

UNCLASSIFIED  
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Regional Development Training - BIMAP Component			2. PROJECT NUMBER 538-0087	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE RDO/C
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 538-86-04	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>83</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>87</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>87</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>3,029,000</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>June, 1983</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>2,150,000</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>October, 1985</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>03-05, 1986</u>	

B. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., Airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Develop proposals for reducing the scope of the Project and for collaboration between BIMAP and other AID-funded management training projects in the Caribbean.	S. Griffith	March 21, 1986 Completed
2. Develop draft Memorandum of Understanding between BIMAP and CAIC (Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce) for collaboration in the delivery of their respective AID-funded management training projects.	S. Griffith	March 21, 1986 Completed
3. Obtain BIMAP concurrence on (a) reduction of scope of project and (b) collaboration with CAIC	H. Wise S. Griffith J. Brown E. Warfield	April 18, 1986 Completed
4. Develop documentation for project amendment.	S. Griffith E. Warfield J. Brown	October 31, 1986

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan: e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify, _____)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T		B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
Dr. Stafford A. Griffith, SEP		Signature _____	
Ms. Holly Wise, C/HPE		Typed Name _____	
Ms. Elizabeth Warfield, PDD		James S. Holtaway, DIR	
Mr. Darwin Clarke, EVAL/SPS		Date _____	
Mr. Peter Orr, A/D/DIR		September 29, 1986	

## PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II

The midterm evaluation of the BIMAP Component of the Regional Development Training Project (538-0087) was conducted by two contractors - Drs. Alan Hurwiz and Cheryl Campbell. The report was adequate for its stated purpose i.e. "to review project activities completed in order to assess the progress of the project toward achieving the goals, purpose, objectives, and end-of-project status as stated in the Project Grant Agreement and the Project Paper." The scope of work was closely followed by the evaluators.

Several recommendations were made. These may be summarized as follows:

- (a) BIMAP, with RDO/C assistance should define more precisely the scope of the Project's commitment to its fee-paying participants.
- (b) BIMAP, with RDO/C support should develop a compensation plan for Chambers of Commerce and other liaison organizations and individuals for the service which they provide to the project.
- (c) Project implementation should be reorganized to
  - (i) provide more effective promotion, follow-up, scheduling, training and reporting and
  - (ii) enable BIMAP to focus more completely on what it does best (i.e., providing consulting services to small and medium size businesses in areas of accounting, financing, computerization and costing) in a reduced number of participating countries.
- (d) BIMAP and RDO/C should renegotiate areas of the Project Grant Agreement which seem "unrealistic or inefficient" based on recent experience and current and proposed RDO/C activities.

These recommendations will form the basis of discussions with BIMAP aimed at accelerating the pace of project implementation. Based on recommendations (c) and (d) as presented in this summary, RDO/C will negotiate collaboration between BIMAP and other AID grantees involved in management related training. The aim of this collaboration will be to provide adequate back-up for BIMAP in areas of project implementation with which the institution experienced difficulty. In order to encourage (a) sharper focus of the project on areas in which BIMAP has demonstrated its capability and (b) consolidation of project achievements to date, RDO/C will negotiate a reduced scope for the project.

The Executive Summary which comprises Section I of the evaluation report gives a complete summary of the evaluation purpose, methodology, findings and conclusions as well as recommendations, lessons learned and development impact. It qualifies as a self-contained document.

In the evaluation report, the section on "Lessons Learned and Development Impact" gives a comprehensive listing of the major lessons learned and their implications for AID. It was acknowledged that the limited scope of the evaluation and the absence of consolidated baseline and updated economic data

EVALUATION COST DATA

USAID/ RDO/C , Bridgetown or Bureau/Officer \_\_\_\_\_

Form completed by Darwin E. Clarke Program 09/29/86  
Typed Name Office Date

1. No. and Title of Project/Activity: 538-0087 Regional Development Training  
(or Title of Evaluation Report) II - BIMAP Component

2. Date of Evaluation Report: January 1986  
Date of PES (if different): September 1986

3. Mission Staff Person Days involved in this Evaluation (estimated):  
- Professional Staff 5 Person Days  
- Support Staff \_\_\_\_\_ Person Days

4. AID/W Direct-Hire or IPA TDY support funded by Mission (or office) for this evaluation:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Period of TDY (Person-Days)</u>	<u>Dollar Cost: (Travel, Per Diem, etc)</u>	<u>Source of Funds*</u>
-------------	------------------------------------	---	-------------------------

5. Contractor Support, if any, for this evaluation:\*\*

<u>Name of Contractor</u>	<u>Contract #</u>	<u>Dollar Amount of Contract</u>	<u>Source of Funds*</u>
Alan Hurwitz	PSC	US\$16,000	Project Budget
Cheryl Samuels Campbell	PSC	US\$14,000	
	Total	US\$30,000	
		=====	

\*Indicate Project Budget, PD&S, Mission O.E. or Central/Regional Bureau funds

\*\*IOC, RSSA, PASA, PSC, Purchase Order, Institutional Contract, Cooperative Agreement, etc.

MIDTERM EVALUATION REPORT

of

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING II  
-- PRIVATE SECTOR --  
(PROJECT NUMBER 538-0087)

submitted to

BARBADOS INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY

and

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
-- REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE/CARIBBEAN

by

Alan Hurwitz, Ed.D. [Team Leader]

and

Cheryl Samuels Campbell, Ed.D.

January, 1986

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
1.1 Purpose of Evaluation	I- 1
1.2 Methodology	I- 2
1.3 Findings	I- 3
1.3.1 Tables I and II: An Overview of Project Progress	I- 5
1.4 Conclusions	I- 8
1.5 Recommendations	I-11
1.6 Lessons Learned and Development Impact	I-15
II. METHODOLOGY	
2.1 Scope of Work	II- 1
2.2 Evaluation Approach	II- 3
2.3 Limitations	II- 6
2.4 Evaluation Team	II- 7
III. FINDINGS	
3.1 Project Organization and Preparation	III- 1
3.2 Progress in Implementation -- Country by Country	III- 2
3.2. 1 Antigua	III- 2
3.2. 2 Grand Cayman	III- 3
3.2. 3 Dominica	III- 5
3.2. 4 St. Vincent	III-10
3.2. 5 Grenada	III-11
3.2. 6 St. Lucia	III-13
3.2. 7 Montserrat	III-13

3.2. 8	St. Kitts-Nevis	III-14
3.2. 9	Tortolla, British Virgin Islands	III-14
3.2.10	Belize	III-14
3.2.11	Barbados	III-14
3.3	Progress in Implementation -- Component by Component	III-16
3.3.1.	Memorandum of Understanding	III-16
3.3.2.	Advisory Committees	III-17
3.3.3	BIMAP Institution Building Activities	III-18
3.3.4.	Project Promotion and Infrastructure	III-18
3.3.5.	Consulting Activities	III-19
3.3.6.	Participant Training	III-21
3.3.7.	Outside Technical Assistance	III-22
3.3.8.	In-Country Seminars	III-23
3.3.9.	RDO/C and BIMAP Coordination	III-23

#### APPENDICES

- I The Project and RDO/C Regional Strategy
- II Guidelines for Evaluation Interviews
- III Persons Contacted
- IV Acknowledgements

## SECTION I

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report constitutes the mid-term evaluation of Regional Development Training II (RDT II) -- Private Sector, a four-year project (June 1983 - May 1987) undertaken by the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity (BIMAP) in a grant agreement of US\$2,150,000. with the United States Agency for International Development, Regional Development Office/Caribbean (USAID, RDO/C). The goal of RDT II -- Private Sector is to increase the viability of private enterprises in the region. The project is targeted for eleven countries (Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines) and it was intended that implementation would be in five countries during year one and in six countries during year two.

BIMAP is to deliver training and consulting services in four ways: (1) implement organizational development (OD) interventions in private enterprises in the eleven countries; (2) conduct management training courses to meet specific needs of clients; (3) obtain technology, productivity, and management assistance (via special consultants from US organizations) on-site for clients; and (4) identify private sector candidates for participant training grants.

In preparation for project implementation, BIMAP was to visit each participating country to obtain a memorandum of understanding with the head of government, establish an advisory committee of government and private sector representatives, and promote the project among potential clients with recruitment on a fee basis determined by company size.

