

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
PROJECT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ST. VINCENT AND THE
GRENADINES

St. Vincent and the Grenadines/98/001/01/99

EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by
Monica Thomas Woodley
P.O.Box 337, Cane Garden
St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Tel:784-456-1196
mbwoodley@vincy.com

October 10, 2006

Updated following the Tripartite Review February 14, 2007
March 10, 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
A. <i>Introduction and Background</i>	4
B. <i>Purpose/Justification Of The Evaluation:</i>	4
C. <i>Progress attained by the Project –assessed by evaluation criteria.</i>	5
1.0 BACKGROUND.....	11
2.0 INTRODUCTION.....	13
3.0 THE EVALUATION ISSUES.....	14
3.1 <i>The UNDP Poverty Eradication Project Framework</i>	14
3.2 <i>The Evaluation Criteria</i>	18
3.3 <i>Poverty Reduction Evaluation</i>	18
4.0 METHODOLOGY	19
4.1 <i>Scheduling</i>	19
4.2 <i>Data Gathering</i>	20
4.3 <i>Document Review</i>	20
4.4 <i>Limitations</i>	21
5.0 THE EVALUATION PROCESS	21
5.1 <i>The Evaluation Tasks</i>	21
5.2 <i>The Logical Framework</i>	22
5.3 <i>GoSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradication Project (UNDP/GoSVG PE Project) Framework</i>	22
5.4 <i>Assessment of Activities in meeting the Project Objectives and Outputs</i>	23
5.4.1 <i>Sequence of activities identified from the Poverty Eradication</i>	23
5.4.2 <i>An assessment of Community Activities – up to the present.</i>	30
5.4.3 <i>An assessment of Community Development Division Aactivities – up to the present.</i>	33
6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	36
6.1 <i>GOSVG/UNDP POVERTY ERADICATION PROJECT - GENERALLY</i>	36
6.2 <i>IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES</i>	36
6.3 <i>TARGET COMMUNITIES</i>	37
6.4 <i>LESSONS LEARNED</i>	38
6.5 <i>RECOMMENDATIONS</i>	39
7.0 BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS RE PROJECT STV/98/001/01/99	40
8.0 COMMUNITY RESOURCE INTERNET RESOURCE CENTRES (CoRICs).....	42
8.1 <i>Background</i>	42
8.2 <i>CoRICs IMPLEMENTATION</i>	43
8.3 <i>CoRICs RECOMMENDATIONS:</i>	45
9.0 CONCLUSION	45
REFERENCES	47
APPENDIX # 1	48
<i>Revised Logical Framework Analysis (Williams)</i>	49
<i>SVG/98/001/99</i>	49
APPENDIX # 3.....	51
<i>INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT</i>	53
APPENDIX # 5.....	57
<i>TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GOVERNMENT OF ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES ASSISTANCE TO POVERTY ERADICATION PROJECT – STV/98/001/01/99</i>	57

Acknowledgement

The Evaluator offers sincere gratitude and appreciation to the many persons (listed below) who assisted with this evaluation by sharing information through individual and group meetings; telephone conversations and documents, materials and also reports from the Management Committees. Despite the short time for the Consultancy many persons adjusted their schedules to make the time to provide meaningful contributions to the work.

Particular appreciation goes to UNDP Officers for their valuable assistance. Ms. Chanda Davis (UNDP/Central Planning Division), provided helpful coordination and liaison activities between the Evaluator and the various stakeholders. The efficient assistance of Ms. Lesia Perch, UNDP Programme Manager, was invaluable in providing direction and guidance for the Evaluation.

CONTRIBUTORS MET BY THE EVALUATOR

Coulls Hill

Evelyn Stapleton	-	President, Management Committee
Jennifer Woods	-	Secretary
Annetta DeFreitas	-	Farmer
Grafton Charles	-	Farmer
Eka Scott	-	Farmer
Christobel Coldeir	-	Farmer
Chaddis Stapleton	-	CDD Field Officer

Orange Hill

Adam Billingsy	-	President – Management Committee
Selwry Lawrence	-	Vice President
Monica Browne	-	Treasurer
Desreene Jordan	-	Member M/C
Wendy Byron	-	Farmer
Jennie Bentick	-	Farmer
Tyrone Cyrus	-	Farmer
Mymie Bracken	-	Farmer
Brenda Arthur	-	Farmer
Orma Billingsy	-	Farmer
Vanessa Cato	-	Farmer
Deslyn Lawrence	-	Farmer
Jimmy Black	-	CDD Field Project Coordinator
Glaston Lavia	-	CDD Field Officer

Implementing Agencies:

Leisa Perch	-	UNDP
Anne Marie Diop	-	UNDP
Chanda Davis	-	UNDP
Pat Fraser	-	Former UNV
Mrs. Laura Anthony Browne	-	Director CPD
Beresford George	-	CPD
Decima Corea	-	CPD
Rosita Snagg	-	CDD Director
Roger Young	-	CDD

ACRONYMNS

CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDD	Community Development Division
CH	Coulls Hill
CoRICs	Community Resource Internet Centres
CPD	Central Planning Division
GoSVG	Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ITU	International Telecommunications Union
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
Min SOC DEV	The Ministry of National Mobilization, Social Development and Local Government
NCB	National Commercial Bank
NESDC	National Economic and Social Development Council
NIT	National Institute of Technology
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States
OH	Orange Hill
RP	Rose Place
SCDO	Senior Community Development Officer
SVG	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNV	United Nations Volunteer

Executive Summary

A. Introduction and Background¹

The UNDP in its commitment to sustainable development and eradication of poverty, collaborated with the Government of SVG and initiated the Assistance to Poverty Eradication project in 1998. The project was to address some of the many problems facing communities in SVG, and to assist in the grassroots development of its people in an effort to reduce, and eventually eradicate poverty by assisting them with an alternative form of employment and income generation. The communities identified as poor communities, and targeted for this programme, are Orange Hill, Coulls Hill and Rose Place (Bottom Town).

UNDP also assists countries in developing innovative strategies that increase access to Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in order to harness it for development. ICT can strengthen participation in global markets; promote political accountability; improve the delivery of basic services; and enhance local development opportunities. ICT has therefore now become an important component in sustainable human development efforts facilitating participation and empowerment by those often left out of dialogue and policy. To this end, the UNDP Initiative to support the development of Resource Centres in communities, in collaboration with the United Nations Volunteers (UNV) to support IT training was subsumed as part of the Poverty Reduction project.

This ICT project, based on a partnership with the ITU and French Cooperation, is implementing a pilot that seeks to provide OECS countries (the Windward Islands, **i.e., Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines**), with a comprehensive programme for community development through community mobilization, training and reduction of the digital ‘divide’; to reduce poverty through the use of information technology for health, education, economic opportunity, empowerment and participation; and for sustaining the environment. The major strategy of establishing Community Resource Internet Resource Centres (CoRICs) will seek to enhance and provide access to training in computer skills. Dominica was the first of these islands to implement this project. Additionally, the centers will be established as support mechanisms for community activities as well as leadership building and small enterprise development, amongst other things.

B. Purpose/Justification Of The Evaluation: ²

The UNDP has made a commitment to sustainable development and the eradication of poverty. Human resource development and sustainable livelihoods are also among its priority themes. The project with its focus on poverty reduction linked to empowerment responds directly to the organization’s mandate.

According to the 1996 Poverty Assessment Report conducted by the Government of SVG in collaboration with the CDB, over 30 percent (30%) of the population in SVG has been living below the poverty line. The communities identified in this programme are listed as having the greatest need for assistance in poverty alleviation, and have also expressed interest in fully participating in relevant programmes or projects.

¹ *Terms Of Reference For Evaluation Of The UNDP/Government Of St. Vincent And The Grenadines Assistance To Poverty Eradication Project – Stv/98/001/01/99, p.1*

² *Terms Of Reference For Evaluation Of The UNDP/Government Of St. Vincent And The Grenadines Assistance To Poverty Eradication Project – Stv/98/001/01/99, p.1*

Furthermore, with the economic crisis and severe decline in the banana industry, and subsequent growth in unemployment and income loss, this project should have restored some vibrancy to the economy of particularly hard hit communities, within a holistic, comprehensive and integrated context. The project should have also provided alternative employment strategies and provide employment skills to particularly vulnerable groups.

The Poverty Eradication Project, initiated in 1998, should have been completed in October of 2001. The original project document makes provision for an evaluation, which should have been completed five years ago. An evaluation and consequent revision of the project was finally completed in December 2004 which served to highlight challenges in the scope of the project and sought to rationalize the activities and focus based on the more recent realities of the communities, their needs and the resources available. With the attendant delays and challenges including some activities which are not making significant progress, it was felt that there was an urgent necessity to bring this project to a close, and to identify the way forward.

As originally defined, the project should have concluded with the three communities attaining improved living standards and an enhanced quality of life through interventions reflecting poverty reduction and eradication.

This evaluation seeks to assess the Poverty Eradication Project, in relation to its impact and the sustainability of community development with relation to human resources and strengthening of capacity. It will also look at the management and implementation of the project, identify constraints, lessons learned and provide recommendations for the future. The beneficiaries of the evaluation report will include the UNDP Barbados and OECS office, the Government of SVG and the selected communities.

C. Progress attained by the Project –assessed by evaluation criteria.

Relevance Criteria

The 2001 Population and Housing Census indicates an increase of over 20% in unemployment in St. Vincent and the Grenadines since the 1991 Census. This is predominantly in the rural areas. Male employment in Agriculture declined significantly by more than 50% between 1991 and 2001³. In 2006, the UNDP Poverty Eradication Project (UNDP PE Project) remains **relevant and necessary**. Rose Place has proven to be a community of issues quite different from the rural farming communities in Coulls Hill on the Leeward side of the mainland, and Orange Hill on the Windward side in the Carib region. **The Rose Place component has not really taken off, and as such does not meet the relevance criteria. The other two communities have.**

In Coulls Hill the interventions are pig farming and bottled seasoning production. In Orange Hill it is pig farming and plantain chips production. Both products are well received by the communities, and are seen to be avenues to raise their economic prospects. The notion of *individual benefit* is strong. As planned, individuals will be the initial recipients of the farming inputs (pigs). The production centres are seen to be beneficial to the individuals who receive small stipends for their work. However, the intention of the Project is that as pig litters increase (actually the 2nd litter), piglets are to be given back to the Management Committees for revolving type distribution to other farmers, or sold and funds used to help others in the community. **The CDD must continue to reinforce the idea of community development over individual benefits solely.**

³ Statistical Office St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Population and Housing Census Report 2001, p.41

Effectiveness Criteria

Effectiveness is the extent to which a development intervention has achieved its objectives, taking their relative importance into account.

Expected Outputs from the project included:

1. Capacity of three poor communities built and strengthened to identify their needs and implement poverty reduction projects on a sustainable basis;
2. Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis;
3. Institutional capacity of the Community Development Division strengthened in order to facilitate the poverty reduction thrust in St. Vincent and the Grenadines; and
4. Efficient coordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.

The projects in the two communities are **beginning** to satisfy the **effective criteria** for the first output (a). “Sustainability” is not yet assured, but is possible with continued support from the CDD. Output (b) speaks to impact which is longer term and cannot be accurately measured at this point. However, it is fair to say that several persons in the community through their involvement with the UNDP PE Project now have a mental vision of an improved standard of living which is the first step of empowerment.

The second level of Outputs ‘c’ and ‘d’ relate to the CDD. In the absence of baseline data or some measurement of where the CDD was in terms of capacity before the UNDP intervention, we glean from the Project document that the UNDP through past experience has concerns regarding the capacity of the CDD. It had invested previously in capacity building efforts. This Project was intended to “contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for poverty alleviation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through building on past efforts at capacity enhancement and management development in the CDD.”

Only a few of the original specific activities designed for capacity strengthening in the CDD were completed. Nevertheless, the CDD must be credited for the gains made in the communities. The mobilization and outreach efforts of the Community Officers and the UN Volunteer, Ms. Pat Fraser must also be commended. The CDD faced several challenges in meeting timelines. Many delays – not necessarily within their control, slowed or prevented the carrying out of decisions. Generally it cannot be said that the end of project objective has been met: “At the end of the project the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities, including Orange Hill.”⁴ **The CDD needs to focus on specific capacity building activities. The prevailing notion that Projects are less of a priority than “substantive” responsibilities needs to be examined.**

⁴ UNPD Assistance with Poverty Eradication Project in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, p.8

Efficiency

The extent to which the costs of a development intervention can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account. Also the extent to which the development intervention is managed effectively by the implementing agency.

The **efficiency level** of the Project is less than satisfactory. Is there justification for the the inputs/resources by the UNDP/GoSVG based on the results to date? Further inquiry is required to accurately determine the budgetary component of the Poverty Eradication Project. Some current findings show:

1. “Budget B” Assistance to Poverty Eradication Project 1998 to 2001 attached to the UNDP/GoSVG Project document shows an amended budget Table for ‘Project Personnel’ totaling \$265,000. The document reflected a cost-sharing contribution of \$100,000. (p.0)
2. Williams’ Evaluation reports⁵
“ Cost Estimate and Financing Plan: The amount approved for the project was US \$265,700. to be distributed over a three year period..... In addition, the gap resulting from the absence of a management / implementing agency during the period 2000 to 2002 resulted in the inability to the project to achieve specific targets, within the specified timeframe. Financial reports indicate that the project has expended US\$ 156, 681.07 (including US\$58,710.07 so far for 2004.)”
3. A revised budget from the UNDP Office “ SVG Implementation –Budget” indicates a commitment of US\$75,000. for the 2006 period.
4. Anne Anderson’s Business Plan states that the Project was funded by the UNDP in collaboration with the SVG government to the tune of US \$265,000. “The project now in its sixth year has recorded disbursement and utilization of funds to the sum of US\$ 156,681.07”⁶

Thus it may be deduced from secondary financial data found in the documents reviewed, the UNDP earmarked US\$ 265,700. to the Project. Towards the end of 2004 US\$156,681.07 had been utilized. The UNDP (Leisa Perch comments) suggests that it had taken more than five years to expend these resources. This evaluation has not been able to ascertain the disbursement of funds including requisitioning from the UNDP. A total budget of USD 224,000 was made to the project. Government cost-sharing of USD 100,000 never materialized directly but was to be rolled out directly from the Ministry of Social Development.

Ms. Perch advises that there was a remaining balance of USD 28, 000. at the beginning of January 2006. The Ministry of Social Development says that the Project still has access to some Government funds to continue working with the communities. In January 2006, in collaboration

⁵ Williams, Monica, Evaluation of Assistance with Poverty Eradication Project SVG/98/001 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Final Report, 30 December, 2004, p.16

⁶ Anderson, S. Anne, Business Plans for a UNDP Poverty Reduction Programme for St. Vincent and the Grenadines, undated – possibly 2004, p.8

with the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, it was agreed that the project would end in June 2006.

