education and training; and

effective governance. The five supporting areas include an enabling business environment; internationally competitive industry structures; hazard risk reduction and adaptation to climate change; effective social protection; and authentic and transformational culture.

Vision 2030 and the related MTF form a major part of the development context within which UNDP Jamaica operates and to which it responds.

2.7 INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

In the current decade, the major international development partners have included the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the European Commission and the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB).

Early in the decade, bilateral donors were far larger than multilaterals, but their contribution began to decline in 2005. By 2007, multilateral donors made a much larger contribution. The major contributors now are the European Union, IDB and the World Bank, while the UN in general and UNDP specifically are extremely small players in financial terms.

¹⁴ Government of Jamaica, 'Vision 2030: Jamaica National Development Plan,' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.

¹⁵ Government of Jamaica, 'Medium-term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (2009-2012),' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009. <<http://www.vision2030.gov.jm/Portals/0/MTF/MTFFinalWeb2.pdf>>

CHAPTER 3: UNDP'S RESPONSE AND STRATEGIES

3.1 THE EVOLUTION OF UNDP'S COUNTRY PROGRAMME STRATEGY

During the 2002-2006 period, the Country Programme Document focused on three programme areas, namely poverty eradication, improved governance, and environment and energy.¹⁶ The poverty eradication and governance initiatives supported by UNDP in this programme focused on policy development and greater integration of policy with direct interventions. During this period, UNDP also focused on the need to build government capacity in the areas of project formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. As UNDP supported the formulation of the MDG report and the national human development report (NHDR), the need to enhance communication and advocacy of development strategies and planned outcomes became clear. Two main lessons emerged. First was the need to engage decision-makers and those at the highest levels of government from the inception. That strategy would ensure that global methodologies and development tools were adapted to transform national policy and development processes. Second, policy-level action must be supported by effective interventions at the institutional and community levels.

For the current CPD, 2007-2011, UNDP assistance focused on three key national priorities, namely: (a) HIV/AIDS; (b) environment and

poverty; and (c) justice, peace and security. The country programme has two primary areas of focus – crisis prevention and management, and energy and environmental security – through which poverty, governance, environment- and energy-related programming inputs and assistance are being delivered.

3.2 COORDINATION WITH THE UN SYSTEM

In addition to UNDP, the following UN system organizations operate in Jamaica¹⁷: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization (PAHO/WHO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Bank, the Joint United Nations Programme for HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) sub-regional Office for the Caribbean. The country has eight resident (three with regional coverage) and five non-resident UN representations.

The UN Resident Coordinator (RC), who is also UNDP Resident Representative, has numerous responsibilities, including¹⁸:

¹⁶ United Nations, 'DP/CCF/JAM/2, Second Country Cooperation Framework for Jamaica (2002-2006),' Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, New York, 7 November 2001.

¹⁷ United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment (CCA) 2006-2010: Jamaica,' UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2006, p.15.

¹⁸ See 'UN Resident Coordinator Generic Job Description' (UNDG Approved Document); <<http://www.undg.org/docs/1341/RC-Generic-Job-Description---UNDG-Approved.doc>>.

- ensuring effective support at the request of the government in its coordination of all types of external development assistance, including from the United Nations System (UNS), within the context of national development plans, UNDAF and/or other available poverty reduction frameworks;
- ensuring coordination of UNS operational activities for development, creating a platform of coordinated delivery, and promoting efforts to develop national capacities;
- ensuring effective advocacy of UNS values, standards, principles and activities on behalf of the UNCT with the highest level of government;
- encouraging and supporting national efforts in disaster risk reduction.

In Jamaica, the RC has an important role in helping to coordinate the interests and activities of the international development partners, both within the UNCT and outside it. This role becomes critical in the event of national disasters, which occur with some regularity in the form of hurricanes and tropical storms, where direct damage and flood destruction are often very substantial. The RC is also seen to have a key coordinating role in the international response to civil security issues, which have been prominent in recent years in the country, and where the UN values and political neutrality are recognized as giving it a unique capacity to provide leadership.

Some specific activities in which the RC has played a focal role in Jamaica include:

West Caribbean Donor Group and Other Donor Coordination Groups

The Western Caribbean Donor Group (WCDG) is composed of four UNCT members¹⁹, eight

major donors²⁰, NGOs, national entities and two regional institutions²¹. It was established in 2005 in response to the spate of hurricanes that devastated the region. Covering the entire range of disaster management activities (prevention, mitigation, preparedness, alert, response, recovery) the WCDG is an example of the potential of harmonization where international, regional and national efforts can be effectively integrated.

Other donor coordination groups cover justice and security, growth, education and food and agriculture.

International Development Partners Retreat

The Annual Retreat of the International Development Partners, now past its 15th year²², is another coordination mechanism that incorporates the UNDAF partners. It brings together the GoJ, the entire UN system, and a significant number of bilateral and multilateral institutions on a yearly basis, to address Jamaica's development goals and challenges. Ad hoc meetings are also convened during the year to address specific issues. The UN RC leads this process of coordination between IDPs and the government, which addresses capacity building, provides support for aid coordination and resource management that ensures that external aid is in line with the GoJ Vision 2030 Strategy and the Paris Declaration.²³ Although the IDP Retreat includes a larger number of participants than the UNDAF, it is guided by the same national development priorities. Its working groups are chaired by and include both UN and non-UN members (e.g., USAID chairs the education group) and are flexible enough to adjust to changed circumstances (e.g., natural disasters, global economic recession).

¹⁹ Jamaica (Bahamas, Belize, Bermuda, Turks & Caicos Is., Cayman), Haiti, Dominican Republic, Cuba

²⁰ DFID, CIDA, EU, IDB, OAS, USAID, JICA, WB

²¹ CDB, CDERA

²² CIDA, DFID, China, France, Belgium, Germany, Japan, Venezuela, EC, India, IDB, IICA, JICA, PAHO/WHO, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, USAID, WB, GoJ (MOA, MOE, MOFPS, MOJ, MNS, PIOJ, ODPEM)

²³ Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, 2 March 2005.

THE UNDAF PROCESS

Conceptually, the UNDP country programme is developed on the basis of the UNDAF process, which shapes and coordinates the roles and activities of all UNDP stakeholders. The UNDAF process begins with the Common Country Assessment (CCA), which outlines the development situation of the country, reviews the national priorities and highlights areas in which support from the UN system is expected to make the most effective contribution. Based on this, a Country Cooperation Framework (CCF) is agreed between the country and the UN system. This framework outlines the areas of cooperation and an indicative budget. Detailed consultations are then held among the UN partners operating in the country and the host government, to develop the UNDAF for the next five-year period together with a more detailed, but still indicative budget, since much of the funding will be from non-core resources and will have to be realized during the course of the framework's validity. Based on the UNDAF, UNDP agrees its final Country Programme Document with the government. National planning processes in Jamaica became more specific during the course of the first decade of this century, culminating in the release of the Vision 2030 for the country. Thus, the national priorities for which assistance was sought from the UNCT became more systematically defined.

As part of the preparation process of the CCA and the UNDAF for 2007-2011, UNDP committed to focus its assistance on three key national priorities, namely: (a) HIV/AIDS; (b) environment and poverty; and (c) justice, peace and security. Its country programme has two main building blocks, crisis prevention and management, and energy and environmental security, through which poverty, governance, environment-and-energy-related programming inputs and assistance are being delivered.

The programme strategy to enhance conflict-prevention and reconciliation mechanisms aimed to support local community development plans with links to the development of upstream policies to establish more participatory processes

and involve government officials, private sector, community leaders and civil society. The rights of vulnerable population groups, including at-risk youth and women were to be addressed with life skills training and enhanced advocacy assistance inputs.

Assistance during this ADR period aimed to support government programmes through justice and security sector reform. The key results to be achieved include: (a) publication of the MDG reports and national human development reports; (b) increased capacity of stakeholders to sustain peace and reconciliation mechanisms; (c) development or restoration of sustainable livelihoods in target communities; (d) participatory planning processes that promote social and economic development and increased resilience to hazards for vulnerable communities; (e) increased capacity and opportunities for technical exchange at policy, institutional and community levels; and (f) male youth in targeted communities provided with livelihood, peace building and conflict prevention skills. Promoting citizen security was to be achieved through advocacy and public education promoting rule of law and improving mechanisms for monitoring justice and security sector reform processes. Expected results included: (a) coordinated responses to crime and violence; (b) national surveys on the impact of armed violence and crime; (c) increased access to justice and dispute resolution processes; and (d) restorative justice.

UNDP also aimed to strengthen the capacity of national stakeholders to manage risks due to natural or anthropogenic hazards. Disaster risk reduction interventions were to be targeted at both policy and local levels. The strategy is to mainstream disaster risk reduction approaches into national development processes and strengthen the capacities of key stakeholders to manage natural or anthropogenic hazard crises. UNDP would also support post-event recovery and relief activities; and would mainstream gender and governance across all of its activities.

3.3 UNDP'S PROGRAMMES AND OFFICE ORGANIZATION

PROGRAMMES

As shown in Table 1²⁴, the Jamaica country office has steadily increased its programme expenditures since 2004. Core resources rose steadily until 2007, but fell sharply after then and have not fully recovered. As a proportion of the total, core resources declined sharply after 2006, owing to an increase in external funding. These trends are explained by the details of programme expenditure by practice area (sector), as shown in Table 2. The energy and environment sector, which had been a small part of the overall portfolio during the early period, rose substantially in later years, to comprise more than 50 percent of total expenditure in 2009. This reflects the materialization of substantial funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), much of which had taken some years in processing. Democratic governance expenditure rose from US\$236,000 in 2004 to US\$1,086,000 in 2009. Poverty reduction has fluctuated over the

period covered, with an increase in 2009. The area of crisis prevention and recovery rose in response to specific events and has declined since 2007, to return to its place as the country office's smallest portfolio.

Comparing the overall portfolios for the CPD I (2002-2006) with CPD II (2007-2011), the most striking differences (as shown in Table 3) are in the rapid growth of the energy and environment, and governance portfolios.

The specific country programme outcomes are discussed in Chapter 4, in relation to the CPAP. As to the sources of expended funds, there are substantial differences in the proportion of core funds used by outcome area. Outcomes in the areas of justice and security, conflict prevention and peace building have expended relatively high proportions of core funding. Poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS and disaster risk reduction have used a lower level of core funding. The energy and environment sector, which was the largest in the portfolio in 2009, relied almost entirely on external funds.

Table 1. UNDP Jamaica Country Office Overview						
Expenditure (US\$ Thousands)	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total expenditures	2,758	3,092	2,883	3,980	4,628	6,141
Total programme expenditures	1,480	1,889	1,724	2,719	3,056	4,384
Management expenditures	904	886	838	913	1,152	1,406
CORE resource expenditures	603	805	935	1,084	656	825
Expenditure (as percentage of total expenditures)	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Management expenditures	32.77%	28.65%	29.05%	22.94%	24.89%	22.90%
CORE resource expenditures	21.86%	26.03%	32.43%	27.24%	14.17%	13.43%

Source: Years 2004-2007: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area on March 31, 2011; Years 2008-2009: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area, Programme Overview, Programme Tree data on March 31, 2011.

²⁴ The figures attempt to give a 'broad-brush' overview of the portfolio and of changes in its distribution by areas of practice over time. They were extracted by the ADR team from one set of figures and are not an 'official' country office perspective on expenditures.

Table 2. Programme Expenditure by Practice Area (in US\$ Thousands)

Practice Area	Programme Expenditure					
	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Not Entered	116	257	1,304	286	143	209
Achieving MDGs and reducing poverty	370	514	286	373	298	463
Fostering democratic governance	236	219	0	0	1,156	1,086
E&E for sustainable development	313	575	0	1,179	1,132	2,312
Crisis prevention and recovery	445	324	134	881	327	206
Responding to HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1,480	1,889	1,724	2,719	3,056	4,276

Source: Years 2004-2007: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area on March 31, 2011; Years 2008-2009: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area, Programme Overview, Programme Tree data on March 31, 2011.

Table 3. Resources Allocated by UNDP Country Office to Thematic Areas by Programming Cycle (in US\$ Thousands)

Practice Area	CPD I (2002-2006) Programme Expenditure 2004-2006	CPD II (2007-2011) Programme Expenditure 2007-2009
Not Entered	1,677	638
Achieving MDGs and reducing poverty	1,170	1,134
Fostering democratic governance	455	2,242
E&E for sustainable development	888	4,623
Crisis prevention and recovery	903	1,414
Responding to HIV/AIDS	0	0
Total	5,093	10,051

Source: Years 2004-2007: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area on March 31, 2011; Years 2008-2009: Executive Snapshot, Financial Details by Practice Area, Programme Overview, Programme Tree data on March 31, 2011.

3.4 COUNTRY OFFICE MANAGEMENT

The programme in Jamaica started in 1976 with the signing of the UNDP-Government of Jamaica Standard Basic Assistance Agreement. The country office ran into management difficulties in the first decade of the current century, which for a time brought into question its continuing existence. Audits of the country office in 2004, 2006 and 2008 rated it as overall deficient/unsatisfactory on each occasion, due to significant operational shortcomings. The year 2007 represented a major crisis, with no fewer than four Resident Representatives (including two interim RRs) in place. As a result, significant management decisions were delayed or incorrectly made. The auditors made 16 recommendations in 2008 (leaving a total of 26 to be implemented from the set of audits), which the new Resident Representative agreed to implement with support from RBLAC.

Reported deficiencies included programmatic, management and operational dimensions. On the programmatic side, it was noted that few targets within the Multi Year Funding Framework were being achieved, related both to unrealistic

target setting and to implementation delays. The country office was recommended to ensure that its annual target setting was realistic.

In 2008, it was also noted that the shortage of thematic programme officers, notably in the fields of poverty and governance, limited its opportunities to identify new project/programme interventions in fields relevant to UNDAF/CPD areas. These areas included policy dialogue and advocacy for fiscal policy reform and debt reduction, increased social expenditure, social compensation programmes, socio-economic data and security, crime and justice issues. Another area pinpointed for strengthening was that of identifying new sources of funding for programme areas in the CPD. Possibilities to be explored included thematic trust funds (with support from RBLAC), other UN agencies (such as UN Habitat) and the international financial institutions, notably the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank.

The country office also needed to improve the implementation rate of projects, through enhanced support to its national development partners. Measures proposed included additional capacity assessment of institutions to identify their needs for training or technical assistance, and to analyse elements of the portfolio that need to be closed or reprogrammed.

Another substantial issue identified was that of procurement. Some proposals to strengthen these processes included:

- developing a roster of pre-qualified suppliers and consultants, both local and international;
- ensuring that a performance evaluation is completed for suppliers of goods and services;
- maintaining data and statistics on supplier performance and procurement processes managed by the country office.

In 2009, further audit showed that of the 26 earlier recommendations, the country office had fully implemented 21 and initiated action on five recommendations, resulting in an implementation rate of 90 percent. It can therefore be seen that, to a substantial extent, the new country office management after the crisis years had successfully responded to reported deficiencies and was largely compliant with country office audit standards. Indeed, by December 2010, the country office had conformed to all 26 recommendations.²⁵ Most importantly, in conformity with the recommendation of earlier audits, the three main operational areas of poverty, governance and environment and energy all had a functional level of staffing. Recently, there have been further changes. The Small Grants Programme (SGP) coordinator and assistant have been moved to an independent office within a national hosting institution. A part-time disaster risk reduction adviser has been added to the energy and environment team.

3.5 REGIONAL SUPPORT

During the previous regional programme cycle (RCF II), support from RBLAC was focused on three thematic areas²⁶: (a) poverty, inequality reduction, and achievement of the MDGs; emphasis on strengthening statistical systems; creation and consolidation of knowledge networks; and technical advisory services for the inclusion of international commitments in development plans and strategies; (b) democratic governance through the creation and dissemination of a conceptual framework regarding the state of democracy and its challenges; the programme also developed methodologies and instruments of analysis, consensus building and dialogue to strengthen democratic processes; and provided policy options to strengthen the democracies of the region; and (c) energy and climate change through programmes in energy provision for the poor, climate change, biodiversity and water and sanitation.

²⁵ Country office comments on the draft ADR, March 2011, based on assessment of corporate audit monitoring tool (CARDS).

²⁶ See UNDP, 'Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Programme Document (2008-2011)', RBLAC, 2008, pp.5-6.

The RCF III programme concentrates on regional initiatives through the following services: (a) demand-driven technical and policy advice for the formulation and implementation of public policy; (b) knowledge management, including the development of conceptual frameworks in key areas, systematization and dissemination of good practices; and development of tools for policy advice, programme support and capacity development; (c) analysis and advocacy of key challenges facing the region and its sub-regions, together with recognized research centres and specialists; (d) development and management of projects and programmes in the four focus areas, including support to national projects; (e) at the request of governments, creation and facilitation of spaces for dialogue and consensus-building, including support to national and local processes and assuring civic engagement; (f) development of effective partnerships with the full range of development actors, with a particular emphasis on other United Nations entities, strengthening the UNDP contribution to coordination of the United Nations system in the region.

Three cross-cutting work areas form the basis of all interventions of the RBLAC regional programme document 2008-2011: (a) The promotion of gender equity and equality, (b) developing capacities and

fostering national ownership, which is at the core of the UNDP approach to development and; (c) fostering South-South cooperation as an instrument for joint work, capacity development and exchange of experiences.²⁷

In environment and sustainable development, regional support now focuses on protecting strategic eco-systems, biodiversity and supporting adaptation to climate change. The programme will also sustain policy dialogue and provide advice on the threats to ecosystems, including the impact of climate change, the promotion of eco-businesses, payment for environmental services schemes, and the establishment of market instruments as options to adapt to and mitigate its effects. It will also deliver policy advice to governments on climate-change adaptation and mitigation policies and promote convergence between initiatives that reduce greenhouse emissions and initiatives that preserve biodiversity, including forest conservation. Systematization of good practices on the use of renewable energy sources will continue with particular focus on poor rural areas. Policy dialogue is facilitated on incentives and regulations against the effects of greenhouse gases and the need to count on a greater proportion of clean and renewable energy sources.²⁸

²⁷ Ibid, p.6.

²⁸ Ibid, p.8

Chapter 4

CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

The CPAP identified seven outcomes to be achieved during the 2007–2011 period. Six of these were under the priority area of crisis prevention and management. This very broad area was sub-divided among the democratic governance, poverty reduction and disaster risk reduction portfolios and the responses to the intended outcomes are analysed under those headings. One intended CPAP outcome aimed to support national efforts in the field of HIV/AIDS, through ‘Evidence-based advocacy strategy and tools in place and effectively implemented with gender differentiated focus’. The intended deliverable was a socio-economic impact study of AIDS. This remained on the programme budget until 2008, but faded from the picture in that year and nothing was implemented.

The development challenges in the programme areas were identified in Chapter 2. The contribution of UNDP activities to development results is addressed in this chapter.

4.1. POVERTY REDUCTION

Priority Area: Crisis prevention and management (conflict prevention and peace-building)

CPAP Outcome 3.1: *Reduction in the incidence of poverty and unemployment and exclusion among vulnerable groups and selected communities, particularly in rural Jamaica. (Poverty portfolio)*

Table 4 lists the five projects reviewed under UNDP’s poverty programme.

