



CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT IN BARBADOS AND THE
EASTERN CARIBBEAN

REPORT NO. 1

Executive Summary and Major Recommendations

PREPARED FOR

GEF SGP & UNDP OFFICE FOR BARBADOS AND THE EASTERN CARIBBEAN

Margaret Harris

Consultant

March 2009



Table of Contents

Acronyms	iv
Background and Introduction	7
Methodology	11
Major Conclusions.....	14
Major Recommendations	22



Disclaimer

The ideas and conclusions in this report are those of the consultant and do not necessarily represent the ideas of the GEF SGP UNDP or UNDP Barbados Sub Regional Office.

Acronyms & Abbreviations

ADIC	Association for Integrated Community Development
ADESCOMI	Millennium Association for Development
ADESSARU	Association for the Sustainable Development of Rural San Jose
ART	Agency for Rural Development
BANGO	Barbados Association of Non Governmental Organisations
BAS	Barbados Agricultural Society
BAWDENS	Bawdens Environmental Park Group
BMT	Barbados Marine Trust
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CBO	Community Based Organisation
COUNTERPART	Counterpart Caribbean @ the Future Centre
CERMES	Center for Environmental Research and Management, UWI
DSCF	Dominica Save the Children Fund
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
FLT	Foundations for Living Trust
FRIENDS	Friends of the San Juan River Foundation
GEMA	The Swamp Eco- Tourism Group
GEF SGP	Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme
GRENEED	Grenada Education and Development Programme
GILBERT	Gilbert Agricultural and Rural Development Center
HEWANORRA	Hewanorra Organic Agriculture Movement

IADB	Inter American Development Bank
ISPN	Institute for Society, Population and Nature
JEMS	JEMS Progressive Organization
JCDT	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
SKSMN	St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network
SLNT	St Lucia National Trust
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NEVIS	Nevis Historical & Conservation Society
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
PANOS	Pan African News Organisations Caribbean Office
PEPA	Portland Environmental Protection Agency
PROGRESS	Progress Multi-sector Cooperative
ROTARY	Rotary Club of Antigua Sundown, Antigua and Nevis
UIEA	Union Island Environmental Attackers Inc
UNDP	United National Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
YDS	Youth Development Service
Walkers Wood	Walkers Wood Community Development Foundation Ltd

Executive Summary and Major Recommendations

1. Background and Introduction

Capacity Development capability in the Middle Income economies of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) has been the subject of much discussion during the last decade. Debate has ensued over persistent failure by many Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) in the region to effectively absorb funds and deliver on goals and objectives. Described as one of the most significant challenges facing CBOs and NGOs in recent times, the direction and status of volunteerism have come under question as have the *raison d'être* and functioning of non-state networks and organizations.

There is evidence to support a perception that the success of CBOS and NGOs in the sub-region has been compromised due to overwhelming inability or struggle to fulfill obligations as development partners, for project and/or programme design, implementation and management. In order to understand some of the inherent challenges external and internal to non-state actors and to develop appropriate assistance strategies, the Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme (GEF/SGP) and the Governance Programme of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in 2008 undertook a survey to examine factors that are common to capacity development projects in the GEF SGP in Barbados and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States.

The goal of the survey was to develop a Five-Year Capacity Development Action Plan for the GEF SGP that will identify intervention points for the programme. The long term objective is to assist NGOs and CBOs in developing required capacity. A comparative study of NGOs and CBOs in Barbados, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and selected Latin American countries where GEF SGP operates was carried out in order to appreciate some of the differences and mutual ways in which Capacity Development processes are viewed and implemented in the two regions.

The object of this paper is not to conclude what Capacity Development is but to offer suggestions as to how it is interpreted as an operational tool in Barbados and the sub-region as well as selected countries in Latin America and how this may impact on outcomes.

Context

The survey took place in a context characterized by significant adjustments in the global political landscape. The process of globalization and its inherent interdependencies, interconnections and impacts on civil society are situated within the framework of marked vulnerabilities of Small Island Developing States. Such vulnerabilities include: high dependency, undiversified economies, vulnerabilities to economic shocks and natural disasters, limited public and private sector capacity as well as size, geography, insularity and environmental and logistical constraints, among others. These make imperative the promotion of a more rapid pace of development and intensification of regional cooperation and integration systems in the sub-region. Such vulnerabilities are exacerbated by the intensification of pressures placed on traditional modes of operating through the process of external trade and economic reform. Such an agenda for change includes the adoption of legal reform and a wider recognition of the role of Civil Society in making a difference and deepening the international focus on poverty alleviation in its connection to sustainable development and environmental management.