This section of the report presents statements on the purpose of the evaluation, provides a general description of the methodology used and the findings obtained, summarizes conclusions and recommendations, and offers thoughts on lessons learned and on the development impact of the project.

#### 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation as stated in the Evaluators' Scope of Work is "to review project activities completed in order to assess the progress of the project toward achieving the goal, purpose, objectives, and end-of-project status as stated in the Project Grant Agreement and the Project Paper". The Evaluators' Scope of Work also specifies that the evaluation report address the question of how the project fits into RDO/C's overall strategy for the English speaking Caribbean.

#### Project goal and purpose.

The goal of the project (as stated above) is to increase the viability of private enterprises in the region. Viability is defined as profitability,

level of productive efficiency, and adaptability to a changing environment.

The project purpose is stated as threefold:

- 1) to upgrade managerial and technical skills of private sector employees through short or long term training;
- 2) to improve the output of and performance capabilities of private enterprises; and
- 3) to expand the institutional capacity of BIMAP to extend its training and consulting assistance to private enterprises.

#### Objectives and end of project status.

A series of numerical targets is listed under objectives and end of project status in the project paper. These are presented in Tables I and II at the end of the Findings section of the Executive Summary.

#### **1.2 Methodology**

In order to fulfill the purpose of the evaluation an effort was made to identify and document the activities of the project to date, and the results of these activities. This identification and documentation effort was undertaken through processes of interview and small group discussion and document review. A guideline using project components as categories for data collection was developed beforehand to aid notetaking during these processes.

The Evaluators visited five of the project target countries to interview participants and liaison persons in the project. Selection of the five countries was based on criteria specified in the Evaluators' scope of work. A review of findings and some preliminary conclusions and recommendations were presented in a draft report to project staff at BIMAP and RDO/C. Feedback from both project staffs has been incorporated in the final report. An explicit description of the evaluation methodology is presented in Section II.

### 1.3 Findings

The findings of the evaluation processes are presented both by country and by program component. They are briefly summarized in this executive summary, by narrative and in two summary tables.

In Antigua, the Memorandum of Understanding was signed early on; and after several contacts between BIMAP and the Advisory Committee, the project never really got off the ground. Members of the committee often raised the issue of fee as a restraining force and often referred to programs of CAIC as a free alternative source of assistance. Some of those involved had had an ongoing relationship with the programs of CAIC, which may have affected their interest in this project.

In Grand Cayman Island, the project has recently begun work with several small businesses, most frequently in the area of accounting assistance, in many cases related to present or future application for expansion financing. Grand Cayman does not have income taxes, so many small businesses have not had a need to develop such systems for keeping track of profits. Several of those interviewed had been using no system, or a very rudimentary one of keeping books. They generally expressed satisfaction with the help received, though most had not yet had the opportunity to fully implement suggested changes. The program was promoted principally by the (then) president of the Chamber, who had had previous positive experience with BIMAP.

In St. Vincent, the government has refused to sign the Memorandum of Understanding. Several reasons were expressed (see the section on the Memorandum in the program components section). Most important to them seemed the need for clear support and initiative from the private sector, through the Chamber of Commerce. After BIMAP's initial contact with the Chamber, BIMAP staff expected that the Chamber would begin organizing the necessary support, which it did not do. The Chamber was expecting further contact from BIMAP, which it did not receive until recently. The project staff now plans to initiate contact with individual companies, in hopes of generating support for the memo, a promotional meeting, and initial clients.

In Dominica and Grenada, the project has been involved with the most companies on a longer term basis. In both cases, the Memoranda of Understanding were signed without problem and responsibility for promoting the program fell principally to the Chambers of Commerce. Both Chambers had staff people as well as political leadership with good contacts in the business community and interest in promoting educational and technical assistance activities. Promotion was done mainly, but not exclusively, by or through the Chambers, and resulted in a solid group of initial clients.

In all territories visited, where the project has been active, most of those participants interviewed indicated having been helped in some ways by the project; and project staff received praise for their individual competence, approach, and knowledge of their subject areas. In Dominica, and to some extent in Grenada, however, there were also many clear statements by participants that the project thus far had not fulfilled the expectations they had when they initially signed up.

The program as presented had seemed very attractive to them, well worth the

fee, according to most of those interviewed; but the reality of what they had since received had left many of them dissatisfied, and in some cases upset. "The chaps have just not been performing according to our expectations," summarized one Dominican participant. This dissatisfaction was expressed with regard to participant training and outside technical assistance, as well as the follow-through on regular in-house consulting. Participants also referred to the lack of ongoing contact with BIMAP staff. Some had not heard from them in several months. It was not clear to what extent this gap was the result of unrealistic expectations by participants at the outset, perhaps related to the initial presentation and contracting process, and to what extent to the lack of "adequate" service, since "adequate" service was never really defined. In some cases, this dissatisfaction was due in part to aspects of the project outside BIMAP's control, in other cases to misunderstandings, such as regarding who was next to contact whom for follow-up activities.

In several cases in these territories, participants were very satisfied and even enthusiastic with the services they received, with regard to quality, usefulness, and timeliness as stated with regard to one computerization case in Grenada, "worth ten times the price."

Three training seminars were also presented by the project, all in Dominica and Grenada, one on Customer Relations and two on Management and Supervision. They attracted a total of 55 participants, generally at lower organizational levels than BIMAP had hoped. The Customer Relations seminar received consistent enthusiastic praise from those participants interviewed. The Management and Supervision seminar was criticized for too much reliance on lecture and the absence of more group oriented and discussion activities. BIMAP attributes some of the problems to the low organizational level of participants sent by the managers to the course.

The advisory committees outlined in the project paper proved to be ineffective, taking up time and energy with little benefit to the project. The committees were not active even in places where promotion was successful, and on occasion proved a barrier to reaching businesses where successful promotion did not take place, most clearly in Antigua.

In other areas of the project, BIMAP has made progress in its internal development, both in terms of formal training and useful practical experience, in familiar and some new areas. Promotion has been successful in the three active territories visited, though as stated, there were some issues raised about the clarity of what exactly was being purchased with the project fee. Also, the Chambers of Commerce (in Grenada and Dominica), requested some system of compensation for their continued efforts.

The participant training and outside technical assistance aspects of the program have not really gotten off the ground, in part for reasons outside the direct control of BIMAP. These aspects of the project have been the cause of some of the dissatisfaction among participants. Outside assistance has depended on agreement between BIMAP and RDO/C regarding contracting procedures, which has just recently come about. Participant training has depended on the approval of proposals and other arrangements by RDO/C and the Institute for International Education. Several proposals have been submitted, one disapproved, with no clear reason specified. There appears to be some gaps of communication among those involved. Clarity with clients about some

of these procedures and probabilities seems lacking, resulting in confusion and dissatisfaction in some cases.

There is evidence from both organizations of the absence of a totally collaborative relationship between BIMAP and RDO/C, which has at times hindered the efficient functioning of the project. This situation has appeared to improve somewhat recently, but there may still be a need for reviewing some project guidelines and ways of doing business together.

### **1.3.1 Tables I and II: An Overview of Project Progress**

The following two tables (I. A Project Overview by Country and II. A Comparison of Project Design Targets with Progress to Date) represent an attempt to present a numerical profile of BIMAP's progress to date in implementing the project in target countries.