Evaluation questions that remain to be answered include: How much of these funds actually reached the communities? Were the funds distributed equitably? Were the Implementing Agencies able to use the funds effectively? Be that as it may, there is evidence that the Projects were not managed effectively and efficiently resulting in delays in disbursements, delays in inputs, production stoppages, prolonged negotiations, sometimes poor workmanship e.g in building the pig pens; and generally poor monitoring of disbursements. The present understanding is that the UNDP is making arrangements to improve the manner in which funds are distributed and managed to their country projects. As agreed with the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, a local officer has been retained and placed in the Central Planning Division to effect improved management and liaison with UNDP and other partners on the implementation of UNDP allocated resources to the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. **The evaluation recommends that the budgetary component of the project needs further inquiry. The UNDP has subsequently provided updated information. By 2006 there was only a small amount left on the project based on an advance sent in 2005. Nevertheless, the Gov of SVG, in the interest of accountability and transparency, ought to be able to easily provide a detailed report of commitments and disbursements. Further training in managing donor funds is recommended for appropriate persons in CDD and CPP.**

Impact Criteria

Impact – the totality of the effects of a development intervention, positive and negative, intended and unintended.

Impact usually refers to the long term effect of a Project. It is difficult to assess the impact of the original farming project in OH. Activities apparently did take place. No documentation of implementation is available. With the exception of the UNV who claims limited knowledge of the project, no other stakeholders – in the CDD or the community were able to explain what happened to the Project(s). **Similarly with the period managed by Project Promotions, little documentation was available.** A further assessment of this component of the project may be required for the UNDP's purposes.

Nevertheless we do know that some of the present farmers actually owned livestock and other farming assets prior to 2005 when these new farming projects began. This may well be attributed to the earlier UNDP Project Implementation.

In addition, particularly in poverty eradication development interventions, effects may be felt and sustained by targeted groups and individuals in unexpected ways. Elements like respect, empowerment, frustration, disenfranchisement, lack of equality can leave both positive and negative effect among targeted populations.

The expected end of project outcomes stated is that “the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities”. Indicators were not established at the outset for measuring progress. However, the continuous delays, stoppages

and generally slow implementation of project work does not indicate quick execution or regular monitoring. The pig projects in OH and CH have progressed reasonably well in that some farmers have already gone on to second litters.

Thus some individual farmers would have reaped some benefits of sales from the initial pig stock.

However, the documentation as a business venture or even as a community development venture is lacking. Several pigs have died. For example, in CH Evelyn Stapleton's 2 pigs produced eleven (11) piglets and eight (8) died. OH farmers also had varying questions about care and rearing of pigs, for which there did not seem to be clear answers as to where they could receive assistance or answers. This suggests a weakness in the monitoring strategy.

Nothing has materialized in Rose Place. The Coulls Hill Seasoning project is yet to get off the ground. The Orange Hill Plantain Chips project, which all stakeholders claim has great potential as a viable thriving business, has stalled or under-produced because of almost trivial issues such as (1) not getting the labels as required by the Bureau of Standards in order to expand sales and marketing (2) having the electricity disconnected because the utility bills were not paid.

With regards to CoRICs: Computers are in evidence – four in each of OH and CH Centres. Several persons have been trained in the use of computers. However, at the time of the evaluation, none of the computers were being used. At OH apparently instructors could not be identified; in CH the computers were not networked. In both cases the locations were not entirely settled in terms of who was responsible for paying the electricity or rental costs. Computers for RP are in storage somewhere.

On the positive side, it is apparent that the communities have a level of confidence and assertiveness as came across in the two community meetings in OH and CH. This can no doubt be contributed to the interaction with the Community and Government Officers at different levels, and the fairly extensive amount of training and exposure to other projects in other communities and in the region. There is also an awareness of community development, although the farmers spoke primarily of individual benefits in increased livestock. Record keeping is commendable by Management Committee assigned members. Skills would be further advanced when they begin to use their computer skills and computers for these tasks.

It is recommended that Service Providers to vulnerable communities seek every training opportunity to improve their capacity in service delivery. Mrs. Snagg's comment of lesson learned is noted- that communities have capacity and capabilities, and that they are all at different levels –as individuals and as communities - like any other group in the world.

Sustainability

Sustainability – the continuation or longevity of benefits from a development intervention after the cessation of development assistance.

There is every likelihood that benefits from these projects - especially in Orange Hill and Coulls Hill will be sustained. Members of the communities are enthused and individuals have already seen the benefits – as outlined in the previous section, although no hard evidence was provided. The absence of young people in the Project Implementation was evident. The CH farmers were

particularly elderly. When asked, they said their younger generation was not interested in farming. Some had jobs outside of the communities. Among those at home several refused to help the older relatives.

This bodes ill for agricultural sustainability. However, if the value of the use of land for farming — becomes entrenched, new modalities for farming may eventually follow. The Ministry of Agriculture is committed to this. Like many others, they see Agriculture as the main vehicle for economic viability in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

One practical element for sustainability is ownership of the Resource and Production Centres. Efforts should be made by sourcing lands and funds to purchase buildings for the operation of these projects.

The Community Resource Internet Resource Centres (CoRICs) project will presumably engage the youth on a longer term basis. However, implementation speed must be increased significantly. After almost two years none of these community projects are yet up and running.

The CDD needs to continue to support the Communities, with increased efficiency. They must also continue to reinforce and to build strategies to encourage the collective approach in farming implementation strategies. As individuals prosper, and benefits are shared, so will the communities thrive.

EVALUATION REPORT

1.0 BACKGROUND

(extracted from the Agricultural Census 2000 St. Vincent and the Grenadines)

THE COUNTRY

St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG) is a small multi-island Developing State. The country consists of the larger island St. Vincent and a chain of smaller islands together known as the Grenadines.

LOCATION

This group of islands is part of the Eastern Caribbean Archipelago, which stretches from Antigua in the North to Grenada in the South. St. Vincent and the Grenadines is located at longitude 61 degrees west and latitude 13 degrees north. It is just about 100 miles west of Barbados.

PHYSICAL/STRUCTURE

St. Vincent and the Grenadines has been described as the Gem of the Antilles. The main island St. Vincent is part of that inner volcanic arc which forms the Windward Islands. It is often referred to as the Switzerland of the Caribbean partly due to its ruggedness and the fact that there are picturesque settlements nestled on its hilltops, mountain slopes, and narrow valley floors.

The Forested Central 1/3 of the island is dominated by several mountain peaks the highest of which is La Soufriere, an active volcano, which last erupted in April 1979. Several spurs and narrow steep sided valleys radiate in all directions from this central mountain range. The rivers are short and swift. The Grenadines are similar in structure to St. Vincent but are also characterized by fringing coral reefs, which add to their beauty.

ECONOMY

The economy of St. Vincent and the Grenadines is driven by several sectors – Agricultural being the leading one until quite recently when Tourism took that position. Agriculture contributes around 10% of GDP. Banana cultivation for export to Britain is the main foreign exchange earner (decreased since 2000). However, the cultivation of a number of tropical fruits, root crops and vegetables are also important. Livestock and fishing are increasing in value.

Light manufacturing including agro-processing is growing as well as the construction industry and services. Given the fact that St. Vincent and the Grenadines has rich soils and favourable climate, agriculture is expected to play an important role in the nation's development in the future. In fact it is Government's stated policy that the economy would be diversified around agriculture.⁷

1.1 Decline in the socio-economic situation is captured in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation of the UNDP Poverty Eradication Project. It states:

⁷ Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries, Agricultural Census 2000 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, pg. 2ff.

SVG faces severe constraints to sustainable human development which are both domestic and external in origin. Limitations of size and natural resources, the heavy reliance on an uncompetitive banana industry and the fragility of the marine ecosystem in the main tourism centers all combine to expose the country to substantial socio-economic vulnerability. Indeed, the loss of preferential arrangements for the banana industry and the intensification of trade liberalization in the global economy serve to aggravate this position. The prevailing socio-economic situation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines is characterized by low growth, high unemployment and social inequality.

In the report of the Country Poverty Assessment (CPA) conducted by the Government during 1995/1996 with support from the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) to measure the ability of households to meet basic food and non-food requirements, almost 38 percent of the population of SVG was determined poor and 26 percent indigent. The causes of poverty identified include a low level of educational achievement, unemployment and underemployment, low wages, high dependency ratios, difficulties in the banana and manufacturing industries, limited access to productive resources (land, credit), inadequate infrastructure (access roads, drainage and irrigation, transportation, extension services) in support of productive sector activity and an inadequate social safety net. While an assessment to update these findings has not yet been conducted, it is recognized that the adverse effects of the shocks to the banana industry since 1996 and the events of September 11, 2001 might have resulted in a worsening of the poverty situation within some segments of the population.

Following a robust performance during the 1980's when the average rate of growth averaged 6.2 percent per annum (p.a.), the rate of economic growth in SVG slowed during the 1990's to 3.2 percent p.a. largely on account of decreasing demand in external markets for major commodity exports. During 2000-04, real growth further slowed to an average of 2.8 percent p.a., mainly under the influence of the slowing global economic environment. Merchandise exports as a percentage of GDP fell from 41.7 percent in 1990 to 15 percent in 1999, and further dropped to 8.3 percent in 2004. Over this period, the SVG economy was undergoing a gradual transformation of the external sector, as service exports (tourism, financial services and informatics) expanded with the ratio of exports of services to GDP rising from 26.1 percent in 1994 to 38.6 percent in 1999. However, in recent years, growing competition in the tourism sector, coupled with initiatives to control the growth of offshore financial services, slowed growth in the services sector, with the ratio of exports of services to GDP falling to 34.1 percent in 2004.

Performance in the agricultural sector, particularly the banana industry, has been steady declining. Several periods of drought, combined with unfavourable climatic conditions during the hurricane season and generally declining market prices have contributed to the overall decline in the banana sector since the early 1990s. This has resulted in the agricultural sector's contribution to GDP falling from 21.6 percent in 1990 to 9.9 percent in 2004.

Real output in manufacturing has also been on a steady decline for more than a decade as the sector has had to face increasing competition from globalization and trade liberalization. The narrow range of products produced for local consumption and the limited amounts that are exported both regionally and internationally have been significant factors underlying the demise of the sector. In addition, manufacturers within SVG (as well as the wider OECS) were protected from competition under Article 56 of the Treaty of Chaguaramas. Average sectoral growth rates have been -0.8 percent, -0.4 percent and -1.3 percent for the periods 1990-94, 1995-99 and 2000-04, respectively. Factors such as small market size and high input costs militate against economies of scale. Problems in the sector have been further exacerbated by falling import prices as barriers to trade are being removed and by the use of synthetics and other high-tech processes in production methods.⁸

Agriculture has a critical place in the socio-economic life and development of St. Vincent and the Grenadines. However, the younger generations have lost interest in Agriculture as a sustaining

⁸ Terms Of Reference For Evaluation Of The Undp/Government Of St. Vincent And The Grenadines Assistance To Poverty Eradication Project – Stv/98/001/01/99, pg.1

occupation. This factor impacts the context of the UNDP Poverty Eradication Project which is closing after almost eight years of operation.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The UNDP in its commitment to sustainable development and eradication of poverty, collaborated with the Government of SVG and initiated the Assistance to Poverty Eradication project in 1998. The project was to address some of the many problems facing communities in SVG, and to assist in the grassroots development of its people in an effort to reduce, and eventually eradicate poverty by assisting them with an alternative form of employment and income generation. The communities identified as poor communities, and targeted for this programme, are Orange Hill, Coulls Hill and Rose Place (Bottom Town)⁹.

The Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines has undergone several changes since the beginning of the Implementation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Poverty Eradication Project in 1998. Major changes included the election of a new Government in March 2001. Government Ministries have also taken on new names and configurations. The concern for the significantly high levels of poverty reported by the Kairi Consultants Poverty Assessment in 1996 and which prompted the UNDP intervention, remains. Thus the new Government has instituted and maintained a focus on Poverty Reduction from its inception.

In April 2001, the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was established and given responsibility for poverty reduction strategies.

“One of the first tasks of NESDC was to elaborate a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), more or less a blue print for developing policies and programmes to address the central elements of poverty reduction in the short, medium and long term”¹⁰

Economic growth is recognized as having significant links to Poverty reduction. The World Bank Sourcebook sites a study that found that on average the income of the bottom one-fifth of the population rose one-for-one with the overall growth of the economy as defined by per capita gross domestic product (GDP) (Dollar and Kraay 2000)¹¹

The Government of SVG’s Poverty Reduction Progress report April 2001 to April 2005 highlighted significant economic growth: “GDP per head has grown faster than in any other country in the Eastern Caribbean Currency Union (ECCU) since 2001. Very few people go hungry in St. Vincent and the Grenadines; very few live on income which is less than US \$1 per day”¹²

These figures suggest that the UNDP’s three targeted communities would have benefited in those four years, prompting the evaluation community’s perennial debate about **attribution**.

⁹ Ibid Terms Of Reference For Evaluation, pg.2

¹⁰ Office of the Cabinet Prime Minister’s Office, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, April 2005, Four Years of Progress POVERTY REDUCTION in St. Vincent and the Grenadines April 2001 to April 2005, pg. 4

¹¹ A Sourcebook for Poverty Reduction Strategies, Vol 2 Macroeconomic and Sectoral Approaches, The World Bank 2002, pg. 4

¹² Four Years Progress - Poverty Reduction in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, April 2001 to April 2005, p i

In any event, the government's deliberate policy eradication approach is expected to provide an even more enabling context for the realization of the UNDP's Development Objective: "To assist with the improvement of the social and economic well-being of the people of St. Vincent and the Grenadines."

The Evaluation of December 2004 by Consultant Monica Williams found that the GoSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradication Project although relevant to the needs to the communities, continued to be affected by some common problems:

- a. *Delays in disbursement of funds to acquire inputs; delayed delivery of inputs*
- b. *Inadequate project management capacity at the implementation agency level, among other factors have resulted in delayed implementation of activities to achieve specified results.*
- c. *Lack of coordination of effort among stakeholders due to factors, which include unclear lines of communication, roles and responsibilities.*
- d. *Non-compliance with specified reporting schedule.*
- e. *The original Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) presented two outputs which tended to be limiting in scope for a project that is specifically targeting poverty reduction and has the potential; to impact on a wide range of sectors and sub-sectors of the economy. To ensure continuity and support sustainability of the initiative, addition outputs could be included. Outcomes of the project are not clearly defined.*¹³

The Poverty Reduction Project appears to have had several phases – or stops and starts. The apparent absence at the outset of a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) with clearly defined outcomes may well have affected the systematic implementation and monitoring of the Project. Thus, there appears to be insignificant change in the Williams' findings, particularly in terms of items 'a' and 'b'. The Community Projects continue to be relevant and continue to hold potential for realizing the UNDP Development Objective "To assist with the improvement of the social and economic well-being of the people of St. Vincent and the Grenadines ."¹⁴

3.0 THE EVALUATION ISSUES

3.1 The UNDP Poverty Eradication Project Framework

The document signed in November 1998 between the UNDP and the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines provides the Framework for the Poverty Eradication Project and the basis for this Evaluation. As stated, one limitation to the evaluation – and perhaps to the ongoing monitoring of the project - is the absence of a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) or a Strategic Results Framework (SRF) table clearly outlining Objectives, Inputs, Outputs, Indicators, Outcomes, Results. Baseline data, targets and timelines would also have made for more efficient and effective implementation.