Literature Review

The UNDP's vision of Capacity Development is the "process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives." This vision is associated with the mandate of the UNDP's Capacity2015 initiative to promote Capacity Development through its various agencies. Amongst the numerous definitions associated with the term, Capacity Development has become known most fundamentally for this application to individual, institutional and national pursuit of development goals in their multiple and varied forms in a process of non-linear, often asymmetrical change and transformation. Concepts of Capacity Development shift from the most basic and innate capacity of human beings to problem solve in keeping with their own perceptions, values, beliefs and experiences to approaches shaped by an external appreciation and formal understanding of the building blocks of Development. It is variously described as an approach or process or methodology for the attainment of development goals. Development is the all

encompassing parameter by which poverty reduction in the broadest sense is measured. Peter Morgan's¹ *what* of Capacity Development comprises three inter-related concepts: process, capacity and performance and developmental impact. There are a number of definitional pillars on which these three principles stand: essentially the compartmentalization (despite the obvious links) of capacity development, capacity and impact. Morgan states: Capacity development refers to the approaches, strategies and methodologies which are used by national participants and/or outside interveners to help organizations and/or systems to improve their performance. Process he notes is not the same as inputs such as training and workshops. He draws a distinction between Capacity and Capacity Development, defining the former as the *organizational and technical abilities, relationships and values* that enable countries, organizations, groups and individuals at any level of society to carry out functions and achieve their development objectives over time. Capacity is about institutional, organizational and behavioural outcomes. Developmental benefits and the results refer to impacts. Capacity may be created as a discovered and discoverable outcome in the natural process of learning and growth of humans. One of the ongoing debates on Capacity Development involves the extent to which implementers, stakeholders and donors own the process. The role that beneficiaries and constituents play is pivotal to the aim of achieving sustainable outcomes.

It is this quest for sustainability that may be converted into a means and an end in itself. Sustainability as a means in Capacity Development may be described as the change process while the end may be equated to the achievement of the goal as well as the mechanisms by which to secure and maintain the goal for as long as it remains relevant. Since the nature of societies and people are in perpetual process of change, renewal and adjustment, the capacity to formulate decisions to ensure continuous development suited to the period, era, phase or stage in which societies find themselves, is critical. A major deterrent to practitioners of Capacity Development therefore is that the anticipated strengthening of abilities to meet larger national goals may be debilitated through a perceived imbalance in the interdependency between human capacity, organisational or institutional capacity and the enabling environment. All three groups have a shared responsibility for improving the means by which to perfect such an imbalance. Development practitioners are most concerned about the linkages between the three, as societies adjust to new influences, both external and internal, that may alter their way of doing things. The role of external

¹ Morgan Peter. Capacity and Capacity Development: Some Strategies. Note prepared for the Social Science Division Policy Branch, CIDA. Accessed at www.impactalliance.org/file_download.php?location=S_U&filename=10343697570CIDA_Strategy_Paper.pdf

interventions in what is understood to be a naturally evolving process of change is highly debated and controversial as are the functions of money and assistance, particularly from external sources, in the process.

Barbados and the OECS

These overarching concerns are critical to interpreting the reality of Barbados and the OECS in formulating an Action Plan for Capacity Development within the GEF SG and for UNDP. In the sub-region, two of the most constant critiques of organizational systems for Capacity Development are the absence of a fully engaged enabling environment, with piecemeal, outmoded and/or inadequate legislative framework to regulate and monitor the practices of civil society actors.

Intentionally or not, the enabling environment falls short of being systematic. There are two opposing viewpoints with regard to the relationship of civil society organizations with the governmental machinery and processes of governance. The first suggests that civil society has a range of instruments that permit it to act and give voice to its diverse stakeholders but that these instruments or opportunities are underutilized or not at all. The second argues for the creation of legitimate space in which CBOs and NGOs are to operate. Proponents of these arguments conclude that the relative proximity of CSOs and NGOs to governments because of the small size of the geographic and political spaces in which they interact may result in both negative and positive outcomes. The other relationship that is of significance to Caribbean Community and GEF SGP interlocutors is the relationship to external donors.

Barring for and sometimes inclusive of NGOs and CBOs operating in the poorest communities, there is a perception that the sector is weak, indiscipline, prone to commit acts of nepotism, while not creating opportunities for the entry of new and younger participants. There is a suggestion that they may function within an unwritten code of lock-out, incapacity to deliver outcomes and objectives even whilst in possession of funds, and when they do not have funds, they are prone to insist on the need to be funded. Delivery of goals is often predicated upon the need to receive funds to operate.

There are a number of viewpoints on the problem with Capacity Development in the Caribbean Community:

- The Caribbean appeared to be a vibrant CBO/NGO space until civil society started to be regularly contracted with limited accountability measures inserted into the project design.