TABLE I - A Project Progress Overview by Country

	MA	Prom. Seminar	Training Seminar	Consult. Clients	Part. Training	Technical Asst.*
Antigua & Barbados	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0
Grand Cayman	Yes	Yes	0	6	0	0
St. Vincent	No	No	0	0	0	0
Dominica	Yes	Yes	2	14	1 (proposed)	0
Grenada	Yes	Yes	1	12	3 prospd 1 offrd	0
St. Lucia	Yes	Yes	0	0	0	0
Montserrat	Yes (amended)	Yes	0	3	0	0
St. Kitts/Nevis	Yes	Yes (one on one)	0	3	0	0
Tortola	Yes	Yes	0	4	0	0
Barbados	Not Necessary	No	0	0	0	0
Belize	No	No	0	0	0	0
Totals	8	8	3	42	4 prospd 1 offrd	0

\* Contracting procedure agreed upon by BIMAP & USAID 11/13/85

**TABLE II - A Comparison of Project Paper Targets with Progress to Date**

	Number Proposed in End of Project Status Project Paper	Number Reported by BIMAP and During Site Visits
Business(or parastatal) organizations to have received OD assistance	48	44
Number of Caribbean states represented by companies receiving OD assistance	8 - 11	6
Management training courses for managers and supervisors	28	3
Number of participants in management training courses	560	53
Intermediate size enterprises to have received assistance (on a group basis)	315	
Number of countries represented	7 - 10	
BIMAP short-term training (person years)	3.5 (2 Master's Degrees)	(1 Master's Degree)
BIMAP capabilities evidence of increase	Increase of 6 full time staff persons	Increase of 4 full time staff

111

## 1.4 Conclusions

- (1) BIMAP has succeeded in initiating a number of activities in eight countries under the RDT II program. These have included the signing of Memoranda of Understanding in eight countries, the formal creation of advisory committees in eight countries, promotion of consulting activities in eight countries, and the signing and initiation of consulting services to business in six countries of the region. These accomplishments have involved breaking new ground and creating many new relationships with governments, businesses, Chambers of Commerce and other local organizations in participating territories.
- (2) BIMAP staff has provided consulting assistance to a total of 42 businesses in the region. This assistance has been of value to most of these client organizations, and exceptionally beneficial to several companies, particularly in the area of computerization. BIMAP staff who work on the project are generally knowledgeable about important aspects of small business management and skillful at applying this knowledge to the practical problems of businesses in the region.
- (3) The benefits, limits, and policies of the project are not clear to many clients, and local liaison organizations. That is, BIMAP staff and a number of participants have different understandings of what participants are to receive from the project, and in what time period. Direct repercussions of this lack of clarity have been client dissatisfaction, sometimes unreasonable demands on project staff, and on occasion, a tension in the client/consultant relationship. This occurs when the client has a clear interest in one of these project activities which the consultant does not necessarily support. This has been an issue primarily with the participant training and outside technical assistance aspects of the project. BIMAP staff seem to see this question as a strictly objective consulting decision; participants (at least in Dominica and Grenada) often see it as at least partially political.

The follow-through of some of these areas is out of BIMAP's direct control. This is certainly true of participant training and has been true of outside technical assistance, until the recent agreement on an approved contract. Within these constraints, it seems very important for BIMAP to be clear about possibilities, limits, and procedures regarding these areas, as well as its own consulting activities, to avoid future misunderstandings. These policies should be clear to clients, potential clients, and any liaison organizations with which BIMAP wishes to collaborate.

- (4) There is a good deal of confusion in the field regarding the many technical assistance programs available through USAID and other donor agencies. The relationship of these programs, even those from USAID alone, is not clear to many clients and potential clients. Some organizations funded by USAID, such as BIMAP and CAIC, are sometimes seen as competitive, or as providing duplicate services, e.g. in Antigua. This creates a more difficult entry situation for a project such as this one. The situation is sometimes made more complex by

differentiated fee structures which often bear little if any relationship to the value of services provided.

- (5) For a project such as this to meet its full potential it appears necessary to have significant on-site support, in promotion, participant information, and service delivery. Maintaining this support over the long run requires creating relationships which serve the interests of all parties. The project is fortunate to have benefitted until now from this kind of support in at least three territories (Grand Cayman, Dominica and Grenada) without such firm relationships yet in place. It seems likely that to maintain and develop this valuable infrastructure, will require:
- a. some kind of equitable fee structure for cooperating individuals and /or organizations;
  - b. ongoing information for, and contact with those organizations;
  - c. the possibility of other benefits to these organizations and/or their staffs (e.g. training);
  - d. these organizations having as high a stake as possible in the well-being and growth of the program.

BIMAP seems reluctant to integrate its activities further with these ongoing organizations, preferring instead to set up their own system. While this approach appears less cost effective to the system as a whole, it could probably meet most of the project's on-site needs, at least in sites where promotion has already taken place. During some of the site visits, a few people expressed interest in working with BIMAP in this way.

- (6) The success of the project has been limited by the absence of a fully collaborative relationship between BIMAP and RDO/C. Responsibility for this situation has been focused in several directions by those interviewed, generally in directions which are not present at the time. The scope of the evaluation process is too limited to make specific substantive suggestions regarding this situation, which, in any case, seems to have recently improved to some degree. Some aspects of this relationship (e.g. payment procedures, contracting for outside consultants, and guidelines for participant training) have made the implementation process of the project more difficult.
- (7) There is an apparent contradiction between the praise of BIMAP staff, for competence and professionalism, on one hand, and the dissatisfaction with the level of follow-up and ongoing support, on the other, expressed by many participants in sites of greatest project activity. This contradiction can be explained by three realities which emerge from the evaluation findings.
- a. Individual BIMAP/project staff are highly knowledgeable and skilled in providing technical assistance to small and medium-size business in a number of important areas, particularly computerization;

- b. Systems currently in operation for scheduling and allocating project resources have not been adequate for insuring their most efficient use and the systematic development of the various activities of the project in the various territories of the region;
  - c. BIMAP has needed additional assistance in developing strategies for broadening its skills in individual business consulting into a comprehensive ongoing regional technical assistance program. The dedication of more resources to project management and coordination activities, as well as strong support from RDO/C, would support the generally effective work of the individual consultants in producing the overall impact which sought by all those involved.
- (8) The introduction of the program to each territory (i.e. project promotion and the development of a necessary infrastructure as a base for consulting/training activities) has been and continues to be, a more demanding and time-consuming activity than either RDO/C or BIMAP had anticipated at the outset of the project. These activities have included the obtaining of MOU's from the governments of potentially participating states, organizing and cultivating of required advisory committees, developing relationships with Chambers of Commerce and/or other sources of on-site support, and promoting the project, i.e. identifying and signing up participating organizations. These activities are expected to take place (eventually) in eleven states of the region (more than half by now), some of these territories which were of no or limited familiarity to BIMAP.

These required activities have involved many visits and other contacts with a range of individuals in each site, as well as familiarity with widely differing local conditions. The success of these activities also depended on relationships among local groups, changing political conditions, and previous involvements with a variety of ongoing activities, many of these out of direct control of BIMAP staff.

- (9) Formally structured coordinating bodies, such as the advisory committees described in the project paper, were ineffective in providing the type of linkage and support which had been anticipated in project plans, and in some cases may actually have impeded the progress of project implementation. In most cases, there is no incentive for those involved to provide the help or support envisioned; in some, there may have been actual conflicts of interest which inhibited their openness to the new activities. Such committees would be most useful in giving the official blessing of the powers that be to the new activities, then allowing the project to be promoted in ways most appropriate to each situation.

## 1.5 Recommendations

- (1) It is recommended that more precise policies be developed by BIMAP, with the input of RDO/C, for defining the scope of the project's commitments to fee-paying participants. These policies should specify a minimum number or range of consulting days (per time period and in toto), and any products to which a firm is entitled under the project. The policy should also specify clearly under what conditions a firm might be entitled to participant training for one or more of its people and extra-regional consulting/training assistance. These policies should be shared with clients as part of the contracting process. They should be developed as a minimum expectation for services in a way which does not inhibit going beyond that minimum in situations where both BIMAP and the individual client are interested and able to do so.
- (2) It is recommended that BIMAP, with the support of RDO/C, develop approaches for compensating Chambers of Commerce and/or other local liaison organizations and individuals for the services and support which they provide the project. Such compensation might include direct fees and consulting services, as well as indirect benefits such as access to training opportunities for staff. It is further recommended that fees or other benefits be related to numbers of participating companies in order to:
  - a. take into account the relationship between numbers of participants and the work involved in providing services to them;
  - b. provide some incentive to those organizations to increase the number of participants. It should be noted that there is also a need to respect some organizations' (such as Chambers of Commerce) primary responsibility to their members in developing this structure, which will most likely involve some services to non-member businesses, as well as the possibility of recruiting new members.
- (3) It is recommended that the administration of the project be reorganized in a way which accomplishes some combination of two goals:
  - a. providing an improved and more systematic structure for addressing the project's many management needs with regard to project promotion, follow-up, scheduling, training, reporting, etc. This could be accomplished by (1) giving the project coordinator more authority to make and implement operating decisions, clearly with substantial input from the rest of the project staff and the Executive Trustee; and (2) adding a high level administrative/executive assistant to work on project-related activities. This person would report to the project coordinator; s/he would coordinate promotion and other project-wide activities, work with BIMAP on accounting and administrative issues, and facilitate communication, information sharing, and scheduling for the project. This would allow consultants to focus on individual clients while still maximizing coordination of project activities.

and/or

- b. backing off from those activities to allow project staff to focus more completely on what it does best and most naturally, i.e. providing consulting services to small and medium size business in the areas of accounting, financing, computerization and costing, among others. In this latter case, USAID with BIMAP should provide a mechanism for promoting these services. This could be accomplished through a systematic program of marketing, such as through small business financing programs, or in conjunction with other activities.
- (4) It is recommended that a policy of scheduled periodic contact with active clients be initiated to:
- a. convey relevant information;
  - b. inquire as to progress, convey a sense of ongoing support from the project, and make it easier for clients to raise any pending issues.
  - c. insure against lost or delayed letters.