¹³ Williams, Monica, Evaluation of assistance with Poverty Eradication Project SVG/98/001, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Final Report 30 December, 2004, pg. 24

¹⁴ United Nations Development Programme Project of the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, signed November 10, 1998, pg. 10

The stated “Expected End of Project Situation” in the document (p.8) is

“This project seeks to contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for poverty alleviation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through building on past efforts at capacity enhancement and management development in the Community Development Division.

At the end of the project the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities including Orange Hill.”

As a close of project evaluation, the focus of this evaluation is an **Outcome Evaluation** which also looks at the two stated “Immediate Objectives and Outputs” (p.10) The **impact** of the Project is also to be examined in terms of the “Expected End of Project Situation”.

Objective 1: *To build and strengthen the capacity of three poor communities to identify their needs and implement poverty reduction on a sustainable basis.*

Output 1: *Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis.*

Objective 2: *To strengthen the institutional capacity of the Community Development Division in order to facilitate the poverty reduction thrust in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.*

Output 2: *Efficient coordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.*

Source: The UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation (*UNDP Evaluation Office, 2002*)

At a minimum, the scope of an outcome evaluation should incorporate the following four categories of analysis, either fully or in part.

Categories of analysis:

1. Outcome status: Whether or not the outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement;
2. Underlying factors: An analysis of the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influence the outcome;
3. UNDP contribution: Whether or not UNDP’s outputs and other interventions can be credibly linked to achievement of the outcome, including the outputs, programmes, projects and soft and hard assistance that contributed to the outcome (see Box 5);
4. Partnership strategy: Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective.

The Williams Evaluation of December 2004 developed a Revised Logical Framework for the UNDP/GoSVG project. Although it is not clear whether it became the official mode of

operation, it is a useful reference to measure the activities which seemed to have accelerated following that Evaluation. The original outputs were modified as follows:

Output 1: Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis.

Output 2 Efficient co-ordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.

Output 3: CoRICs - The level of awareness of IT improved among residents¹⁵

Output: 4 Appropriate income-generating activities for selected communities developed.
- Self-employment opportunities of communities enhanced through micro and small credit
- Number of self-employed residents increased

The complete Williams' Revised Logical Framework Analysis SVG/98/001/99 is found in Appendix # 2. The following shows the revised intended outcomes.

¹⁵ Implementation of Community Programmes and the Establishment of a Pilot CoRICs, Rodney Grant, September 2004.

Revised Logical Framework Analysis¹⁶

SVG/98/001/99

APPENDIX

Results and Resource Framework

PROJECT RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK*

Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Results Framework and MYFF combined with the second set: (taken from the UNDAF)			
1.1 Local Poverty Initiatives – National target communities (OECS countries) enabled to generate income, access information, use ICT through the CoRICs initiative and work collaboratively as a community. - Creation of a larger pool of computer-literate citizens and provision of greater opportunities for equal access to employment, particularly for the unemployed youths. Micro-finance opportunities identified and appropriate strategies for enhancement formulated.			
1.2 National target communities enabled to generate income - Supporting sustainable economic development - Creation of skilled self-employed communities with a greater opportunity for equal access to markets -			
1.3 <i>Achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty – Local poverty initiatives, including Micro-finance (MYFF)</i> - Enhancing local poverty reduction initiatives, including micro-finance and Micro/Small-enterprise Development (MSED)			
1.4 Promoting job creation for poor communities including youth			
1.5 Poverty Reduction Strategies and Plans (PRSPs) - Strengthening and enhancing Interim PRS/PRSPs for effective implementation. - Strengthening of local poverty reduction initiatives).			
Outcome indicator as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and target.			
Applicable MYFF Service Line:			
Partnership Strategy UNDP will provide support to the GoSVG through technical assistance and capacity building of existing framework at the governmental/institutional and community levels seek to provide solutions to: 1.1 The need for a community development framework for poverty reduction to include training, social development, TA, credit, and marketing, Information Technology through the CoRICs 1.2 The lack of opportunities for equal access to employment, particularly for the poor (including youth) 1.3 The need to strengthen local poverty reduction initiatives for the poor and ‘non-bankable’ including micro-finance and Micro/Small- Enterprise Development (MSED) activities.			
Project title and ID: Assistance with Poverty eradication – SVG/98/001			
Intended Outputs (and output indicators)	Output Targets for (years)	Indicative Activities	Inputs

¹⁶ Williams, Evaluation of Assistance with Poverty Eradication Project SVG/98/001, 30 December, 2004, Appendix 9.

3.2 The Evaluation Criteria¹⁷

The evaluation utilizes the standard criteria used to assess the merits and value of a development project:

- a. Relevance – the extent to which a development intervention conforms to the needs and priorities of target groups and the policies of recipient countries and donors.
- b. Effectiveness – the extent to which a development intervention has achieved its objectives, taking their relative importance into account.
- c. Efficiency – the extent to which the costs of a development intervention can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account. Also the extent to which the development intervention is managed effectively by the implementing agency.
- d. Impact – the totality of the effects of a development intervention, positive and negative, intended and unintended.
- e. Sustainability – the continuation or longevity of benefits from a development intervention after the cessation of development assistance.

3.3 Poverty Reduction Evaluations

Poverty Reduction needs to be the overall goal of any relatively poor small island developing state as is St. Vincent and the Grenadines. All socio-economic development must be geared to increasing the standards of living. It follows that when 38% of a country's population is deemed to be living in poverty, and 25% classified as indigent poor, all government initiatives will have a focus of alleviating poverty.

Poverty is multidimensional. Not only does it involve material deprivation and lack of economic opportunity, but also vulnerability and deprivation with respect to health and education, power and influence, social status and human dignity.

Thus it was no accident that the objectives of the Poverty Eradication Project included the strengthening of institutional capacity within CDD to deliver poverty reduction programmes. **However, as indicated by the Director of the CDD in an interview, the Project may have been more effective had this strengthening taken place as a first phase of the project, followed by training in the Communities, and then implementation of the Interventions.**

¹⁷ Adapted from Sida Evaluation Manual, Looking Back, Moving Forward, 2004, pg. 25

The SIDA Evaluation Manual states that the multidimensional nature of poverty has far-reaching implications for evaluation. In evaluating from a poverty reduction perspective, we need to look at it in relation to all the main dimensions of poverty:

- Will it increase the assets of poor people, create better opportunities for poor people to earn a living, or otherwise improve their material standard of living?
- Will it have a significant impact, positively or negatively on the health and life chance of poor people?
- Will it provide poor people with education and increase their access to useful and otherwise valuable information and knowledge?
- Will it strengthen the rights of poor people and make state organization more responsive to their needs and interests?
- Will it empower poor people, individually or collectively? Will it increase their ability to assert their rights in relation to the state and more affluent citizens?
- Will it make poor people less vulnerable to the adversities of armed conflict, natural and humanitarian disasters, market fluctuations, and other untoward developments?¹⁸

This Evaluation may not answer all of these questions directly. The hope is that by thrusting this type of focus into the evaluation, it raises a necessary perspective that will assist other interventions in terms of service delivery to the poor. For example, the question becomes not simply did the farmers grow the pigs successfully and make a profit to utilize in and for the community, but what are the effects in terms of empowerment, dignity and self –esteem? Thus it is as much a question of **how** is the Intervention delivered as to **what** the Intervention delivers.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

4.1 Scheduling

The methodology attempted to be fitted into the **eight days specified duration** in order to meet the UNDP deadline for the Tripartite Review Meetings in October 2006. Obviously the exercise would have surpassed those days; more days to carry out further research activities would have been desirable.

Two(2) visits were made to Orange Hill, one (1) to Coulls Hill and one (1) to Rose Place. Meetings were attended in CH and OH with opportunity for focused questions with the farmers and management team present.

Individual Interviews were held with members of the three Management Committees – Mr. Biliingy OH; Ms. Jennifer Woods, CH and with Mr. Junior Cottle of Rose Place.

Telephone interviews were held with Ms. Pat Fraser, former UNV, and briefly with Ms. Monica Browne, Treasurer, Management Committee and Production Team. A review of Ms. Browne's records (borrowed for review) indicated records were well kept. Mr. Jimmy Black has offered to increase her ability by helping her to learn a simple computer programme to keep her records.

¹⁸ Ibid, Sida, pg. 42

Informal chats were had in Rose Place with a group of young persons including a fisherman – Mr. Spann, and Mr. Ollivierre and Mr. John.

Mrs. Rosita Snagg, Director of CDD (and presently Permanent Secretary Ag) was interviewed. Informal talks were held with Mr. Roger Young, Senior CDO, Mr. Jimmy Black CDO responsible for the three projects., and Mr. Beresford George, CPU.

4.2 Data Gathering

The main tool for the Evaluation is the Interview Questionnaire, Appendix # 1 which looks at the selected Programmatic Elements of the UNDP-funded Poverty Eradication Project, and is based on the work of Chen, Huey-Tsyh.¹⁹ It is a structured interview outline consisting of six major sections:

1. Implementing Organization
2. Programme Implementers
3. Intervention and service delivery
4. Associated organizations and community partners
5. Target Population
6. External context / environment

4.3 Document Review

In addition to the Williams Evaluation, other documents reviewed and that supported this evaluation report included:

1. Anne Anderson: Business Plans for A UNDP Poverty Reduction Programme for St. Vincent and the Grenadines, October 2004 (unconfirmed)
2. Edwin St. Catherine: Socio-Economic Assessment of Coulls Hill, Rose Place and Orange Hill, 24 March 2005.
3. J.E Marketing Co. Ltd.: Marketing Research on the Purchasing and Consumption Patterns of Cakes & Pastries for Rose Place Community, September 2004
4. Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries, Agricultural Census 2000 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, May 2002
5. NESDC Poverty Reduction Taskforce: St. Vincent and the Grenadines Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, June 2003
6. Office of the Cabinet Prime Minister's Office: Four Years of progress POVERTY REDUCTION in St. Vincent and the Grenadines , April 2001 to April 2005.
7. The World Bank, A Source Book for Poverty Reduction Strategies, Vols 1& 2, 2002

Access was provided to several **reports relating to the project and Minutes of Meetings** of the Project Steering Committee, and Management Committee Meetings. The following were specifically referenced:

¹⁹ Chen, Huey-Tsyh, Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness, Sage Publications, 2005

8. Fraser, Patricia, UN Volunteer, Progress Report for Period May – November 2004; Report For Period 30th January – 16th February 06;
9. Young, Roger, Status Update – UNDP/GOSVG Poverty Reduction Project as at 30 June 2006.

Reference was applied from evaluation books and manuals including the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results, UNDP Evaluation Office, 2002; and the SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) Evaluation Manual, “Looking Back, Moving Forward”, 2004.

4.4 Limitations

1. The short time allotted – eight (8) days – to the Evaluation.
2. Original project document not clearly defined – absence of indicators, outcomes, timelines and targets.
3. Related and necessary documents were not easily obtained from relevant project administrative sources.

De-Limitation (What the evaluator was not prepared to do.)

Spending just minimum time in the communities was an unanticipated limitation. Time in the communities was dependent on travel by taxis. This limited available time for informal talks and just walking around the community. Given the short period of the consultancy this was appropriate, but not ideal for a fuller picture of the community.

5.0 The Evaluation Process

The Evaluation tasks will be examined in the context of the evaluation criteria of **Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability**, and the **Objectives, Outputs and Activities of the Original UNDP/GoSVG Poverty Reduction document**. The data collected from the Questionnaire on the Programmatic Elements of the UNDP Poverty Eradication Programme will also inform the Findings..

5.1 The Evaluation Tasks

1. Assess the progress attained by the project in relation to key activities, result/outputs, and purpose as defined by the Logical Framework Analysis;
2. Assess the role of the National Committee set up with representation from relevant Government Ministries and Departments working on poverty eradication;
3. Evaluate performance of selected projects within the programme paying attention to overall project performance including recommendations for improvement;
4. Examine the options for sustainability of community development, in particular transferable skills for employment, and give recommendations for improvement;

5. Compare and contrast programme arrangements in each of the three targeted communities, to identify constraints to implementation and lessons learned;
6. Assess the status of current policy formulation to support poverty reduction efforts at community and country level and
7. To determine from the client perspective, the major issues arising in relation to access, quality and equitable distribution of the various products of the project

5.2 The Logical Framework

The weakness of the original Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) has been discussed. The Williams Evaluation created a Results and Resource Framework²⁰, which compensated to some degree, and informed the objectives of that evaluation - design, implementation, financing and institutional framework. Actually, the original document does not provide sufficient information to develop a comprehensive LFA – even without the required stakeholder participatory approach.

The importance of the LFA is reiterated in the Minutes of the February 23rd, 2005 Project Steering Committee (PSC) which report that “Leisa (Perch, UNDP) said a logical framework need to be developed so that while farmers are waiting on material, they would commence some practical training. She said without proper sequencing of work, people would get frustrated.”

However, it is necessary and helpful to assess the objectives and outputs defined in the original UNDP document. In addition the Williams’ revised LFA also informs the process after December 2004.

5.3 GoSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradiction Project (UNDP/GoSVG PE Project) Framework

The Framework of Objectives, Outputs and Activities has two components, both essential in order to achieve the overall objective or “**Expected End of Project Situation**” *This project seeks to (1) contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for poverty alleviation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through building on past efforts at capacity enhancement and management development in the Community Development Division.*
(2) At the end of the project the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities including Orange Hill.”

One of the anomalies of the Logical Framework is that the Impact or end of project result is a strengthened CDD, but the focus appears to be primarily on the Target Beneficiaries - the three Communities. The original intent was no doubt cyclical in that effective work by the CDD would result in empowered communities, and an enabling national environment for poverty reduction. Invariably service providers are so caught up in providing service that their

²⁰ Williams, Monica, Evaluation of Assistance with Poverty Eradication Project SVG/98/001 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Final Report, December 2004, pg. 37

own capacity strengthening is neglected, which in fact hinders the effectiveness of the service provided.