Award	Award Start and End Year	Implementing Partner	Project Status	Approved Budget²⁹ (US\$)	Total Expenditures (US\$)
Promotion of MDGs and Human Development in Jamaica	2007-2011	PIOJ	Ongoing	\$901,398	\$625,160
UNDP Response to the Economic Crisis	2009-2010	UNDP	Complete	\$88,350	\$88,350
Rural Youth Employment Project	2010-2013	SRC	Initiating	\$215,108	\$6,869
Strategic Flexible Funding Facility	2008-2011	PIOJ	Ongoing	\$588,585	\$416,000
Support to Development of National Statistical System	2009-2012	STATIN	Initiating	\$173,691	\$0

²⁹ This figure shows the cumulative yearly budgeted amounts up to the time of this assessment.

Of the five projects, at the time of data collection:

- one project, UNDP Response to the Economic Crisis, is complete;
- two projects, Rural Youth Employment Project (RYEP) and Support to Development of National Statistical System (NSS) are just getting started;
- two projects, Promotion of MDGs and Human Development in Jamaica and Strategic Flexible Funding Facility are well underway.

An overview of the poverty reduction portfolio is provided below.

SUMMARY OF THE POVERTY REDUCTION PORTFOLIO

Relevance

All of the projects were relevant to Jamaica's anti-poverty strategies, as outlined in Vision 2030 and the Medium Term Plan. UNDP's stated outcome of this portfolio of projects, 'reduction in the incidence of poverty,' was directly supported by only one of the five projects, covering rural youth employment, which is an important focus of government policies. Three of the other four projects offered support for public policy, namely, Promotion of MDGs, Flexible Funding Facility, and Response to the Economic Crisis. These are expected to indirectly enhance the GoJ's capacity to provide resources for programmes addressing the needs of the poor and vulnerable. The remaining project, Support for the National Statistical System, is intended to strengthen the GoJ in the areas of policy-making and project and programme monitoring.

Overall, the broad objectives of the projects qualify them rather as a programme for economic management than as one that directly addresses poverty, although there is clearly a relationship between the two. There is an underlying assumption, for example, that if the government spends less on debt repayments, it will expend more on poverty reduction efforts. However, there appears to be no empirical verification of this process.

Efficiency

Projects were affected by delays in implementation, sometimes to a considerable extent. The two main reasons were:

- delays in the granting of permission to open special bank accounts to receive project funds (Strategic Flexible Funding Facility, NSS);
- difficulties in recruiting consultants or getting studies completed (Strategic Flexible Funding Facility, RYEP, MDGs).

The first of these results from UNDP requirements for a separate project bank account and the government regulations requiring Ministry of Finance permission for ministries to open such accounts. The second reason derives from poor availability and affordability of specialized consultancy skills and knowledge locally and internationally.

Effectiveness

Since only one project is completed, Response to the Economic Crisis, referred to as the JDX project, it is difficult to assess the overall effectiveness of this portfolio. This project is viewed as effective in terms of its direct goals, since it made a valuable contribution in enabling the government to ease the difficulties it faced in servicing the national debt repayments. It has been estimated that this small intervention saved the Jamaican Government some US\$450 million per annum in debt repayments. However, any attempt to assess it in terms of outcome 3.1, 'Reduction in the incidence of poverty, unemployment and exclusion among vulnerable groups and selected communities, particularly in rural Jamaica', would be highly speculative. This would require evidence that the resources saved because of improved debt management have been used in pursuit of poverty reduction and that they have been effective in achieving that objective. These conditions cannot be met.

The two projects that are well underway, the Promotion of MDGs and Human Development in Jamaica and the Strategic Flexible Funding Facility, are both judged effective within the

perspective of their goals. However, both have primarily contributed to 'upstream' activities, such as studies and development of policy documents and their contribution to outcome 3.1 cannot be realistically assessed.

With regard to the two projects that have just started, the implementing body of the Rural Youth Employment Project, the Scientific Research Council (SRC), expressed some reservations concerning the final design of the project, which may reduce its effectiveness if not overcome. It seems that the SRC had discussed involvement in a modest pilot project, but that UNDP scaled this up to match improved funding availability. The SRC expressed the fear that the management of such a large project covering four parishes would challenge its management capacity. The other project, with the Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN), has been subject to substantial start-up delays. These may reduce project effectiveness, unless the project duration is extended to take account of them.

Concerning the effectiveness of UNDP partnerships in this area, the PIOJ is the primary partner in implementing the poverty reduction projects. However, through the mechanism of the project board, UNDP has a range of secondary partnerships around each project, which includes government agencies and NGOs. For example, the implementation of Rural Youth Employment Project in four selected parishes is supported by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, and four state entities (Rural Agricultural Development Agency (RADA), the Social Development Commission (SDC), the National Youth Service (NYS) and 4H³⁰). In addition, the project seeks private-sector partners for enterprises established by the youths who have successfully completed its training programmes. Already, Caribbean Broilers, one of the two major poultry processing companies, has indicated its interest in participating.

Similarly, the project steering committee for the Support to the Development of the National Statistics System is led by STATIN and includes a range of government agencies, such as the PIOJ, the Cabinet Office, and several other ministries. In addition, the project will consult with other national bodies and the general public.

The current UNDP country office leadership and programme staff are positively regarded by development partners in the field of poverty. The UNDP Jamaica office is recognized as flexible, facilitating, cooperative, supportive, in tune with the needs of the GoJ, and efficient. The improved relationship with its stakeholders, compared to the recent past, has thereby promoted awareness of its potential to play a more significant role, both at the level of policy formulation and intervention. Certainly, a strengthened role for UNDP as coordinator of support from IDPs to address poverty-related issues is one supported by partners in national ministries and agencies, as well among IDPs themselves.

Sustainability

The sustainability of the results of the projects targeting the GoJ's capacity for managing the economy, implementing the MDGs and formulating and monitoring social policy depends on the creation of fiscal space in the medium to long run. This has been a major challenge for the GoJ for several years. Studies, including the Public Investment Prioritization Framework (2009), the Tax Expenditure Study for Jamaica (2009) and the Debt Exchange Programme³¹ funded by the Flexible Funding Facility have contributed to the GoJ's improved management of public finances. The Response to the Economic Crisis project made a major contribution in enhancing the GoJ's debt management, and in particular, the successful implementation of the Jamaica Debt Exchange programme. Sustainability will depend on how well the gains from these projects are maintained and enhanced by the GoJ's management of its fiscal resources.

³⁰ 4H is an organization for the practical training of rural youth in agriculture and related skills.

³¹ See, for example, UNDP, 'Jamaica's Debt Exchange: Discussion Paper', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, May 2010.

The sustainability of the benefits of the Rural Youth Employment Project will rely on the continuing commitment of the young entrepreneurs trained, the recovery of the economy and the sustained support of its partners, such as the RADA, the SDC and the 4H. The support of these agencies will ultimately depend on the GoJ resources, and in this sense, the sustainability of this project will also depend on the GoJ's improved fiscal management.

In light of the increasing poverty rate in Jamaica from 14.3 percent in 2006 to 16.5 percent in 2010, and UNDP's long-term support for socio-economic development and short-term support for weathering and recovering from the global economic crisis of 2008, it is clear that there is considerable scope for UNDP to increase its support for poverty-related activities in the country. The ADR team found that the following approaches offer potential opportunities for enhanced engagement:

- *Articulate a more coherent programme of poverty projects within the UNDP portfolio.* The underlying unity of the portfolio of poverty projects should focus more clearly on direct impact on the lives of the poor; whether in support of building capacity for poverty policy, such as the Promotion of MDGs project, or by direct intervention, such as the Rural Youth Employment Project.
- *Enhance the coordination of the poverty projects of the IDPs with UNDP's projects.* UNDP's current strong reputation with government ministries and agencies and the benefits the GoJ will derive from more coordination of the IDPs, indicate that there is great potential for UNDP's 'honest broker role' as coordinator of the poverty programmes of IDPs, and thereby leveraging resources committed by the IDPs for a more coherent thrust against poverty by the international community.
- *Coordinate development of an IDP programme to support the GoJ articulating a new poverty policy and an associated programme of measures to reduce poverty.* The sharp increase in the poverty rate requires a revised policy response from the GoJ. The government is now in a better position to articulate a revised poverty policy and to formulate relevant projects because of the improved statistical basis for decision-making that has come out of the Promotion of MDGs project, and is anticipated from the Support to the National Statistical System project. In addition, the long-term plan, Vision 2030, and the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework, will imbue the new policy and the associated projects with the appropriate holistic development perspective in ways that previous poverty policies lacked.
- *Increase UNDP's support for poverty policy.* Although this is clearly an area in which UNDP Jamaica's role could and should be scaled up, the proposal runs into the barrier of the small scale of the country office's core funding. Since poverty and governance are both cross-cutting, and since issues of governance bear directly on poverty, one possibility would be to re-allocate resources (relatively) away from the governance theme to poverty, while addressing some of the governance issues that impact directly on poverty. However, the ADR team found that UNDP governance activities are positively assessed within the country and that they are not in any sense over-resourced, so that there is little scope for any re-allocation. This implies that UNDP Jamaica should therefore continue to focus its attention on raising additional resources from its IDPs in the field of poverty policy and programmes.

4.2 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Priority Area: Crisis prevention and management (justice and security sector reform)

Outcome 5.1: *Improved governance and enhanced sectoral and inter-sectoral response to social justice, instability and insecurity. Government assisted to meet its international obligations and review its legislation accordingly.*

Priority Area: Crisis prevention and management (justice and security sector reform)

Outcome 5.2: *Awareness of and respect for rule of law increased among decision-makers, institutional providers and communities.*

Priority Area: Crisis prevention and management (conflict prevention and peace-building)

Outcome 5.3: *Sustained reduction of violence and social injustice in targeted communities.*

The main activities included in the ADR were:

- The Jamaica Violence Prevention, Peace and Sustainable Development Programme (JVPPSD)
- Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building
- EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative (which includes three projects)
- Building Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance.

The status of these projects is shown in Table 5.

The stand-alone governance portfolio was established with the splitting of the poverty and governance areas of work in 2008. During the previous CPAP period, some activities related to governance issues had begun and, in some cases,

Table 5. Democratic Governance Projects (as of November 2010)³²

Project	Award Start and End Year	Main Implementing Partner	Project Status	Approved Budget (US\$)	Total Expenditures (US\$)
JVPPSD	2008-2010	Ministry of National Security	Ongoing	\$2,681,377.06	\$2,478,185.01
Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building	2009-2011	Department of Local Government	Ongoing	\$184,000.00	\$111,312.15
EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative J-062 Mitigating the Negative Impact of Migration on the Multi-Generational Household	2009-2011	Hope for Children Development Company	Ongoing	\$140,646.98	Not shown in RBLAC overviews
EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative J-072 Knowledge Networks for Connecting Jamaica	2009-2011	Mona School of Business (UWI)	Ongoing	\$138,904.87	Not shown in RBLAC overviews
EU-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative	2009-2011	Institute of Sustainable Development (UWI)	Ongoing	\$68,023.26	Not shown in RBLAC overviews
Building Civil Society Capacity	2010-2011	Centre for Leadership and Governance (UWI)	Ongoing	\$150,000.00	\$32,921.50

³² All financial figures were extracted from the RBLAC All Projects Awards Overview October 2010. Additional information was provided by the country office (May 2011).

Table 6. Democratic Governance Projects (2004-2007)

Project	Award Number	Project Year
1. ICT Training for Disadvantaged Youth Phase II	00046497	2007-2008
2. Economic & Social Costs of Crime	00042505	2005-2007
3. Civic Dialogue on Democratic Governance	00033046	2002-2005
4. Aid to Refugees Fleeing the Violence in Haiti	00033112	2004
5. Human Resource Development	00035484	2004
6. Gender Training & Research	00013169	2003-2009
7. Drug Abuse Prevention Programme	00036081	2002-2007
8. Educational Planning & Management	00035491	2004-2005
9. Sustainable Development Networking Programme – Phase II	00013167	2002-2008
10. Sustainable Development Networking Programme	00025204	1998-2010
11. UNDP/Microsoft ICT Training for Disadvantaged Youth	00039124	2005-2007

completed. These are shown in Table 6. These activities were either small, or not well known to current programme staff, or both. The ADR therefore focused on the current generation of activities, in which the current team have been substantially involved.

In addition, one major set of activities, the Jamaica Sustainable Peace and Development Programme (JSPD), started in the earlier period. This was scheduled to operate during the 2006-2009 period, but is still listed as ongoing. It provided preparatory inputs for the JVPPSD, which is scheduled to run from 2008 to 2011. The finances of these programmes cannot be readily separated. In the RBLAC Financial Overviews, the JVPPSD is shown as a sub-category of the JSPD. If the two programmes are rolled together, they total some US\$5.2 million in commitments, of which about US\$3.3 million had been expended as of October 2010. The ADR focused mainly on the activities identified as the JVPPSD, with commitments of about US\$1.8 million.

The ADR's assessment of these activities is as follows.

RELEVANCE

The activities of the governance portfolio have been well conceived in terms of addressing issues of high relevance, not to say urgency, for the country. For example, the JVPPSD has focused on a range of critical governance challenges affecting Jamaica. These revolve around violence in communities and are associated with policing, delays in the justice system, drugs and crime. Similarly, the EU-UNDP joint project on Knowledge Networks for Connecting Jamaica and its Diaspora was a relevant and timely project for the country. Its web portal is a very important building block for the newly established Jamaica Diaspora Institute. Its databases, needs assessments of 45 community-based projects and six tertiary level institutions' research of diaspora issues, case studies of best practices of projects in Jamaica supported by the diaspora or seeking

support from the diaspora, and the international research study of best practices in governance were important results of the project. These results have informed national strategies and policies related to more effective engagement with the diaspora.

Overall, the democratic governance projects have been highly responsive to national priorities, both in terms of the government's long-term strategies of Vision 2030 and, even more particularly, in response to various national crises.

EFFECTIVENESS

The JVPPSD is the major project in the portfolio in terms of results to date, since it has had a substantial budget and has built upon earlier activities of the JSPD. Some of its areas of achievement include delivery of courses on small-arms control to law enforcement officers and civil society organizations; capacity strengthening of nearly 600 community representatives on conflict prevention, gender and peace-building issues; capacity strengthening for around 200 government officials on restorative justice; and development of a broad and effective range of partnerships with international and UN agencies, which can provide expert assistance to national partners.

The programme was instrumental in supporting the ministry's thrust toward restorative justice in Jamaica. The introduction of activities in this area in Jamaica is directly in keeping with a commitment of the then administration (carried over into the new administration) to use restorative justice to address the damage being experienced in Jamaican communities affected by crime. It was from the 2002 West Kingston Enquiry that the recommendation to advance restorative justice in Jamaica was made. The Cabinet later gave its approval for the Ministry of Justice to develop an appropriate policy and ensure its implementation. The programme's focus on crime prevention and the efforts to engage a wide cross section of stakeholder groups in its implementation has contributed to the good results. Examples are the usefulness of the Crime

Observatory and the introduction of the Partners for Peace Community of Practice supported by this programme.

The EU-UNDP Knowledge Networks project has good prospects for achieving effectiveness, but also experienced some challenges. It would have benefited from more lead time at the planning stage and funding for pre-project on-site discussions with UK partners, to obtain a better understanding of issues (such as privacy laws in the UK) related to effective delivery of results by the UK partner, which would in turn have improved the results of the Jamaica partner. With regard to the EU-UNDP project on Mitigating the Effects of Migration on Multi-generational Households, despite the early stage of the project a number of effective aspects can already be highlighted. There is heightened awareness of the negative effects of migration among the target beneficiaries, of the level of preparation needed to make migration an effective move and of the shifts in government policy required to limit the push factors for many cases of migration that have poor consequences both for the individual and the family left behind. The programme has also provided opportunities for beneficiaries to explore livelihood opportunities that could address the poverty that is fuelling the drive to migrate.

The Migration for Development Community of Practice has provided an important platform for sharing and learning from the experiences of the project across the world and has proven an effective and innovative initiative.

Overall, the necessity and importance of small but timely and valuable interventions have increased over the past three to four years, to an extent that could not have been anticipated in the CPAP. In order to make funds available for an urgent initiative, the country office on one occasion utilized unspent funds from existing projects, which enabled a grant to be made to the PIOJ to prepare part of the National Transformation Programme. UNDP has played a role in identifying additional partners among GoJ agencies and harnessing their support through

the deployment of its resources to help address urgent national issues. These efforts have been highly appreciated by the PIOJ and ministries of the government.

A number of government stakeholders stated that they have not found it easy to work with non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and that they must give priority to their public-sector obligations and mandate. As a result, UNDP's efforts to promote partnership and democratic participation have not been fully effective in harnessing all relevant stakeholders into a new set of relations to achieve common objectives. In this respect, it cannot be said that UNDP has been at fault, since its scope to change how Jamaican society works is limited.

EFFICIENCY

There have been many hindrances to efficiency in activities in the governance field. For example, the JVPPSD was directly implemented by the governance team of UNDP until the end of 2009 and issued no advances until that time. The initial arrangement was for each of the nine partners³³ to make expenditures and for UNDP to reimburse upon satisfactory documentation. This led to delays in re-imburement. Under a revised system, with the establishment of a fully nationally implemented project, advances were made by the project management established in the Ministry of National Security to carry out activities with the streamlined number of partners (Social Development Commission and Ministry of Justice). However, this does not appear to have resolved the issues, since disbursements are still taking long, diminishing the ministry's ability to deliver activities in accordance with the agreed work plan. The project was efficient in other aspects, notably in stakeholder harmonization and dialogue, reporting systems, oversight by a project board and monitoring and evaluation.

The Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building project also had a difficult start in terms of efficiency. However, its administrative arrangements improved dramatically once additional administrative support was established within the Department of Local Government. The joint European Union-UNDP projects (Knowledge Networks, Supporting Deported Migrants, Mitigating the Effects of Migration on Multi-generational Households) also experienced delays, some of which related to slow administrative systems of UNDP's partner organizations. For the Knowledge Networks activity, the administrative arrangements have generally been efficient, with good support and facilitation from the UNDP office in Jamaica and useful suggestions from the JMIDI-UNDP team in Brussels. In the case of the EU-UN Supporting Deported Migrants project, misunderstandings in contract-signing protocols delayed the first set of funds for the project. Hence, there was a starting setback of more than two months. Since this initial difficulty was ironed out, things have been running in a timelier manner. Concerning the EU-UN project Mitigating the Effects of Migration on Multi-generational Households, the joint partnership approach, in which each partner has responsibility for its own budget and reporting, is innovative but has presented challenges. It will be important to evaluate the lessons learned from this approach, since it has not worked well for the most part.