By providing a ready vehicle for communication, such contact would insure against a build-up of the resentments and misunderstandings (e.g. about who should next contact whom) which were observed during the interviews. It could be effected by telephone or even cable, at regular intervals, perhaps monthly during active stages of involvement and less frequently during other periods. This would be expensive, but cheaper than more extensive travel, and seems necessary to give clients the required sense of personal attention, at least at early stages in the relationships. It would probably require a separate budget line item, so as not to compete with other overhead needs; and a system of monitoring calls which minimizes added burdens to BIMAP's administrative systems.

Also, a short but informative and attractive, newsletter, perhaps monthly, with information on the activities of the project and some helpful business tips and/or networking information would be well-received by clients, and do a lot to provide useful information and a better sense of project goals and work. In any such communication, care must be taken to protect the confidential relationships of BIMAP and clients by omitting the specifics of any consultation, or even the names of clients without prior approval. There is much general information which could add to the networking and communications and serve the project's longer run goals.

- (5) It is recommended that the numerical objectives and timelines of the project be reformulated in a way which allows BIMAP to focus more directly on currently existing companies and territories (particularly Dominica and Grenada) as new areas are more gradually developed. It seems most critical that BIMAP's activities, particularly in territories where they have been less known, be built on a solid base of satisfied clients. This base does not yet exist. The demands of initiating an

infrastructure and activities in many territories at one time takes away from the ongoing attention which seems necessary to satisfy new clients in early stages of a consulting relationship. The recommendations regarding clearer policies and administration will respond to this need and may rectify current gaps quickly and allow the project to move ahead with original plans in short order.

Specifically, the staff should be encouraged to focus on existing companies in these most active territories (Dominica and Grenada). Grand Cayman presents a bit of a dilemma. On the one hand, it reflects a successful promotion effort and a number of interested participants. On the other, its distance and economic situation make project activity less cost effective in terms of overall goal and purpose. In any case, successful, ongoing clients there and in other territories should not be abandoned by changes in project emphasis or direction.

- (6) The promotion of the project, i.e. signing on more participants in active and new territories, could benefit from the following additions:
  - (a) Attractive and clear information brochures, perhaps on the model of BIMAP's more general existing material. The process of clarifying project agreements, etc., which was previously recommended, should help provide the necessary information for such a brochure. To respond to different situations in the different territories, a basic brochure could be put together (to benefit from economies of scale) and inserts for each territory could be developed and added, perhaps in collaboration with cooperating on-site organizations or individuals.
  - (b) Some way of tying the assistance of the project to the financing activities of local or regional institutions. Much of BIMAP's small business consulting is related to actual or potential financing/expansion situations. A number of participants and one Chairman of the Board of a local financing institution (St. Vincent) expressed strong interest and the value of relating this technical assistance to financing, particularly at early stages of a new or expanded business. The process could begin with parastatal/subsidized lending institutions, but would probably seem useful for private banks as well. This approach has the added advantage that consulting/training costs can be included in the financing which is sought, and usually not present an additional cash flow burden to the client. RDO/C should consider ways of facilitating this linkage.
- (7) It is recommended that BIMAP and RDO/C recreate their operating agreement so as to take account of changes in the perspectives and realities of both. The agreement should be based on the clear sense of the goals, needs and limits of both organizations. The experience of the project thus far should give both the necessary data to discuss realistically potential pitfalls and ways to avoid them. RDO/C should also initiate similar conversations with other grantee organizations, such as CAIC and IIE, to ensure that agreements which reflect intended directions, collaborations, etc., are genuinely agreed to by all concerned. RDO/C may see the need to incorporate some of these areas

into final grant agreements.

It is intended that this recommendation provide BIMAP the opportunity to renegotiate any areas of the operating agreements which seem unrealistic or inefficient based on recent experience and RDO/C the opportunity to make any adjustments based on its own plans and the need for more coordinated efforts in the region.

## 1.6 Lessons Learned and Development Impact

Several lessons can be learned from the experience of this project.

- (1) A project enters an already formed network of people, groups, interests and political relationships. When the success of a project depends on assumptions regarding other groups and their potential for supporting or contributing to project efforts, those assumptions must be carefully reviewed; and where doubts exist, means included in the capacity of the project to insure the desired result.

This project design assumed the active support of advisory committees made up of representatives of government and private sector organizations. It assumed the ongoing assistance of Chambers of Commerce and in some cases, other groups, without additional incentives or compensation. The people and groups involved had interests and/or goals which were not always fully congruent with those of the project. As a result, these assumptions were not always realized; Antigua is perhaps the clearest example. RDO/C plans for the future seem to require a great deal of collaboration among different actors. Care must be taken to insure that that collaboration will occur, and incentives provided where necessary. All assumptions on which the success of those longer run plans depend should be reviewed in similar fashion and addressed where necessary in the project goals or design.

- (2) Attempts to deliver services on a regional basis require an infrastructure of information, coordination and support. Such an infrastructure requires time, energy and resources to create. Also, its development often depends on local and sometimes international factors which are beyond the control of any of the actors involved. Everything from local private sector-public sector relations to the political orientations of the powers that be, to even the vacation schedules of people whose approval is required for agreements, can and does significantly affect the rhythm and progress of these activities.

This project required political agreements, promotional activities, and services to clients in eleven territories throughout the region, including some in which BIMAP did not have significant experience. The territories are scattered geographically. They differ in their local political agendas and relationships, even in their attitudes toward programs such as this. (Perhaps it was no coincidence that the two most active territories, Grenada and Dominica, are those which have the closest political ties to the United States government.) BIMAP lacked experience in a number of the activities necessary for the success of the project. Into this context came RDT II. It seems natural to expect that much time and effort would be required to really begin operations. And it seems important to plan for the necessary initial activities as a principal part of the project work, as a way to ensure that they get the necessary attention. In the case of a project whose clients are individual small businesses, some of whom are not part of any formal network, this requirement is even more important and more demanding. This means that in planning a project, sufficient time, resources, and other support where necessary must be allocated for the development of

these important preconditions, even at the expense of more visible short term results.

- (3) The project confirms the importance of clear operating agreements among all of those involved in a common endeavor. The temptation to move toward action without full alignment is understandable, particularly given the pressures of project situations, and the difficulties and risks involved in raising sometimes difficult issues. In this case, the lack of complete clarity between BIMAP and RDO/C and between BIMAP and some participants caused confusion and took energy away from the thrust of the project. One Chamber of Commerce representative commented that at times project staff seemed "just a little less confused about the project than I was." At times, all those involved (staff, clients, supporters, mission staff, and even evaluators) participated in activities which had elements about which they were not clear, or sensed there was not full agreement. The effect of these gaps inevitably emerged to cause difficulties later on. This type of situation does not provide the context for consultants or clients to perform at their best.

Insuring good communications requires a commitment from all sides not to settle for anything less than full mutual understanding. It requires the time to raise and respond to issues, the patience to stay with difficult problems, and flexibility to do things differently where needed. Short cuts in this area often seem expedient in the moment; they rarely produce the results desired over the long run.