Table 1 below outlines these two components – under the headings of:

1. Communities – Orange Hill, Coulls Hill and Rose Place.
2. The Community Development Division (CDD) of the Ministry of Social Development, as Implementers of the Project.

It is useful at this point to look also at the revised outputs iterated in the Williams' revised LFA of 2004 - some six years after the original UNDP/GoSVG project document. Included is a new budget for \$280,000 USD.

Output 1: Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis.

Output 2: Efficient co-ordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.

Output 3: CoRICs - The level of awareness of IT improved among residents²¹

Output: 4 Appropriate income-generating activities for selected communities developed.
- Self-employment opportunities of communities enhanced through micro and small credit
- Number of self-employed residents increased

5.4 Assessment of Activities in meeting the Project Objectives and Outputs

This section includes (1) a sequential list of activities and events identified by the Evaluator, and (2) a systematic assessment of the activities outlined in the UNDP document. (Refer Table 1 above.) The Evaluation attempts to find links between both.

5.4.1 Sequence of activities identified from the Poverty Eradication Project

A) UNDP PE Project was signed in November 1998. Apparently it was a follow-on to a project facilitated by Samuel Barnwell (Square Deal Investments) that ran from July 1998 to December 1998:

1998 July – December - Orange Hill Farm Families Development Project.

“The overall goal is to enhance the capacity of the Orange Hill community to improve living standards and gradually eradicate poverty, by using agriculture as the means of achieving such development. The Project will provide farmers in the community with the necessary technical assistance and training in farm management,

²¹ Implementation of Community Programmes and the Establishment of a Pilot CoRICs, Rodney Grant, September 2004.

production and post harvesting techniques and general support to enable them to generate returns from their farms.”²²

- 1) Families had been given land previously.
- 2) Provide Training to farmers
- 3) Introduce the cultivation of new crops for which markets are available.
- 4) Establish a technical support network among agencies such as the Ministry of Agriculture and the Chinese Agricultural Technical Mission to provide post project assistance.
- 5) Establish five demonstration plots on selected farms to be used for practical training sessions.

Components of the Project

- 1) Training
- 2) Field Visits
- 3) Crop cultivation
- 4) Materials and Supplies – farming tools and equipment (spent EC\$25,000.)
- 5) Demonstration Plots

No further records/reports are available on the Farming Project – the Proposal is attached to the UN Project document, with a budget of EC \$59, 865. The former UNV, Ms Pat Fraser, advised that equipment and farming tools were purchased and used – EC\$25,000 in the Budget. No one appears to know what happened to the tools, when the project ended.

B) Project Strategy and Implementation Arrangements²³

The Central Planning Division (CPU) was given responsibility for administering and implementing the Project.

1. There is little supporting documentation that Project Promotions was contracted for the project management of the UNDP project in 1999. Documents and interviews refer to the fact that the contract was terminated around 2000-1. (Williams p.12)
2. A New Government was elected in St. Vincent and the Grenadines in March 2001
3. An Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy was developed between November 2001 and June 2003
4. There appears to have been a hiatus of the UNDP/GoSVG PE Project between when Project Promotions ended 2001 (?) and the Project Management was handed to the Community Development Division in October 2002.

²² UNDP/GoSVG Project, pg. 3 (attachment)

²³ Ibid , pg. 9

5. The UNV Pat Fraser was retained in 2003. The UNV was a member of the Project Team which reported to the Director of the CDD. Other Members included the Senior Community Development Officer, Community Development Officers (CDO). April 2005 Ms. Fraser's contract ended. Daily coordination, monitoring and follow-up of the project and its activities was then allocated to CDO Jimmy Black.

C) May to November 2004 (Fraser's progress report) *Green Seasoning and pig rearing identified by the CH Community as income generating projects. Work begun on the seasoning. Farmers were asked to plant certain herbs and greens. Negotiations and renovations began on a house owned by Mrs. Allen. Farmers were told to sell their plants elsewhere. The UNV report of January – February 2006 indicates a trial production. Despite equipment setbacks thirty-three (33) 7.5 ml bottles were produced. However, in October 2006, although the house is ready for use, the unsettled leasing agreement still prevents the Seasoning work from proceeding..*

D) Evaluation – Monica Williams December 2004

The Project continues to be affected by four common problems:

- a. Delays in disbursement of funds to acquire inputs; delayed delivery of inputs
- b. Inadequate project management capacities at the implementation agency level, among other factors have resulted in delayed implementation of activities to achieve specified results.
- c. Lack of coordination of effort among stakeholders due to factors, which include unclear lines of communication, roles and responsibilities.
- d. Non-compliance with specified reporting schedule.

The original Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) presented two outputs which tended to be limiting in scope for a project that is specifically targeting poverty reduction and has the potential to impact on a wide range of sectors and sub-sectors of the economy. To ensure continuity and support sustainability of the initiative, additional outputs could be included. Outcomes of the project are not clearly defined.

Performance Ratings: (pg. 3ff)

Relevance - Satisfactory

Efficiency – Less than satisfactory

Effectiveness – Less than satisfactory / Fair

Impact - Poor

Sustainability - Poor²⁴

The Williams report integrated revisions to the SVG/98/001 project. These included a revised LFA – with two additional Outputs, and a revised budget of \$280,000:

Output 3: CoRICs - The level of awareness of IT improved among residents

Output: 4 Appropriate income-generating activities for selected communities developed.
- Self-employment opportunities of communities enhanced through micro and small credit; Number of self-employed residents increased.²⁵

²⁴ Williams, p.3ff

E) Business Plan – Sister Anne Anderson – 2004-2005

Sister Anne Anderson’s Business Plan appears to have been completed in 2005, after significant delays. The Plan provides useful information on the communities and on the costing related to the selected farming activities. There is little evidence of the use of this Plan. Perhaps what is missing is a simple, easy to follow Business approach for community persons with average to low literacy levels. The Project now in its 6th year has recorded disbursement and utilization of funds to the sum of US \$156,681.07 as of October 2004 (p.8).

F) Socio-Economic Assessment of Coulls Hill, Rose Place and Orange Hill – St. Catherine March 2005.

This assessment sampled over 50% of the households in the three communities. The populations were as follows:

<u>Community</u>	<u># of Persons</u>	<u># of households</u>	<u># of households surveyed</u>
Coulls Hill	277	85	50
Rose Place	237	97	60
Orange Hill	243	71	50

The Assessment shows that the two rural communities although poor have a fair standard of living in terms of home and land ownership CH 88 % and OH 86%. Comparisons with any available baseline data would be very useful, in determining changes in standard of living.

G) Minutes from Rose Place Community meeting, 17th March, 2005.

Volunteers/committees organized for

- Soccer Team
- Netball team
- Heritage park - Re Roger’s report

One stark issue that plagues Rose Place which has a transient population is that of waste (including human) disposal. It continues to be identified as a major problem that needs attention – St. Catherines Socio-Economic Assessment (p.4); interviews with Rose Place consultant and residents.).

Some Computers are stored in the Anglican School, which according to the MoSD were presumably purchased when the Project was being managed by Project Promotions. Four computers were bought for Rose Place in 2005 with Project Funds and remain in storage with the Ministry of Social Development. As of September 2006 nothing appears to be in place In Rose Place – with respect to CoRICS – or other projects.

²⁵ Williams, Appendix 9

H) Pig Farming

At Coulls Hill eight (8) pig farmers were given two (2) piglets each – one sow and one boar - between late September and Early October 2005.

In Orange Hill eight (8) pig farmers were given three (3) piglets each – 3 sows - between May and June 2005.²⁶

Issues of Pig Farming:

- **Pig-care. Can the number of pigs that die be avoided?**
- **Need for additional pen space as the pigs produce.**
- **Farmers have difficulties affording to purchase pig feed. Suggestions for bulk buying do not appear to have been pursued.**

I) Agro-Processing Production Centres:²⁷

In Orange Hill Plantain chips trial production began 8th February, 2006

The response from the community was very encouraging so far. The plantains for both trials were also donated by farmers in the community, they too received their samples.

In Coulls Hill Seasoning production trial was done on 15th February 2006

They were initially able to produce bottles of seasoning used as samples for the Bureau of Standards.

J) In January 2006, it was agreed with the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines that UNDP funding would end in June 2006.

²⁶ Young, Roger, Status Update – UNDP/GoSVG Poverty Reduction Project as at 30 June, 2006, p.1.

²⁷ Fraser Pat (UNV) Report For Period 30th January – 16th February 06

Table 1: UNDP Project Objectives – as outlined in the Project document

The Project Document is not formatted for easy clarity; the following evaluation table attempts a user-friendly format.

<p>“Expected End of Project Situation” (p.8) <i>This project seeks to contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for poverty alleviation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through building on past efforts at capacity enhancement and management development in the Community Development Division. At the end of the project the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities including Orange Hill.</i></p>		
<p>Development Objective To assist with the improvement of the social and economic well-being of the people of St. Vincent and the Grenadines</p>		
<p>COMMUNITIES: ORANGE HILL; COULLS; ROSE PLACE</p>		
OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	ACTIVITIES
<p>Immediate Objective 1 To build and strengthen the capacity of three poor communities to identify their needs and implement poverty reduction projects of a sustainable basis.</p>	<p>Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis.</p>	1. Identify the poor communities to benefit from the project
		2. Identify and review the needs and priorities of the selected communities
		3. Prepare community profiles, which will include, interalia, baseline data, indicators for success and monitoring tools
		4. Organise project committees at the community level to include representation from the CDD
		5. Identify and select projects to be introduced into the communities (in collaboration with the project committees and stakeholders.
		6. Commence implementation of projects utilizing seed money earmarked.
		7. Mobilise additional resources for an integrated poverty reduction programme.
		8. Formulate poverty reduction projects
		9. Conduct training workshops for community participants.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION		
OBJECTIVES	OUTPUTS	ACTIVITIES
<p><u>Immediate Objective 2</u> To strengthen the institutional capacity of the Community Development Division in order to facilitate the poverty reduction thrust in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.</p>	<p>Efficient coordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.</p>	1. Undertake a full evaluation of the CDD operations and determine the most effective management, administrative, and technical frameworks for the fulfillment of its mission;
		2. Evaluate the information technology infrastructure of the CDD and make recommendations for its enhancement;
		3. Make contact, in collaboration with CPU, with all the major donors and establish an ongoing liaison activity to facilitate resource mobilization;
		4. identify and obtain quanta timeframes and constraints in the uses of donor funds which are earmarked for poverty reduction and management development in SVG;
		5. rationalize the use of all these funds to the benefit of poverty reduction in SVG and obtain agreement between the CPU and the donor agencies to mobilize these funds over period of the availability of the funds;
		6. design a training programme to focus on project identification, management, and implementation for the staff of CDD
		7. coordinate the formulation of specific poverty alleviation projects
		8. convene regular meetings of a Project Management Committee, consisting of government, NGO, donor, private sector and trade union representatives to monitor the development of the project and ensure that this activity is developed in harmony with the concept of a National and Social (Sustainable Development) Council
		9. define the strategic priorities the CDD intends to address in order to build on its strengths, correct its weaknesses, toake advantage of opportunities and prepare for challenges in the long term;
		10. elaborate a set of action programmes that establish the key steps needed to be taken to achieve long term objectives, resource requirements, accountability and feed back requirements.

5.4.2 An assessment of Community activities relating to the objectives from the UNDP/GoSVG PE Project document – up to the present.

The Objectives and Activities are found in Table 2 above.

Activity 1: Identify the poor communities to benefit from the project

Action/Comments/Status: Coulls Hill (CH) , Orange Hill (OH) and Rose Place (RP)

Activity 2: Identify and review the needs and priorities of the selected communities.

Action/Comments/Status: The Evaluation has not had access to an initial baseline study or needs assessment.. In March 2005 a Socio-Economic Assessment was done by consultant, Edwin St. Catherine. This was designed more specifically for data collection and analysis purposes – specifically to establish a baseline against which to assess results and impacts. The extensive computer information is also useful in terms of the design of the CoRICS project.

According to the UNV, Mrs. Pat Fraser, the communities were involved in the selection of the activities:

Coulls Hill: Pig Rearing and Bottled Seasoning
Orange Hill: Pig rearing and Plantain Chips
Rose Place: Pastry Making; Heritage Park.

Activity 3: Prepare community profiles, which will include, interalia, baseline data, indicators for success and monitoring tools

Action/Comments/Status

Community Profiles exist in the related documents referenced in this evaluation. Apparently some baseline data was collected, but it was not analyzed. Indicators were not initially established. Monitoring took place mainly through Steering Committee meetings, UNV and CDD officer Reports, and through Annual Reviews. The St. Catherine Assessment was intended to assist in this data component of the work. No apparent comparisons with previous data collected in this Project. Presumably St. Catherine data was utilized in the setting up of the CoRICS project in SVG.

Activity 4

Organise project committees at the community level to include representation from the CDD.

Action/Comments/Status

Management Committees (MC) were formed at the beginning of the projects. OH was formed in November 2004. It appears that at first, meetings in OH and CH were held regularly. Members say that frustrations with the many stops and starts to the

programmes, caused interest to wane. Prior to meetings organized for this Evaluation data gathering in CH and OH, it would appear that the MCs had not met recently. These meetings fed into the Project Steering Committee meetings which from 2004 tried to meet more regularly – sometimes once a month. The community representatives on the Project Steering Committees seemed to have enjoyed and grown from that experience. The Rose Place MC no longer exists.

It would appear that the CDD would like to see these MCs operate on their own, but it also appears that they may not be ready. The weaning process needs to be a more definite one –including open discussions and steps to follow. The Project anticipated continuous involvement by CDOs.

Activity 5

Identify and select projects to be introduced into the communities (in collaboration with the project committees and stakeholders).

Action/Comments/Status

The original 1998 Orange Hill Farm Families Dev Programme, presumably provided farmers in the community with technical assistance and training in farm management. The Government's Agricultural Diversity Programme encourages various types of farming to offset the declining banana industry. Pig Farming and Agro-Processing were therefore appropriate, relevant and manageable. Some of the farmers originally selected in Coulls Hill could not qualify for the Pig farming, as inspections by Health and Agriculture officials determined that certain sizes of land were necessary to 'house' the pigs. This process would have, in some cases, eliminated the poorer farmers with less land.

Activity 6

Commence implementation of projects utilizing seed money earmarked.

Action/Comments/Status

While the project appears to be useful and relevant, with a capacity to revolve within the community providing wider benefits, implementation was fraught with many challenges and delays. Eight(8) farmers in CH and OH were each given 2 piglets (1 sow and 1boar), only in 2005. This configuration varied slightly based on availability from the Agricultural Division. Farmers at CH were and still are short one piglet.

Pig feed was supplied to farmers up to January 2006. According to the SCDOs Status Update report as of June 2006 "as a result of the unavailability of project funds from January 2006, the project was and still is unable to meet that obligation.... It appears that some farmers are finding it difficult to purchase their own feed.²⁸ The UNDP Project Manager states that funds unspent at the end of December 2005 could have been used to assist.