- The Caribbean was a Middle Income zone which no longer had any problems and social causes were obsolete or everyone had access to basic social comforts and therefore there were no longer any social causes to act on behalf of.
- There was need for the development of a framework that showed what such causes were since many issues felt to have been resolved could reappear overnight
- Lack of inclusion of young people in organizational development in the sub-region.
- There is no sense of community anymore
- There are inadequate effective structures and systems at the community and national levels, contributing to a majority of weak and disorganized NGOs.
- The institutional environment is not enabling
- Volunteerism is dead and philanthropic zeal and enthusiasm have been submerged along with volunteerism
- A lack of internal organizing capacity, minimal advocacy and networking – which negates possibility of attracting new members and people-support, the mandate of the organization not widely known and this further negatively impacts its legitimacy and sustainability.
- Volunteerism is dead and therefore Capacity Development suffers
- Capacity Development has become a means to acquire finance
- The Caribbean community is now more developed and CSO members needs have developed in consonance with those needs\
- The one person advocate and lobbyist in the Caribbean Community had less and less legitimacy in region of increasing interconnectedness.

Whatever Capacity Development may be defined as, there are a number of things analysts agree that it is not: human resource development alone, technical cooperation alone, a relationship between donor and recipient, an individual, institutional or national pursuit in isolation of the other but must function in relationships of interdependency. Yet there are some peculiarities worth mentioning: the need for ownership and self-confidence. In the Caribbean community, national and indigenous approaches have been altered as society developed. It is felt however that the nature of technical cooperation has remained essentially static, assuming an unnatural control over indigenous processes of community building and capacity development.

In the sub-region it has been observed that community organizations which develop from within appear to be more driven. These are allowed to resolve their own problems and devise solutions for them. It has

been argued by one development practitioner in the region, that the influence of agencies such as USAID during the height of the cold war has been negative. It is felt to have bred core groups of NGOs who were not held accountable for outcomes. The nature of aid altered the culture and ethos of community NGOs. The community had now come to depend heavily on external assistance for their survival. However, the general weakness was felt to be that initiative-taking for fundraising was stymied since funding was readily available.

Financial, political and planning structures changed hinged on the superior knowledge and expertise of external agencies. Communities and government involvement dwindled. The message on change was now transferred indirectly by foreign interlocutors and the local philosophies of life were now sidelined for the better foreign development good. The relatively stronger economic positioning of CARICOM CBO/NGOs is held to be both strength and a weakness within the development paradigm. The impacts are analysed more closely by participants in the survey.

2. Methodology

The methodological framework for the overall survey consisted of the following components:

- A literature review of existing general theories of Capacity Development. The review also examined issues of regional civil society Capacity Development in the Caribbean Community and Latin America. Some related mechanisms of governance and legitimacy are reviewed in the two regions.
- Review of GEF SGP database to identify capacity development issues from past projects
- A three hour focus group session was held on July 31, 2008. The immediate goal of the session was to formulate discussion around the notions of Capacity Development and its application within Barbados, the OECS and the wider Caribbean. Participating organizations debated the internal and external operational conflicts and values as well as the challenge of adjusting traditional to non traditional methodologies. The evaluation of the influences, behavior and trends that may point to some of the reasons behind a perceived weakening of CD in the sub-region formed a central part of the discussions.
- A number of interviews were conducted where necessary.
- Separate questionnaires were sent to GEF grantees, national coordinators and donors in the sub-region. Questionnaires for Latin American counterparts were prepared and translated by the consultant to GEF SGP Barbados and distributed through the New York coordination office to

Latin American counterparts. The questions were broken down according to the following conceptual areas categories:

- Capacity Development as theory and practice
- Identity and Values
- Purpose, vision and strategy
- Internal Systems and procedures
- Organizational culture
- Structure, organization and institutional development
- Programmes and services
- Performance and results
- Learning and change, training
- Leadership development, management and decision-making
- External links and relations
- Influencing and Advocacy
- Strengths, Weaknesses & Limitations

The methodology and analysis centered primarily on how GEF SGP recipients may be affected by general trends in the enabling environment in the Caribbean Community as well as performance and behaviour that inform NGO culture in the region. A further interpretation was made of some of the wider region-wide tendencies by firstly juxtaposing the experience of Barbados and the OECS GEFSGP partners within the wider context of the Caribbean Community Civil Society and secondly, to some working modalities of GEF SGP partner organisations in Central and South America. This was geared fundamentally at gaining an appreciation of the undercurrents of individual and institutional behaviour as well as country and regional culture that may be influencing NGOS and CBOs in Barbados and the sub-region. This paper therefore mainly addresses the constraints and factors that may inhibit and prevent GEF SGP partners in Barbados and the OECS from absorbing funds within the GEF SGP. The overall goal is the development of a Five-Year Capacity Development Action Plan for the programme.

