



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

CARISECURE Project Appraisal Committee (PAC) Meeting

25 July 2016

1. Agenda

The Agenda was adopted and is attached as Appendix I.

2. Attendees

The participants' list is attached as Appendix II.

3. Welcome & Introductions

The Chair, Rebeca Arias, Director, Regional Bureau welcomed those in attendance in country offices in Barbados, Guyana and Suriname. Colleagues from the Trinidad country office were in a meeting with the Ministry of National Security and would join once their meeting had concluded.

The Chair congratulated the team on the successful submission of the proposal to USAID and noted that while the proposal process had been comprehensive, the project was critical for the Caribbean, highlighting the increasing crime and violence rates in the eastern Caribbean. She noted it was a priority area of intervention for the Caribbean region as well as the regional bureau. The Chair shared that the total award was for USD \$14, 000,000 and had similar objectives to the *InfoSegura* project currently being implemented by UNDP in Central America, also funded by USAID. The project's objective, to strengthen evidenced-based decision-making in the region, was clearly a regional priority for the United States government.

4. Objective of PAC Meeting & Agenda

There were no comments on the agenda and it was accepted.

The Chair advised the Committee that the objective of the PAC is to review the project document to ensure quality and its alignment with UNDP corporate policy and quality standards, particularly to ensure the project is in sync with the new quality assurance policy. Once the project is reviewed, the committee will recommend its approval or recommend the document undergoes further revisions and adjustments.

Ms. Arias also advised that the project had undergone several redrafts which had been done collaboratively with other Country Offices (COs) before the final submission to the donor. It was noted that project implementation would need to begin almost immediately, it was recommended to prepare a Project Initiation Document (PID), which is essentially a smaller version of a full project document. A PID

is utilised when a full project document is not ready for approval but allows for project activities to begin. It was noted that the project document is finalised, however the endorsement of the participating countries was just beginning and in some cases could be lengthy. The PID will allow for some project activities to begin while the endorsement is being sought by the participating COs. The Chair advised that the PAC will seek to get approval of both documents, the PID and the project document.

5. Overview of the project and process

Mr. Stephen O'Malley thanked the team for their hard work on the successful proposal and stated it was a great opportunity for this type of intervention in the Caribbean. The project will compliment what the *Infosegura* project is achieving in Central America, and provides a great opportunity for UNDP to position itself as critical partner in this area.

- Increase in unemployment in the region is a concern particularly amongst youth. Rising pressures from arms trafficking, arms trade and rates of violence crime. Data suggests that men and women are at a higher risk of engaging in and becoming victims of these behaviors. In Barbados and OECS crime rates increasing, particular in St Lucia, St Kitts and St Vincent. This includes serious violence crime, theft etc. A Regional Security Systems (RSS) survey identified 139 street gangs reported by the police. The numbers are not on the same level as America, but nonetheless in small societies they can be very disruptive. In Guyana, there are continued challenges there; wide range of violence existing in multiple forms: against children, intimate partners. In Trinidad, there are fundamental problems to criminal gangs, weapons smuggling and drugs. Suriname does not appear to be suffering from same set of issues. The homicide rate is below the regional average, although property crime is still an issue.
- The Theory of Change can assist by strengthening the decision-making process in Caribbean public institutions through the use of quantitative and qualitative data tools for analysis. Ultimately the project wants those to be incorporated into national citizen security action. At the end of the project, we expect an increased use of evidenced based decision-making to affect policy making.
- The logic of intervention uses the public health model of intervention:
 - a) Define the problem; identifying the risk and protective factors; developing and testing the prevention strategies; then assuring widespread adoption. The process employed by the Project covers the first three steps and implies a) processing data required to define the problem;
 - b) Transforming it into information to identify risk and protective factors of youth involvement in crime and violence;
 - c) Facilitating decision-making required to develop preventive policies and programmes.
- It is therefore expected that by improving the availability, comparability, reliability and analysis of disaggregated citizen security data, the project will complement the on-going efforts for improving the quality of preventive policy decisions made in target institutions, and thus contribute to the overall reduction of youth crime and violence.

- It is important to note the CARISECURE is one of three (3) projects within the broader USAID citizen security programme in the region. Other components of the programme are currently being awarded by USAID.
- Following the logical chain, the project will work simultaneously with three groups of stakeholders at national and sub-regional institutions:
 - Technical personnel in police, healthcare and judicial institutions;
 - Middle-level managers and programme/policy analysts in police forces, judiciary, ministries of youth and social development, national observatories and regional institutions; and,
 - Decision-makers at the level of director/head of unit, permanent secretary and minister at the national level and where feasible regional decision making processes. Senior decision makers

Output 1: Standardized and disaggregated crime data sources established to facilitate identification and measurement of youth risk and resilience factors. The project will start by establishing standardised and disaggregated crime and violence data sets in target institutions and will work with the first group of beneficiaries including police constables, prisons and court officials responsible for intake/record keeping, and emergency rooms' personnel in hospitals (where feasible) to collect, classify and monitor crime and violence data according to the set of indicators established for each country. Currently, there is no data sharing protocols, with only ad hoc sharing and analysis.