²⁸ Young, p.1

The Coulls Hill Seasoning project – another viable project, has met with difficulties in finding a location for project manufacturing. The Ministry of Social Development spent over \$20,000. on renovations for a house to be used. Yet, negotiations regarding the paying of utilities have prevented the project from getting underway.

The Orange Hill Plantain Chip production found and relocated an ideal location after commendable work by the CDD and MC. Production which has good potential for income generation was slowed or halted waiting for labels and then electricity was disconnected in August and reinstated in October because the utility bill was not paid. This was apparently due to poor communication between the CDD and the MC, and also the ineffective functioning of the Management Committee at the time.

It must be noted that these projects have documented potential for being economically viable projects. As indicated in several reports, they would only work if there is effective and efficient management of the projects, and close collaboration between the CDD and the Community MCs..

Activity 7

Mobilise additional resources for an integrated poverty reduction programme

Action/Comments/Status

Not sure if this was done. NDF has funding challenges. Was SEDU/ CED (The Centre for Enterprise Development) or SIF (The Social Investment Fund) approached? Farmers are now being trained by SIF in a larger national programme.

Activity 8

Formulate poverty reduction projects

Action/Comments/Status

Pigs, Seasoning, Plantain Chips began to take form between May and November, 2004. None of the projects have sailed easily. Nevertheless interest has been maintained. The Management Committees have worked with CDD to ensure that the projects would eventually be beneficial for the whole community. The lines of communication need to be strengthened to ensure success. Having the UNV dedicated to the projects seemed to have been appreciated by the Communities. Rose Place is a difficult community to manage. Too many persons have too many different solutions as to what RP needs. The Project did not fully address the transitory nature of the community, and the degradation of the environment.

The evaluator walked through the community and chatted with some young men sitting on the block. They feel very left out of any process to lift the community. They claimed that the old folk on the Management committee are in it for the money and don't really care about the Community. (Incidentally one of the Reports at a PSC meeting indicated that the members of a proposed committee must be over 40 years!! Fortunately this notion was revoked by the meeting.) The young men said they are never asked to be involved, the organizers say that the youth are just smoking weed and have nothing to

contribute. The opinion of the young men is that the authorities first need to be serious and tough about cleaning up the environment. The public toilets should be fixed and security placed there to come down hard on any offenders. Similarly, anyone found defecating on the beach should be fined or jailed. **MoSD advises that The Ministry of National Mobilisation repaired the toilet facilities several times. The Ministry collaborated with the Public Health Department to pay a full time caretaker, while the monthly electricity bill was paid by the Kingstown Board.**

Activity 9

Conduct training workshops for community participants.

Action/Comments/Status

Workshops have been on-going, providing training and capacity building in several areas since implementation began in 1999: Forty-five persons attended a youth leadership course; life skills training; one representative from each of the CH and OH MCs attended training in Sustainable Livelihoods in Trinidad & Tobago; there were exchange visits between the two rural communities; all three communities participated in computer training.

The training component has been well-received by the Communities. There is little evidence that persons have not been taking advantage of the opportunities. Concerns are more if they have been encouraged to use the training received, and for delays in applying the training. Several persons have been involved in computer training. The delays in setting up the CoRICs computers means that trainees have not had opportunity to utilize the training received. It would be quite effective for members of the management committee trained in using computers to use that knowledge in the practical management of the projects. Training must continue if sustainability is to be assured.

Continuous Training must include MCs, CDD officers, community at large and to include management, leadership, project management, poverty reduction strategies, record keeping utilizing technical aids e.g. computers. Active efforts to develop linkages with other non-governmental and private sector entities must be established.

5.4.3 An assessment of Community Development Division (CDD) activities relating to the objectives from the GovSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradication Project document – up to the present.

The “Expected End of Project Situation”

This project seeks to contribute to the creation of an enabling environment for poverty alleviation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through building on past efforts at capacity enhancement and management development in the Community Development Division.

At the end of the project the CDD is expected to have attained the ability to quickly execute and monitor projects in three target communities including Orange Hill.

The CDD was intended to be a **significant** beneficiary of the UNDP PE Project by increasing its capacity for service delivery particularly to the poor and vulnerable, and through it to impact and improve their lives. The responsibility was with the Central Planning Division, as Implementing Agency who endeavoured to ensure the commitment and participation of the line Ministry in the ensuing activities.(Refer to Table 2 below). Almost none of the specified activities took place, or reaped the intended results. Those activities that were done, as # 8, were not done so in a manner to optimize the full value of the exercise. It appears that a shift was made to focus the CDD capacity strengthening on project management in 2004.

This gap was probably another casualty of unclear responsibilities between the CPU and the CDD. So too the lack of a well-defined framework with indicators, targets and timelines. From its articulated Vision and Mission CDD was not only ideal for the capacity building activities prescribed, but duty bound to have them:

Vision: The Community Development Division is a model for achieving sustainable development intended to significantly effect self-sufficiency and a high quality of life.

Mission: Our Mission is to facilitate sound, cultural and economic development at the community Level.

Earlier in Section 3.3 on Poverty Reduction Evaluation, the point was made that Poverty Reduction objectives are much more than simply carrying out a set of activities. It is a learned skill. It is giving voice to the voiceless and empowering the powerless. Thus, regardless of what flaws may have existed in the writing of the Poverty Eradication Project, there was no doubt that the success of its programmes rested heavily on deliberate capacity strengthening efforts and activities **within** the Community Development Division. This evaluation sees this as a noteworthy shortcoming of the Project, which significantly affected the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of a relevant and timely project.

Table 2	CDD ACTIVITIES specified in the Objectives of the Project in order to meet the objectives of the GoSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradication Project
1.	Undertake a full evaluation of the CDD operations and determine the most effective management, administrative, and technical frameworks for the fulfillment of its mission;
2.	Evaluate the information technology infrastructure of the CDD and make recommendations for its enhancement;
3.	Make contact, in collaboration with CPU, with all the major donors and establish an ongoing liaison activity to facilitate resource mobilization;
4.	Identify and obtain quanta(?) timeframes and constraints in the uses of donor funds which are earmarked for poverty reduction and management development in SVG;
5.	Rationalize the use of all these funds to the benefit of poverty reduction in SVG and obtain agreement between the CPU and the donor agencies to mobilize these funds over period of the availability of the funds;
6.	Design a training programme to focus on project identification, management, and implementation for the staff of CDD
7.	Coordinate the formulation of specific poverty alleviation projects

Table 2 CDD ACTIVITIES specified in the Objectives of the Project in order to meet the objectives of the GoSVG/UNDP Poverty Eradication Project	
8.	Convene regular meetings of a Project Management Committee, consisting of government, NGO, donor, private sector and trade union representatives to monitor the development of the project and ensure that this activity is developed in harmony with the concept of a National and Social (Sustainable Development) Council
9.	Define the strategic priorities the CDD intends to address in order to build on its strengths, correct its weaknesses, to take advantage of opportunities and prepare for challenges in the long term;
10.	Elaborate a set of action programmes that establish the key steps needed to be taken to achieve long term objectives, resource requirements, accountability and feed back requirements.

An Interview using the Questionnaire of the Programmatic Elements with the CDD Director, Mrs. Rosita Snagg, revealed that a major issue was that the Ministry of Social Development, under which the CDD fell, never had a sense of ownership of the Project. Much of the capacity building they received related more to Project Management than to poverty eradication Project Implementation. The UNDP Programme Manager recognizes the need for capacity strengthening in planning, monitoring and reporting was critical at that point.: *“because by 2004 project management was a significant shortcoming of the project – the capacity to identify, maintain and report on indicators for example was not possible without project management training. The capacity to report and support the preparation of proposals by the communities was also key as well as to carefully think through the proposed activities and budgeting were part of the responsibilities that would fall to the MoSD. Weaknesses in these areas identified by the evaluation and through discussions with all parties. With more time I think we could have expanded the training and agree that the support to MOST needed to be much more.”*

Nevertheless, one of the strong features of the CDD and UNV was the grass roots community mobilization which added greatly to the capacity for service delivery to the most vulnerable communities..

In recognizing that poverty eradication measures go beyond the project activities, the Director acknowledges that one of the strengths of the whole programme is the self-confidence and assurance in speaking up for their interests that community members have gained from being a part of the Project Steering Committee (PSC). This Committee is comprised of representatives from CPU, CDD, the UNDP and the three target Communities.

According to the Director, one of the lessons learned is to work with and consider the varying capacities, needs and structures of the communities. They are not homogenous. Educational formal systems do not necessarily help or hinder such processes. It is the willingness to organize if it will benefit financially.

6.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

6.1 GOSVG/UNDP POVERTY ERADICATION PROJECT - GENERALLY

- The PE Project was fully compatible with the Government's Poverty Reduction thrust.
- The project was relevant and timely with potential for significant impact and sustainability – if implemented and managed well.
- The Project attempted to address significantly two key causes of the “chronic, structural, and transitory poverty” which existed and in some cases, still persists in St. Vincent and the Grenadines: (a) low income and employment generation in the key productive sectors; and (b) deficient capacity to facilitate training and development for expanding skills and increasing productivity.²⁹
- The lack of a clearly framed Logical Framework Analysis, may have hindered implementation without the easy layout of a logical sequence of Objectives, activities, indicators, results, risks.
- It appears that the **UN Volunteer** had an important part to play in coordinating the activities of the Project. This position may be reexamined for future ventures with a view to reinstating some similar coordinating component. The weaknesses and strengths of the previous mode d'operandum must be reviewed and appropriate changes made before reinstating

6.2 IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES

- The SVG Government's– or at least its line Ministries' - capacity to access and effectively utilize funds made available by the various international donor and lending agencies continues to be weak and unorganized.
- According to the SCDO's status report³⁰ “the late and non-release of project funding, created a lot of frustration for the implementing agency and the communities. The arrangement in place for accessing UNDP project funding through the government machinery has not worked well and needs to be reviewed.
- There may have been insufficient collaboration with NGOs besides the target communities Management Committees. For example The Centre for Enterprise Development offers excellent training opportunities and assistance to micro businesses – at minimal costs. Were they sought in terms of partnerships? Were the communities exposed to the NCB micro enterprise lending programme? There is evidence that the CoRICS programme sought – sometimes with slow response, to collaborate with the National Institute of Technology (NIT) and the Ministry of Telecommunications.

²⁹ UNDP Project document, p.6

³⁰ Young, Roger, Status Update – UNDP/GOSVG Poverty Reduction Project as at 30 June 2006. p.9

- It appears that the PE Project was seen by the Implementing agencies (CDD and CPU) as a separate/add-on task and not fully integrated into the substantive work of the implementers.
- There were too many delays that might have been dealt with more quickly and efficiently e.g. electricity and water related. Also decisions which are taken by the Project Steering Committee were not implemented quickly (sometimes for long periods) and resulted in some being recycled through following meetings.
- The Tripartite Meeting of 13th December 2004 lists 12 decisions for action with dates that were taken. More than half of these, with dates of December 2004 or January 2005 were yet to be executed at the time of this review. This is not necessarily a reflection on the government, but as much on the Communities taking ownership of the project.

6.3 TARGET COMMUNITIES

Situational Analysis taken from the St. Catherine Socio-Economic Assessment Report

Community	Poverty - % of residents with less than EC\$250. per month	Home Ownership		Highest Level of formal education attained	Economic Activity	
		House	Land		Male employment rate	Female employment rate
Coulls Hill	80%	88%	76%	Primary 45.0%	68%	32%
Orange Hill	78%	86%	60%	Primary 66 %	66%	34%
Rose Place	75%	56.7%	35%	Primary 58 %	67%	33%

Farming and fishing predominantly and craft and related trade work such as building trades - masonry, carpentry, are the main types of employment in the selected in communities. In most cases the men tended to have the larger percentages of being employed outside of the home.

- Despite issues in delivery and implementation in terms of timeliness, effectiveness and efficiency, awareness was raised, and a process has begun to “build and strengthen the capacity of two out of the three poor communities to identify their needs and implement poverty reduction projects on a sustainable basis.” (Immediate Objective 1)
- Greater commitment to participate effectively and efficiently is required by the Management Committees and the production workers if the projects are to be economically feasible and sustainable. Mrs. Monica Browne states that if the production workers came to work on time and regularly, they would make a great deal more money personally - and community income - than they are currently.

- Several individual farmers within the Communities have benefited from pig rearing to date. Clear strategies need to be in place that will assist persons to understand the concepts of shared and revolving benefits so that others and the community at large will also benefit. Over a year ago, it was agreed that a contractual agreement be drawn up for farmers to sign indicating the process of giving back piglets or financial returns to the Management Committee for further distribution.. A plan relating to this agreement was brought to the meeting attended by the Evaluator for approval by the MC. The decision was that it would be properly written up and presented for signatures.

6.4 LESSONS LEARNED

1. The critical importance of project design – with clearly defined objectives, indicators, targets, outcomes and impact results. The LF approach contributes significantly to implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
2. Selection of activities for those persons/areas targeted need to be carefully scrutinized.. In CH a certain amount of land was necessary for pig farming. This suggests that poorer farmers may not have qualified and the objective of helping the poorest of the poor may not have been met..
3. Working in and with impoverished and vulnerable communities requires a sensitivity and a variety of different methodologies that encourage empowerment, independence and display an honest recognition of the abilities that exist and need to be carefully nurtured.
4. Community Projects require a system where Service Providers are able to access funds from foreign partners for community development much easier and swifter than occurred in this Project.
5. The skill of community mobilization as seen in the CDD is an important ingredient for successful initiatives in community development. It must be developed.
6. The deleterious effects of delays particularly on those to whom the service is provided. This effects include frustrations to implementers, service providers and recipients of the service; wastage of time and resources; general cost-effectiveness and efficiency in project management and implementation.
7. Ensure that all future projects are designed carefully with reference to Needs assessments, and LFAs that set clear goals, baseline data, indicators, targets, timelines and expected results. Proper preservation and utilization of these documents are crucial.