It is difficult to comment further on the development impact of the project at this stage. This is due to: (1) the relatively early stages of the project and the time lag for this type of assistance to take effect, even on individual businesses (2) the limited scope of the evaluation; it involved primarily interviews with BIMAP and the owners/managers of individual businesses. The interviews focussed on efforts of BIMAP to implement the activities of the project and the reactions of the business community to those efforts (3) the absence of consolidated baseline and updated economic data on the businesses participating in the project.

From the interviews and general sense of the project it would appear that several aspects of the project's work do have the potential to contribute to development in several ways: (1) the improvement of accounting systems for small businesses is often related to financing/expansion activities, which create employment (2) training has the capacity to prepare local people to assume higher level management positions and increase national self sufficiency; and (3) effective outside technical assistance for successful larger (medium size) companies, in the right industries, could contribute to making them competitive exporters, increasing foreign exchange. To maximize these potential results it would seem useful to guide this project and others as clearly as possible in these directions. It might be useful to link development indicators in these areas as closely as possible to the project purpose.

## SECTION II

### METHODOLOGY

As is the character of an evaluation, processes of data collection and analysis were undertaken in the effort to achieve the purpose of the evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation was included in the Evaluators' scope of work. This document was set forth as follows.

#### 2.1 SCOPE OF WORK EVALUATION OF BIMAP COMPONENT OF RDT II

##### Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to review project activities completed under the BIMAP Component of the Regional Development Training Project (RDT II) No. 538-0087 in order to assess the progress of the Project towards achieving the goal, purpose, objectives and end of project status as stated in the Project Grant Agreement and the Project Paper.

##### Scope of Work

The Contractor will serve as a member of a two-person evaluation team. This responsibility shall include but shall not be limited to the following tasks:

- (a) Review the Project Grant Agreement and the Project Paper so as to be conversant with the scope and intent of the BIMAP Component of the Regional Development Training Project (RDT II).
- (b) Review BIMAP's implementation plans and Quarterly Reports for the Project as well as RDO/C Quarterly Status Reports and any other relevant documentation of BIMAP and RDO/C as sources of implementation.
- (c) Consult with/interview the following persons:
  - (i) Project and Project-related staff at BIMAP including the Project Coordinator, the Executive Trustee of BIMAP, and Training and Consulting staff employed by BIMAP under the Project, and
  - (ii) RDO/C staff associated with the Project including the Project Officer, the RDO/C backstop officer for the BIMAP Project (present and former) and the head of the Project Development and Management Division. The data collected from these meetings will be utilized to help achieve the main purpose for which this evaluation is undertaken.
- (d) Visit a minimum of five countries in which BIMAP was expected to implement the project. Two of these countries should be ones in which BIMAP

feels it has been most successful, one should be a country in which the evaluators feel (based on the documentation available) that BIMAP has had moderate success and two should be countries in which RDO/C estimates that the Project has encountered the greatest difficulties. The purpose of these visits would be (i) to assess the effectiveness of the activities undertaken by BIMAP as well as the factors contributing to delays in project implementation, and (ii) to assess the relationship between the Project and other management training and related activities in the region. In each territory interviews will be conducted with a number of persons capable of providing useful information for the appraisal. These will include (i) top and middle managers of business enterprises or parastatal organizations and owners/managers of small and intermediate size enterprises; and (ii) representatives of the Chambers of Commerce and senior government officials with whom BIMAP was expected to liaise with the private sector or with parastatal organizations.

- (e) Using the data collected, assess (i) how (and how successfully) the Project fits into RDO/C's overall strategy for the English speaking Caribbean and (ii) the level of demand which can be expected over the next year for the type of program delivered by BIMAP under the Project.
- (f) Develop an evaluation report which includes the following:
  1. An executive summary including purpose of the evaluation, methodology used, findings, conclusions and recommendations, development impact of the project and lessons learned.
  2. An explicit description of the methodology; a copy of the scope of work followed should be included in this section.
  3. A listing of members of the evaluation team, including host country personnel, their field of expertise and the role they played on the team.
  4. BIMAP's progress to date in implementing the Project; and the development benefits resulting from the Project.
  5. Difficulties encountered by BIMAP in Project Implementation and reasons for these

difficulties.

6. Lessons learned from project implementation to date including the political, policy, economic, social and bureaucratic pre-conditions within participating countries and RDO/C which proved critical to the success or failure of the Project.
7. How (and how successfully) the Project fits into RDO/C's overall strategy for the English speaking Caribbean.
8. Recommendations arising out of the evaluation of the Project.

### **Level of Effort**

The contract will consist of 28 work days (31 work days for the Team Leader) and will commence on or about November 18, 1985 and will end on or about December 31, 1985.

### **Reports**

The contractor will collaborate with the team leader to prepare an evaluation report the first draft of which will be submitted to BIMAP and RDO/C at least two days prior to his/her departure from Barbados and will attend a meeting at RDO/C to review the report. He/she will also assist in soliciting comments from BIMAP on the draft. The comments from both RDO/C and BIMAP will be considered in preparing the final version of the report, five copies of which must be submitted to BIMAP and five to RDO/C no later than December 31, 1985.

### **2.2 Evaluation Approach**

A two part methodology for data collection suggested itself from task descriptions in the Evaluators' scope of work. In these task descriptions people and documents were identified as sources of data. Thus the methodology employed for the data collection consisted of (1) reviewing documents and (2) meeting/interviewing persons.

### **Document Review**

#### Document identification

The documents reviewed can be categorised as either those specifically identified for review in the Evaluators' scope of work; these were:

1. project paper,
2. project grant agreement,
3. BIMAP's quarterly project status reports (April - June, 1984 through July to September, 1985),

4. RDO/C's quarterly status reports;

or those identified by RDO/C, BIMAP, or the Evaluators as "other relevant documentation of BIMAP and RDO/C". These were:

5. "Report on the Need and Demand for Private Sector Management Development in the English Speaking Caribbean (supplied by RDO/C staffers)",
6. "RDO/C Annual Action Plan, June 1985" (requested by Evaluator for completion of task (e) in the scope of work),
7. "AID Congressional Presentation Fiscal Year 1986 Annex III, Latin America and the Caribbean" (supplied by RDO/C staffers),
8. Summary of activities completed in countries selected for site visits (requested of BIMAP by Evaluator).

Review process

While all eight documents were identified as relevant sources of data for the evaluation, some were reviewed more thoroughly than others depending on the degree to which their contents provided data which could be used to help achieve the main purpose for which the evaluation was undertaken.

Document 1, the Project Paper was thoroughly reviewed in order to extract specifications on the project scope, goal, purpose, and objectives and end of project status. Extracts on the specifications of the project scope readily appeared not only as project components but also as logical categories for the entire data collection. These categories were delineated as:

- o Project Organization and Preparation
- o Memorandum of Understanding
- o Advisory Committee
- o Project Promotion
- o Implementation of Training and Consulting Programs
- o BIMAP Institution Building Activities

Review of document 2 led to one further category for data collection:

- o Coordination of Participant Training Opportunities.

Documents 3 and 4, BIMAP's and RDO/C's quarterly status reports respectively, were reviewed to gain an overall history of project implementation. Some of these documents were reviewed prior to meeting with/interviewing people and all were reviewed after completion of interviews.

Documents 5 and 7 (Report on Private Sector Management Needs in English speaking Caribbean and AID Presentation Fiscal Year 1986) were reviewed for general background information in preparation for site visits. In document 6, RDO/C Annual Action Plan 1985, the table of contents was reviewed

to highlight those parts that appeared related to the design of the BIMAP project. Document 8, the summary of activities in countries selected for site visits, was reviewed not only for an at-a-glance look at the country profile under the project but also for selecting companies for interviews.

### Meetings/interviews

Meetings/interviews were held with five groups of persons:

1. project related staff at BIMAP
2. project related staff at RDO/C
3. project liaison persons in countries visited (e.g. Chamber of Commerce or Government representatives)
4. heads/owners of companies
5. participants of training courses

The Evaluators met with project related staff at BIMAP and RDO/C in two separate group meetings. The Evaluators met separately with BIMAP's Executive Trustee, Mr. Rudy Gibbons, as he was away from office at the time of the group meeting. In all three of these meetings, there was free-form discussion of project issues and activities. The Evaluators took notes on those points in the discussion which they judged as helpful in achieving the main purpose of the evaluation. One further category was identified for data collection during these meetings:

- o RDO/C and BIMAP coordination.