Output 2: Analysis, Focuses on higher level analysis and contextualization. This primary information, complimented with in-depth sectorial analysis and public opinion surveys, will be transformed into qualitative information, used to identify and measure youth crime and violence trends and resilience factors, draw conclusions on the actual state of citizen security in their countries, identify possible solutions and assess costs and benefits of each of these solutions. Analysis will be carried out at both operational/tactical and policy levels in line with the institutional mandates and response needs. At the operational/tactical level, police commissioners, superintendents and station sergeants will process the available data and use it in operational decisions such as deployment, analysis of crime trends, accountability and the like. Policy and programme analysts and managers in the ministries of national security, youth, social transformation and health will also analyse the data to elaborate recommendations for the design of new policies and programmes and monitoring and evaluation of the existing ones, with the purpose of their improvement and expansion. As the result of this phase, it is expected that institutions have developed policy recommendations, programme proposals and draft standard operating procedures for the approval of decision-makers.

Output 3: Improved decision-making on youth crime and violence based on available evidence at the national, sub-regional and regional levels. This of course has challenges; lack of informed decisions about youth crime and violence prevention policy and programming due to unavailability of data on the prevalence and nature of youth risk and resilience factors.

Governance arrangements:

Given the regional nature of this project, it is proposed that this project is implemented using the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). UNDP Country Offices will be each accountable for activities in their respective countries under the overall oversight of the Project Team Leader. The Country Offices will be

responsible for financial disbursements and provision of administrative/operational support for the implementation of national components in each target country. The project is set-up in ATLAS with one award and several outputs representing each country office for planning and reporting purposes. Each country office is able to commit, disburse and approve purchase orders/requisitions. This is based on advice received from Maribel Landau and Karina Servellon.

The Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) will be under the day-to-day supervision from the Resident Representative of UNDP Barbados and the OECS or their designate, who will be primarily accountable for the overall leadership, decision-making and management of the project including budget and financial management (achievement of results, approval of budget revisions, and allocation of financial resources and overall reporting). The RCU will be comprised, at a minimum, of a full time Project Team Leader, Deputy Team Leader, Procurement Analyst, Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, Communication Analyst, Data/Reporting Specialist, and Project Support Associate.

UNDP SRO, assuring the overall quality control and oversight for this initiative (especially on substantive results monitoring and financial management), will report to USAID (via their Agreement Officer Representative in the USAID Mission for the Eastern and Southern Caribbean based Barbados) on a quarterly basis.

Funding Distribution

Country Office/Unit	Allocation
Regional Coordination Unit (based in UNDP Barbados and the OECS)	\$9,853,730.33
UNDP Barbados and the OECS	\$1,697,094.72
UNDP Guyana	\$1,132,526.88
UNDP Suriname	\$260,162.28
UNDP Trinidad and Tobago	\$1,056,486.24

Figure 1: Funding table for participating Country Offices

6. Comments on project

Guyana:

Mr. Patrick John queried if it was possible to begin the recruitment process for national staff to be started as soon as possible to avoid potential delays. Ms. Janine Chase advised that it was planned for the national officers to be based in the Government's Ministry of Security, it was recommended that the CO engage the government on this and the actual project document. Following that, the TORs for the posts would be shared so the CO can begin the recruitment process. Ms. Shabnam Mallick also noted that it's important for a project of this nature to consider all types of data to be analysed as well as possibly explore anthropological research.

Mr. Fabio Oliva queried the factors that resulted in Guyana being selected as part of this regional initiative from the perspective of USAID, noting that the crime was not comparable to that in neighbouring Trinidad and Tobago or Jamaica in terms of gang violence. Mr. Oliva also noted that he had been working on a social cohesion programme Guyana in Suriname and he sought to broaden the programme beyond the factors of race and ethnicity. Mr. Oliva queried whether issues of security could be linked and how potential synergies could be built in. Ms. Chase advised that Guyana was identified early on in the process as a priority country for USAID, while Jamaica is not covered by the USAID Representation Office for the Eastern and Southern Caribbean. Ms. Chase also noted that Trinidad already has a well-funded citizen security programme funded by IDB. Ms. Solomon also noted that synergies would be sought where possible with the social cohesion programme.