Overall, in terms of efficiency, there has been consistent difficulty in getting local partners to meet their reporting obligations in a timely manner and in accordance with UNDP procedures. The effect of this deficiency has been to retard the progress of projects, since committed funds cannot be advanced to partners until each pre-established requirement has been met. Unexpended funds have to be returned to UNDP and cannot be held for later disbursement

³³ Ministry of Justice the Ministry of National Security, the Social Development Commission, the Dispute Resolution Foundation, the Women's Resource and Outreach Centre, the Violence Prevention Alliance, the Institute for Criminal Justice and Security, Kingston and St. Andrew Action Forum.

to partners. Therefore, neither the anticipated outcomes nor the expected benefits to groups and communities have generally emerged on schedule.

The UNDP country office responded to this adverse situation by developing processes to encourage compliance and by brokering agreement with its partners on more effective enforcement mechanisms. In the short to medium term, UNDP has addressed the issue by requiring NGOs to bid competitively with other applicants for project support.

This gave the country office a clear basis on which to make a judgment concerning the competence of applicants. In some cases, UNDP assisted NGOs to identify and deploy project managers, partly with the expectation of imparting sustainable capacity to participating bodies and partly to ensure speedier project execution. The steps taken by the country office to achieve stricter accountability for use of resources have led to noticeable improvements in project performance.

SUSTAINABILITY

The initial achievements of the JVPPSD will need to be reinforced and expanded over time. It is likely that partner institutions will need substantial additional support over time if real progress is to be made in the fields of security, peace and justice. For example, the Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building project will require follow-up with local authorities to ensure that the recommendations of the audits conducted are actually implemented. Institution of a follow-up local government accountability project in June 2010 is expected to support sustainability of results. While some of this support may be provided by UNDP itself, it is also desirable and likely that other IDPs will adopt and expand on the innovations made by the programme.

With regard to the EU-UN Knowledge Networks activity area, initial assumptions by the project partners (in Jamaica and the UK) about the participation of research groups on the web portal proved unrealistic and greater

focus was needed on initiating e-discussions on a small number of research questions related to critical migration issues, to ensure sustainability of interest and follow-up. This is being done in the closing stages of the project. In the case of the EU-UN Supporting Deported Migrants project, further activities are anticipated because of its location in the Institute of Sustainable Development. Prospects for the sustainability of results from the project focused on Mitigating the Effects of Migration on Multi-generational Households look good, because its NGO partners have already secured funding support from other agencies to respond to some of its emerging areas for further activities.

Overall, the UNDP projects in this area have gradually acquired a more sustainable focus in the period since 2007. The programme has built on previous country office work in the governance field and has reached the point where the main challenges now concerns ways of cementing, expanding and replicating or taking to higher levels the governance policy commitment; achieving technical gains in building greater capacity; and achieving consistent accountability from local partners.

Another means of enhancing sustainability of results is through UNDP's support to the Community of Practice, 'Jamaica Partners for Peace', which was established in November 2009. This will enable sharing of information on activities in the field and on their results in a systematic fashion, and is expected to promote networking and collaborative developments. It is too early to establish the results of this CoP, but its website had received over 8,000 'hits' as of February 2011, suggesting a solid level of interest in its resources.

Part of a strategy for sustainable results is the ability to anticipate emerging areas in the governance field, for which support will be needed for some years into the future before the government and others are in a position to mainstream them. The ADR found that, although the area of governance has attracted a number of IDPs, some of which

have committed substantial funds in the area, there are also some emerging gap areas that might present new opportunities for the UNDP country office to support relevant and effective initiatives. Two specific potential gaps/opportunities are:

- *Modern Governance Tools and Methods:* The evaluation found that many government stakeholders (at national, local, parish and community levels) lack knowledge about modern or ‘cutting-edge’ strategies to help achieve good governance. One major area is a clear demand for the inclusion of Information Communication Technologies (ICT) as a tool for civil participation and public education. Raising the level of knowledge in Jamaica concerning methods used in contemporary governance (processes, methods and tools for achieving ‘good governance’). The absence of such knowledge may affect national political will to improve practices.
- *Bringing Youth into Governance Processes:* This is of great importance because youth are both the main perpetrators and victims of crime and violence in Jamaica. This is not to say that efforts to address the specific needs of youth are lacking. But these efforts appear to be somewhat ad hoc. There remains a great need for a cohesive and adequately funded programme geared at addressing the challenges of youth marginalization to the governance system. Special attention should also be placed on countering the phenomenon of youth un-attachment (at-risk youth).

4.3 ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY

Priority Area: Energy and environmental security

Outcome 3.3: *Integrated land, coastal zones, water and energy management practices improved.*

In the CPAP, the energy and environmental security portfolio aimed to promote one outcome of ‘Integrated land, coastal zone, water and energy management practices improved’ (outcome 3.3)

through delivery of three outputs: (3.3.1) Institutional capacity strengthened to implement policies and plans, including those that address global climate change issues; (3.3.2) strengthened land, water and sanitation management in targeted communities, including those with high risk of natural hazards; and (3.3.3) energy efficiency in the public sector increased.³⁴ This outcome appears to be a ‘catch-all’ for the sector, rather than a coherent objective that could be programmatically supported, since energy management is not intrinsically connected to the other three aspects, which form an inter-related set.

The ADR faced some difficulties in analysing this outcome. These arose from the fact that all of the ‘outputs’ intended to enable this outcome to be delivered would themselves normally be considered outcomes. An assessment against the stated outcome would be difficult to verify in view of its somewhat ‘catch-all’ nature. On the other hand, verification of achievement against the stated ‘outputs’ is possible and provides a good indication of progress towards the higher order outcome. For this reason, although an ADR would not normally assess output delivery, this is undertaken here in order to assess UNDP’s contribution towards achievement of outcome 3.3.

THE ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY PROJECT PORTFOLIO

The environment and energy portfolio for the UNDP country office contains 16 projects that were active during the period under review (2004–2010). These projects can be categorized in the following sub areas: biodiversity (three), climate change (two), disaster management (two) (covered separately in Section 4.4), environmental management (two), land management (one), persistent organic pollutants (two), watershed management (one), energy (three). Of these projects, five have been completed and are closed or about to be closed; eight projects are running; and three are just being initiated or were delayed in start-up. Table 7 shows the projects included in the review.

³⁴ UNDP, ‘Country Programme Action Plan for Jamaica (2007–2011),’ UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007, pp 23–34

Table 7. Environment and Energy and Disaster Management Projects (as of October 2010)

Award	Award start and end year	Implementing Partner	Project Status	Approved Budget (US\$)	Total Expenditures (US\$)
Emergency Activities Hurricane Ivan	2004-2006	UNDP	Completed	\$198,881	\$105,930
Environment & Disaster Management Unit – Monitoring and Admin. Support ³⁵	2006-2010	UNDP	Ongoing	\$102,298	\$23,013
Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments	2009-2012	NEPA	Ongoing	\$102,669	\$7,693
Preparation of HCFC Phase-Out Management Plan	2009-2010	NEPA	Ongoing	\$93,295	\$3,168
Improved Energy Efficiency & Security	2009-2010	UNDP	Ongoing	\$68,370	\$33,230
Introduction of Renewable Wave Energy Technologies for the Generation of Electric Power in Small Coastal Communities in the Caribbean ³⁶	2010-2011	Ministry of Energy & Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica	Ongoing	\$26,400	\$0
Jamaica National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management	2003-2010	UNDP	Completed	\$214,353	\$191,156
Terminal Phase-Out Management Plan for CFCs	2003-2006	NEPA	Ongoing	\$140,000	No data
Enabling Activities for Jamaica to Develop and Implement the National Implementation Plan for the POPs Convention	2003-2009	NEPA	Completed	\$219,171	\$189,547
Technical Assistance Project Soil & Sterilants in Jamaica	2004-2009	NEPA	Completed	\$53,896	\$21,810
Jamaica Self-assessment for SNC to the UNFCCC	2005-2010	Meteorological Service	Ongoing	\$537,070	\$425,600
Environmental Management in Hospital & Schools Phase 1	2005-2009	PCJ	Completed	\$618,097	\$518,708
Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Areas System ³⁷	2008-2015	UNDP and NEPA	Ongoing	\$7,983,506	\$80,567
Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) in Caribbean SIDS (Regional expenditure)	2006-2011	UNOPS	Ongoing	\$6,899,805	\$4,573,000
Developing Sustainable Land Management to Address Land Degradation in Jamaica	2005-2012	Forestry Department	Significant delays and ongoing	\$188,943	\$60,909
Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of the 3rd National Report (CBD) and Clearing House Mechanism	2008-2010	NEPA	Ongoing	\$337,123	\$111,696

³⁵ This project could not be located.

³⁶ Although the project was awarded to Ministry of Energy/PCJ, the implementing arrangements were changed and approved by GoJ as indicated on the signed project document. NEPA is the implementing partner.

³⁷ This entry reflects two projects with the same name: i) the PPG was implemented by UNDP, 2008-2010, with a budget of US\$162,921, and is now closed; and ii) the Full Size Project being implemented by NEPA, 2010-2015, with a budget of US\$7,820,585, is ongoing.

RELEVANCE

All project activities were in line with the development goals outlined by the GoJ in the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework, as well as with National Development Plan: Vision 2030 Goal Number 4, 'Jamaica has a healthy natural environment'. They were therefore relevant to national needs. The project activities also contributed to UN values in Jamaica as evidenced through supporting the development of policies, Laws and UN Conventions, in particular the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the Montreal Protocol, the Kyoto Protocol, and the Cartagena Convention and associated Protocols.

By far the largest contributor to the portfolio in terms of funds is the Global Environment Facility and the few larger projects are financed from this source. Otherwise, there is a broad spectrum of small activities, rather than a cohesive programme. This relates to the fact that Jamaica has access to several GEF funding envelopes, but to relatively small amounts in each.

EFFICIENCY

UNDP Jamaica has achieved satisfactory scorecard ratings in management efficiency, measured as the ratio of management costs to expenditures. Clearly, this concept of efficiency is somewhat minimalist. Certainly, it cannot be said that the environment and energy portfolio has operated efficiently. Many projects have experienced some form of delay, which frustrates partners and may reduce effectiveness, since projects often have to take short cuts, to try to get back on schedule. The environment and energy programme staff cannot directly address most of the challenges to efficiency.

Few projects seem to avoid contracting delays, because of limited national and regional availability of qualified environmental expertise, as well as administrative hold-ups. For example, the commencement of the Capacity Building

for Sustainable Land Management project was delayed for more than two years after its approval in January 2008. This was due to the recruitment process for the lead land degradation expert, which occurred three times between January 2008 and October 2009, as no suitable candidate could be identified. Under such conditions, implementation can become slow and disjointed. For example, Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System was intended to be implemented from September 2008 to January 2010. The project commenced on time, but there was no head of the environment and energy section until February 2009 and recruitment of project staff did not take place until after that time. The process of approval of the terms of reference by the National Protected Areas Committee also took longer than anticipated. By the end of 2009, only 30 percent of the budget had been spent, and an extension was requested. Delays in obtaining clearance from the National Protected Areas Committee on ToRs for consultant posts also held up implementation. The Biodiversity Add On project was signed in May 2008; the project coordinator arrived in April 2009 and the project work plan was revised. Project activities commenced several months later, and a six-month project extension was approved until January 2010.

The Second National Communication to the UNFCCC faced delays in identifying and hiring project consultants. The belated recruitment of a mitigation expert led to delays in the analysis of mitigation options and preparation of the final report. As a result, the project had to be extended. The Natural Resource Valuation project was scheduled to begin implementation in September 2008, but had only spent 1.3 percent of a budget exceeding US\$500,000 one year later. It went through a long recruitment process for the environmental economics specialist due to the limited expertise available. IWCAM experienced delays in the procurement and installation of stream flow monitoring stations.

Implementation delays affect programme and financial delivery. Between 2007 and 2009, total

annual environment and energy expenditures were below allocated budgets with unspent balances of US\$946,000 (2007), US\$347,000 (2008) and US\$805,000 (2009).³⁸ During this period, UNDP environment and energy expenditures averaged 68.5 percent of the allocated budget. Although the environment and energy portfolio (including disaster risk reduction) now absorbs about half of UNDP's programme budget, it only delivered 3 percent during the first quarter of 2010, well below the delivery rates of the other two practice areas.

A number of factors contribute to this unfavourable situation. GEF funding processes are known to be slow, the preparation of environment projects in UNDP requires inputs from many staff in different locations, both UNDP and government procurement processes are slow and the institutional profile of the environment sector in the Jamaican Government is complex and subject to frequent changes. Regional projects may face even greater hurdles before and during implementation. Almost all environment and energy projects are implemented by national partners under the NEX modality. However, UNDP provides contracting and procurement services in most cases, in lieu of financial advances. Staff workloads, slow administrative processes and the large volume of applications that must be processed for project positions affect performance.

It was reported that a common problem for implementing project activities across the portfolio has been the issue of delays in procurement of goods and services. It will therefore be important for the UNDP country office to assess how its procurement processes can be made more efficient and effective. It would also be vital for the country office to evaluate whether simpler systems could provide sufficient rigour, while easing the difficulties in finding sufficient competition to supply goods and services, which are often limited in Jamaica.

The combination of inconsistent project timelines and implementation delays limit UNDP's ability to build project linkages and encourage synergy.

The communication gaps that several government partners perceive may also affect efficiency.

The almost total dependency of this portfolio on GEF and other non-core funding sources also affects UNDP Jamaica's control over its own programme. In the case of the Montreal Protocol, the existence of several implementing agencies without a central location has led to coordination difficulties for NEPA that UNDP has alleviated in its intermediary role.

The recurrent problems that affect project implementation need to be critically analysed and alternatives considered. Challenges to be addressed include extended contracting delays caused by the limited availability of qualified environmental expertise, over-ambitious project timelines that are exacerbated by recruitment delays, and slow disbursement processes that are attributed to problems with the harmonized cash transfer mechanism. Some of these constraints are systemic and outside the control of the country office. Others reflect externalities that affect UNDP projects across the Caribbean and need to be addressed at a higher organizational level. For example, UNDP's Panama Regional Office has initiated use of a consultant roster, which might be shared with or replicated by the country office. This could facilitate the rotation and cost sharing of specialized expertise among projects addressing common issues or 'topping up' budget lines for international expertise when national or Caribbean-based candidates are not available. Unrealistic project timelines can be partially offset by budgeting additional time to compensate slow recruitment and start-up processes, and by including inception phases to expedite implementation and contracting arrangements in advance. Although the challenges and possible solutions have been under discussion for several years, having been presented in successive audit reports, there appears to have been little progress. Renewed efforts are urgently required in view of the strong negative effects of this issue on the environment and energy portfolio (as well as on most other activities undertaken by the country office).

³⁸ Executive Snapshot V. 4.5: Programme Financial Summary – RBLAC/Jamaica

EFFECTIVENESS

UNDP activities in this area have been conducted with a substantial number of partners who play a critical role in ensuring the effectiveness of the portfolio. Recently, these have included:

- Planning Institute of Jamaica
- National Environment and Planning Agency
- Meteorological Service of Jamaica
- Office of the Prime Minister
- Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management
- Civil society
- Ministry of Energy and Mining
- Forestry Department
- Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica
- Ministry of Health
- Ministry of Education
- University of the West Indies
- NGOs (including the Nature Conservancy, PANOS and the Jamaica Association on Mental Retardation).

Overall, the effectiveness assessment made by the ADR team confirms that made by the recent outcome evaluation of the environment portfolio, commissioned by the UNDP country office.³⁹ Several projects have produced 'outputs' that may contribute to the sectoral outcome.

The largest single set of activities was undertaken under the GEF-financed regional project, IWCAM, which contributed to outputs 1 and 2. This developed an approach to integrated watershed management that has been seen as effective and innovative, and as one likely to be replicated on a wider scale. IWCAM is also the project that has generated the most tangible results at the field level, since several projects are

at an early stage, while others are mainly targeting the upstream level of policies and strategy formation. For example, under output 3, UNDP has supported the Ministry of Energy and Mining in designing new energy policies and action plans.

In recent years, the UNDP Jamaica environment and energy programme has expanded and strengthened, as GEF-funded projects have slowly moved from preparation to implementation phase. This portfolio has become the country office's largest in terms of projects and resources. There is some evidence of progress towards the three outputs that were expected to promote achievement of the environment and energy outcome. UNDP's main contributions to the outcome have been through its support for capacity development and policymaking, partnership building, awareness raising and piloting innovative approaches that inform policy and are in principle replicable.

Looking at the outputs intended to contribute towards outcome 3.3, the following observations of the environment evaluation⁴⁰ have been confirmed and expanded upon by the ADR.

Output 1: Strengthened institutional capacities for policy/plan implementation

UNDP Jamaica has played an effective and important supportive role in the development of energy policies that are central to Jamaica's Vision 2030 and the 2009-2012 Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework. The Energy Initiation Plan provided support to the Ministry of Energy and Mining in the development of the National Action Plan and five sub-policies of the National Energy Policy. The Ministry of Energy and Mining, in order to facilitate sound policy development, established working groups to guide the development of each of the sub-policies – renewable energy, carbon emissions trading, energy conservation, waste and bio-energy. Protocols are being designed to guide energy conservation and efficiency measures for the public sector.

³⁹ UNDP, 'Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective', by Hugo Navajas, UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, June 2010.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p.12.

An Energy Action Plan was completed early in 2010 to implement energy policies, monitor consumption and investigate renewable sources. UNDP support has been instrumental in helping the Ministry of Energy and Mining develop policy positions and implementation strategies on key energy issues and is formally acknowledged in energy policy documents.

The Programme of Environmental Management in Hospitals and Schools conducted audits in hospitals and schools, and demonstrated savings of 15 percent to 30 percent in energy costs and water consumption. It validated an approach to energy efficiency for public institutions that could be replicated for existing facilities and incorporated into the design of new ones. It can therefore be seen as an effective programme.

The IWCAM project has strengthened NEPA's approach to policy and programme implementation. It is now able to approach integrated watershed management from an ecosystems perspective that links conservation to a broader development context and encourages the engagement of local government, farmers groups, community organizations and schools. Activities included sustainable farming, environmental governance and monitoring, waste treatment and recycling, and public awareness. The government plans to apply similar integrated approaches to other watersheds in Jamaica, including the watershed serving the Kingston area. This is a major contribution in a critical area for the environment, with potential to feed into disaster risk reduction. Again, the project can be seen as effective in its 'demonstration' role.

The consultations and assessments held under the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC broadened the Meteorological Service's contacts with line ministries, NGOs and civil society organizations. This led to an innovative awareness campaign with the NGO PANOS in which climate change information and good practices have been incorporated into the music of recognized reggae artists. Although the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC was not completed in time for the

15th Conference of Parties in 2009, the process made a number of important national contributions. UNDP topped up the GEF funding with TRAC resources, which were used to add an advocacy and communication component. That in turn facilitated a series of high-level roundtable dialogue sessions, which assisted in the preparations of the Jamaican delegation to Copenhagen.

An early UNDP contribution to policy implementation had been made by the National Capacity Self Assessment for Global Environmental Management, which covered climate change, biodiversity and desertification and was undertaken with NEPA in 2003. In biodiversity, this contribution has increased with the commencement of other GEF-funded projects. Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System will assist NEPA and other institutions in implementing elements of the master plan for the national system of protected areas. Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of the 3rd National Report (CBD) and Clearinghouse Mechanism was a biodiversity add-on project that assisted in the preparation and submission of the report, upgraded the mechanism and prepared documentation on indigenous knowledge, which will be used to design a comprehensive capacity development programme for biodiversity conservation and management. Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management held its start-up meeting in June 2010. It aims to incorporate a sustainability dimension within Jamaica's national Land Use Policy, drawing on a set of pilot projects.