Limitations

The analysis of regional trends and patterns was constrained by the reach of the questionnaire and interviews. The survey was confined to the GEF SGP counterparts and partners within the UNDP programme in Barbados, the OECS and Jamaica in the Caribbean Community. Latin American respondents came from the Dominican Republic, Panama, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Argentina, Brazil,

Bolivia, Costa Rica and Perú. Respondents from the Caribbean were from Jamaica, Barbados, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Lucia, Nevis, St Kitts and Antigua, Grenada and Dominica.

A common disadvantage of Focus Group sessions is that a few participants may be more vocal than others. While there was a generally high level of participation by all, the session was dominated by three main spokespersons. Nevertheless, the quality of the interventions was extremely high and relevant. The time and resources available for the overall survey was also limited, excluding a broader cross section of CBOS and NGOs from the Focus Group Session and Seminar.

The questionnaire analysed the points of views of grantees, donors and national coordinators. Donors numbered three only. All of these were regional organizations representing Barbados and the OECS sub-region. Notwithstanding these circumstances, the analytical framework used enabled valuable determinations to be made on the nature of capacity development, organizational change and performance within given structures and systems, factors exogenous to the organization's values which may influence outcomes, internal dynamics, roles and responsibilities, financing and cultural orientation in the sub-region.

This report is an executive summary that presents the backdrop to the discussion, firstly examining perceptions of Capacity Development juxtaposing concepts in the international, Latin American and Caribbean Community. It also addresses some of the principle lessons learnt to date from the GEF SGP programme in Barbados and the OECS. This section also covers the major recommendations based on the analysis in the survey.

Report No 2 begins the disaggregation of data collected and the formal presentation of the findings of the study and is for internal consumption only. It addresses the issues in the Focus Group Discussion and the responses to questionnaires by grantees, national coordinators and donors. It also summarizes the seminar discussion at which the initial findings were presented. The information collected relates closely to NGO management and strategic planning seen from perspectives of GEF SGP grantees, national coordinators and donors.

Report No 3 presents the Draft Five Year Action Plan and analysis based on further sub-division of data into sets and sub-sets of categories for successful project management and strategic planning. It incorporates ideas for specific action in Barbados and the OECS from the internal and external factors redefining and reshaping operational protocols and ethical standards for the CBO/NGO sector.

3. Major Conclusions

The object of the survey was to discover why organizations may not be absorbing funds and why there are high levels of under-performance of NGOs and CBOs under the GEF SGP programme. In addition, there was an attempt to understand and interpret some characteristics of the wider English Speaking Caribbean community in its approach to Capacity Development and organization and how these may be influencing patterns of behaviour in GEF SGP partners. There were parallel positions and viewpoints regarding the development of the GEF SGP programme. Firstly, it is situated within an overall framework of donor/ NGO relations and the socio-economic and cultural context of the English speaking region with its special historical characteristics. Secondly, Governance in the Caribbean Community is maturing in the post-independence as well as mechanisms and solutions to address issues such as multi-ethnicity, multiculturalism, economic crises, crime and related conflict management resolution and consensus building.

Within this paradigm, there is an inherent challenge around how NGOs and CBOs may be improved as they call for a shift in interpretation and understanding of their internal mechanisms and the external factors that may negatively impact their performance. Coinciding with this interest is the call for some redefinition of some terms of engagement between GEF SGP and the sub-region. This is based in part on perceptions of how GEF SGP may itself improve and performance outcomes and impacts when the GEF SGP grantees in sub-region are compared with their Latin American counterparts.

In the first place, Latin America is a wide geographic expanse where levels of poverty are far more endemic and where volunteerism appears to be heavily relied on in Latin American countries to support poverty reduction work. In the Caribbean sub-region higher levels of volunteerism were more evident during the early post independence of the 1960s and 1970 and 80s. In the sub-region the existence of Middle Income Economies and the increasing prevalence of market competition seem to be resulting in some measure in the decline of the traditional voluntary sector. Participants in the survey felt that this was informing a shift in thinking and modus operandi within CBO/NGOs. Secondly, participants in the survey felt that society's mores and values had changed and volunteers' work was no longer as present as when the desires, needs and wants of people were different. Moreover they contended that individual survival for those interested in working in the sector was a bigger necessity with the market shifts brought about

by neo-liberalism. This made incumbent the creation of a localized, culturally bound not for profit business model for the sector and/or agreement by donors to core funding.