Suriname:

Mr. Bryan Drakenstein queried whether there would be a national implementation unit based in Suriname. He also noted that the budget allocated for Suriname was USD \$260,000.00 and whether DPC was included in this figure. Ms. Chase shared that during the discussions with USAID, the donor explained they did not see scope with the Government of Suriname for UNDP to implement many activities, hence the budgetary allocation and the decision not to create a project implementation unit in Suriname. Although Suriname is not a priority country, the three (3) floating national officer's positions did provide opportunity based on change in uptake for national activities and agreement from the donor to respond with a national implementation unit. It was also noted that the DPC allocations in the budget were donor-approved and any further adjustments would require getting donor approval.

Panama:

Ms. Carla Zacapa shared that the new fast-track acceleration package was now available to all COs and encourage all to take advantage of the packages on offer, such as those for procurement and HR. Ms. Zacapa noted that it was important for the project team to discuss how it would manage the possible varying rates of implementation between countries and even COs as this was a regional initiative. The importance of monitoring not just at the regional level, but also in-country was also highlighted. Specifically, that monitoring is done for the entire lifetime of the project in the national implementation units. It was also noted that the project team should ensure full harmonization of reporting between UNDP and USAID. Ms. Chase advised that a fulltime M&E Officer had been budgeted within the project who would have responsibility for monitoring activities, outputs and monitoring progress of all the indicators. She further indicated that USAID has very specific reporting requirements; quarterly reports

by country and not by CO; reporting on the expenditure by each country; they also requested to see planned expenditure for the following quarter, and a monitoring report that report on the indicators set for the year. In particular, it was noted that the donor can also request information on the rate of implementation by country office which would highlight lagging countries. This information was requested on the *Infosegura* project.

Mr. Richard Barathe advised that the PID should clearly identify the number and nature of activities that will move forward without government endorsement. He highlighted the importance of selecting this very carefully as not all countries are at the same stage of engagement. He urged that this be clarified early on in the implementation phase to avoid possible government resistance which could delay overall implementation. Ms. Chase noted that the possible varying rates of implementation had been very much considered throughout the various drafting process.

Mr. Barathe also noted that the implementation modalities need to be clearly defined in the project document, particularly where UNDP will recruit national officers who will be based in their respective government ministries to implement UNDP project activities. Ms. Juliet Solomon confirmed that the project will be implemented under the full DIM modality.

Mr. Barathe recommended the project document identify any specify areas of support from the Panama Regional Hub, noting the Barbados CO would undergo a capacity assessment the following month. Although it did not need to be defined in the project document, it should be identified as a possibility. Mr. Barathe also noted the need to include a separate instrument that allowed colleagues to capture the DPC accurately and plan accordingly. Ms. Solomon confirmed that the DPC allocations had been clearly and fully defined in the workplan and disaggregated by CO.

It was also remarked by Mr. Barathe that the Barbados CO will be fully accountable for the results of this project and would need to ensure they have the necessary leverage to address any implementation issues to ensure deliverables are met on time, which can often be a challenge in regional projects. He further noted that the project had defined a solid foundation by incorporating the national officers, but noted it was important to define a way of committing to timeframes within the project, and defining what type of measures would be taken should the timeframes not be met.

The Chair noted that typically, in projects of this magnitude, there are a number of regional public goods that are included within the project document; however, the Chair noted the absence of the publication of studies, the possibility of a regional observatory on crime etc. Ms. Chase advised that the original drafts of the project that had been submitted to USAID had contained the budgeting for a number of regional studies, working collaboratively with CSOs and regional observatories. However, the donor had requested UNDP remove them as they questioned the value of the results and who would benefit.

It was noted that in particular there was some scope in Outcome 2, the Risk and Resilience Factors of Youth, however this output was limited to the priority countries only. Mr. O'Malley shared with the committee that Creative Associates, a Washington-based international development organisation, had been awarded the other component to the Citizen Security programme. UNDP colleagues had already been in communication with Creative Associates to maximize synergies.

Ms. Solomon further indicated that the donor wanted UNDP to concentrate on three (3) priority countries initially rather than work directly with some of the regional institutions (e.g. CARICOM); however, the

project intended to work on a subregional basis with the OECS Commission and Regional Security System (RSS). It was also important to note that the project had incorporated several regional activities that would take place at the end of the project, for example, a regional knowledge fair and a number of regional consultations. Mr. O'Malley added that the team had many discussions with USAID on how to engage with the priority countries initially, and the non-priority countries. It was agreed to rollout the activities to the priority countries initially, whilst engaging with the non-priority countries through discussion and dialogue.

Trinidad:

Ms. Ramsaran apologised for the delay in her joining the meeting, however the team had been in a meeting with the Ministry of National Security. They would follow up with their comments with Juliet and Janine following the meeting.

7. Presentation on Project Initiation Document (PID)

Ms. Solomon confirmed that the recruitment process of the project team had begun and was in full swing. A one (1) year workplan and M&E plan must be submitted to USAID by 26th August and Juliet and Janine would be engaging all COs in order to finalise both documents before the deadline.