UNDP's activities concerning improvements to institutional systems in the environment and energy sector can therefore be regarded as effective overall, with some limitations to achievement, largely attributable to delays and inefficiencies in the overall system.

Output 2: Improved practices in integrated land, water and coastal area management

IWCAM has demonstrated innovative watershed management practices that build local capacity and apply ecosystem principles. An integrated approach was piloted in Portland parish, reaching over 7,000

households. There were initiatives in training and infrastructure support for solid waste management, environmental monitoring, community clean-ups, awards for community and school sanitation, improved farming techniques, waste recycling, and the creation of a stakeholders group with planning and oversight functions. An environment centre will be created to offer information on IWCAM initiatives and sustain activity after the project has finished. It is too early to measure the project's contribution to the condition of the watershed, so in this sense effectiveness is difficult to verify. However, the process was valued by government partners at NEPA and the PIOJ, who consider that the IWCAM experience provides a working model for Jamaica's 23 watersheds. In March 2010 a memorandum of understanding was signed among government agencies to apply the IWCAM model in future initiatives.

The GEF-supported Small Grants Programme (SGP) has helped many small-scale organizations to pursue environmental and sustainable development objectives. For example, the Jamaica Conservation Development Trust introduced agro-forestry, organic coffee cultivation and other income-generating activities in rural communities in the Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park. Such initiatives have made a small-scale contribution towards lowering the threat of biodiversity loss from logging within the protected area, while encouraging local 'buy-in' to conservation goals. This type of approach has the potential for incorporation into the management plans of other protected areas. A GEF-SGP award for the Jamaica Association on Mental Retardation has enabled the Kingston facility to meet part of its food needs, by rehabilitating hillsides with used tyres placed along contour lines and using composting techniques. Initial attempts to sell aromatic herbs were successful but business training is needed, as well as drip irrigation to offset seasonal drought.

Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management is supporting small demonstration projects on sustainable land use and rehabilitation of degraded mining sites. These will inform the design of a national Land Management Plan,

with chances for replication on a wider scale. This project has not yet produced results and its effectiveness cannot be judged, since it has been affected by inefficiencies. Similarly, although the implementation of Incorporating Natural Resource Valuation Tools into Environmental Impact Assessment Procedures (NRV) has been stalled by delays, it is expected to strengthen NEPA's capacity for making informed decisions on licensing and permit applications. It could also provide inputs for future carbon emissions and PES (payment for environmental service) initiatives that are under consideration.

Output 3: Energy efficiency in the public sector

The Programme in Environmental Management in Hospitals and Schools conducted energy audits in 22 hospitals and eight schools and installed solar water heating systems in three hospitals. Project activities demonstrated savings of 25 percent to 30 percent in energy costs for hospitals and 10 percent to 15 percent savings in water consumption. According to a tripartite review report, the project exceeded its objectives and raised public interest in solar energy. The planned installation of renewable energy systems in 22 hospitals could generate eligibility for carbon credits, according to project reports. However, the costs are significant and the financing mechanism has not been determined. The project was therefore effective in its demonstration potential, although the extent of follow-up cannot be predicted.

The Terminal Phase Out Management Plan was funded by the Montreal Protocol and implemented by the National Ozone Unit of NEPA, with the National Ozone Commission forming the steering committee. Under this plan, 22 institutions received awards to help replace or retrofit CFC refrigeration equipment. The project has already reduced use of CFCs and the management plan is expected to completely phase out CFCs in Jamaica. As of this year, no new imports of CFCs are allowed into the country, in compliance with control measures set by the Montreal Protocol. The project was therefore very effective in meeting its objective.

In terms of partnerships, UNDP's most immediate relationship is with the PIOJ, which is its main counterpart. NEPA implements over half the environment and energy projects (under the NEX modality). NEPA's regulatory and coordination mandate opens access to other stakeholders, and it has considerable institutional memory and project implementation experience. UNDP has also developed a programme niche in energy efficiency and security that has strengthened relations with the Ministry of Energy and Mining and the Jamaica Petroleum Corporation's Centre of Excellence in Renewable Energy. National partners confirmed to the ADR team that they value the role and assistance of the UNDP country office in managing environment and energy initiatives in Jamaica. They indicated that its greatest asset is its flexibility and responsiveness to their needs.

To coordinate the implementation of Vision 2030 Jamaica and other development activities, the PIOJ has organized thematic working groups with government agencies, donors and other participants. There is a Thematic Working Group (TWG) on Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation to Climate Change, which is co-chaired by ODPEM and the Meteorological Service. There is also a TWG on Energy and Minerals, which is chaired by the Ministry of Energy and Mining. The PIOJ serves as the secretariat for all the TWGs and the UNDP country office actively participates in them. Another TWG is planned for the environment sector. It is too early to gauge the effects of these groups on UNDP's work.

Partnership building is an important component of the expected 'additionality' of UNDP support, expected to generate benefits beyond those of the immediate activities supported. This is particularly important for a small programme, such as that of UNDP Jamaica. In several cases, national implementing agencies have expanded their partner networks through UNDP and GEF projects. The IWCAM project has helped

NEPA develop a new approach to working with government agencies, local government and community organizations. The Ministry of Energy and Mining has collaborated with utility companies, the Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica, and the private sector on energy audits and policy development. It is now designing five core policy areas with UNDP assistance that should lead to new partnership opportunities. Meteorological Services, which is the national focal point for the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, strengthened its contacts with the Cabinet of Ministers and line agencies while preparing the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC and (for the first time) worked directly with an NGO on climate change. The attempt by UNDP to operate with inclusive design and implementation arrangements in this sector has had substantial results, which can be expected to contribute to the quality of national environmental management, although this would be difficult to verify through evaluation.⁴¹ Overall, considering the quality and range of partnerships made by UNDP in this field and in this aspect, the programme is seen as highly effective.

One aspect of the environment and energy programme that is assessed as somewhat less effective is that of communications. Once projects have started, communications between UNDP and government partners seem to function well. However, communication gaps appear common during the project design and approval stages, when some implementing partners feel that they have not been consulted or informed on decisions affecting their projects. The PIOJ would like more interaction with UNDP when consulting with stakeholders during project design, to ensure that resources are allocated in a focused and effective manner. It is acknowledged that there are also communication gaps from the government side, while other communication problems are caused by slow communications or response within UNDP's organizational structure or those of funding organizations, notably the GEF.

⁴¹ Ibid., p.18

Another area of less effective performance in the energy and environment sector concerns inter-agency collaboration within the UNCT, which the ADR team found to be at a low level. The main example of such collaboration encountered was UNEP's role in the IWCAM project, a regional project supported by the GEF, which identified complementary roles for the two agencies.⁴² However, this collaboration was externally determined and was not a result of national initiatives. UNCT meetings do not appear to focus on inter-agency collaboration or joint implementation in this sector, and outside of the UNDAF exercise there seems to be little discussion or information sharing on programme matters.

The UNEP-Regional Coordination Unit is located in Kingston and, until recently, had a strong regional outlook, as it mainly serviced the Cartagena Convention. The unit has now begun to develop national environmental activities, in addition to its role in national implementation of regional projects. It appears that the UNEP-RCU is currently not formally made aware of UNDP country office programmes, or vice versa, although this occurs at the informal level through programme officers. Furthermore, in the current UNDAF, coverage of the environment and energy sector does not provide a strong framework for collaboration among UN agencies. It appears that the UNCT's delivery of support in this sector could benefit from increased communication, (including in the field of disaster management, which overlaps with environment in major areas, such as watershed management) and a closer working relationship. This is particularly important in view of the changing framework of access to GEF funds, which gives the country, through its focal point, enhanced opportunities to develop and implement programmes with existing or new implementing agencies or through partnerships.

UNDP Jamaica recently decided to withdraw from hosting GEF-SGP and the programme moved to the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica

(EFJ), an NGO that sits on its national steering committee and co-funds some of its projects. The foundation is a national hosting institution within the SGP system. UNOPS in New York has management responsibility for the SGP, but has no mandate to give programmatic assistance and no local presence. Although the UNDP country office has stated that this move will not reduce the support it gives to the programme, there is concern among the SGP and its partners that this may prove to be the case over time.

Within UNDP, there are few incentives for programmes to work together on common initiatives. However, the environment and energy programme plans to create a Community of Practice (CoP) based on the one that was recently started by the Governance Unit. In most cases, however, collaboration is ad hoc and influenced more by personal initiative than office practice. Each programme has its own budget and performance targets, which does not encourage cooperation with other programmes, according to staff. There are missed opportunities for joint programming and implementation and knowledge management. The ATLAS financial management system is also considered to discourage cross-programme collaboration by focusing on individual project and unit performance.

The environment and energy portfolio activities have effectively contributed to a number of UN values in Jamaica as evidenced through supporting the development of policies, Laws and UN Conventions, in particular the UNFCCC, CBD, UNCCD, Montreal Protocol, Kyoto Protocol and the Cartagena Convention and its associated Protocols.

The environment and energy programme is responsive to and maintains regular contact with its project partners. However, there appears to be a limited internal monitoring budget and extended field visits depend on project funds. This seems surprising, since GEF project budgets include a provision for management, some of

⁴² UNDP co-finances the Strategic Flexible Funding Facility with DFID, and collaboration is being sought for disaster reduction projects.

which is applied to services provided by global and regional levels of the UNDP GEF operation, while some reaches the national level. Within the country office, financial records indicate that most GEF management funds are expended during the project preparation stage, rather than during implementation. The combination of heavy workloads, limited staff and resources does not allow for in-depth monitoring and evaluation. Nevertheless, the GoJ and NGO partners consider UNDP monitoring satisfactory and regard the environment and energy team as responsive and effective partners.

The CPD calls for results-based management, in-depth evaluations and documentation of best practices. However, actual monitoring practices remain project-centred and focused on output delivery. Annual project work plans and results matrices include baselines and measurable indicators, yet tend to be activity-specific without a clear link to the broader environment and energy programme and outcome. While the approach used is reasonably effective for tracking activities and expenditures for current individual projects (as enabled by ATLAS), the monitoring approach is not useful for aggregating project findings to a programmatic scale.

The indicators linked to the environment and energy outcomes and outputs tend to be highly detailed and quantifiable. For example, we can consider the outcome indicators: 'Amount of soil eroded and number of flora and fauna under threat. Area of land and sea protected'. In view of the absence of baselines and of systematic monitoring data, any evaluation exercise would be largely dependent on stakeholder perceptions and secondary data analysis. Even if more realistic indicators were utilized, it is doubtful if the mechanisms and resources needed to verify them would be available. A recent UNDAF working group discussion questioned the relevance and utility of its current outcome indicators as a means of verification of progress towards

objectives. This ADR confirms that there is a substantial mismatch between the over-elaborated and specific indicators of the CPAP (and the UNDAF) and any possibility of collecting even a fraction of the data they require.⁴³ Attention should be given in future UNDP and UNCT planning exercises to developing only a few key indicators, for which baselines can be established and monitoring data gathered.

Sustainability

The wider application of energy audits and demonstration projects that were piloted under the Programme in Environmental Management in Hospitals and Schools will require further investment and policy guidance. However, the conditions for sustainability are present. The project demonstrated energy and water savings valued at US\$1.35 million for 22 hospitals, with an overall payback of 1.1 years and a 91 percent return on investment.⁴⁴ The tangible benefits resulting from the energy audits and use of solar technology offer an entry point for implementing energy efficiency and security policies that are being designed with UNDP support. The activities conducted during the pilot phase of Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System are expected to implement components of the Protected Area Management Master Plan.

Sustainability can also be reinforced through project linkages. For example, the methods developed for Incorporating Natural Resource Valuation Tools into Environmental Impact Assessments are expected to be incorporated into an EIA for Cockpit Country.

The Preparation of an HCFC Phase-Out Management Plan outlines activities required of NEPA and other government agencies to meet the phase-out targets. These will be implemented with support from the multilateral fund for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol. Imports of CFCs are no longer allowed into

⁴³ Minutes of the UNDAF Review Outcome 3 Working Group: Environment and Poverty – 2/18/2010, p.2

⁴⁴ Tripartite Review Report

Jamaica, in compliance with the Montreal Protocol. Market forces may also contribute to the achievement of phase-out targets through the increased importation of non-CFC equipment from the United States and EU. The consultations and outreach activities for the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC are being used to design a national plan for climate change resilience that is highlighted in Jamaica's 2009 MDG report.

However, for sustainability and replication to be viable, substantial follow-up actions are needed to expand the outcomes, demonstration value and policy effect of environment and energy initiatives. The ADR found that, outside of the immediate circles involved with UNDP environment and energy activities, they are not well known. Since they now form the largest sector in the UNDP portfolio, this needs to be addressed. This reinforces the earlier finding of the environment outcome evaluation,⁴⁵ that UNDP could scale up its results by earmarking 'soft support' to document/disseminate case studies, facilitate institutional exchanges and mentoring, inform policymakers or parliamentary commissions, and upstream successful pilot experiences. This form of intervention would help UNDP Jamaica capitalize on prior project investments by applying a low cost/high impact approach.

A substantial concern for the sustainability of the UNDP environment and energy portfolio concerns its funding profile. The portfolio heavily relies on GEF as the primary funding source: eight of 11 projects are GEF financed, in some cases with TRAC contributions. The use of core funds is minimal. It is understandable that UNDP Jamaica should use its very limited core funds where there are few external funding possibilities. However, the current level also conveys an impression that the sector is not seen as a priority area for development or sustainability by the UNDP country office, despite its primary position in the overall project portfolio

and its contribution to many UN values in the environment field. Under the present system, were there to be a lull in GEF funding, which is quite possible in view of delays in its project preparation and processing systems, it may prove difficult to continue operations in the sector, since core funds are already fully committed to other portfolios.

Sustainability of results in this area need not be restricted to continuation of what has already been done. Adaptation to climate change presents itself as a major area of opportunity for UNDP in Jamaica. On the one hand, it provides an overarching conceptual framework that can be used to better align UNDP's support for energy efficiency and security, environmental management, disaster risk reduction and advocacy/public awareness. On the other, it is an area of growing interest to international development partners, to some extent to the detriment of more traditional funding areas in the environment and energy sector.

Projects in the existing country portfolio that support integrated watershed management, sustainable land use and national communications to UNFCCC are all related to climate change adaptation. This therefore offers a strong opportunity to re-focus future environment and energy efforts and to expand partnership and funding opportunities. Furthermore, the GoJ is in the process of drafting a national Climate Resilience Action Plan that is expected to be operational in 2011. This plan is likely to include initiatives in environmental management, disaster risk reduction, capacity development and public awareness. Several key donors are focusing their support for the Caribbean region on climate change adaptation. As UNDP Jamaica approaches the next country programme cycle, it should therefore make one of its key areas for future environment and energy support and linkages on issues relevant to climate change adaptation, as well as on such mitigation areas as energy efficiency.

⁴⁵ UNDP, 'Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Energy and Environment Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective' Hugo Navajas, UNDP Jamaica, June 2010, pp. 32-33.

One important step in this direction is the proposed CoP for climate change adaptation, environment, energy and disaster risk reduction. This could be effective in generating feedback loops and support services in knowledge management and dissemination: technical back-stopping, peer reviews of national policies and institutional mentoring, information queries, and accessing consultant expertise. Government partners have emphasized the need for a regional mechanism that brings new perspectives, expertise and resources to Jamaica and the CoP could provide this.

It is not clear how a CoP would fit into UNDP's resource mobilization strategy. However, the circulation of information and support services could be expected to generate new funding and partnership opportunities. Furthermore, the availability of knowledge products, consultant rosters and short-term technical expertise, which the CoP could facilitate, would be likely to alleviate some of the problems resulting from project recruitment delays. However, the CoP would need to be adequately resourced, so as not to be a burden on the environment and energy practice area.

4.4 DISASTER RISK REDUCTION ACTIVITIES

Priority Area: Crisis prevention and management (disaster risk reduction)

Outcome 3.2: *National capacity enhanced to reduce the risk of natural and human-induced hazards.*

With regard to the two initiatives included in the agreed project list, Emergency Activities – Hurricane Ivan was implemented in 2004/2005 and involved a commitment of US\$100,000. UNDP participated with the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and the government in a multi-sectoral damage assessment, which explored the socio-economic and environmental impacts of the disaster. The report was presented to the Minister of Finance as

a resource in organizing early-recovery measures and the reconstruction process in the aftermath of the hurricane. Discussions were also held on what additional resources the country would need to adopt appropriate mitigation measures and to establish appropriate disaster reduction and risk management systems and to explore the possible use of risk-transfer mechanisms.

A project listed as providing administrative and monitoring support to the Environment and Disaster Management Unit of 'ODPEM does not appear to be active. Four other relatively small interventions not on the original list were discovered and are summarized below.

PROJECTS: HURRICANE DEAN SCHOOL ROOF REPAIR, DAMAGE ASSESSMENT, RELIEF ACTIVITIES AND RECOVERY PLAN

Relevance

In collaboration with DFID, UNDP implemented a programme of school roof repairs late in 2007, following damage inflicted by Hurricane Dean. It also committed US\$100,000 of TRAC funds to conduct damage assessment, relief work and prepare a recovery plan. In 2008, US\$100,000 from BCPR was used for early recovery and damage assessment work following Tropical Storm Gustav.

Effectiveness

These projects were developed jointly by the PIOJ, ODPEM and UNDP, in conjunction with other partners. Its main activities were to rehabilitate a primary school affected by the hurricane, to assess damage and post-recovery needs and later to assess the potential for watershed rehabilitation efforts as a means of disaster risk reduction. The projects were assessed as effective, within the limitations imposed by small budgets and the lack of continuity in the country office's approach to disaster management.

Efficiency

The projects were mainly focused on providing rapid responses to emergency events and had a short time scale. Stakeholders raised no concerns

about the efficiency of their implementation and the projects were all satisfactorily completed.

Sustainability

The disaster risk reduction concepts developed by these projects were an important input into the development of approaches towards watershed management to reduce flood damage, particularly in urban areas such as the Hope River Catchment. They were therefore predecessors of a new generation of watershed projects to be funded by the EU and the IDB. However, institutional stakeholders contacted did not recall the contribution of UNDP to these projects until prompted, indicating that the results of the intervention have not been adequately followed up or publicized.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS IN DISASTER MANAGEMENT

Overall, with regard to disaster management in Jamaica (and more broadly in the region), the UNDP country office has mainly played a coordinating role in helping partner agencies respond to emergencies. It has therefore been in the business of disaster response and recovery, rather than in risk reduction. However, measures have been taken to try to develop a more substantive portfolio. A US\$1 million-plus project proposal to assist in mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in the country has been prepared in collaboration with the PIOJ and ODPEM, to respond to CPAP outcome 3.2, 'National capacity enhanced to reduce risk of natural or human induced hazards'.