GEF SGP partners' performance was also impacted by high levels of understaffing and the need for more personnel and volunteers. It was felt that changing lifestyles and patterns of development justified a call for paid volunteers to motivate persons to work better. The challenge with this categorization is that the traditional notion of volunteerism has been that of unpaid community service. This notion may be changing in formal environments where the business ethos has outpaced traditional ways of community engagement. Whatever patterns of development emerge in future years, volunteerism nevertheless is a fact of life, whether formalized into society's institutions or not. The question being raised is how to remunerate volunteers – in the modern institution – for work performed when the organisation he/she performs duties for is not for profit. In the first case, the volunteer is now in a sense, a worker if they receive a salary and therefore can no longer be easily termed a volunteer. Secondly, the term paid volunteer has been included in the nomenclature of some international organisations. Volunteers however even with this categorization aspire to receive the salaries that other workers do. Salaries may be seen as important incentives and recognition of the work they do.

In addition to understaffing, the lack of absorption of funds appear to stem from the need for better training in project management, that ultimately leads to poor or less than adequate implementation. Volunteers and paid staff alike tend to move on to more lucrative positions in the increasingly market economy of the Middle Income states of the Caribbean. The absence of a strong culture of youth volunteerism is also preventing turn-over in the system with possibilities for stagnation and over-reliance on outdated modes of organisational behaviour. A culture of poor implementation is being attributed to lack of resources to pay staff.

The responses from Jamaica, Barbados and the OECS show that project management is a major organisational challenge. There is anxiety over showing donor driven results and how the organization evolves as opposed to the *plural, participative and democratic process* that is Capacity Development. The latter is undermined by limited understanding of its broadest fundamental mission and purpose. The people centered “grassroots” and systems approaches are not as important for the majority of organizations as is the organisational/institutional approach. The holistic systems modality involving people, communities and the enabling environment of which the organization may be the center lacks clear focus.

The overarching philosophical framework for capacity development that informs organizations' work in Jamaica, Barbados and the OECS is vague. This may be for a number of reasons: capacity development itself is a variety of related concepts in which intervention points may be from distinct but complementary angles. On the other hand, a strong theoretical underpinning is critical for practical implementation. In the vast majority of cases, definitions are confined to internal procedures and somewhat closed approaches instead of the broader, wider context. In attempting to situate organizations in the sub-region, a number of things become clear: governance is viewed by the majority as a dynamic that mainly takes place within the organization in relation to its own evolution. Its evolution in relation to the global, regional and even national and local levels is without a clear methodological framework and as such the organization is limited in its own outward projection and local, regional and international reach.

Whether they are circumstances of geography or distance from politics, GEF SGP Latin American counterparts place high value in human resource capability combined with strong leadership, community orientation and creative resolution of problems. There is also evidence of a marked and stronger self confidence and organisational awareness in the detailed description of processes. Latin Americans distinguish between NGOs and CBOs in terms of size and opportunity, with CBOs being rendered less able to access funding. Small size is a factor in CBO/NGOs in the English speaking Caribbean sub-region.

The organizations are all consistent with regard to the need for knowledge, skills enhancement and funding. The question of individual rights and entitlement is far less acknowledged, rights being the basic and natural inheritance of human beings in their context of growth and development. This is not as strongly reflected in answers as the more immediate internal challenges and organisational issues. In this regard, there was a strong call across groups for the enabling environment and governance structures to be strengthened to provide the legal framework for organisations to be given recognition by the state and be more publicly accountable. The need to increase communication, dialogue and collaboration between NGOs and governments for the creation of a more enabling environment emerged as a central goal across all three groups in the survey.

Organisations for the most part fail in their project management functions despite claims of reasonably good successes. The question is why is there this lack of coincidence between what organizations believe about themselves and what they may be accomplishing. The answers appear to lay in the fact that the internal environments in which organizations are functioning have for the most part remained stagnant or unchanging. On the other hand, the demands of international donors have adjusted in keeping with

changes in criteria and relationships with the Middle Income Countries of the English Speaking Caribbean. In effect, much of the criteria have shifted as external funding sources have tended to decline with the emergence of mandates deemed more pressing and urgent than Barbados and the sub-region.

This is seemingly complicated by the fact that NGOs and CBOs in the sub-region, and the overall regional environment have not been able to adjust their systems to accommodate these demands. Some of the expectations of external donor agencies one might argue are not new but the same that have not been respected over the years by the culture of NGO and CBO operations in the sub-region. Yet the pressure to be more accountable has increased. This would appear to have a deep and lasting impact on a culture that is largely historically still a very oral one in nature. Documentation of meetings, work and decisions for example and compilation of information is an area of work that the broader culture, even governmental institutions have found challenging. The challenge to better performance of GEF SGP partners therefore is one that emanates in part from the wider societal values that are culturally bound, as well as being organizationally confined. Many of the same problems have been documented in other programmes in the English Speaking region. Additionally many of the same issues of under-performance and limited capacity to absorb funds have been observed in other donor-funded programmes.