6.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Communities need continuous sensitization and reinforcement by CDD that the UNDP Projects are intended for community development and not only individual growth and economic benefits.
2. The CDD authorities need to establish a plan for continuing activities that relate to capacity building in service delivery and in the utilization and management of donor funds. Include understanding of poverty reduction service strategies.
3. A Monitoring system needs to be in place, so that some person(s) is (are) held accountable for the monitoring of projects. If CDD is the Implementing Agency, CPU might take on the Monitoring Role of projects. If it is to be done by the Project Steering Group the system must be operative and transparent.
4. A prevailing notion that external partner projects are less of a priority than “substantive” responsibilities within the Public Service needs to be examined, and measures put in place by donors for more dedicated coordination of specific projects. Or that they are rolled into the regular programming of the Ministry.
5. **Budgetary considerations are critical to assess the efficiency of a programme or project. The budgetary component of the project needs further inquiry. We recommend that a detailed report of commitments and disbursements be considered as soon as possible.**

A detailed report and analysis of allocations and disbursements is required to assess whether funds were handled efficiently, delivered in a timely manner. The CDD Senior CD Officer stated that “the late and non-release of project funding, created a lot of frustration for the implementing agency and the communities.”³¹ Plans are being put in place to correct this process. Proper feed back about the old system will increase the success of the new. **Further financial information is included at the end of this Section.**

6. Greater effort be applied in forging partnerships both inside and outside of the government to avoid duplication, to stretch scarce dollars and to perform with greater efficiency. Inter-ministerial partnerships need to be formalized at the highest levels.
7. Ensure that the poorer persons in the target communities are not further disenfranchised or excluded from benefits of development projects and programmes. For example in Coulls Hill persons without appropriate land space were not given pigs. Ensure that they are recipients of benefits in some other way. Many of the farmers involved in the Intervention had other livestock.

³¹ Young, Staus update as at June 30,2006, p.9

8. One practical element for sustainability is ownership of the Resource and Production Centres. Efforts should be made through sourcing lands and funds to purchase buildings for the operation of these projects.
9. It appears that an SVG design for the CORICs project has not been done. Reference is made in 2005 reports to obtaining the Grenada design as a possible model. The design should be done before further work is undertaken. However, it must be done expeditiously, as the project is already behind in that the computer training has already taken place. If the Grenada or other model is to be utilized, IT expertise will be required for modifications to the SVG situation.. See also Section 5.6.1 CoRICs Recommendations.
10. Existing projects need to continue to be actively supported by CDD. CDD needs to assist with the “critical roles” identified by R. Young including “identification of markets; arranging delivery of products; advertising of products; book and record keeping; procurement of inputs, and settling of outstanding bills.”³²
11. The Parliamentary Representative for Rose Place, Minister of Urban Development, is apparently interested in developing the Heritage Park. This may be an opportunity for collaboration to ensure that the project is completed. **MoSD comments:** “The Heritage Park was started with project funds. Work on the park was done up to December 2005. The Ministry of Urban Development has indicated its willingness to complete the project.”
12. The Ministry of Social Development may wish to initiate a joint effort with the Ministry of Health and the Environment and the several prominent businesses presently existing in Rose Place to clean up and maintain the beach and the community generally.

7.0 BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS WITH REGARDS TO THE UNDP/GoSVG PROJECT STV/98/001/01/99

***Efficiency Criteria:** The extent to which the costs of a development intervention can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account. Also, the extent to which the development intervention is managed effectively by the implementing agency.*

The available financial data indicates that the original project budget has been exceeded, and that the project has an outstanding advance of **EC\$27,556.78**
Expenditures to date = \$311,707.66 Original UNDP allocation \$227,700.

The evaluation has not been able to make evidenced conclusions about the financial efficiency of the project. The best informed data at this point shows the following:

³² Young, Ibid, p.3

Summary of UNDP & Cost Sharing (SVG Government)
As appears in the original Project Document signed November 1998

UNDP EC\$

Current	Previous	Change
\$168,164.	\$227,700.	\$59,536.

Government

\$100,000.

Attached to the above document is a Table "Budget B"

Main Source of Funds: 01 –UNDP IPF/TRAC

Presumably this relates to Project Promotions Ltd .management period.

Section 010 Project Personnel - 1998 to 2001

Budget Total	1998	1999	2000	2001
\$265,000.	52,600.	107,100.	95,500.	10,500.

PROJECT ID 00011308 - Assistance with Poverty Eradication	
Expenditures to date	
Year	Expenditures
1998	4,404.00
1999	15,126.00
2000	25,091.00
2001	13,193.00
2002	16,418.00
2003	21,739.00
2004	95,357.28
2005	100,571.70
2006	19,807.68
Total Expenditures	311,707.66

INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT
(Received from the UNDP)

	Orange Hill	Coulls Hill	Rose Place	TOTALS
Agro Processing	15,764.20	15,340.40		29,048.90
Computers	2,978.00	227.50		20,738.60
Pig Framing	10,306.70	5,170.70		2,590.92
	29,048.90	20,738.60	2,590.92	52,378.42

FINDINGS:

Financial and budgetary information was not readily available or easily accessible in the SVG component of the project. Information received from the UNDP office suggests the following:

Amount originally allocated was	EC\$ \$227,700.
Amount of expenditures was	\$ 311,707.66
Expenditures re Equipment to Communities	\$52, 378.42

The amount expended on Community Training has not been obtained. Without those figures it appears that about 25% of project funding was spent on the poor communities directly. The total population of selected communities for this project is 757 persons in 220 households.

<u>Community</u>	<u># of Persons</u>	<u># of households</u> ³³
Coulls Hill	277	85
Rose Place	237	97
Orange Hill	243	71

There is a need for better record keeping and data storing of financial information. The UNDP is to establish a different mechanism/system for the processing of donor funds. The expectation is that any new system will have enhanced methods of management and accountability.

8.0 Community Resource Internet Centres (CoRICs)

The CoRICs programme is a UNDP/French Government/ITU/OECS/Windward Islands Collaborative Effort. See Appendix 3

8.1 Background³⁴

As part of the Community Empowerment/Development thrust, of the Poverty Reduction Programme, UNDP has given support to countries of the Windward Islands in the establishment of community management teams, community assessments, development of community work plans, and assessments of Community Development Divisions. UNDP's larger development goal is to support the establishment of Community Resource and Internet Centers (CoRICs) where community capacities in leadership and for sustainable livelihoods can be further enhanced.

³³ St. Catherind, Edwin, Socio-Economic Assessment, p.3

³⁴ Perch, Leisa, a Brief on Community Resource Internet Resource Centres (CoRICs): a UNDP/French Government/ITU/OECS/Windward Islands Collaborative Effort

With the support of the French government, and in partnership with the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), UNDP has supported the establishment of CoRICs, as an integral part of the quest for solutions to eradicate absolute poverty since the participation by beneficiaries will broaden their access to information, education, and training at the community level.

Activities undertaken through the CoRICs are complementary, and resources allow for mobilization of communities around these activities. One of the major activities of the CoRICs is the introduction of computer technology and skills in needy communities. Expected outcomes include:

- *Creation of a larger pool of computer-literate citizens and provision of greater opportunities for equal access to employment particularly for youths.*
- *Promotion of partnerships and participation in communities.*

The availability of computers will allow for expanded community training and self-knowledge for setting-up small businesses and encouraging youth entrepreneurship. It is also expected that civil participation on social issues that affect the country will be broadened through Community Internet access. To date activities have been mainly focused in Dominica; however, recent discussions with the governments of Grenada, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Lucia indicate that activities could soon be initiated in these three countries.”

8.0 CoRICs IMPLEMENTATION

The CoRICs Initiative was conceived in early 2004 as a separate poverty eradication project in collaboration with the French Government and parties identified in the above background. Its objectives and outcomes of increased opportunities for equal access to employment, particularly for youths, fitted well with the GoSVG/UNDP SVG/98/001 project. The process for integrating the one with the other is not found, but in the December 2004 Evaluation, Williams added CoRICs as a new output into the GoSVG/UNDP project.

The process of incorporation may not have been as smooth as desired, as the initiative is still seen by some government officers as a separate and unconnected project. It is not clear that the Management Committees fully understand their role and responsibility for the CoRICs. The Orange Hill MC expects that the electricity bills for the CoRIC, which is housed in the same building as their Processing Unit, is to be handled separately.

Nevertheless, SCDO Roger Young in his status report indicates that CDD holds responsibility for its implementation. Questioning the capacity of the CDD to manage the CoRICs along with the Poverty Eradication project is fair. The Project, from the Williams' evaluation was not being managed satisfactorily, yet another project was added.

The attached UNDP brief (Appendix 3) outlines “next steps” and activities that would have had the CoRICs up and running by September 2004. At the time of this 2006 Evaluation they are not. The IT/ICT skills were supposed to support income generating

projects. The SVG plan to be integrated with the GoSVG/UNDP project presumably was informed by the St. Catherine Socio-Economic Assessment that focused of the three communities.

Box 1 - from Edwin St. Catherine, Socio –Economic Assessment of Coulls Hill, Rose Place and Orange Hill, March 2005

Socio- Economic Assessment of the three communities in terms of

- (1) **computer ownership and Internet connectivity by household; and**
- (2) **interest in learning more about computers and the internet** is as follows:

Computer ownership :

Coulls Hill and Orange Hill - 3% to 6%. Rose Place 13%

Internet Connectivity:

Coulls Hill and Orange Hill - 1% - 2% Rose Place 8 %

Interest in learning more about computers and the internet:

Coulls Hill and Orange Hill - 80% Rose Place 56%

Was a specific plan designed/developed for St. Vincent and the Grenadines? Apparently the Grenada plan was to have been reviewed and used as a model several months ago. This does not appear to have occurred, thus there appears to be an unsystematic approach to the SVG Project thus far. Table 4 attempts to capture the current status.

Roger Young in his Status Update of the Projects as at June 30, 2006 provides the following:³⁵

The CoRICs project is being piloted in the three UNDP targeted communities for poverty eradication. The project seeks to establish three telecentres in the pilot communities – CH, OH, RP. Each Telecentre is to be equipped with four computers, Internet access, two printers and other equipment.. Each Telecentre will be managed by a local management committee with a Telecoordinator to provide day-to-day management and training activities. Communities to communicate and access information and training. No Telecentre has launched as yet:

	Orange Hill		Rose Place		Coulls Hill	
	Done	O/S	Done	O/S	Done	O/S
Establish three Centres	√		√		√	
Acquisition space	√			√		Acquired but not finalized
Retrofitting of Space						
Equip with four computers	√			Apparently in storage in 2005	√	

³⁵ Young, Roger, Status Update UNDP/GOSVG Poverty Reduction Project, p. 5

Two printers				√		
Network computers	√			√	√	
Internet installation		√		√		√
Telephone installation		√		√		√
TOT training for three (3) persons		√		√		√
Identify Telecoordinator		√		√		√
Training of sixteen (16) persons at Colonaire		√	√ 11 trained in 2005		√ 25 trained in Aug 2005	

8.3 CoRICS RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) A separate team be established to ensure the establishment and launch of the CoRICs. Possible team composition to include the CDD, Ministry of Telecommunications, NIT, a UNDP representative, and Management Committees representative. Perhaps involve the private sector. One person (with IT capability) will be assigned coordination and close supervision of the project.
- 2) The team will review and modify related plans appropriate to St. Vincent and the Grenadines
- 3) **A Logical Framework Analysis be developed with objectives, indicators, timelines, expected results – outcomes and impact. Specific, practical ways of supporting the ongoing income generating projects must be articulated.**
- 4) Mechanisms for monitoring will be established. Oversight of which will be the team's responsibility.
- 5) Measures for maintenance and sustainability be established.
- 6) The team must assess the Rose Place community to explore their involvement. Attempt to involve the private sector. There are several established businesses in the area.

9.0 CONCLUSION

In conclusion following is a comparative performance rating with that of the Willaims Evaluation of 2004, utilizing the evaluation criteria of Section 3.2.

Rating: Satisfactory- Fair – Good - Excellent

- a. Relevance – the extent to which a development intervention conforms to the needs and priorities of target groups and the policies of recipient countries and donors.
- b. Effectiveness – the extent to which a development intervention has achieved its objectives, taking their relative importance into account.
- c. Efficiency – the extent to which the costs of a development intervention can be justified by its results, taking alternatives into account. Also the extent to which the development intervention is managed effectively by the implementing agency.

- d. Impact – the totality of the effects of a development intervention, positive and negative, intended and unintended.
- e. Sustainability – the continuation or longevity of benefits from a development intervention after the cessation of development assistance.

Criteria	Williams	Woodley	Comments
Relevance	Satisfactory	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poverty reduction strategy; - Promotes community economic development - Important to achieving MDGs. - Rose Place programmes may not have been relevant
Effectiveness	Less than satisfactory / Fair	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some objectives have been met. - Communities are involved. - Some benefits derived. - Enabling environment for generating income established.
Efficiency	Less than satisfactory	Fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need Budget/Financial Information to assess if costs can be justified. - Too many delays, stops and starts
Impact	Poor	Fair. CH & OH Projects require more time to determine realistic impact. Poor – Rose Place	Project implementation too slow. Delayed starts resulted in unfinished /incomplete projects.
Sustainability	Poor	Fair – has potential	Conditionally – Requires further support/assistance from CDD.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Anne: Business Plans for A UNDP Poverty Reduction Programme for St. Vincent and the Grenadines, October 2004 (unconfirmed)
2. Chen, Huey-Tsyh, Practical Program Evaluation: Assessing and Improving Planning, Implementation, and Effectiveness, Sage Publications, 2005
3. Fraser, Patricia, UN Volunteer, Progress Report for Period May – November 2004; Report For Period 30th January – 16th February 06.
4. J.E Marketing Co. Ltd.: Marketing Research on the Purchasing and Consumption Patterns of Cakes & Pastries for Rose Place Community, September 2004
5. Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries, Agricultural Census 2000 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, May 2002
6. NESDC Poverty Reduction Taskforce: St. Vincent and the Grenadines Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, June 2003
7. Office of the Cabinet Prime Minister's Office: Four Years of progress POVERTY REDUCTION in St. Vincent and the Grenadines , April 2001 to April 2005.
8. SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) Evaluation Manual, "Looking Back, Moving Forward", 2004.
9. Statistical Office St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Population and Housing Census Report 2001.
10. St. Catherine, Edwin: Socio-Economic Assessment of Coulls Hill, Rose Place and Orange Hill, 24 March 2005.
11. The World Bank, A Source Book for Poverty Reduction Strategies, Vols 1& 2, 2002
12. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results, UNDP Evaluation Office, 2002.
13. Williams, Monica, Evaluation of Assistance with Poverty Eradication PProject SVG/98/001 St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Final Report, 30 December, 2004
14. Young, Roger, Status Update – UNDP/GOSVG Poverty Reduction Project as at 30 June 2006.