During these meetings also, selection of five countries for site visits were finalized using the criteria stated in the Evaluators' scope of work. The selection was:

- 1, 2. Antigua and St. Vincent

countries in which RDO/C estimates that the project has encountered the greatest difficulties

- 3, 4. Grenada and Dominica

countries in which BIMAP determines it has been most successful

5. Grand Cayman

country in which the Evaluators determine BIMAP has had moderate success.

Each of the five countries was visited for one or two days during the two week period, Monday, November 25 through Friday, December 4.

In Antigua and St. Vincent where the project has encountered the greatest difficulties, interviews were limited to liaison persons in the government and

private sector organizations. BIMAP provided the names, titles and phone numbers of these persons and assisted in scheduling appointments for the Evaluators.

In Grand Cayman, Dominica, and Grenada where progress has been made in project implementation, companies were selected for site visits on the basis of representativeness of the type of companies the project was intended to serve and type of services provided under the project. These were ownership -- private and parastatal; size -- intermediate, small; business activity -- manufacturing, service, sales; receipt of project assistance -- organizational development; training; participant training; on-site technical assistance.

The Evaluators thus selected five companies in Grand Cayman, five in Dominica and eight in Grenada. BIMAP provided the name, address and telephone number of the liaison person in the Chamber of Commerce in each of these countries and assisted in scheduling appointments for the Evaluators.

Using the data collection categories delineated above, the Evaluators prepared an interview guideline which was used to gather and record data during all the in-country interviews. A copy of this guideline is included in Appendix 2.

Upon return from these site visits, the Evaluators held brief discussions with various members of the BIMAP and RDO/C project staff in order to fill gaps in the data collection. The Evaluators then prepared a draft report which was presented in separate meetings to project staff of BIMAP and RDO/C. As a draft, the report reviewed the findings to date and presented some preliminary conclusions and recommendations. The Evaluators received feedback from both project staff (oral from RDO/C and oral and written from BIMAP) on the accuracy and completeness of the draft report. The feedback was reviewed and incorporated as necessary in this final report.

### 2.3 Limitations

The evaluation is limited to a review of activities undertaken within the scope of RDT II -- private sector. Persons interviewed and documents reviewed were those identified as pertinent sources of data for the evaluation. Thoughts offered on the development impact of the project and on how the project fits into RDO/C's overall strategy for the English speaking Caribbean are limited in basis to the dataset of the evaluation. No attempt was made to gather data from persons and documents not pertaining to the project; neither was any examination made of the structure (social, economic, political) of the English speaking Caribbean as a whole, nor of the organization structure of BIMAP as a whole or of policy making in RDO/C as a whole.

Time constraints prevented any pilot test or refinement of the interview guideline. The methodology applied in this evaluation is therefore limited by the Evaluators' abilities to:

- o delineate categories for data collection;
- o compose an interview guideline to capture data;
- o collect data primarily through note-taking at meetings and interviews;
- o consistently classify data into the categories established.

The evaluation was further limited by several contextual factors: (1) time and other resources were available for visits to only five sites of the eight with some project activity to this point. Given differences in the sites, other sites might have added to the understanding of the project. This does not appear to be a major factor. (2) The evaluation schedule was decided on very short notice. It was important to RDO/C to complete the site visits before the end of the year. This limited lead time for interviews and put demands on BIMAP staff to put aside other work to help with interview arrangements. There were some failures of communication with regard to these arrangements for on-site meetings, but the cause for this is not clear. With the exception of a few cases (e.g. vacations), the short lead time did not appear to create problems of availability. (3) Some limitations of collaboration between BIMAP and RDO/C in the project also became a part of the evaluation process. The two-person evaluation team was composed of one consultant recommended by each organization. This made more difficult the development of a full sense of team between the evaluators. (4) There was also evidence in the evaluation process of some unresolved administrative issues regarding obtaining and spending grant funds. For example, the Evaluators' expense reimbursements have been held up due, according to BIMAP, to lack of a transfer of funds from RDO/C to BIMAP, which RDO/C attributes to the lateness of BIMAP's request submission. As well as being an indication of unresolved administrative issues, such concerns took up some of the evaluators' effort. (5) The administration of the evaluation contract through the grantee (BIMAP), in a situation such as this, where some difference in perspective is anticipated, would appear to add to the potential for stress, as the evaluators attempt to respond simultaneously to two distinct superiors.

The reactions of program participants were a primary source in this report for evaluating the quality of help received. No other data was readily available, particularly as BIMAP staff correctly point out, given the relatively early stages of the project and inevitable lag time between changes in approach and bottom-line results. Also, according to the project paper, BIMAP was to be responsible for collecting baseline and periodically updated economic data on the companies participating, which would keep track of any improvements resulting from the assistance. The project coordinator reports that this has not yet been done.

#### 2.4 Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of two persons.

1. Alan Hurwitz, Ed.D. Dr. Hurwitz is a graduate of programs in international relations, international development and management studies at Yale University and the University of Massachusetts. He lives near Boston, Massachusetts where he is an independent consultant in Management and Organizational Development. For this evaluation, he performed the role of team leader.

2. Cheryl Samuels Campbell, Ed.D. Dr. Samuels Campbell is a graduate of the Educational Technology, Media and Instructional Systems program at Columbia University. She lives in St. Lucia where she is an independent consultant in Training Systems and Development.

## SECTION III

### FINDINGS

This section presents a review of the Evaluators' data collection. The presentation is in two main parts: progress in project implementation country by country (including those countries not visited by the Evaluators) and progress in project implementation, project component by component.

#### 3.1 Project Organization and Preparation

This project component is discussed at the outset as an introduction to the two main section parts.

The project grant agreement was signed by representatives of BIMAP and USAID on June 29, 1983. A three month period (August - October, 1983) was estimated for project organization and preparation activities as it was forecasted that initial conditions precedent and visits to participating countries for signatures to the Memorandum of Agreement could be completed by October, 1983.

In effect, BIMAP began these project organization and preparation activities in September 1983 following the Executive Trustee's return from three months study leave. In October, BIMAP completed documents pertaining to the initial conditions precedent (legal counsel, accounting system, and fee structure) and delivered these documents to RDO/C's offices. BIMAP received approval of these documents in January 1984 and visits to participating countries were then initiated.

BIMAP estimates that political and economic upheavals in the region at the time inhibited its progress in project promotion activities. BIMAP itself was sensitive to mixed reactions to these upheavals being expressed in the press by governments and private sectors in the region. Project promotion was being encouraged in Grenada, a change in target country priority as Grenada was among the six countries targeted for project implementation in year two of the project. In July 1984, the first Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the Grenada government thus paving the way for implementation of the first in-country program.

The period leading up to project implementation was thus triple what was estimated, and as a result BIMAP lost nine months (August 1983 to June 1984) in project implementation.

#### 3.2 Progress in Project Implementation Country by Country

The project was targeted for eleven countries. It was intended that during

the first two years the focus would be on OECS member countries and Barbados. To date, BIMAP project staff has taken steps to engage the participation of eleven countries and there is now variable progress in project implementation, and in some cases project preparation, in each of these eleven countries. This section presents the Evaluators' findings on project activities to date in each of these eleven countries. For a summary of these developments, see the tables at the end of the Findings section of the Executive Summary.

### 3.2.1 Antigua

#### Profile from BIMAP Quarterly Reports and Project Staff

BIMAP staff visited Antigua in March 1984 to introduce the project to the Government and to request signature to the Memorandum of Understanding. The staff, accompanied by Dr. Ambrosio Ortega of USAID, visited Antigua again in August of that year and obtained the formal signature to the Memorandum. In this visit, project promotion meetings were held with representatives of the Employers' Federation and the Manufacturers' Association, Messrs. Wrenford Ferrence and Peter Harker, respectively. BIMAP reported that both representatives, although expressing a seemingly genuine interest in the BIMAP/USAID project, stated that the training program planned by the Caribbean Association for Training and Industry (CAIC) was more attractive because it did not have a fee structure. BIMAP further reported that the Antiguan private sector representatives' concern over the payment of fees affected "the level of interest," commitment and enthusiasm for the project. On the other hand, interest and enthusiasm of the Government representative appeared high.