There is another element that is associated with under performance, that of repeated direct calls for more funding. The calls for more funding have not however been supported by evidence that organizations will be more responsible to donors and to their implementation mandates and contractual agreements. Neither is it supported by evidence of strong fundraising drives. Once again, this is a big challenge for a broad cross section of NGOs and CBOs in the region. Interestingly, despite resources limitations many organizations have paid staff, though it is not explicitly clear what are the roles played by these staff members and how much funds they are paid as well as source of salaries. This becomes important since there is a frequent request for core funding. If funds dedicated for implementation are to be re-directed towards staff salaries then meeting goals and objectives will be a problem, unless additional sources of funding for the particular project are sought.

They argue for an end to a would-be dependency syndrome in their relationship with donors. On the other hand, they insist on more and more targeted resources, going to for example, framework funds for more established organisations. The provision of core funding as the case of some GEF SGP partners has shown, does not guarantee good performance or absorption. On the other hand, core funding has been proven to stimulate NGO staff to perform better. Organisations in Barbados and the OECS in theory appear to place resources over deliverables. Deliverables may indeed be achieved once costs are matched

to schedules with proper project management backed by strong community engagement and participation. Resources are only as effective as the capacity of organisations to ably utilise them. Donors and CBO/NGOs argue that the institutional context is weak. One organisation called for organisations to be forced to meet specific donor criteria prior to initiating projects.

Undoubtedly NGOs are forced to come to terms with aspects of the movement that they were not faced with in the past. This includes the movement towards economic rationalization and accountability that were not strong features of traditional operations and the need to continually adapt practices to suit the demands of financiers, measuring performance and assessing outcomes identified. In this regard, they must be clear of the basis and reason for their existence and how they can most adequately fulfill their purpose without losing sight of financial obligations. In terms of strategic management, while the organization cannot control their environment, they can read or anticipate it and adapt systems whilst maintaining their strategic goals and objectives. In this sense, the strategic direction, vision and project scope must be more realistic so that organizations may accomplish goals.

The general approach to management and decision-making for the most part has to be revised. Management approaches are inefficient and this does not appear to be the result of a lack of funding. The complexity of not having core funding is an issue that does not resolve the fact of unused funds. There are a number of other important considerations: absence of marketing procedures among some agencies and sound governance which are critical for NGOs to maintain high levels of integrity, public trust and confidence. Implicit is the requirement for performance management and measuring outcomes. In terms of financial management and its impact on project delivery, it serves the NGO CBO little to complain of a lack of sufficient funding while not being able to absorb funds. It defeats its own argument through incapacity to fulfill part of the purpose. Insufficient absorbance of funds, regardless of sound theory, denotes a need for efficient organizational structures, discipline and adherence to donor demands, more efficient staffing of the project and office.

There also appears to be a need to upgrade skills in management functions within the project management context. This includes management of conflict and performance management. Most apparent are the absence of effective planning mechanisms that demonstrate good knowledge of the project life cycle, roles and responsibilities, milestones, schedules and time management and efficient baseline data collection and situational analyses. Lack of effective networking and advocacy skills affect capacity to resource funds as well as underscore the competitive nature of CBO and NGO work. There is also need for risk management planning and efficient documentation of project implementation processes.

The next observation is that NGOs and CBOs that work directly in communities or have a deeper bond with communities appear to be more successful as well as those that are operating in more impoverished areas where demand and need seem to be greater. In Barbados and the OECS sub-region therefore, there is a clear trend that where there is higher community participation, there is a higher level of impacts. There are indicators that this is true of the Latin American region. Unfortunately, the number of responses from Grantees in Latin America was extremely limited. There is evidence however to suggest that team building and ongoing community participation are given higher priority compared to the Barbados and OECS sub-region. Because organisations appear to operate often at the margins of strong community involvement, they may very well be extremely top down in their management approaches. The needs and wants of the immediate communities and their active involvement appear to be secondary considerations for the most part even while this is the stated goal. This is a classic error that often undermines short, medium and long term implementation and good outcomes. Delivery of goals and objectives requires understanding of not just which part of the environment is being tackled but what the target community may be – except of course for very specific cases where a community may not be directly involved.

Management systems appear to be non-participatory, that is, for the most part without the direct input of beneficiaries and stakeholders. Project planning approaches strongly reflect executive type models in which boards direct the overall implementation and are responsible for decision-making, taking the mandate away from project teams and/or stakeholders. Individual roles and responsibilities need better and clearer clarification. Organisational development has to be agency wide and not the precinct of one or two individuals, either for their prestige or because they have advanced concepts about where the organization should be. While grounded in a perception that all hands must be on board, it appears that in actual implementation, this principle does not necessarily hold true in all organizations. Organisations generally by the concepts expressed define themselves as project driven organizations with varying degrees of line management capability. Boards appear to have an extremely strong power of decision with regard to content of programmes. Project managers may not be allowed to do their jobs because of the overarching power of Boards and executives.