APPENDIX # 1

Programmatic Elements for the UNDP Poverty Eradication Project		
Programmatic Elements	Stakeholders	Evaluation Focus
Implementing organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Planning Division • Ministry of Social Development • Community Development Division (CDD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial situation • Capacity building activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge & Training - Technical assistance and skill transfers • Reporting • Successes, constraints, problems and lessons learned
Programme implementers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management Committee • CDD • Local Management Committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and training • Communication • Performance monitoring and feedback • Successes, constraints, problems and lessons learned
Intervention and service delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Managers • Trainers • Production workers • Farmers • Target communities • CDD community officers • Capacity Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature and content of the intervention • Standardization and/or differences between activities and countries • Procedures for addressing needs of target populations • Roles and responsibilities of staff • Communication • Performance monitoring and feedback • Successes, constraints, problems and lessons learned
Associated organizations and community partners	<p>Local</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shop keepers • Various Community groups • Purchasers of goods and services • NGOs <p>CDD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Ministries e.g. Finance; Trade; Technology • Buyers / Supermarkets • NDF / NGOs / CED • Social Investment Fund 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategies for establishing and/or fostering collaborations • Nature and purpose of collaborations • Sustainability • Successes, constraints, problems and lessons learned
Target populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Orange Hill & Stakeholders • Coulls Hill & Stakeholders • Rose Place & Stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for selection • Receptivity, willingness and commitment of target populations
External context / environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Role of the UNDP • This Section needs further definition and decision as the evaluation gets underway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature and aspects of supportive / conducive environments • Strategies for enhancing support • Successes, constraints, problems and lessons learned

Revised Logical Framework Analysis³⁶ (Williams)
SVG/98/001/99
APPENDIX

Results and Resource Framework
PROJECT RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK*

<p>Intended Outcome as stated in the Country Results Framework and MYFF combined with the second set: (taken from the UNDAF)</p> <p>1.6 Local Poverty Initiatives – National target communities (OECS countries) enabled to generate income, access information, use ICT through the CoRICs initiative and work collaboratively as a community. - Creation of a larger pool of computer-literate citizens and provision of greater opportunities for equal access to employment, particularly for the unemployed youths. Micro-finance opportunities identified and appropriate strategies for enhancement formulated.</p> <p>1.7 National target communities enabled to generate income - Supporting sustainable economic development - Creation of skilled self-employed communities with a greater opportunity for equal access to markets -</p> <p>1.8 <i>Achieving the MDGs and reducing human poverty – Local poverty initiatives, including Micro-finance (MYFF)</i> - Enhancing local poverty reduction initiatives, including micro-finance and Micro/Small-enterprise Development (MSED)</p> <p>1.9 Promoting job creation for poor communities including youth</p> <p>1.10 Poverty Reduction Strategies and Plans (PRSPs) - Strengthening and enhancing Interim PRS/PRSPs for effective implementation. - Strengthening of local poverty reduction initiatives).</p>
<p>Outcome indicator as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and target.</p>

Applicable MYFF Service Line:

Partnership Strategy

UNDP will provide support to the GoSVG through technical assistance and capacity building of existing framework at the governmental/institutional and community levels seek to provide solutions to:

- 3.3 The need for a community development framework for poverty reduction to include training, social development, TA, credit, and marketing, Information Technology through the CoRICs
- 3.4 The lack of opportunities for equal access to employment, particularly for the poor (including youth)
- 3.5 The need to strengthen local poverty reduction initiatives for the poor and 'non-bankable' including micro-finance and Micro/Small-Enterprise Development (MSED) activities.

Project title and ID: Assistance with Poverty eradication – SVG/98/001

Intended Outputs (and output indicators)	Output Targets for (years)	Indicative Activities	Inputs
<p><i>Outputs</i></p> <p>Output 1: Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis.</p>	<p>Output Targets – For more complex projects where an output takes more than one (1) year.</p> <p>1. Number of Micro and small enterprises established by communities.</p>	<p>Main activities needed to produce each output or annual output target.</p> <p>Please see attached pages 2-3 for list of activities (original and revised).</p>	<p>Nature and cost of the inputs needed to produce each output.</p> <p>US\$</p> <p>Implementation of poverty reduction/income-generating projects:</p> <p>1.1 <i>Training Workshops Consultant</i> \$7,000</p> <p>1.2 <i>Material and Equipment</i> \$2,000</p> <p>1.3 <i>Consultant – Community Profiles</i> \$2,000</p>

³⁶ Williams, Appendix 9, p. 37

³⁷ Implementation of Community Programmes and the Establishment of a Pilot CoRICs, Rodney Grant, September 2004.

<p>Output 2: Efficient co-ordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.</p> <p>Output 3: CoRICs - The level of awareness of IT improved among residents³⁷</p> <p>Output 4: Appropriate income-generating activities for selected communities developed. - Self-employment opportunities of communities enhanced through micro and small credit - Number of self-employed residents increased</p>	<p>2. CDD capacity enhanced to manage poverty reduction activities in communities - CDD staff trained in project management, business development techniques, participatory research methodology.</p> <p>3. Number of training programmes for youths and adults in IT- number of residents computer literate</p> <p>4. Micro and small enterprises established by the mid 2006. - Strategic Alliances with agencies – Teachers Credit Union MicroStart providing credit to communities - Number of residents operating their income-generating activities</p>		<p><i>1.4 Consultant Team Building \$6,000</i></p> <p><i>1.5 Management skills training – NDF \$2,000</i></p> <p><i>1.6 Rose Place Community Development \$60,200</i></p> <p><i>1.7 Project support (Project Manager and UNV) \$84,000</i></p> <p><i>1.8 Monitoring and Evaluation \$19,400</i></p> <p><i>1.9 Consultants - PRSP, Policy Indicators, MED Feasibility \$22,000</i></p> <p><i>2.1 Consultant – Evaluation of CDD operations \$2,000</i></p> <p><i>2.2 Consultant – training of CDD staff \$7,000</i></p> <p><i>2.3 Consultant - data strengthening \$5,000</i></p> <p><i>2.4 Consultant Social Policy Analysis \$5,000</i></p> <p><i>3.1 Materials and equipment (including computers) \$3,000</i></p> <p><i>3.2 Consultant - IT Training \$2,000</i></p> <p><i>3.3 Life and skills Training \$5,400</i></p> <p><i>3.4 Tele. Co-ordinator \$12,000</i></p> <p><i>3.5 CoRICs launch \$1,000</i></p> <p><i>4.1 Agricultural inputs, operating costs to sustain income-generating projects (including utilities, feed) \$24,000</i></p> <p><i>4.2 Consultations/SC among other meetings \$4,000</i></p> <p>TOTAL: \$280,000</p>
---	--	--	---

***Community Resource Internet Centers Initiative (CoRICs):
a UNDP/French Government/ITU/OECS/Windward Islands Collaborative
Effort***

Background

As part of the Community Empowerment/Development thrust, of the Poverty Reduction Programme, UNDP has given support to countries of the Windward Islands in the establishment of community management teams, community assessments, development of community work plans, and assessments of Community Development Divisions. UNDP's larger development goal *is to support the establishment of Community Resource and Internet Centers (CoRICs) where community capacities in leadership and for sustainable livelihoods can be further enhanced.*

With the support of the French government, and in partnership with the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), UNDP has supported the establishment of CoRICs, as an integral part of the quest for solutions to eradicate absolute poverty since the participation by beneficiaries will broaden their access to information, education, and training at the community level.

Activities undertaken through the CoRICs are complementary, and resources allow for mobilization of communities around these activities. One of the major activities of the CoRICs is the introduction of computer technology and skills in needy communities. Expected outcomes include:

- **Creation of a larger pool of computer-literate citizens and provision of greater opportunities for equal access to employment particularly for youths.**
- **Promotion of partnerships and participation in communities.**

The availability of computers will allow for expanded community training and self-knowledge for setting-up small businesses and encouraging youth entrepreneurship. It is also expected that civil participation on social issues that affect the country will be broadened through Community Internet access. To date activities have been mainly focused in Dominica; however, recent discussions with the governments of Grenada, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Lucia indicate that activities could soon be initiated in these three countries.



Picture: CoRIC in Good Hope, Dominica

Implementation Arrangements

The project is implemented by the UNDP office in Barbados in collaboration with the OECS Secretariat and the ITU. The CoRICs activity is implemented under an existing regional project executed by the OECS Secretariat, which also supports social development policy and planning at the sub-regional level. The implementation of the CoRICs programme has also been enhanced significantly by the presence on the ground of National United Nations Volunteers (NUNVs) where they already exist.

Additional Partnerships

UNITeS, the IT specialist arm of the UN Volunteers Programme (UNV) has indicated its interest in providing specialist support for ICT for Development and specifically to the CoRICs programme. This support would provide a UNITeS Volunteer/UNITeS Focal Point for a year in the first instance.

Recent Activities

Assessment Missions have recently been conducted to Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines in March 2004 with a mission to Grenada planned for May 2004. All CoRICs are expected to be up and running by the third quarter of 2004.

Next Steps

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Provisional</u>
<u>Timeline</u>	
Briefing and Discussion of collaboration on CoRICs with other UN agencies	(April 2004)
Launch of Dominica CoRICs	(May 2004)
Conduct CoRICs assessment mission to Grenada	(May 2004)
Development of new implementation plan and budget for 2004-2005	(May 2004)
Procurement of computers and other equipment	(June/July 2004)
Procurement of Internet service for all communities	(June/July 2004)
Development of training programme	(July 2004)
Launch of all CoRICs	(July 2004)
Implementation of comprehensive basic IT skills programme 2004)	(July/August
Develop of IT/ICT skills to support income-generating projects	(Aug/Sep 2004)

For further information, please contact:

Leisa Perch
 Programme Manager, Poverty Reduction
 United Nations Development Programme
 Sub-regional Office for Barbados and the OECS
 UN House, Marine Gardens
 Hastings, Christ Church
 BARBADOS
 Tel: (246) 467-6005
 Fax: (246) 429-2448
 Email: leisa.perch@undp.org
 Website: <http://www.bb.undp.org/poverty.html>

APPENDIX # 4

INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT (from the UNDP office)

ORANGE HILL PRODUCTION CENTER KITCHEN

<i>Quantity received</i>	<i>Description of Items (including make and model number)</i>	<i>Unit price Ec\$</i>	<i>Cost/ Value Ec\$</i>	<i>Serial Number</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
20 Pc	Dinner Set	59.95	59.95		
2	Kitchen Scale	39.95	119.85	88934-10011/883335-005989	
2	Measuring Cup	23.95	47.90		
2	Pot Spoons	7.95	15.90		
5	Wooden Spoons	14.95	74.75		
4	Turners 2m – 2L	9.95	39.80		
1	Clock	24.95	24.95	5168	
2	Stainless steel pizza pans	14.95	29.90		
2	Plastic Tubs	24.95	49.90		
1	10 Speed Blender	249.95	249.95	890 -96F	
1	Garbage bin	125.00	125.00		
3	Plastic wash dish	14.95	44.85		
2	Stainless Steel wash dish	69.95	133.90		
2	Ketchup container	7.95	15.90		
7	Cake pans	17.50	122.50		
4	Cookie pans sheet	18.95	75.80		
1	Rollin pins	23.95	23.95		
3	Non Stick baking trays	17.95	53.85		
6	Plastic buckets	13.95	83.70		
2	Plastic Container	11.95	23.90		
1	Stove	2295.00		0244 -0017 R	
2	20 Lb LPG gas cylinder-complete	350.00	350.00		
1	Refrigerator	3275.00	3275.00	G11521 NDFW	
1	Deep fryer	2714.00	2714.00	04BF11503	
2	100 lb LPG gas cylinders	140.00	280.00		
1	Stainless steel tables	1702.00	1702.00		
1	Sealer	450.00	450.00	48109	
1	Table	300.00	300.00		
3	Chairs	125.00	375.00		
1	Slicer	150.00	150.00	72898-93500	
2	Blender – heavy duty	1541.00	3082.00		
1	Air Conditioning	1670.00	1670.00	900549035033	
4	Computers				
	CPU 1			DB2PV75	
	CPU 2			D962PV71	
	CPU 3			DCG2PV71	
	CPU 4			DDG2PV71	
	Monitor 1			MY0Y13524760355RBF EY	
	Monitor 2			BFFD	
	Monitor 3			BFS1	
	Monitor 4			BFF9	
	Mouse 1			HCG51613256	

		Mouse 2			HCA51600351	
		Mouse 3			HCA51600586	
		Mouse 4			HCA51600698	
		Keyboard 1			CN-04N45437172-537-00XR	
		Keyboard 2			O1FV	
		Keyboard 3			534 -04NW	
		Keyboard 4			01EE	
	4	Computer desk	550.00	2200.00		
	4	Computer chairs	150.00	600.00		
	1	Transformer	178.65	178.00	SD-12G 250 AV Step down	

Orange Hill Pig Project

	1	100 feet hose	79.50	79.50		
	8	Buckets	10.95	87.60		
	8	Shovels	62.95	503.60		
	8	Rakes	7.60	60.80		
	8	Wheel Borrows	275.00	2200.00		
	8	scrubbing Broom	18.95	151.60		
	8	Pairs Water Boots	46.95	375.60		
	8	Water Tanks - Complete	856.00	6848.00		

INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT

West Hill Development Organization- GREEN SEASONING

<i>Quantity received</i>	<i>Description of Items (including make and model number)</i>	<i>Unit price</i>	<i>Cost/ Value</i>	<i>Serial Number</i>	<i>Remarks</i>
1	Garbage Bin- plastic	125.00	125.00		
7	Cake Pans	19.95	119.70		
2	Wash Dish – stainless steel	35.95	143.80		
4	Wash Dish – plastic	24.95	99.80		
8	Apron – cloth	13.95	111.60		
12	Kitchen Towel – cloth	2.95	35.40		
4	Pot spoon – wooden	14.95	59.80		
4	Cookie sheet -	18.95	75.80		
2	Storage – plastic	24.95	49.90		
12	Dinner Plates – breakable	5.95	71.40		
11	Soup Bowls – breakable	3.95	43.45		
12	Bread Plates – breakable	3.95	47.40		
1	Cutting Board – wooden	10.95	10.95		
1 pks	Strainers – plastic	3.50	3.50		
24	Drinking glasses – glass	2.95	70.80		
6	Table Mats – plastic	2.95	17.70		
1	Rolling pin – wooden	6.95	6.95		
1pk [3pcs]	Biscuit cutter	8.50	25.50		
6	Buckets – plastic	13.95	83.70		
12	Forks - stainless steel	2.50	30.00		
12	Spoons - stainless steel	2.50	30.00		
12	Teaspoon - stainless steel	1.25	15.00		
12	Soup Spoon	2.50	30.00		
12	Table knives - stainless steel	3.95	47.50		