According to BIMAP's Quarterly Report of October-December 1984, a total of five visits were made to Antigua to organize the Advisory/Coordinating Committee and to promote the Project. These visits included one made during the week of October when a Project Orientation Seminar and follow up visits to companies could not have taken place because the private sector members of the Committee did not act upon the Government member's request to invite persons to the Seminar. BIMAP reported having discussions with these private sector members (Mr. Harker of the Manufacturers' Association and Mr. Ferrence, Chamber of Commerce) to clarify and explain differences between the CAIC and BIMAP/USAID projects and to request arrangements to visit companies so that the decision for project participation could be made at the company level. BIMAP reported that to date the private sector representatives have not acted on their request.

#### Profile from Site Visit

The Evaluators met with Mr. Lionel Boulous, President of the Chamber of Commerce, and he arranged appointments with Mr. Wrenford Ferrence, previous President of the Chamber of Commerce and now Director of the National Development Foundation, Mr. Peter Harker, President of the Manufacturers' Association, and Mr. Clarence Edwards, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism and Energy.

Generally, the findings from these interviews correlate with that obtained from the review of BIMAP's reports and the meeting with BIMAP's project staff.

#### Chamber of Commerce

The current President, Mr. Lionel Boulous, stated that he had no knowledge of the BIMAP/USAID Project other than what he was just told by Mr. Ferrence, whom he telephoned for a preview about half an hour before our arrival. He said his secretary only just handed him a copy of BIMAP's project promotional material and he hadn't had a chance to read it. He understood from Mr. Ferrence that what BIMAP offered was duplicated by CAIC, and whereas BIMAP is fee based, CAIC is free.

Asked if he would give BIMAP a list of the Chamber's members so that BIMAP could contact these companies individually and promote the project, Mr. Boulous responded, "Why not? I would do that. It's public information. They could even get that out of the telephone directory."

The past president, Mr. Wrenford Ferrence, stated that he and other private sector representatives who met with BIMAP were quite excited when they first heard of BIMAP, as they wanted a West Indian organization providing services. However, when BIMAP presented the program, "the fee thing was a deterrent." He stated that it was felt at the Chamber level that although they had some excellent reports about BIMAP's work, the Chamber could not recommend BIMAP's services to member companies "seeing that those services would be free from CAIC."

In his new position, Mr. Ferrence had just received a set of training manuals from the Canadian High Commission. He displayed these to the Evaluators, pointing out that they had been developed by BIMAP. He stated that he was quite impressed with the quality of these training manuals.

Asked what suggestions he would give to BIMAP for making some headway in implementing the project in Antigua, Mr. Ferrence replied that BIMAP would have to do some aggressive marketing, as they would have to convince the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers' Association.

#### Manufacturers' Association

The President, Mr. Peter Harker, repeated the objection to the fee charged for services in the BIMAP/USAID project and stated that these same services were available free of cost from CAIC. Asked if BIMAP should approach the companies directly or continue to work through the Committee, Mr. Harker stated that the Committee's approach was appropriate but that he should not be expected to work on a volunteer basis while BIMAP would be making a profit.

The Government Representative, Mr. Clarence Edwards, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism and Energy, was interviewed on Saturday, November 30. His statements confirmed the government's willingness to cooperate, and the disinterest on the part of other committee members.

#### **3.2.2 Grand Cayman**

##### Profile from BIMAP Quarterly Reports and Project Staff

BIMAP reported making the first promotion visit to Grand Cayman during the first quarter of 1985. In a follow-up visit in April, BIMAP conducted a project orientation seminar that attracted thirty (30) business persons. The

seminar was held under the sponsorship of the Chamber of Commerce and the Memorandum of Understanding was signed at this time. BIMAP reported that "a number of enterprises" were identified for participation in the project.

At this time, BIMAP project staff has listed six participating companies in Grand Cayman. Activity has been limited to organizational development "almost exclusively in financial and data processing areas."

#### Profile from Site Visit

The Director of the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Bill Adam, actively assisted in promoting the BIMAP/USAID project and in obtaining the signature to the Memorandum of Agreement. While BIMAP project staff was in Grand Cayman for the orientation seminar, Mr. Adam arranged interviews with the press and newspaper articles on the project were printed in the Daily Caymanian Compass before and after the orientation seminar (see Appendix 3). There was also a release in the radio news broadcast. In addition, members of the Chamber received an announcement by mail.

Mr. Adam stated that not enough companies were participating in the program. Asked what was the reason for this, he replied that the small businessman had to be pushed into taking the project's services seriously and into realizing that participation was an investment. Asked for suggestions on how this could be done, he replied that he was doing a lot of canvassing and handed over a list of nine companies which he had lined up for the project staff visit in early December.

A businessman himself, Mr. Adam is the owner of an aptly named store, "Hobbies and Books." BIMAP conducted a needs assessment of his company and determined that his prime need was for a computerized accounting system. Mr. Adam was doing his own research on capabilities and prices of computer systems and was looking forward to his meeting with the BIMAP systems analyst scheduled, for early December.

The evaluators visited four other participating companies. In each company, the owner reported first hearing about the program from the radio or through the Chamber of Commerce and attending the orientation seminar as a result. Each signed up at the end of the seminar and held an appointment with a BIMAP staffer within the following day or two. One owner gave the time of the orientation seminar as June and another, July. The other two could not remember exactly when it was. All reported having two or three on-site visits from the project team between August and November.

Three of the four companies had received assistance in setting up a systematic manual accounting system. All three reported that they understood the system, it was "good" but that they did not have the time to complete it on a daily basis as intended. They all stated that they had become more rigorous in saving/storing records of business transactions and the system helped: showing overhead costs, seeing where their money was going, and giving an idea how to control cost. One owner declared that the system helped him make the decision to put a new product on the market and that his bottom line had improved. The owner of the fourth company had received assistance in conducting a feasibility study for the operation of a second restaurant. This owner was last visited by a BIMAP staffer in September and since then had been

expecting a report on the feasibility study. This report is to be used to support an application for a bank loan.

The Evaluators also visited the owner of a company listed as a prospective participant in the program. This owner stated that he had heard of the orientation seminar on the radio but was not motivated to go. His business was new, he was "bitten" into spending large sums of money by advertising agents, and he was cautious about paying fees. He had heard good reports about the program from a fellow businessman and, given his current financial distress, he wishes participation in a program such as BIMAP's had been stipulated by his bank loan agreement.

Within nine months, the project has achieved moderate success in Grand Cayman. It has the full support of the President of the Chamber of Commerce, who is actively recruiting companies. Participating companies reported benefits and are spreading the word about the program.

### 3.2.3 Dominica

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staff

The first promotion visit was made during the first quarter of 1984 and the Memorandum of Agreement was signed during the following quarter. BIMAP met with Government and private sector representatives on the Board of the Dominican Association of Industry and Commerce (DAIC -- the local Chamber of Commerce) and an orientation seminar was scheduled with DAIC members for the next quarter. The DAIC representatives expressed interest in having a local management consulting firm provide services under the project. BIMAP responded that this arrangement was not feasible under the terms of the project. The DAIC President did not pursue the issue; she indicated that she was uncertain about the capability of the local management consulting firm.

The orientation seminar was held under the auspices of DAIC in October 1984. Ten companies were represented and eight signed up for participation. Management of some of the large companies requested a reduction in the fee of \$7,500 U.S. and BIMAP gave consideration to this.

BIMAP began working with nine companies during the first quarter of 1985. Needs assessments of these companies highlighted requirements for activities in all four areas of the program.

1. Training. A course in Customer Relations and one in Personnel Management attracted participants from all nine companies. Twenty-nine participants attended the Customer Relations course and fifteen attended Supervisory Management. BIMAP reported that most of the participants in the Supervisory Management course held clerical positions. According to BIMAP, company selectors failed in meeting the objectives of sending qualified personnel who could bring some performance improvement to the company. BIMAP indicates that they (BIMAP) employed a general lecture approach since they decided that a participatory method could not have been effective with such a heterogeneous group.