Ms. Solomon outlined the activities to be implemented in the PID, which would cover the period 1st August-31st December 2016. The budgeted activities are as follows:

- Project initiation activities
- Continued recruitment of project team
- Continued engagement with focal point ministries
- Hosting of project board meeting and inception workshops
- Needs assessments for baseline data
- Procurement of furniture and equipment, branding and marketing
- Follow-up dialogues in priority countries and in Trinidad and Tobago

Ms. Zacapa recommended a procurement strategy be included in the PID to ensure suitable planning. Ms. Ramsaran queried how the COs could assist in the preparation of the workplan and M&E plan. Ms. Solomon confirmed that the project team would be calling upon colleagues to ensure its completion by the deadline and their inputs are included.

Mr. Barathe advised that all Resident Representatives need to be informed of the planned activities in the PID as some of these will take place without the endorsement with the government. The Chair reiterated that all Resident Representatives should be informed that the PID and project document have been approved by the PAC. The Chair also explained the interim project management arrangements; Ms. Solomon is Interim Project Team Leader, and Janine Chase is interim Deputy Team Leader.

Mr. Barathe advised that it would be important to define ways of dealing with slow implementation in countries and the project cannot afford to have delays in the project start-up as this can pose as a reputational risk with the donor. Ms. Arias agreed and noted that it may be appropriate to schedule ad

hoc project board meetings where necessary, and where implementation is a concern, the donors should be included in those discussions and should be reflected in the management arrangements to address issues related to implementation.

8. Summary and Closing

Mr. O'Malley remarked the session had been extremely productive and noted the project gives UNDP a number of opportunities to try different things, such as the planned pilot of the Safety Pin app, and the possibility to scale-up in different countries. The Chair requested the PAC members their agreement to approve the project document and the PID. The interim project management arrangements will be communicated via email to all country offices. The Chair thanked everyone for their commitment to the process and the contribution of UNDP, and wished the countries and the team success in their future endeavours.

Recommendations

Implementation modality is clearly defined throughout the project document

The outcome of the Barbados Country Office capacity assessment may have implications on operational aspects of the project (e.g. procurement)

Procurement plan to be included in PID

All RR's/DRR's are informed that the PAC has approved both the project document and the PID

PID clearly defines what activities will move ahead in the absence of government endorsement; all RR's/DRR's are made aware of this

Interim project management and coordination arrangements to be communicated to all Country Offices
Project document and PID approved by PAC.

APPENDIX I

Project Appraisal Committee (PAC)

Strengthening Evidenced Based Decision Making for Citizen Security in the Caribbean – CARISECURE

Monday, 25 July 2016
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Agenda

10.00-10.15am	Welcome and introductions	Rebeca Arias, Director UNDP Panama Regional Hub
10.15-10.30	Objective of PAC Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Review and endorsement of PRODOC- Approval of Project Initiation Plan	Rebeca Arias
10.30-10.45am	Overview of the project and process	Stephen O'Malley, Resident Representative UNDP Barbados & the OECS
10.45-11.15am	Presentation of the PRODOC	UNDP Barbados & Juliet Solomon
11.15-12.00	Review and discussion of PRODOC	By CO
12.00-12.15	Project Initiation Activities and next steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Submission of Year 1 Workplan to USAID (due 26 August 2016)- Submission of Year 1 M&E Plan to USAID (due 26 August 2016)	UNDP Barbados & Juliet Solomon
12.15-12.30	Summary and wrap-up <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Interim Project Management arrangements	Rebeca Arias

APPENDIX II
 CARISECURE PAC Meeting
 25th July 2016

Name	Title	Signature
Rebeca Arias	Director UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Richard Barahne	Chief, CO & Regional Programme Support UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Daniel Luz	Citizen Security & Justice Regional Advisor UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Juliet Solomon	Citizen Security Specialist IAC UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Carla Zacapa	Country Advisor IAC UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Maria Valena Cabrera	Regional Programme Associate UNDP Panama Regional Hub	
Stephen O'Malley	Resident Representative (RR) UNDP Barbados and the OECS	
Janine Chase	Project Coordinator, Youth & Citizen Security UNDP Barbados and the OECS	
Nathalie Thomas	Programme Associate UNDP Barbados and the OECS	
Cherryanne Hinds	Programme Finance Associate UNDP Barbados and the OECS	
Sharon Rambaran	Programme Analyst UNDP Trinidad	
Shabnam Mallik	Deputy Resident Representative (DRR) UNDP Guyana	
Patrick John	Project Associate UNDP Guyana	
Fabio Olivia	Peace and Development Advisor (PDA) UNDP Guyana	
Bryan Drakenstein	Programme Specialist UNDP Suriname	