An additional concept note has been circulated for the establishment of a CoP in the fields of environment, energy and disaster management, which would also enhance the profile of UNDP. This is an important step since, to date, minimal emphasis has been placed by the country office on developing a coherent disaster management portfolio that could assist Jamaica in building appropriate emergency-response mechanisms nationally. These are likely to be particularly important as the effects of climate change are increasingly felt.

Overall, the team found that the disaster management portfolio (currently described mainly in terms of disaster risk reduction) needs to be more fully developed, not just with emergency response activities but also to assist with national disaster preparedness needs (such as capacity building and equipment). It is likely that this could be most readily delivered by building on the complementarities between adaptation to climate change, broad environmental management (particularly watershed management) and natural disaster risk reduction.

The disaster risk reduction activities were not well known among other IDPs or well integrated into the broader UNCT programme. Although substantive, but limited, results have been delivered in this sector, and the support from the (part-time) specialist is appreciated within government and among IDPs, it has suffered from severe under-resourcing, both in terms of personnel and core funding to develop activities.

4.5 GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Gender and human rights are UN values that are expected to be mainstreamed throughout the work of UNDP and may also be addressed through targeted projects or programmes. The ADR conducted a specific sub-study to explore these issues.

Relevance

Based on the issues raised in the analysis of the Jamaican development challenges, the projects completed by UNDP from 2004 to 2010, were relevant to national priorities in gender and human rights. Gender and poverty links were explicitly made in the Rural Youth Poverty Reduction, EU-UN Migration, and Strengthening Community Safety projects. Human rights issues have been directly addressed in a number of small interventions related in particular to alleged police violence and have been promoted directly or indirectly in other projects.

Despite these specific instances of inclusion, stakeholders contacted by the ADR team often remarked upon the lack of gender mainstreaming

in UNDP activities. Although gender is recognized as a cross-cutting issue, UNDP projects do not place it high on aspects to be pursued in project design or implementation. It was reported that a gender mainstreaming strategy document was developed by the UNDP country office, but that its proposals were not implemented. Although the last Jamaica ADR (in 2004) had noted this situation, it was also reported, there has been relatively little advance since. Although a gender focal point has been identified, the position has not been supported by sufficient resources to deliver sustained results on gender issues. As noted in Section 2.3, gender is a complex issue in Jamaica, since both males and females suffer gender-based disadvantage in different aspects of its socio-economic processes.

Effectiveness

Overall, it was found that UNDP's approach to gender has not been effective, while there have been some important, but small, interventions with regard to human rights that have been effective within their limited objectives. Since gender is a cross-cutting theme, gender issues (and indicators) should be integrated from the conceptualization of projects. Despite the financial implications, serious consideration should be given to the resources and approaches needed to pursue the 'gender agenda', more effectively. Little seems to be in place to raise the capacity of the country office with regard to gender aspects of its portfolio and coordinating activities. Short-term training/courses should be available to UNDP staff (including managers and programme officers) on how to mainstream gender more effectively. A database should be maintained of the gender approaches and effects of UNDP projects and made publicly available through the CoP and on the country office website.

Generally, however, gender-focused activities do not have a high profile compared to other UNDP activities, even on the organization website. Although there is a gender focal point, there is no one in the country office with clearly defined tasks, mandate, resources and budget to promote gender mainstreaming, and to ensure that the

relevant gender issues are addressed in the UNDP projects. Although the PIOJ is mandated to incorporate gender issues, local advocates believe that there is also insufficient effort on the government's part to mainstream gender.

Overall, it was found that UNDP Jamaica needs to play a more active role in promoting MDG 3, which calls upon stakeholders to promote gender equality and empower women, and in highlighting the inter-connections between poverty, gender and human rights. UNDP is perceived by its partners as being the 'custodian' of MDG 3 in national development strategies. Consequently, its projects should be the vanguards of 'gender mainstreaming'. Furthermore, better targeting of the vulnerable is necessary to increase and strengthen the relationship with gender, human rights and poverty. Based on national data, there is a need to focus on women in the rural areas, men in the urban areas, children and older persons.

During the ADR focus period, UNDP's partners in activities related to gender and human rights included:

- Planning Institute of Jamaica
- Statistical Institute of Jamaica
- Institute of Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies
- Institute of Sustainable Development
- Huairou Commission
- Hibiscus
- Women's Research and Outreach Centre
- Department of the Built Environment, University of Technology
- USAID
- DFID
- Ministry of Finance and Planning
- Department of Local Government.

It was assessed that collaboration with other UN agencies was not at the level that might have been anticipated. There needs to be more coordination of efforts with other IDPs to scale up the benefits of gender-focused activities.

Efficiency

There have been general problems with setting work plans and recruiting consultants. There has sometimes been inadequate flexibility in funding relevant activities, which do not fit pre-determined budget headings. Problems of UNDP development partners with adherence to timelines outlined in grant agreements were noted. Some interviewees complained of the unnecessary bureaucratic system (e.g., substantiating claims – number of forms and processes) and the slow release of funding by UNDP.

Sustainability

UNDP has been working well with its government partners, who display a willingness to take national ownership of development processes. However, due to the limited scope of many UNDP projects the prospects for sustainability and ‘scaling up’ of their effects are not strong.

Some national stakeholders felt strongly that UNDP could play a major role to facilitate the revitalization of the National Gender Task Force. This would aim to increase the visibility and impact of the task force and enable it to ensure the sharing of information on emerging gender issues and concerns. There the national priorities for ‘gender’ could be determined and projects aligned with these priorities. The country office could review whether such a role would fit within its gender priorities, as these are further defined.

National partners also believe that UNDP can play a more active role in the promotion of human rights in Jamaica. While all projects deal in some way with human rights, a more specific focus on human rights could be developed. For example, there is a pressing need for human rights training for police officers and other custodians of security. There are also substantial shortfalls in the protection available (including legal support) for those whose human rights have been violated.

Thus, the prospects of sustainability for the limited results that UNDP has enabled in gender and human rights are seen to depend on its

playing a more active role in these fields, notably through enhanced collaboration with national institutions in the field, many of which are in need of technical and financial support.

4.6 PORTFOLIO RESPONSE TO ADR 2004

This section summarizes the UNDP country office response to the recommendations of the ADR 2004. The ADR report made six main recommendations, the responses to which are now reviewed.

The first recommendation was that the UNDP country office should engage in an ‘an intensive dialogue’⁴⁶ with the government concerning follow-up to its project on a national Civic Dialogue. In 2005, this project received a somewhat mixed evaluation. The country office built on some of its more successful elements in the design of the JVPPSD project, which has taken forward a number of processes of dialogue and promoted measures to reduce levels of violence in communities.

The second recommendation was that the country office should ‘continue to emphasize support to poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS, the environment, and natural disaster management initiatives (p.8)’. In this respect, within its limited budget, UNDP Jamaica did continue with all areas except HIV/AIDS, where the country office’s comparative advantages were less than in the other fields.

With regard to the third recommendation, which concerned identifying macroeconomic issues that UNDP could help address through technical cooperation, the country office has already supported one important and successful initiative, which helped the GoJ to considerably reduce its debt repayment burden.

The fourth recommendation in ADR 2004 was that the country programme should strengthen its focus on a number of key issues while remaining flexible enough to respond to priority government needs (p.8)’. This has been broadly achieved, although the portfolio in the environment and energy sector

⁴⁶ UNDP, ‘Assessment of Development Results (ADR) for Jamaica,’ UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, 2004, p.8.

gives an impression of being somewhat driven by the supply of funds (mainly from the GEF), rather than pursuing a particular focus.

The ADR made a fifth recommendation that ‘the UNDP country office, with the assistance of the appropriate headquarters units, should seek to articulate a viable strategy for resource mobilization (p.9)’. The recommendation as worded has been achieved, although financial viability of the programme remains elusive. It is still the case that the full potential of the programme areas cannot be realized owing to inadequate funding. It is also clear that there is no magic solution to this issue and that the country office has taken most of the possible measures to improve its situation.

Finally, the previous ADR referred to the ‘ruptured’ relationship between the Jamaican Government

and the country office and (implicitly) recommends that the relationship should be strengthened. This has been achieved and the current ADR found positive perceptions of UNDP Jamaica, with some remaining reservations about the efficiency of UNDP-wide procedures, which are largely outside of the scope of the country office to change.

Overall, the assessment is that the recommendations of the previous ADR have been broadly achieved and that the main outstanding issue concerns the inadequate resource base of the country office, which it has been partially successful in addressing. A full resolution of this issue would require substantial additional core funds, a situation which seems highly unlikely to be realized.

UNDP'S STRATEGIC POSITIONING

5.1 STRATEGIC RELEVANCE

The Country Programme Documents for 2002 to 2006 and for 2007 to 2011 both responded well to GoJ priorities outlined in the Social Policy Framework, the Public Sector Investment Programme and, later, Vision 2030 and the first Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework. The emphasis on poverty reduction and justice, peace and security begun in the earlier CPD was somewhat strengthened during the later programme. This was due to the creation of separate units for poverty and governance, whereas the two had previously been combined. The programmes undertaken in these two areas have been assessed in Chapter 4. Based on this assessment, it is concluded that the programmes are strategically relevant, but that the resources to enable them to operate effectively are not yet available. Thus the poverty function, in particular, does not have a fully viable programme. The emphasis on HIV/AIDS of the CPD 2002-2006, which had been relevant when the programme was devised, did not materialize and gradually faded from the priorities of the country office.

The area of environment and energy, which is of great importance to Jamaica's prospects for sustainable development, emerged over the course of the two CPDs as the largest funding area of the country office portfolio. However, this was almost entirely due to the availability of GEF funds, which became operational gradually over the eight-year period covered. In addition to a number of projects operating at the field level, particularly in the vital area of watershed management, UNDP played an important advisory and support role in the development of the new national Energy Policy and its many supporting documents, a role

that is acknowledged in the policy documents themselves. However, the ADR team noted two areas of concern with regard to this practice area. First, in the current CPD, only 3 percent of the resources in this area came from core funds. While it is understandable that core resources are used in those areas where external funds are less available, the current level might also be interpreted to mean that this is perceived as less of a 'priority' area of the Jamaica operations than those related to poverty and governance. This perception was somewhat supported by the ADR team's discussions with other IDPs, where the energy and environment activities of UNDP in the country were barely known. By contrast, the contributions in poverty, governance and in helping Jamaica meet its MDG targets were readily identified and appreciated.

The area of disaster management is another one of vital importance to Jamaica, which is susceptible to many natural hazards. Here, UNDP has played a valuable coordinating role, particularly in response to specific events, when it has been a key player in bringing together the national government and the full range of IDPs, as well as in damage assessment activities. These activities have had both short-term results and have helped to develop methodologies for incorporation into the procedures of the Office of Disaster Preparedness and Management and other government agencies. Despite the high relevance of support for the country in this area, it has yet to achieve a substantial place in country office activities, or indeed in the CPD. Some strengthening was achieved through the recruitment of a part-time disaster risk reduction specialist, attached to the environment and energy team, but more in-house resources would

be needed to realize the potential of this practice area. However, given the limitations on core funding and the relatively low profile of UNDP in this area in Jamaica, it seems that the country office may struggle to substantially increase its activities in this field. This is still more so, in the light of the fact that most of the IDP disaster management funding in the Caribbean is put into regional programmes, most of which have quite small national components.

With regard to strategic relevance, the UNDP country programme faces a paradox. The practice areas for which it is known and where it places most of its core funding are poverty reduction (and meeting the MDGs) and governance (including peace and security). However, these are relatively small areas in terms of its funding and, furthermore, are areas where much larger international funds have been brought to bear by IFIs, bilateral and multilateral donors. It is likely to remain a small, but influential and effective, player in these areas. The area where more funds have become available, environment and energy, is one where UNDP's efforts have been substantial and effective, but they do not yet seem to have established its role as a key stakeholder among the wider development community, which could leverage even more funds. The area of disaster management has not yet been adequately developed, but offers potential for enhanced strategic partnerships, both within the UN system and with other IDPs.

5.2 CONTRIBUTION TO UN VALUES

The UNDP country office and its activities have contributed towards several key UN values, but there are also some challenges that need to be overcome. In the field of human rights, there were several important project-related activities, particularly in association with the civic unrest

that occurred most dramatically in 2010. Ongoing work with the Jamaica Constabulary is also expected to promote greater adherence to civil rights by that force, particularly in low-income areas.

As stated earlier, the work in connection with poverty reduction and assistance to meet the MDGs is ongoing, but on a very small scale. This work is valued by the government and other IDPs, but the latter group felt that the UNDP profile in these areas, which are very much identified as UN-led, should be higher. It appears that there are more opportunities for collaborative work in this practice area than have been realized.

Sustainable development is again very much identified as an area championed globally by the UN. The work of UNDP in the environment and energy sectors therefore contributes to this UN value, but it again seem to be somewhat short of what could be achieved. If the level of awareness of UNDP's work in this area could be raised, it again seems likely that more opportunities for collaborative work with other international stakeholders could be accepted. Similarly, the role of the UN in general and UNDP in particular is well-recognized in the field of disaster response and offers opportunities to expand from post-impact damage assessment to a more coherent set of activities, particularly in the fields of disaster preparedness and mitigation. Furthermore, this work could be linked into the growing body of international assistance that is becoming available, particularly for SIDS, in the light of the need for climate change adaptation, which is again widely identified as a UN-led endeavour.

The final value to be considered is gender equality. According to UNDP policy directives⁴⁷, this is to be mainstreamed throughout the organization's activities. However, the ADR team found that

⁴⁷ On 23 June, 2005 the UNDP Executive Board adopted the UNDP Corporate Gender Strategy and Action Plan prepared by the Gender Unit: while also urging UNDP to 'further expand its work on gender mainstreaming, including through the increase of financial and human resources to support the implementation of the action plan'. Details of the history of this issue are described in UNDP, 'Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in UNDP', UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, 2006.

this has not happened in the case of the UNDP Jamaica operations. More emphasis and resources will need to be placed if any real contribution is to be made in this area, which is of considerable importance in the country.

5.3 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

The main partner of the UNDP country office is the GoJ and most specifically the Planning Institute of Jamaica. In the early years reviewed by the ADR, the country office had a low period in its effectiveness. Successive audits found it to be non-compliant in many aspects and these management difficulties reflected on to the office's external relations and partnerships. The year 2007 was a critical point, with no fewer than four Resident Coordinators, including two temporary appointees, in place. Around the same time, a number of programme and operational staff left and external partners, both in government and more broadly, told the ADR team that at that time they found it very difficult to obtain effective collaboration from UNDP. However, since that time, the country office has managed to largely put the office management problems behind it (with a few issues awaiting final resolution) and partnerships are once more effective. Where partnership issues remain, these are as often on the government side as on that of UNDP. Indeed, the ADR team was broadly informed that the current country office team, from the Resident Representative through programme staff to the operational level is now regarded as highly collaborative and effective, within the limitations of UN operating procedures and systems.

COORDINATION OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RELIEF

This represented an area of collaboration among all the UN agencies in Jamaica, during and after Tropical Storm Gustav on September 25, 2008. The Office of the Resident Coordinator acted as the convener of the Western Caribbean Donor Community (WCDG). Several pre and post-Gustav WCDG meetings were held to assess the situation, highlight main areas of

need and define concrete support that respective IDPs were able to provide. This presented an opportunity for the GoJ to have dialogue with all the IDPs as a group during a time of urgent need. The UNRC also contributed to the conducting of initial damage assessments with the provision of the services of consultants to the GoJ, and the UNCT was also actively involved in the early recovery efforts.

During this period, under the guidance of the RC, the UNCT acted as an instrument of coordination for both the assessment and immediate disaster relief efforts in the country. Additionally, the UNCT acted as a vehicle for the sharing, management and dissemination of information and also as a reservoir for a pool of experts. In this area, the role of the UNRC fed into the work of UNDP, since UNDP has in-house capacity in disaster management, which it was able to utilize in implementing support agreed by the UNCT.

CONTINUATION OF COLLABORATION

In 2009, a separate section on the Jamaica UNDP website was dedicated to highlighting the collaborative work of the UNCT and the activities of the UNRC. Implementation of Communities of Practice in the selected MTF development areas is in process and is expected to advance information sharing among UNCTs and the wider IDP community.

Additionally, the vulnerabilities that were exposed by the spate of natural disasters in Jamaica over the last five years has propelled the UNCT to press for reforms in disaster preparedness, management and recovery systems, drawing on lessons learned. Here, UNDP will be a key player, in view of its experience and capacity in the area.

5.4 RESPONSIVENESS

The UNDP leadership and programme staff are positively regarded by stakeholders contacted. The predominant view is that the UNDP Jamaica office is more flexible than other IDPs in responding to emerging issues and changing priorities in the

country. It is also seen as facilitative, cooperative, supportive, in tune with the needs of the GoJ and efficient within the broader constraints of the UNDP system. This suggests that there has been a substantial improvement along these dimensions since the last ADR (2004). The UNDP country office generally enjoys a good relationship with its partners. The country office staff are seen as responding flexibly, most of the time, and are good facilitators, able to mobilize funds and respond well to emerging issues.

In comparison to other IDPs, UNDP country office projects are smaller and typically more focused on policy work than delivery of services. However, it should be noted that despite their small size, the government sees them as significant projects within its IDP portfolio. The Strategic Flexible Funding Facility was specifically highlighted as an example of a responsive mechanism, which enables short-term objectives (based on national priorities) to be fulfilled.

Often, these short-term deliverables play an essential role in unlocking larger resources.

A number of UNDP's development partners in national ministries and agencies, as well as among IDPs, identified the opportunity for UNDP to be even more responsive to national needs, by adopting a strengthened role as coordinator of support from IDPs to address poverty-related issues. This was seen as appropriate to UNDP's focal position within the UN system concerning these issues and its perceived 'neutrality' as an adviser to the government, in view both of its mandate and values and of its relatively small financial inputs, which are seen to reduce the possibility of bias towards any particular approach.

In some specific areas, particularly in connection with national emergencies or disasters, UNDP has responded rapidly and effectively, enabling and catalysing larger support programmes from the international community.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

PROGRAMMING AND PERFORMANCE

Conclusion 1: Regarding the relevance of its activities, the UNDP Jamaica programme has performed well, particularly in responding to changing national priorities.

Most of its activities can be clearly located within the National Development Plan: Vision 2030 and the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework of the government. In the environment and energy field, UNDP assistance has helped the country prepare for and meet a substantial set of commitments made under international agreements and conventions, and has contributed to the development of a national energy policy.

Conclusion 2: The programme in governance has been substantive, particularly in responding to urgent issues in the areas of peace, security and justice.

Support from the UNDP governance function is well regarded, and the country office has built effectively on its advantages as seen by international and national partners and has delivered results, despite limited resources. However, the programme could benefit from a Flexible Funding Facility similar to that available to the poverty programme.

Conclusion 3: The area of poverty reduction has made relevant and valuable interventions, but has so far received limited resources in the country programme.

Other IDPs see scope for UNDP to play a larger role in this area, particularly in leading the coordination of support to Jamaica's efforts to meet its targets for poverty-focused MDGs.

Conclusion 4: With regard to the energy and environment portfolio, UNDP has provided valuable support to the government and other partners to strengthen environmental management in the country.