NGOs/CBOs across the board complain of the challenging mandate of GEF SGP. The GEF SGP may be criticized for its “bureaucracy.” On the other hand, NGOs and CBOS have to take ownership for being part of a culture that is systematically criticized for being weak and not following guidelines and seek to correct it. Latin American counterparts’ efforts to meet donor requirements despite the onerous nature of the task, gives them seemingly greater credibility. The extent to which Latin America compares more

favourably over Jamaica, Barbados and OECS must be weighed in the context of its discipline, performance management and adaptability to donor requirements.

Good internal governance demands careful delegation of responsibilities and division of labour which are not always clear cut, particularly with constantly changing staff and anti-ethical behaviour such as the double roles played by some organizational leaders. Good governance and management generally fall into the hands of the role of the most senior person who needs to understand his/her function in order to help realize the goals of the organization. Good internal governance demands careful delegation of responsibilities and division of labour which are not always clear cut, particularly with constantly changing staff and anti-ethical behaviour such as the double roles played by some organizational leaders. Good governance and management generally fall into the hands of the most senior person who needs to understand his/her function in order to help realize the goals of the organization. A general conclusion made is that organizations must focus on the role and needs of people and what they want as part of the environmental thrust.

A challenge to the CBO/NGOs is to avoid the trap of competition while recognizing that most competitors also have the possibility of being collaborators. Governance must also be undertaken consistent with agreements and contractual arrangements entered into. An organization must be able to recognize and acknowledge its limitations and based upon these ensure that measures are taken to attain high standards and that its actions can stand up to scrutiny. When staff turn over is high, boards tend to step in and manage and not always with the effectiveness of project teams. The vacuum of people and the deficit in human resource capacity (both in terms of volume and skills and competence) is a high factor in delivery or failure. Yet if systems are in place, even with high turn over, there would be a measure of continuity that is based on good planning and documentation.

NGOs and CBOs appear to be wrestling with ideas about self-definition. Ideologies about who they are in the region are clearly shifting or have shifted. This reflects some shifts in the external environment but also internal socio-economic adjustments. The need to recreate the policy environment is reflective of such changes. There is also a demand for greater efficiency, which becomes a challenge and a responsibility for NGOs and CBOs in the sub-region. They must be more efficient, practical and economic with resources in an environment in which new alliances are being created. This is demanding an end to paternalistic partnerships. In developing partnerships, a search for practical recognition of the NGO must be a priority. A part of the strategy must be to find out the Government's strategic thinking process and how it impacts on goals and objectives and work to resolve grey areas.

The pattern suggests information may not be used sufficiently to improve the organization. Policy documents exist but the context and framework in which governments, donors, the private sector and organisations operate is not strong enough to guarantee meaningful information transfer, communication and change. The very same historical culture in which CBO/NGOs exist while presenting valid reasons for special differences and performance and treatment, also acts as a counter to good organisational behaviour and practice. The difference in scale, size and income of regional NGOs compared with southern partners may be attributed in part to this trend. However, it may also have something to do with the self-belief and confidence of NGOs in the region to assume the roles to which they are entitled. This may significantly undermine advocacy goals and objectives.

The challenge for CBO/NGOs is to re-appropriate their place as advocates of social causes and not be privy to what may be deemed the whims and fancies of changing external donor demands but control the tools and logic of the voluntary sector, avoiding the pitfalls of competition in an increasingly market oriented environment. When CBO/NGOs in the sub-region operate in a climate in which they believe that they have little power to change things, it goes against the grain of what the sector traditionally has stood for.

The ideology and philosophy that governs CBO/NGOs is changing in the sub-region as the connection with the market deepens and market ideas become more and more of a driving force. In developing the idea of the new business model sustainability was defined as an objective of and for organisations. There was little reference to the sustainability of communities, the environment, the development of people or poverty reduction or the focal areas of the GEF SGP.

The business model, notwithstanding the example of the Pinelands Creative Workshop has both merits and demerits. PCW evaluated the negative impacts of a not for profit organisation operating businesses and making money in their community. In the Latin American examples in questionnaires it was shown that businesses are set up in which community members are involved. It would be instructive to know the substantive differences, if any, between some of these businesses and models in the sub-region. Some of the Latin American business and commercial have products from these same communities. The context of the sub-region is somewhat different from island to island.

Organisations also stressed the need to understand how GEF Focal Points work and how to harmonise reporting mechanisms and coordinate effort, as well as implementing mandatory training by donors prior to provision of funding.