12	Saucer tea cups - breakable	5.00	60.00		
4 [1 pks]	Measuring spoon – plastic	5.95	23.80		
6	Bottle cleaner – plastic	2.95	17.70		
6	Ladles (spatula)	3.95	23.70		
6	Pot spoon - plastic	7.95	47.70		
2	Kitchen Scale	39.95	119.85		
2	Serving trays - stainless steel	4.95	9.90		
1	Clock	24.95	24.95		
3	Measuring Cups – glass	23.95	71.85		
6	Funnels	3.00	18.00		
1	Blender - plastic	249.95	249.95		
1	Broom	14.95	14.90		
1	Table –stainless steel	1702.00	1702.00		
2	Towel set – cloth	5.75	11.50		
1	Large pot stainless steel	1100.00	1100.00		
6	Funnels	3.00	18.00		
1	Mop bucket	24.95	24.95		
1	Stove	2295.00	2295.00	02440015R	
1	Refrigerator	3295.00	3295.00	GT152INDEW- 134A	
2	Industrial blender –stainless steel	1541.00	3082.00	67677-67685	
2	Gas bottles-complete	350.00	350.00		
1	Table	300.00	300.00		
9	Chairs	125.00	1125.00		

Coulls Hill Pig Project

1	100 feet hose	79.50	79.50		
8	Buckets	10.95	87.60		
8	Shovels	62.95	503.60		
8	Rakes	7.60	60.80		
8	Wheel Borrows	275.00	2200.00		
8	scrubbing Broom	18.95	151.60		
8	Pairs Water Boots	46.95	375.60		
2	Water Tanks - Complete	856.00	1712.00		

Rose Place Project

1	Wheel Borrow	360.00	360.00		
3	Shovels	31.95	95.85		
1	Pick	78.95	78.95		
1	100 ft water hose	89.95	89.95		
4	Concrete Buckets	27.95	111.80		
1	Hard broom	36.95	36.95		
1	Digital Camera	1539.43	1539.43		
1	SD – Card	195.00	195.00		
	Trasonic Battery charger	22.99	22.99		
4	GP Rechargeable battery	30.00 per pair	60.00		

CoRICs

3	<u>Computers</u>				
	CPU 1				CN-OCT670-70821-569-E48X
	CPU 2				CN-OCT670-70821-569-6484
	CPU 3				FGTXT-364R3-MXRKY-6FP2J
	Monitor 1				MY-OY1352-47603-55R-BFJC
	Monitor 2				MY-OY1352-47603-55R-BFJA
	Monitor 3				MY-OY1352-47603-55R-BFFC
	Mouse 1				CN-0W1668-48723-541-01W2
	Mouse 2				CN-0W1668-48723-541-07FU
	Mouse 3				CN-0W1668-48723-541-032Y
	Keyboard 1				CN-04N454-37172-537-01FT
	Keyboard 2				CN-04N454-37172-537-011V
	Keyboard 3				CN-04N454-37172-537-01DM
1	Transformer	178.65	178.65		
1	Broom	14.95	14.95		
1	Mop	8.95	8.95		
1	Mop Buckets	24.95	24.95		SD-12G 250 AV Step down

TOTALS OF THE ABOVE INVENTORY OF EQUIPMENT

	Orange Hill	Coulls Hill	Rose Place	TOTALS
Agro Processing	15,764.20	15,340.40		29,048.90
Computers	2,978.00	227.50		20,738.60
Pig Framing	10,306.70	5,170.70		2,590.92
TOTALS	29,048.90	20,738.60	2,590.92	52,378.42

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION OF THE UNDP/GOVERNMENT OF ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES ASSISTANCE TO POVERTY ERADICATION PROJECT – STV/98/001/01/99**BACKGROUND**

St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG) is situated in the southern part of the Windward Islands Group of the Lesser Antilles. St. Vincent is the main island and the Grenadines comprise seven smaller inhabited islands and approximately 30 islets. Although the chain of islands represent a land mass of 388.5 square kilometers, it extends over a significantly larger area of the Caribbean Sea. The larger islands are essentially volcanic and mountainous by nature, while the smaller islets are substantially of coral formation with significant stretches of beaches. Agricultural activity is concentrated on the main island and tourism in the smaller islands. The total population is estimated at 106,253 (2001 Population and Housing Census) and economic activity is based mainly on three sectors: agriculture, tourism and manufacturing.

SVG faces severe constraints to sustainable human development which are both domestic and external in origin. Limitations of size and natural resources, the heavy reliance on an uncompetitive banana industry and the fragility of the marine ecosystem in the main tourism centers all combine to expose the country to substantial socio-economic vulnerability. Indeed, the loss of preferential arrangements for the banana industry and the intensification of trade liberalization in the global economy serve to aggravate this position. The prevailing socio-economic situation in St. Vincent and the Grenadines is characterized by low growth, high unemployment and social inequality.

In the report of the Country Poverty Assessment (CPA) conducted by the Government during 1995/1996 with support from the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) to measure the ability of households to meet basic food and non-food requirements, almost 38 percent of the population of SVG was determined poor and 26 percent indigent. The causes of poverty identified include a low level of educational achievement, unemployment and underemployment, low wages, high dependency ratios, difficulties in the banana and manufacturing industries, limited access to productive resources (land, credit), inadequate infrastructure (access roads, drainage and irrigation, transportation, extension services) in support of productive sector activity and an inadequate social safety net. While an assessment to update these findings has not yet been conducted, it is recognized that the adverse effects of the shocks to the banana industry since 1996 and the events of September 11, 2001 might have resulted in a worsening of the poverty situation within some segments of the population.

Following a robust performance during the 1980's when the average rate of growth averaged 6.2 percent per annum (p.a.), the rate of economic growth in SVG slowed during the 1990's to 3.2 percent p.a. largely on account of decreasing demand in external markets for major commodity exports. During 2000-04, real growth further slowed to an average of 2.8 percent p.a., mainly under the influence of the slowing global economic environment. Merchandise exports as a percentage of GDP fell from 41.7 percent in 1990 to 15 percent in 1999, and further dropped to 8.3 percent in 2004. Over this period, the SVG economy was undergoing a gradual transformation of the external sector, as service exports (tourism, financial services and informatics) expanded with the ratio of exports of services to GDP rising from 26.1 percent in 1994 to 38.6 percent in 1999. However, in recent years, growing competition in the tourism sector, coupled with initiatives to control the growth of offshore financial services, slowed growth in the services sector, with the ratio of exports of services to GDP falling to 34.1 percent in 2004.

Performance in the agricultural sector, particularly the banana industry, has been steady declining. Several periods of drought, combined with unfavourable climatic conditions during the hurricane season and generally declining market prices have contributed to the overall decline in the banana sector since the early 1990s. This has resulted in the agricultural sector's contribution to GDP falling from 21.6 percent in 1990 to 9.9 percent in 2004.

Real output in manufacturing has also been on a steady decline for more than a decade as the sector has had to face increasing competition from globalization and trade liberalization. The narrow range of products produced for local consumption and the limited amounts that are exported both regionally and internationally have been significant factors underlying the demise of the sector. In addition, manufacturers within SVG (as well as the wider OECS) were protected from competition under Article 56 of the Treaty of Chaguaramas.

Average sectoral growth rates have been –0.8 percent, -0.4 percent and –1.3 percent for the periods 1990-94, 1995-99 and 2000-04, respectively. Factors such as small market size and high input costs militate against economies of scale. Problems in the sector have been further exacerbated by falling import prices as barriers to trade are being removed and by the use of synthetics and other high-tech processes in production methods.

The UNDP in its commitment to sustainable development and eradication of poverty, collaborated with the Government of SVG and initiated the Assistance to Poverty Eradication project in 1998. The project was to address some of the many problems facing communities in SVG, and to assist in the grassroots development of its people in an effort to reduce, and eventually eradicate poverty by assisting them with an alternative form of employment and income generation. The communities identified as poor communities, and targeted for this programme, are Orange Hill, Coulls Hill and Rose Place (Bottom Town).

UNDP also assists countries in developing innovative strategies that increase access to Information Technology (IT) in order to harness it for development. IT strengthens participation in global markets; promotes political accountability; improves the delivery of basic services; and enhances local development opportunities. IT has become an important component in sustainable human development. To this end, the UNDP/United Nations volunteers' initiative to support the development of Resource Centres in communities where UNVs could offer IT training was subsumed as part of the Poverty Reduction project.

Further, UNDP, together with the French Cooperation is implementing a pilot project to provide OECS countries (the Windward Islands, *i.e.*, **Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines**), with a comprehensive programme for community development through community mobilization, training and reduction of the digital 'divide' and, to reduce poverty through the use of information technology for health, education, economic opportunity, empowerment and participation and for sustaining the environment. The major strategy will be the establishment of Community Resource Internet Resource Centres (CoRICs) and to provide training in computer skills. Dominica was the first of these islands to implement this project. Additionally, the centers will be established as support mechanisms for community activities as well as leadership building and small enterprise development, amongst other things.

B. PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF THE EVALUATION:

The UNDP has made a commitment to sustainable development and the eradication of poverty. Human resource development and sustainable livelihoods are also among its priority themes. The project is therefore central to the organization's mandate.

According to the 1996 Poverty Assessment Report conducted by the Government of SVG in collaboration with the CDB, over 30 percent of the population in SVG has been living below the poverty line. The communities identified in this programme are listed as having the greatest need for assistance in poverty alleviation, and have also expressed interest in fully participating in relevant programmes or projects.

Furthermore, with the economic crisis and severe decline in the banana industry, and subsequent growth in unemployment and income loss, this project should have restored some vibrancy to the economy of particularly hard hit communities, within a holistic, comprehensive and integrated context. The project should have also provided alternative employment strategies and provide employment skills to particularly vulnerable groups.

The Poverty Eradication Project, initiated in 1998, should have been completed in October of 2001. The original project document makes provision for an evaluation, which should have been completed five years ago. There is therefore an urgent necessity to bring this project to a close, and to identify the way forward.

At the end of the project, the three communities should have attained improved living standards and enhanced quality of life through interventions reflecting poverty reduction and eradication.

Expected Outputs from the project included:

5. Capacity of three poor communities built and strengthened to identify their needs and implement poverty reduction projects on a sustainable basis;
6. Empowered communities with the ability to improve their standard of living on a sustainable basis;
7. Institutional capacity of the Community Development Division strengthened in order to facilitate the poverty reduction thrust in St. Vincent and the Grenadines; and

8. Efficient coordination and implementation of management development and poverty reduction activities within the Community Development Division.

The evaluation will assess the Poverty Eradication Project, in relation to its impact and the sustainability of community development with relation to human resources and strengthening of capacity. It will also look at the management and implementation of the project, identify constraints, lessons learned and provide recommendations for the future. The beneficiaries of the evaluation report will include the UNDP Barbados and OECS office, the Government of SVG and the selected communities.

C. OBJECTIVE

The objective of the Evaluation is to:

- **assess the progress attained by the project in relation to key activities, result/outputs, and purpose as defined by the Logical Framework Analysis;**
- **assess the role of the National Committee set up with representation from relevant Government Ministries and Departments working on poverty eradication;**
- **evaluate performance of selected projects within the programme paying attention to overall project performance including recommendations for improvement;**
- **examine the options for sustainability of community development, in particular transferable skills for employment, and give recommendations for improvement;**
- **compare and contrast programme arrangements in each of the three targeted communities, to identify constraints to implementation and lessons learned;**
- **assess the status of current policy formulation to support poverty reduction efforts at community and country level; and**
- **To determine from the client perspective, the major issues arising in relation to access, quality and equitable distribution of the various products of the project.**

D. THE ASSIGNMENT: SCOPE OF WORK

The proposed Evaluation Consultant will seek to achieve the objectives of this evaluation through the following:

- Review and evaluate project implementation, including the existing structure and its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability including the role of the National Coordinating Mechanisms, as well as the linkages to the UNDAF.
- Review the original project document and conduct consultations with both UNDP and the Government of SVG.
- Examine and assess the current policy formulation and framework with regards to poverty reduction.
- Examine all relevant documents (including Narrative, Financial and Tri-partite Reviews).
- Conduct field/site visits to the three communities targeted in order to present an updated situational analysis with regards to the level of poverty, access to, and knowledge of the project.
- Assess the progress attained by the project in relation to key activities.
- Compare and contrast programme arrangements in the three communities, identify constraints to implementation and lessons learned.
- Examination of the effects of changing socio-economic conditions within the communities and the country at large, identifying any new or emerging discriminated, marginalized or vulnerable populations.
- Assess the effectiveness of project inputs into the development of management capacity at the community level.
- Assess whether the project addressed the needs of any of the aforementioned groups, and review the needs and priorities of selected communities.
- Assess whether the project was implemented within the context of the individual community, taking into account the diversity of the population.
- Investigate the need for assistance to other communities that have also been characterized as poor or have since the completion of this project emerged as also being either equally or even more vulnerable compared to the original selection of communities.
- Develop detailed outlines or summaries for specific projects within the programme including CoRICs.

- Draft an interim report which will include the consultant's major findings and recommendations on the policy environment and operational framework which would make further UNDP inputs sustainable.
- Submit and make a presentation of the draft final report on the evaluation findings to the Tri-partite Review Meeting for the project to be jointly coordinated by UNDP Barbados and the OECS and the Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.
- Include in the final report, a report of the Tri-partite Review Meeting.

E. DURATION

The total duration of the assignment will be over a period of eight (8) working days commencing 21 August 2006 and ending no later than 30 August 2006.

F. MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

The overall responsibility for managing the review will be with the UNDP Barbados Office, in close collaboration with key stakeholders in SVG.

The consultant will be expected to consult with former consultants, coordinators, and other designated staff within the UNDP Barbados Office and the Community Development Division of the Government of SVG. All relevant project documentation will be made available to the Consultant by both UNDP and the Government of SVG.

The consultant is expected to prepare and forward a list of specific requested materials and a proposed WorkPlan/Timetable of activities at least five (5) days in advance of the commencement of her/his assignment.

The consultant will report to the UNDP Programme Manager for Poverty Reduction and copy all submissions to the Government of SVG, in particular the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning and the Ministry of National Mobilization, Social Development, Gender Affairs, etc.

G. DELIVERABLES:

The consultant is expected to complete the assignment within eight (8) working days. He/She shall submit the following:

1. A prepared work-plan and methodology;
2. A final Terminal Report for the project based on the draft prepared by the Government;;
3. A draft report and review on the evaluation findings for review and comments by the UNDP Barbados and OECS and the Government of SVG, which will also be presented at the Tripartite Review Meeting and will comprise the following components;
 - a. The consultant's findings of the evaluation of the performance of the various components of the project;
 - b. Comprehensive recommendations on strategies on the way forward and for future related interventions for SVG including specific areas related to design and implementation;
 - c. A review of the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) comparing the purpose and objectives of the project in relation to achievement of specified results and performance targets.
4. A final evaluation report reflecting the comments from UNDP Barbados, the Government of SVG, and any other stakeholders.
5. A draft programme support document for a follow up project which will be centred around follow-up support to the CoRICs initiative in SVG.

H. BUDGET:

The budget (in United States Dollars) for the services of the consultant is as follows:

Fees: \$2,000.00 (USD\$250 @ ~~fifteen~~ eight working days)

Travel, Communication and Administrative costs: \$500.00

Total: US\$2,500.00