The support provided by the UNDP specialists is well regarded among implementation partners. Assistance to policy formulation in the energy sector has been valuable and is acknowledged in the policy documents. Activities in the portfolio have been broadly effective, although results are restricted by the absence of a clear focus or strategy in the sector. Although this is currently the largest UNDP Jamaica portfolio, it is not well known among IDPs. Linkages between UNDP environment activities and those of other international stakeholders are weak, even where those activities can be seen as building on or related to those of UNDP. Coordination between UNDP and UNEP is inadequate and there is no effective UNCT strategy to maximize activities and results in this operational area, which could have been expected from the UNDAF process.

Conclusion 5: The UNDP Environment and Energy Unit has provided consistent support to the Global Environment Facility portfolio in Jamaica.

By virtue of its in-country expertise housed in the country office, UNDP has provided the most consistent support among the GEF implementing agencies in Jamaica. Together with local partners, it has implemented enabling activities for capacity development and is now moving into full-scale environmental projects.

Conclusion 6: The related area of disaster management is one in which UNDP has made a valuable contribution in terms of response, policy formation and disaster risk reduction.

Although substantive results have been delivered in this sector, and the support from the (part-time) specialist is appreciated, it has suffered from severe under-resourcing, both in terms of personnel and core funding to develop activities.

Conclusion 7: Overall, UNDP project outcomes have in large part been delivered.

However, in many cases the initiatives have been small in comparison with the scale of issues being addressed and of a pilot, demonstration or catalytic nature. Given the financial constraints under which UNDP Jamaica operates, the scope for the country office to expand its operations is likely to remain limited. Furthermore, the resources available to the Government of Jamaica are also very constrained. The ultimate results of UNDP efforts will largely depend on the extent to which the approaches, which it has helped to develop, are adopted by other stakeholders and taken forward in time and scale. The programme during this ADR period has set in motion a number of developmental approaches, which may over time produce substantial results. This situation reiterates the importance of promoting the broadest possible awareness of the outcomes to which UNDP Jamaica has contributed.

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

Conclusion 8: Overall, the UNDP country office has been successful in establishing strategic positions in its areas of activity, in respect of both government priorities and the broader IDP landscape.

However, awareness of the full range of UNDP country office capacities, potential and activities has not reached all relevant stakeholders, despite ‘spinoff’ benefits to the UNDP country office from the activities of the Resident Coordinator. Among IDPs and government agencies, many programme and operational staff have minimal knowledge of the current UNDP programmes and where they are positioned in the sector

concerned. This situation reduces opportunities for complementarity and joint working, which has negative implications for UNDP in view of its position as a financially small player in all of its sectors of operation. In particular, the positioning of the portfolios in environment and energy, and disaster management is not widely known.

Conclusion 9: With regard to ‘UN values,’ the effectiveness of positioning has been mixed.

On the one hand, the country office has effectively positioned UNDP with regard to human rights issues through a number of well-focused interventions. On the other hand, a strategic position on gender mainstreaming has not been achieved. More emphasis and resources will be required in this area if any significant contribution is to be made through the country programme operations.

OPERATIONAL MATTERS

Conclusion 10: The planning processes involved in developing the UNDP country programme have been disproportionately large compared to its scale and have not been decisive in terms of shaping activities.

The CPD/CPAP (and UNDAF) procedures show very high costs in senior management and staff time, with relatively little gain in terms of programme quality or coherence. Some important areas, notably environment, energy and disaster management are inadequately included in the plans and documents produced. Others that are included, such as HIV/AIDS, later disappeared from view during implementation of the current CPD/CPAP. Finally, the ADR shows that one of the main advantages of a small player such as UNDP is its ability to respond flexibly to changing national circumstances. The current planning processes do not take account of or contribute towards this.

Conclusion 11: A related conclusion is that the results framework as expressed in the CPAP contains too many targets and indicators.

Furthermore, given the broad absence of baselines and the small scale of many UNDP inputs, most of the indicators would be extremely difficult to measure or interpret. The cost of any serious

attempt to do so would be a substantial fraction of the overall programme budget.

Conclusion 12: Despite major progress made during the current CPAP period, the UNDP country office programme is not yet running efficiently.

Neither the UNDP nor the GoJ planning and administrative systems function in a timely manner. Furthermore, many UNDP partners in government, academia and civil society perceive the cost of doing business with UNDP as high. Specifically, procurement and recruitment procedures are very complex and time consuming. On the other hand, the efforts of UNDP country office staff to help partners through the system are widely regarded as helpful and effective, and the office has little room to manoeuvre within UNDP-wide systems and regulations. An additional relevant conclusion, derived from the parallel study of the GEF Jamaica portfolio, is that all GEF-implementing agencies have experienced problems with procurement and recruitment in the region, often leading to substantial operating delays and extensions of project duration.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Establish a flexible fund mechanism in the governance area.

One of the strengths of the UNDP country office, as perceived by its development partners in Jamaica, is its ability to respond flexibly and effectively to changing circumstances. In its poverty portfolio, the Strategic Flexible Funding Facility has been invaluable in rapidly providing modest amounts of funds, which have enabled timely implementation of strategic activities, and have sometimes leveraged substantial follow-up. A similar facility for the governance area would enable it to further strengthen its development contribution, within the limited resources available to UNDP.

Recommendation 2: Target young people through the media they use.

The country office should explore the possible additional benefits of programmes using

innovative approaches, such as harnessing the communication potential of texting and social networking sites, to engage young people in issues of governance and human rights. The assessment of this potential could draw on the Community of Practice already established to probe experiences with different approaches in the region.

Recommendation 3: Raise the profile of poverty-related activities.

The country office should explore possibilities to raise the profile of its poverty-related activities, with a particular focus on leading the coordination of support to Jamaica's efforts to meet its targets for poverty-focused MDGs. UNDP's national and international development partners regard it as having a comparative advantage in this area. Specific activities could include improving IDP coordination around support for effective national poverty policy formulation and the development and scaling up (thematically or geographically) of focused interventions to address the most pressing poverty concerns.

Recommendation 4: Raise the profile of environment and energy activities.

The country office should make renewed efforts to raise the profile of its work in the environment and energy sector. Specific measures could include:

- establishing clear and coherent priorities for country office activities in the sector, both from its GEF support and through collaboration with potential new international partners;
- enhancing incorporation of the sector in the UNDAF/CPD/CPAP process;
- seeking appropriate opportunities to collaborate with the UNEP Regional Office for the planning and implementation of national components of regional projects, to assess possibilities for collaboration within the country and to raise the national profile of UNCT in this sector;
- enhancing collaboration with the GEF focal point to increase knowledge and understanding in the country of the possibilities for development and management of a national

GEF portfolio, which have emerged as a result of reform processes in the GEF;

- ensuring maximum dissemination of information concerning its activities and achievements in the sector, to a broad audience of national and international stakeholders.

Recommendation 5: Make strenuous attempts to raise additional funds in the disaster management area.

In the disaster management area, the UNDP country office should take all possible measures to meet the challenges of severe under-resourcing, both in terms of personnel and core funding. It should develop activities that target complementarity with broader environmental initiatives in such areas as adaptation to climate change and watershed management. These measures should build on the results already achieved and address a broad range of disaster management needs, including preparedness, both to strengthen coherence in the country office programme and to open up additional funding possibilities.

Recommendation 6: Ensure that gender issues are systematically and fully addressed.

The country office should clarify, support and enhance the role of the gender focal point to ensure that gender issues are appropriately incorporated in country office activities. As part of this process, it should map out an active role for the country office in support of national efforts to address MDG 3, 'promoting gender equality

and empowering women'. This role could best be developed in collaboration with the broader UNCT, where UNFPA and UN Women in particular have resources and complementary areas of comparative advantage.

Recommendation 7: Effectively disseminate information on UNDP activities and results.

The country office should develop and implement a specific strategy to effectively disseminate information about its current and intended activities, particularly in the areas of environment and energy, and disaster management to targeted stakeholders in international and national bodies.

Recommendation 8: Develop and measure limited set of progress indicators.

Future CPAPs should develop a limited set of indicators, targeted directly at the anticipated contribution of the interventions programmed and with specification of how their baselines and monitoring data will be collected within available resources.

Recommendation 9: Take measures to increase efficiency, particularly of procurement and recruitment.

Given the challenges it faces with procurement and recruitment processes, the country office should explore what additional measures it might take to increase efficiency through, for example, pre-qualifying suppliers and specialist consultants in its main operational areas and calling for specific bids from these pre-established 'pools'.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts country evaluations called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level. ADRs are carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.⁴⁸ The overall goals of an ADR are to:

- provide substantive support to the Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board;
- support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country;
- serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level; and
- contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The Evaluation Office plans to conduct an ADR in Jamaica in 2010. The ADR will focus on the results achieved during the current country programme cycle (2007-2011), as well as the previous country programme cycle (2002-2006), building on the first ADR completed in 2004. The ADR is expected to contribute to the preparation of the next United Nations

Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and the country programme.

2. BACKGROUND

DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES

Jamaica is a small island developing state (SIDS) and is classified as a lower middle-income country with a gross national income of US\$2,820.⁴⁹ The population of approximately 2.7 million people is expected to reach 2.9 million by 2030.⁵⁰ The UNDP Human Development Index for Jamaica is 0.688, which places the country 80th in the world.⁵¹

During the period between its independence in 1962 and the early 1970s, Jamaica experienced strong growth in economic sectors, such as mining, manufacturing and construction.⁵² This was followed by periods of poor economic performance, and despite various government efforts henceforth, the country has remained on a low economic growth path. The country's modest development has been constrained by a series of natural disasters and an array of external and internal factors, including high public debt, increased competition and rapid liberalization of trade, high incidence of violent crimes, unemployment among youth (age 15-24), and critical responses required for HIV/AIDS prevention and strong educational systems.⁵³ The vulnerable and

⁴⁸ <<http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>>

⁴⁹ United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment (CCA) 2006-2010: Jamaica,' UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.

⁵⁰ Government of Jamaica, 'Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (2009-2012),' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009. Available at <<http://www.vision2030.gov.jm/Portals/0/MTF/MTFFinalWeb2.pdf>>.

⁵¹ UNDP Human Development Report 2010, Country Profiles and International Human Development Indicators - Jamaica. Available at <<http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/JAM.html>>

⁵² MTF (2009-2012).

⁵³ CCA (2006-2010) and MTF (2009-2012).

disadvantaged groups, including women, children, and those who live in extreme poverty, remain particularly at risk and require urgent attention.

NATIONAL STRATEGIES

Jamaica has recently embarked on its first long-term development plan, Vision 2030 Jamaica: National Development Plan. Its overarching aim is to transform the country from a middle-income developing country to a developed country by 2030. Vision 2030 is built on four strategic goals reflecting the economic, environmental, governance and social areas:⁵⁴

- Goal 1 - A society empowered to achieve its fullest potential;
- Goal 2 - A secure, cohesive, orderly and just society;
- Goal 3 - A prosperous economy; and
- Goal 4 - Development in harmony with the natural environment.

Vision 2030 is being implemented in a series of three-year policy frameworks referred to as the Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (MTF). The country is currently in its first MTF (2009-2012), which addresses a set of priority areas and supporting areas.⁵⁵ The six priority areas include security and safety; stable macro-economy; strong economic infrastructure; energy, security and efficiency; world-class education and training; and effective governance. The five supporting areas include an enabling business environment; internationally competitive industry structures; hazard risk reduction and adaptation to climate change; effective social protection; and authentic and transformational culture.

UNDP'S RESPONSE AND STRATEGIES

The UNDP country programme for the 2002-2006 period focused on three programme areas, i.e., poverty eradication, improved governance, and environment and energy.⁵⁶ The current country programme (2007-2011) is designed to directly link with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF articulates a coherent, coordinated and collaborative UN system approach to supporting national priorities. In Jamaica, the current UNDAF (2007-2011) is in alignment with the country's national priorities as outlined in its MTF, addressing national development through five thematic areas: i) education; ii) HIV/AIDS; iii) environment and poverty; iv) health, and v) justice, peace and security.⁵⁷ The UNDP country programme (2007-2011), based on the ongoing UNDAF, has two focus areas – crisis prevention and management (including HIV/AIDS; conflict prevention and peace-building; disaster risk reduction; and justice and security sector reform), and energy and environmental security.⁵⁸ The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), a detailed roadmap for the implementation of the country programme, has been prepared for the current period with a set of specific results and resource framework.⁵⁹

3. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the ADR in Jamaica include:

- to provide an independent assessment of the progress made towards achieving the expected outcomes envisaged in the UNDP country programme documents;

⁵⁴ Government of Jamaica, 'Vision 2030: Jamaica National Development Plan,' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.

⁵⁵ MTF (2009-2012).

⁵⁶ United Nations, 'DP/CCF/JAM/2, Second Country Cooperation Framework for Jamaica (2002-2006),' Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, New York, 7 November 2001.

⁵⁷ United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment (CCA) 2006-2010: Jamaica,' UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.

⁵⁸ CPD for Jamaica (2007-2011).

⁵⁹ CPAP (2007-2011).

- to provide an analysis of how UNDP has positioned itself to respond to national needs; and
- to present key findings and lessons learned, as well as a set of forward-looking recommendations useful for country office management and the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean in their efforts for improving the country programme operations.

The ADR will examine the UNDP's operational activities in the 2004-2010 period, covering the current country programme (2007-2010) and part of the previous programme (2002-2006), taking into account the activities and results addressed in the first ADR in 2004.

The overall methodology will be consistent with the ADR Method Manual and the ADR Guidelines.⁶⁰ The evaluation will undertake a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio and activities during the period under review specifically examining UNDP's contribution to national development results across the country. It will assess key results, specifically outcomes – anticipated and unanticipated, positive and negative, intentional and unintentional – and will cover UNDP assistance funded from both core and non-core resources.

The evaluation has two main components, i.e., the analysis of development results and the strategic positioning of UNDP.

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

The assessment of development outcomes will entail a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio of the period under evaluation. This includes an assessment of development results achieved and the contribution of UNDP in terms of key interventions; progress in achieving outcomes for the ongoing country programme; factors influencing results

(UNDP positioning and capacities, partnerships, policy support); achievements, progress and contribution of UNDP in practice areas (both in policy and advocacy); and analysis of the cross-cutting linkages and their relationship to MDGs and UNDAF. The analysis of development results will identify challenges and strategies for future interventions. A set of core criteria will be used in assessing development results:

- Thematic relevance – To what extent have the objectives of the UNDP programmes been relevant to existing country needs, UNDP's mandate and national strategies? Has UNDP applied the right strategy within the specific political, economic and social context of the country and region? Are the design of the interventions and resources allocated realistic?
- Effectiveness – To what extent have the UNDP programmes accomplished their intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? What are the unexpected results it yielded? Should UNDP continue in the same direction or should its main tenets be reviewed for the new cycle?
- Efficiency – How well has UNDP used its resources (human and financial) in achieving its contribution? What could be done to ensure a more efficient use of resources in the country/regional context?
- Sustainability – To what extent is the UNDP contribution likely to be sustained in the future? Have the benefits of UNDP interventions been owned by national stakeholders after the completion of the interventions? Has an exit strategy been developed?

STRATEGIC POSITIONING

The evaluation will assess the strategic positioning of UNDP both from the perspective of the organization and the development priorities in the country. From the organization's perspective, this

⁶⁰ ADR Method Manual (March 2010); and ADR Guidelines (draft January 2010). UNDP Evaluation Office.

entails: i) a systematic analysis of the UNDP place and niche within the development and policy space in the country; and ii) the strategies used by UNDP to create and strengthen its position in the country in relation to the core practice areas. From the perspective of the development results in the country, the evaluation will examine the policy support and advocacy initiatives of the UNDP programme vis-à-vis other stakeholders. The core criteria related to the analysis of strategic positioning of UNDP will include:

- Strategic relevance – To what extent has UNDP leveraged national development strategies with its programmes and strategy? What approaches have been used to increase its relevance in the country? Is there appropriate balance between upstream (policy-level) and downstream (project-level) interventions? To what extent are the resources mobilized adequate? To what extent are long-term development needs likely to be met across the practice areas? What are critical gaps in UNDP programming?
- Responsiveness – To what extent has UNDP anticipated and responded to significant changes in the national development context? To what extent has UNDP responded to national long-term development needs? What are the missed opportunities in UNDP programming?
- Partnerships and coordination – To what extent has UNDP leveraged partnerships within the UN system, government, regional/international development partners, civil society and the private sector? To what extent has UNDP coordinated its operational activities with other development partners and stakeholders?
- Promotion of UN values – To what extent has UNDP supported national efforts in the achievement of MDGs? To what extent have the UNDP programmes addressed the issues of social and gender equity, as well as the needs of vulnerable and disadvantaged groups?

The specific evaluation questions will be developed by the evaluation team in consultation with the Evaluation Office. The evaluation criteria and questions will guide the data collection and analysis.

4. EVALUATION APPROACHES

The ADR for Jamaica will be conducted in close collaboration with the UNDP country office, Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean and the national counterpart, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ).

DATA COLLECTION

The evaluation will use a multiple method approach that would include desk reviews of reference material, interviews with relevant individuals and groups both at the headquarters and in the field (e.g., UNDP staff members, government officials representing the ministries and institutions in programme practice areas, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations, the private sector and beneficiaries) and project site visits, as well as surveys, as appropriate. A specific method for data collection will be developed through a scoping mission, which will be defined in the inception report.⁶¹ A number of documents will be consulted, including the following:

- UNDP corporate documents (e.g., strategic plan, multi-year funding frameworks, policy papers, etc.);
- Country programming documents;
- UNDP corporate reporting (e.g. results-oriented annual reports (ROAR), etc);
- Project/programme documents and reports by UNDP and the GoJ;
- Evaluation reports at programmatic and project level; and
- Any research and analytical papers and publications available useful for the evaluation.

⁶¹ See Section 5 on the scoping mission and inception report.

VALIDATION

All findings should be supported with evidence. Triangulation will be used to ensure that the information and data collected are valid.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

The evaluation will use a participatory approach to the design, implementation and reporting of the ADR. At the start of the evaluation, a stakeholder mapping will be conducted to identify all relevant UNDP direct partners, as well as stakeholders who may not work with UNDP but play a key role in the outcomes of the practice areas.

5. EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation will follow the operational processes defined in the ADR Guidelines. The evaluation process can be divided into three phases, each including several steps:

PHASE 1: PREPARATION

- Desk review – The Evaluation Office, in consultation with country office and RBLAC, will collect a set of relevant reference documents. The evaluation team will further identify and collect any other relevant material for its analysis throughout the evaluation.
- Stakeholder mapping – A detailed analysis of all direct and indirect stakeholders will be prepared by the evaluation team to identify the relationships between various players involved in the UNDP programmes and projects. The mapping will include state and civil society stakeholders and may go beyond UNDP partners.
- Scoping mission – A visit to Jamaica will be carried out by the team leader and Evaluation Office task manager in order to:
 - ensure that the country office and key stakeholders understand the objectives, methodology and processes of the ADR;
 - obtain stakeholder perspectives on key issues to be examined;

- improve the understanding of UNDP programmes and projects, as well as the operational environment, e.g., country office operations and types of stakeholders involved, etc.;
- identify and define the data collection and analysis methods;
- assess the availability of evaluative evidence;
- develop an operational plan with the country office staff, detailing data collection and analysis methods, project site visits, and the availability of logistical and administrative support;
- identify a list of potential national experts who could participate in the evaluation; and
- further identify and collect relevant documents and information.