4. Major Recommendations

General Recommendations

1. **Volunteerism:** Conduct a study on why CBO/NGO culture in Barbados and the OECS sub-region Caribbean may be undergoing change, examining paid volunteering systems and how they are applied and the lessons that may be learned. Examine the principle of volunteerism and the debate over whether and how to shift from non-paid to paid volunteers within the context of community and project management.
2. **Skills Transfer:** Examine the extent to which skills transfer is taking place since it implies in capacity development a process of growth for individual and beneficiaries inside and outside of institutions.
3. **Donor funding:** Conduct a survey to find out which donors fund what and which organisations in order to assess (1) areas of work (2) levels of duplication (3) direction and interests of organisations (4) frequency of funding and (4) reporting and evaluation and accountability standards in respect of these funds.
4. **Entitlement and Rights:** CBO/NGOS must assume stronger and more meaningful roles as lobbyists and give themselves stronger voices in order to represent society's causes. In a process of self-evaluation, they must seek to achieve new standards of advocating and communicating with governments and other stakeholders with respect to causes.
5. **The Business Model:** Investigate the idea of the business not for profit model and how to achieve legitimacy and credibility within communities while making money for

organisational sustainability, since transient volunteers and their sustainability is a problem and organizations wish to reduce need to reduce dependency and retain staff.

6. **Institutions, Individual and Country relationship:** Assess relationship between the institutional, individual and country frameworks of CBO/NGO operations to see what improvements may be made in order to help re-invent systems particularly in accordance with GEF SGP principles.
7. **Baseline Data:** Collect Baseline data and stakeholder analysis of all country programmes involved in GEF SGP as part of a broader evaluation of all CBO/NGOs in the sub-region.

Recommendations for Internal Organisation

1. **Capacity Development modalities:** Deepen understanding and awareness of theories of governance, policy making institutional and individual development in capacity development to enhance understanding of problems, underlying causes and potential solutions. This includes present-day trends in volunteerism, environmental management, Poverty Reduction & Capacity development and relationship to goals and objectives of GEF SGP as well as the enabling environment, the Governance superstructure and ethical standards.
2. **Principles of Project Management:** Develop skills and competencies for project managers including Duties, Roles and Responsibilities, board and executive classifications and functions, beneficiary and stakeholder functions and involvement, organisational structure, and awareness internal governance, authority, delegation, performance management and power relations.
3. **Personal and Business competencies:** Develop information gathering and decision-making skills such as how to motivate and develop others, and use of critical thinking skills and development of organisational awareness, and management of performance, business modalities for capacity development, development of partnerships and networking

4. **The Legislative Framework:** Support CBO/NGOs in understanding entitlement, rights based development, legitimacy and institutional organization; harmonization of the Charities Act, formulation of a Code of Ethics and lobby for ^{recognition} of CBO/NGOs
5. **Design and Planning:** Develop responsive and technically sound activity design, strategic planning, proposal writing, baseline data collection techniques and strategic planning skills, Stakeholder & Situation Analysis, socio-economic, environmental data collection and poverty indicators in target communities, work breakdown structures, project activities formulation and estimation of timelines, exit strategies.
6. **Implementation:** Deepen understanding of tools and methodologies for timely and successful implementation of activities, organisation of the project team, establishment of roles and responsibilities, consensus building guidelines, team -building and meetings, developing relations with community based members understanding donor requirements, risks and assumptions, progress reporting systems.
7. **Graphical management: Develop I.T tools for project management including** Gantt charts, milestone trend charts, cost schedule control and other electronic techniques for reporting
8. **Advocacy and Negotiations:** Understand and apply negotiating and advocacy tools and skills to enable strong alliance-building, develop clear strategies and purpose, to exert influence on public policy issues at various levels and among different stakeholders
9. **Integrating GEF SGP focal areas:** Strengthen intervention points for GEF focal areas & cross cutting issues into strategic learning and planning, develop training in GEF SGP tools and techniques to improve collaboration and communication with focal points
10. **Environmental Impact Assessment:** Guidelines on how to assess community development and environmental projects.
11. **Incentive systems:** Organisations learn how to stimulate better performance through incentives, showing the relationship between performance and non-material and material motivation

- 12. Donor Contract Management:** Apply policies on management of donor contracts, including payment conditions, standard guidelines and policies and managing multiple contracts.
- 13. Fundraising and funding sources:** develop internal fundraising skills and capacities, learn how to improve co-financing opportunities and alternative fundraising methodologies to reduce dependency on traditional donors
- 14. Trade and capacity development for GEF SGP partners:** To understand the role of GEF SGP partners in supporting lobby for sustainable development modalities in new trade liberalization.
- 15. Succession Planning & Change Management:** how to transition to new structures and ways of working; To be able to coordinate and plan for changes during transition periods
- 16. Exchange visits and mentoring:** Increase exchange visits and collaboration between GEF SGP and partners in Latin American and Caribbean and other regions . Encourage Youth participation.