- Inception report – Upon completion of the scoping mission, a short inception report will be prepared by the team leader. The report will include the specific evaluation design, including evaluation questions, stakeholder mapping, data collection and analysis methods, selection of projects and plans for relevant site visits, as well as practical local logistical and administrative arrangements.

PHASE 2: CONDUCTING THE ADR AND PREPARATION OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

- Main data collection mission – The evaluation team will visit Jamaica on a two- to three-week mission to collect data in accordance with the evaluation plan detailed in the inception report. The team will conduct interviews with relevant stakeholders and visit selected project sites. At the end of the mission, an exit meeting will be organized by the evaluation team, participated by key stakeholder representatives, to discuss preliminary findings and obtain feedback/clarification from the stakeholders.
- Data analysis and reporting – The evaluation team will conduct data analysis based on all information collected and prepare a draft

Table A1. Evaluation Time-frame and Responsibilities

Activity	Estimated date
Collection and mapping of documentation by research assistant	Spring 2010
Preparation of the TOR by task manager	August 2010
Scoping mission by team leader and task manager	September 2010
Preparation of the inception report by team leader	Sept-Oct 2010
Main data collection mission	October-November 2010
Submission of the first draft report	December 2010
Provision of comments by Evaluation Office and Advisory Panel	End of December 2010
Submission of the second draft report	January 2011
Review of the report by country office, Regional Bureau and government	End of January 2011
Stakeholder workshop	March 2011
Issuance of the final report	May 2011

evaluation report within three weeks upon completion of the main mission. The team leader will ensure that all inputs from the team members have been included in the report and submit the draft ADR report to the Evaluation Office task manager. The report will be written in accordance with the Term of Reference, the inception report and other established guidance documents.⁶²

- Review of the draft report and finalization of the report – The draft report will be submitted for factual corrections and feedback by key client groups, including the government, UNDP country office and Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean. The draft report will be subject to an external review, prior to the submission of the report to the country office and the Regional Bureau, for quality assurance. The team leader, in consultation with the Evaluation Office task manager, will prepare an audit trail to indicate

how the comments were taken into account. The team leader will finalize the ADR report based on all comments received.

- Stakeholder workshop – A meeting with the key stakeholders will be organized in the country to present the evaluation results and discuss ways forward. The purpose of the meeting is to facilitate greater buy-in by national stakeholders for learning from lessons learned and recommendations and to strengthen the national ownership of development process and the accountability of UNDP interventions at the country level.

PHASE 3: FOLLOW-UP

- Management response – UNDP management will request the country office to prepare a management response to the ADR report. As a unit exercising oversight, the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing the

⁶² They include the ADR Method Manual, ADR Guidelines, and the Qualitative Data Analysis for Assessment of Development Results (draft March 2010).

implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC).⁶³

- Communication and dissemination – The ADR report and its brief will be widely distributed in both hard and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to the UNDP Executive Board by the time of approving a new Country Programme Document. The Planning Institute of Jamaica will be responsible for the dissemination of the report within the government and to other national stakeholders. The ADR report and the management response will be published on the UNDP website.⁶⁴

The time-frame and responsibilities for the evaluation process are described in Table A1.

6. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP EVALUATION OFFICE

The Evaluation Office task manager will manage the evaluation process and ensure coordination and liaison with the country office, the Regional Bureau, and other concerned units at headquarters and in the country. The evaluation will be supported by a research assistant, who will be recruited by the Evaluation Office to facilitate the initial collection of reference material, as well as by a programme assistant who will provide logistical and administrative support. The Evaluation Office task manager will participate in the missions, where appropriate, provide guidance and feedback to the team throughout the evaluation for quality assurance, and manage the review process.

The Evaluation Office will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR, including the costs related to participation of the team leader and team specialists, the preliminary research, any stakeholder workshops as part of the evaluation, and the issuance of the final ADR report.

THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation will be carried out by a team consisting of the following:

- Team leader – An international consultant, with the overall responsibility for providing guidance and leadership to the team and for coordinating the preparation of the draft/final report. The team leader must have demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice, ability to lead an evaluation of complex programmes, excellent drafting skills, as well as substantive knowledge of development issues (in particular, programmatic areas covered by UNDP in the country).
- Team specialists – A few thematic experts, either international or national, who will provide the expertise in the core subject areas of the evaluation, undertake data collection and analysis in the country, and be responsible for drafting relevant sections of the report.

All members of the team are expected to be familiar with various evaluation approaches and methods. The team's work will be guided by the norms and standards for evaluation established by the United Nations Evaluation Group and will adhere to the ethical code of conduct.⁶⁵

UNDP COUNTRY OFFICE IN JAMAICA

The country office is expected to provide support to the evaluation by means of: i) liaising with national stakeholders in the country; ii) assisting the evaluation team with the identification and collection of necessary information, data and documentation related to UNDP programmes and projects, as well as with the conduct of stakeholder workshops; and iii) any logistical and administrative support that may require by the team. All costs pertaining to the evaluation will be covered by the Evaluation Office. The country office will review the draft ADR report, once submitted for comments, and provide any factual corrections and feedback before the finalization of the report.

⁶³ <<http://erc.undp.org/>>

⁶⁴ <www.undp.org/evaluation>

⁶⁵ See 'Norms for Evaluation in the UN System' and 'Standards for Evaluation in the UN System,' United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), April 2005.

Annex 2

EVALUATION MATRIX

Criteria/ Sub-criteria	Main Questions to be Addressed by the ADR	What to Look For	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
CPAP 2007-2010: THEMATIC AREAS: HIV/AIDS; ENVIRONMENT AND POVERTY; JUSTICE, PEACE AND SECURITY				
A.1 Relevance				
A.1a Relevance of the objectives	Are UNDP activities aligned with national strategies? Are they consistent with human development needs in that area (whether mentioned in strategies or not)?	Has UNDP leveraged national objectives, balance between upstream and downstream work, strategic positioning among donors, responsiveness to changes in national priorities, partnerships and coordination, promotion of UN values?	Documents: Vision 2030, MTF 2009-2012, UNDAF, CPAP, CCA, other donor programmes, UNDP project documents. Institutions: PIOJ, UWI, ministries, GEF focal points, UNDP country office, RBLAC.	Desk review of govt., UN, donor and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
A.1b Relevance of the approaches	Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve planned outcomes? Do they follow known good practices?	Leveraging of limited resources to contribute towards outcomes, maximizing strategic role by filling key gaps, innovation.	Documents: Vision 2030, MTF 2009-2012, UNDAF, CPAP, CCA, other donor programmes Institutions: PIOJ, UWI, ministries, GEF focal points, UNDP country office, RBLAC.	Desk review of govt., UN, donor and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
A.2 Effectiveness				
A.2a Progress towards achievement of outcomes	Did the programme implementation contribute to progress towards the stated outcome? Or at least did it set dynamic processes and changes that move towards the long-term outcomes?	Progress towards outcomes, shown by indicators or other form of verification. Evidence of progress along theoretical results chain.	PIOJ, other govt., UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions. Limited field verification where appropriate.	Desk review of govt., UN and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions, possible field verification.
A.2b Outreach	How broad are outcomes (e.g., local community, district, region, national)? For GEF projects, contribution to global change?	Changes in national policies and programmes, project results, evidence of catalytic effects.	PIOJ, other govt., UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions. Limited field verification where appropriate.	Desk review of govt., UN and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions, possible field verification.
A.2c Poverty depth / equity	Who are the main beneficiaries (poor, non-poor, disadvantaged groups, gender equity)?	Targeting of programmes and projects. Did target groups participate fully, were they reached as anticipated, were gender and human rights incorporated in activity design and implementation?	PIOJ, other govt., UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions. Limited field verification where appropriate.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions, possible field verification.
A.3 Efficiency				
A.3a Managerial efficiency	Have the programmes been implemented within deadlines, costs estimates? Have UNDP and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?	Successful financial, human resource and programme management as evidenced by timely availability of resources to complete planned activities.	UNDP country office and RB documents, audit reports, reviews and evaluations, interviews and discussions. PIOJ and other government offices, UNCT.	Desk review of UN and govt documents. Interviews, group discussions.

Criteria/ Sub-criteria	Main Questions to be Addressed by the ADR	What to Look For	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
A.3b Programmatic efficiency	Were the UNDP resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results? Was there any identified synergy between UNDP interventions that contributed to reducing costs while supporting results?	Relationship of resources and interventions to scale of issues targeted, balance of upstream and downstream support, partnerships, development of inter-related activities, collaboration within UNCT, location of niches, and gaps in coverage, opportunistic activities.	PIOJ, other govt., UNCT, donor, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, donor and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
A.4 Sustainability				
A.4a Design for Sustainability	Were interventions designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks and did they include an exit strategy?	Explore theories of change behind interventions, activities and partnerships, including relationships to govt., NGO and CBO partners.	PIOJ, other govt., civil society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions. Limited field verification where appropriate.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions, possible field verification.
A.4b Implementation issues: capacity development and ownership	Has national capacity been developed so that UNDP may realistically plan progressive disengagement?	Status and activities of national govt. and civil society bodies; staff turnover, budgets and mandates.	PIOJ, other govt., civil society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
A.4c Upscaling of pilot initiatives	If there was testing of pilot initiatives, was a plan for upscaling of successful initiatives prepared?	Evaluation of results achieved, existence of plans, resource allocation, national champions.	PIOJ, other govt., civil society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
ASSESSMENT OF UNDP STRATEGIC POSITION				
B. 1 Strategic Relevance and Responsiveness				
B.1a Relevance against the national development challenges and priorities	Did the UN system as a whole, and UNDP in particular, address the development challenges and priorities and support the national strategies and priorities? Did the UNDP's programme facilitate the implementation of the national development strategies and policies and play a complementary role to the government?	Focus and responsiveness of UN as a whole and UNDP in particular to challenges and priorities of govt. and to major events which changed these? Duplication or redundancy in UN and/or donor system, ability of govt. to implement its policies.	PIOJ, other govt., UNCT, donor, UNDP policy, project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
B.1b Relevance of UNDP approaches	Is there balance between upstream and downstream initiatives? Balance between capital and regional / local level interventions? Adequacy of resources? Quality of designs, conceptual models?	Have UNDP resources been generated and used to maximum effect? Has upstream policy work led to actual changes in govt. policies and programmes? Have changes at ground level catalysed more widespread results?	PIOJ, other govt., civil society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
B.1c Responsiveness to changes in context	Was UNDP responsive to the evolution over time of development challenges and the priorities in national strategies, or significant shifts due to external conditions? Did UNDP have an adequate mechanism to respond to significant changes in the country situation, in particular in crisis and emergencies?	Evidence of changes in UNDP strategy and activities to meet emerging challenges, crisis and emergency response activities delivered.	PIOJ, other govt., academic, civil society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.

Criteria/ Sub-criteria	Main Questions to be Addressed by the ADR	What to Look For	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
B.1d Balance between short-term responsiveness and long-term development objectives	How are the short-term requests for assistance by the government balanced against long-term development needs?	Evidence of budget flexibility, technical expertise and responsiveness to new challenges, whilst delivering longer term programmes on schedule.	PIOJ, other govt., academic, civil Society partner, UNDP project and programme documents. Interviews and discussions.	Desk review of govt., UN, civil society partner and academic documents. Interviews, group discussions.
B.2 Assessing UNDP's use of networks and comparative strengths				
B.2a Corporate networks and expertise	Was the UNDP strategy designed to maximize the use of its corporate and comparative strengths? Expertise, networks and contacts?	Partnerships, use of UN system contacts, provision of specialist expertise, coherence of UNCT, role of Resident Coordinator.	UNCT programming documents, partner surveys, UNDAF, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNCT documents, partners surveys; followed up by interviews and discussions.
B.2b Coordination and role sharing within the UN system, including associated funds and programmes	Actual programmatic coordination with other UN agencies in the framework of UNDAF, avoiding duplications? Did UNDP help exploit comparative advantages of associated funds (UNV, UN Women, UNCDF), e.g., in specific technical matter?	Joint activities, absence of duplication, selection of activities by comparative advantage, role of Resident Coordinator.	UNCT programming documents, partner surveys, UNDAF, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNCT documents, partner surveys; interviews and discussions.
B.2c Assisting government to use external partnerships and South-South cooperation	Did UNDP use its network to bring about opportunities for South-South exchanges and cooperation?	Evidence of exchanges or collaboration.	UNDP programming and project documents, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNDP documents, interviews and discussions.
B.3 Promotion of UN values from a human development perspective				
B.3a UNDP's role in supporting policy dialogue on human development issues	Is the UN system, and UNDP in particular, effectively supporting the government monitoring on the achievement of the MDGs?	Evidence of activities and results in support of such monitoring; govt. capacities enhanced.	UNCT programming and project documents, partner surveys, PIOJ documents, UNDAF, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNCT and PIOJ documents, partner surveys; interviews and discussions.
B.3b Contribution to gender equality	The extent to which the UNDP programme is designed to appropriately incorporate in each outcome area contributions to the attainment of gender equality? The extent to which UNDP supported positive changes in terms of gender equality and were there any unintended effects?	Evidence of gender-focused activities, and/or or gender focus mainstreamed into overall portfolio. Results of these activities, intended or unintended.	UNDP documents, PIOJ documents, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNDP and PIOJ documents; follow up interviews and discussions.
B.3c Addressing equity issues	Did the UNDP programme take into account the plight and needs of vulnerable or disadvantaged to promote social equity?	Poverty analysis, targeting of activities and support, UNDP country office promotional material, partnerships with civil society.	UNDP, PIOJ and civil society documents, interviews and discussions.	Desk review of UNDP, CSO and PIOJ documents; follow-up interviews and discussions.

Annex 3

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Amnesty International, 'Sexual Violence Against Women and Girls in Jamaica: "just a little sex"', London, 2006.
- Athill, Catherine, et al, 'Gender and Trade: Action Guide', Commonwealth Secretariat, 2007.
- Blake, Marion E. and Associates Ltd, 'Functional Reorganization Based on Expanded Coverage of Public Bodies to be Monitored – Final Project Report', Kingston, 25 May 2010.
- Brown, D. 'The Private Sector as a Social Partner: the Barbados Model', in *Governance in the Caribbean*, edited by S. Ryan and A.M. Bissessar, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, 2002, pp.37-46.
- Buddan, R. 'Jamaica's Risk Society', *Sunday Gleaner*, 20 July 2008, Kingston. Retrieved 20 July 20, 2008 from <<http://www.jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20080720/focus/focus4.html>>
- Buddan, R., 'Mendicancy Revisited', *Sunday Gleaner*, 13 July 2008, Kingston. Retrieved 13 July 2008 from <<http://www.jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20080713/focus/focus2.html>>
- Buddan, R., 'The Caribbean and Europe: Talking About Poverty', *Sunday Gleaner*, 25 May 2008, Kingston. Retrieved 25 May 2008 from <<http://www.jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20080525/focus/focus4.html>>
- EC-UN, 'EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative - Mitigating the Negative Impact of Migration: Grant Agreement,' Kingston, 2009.
- EC-UN, 'EC-UN Joint Migration and Development Initiative - Supporting Jamaican Deported Migrants and their Families: Grant Agreement,' Kingston, 2009.
- EIU, 'Country Profile: Jamaica,' 2008.
- Francis, A., 'Human Rights and Governance in the Caribbean', in *Governance in the Caribbean*, edited by S. Ryan and A.M. Bissessar, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, 2002, pp.175-182.
- GEF, 'The Global Environment Facility's Small Grants Programme: GEF-4 Project Funding Guidelines,' GEF, Kingston, 2008.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Economic and Social Survey of Jamaica', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, Annual Surveys 2000 to 2009.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Jamaica 2015: A Framework and Action Plan for Improving Effectiveness, Collaboration and Accountability in the Delivery of Social Policy, Kingston, 2002.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Jamaica 2015: National Progress Report 2004–2006 on Jamaica's Social Policy Goals, Office of the Cabinet, Kingston, 2007.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (2009-2012),' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009. Available at <<http://www.vision2030.gov.jm/Portals/0/MTF/MTFFinalWeb2.pdf>>
- Government of Jamaica, 'National Report of Jamaica on Millennium Development Goals for the UN Economic and Social Council Annual Ministerial Review', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- Government of Jamaica, 'National Report on Sustainable Development', Ministry of Land and Environment, Kingston, 2003.

- Government of Jamaica, 'Public Sector Modernization – Government at your Service: A Medium Term Action Plan', Kingston, 2007.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Residential Consumer End Use Survey,' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Strategic Flexible Fund Donor – Progress Report – DFID – January 1 – August 30, 2009', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Strategic Flexible Funding Facility – Standard Progress Report, August 1, 2009 – December 31, 2009', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Support to National Development Goals, MDGs and Human Development - Standard Progress Report, July 2009 – December 2009', Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- Government of Jamaica, 'The Labour Force', Statistical Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, Annual Surveys for 2006, 2007.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Vision 2030: Jamaica: National Development Plan,' Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- Government of Jamaica, 'Vision 2030: Jamaica: National Development Plan – Poverty Reduction Sector Plan,' Planning Institute of Jamaica, 2009. Retrieved 1 December 2010 from <http://www.vision2030.gov.jm/Portals/0/Sector_Plan/Microsoft%20Word%20-%20POVERTY%20REDUCTION%20SECTOR%20PLAN%20pdf.pdf>
- Government of Jamaica, 'Vision 2030: Jamaica, Popular Version', (Booklet), Planning Institute of Jamaica, Kingston, 2010
- Harriot, A., *Organizational Crime and Politics in Jamaica*, Kingston: University of the West Indies Press, 2007
- Graham, S. and P.J. Patterson, *The Transforming Landscape of Jamaica*, Communications Unit, Office of the Prime Minister, Kingston, 2006.
- Hoffman, Joseph, 'Jamaica Public Investment Prioritization Framework: Final Report', 14 August 2009.
- Hoffman, Joseph, 'Public Investment Prioritization Framework: Approach to Design Features', 21 June 2009.
- Hoffman, Joseph, 'Report on Initial Design Consultation on Plan2FundOPT with EFC/Boise State', 3 July 2009.
- Hutton, Eric, 'Jamaica: Tax Expenditure Budget', Inter-American Development Bank and Ministry of Finance and the Public Service of Jamaica, 2009
- Inter-American Development Bank, 'The Informal Sector in Jamaica', Economic and Sector Study Series RE3-06-010, Washington DC, 2006.
- Jamaica Economy Project, 'Taking Responsibility—The Jamaican Economy Since Independence, Draft Report', Department of Government, University of the West Indies, Mona, Jamaica, 2006.
- JASPEV (2006) "Tracking Governance in Jamaica" (Draft). Cabinet Office (Jamaica): "Service Standards in Citizen's Charters;" retrieved August 2006, from <<http://www.cabinet.gov.jm/docs/pdf/Service%20Standards%20in%20Citizens%20Charter.pdf>>
- Jones, E., 'Maladministration and Corruption: Some Caribbean Realities', in *Governance in the Caribbean*, edited by S. Ryan and A.M. Bissessar, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, 2002, pp.183-186.
- Merriam, S.B., and Associates, *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. California: Joseey Bass, 2002.
- OECD Gender, Institutions and Development Data Base GID-DB, 'Gender Equality and Social Institutions in Jamaica', 2006
- OECD DAC, 'DAC CRS Profile for Jamaica (2002-2006),' 2009.

- Osei, P., 'A Critical Analysis of Jamaica's Poverty Eradication Programme', SALISES, 2001.
- Osei, P., 'A Critical Assessment of Jamaica's National Poverty Eradication Programme', *Journal of International Development*, Vol.1.14 Issue 6, pp.773-788, August 2002.
- Porter, Michael E., and Klaus Schwab, 'The Global Competitiveness Report 2008-2009', World Economic Forum, Geneva, 2008.
- Powell, Lawrence Alfred, Paul Bourne and Lloyd Waller, 'Probing Jamaica's Political Culture' (Vol. 1) – Main Trends in the July-August 2006 Leadership and Governance Survey. Centre for Leadership and Governance, Department of Government, University of the West Indies, Mona, 2006.
- Public Sector Reform Unit: 'Governance', Retrieved September 2009, from <<http://www.cabinet.gov.jm/psru/pdf/Chapter2-%20Governance.pdf>>
- Richards, Audrey, 'Consultancy to Assess and Guide the Implementation of a Small Business Investment Company Programme in Jamaica', Kingston, 17 September 2010.
- Ryan, S., 'We Are All Corrupt', in *Governance in the Caribbean*, edited by S. Ryan and A.M. Bissessar, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, 2002, pp. 187-188.
- Scientific Research Council, 'Rural Youth Employment Project - Project Report', Kingston, April 2010.
- Scientific Research Council, 'Rural Youth Employment Project - Project Report', Kingston, August 2010.
- Scientific Research Council, 'Rural Youth Employment Project - Project Report', Kingston, July 2010.
- Scientific Research Council, 'Rural Youth Employment Project - Project Report', Kingston, June 2010.
- Scientific Research Council, 'Rural Youth Employment Project - Project Report', Kingston, September 2010.
- Sen, A., *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999.
- UNDAF (2007-2011) Evaluation Report, June 2010 Joint UN Review, Kingston, Jamaica. 2010.
- UNDP, 'Addendum to Project Document to JVPPSD', 2006.
- UNDP, 'Annual Tripartite Review Report on Microsoft Information & Communication Technologies (ICT) Training for Disadvantaged Youth', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Assessment of Capacity Building Needs, Preparation of the Third National Report (CBD) and the Clearing House Mechanism: Project Document', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Assessment of Development Results (ADR) for Jamaica', UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, 2004.
- UNDP, 'Audit of UNDP Jamaica', 2008. Office of Audit and Investigations. Regional Audit Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean. Confidential.
- UNDP, 'Building Civil Society Capacity to Support Good Governance by Local Authorities: Project Document', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Building Skills and Partnerships to Enhance Personal and Community Empowerment Curriculum: Project of the Women's Resource and Outreach Centre, Jamaica', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Challenges to Developing Countries', 2000. Retrieved October 12, 2005, from <<http://www.undp.org/info21/e-com/e7.html#Anchor-Human-51139>>
- UNDP, *Choices*, New York, 2000.
- UNDP, *Choices*, New York, 2001.
- UNDP, 'Civic Dialogue for Democratic

- Governance Annual Project Report 2002-2004', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2004.
- UNDP, 'Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Annual Project Report', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2005.
- UNDP, 'Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance Annual Project Report 2006', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Civic Dialogue for Democratic Governance: Evaluation Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Conflict Prevention and Peace Building for the Government of Jamaica: Preparatory Assistance Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Country Office Organigram,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Country Office Staff by Series,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Country Programme Action Plan for Jamaica (2007-2011),' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2002-2006)', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2002.
- UNDP, 'Country Programme Document for Jamaica (2007-2011),' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Democratic Governance Projects 2004-2007' (matrix sent by Jamaica country office)
- UNDP, 'DIPECHO/UNDP Radar Based Early Warning System for Weather Related Natural Hazards in the Insular Caribbean Project: Evaluation Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2004.
- United Nations, 'Draft Regional Programme Document for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2008-2011', Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, New York, September 2007. Available at <<http://www.undp.org/latinamerica/country-docs/RPD2008-2011.doc>>
- UNDP, 'Environmental Management in Hospitals and Schools: Evaluation Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Evaluation of Gender Mainstreaming in UNDP', UNDP Evaluation Office, New York, 2006.
- UNDP, 'First Caribbean Human Development Report on Citizens' Security: Concept Note,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Gender and Training Research Project Evaluation Report: Medium Term Evaluation of the Summer Institute in Gender and Development Intensive Training Programme 2003', July 2004.
- UNDP, 'Governance Portfolio Project Partners 2004-2010' (sent by Jamaica country office).
- UNDP, *Human Development Report 2010*, Country Profiles and International Human Development Indicators - Jamaica. Available at <<http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/JAM.html>>
- UNDP, *Human Development Report - Human Rights and Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- UNDP, *Human Development Report - Making New Technologies Work for Human Development*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- UNDP, *Human Development Report - Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2004.
- UNDP, 'ICT Training for Disadvantaged Youth: Final Evaluation,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Improved Energy Efficiency & Security: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.

- UNDP, 'Inner-Office Memo RE: Jamaica Outcome Transition,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Institutional Development of the NSSIU for the Government of Jamaica: Preparatory Assistance Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management (IWCAM) in the Small Island Developing States of the Caribbean: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Introduction of Renewable Wave Energy Technologies for the Generation of Electric Power in Small Coastal Communities in Jamaica: Initiation Plan for a GEF PPG,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Debt Exchange Programme: Discussion Paper,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, May 2010.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Human Development Report 2005,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2005.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Millennium Development Goals Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2005.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Millennium Development Goals Report 2009,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Programme Results Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2004.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Programme Results Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2005.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Programme Results Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Programme Results Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Sustainable Peace and Development (JSPD) Programme: Project Document,' UNDP, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Violence Prevention, Peace and Sustainable Development Programme (JVPPSD): 2008 Annual Report,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Jamaica Workflows (Excel),' 2008
- UNDP, 'LIFE Jamaica: Final Evaluation,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2005.
- UNDP, 'Microsoft/UNDP Training for Disadvantaged Youth,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective', by Hugo Navajas, UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments: Project Document Annual Operational Plan Toolkit and Template', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments: Project Document Final Draft with CD indicators,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Preparation of an HCFC Phase Out Management Plan (HPMP): Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Promotion of MDGs and Human Development in Jamaica – Quarterly Progress Report, Quarter 1 2010', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Promotion of MDGs and Human Development in Jamaica – Quarterly Progress Report, Quarter 2 2010', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean Regional Programme Document (2008-2011),' RBLAC, 2008.

- UNDP, 'Resident Coordinator Annual Report for Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Resident Coordinator Annual Report for Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Response to and Assessment of Damage Done by Hurricane Dean, August 2007: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Response to and Assessment of Damage Done by Hurricane Dean August 2007: School Roof Repairs: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Results Oriented Annual Report for Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Results Oriented Annual Report for Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Rural Youth Employment Project: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010
- UNDP, 'Rural Youth Employment Project – Quarterly Progress Report – Quarter 2 2010' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010
- UNDP, 'Rural Youth Poverty Reduction Project: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Second Country Cooperation Framework for Jamaica (2002-2006),' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2002.
- UNDP, 'Second Multi-year Funding Framework (MYFF), 2004-2007,' UNHQ, New York, 2003.
- UNDP, 'Strategic Flexible Funding Facility: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Strategic Flexible Funding Facility – Quarterly Progress Report, Quarter 1 2010' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010
- UNDP, 'Strategic Flexible Funding Facility – Quarterly Progress Report, Quarter 2 2010,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010
- UNDP, 'Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Strengthening the Operational and Financial Sustainability of the National Protected Area System: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Support for the Development of a National Statistics System: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.
- UNDP, 'Support to National Development Planning Goals, MDGs and Human Development: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'Support for the Development of a National Statistics System: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston 2009.
- UNDP, 'Support to the National Statistics System – Quarterly Progress Report – Quarter 2, 2010', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP, 'Technical Support on Restorative Justice for the Government of Jamaica: Preparatory Assistance Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'Tropical Storm Gustav – Early Recovery and Assessment: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'Typhoid and Control Programme in Jamaica: Final Evaluation,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 1999.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Global Staff Survey: Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Global Staff Survey: Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Global Staff Survey: Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Global Staff Survey: Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2009.

- UNDP, 'UNDP Jamaica Country Office Mission to Establish Operational Structure And Business Processes', 2009.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Full Scope Audit of UNDP Office in Jamaica', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2008.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Partner Survey: Jamaica,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP, 'UNDP Strategic Plan, 2008-2011: Accelerating Global Progress on Human Development,' UNHQ, New York, 2007.
- UNDP, 'What Is HD', 2005. Retrieved October 21, 2005, from <<http://hdr.undp.org/hd>>
- UNDP, 'Youth-at-Risk: Final Evaluation,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP-BCPR, 'Coordination Support to Jamaica in Accommodating Haitians in Jamaica Fleeing the Civil Unrest and Coup In Haiti', UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2010.
- UNDP-GEF, 'Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Jamaica: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNDP-GEF, 'Jamaica: Second National Communication to the UNFCCC: Enabling Activities,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- UNDP-GEF, 'Self-Assessment for the Preparation of a Project Proposal: The Bahamas, Second National Communication to the UNFCCC: Project Document,' UNDP Jamaica, Kingston, 2004.
- UNDP-Government of Jamaica, 'Standard Basic Assistance Agreement,' Kingston, 1976.
- United Nations, 'United Nations Development Assistance Framework for the Government of Jamaica (2007-2011), UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2007.
- UNESCO/UNAIDS Research Project, 'A Cultural Approach to HIV/AIDS Prevention and Care: Jamaica's Experience', Studies And Reports, Special Series, Issue No. 8, Cultural Policies For Development Unit, UNESCO, 1999.
- United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment (CCA) 2000-2005: Jamaica,' UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2000.
- United Nations, 'Common Country Assessment (CCA) 2006-2010: Jamaica,' UNCT Jamaica, Kingston, 2006.
- United Nations, 'DP/CCF/JAM/2, Second Country Cooperation Framework for Jamaica (2002-2006),' Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme and of the United Nations Population Fund, New York, 7 November 2001.
- United Nations, 'Johannesburg Summit 2002 on Sustainable Development: Jamaica Country Profile', 2002.
- U.S. Department of State, 'Background Note: Jamaica', Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, Washington DC, August 2010.
- Wilson, C., The Food Crisis: Jamaica's Reality. *Sunday Gleaner*, Kingston, 15 June 2008, Retrieved 15 June 2008 from <<http://www.jamaica-gleaner.com/gleaner/20080615/cleisure/cleisure2.html>>
- World Bank, 'World Bank Data Profile: Jamaica 2000-2008,' 2009.
- World Bank, 'World Bank MDG Statistics: Jamaica,' 2009.

Annex 4

PEOPLE CONTACTED

GOVERNMENT OF JAMAICA

Barnaby, Leonie, Senior Director and GEF Focal Point, Office of the Prime Minister, Environmental Management Division

Barrett-Edwards, Yvonne, Director, Energy Division, Ministry of Energy & Mining

Bryan, Rosemarie, Project Manager, Natural Resources Valuation Project, National Environment and Planning Agency

Cunningham, Tanisha, Project Associate, Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building, Dept. of Local Government

Edwards, Michelle, Senior Director, Mitigation Planning and Research Division, Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management

English-Johnson, Nelsa, Project Manager, Invasive Alien Species Project, National Environment and Planning Agency

Glaze, Horace, Senior Director, Preparedness and Emergency Operations Division, Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management

Green, Earl, Group Technical Director, Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica

Harris, Hugh, Senior Project Economist, Ministry of Finance

Headley, Marilyn, CEO & Conservator of Forests, Forestry Department

Henry, Wayne, Technical Advisor to the Minister of Finance and the Public Service, Ministry of Finance and Planning

Hill, Robert, Programme Coordinator, Strengthening Community Safety through Local Government Capacity Building, Department of Local Government

Jackson, Sonia, Director-General, Statistical Institute of Jamaica (STATIN)

Jones, Peter, Local Government specialist, Office of the Prime Minister

Knight, Pauline, Director, Social Policy, Planning and Research, Planning Institute of Jamaica

Logan, Nigel, Acting Group Managing Director & CFO, Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica

Mahlung, Clifford, Section Head, Data Processing, Climate Branch and Climate Change Focal Point, Meteorological Service Jamaica

Parchment, Peter, Director of Policy and Research, Ministry of Justice

Petersen, Hopeton, Head, Sustainable Development Division, Planning Institute of Jamaica

Roper, Le-Anne, Sustainable Development Planning Officer, Planning Institute of Jamaica

Rowe, Claon, Senior Project Engineer, Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica

Sheppard-Stewart, Andrea, Manager of Multilateral Technical Cooperation, Planning Institute of Jamaica

Simpson, Sheries, Manager, Projects Planning & Monitoring Branch, National Environment and Planning Agency

Smith, Bert, Director, Legal Affairs,
Maritime Authority of Jamaica

Spooner, Jeffery, Climate Branch Head,
Meteorological Service Jamaica

Stitchel, Kensington, Fisheries Officer,
Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture

Thompson, Selvyn, Watershed Officer,
National Environment and Planning Agency

Townsend, Winsome, Senior Director,
Strategic Planning, National Environment and
Planning Agency

Tulloch, Denise, Senior Research Officer,
Center of Excellence for Renewable Energy,
Petroleum Corporation of Jamaica

Vidal, Fitzroy, mSenior Director, Energy
Division, Ministry of Energy & Mining

Wade, Delores, External Cooperation Division,
Planning Institute of Jamaica

Walker, Nicol, Project Manager, National
Ozone Unit, National Environment and
Planning Agency

UNITED NATIONS

Brown, Nicole, Programme Assistant,
Environment & Energy, UNDP

Cieux, Tess, Programme Officer,
CETA, United Nations Environment
Programme – CEP/RCU

Corbin, Chris, Programme Officer,
AMEP, United Nations Environment
Programme – CEP/RCU

Douglas, Hyacinth, National Coordinator,
UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme

Fujii, Akiko, Deputy Resident Representative,
UNDP

Gooden, Adrian, former staff, UNDP

Jones Williams, Margaret, Programme Advisor,
Environment & Energy, UNDP

Khammar, Carla, Senior Programme Adviser,
UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America,
New York

Pham, Minh, UNDP Resident Representative
and UN Resident Coordinator

Prendigast, David, former staff, UNDP

Robinson, Holly-Rose, Programme Assistant,
UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme

Ross, Alan, Disaster Risk Reduction
Consultant, UNDP

Smith, David, former staff, UNDP

Stewart, Machel, Programme Advisor,
Poverty, UNDP

Williams-Thompson, Vivienne, former
staff, UNDP

NON-GOVERNMENTAL/COMMUNITY- BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Bailey, Janet, Convener, Fairy Hill
Community Group

Blake, Donna, Jamaica Country Representative,
The Nature Conservancy

Cargill, Patrick, Convener, Driver's River
Community Group

Doyle, Omar, Chairman DAC, IWCAM
Project, Manchionel Community Group

Griffith, Carmen, Director, Construction
Resource and Development Centre,
Huairou Commission

Harper, Melonia, Officer, 4H, Manchester

Hines, Natanish, Officer, 4H, Trelawny

James, Jeff, Caribbean representative,
Help Age International

McKenzie, Hermione, President, Association
of Women's Organizations of Jamaica

Moody, Duane, Officer, 4H, St. Thomas

Munroe, Trevor, Founder, National Integrity
Action Forum/CLG

Robinson, Monica, President,
Long Bay Community Group

Shagoury, William, Chairman, National
Association of Parish Development Committees

Ustanny, Saint Rachel, Executive Director,
Hibiscus

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

Belgrave, Julian, Operations Specialist, Inter-
American Development Bank (IDB)

Cunningham, Glaister, Operations Analyst, IDB

Dunbar, Gregory, Operations Senior
Associate, IDB

Ebanks, Rajiv, Research Fellow, IDB

Grey, Vivian, Senior Development Officer,
Canadian International Development Agency
(CIDA) - Governance

Jenkinson, Helen, Head of Sector,
EU Delegation

Longmore, Rohan, Economist,
World Bank Jamaica

Millar, Thomas, First Secretary, EU Delegation

Osner, Sean, Supervisory Programme
Officer, USAID

Parke, Sasha, Project Management Specialist,
Governance, USAID

Quarrie, Janet, Operations Analyst, IDB

Schnid, Juan Pedro, Country Economist,
Senior Specialist, IDB

Spence, Althea, Operations Analyst,
World Bank Jamaica

Spence, Rania, Agricultural Officer, USAID

PRIVATE SECTOR

Glasgow, Sandra, CEO, Private Sector
Organization of Jamaica

Troupe, Richard, Director, Hope for Children
Development Company

Wright, Raymond, Consultant, Petroleum
Corporation of Jamaica

UNIVERSITY/TRAINING CENTRE

Archer, Carol, Dean, University of Technology

Bailey, Barbara, formerly of the Institute of
Gender and Development Studies

Bean, Dalea, Lecturer, Institute of Gender
and Development Studies, University of the
West Indies

Bromfield, Charles, Jamaica Maritime Institute
Trust Fund, SGP Grantee/consultant

Buddo, Dayne, Marine Biologist, Marine
Invasive Alien Species – National Lionfish
Project Lead, University of the West Indies

Daley, Gavin, Lecturer, Centre for Leadership
and Governance, University of the West Indies

Dunn, Leith, Head, Institute of Gender and
Development Studies, University of the
West Indies

Harriott, Anthony, Head, Institute for
Criminal Justice and Security

Headley, Bernard, Director, EU-UNDP Reintegrating Deported Migrants Project, Institute of Development Studies, University of the West Indies

Henry, Marcia, Manager, Project and Quality Management Systems, Scientific and Research Council

Maxwell, Shakira, Administrative Officer, Regional Coordinating Unit, Institute of Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies

McClaren, Kurt, Researcher, University of the West Indies

McLean, Eron, Director, Corporate Planning and Administration, Caribbean Maritime Institute

Shepherd, Vereen, Director, Institute of Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies

Sutherland, Violet, Project Manager, STATIN, Women's Research and Outreach Centre

Vassel, Linette, Community Development and Gender Specialist, Women's Research and Outreach Centre

Webber, Mona, Head, Life Sciences, University of the West Indies

Wilson, Byron, Researcher, University of the West Indies

Ying, Neville, Executive Director, Diaspora Institute (Mona Institute of Business)



United Nations Development Programme
Evaluation Office
220 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017, USA
Tel. (646) 781 4200, Fax (646) 781 4213
Internet: www.undp.org/evaluation

ISBN #: 978-92-126301-5
e-ISBN: 978-92-1-054787-1