2. **Short Term Specialised Participant Training.** A different area of need was identified in each of the nine companies. These areas included photo finishing, meat cutting and insurance claims adjustment. The application for participant training in photo finishing was denied by the Institute for International Education and/or RDO/C; the application for training in meat cutting has not yet been submitted to BIMAP by the company; according to BIMAP, the company had been given the application in May 1985.
3. **Consulting Services.** All nine companies required market planning, new venture analysis and improvement of accounting and financial systems. Three companies required assistance with organization structures and personnel procedures. In one of these companies, BIMAP submitted recommendations for implementing an inventory system. The company requested deferred action on implementation until they had relocated to another building and had informed BIMAP of such. There has been no communication between BIMAP and the company in question, and BIMAP was not aware that the move had taken place. Two companies required advice in computer applications. As yet, neither company has made a decision in the selection of computer hardware. In one of these companies, a large retail operation, information was gathered and specifications for the performance of the computer were prepared in detail by the comptroller of the company prior to the commencement of the BIMAP/USAID project. BIMAP decided to build upon this effort, thus spending only a short time in verifying the specifications and a longer, full scale analysis did not appear necessary.
4. **Recruitment of U.S. Based Consulting Firms.** On-site technical assistance was requested in areas such as food processing, cigarette and cigar manufacturing and equipment maintenance. There has been delay in providing firms with U.S. technical assistance. The delay was primarily administrative and was caused by legal reviews on the acceptance of the correct wording of a contract which was satisfactory to BIMAP and USAID.

It appears that since June 1985, six more companies in Dominica have signed up for participation in the program, as the Evaluators were given a list of fourteen companies where the project is now active.

#### Profile from Site Visits

The Evaluators met with the new fulltime director of DAIC, Ms. Cheryl Rolle, who helped to schedule appointments with company owners. Ms. Rolle expressed a desire for DAIC to assume more coordinating responsibility in the Project. At present, DAIC's role is limited to setting up appointments and providing administrative services such as use of telephone, photo copier and meeting room. DAIC requested payment in the form of an honorarium from BIMAP for these services, and after some negotiation, BIMAP offered to pay for these services at a daily rate. DAIC requested payment either in kind (preferably

audiovisual equipment) or in cash to cover overhead costs incurred during project liaison activities. BIMAP submitted the request for payment in equipment to RDO/C but the request was refused as RDO/C stated that they had no excess equipment to offer at that time or in the foreseeable future. BIMAP now pays DAIC out of its own funds for overhead expenses incurred.

Ms. Rolle stated that she wanted more information from BIMAP on the project activities in Dominica. Having up-to-date information would enable her to respond to queries from DAIC members participating in the program. She said DAIC could be of tremendous service to BIMAP -- publicising the project in newsletter articles, recruiting participants and processing applications for overseas training and assistance.

The Evaluators met with owners of five companies in Dominica. Three of these owners met as a group with the Evaluators in the DAIC boardroom. The consensus of these three was that the program was attractive, "a good package," given the services they were told they could obtain over a four-year period. At this time, though, all three view the program as being at a standstill, as none has had a site visit from a BIMAP staffer since August. Said one owner, "something went wrong, we don't know what."

Specifically, one owner reported that his dissatisfaction came from not being granted the request for a U.S. technical assistant. He stated that the arrangement was taking much too long and he had received "lots of letters apologising for the delay." The last letter from BIMAP was dated November 13 and stated that the contract arrangements had only just been finalized and so the owner could expect some activity in early 1986.

Another dissatisfied owner stated that he had received a report in July on recommendations for implementing an inventory system. Since then, he has been looking forward to a follow-up visit from BIMAP for guidance in implementing the system. The accountant of the first owner also described a similar scenario -- accounting system recommendations sent in August, no communication or follow-up visit since.

The third owner, who had requested assistance in several areas -- update financial system with possible change in computer system, office procedures in insurance department and technical assistance in meat cutting, refrigeration and retail management -- also expressed dissatisfaction with time delay between receipt of recommendations and follow-up visit.

All three agreed that they wanted the program to be active, that BIMAP staffers are "very capable, very professional," but that the main concern and dissatisfaction was that there isn't sufficient follow-up.

The Evaluators visited four companies. A manager in one of these companies reiterated the theme of untimely follow-up. He was waiting for a report on recommendations for personnel system revision and he wanted the revised system in place in early 1986.

At a large, family-owned retail company, the Evaluators met with a family member manager who at once stated that the company paid its fee and "BIMAP did nothing." The Evaluators reviewed the nature of BIMAP's activity in the company and found that the manager's dissatisfaction stemmed from the fact

that:

1. BIMAP staffer spent a much shorter time (half a day) than he (the family manager) expected (one week) gathering information about the company's operation in order to recommend a computer accounting system.
2. The report sent by the BIMAP staffer contained two major inaccuracies and he wrote a letter pointing them out to BIMAP. The BIMAP staffer replied, stating that he had made some incorrect assumptions.

Asked whether he wanted to withdraw the company's participation from the project, the manager said he wanted to do that but other managers of the business said, "No, no let's go ahead." "Besides," he continued, "we have no choice, there's only BIMAP."

Toward the end of the interview, the manager expressed concern that none of what he said would be reported to BIMAP, as the company still had a "very good working relationship" with the BIMAP staffer and he did not want to jeopardize that.

The Evaluators also held brief interviews with two employees at this company who had attended the course in Personnel Supervision. Both were in agreement that they got little out of the course. The instructor "literally read to us." "It was just "lecture all the time." They also reported that the instructor had distributed a lot of handouts, but these were not discussed in detail.

At another company, the part-owner was very enthusiastic about the program. She had attended both training courses and rated them as "good," especially the one in Customer Relations. Asked what she can now do as a result of the course that she couldn't do before, she replied that all she got was an awareness of certain things, as the business was a three-person operation and she had no one to manage. Their assistant had also gone to the Customer Relations course and "yes, she seemed friendlier with customers as a result."

At the fourth company, which was not yet an official participant in the program (no fee had been paid), the manager stated that the company could use the training programs offered but she was waiting for BIMAP to return and "sell" the package to her. BIMAP had allowed the company to send a participant to the training program, and the manager reported that she had gotten very positive feedback from the participant. She said that participant would even stop by her home after the day's session to tell her about the course.

The Evaluators interviewed this participant and found that her reported enthusiasm was exaggerated. Her position in the company is Senior Administrative Assistant. She repeated the comments that there was too much lecture and too little group discussion. She did say that she learned about strategies for new employee orientation and also received a handout with guidelines. This was timely, as she had to "break-in" a new employee the week following the course.

The Evaluators interviewed yet another participant in both training courses. She is a Secretary in her company. She said the Customer Relations course was

"very, very good" and that the Supervisory Management course was "something else." Her comments on the methodology of this second course agreed with previous comments.

The past president of DAIC presented a picture of the project from her old position as well as from her current position as manager of a commercial bank. From her manager's, she reported that BIMAP had conducted a needs assessment of the bank and had put together a "very impressive package" involving strategies for expanding savings and current accounts, and staff training in management and computer operations. The package was now under review by her headquarters.

From her past position at DAIC, she assessed BIMAP staffers as "very capable and very professional in their approach." She reported companies' dissatisfaction that there was not a smooth flow of BIMAP's activity and there was no consistent follow-up. Issues addressed were:

1. Fee Structure. This needed revision. The fee was determined according to size of company and size was determined according to number of employees. She said the fee should be based on revenue. For example, her bank has a greater revenue than the Banana Association but has fewer employees, so she paid a lower fee while she could have afforded a higher fee, and the Banana Association paid a high fee it could not afford. The Evaluators interviewed the manager of the Banana Association prior to interviewing the past president of DAIC. To the question of whether the Association found the fee reasonable, he responded, "Well, of course we wished it could have been lower, but in terms of what we were buying, we had no problem paying it."
2. DAIC Involvement. DAIC wants payment for overhead -- telephone, boardroom, refreshments for participants at courses. This payment could be in kind -- for example, in equipment such as a slide projector or video tape recorder. DAIC wants specific data on exactly what in the project funds and quotas is earmarked for Dominica. In terms of on-going activity in the project, DAIC wants to have a broad picture at all times -- who is doing what -- so that project progress is known. BIMAP needs a person on ground (in Dominica) to liaise and DAIC can fill that role.
3. Local Company Involvement. Dominica has a consulting firm which can provide services under the project. The past president urged that the project provide a way for using local consulting companies.

Within 13 months, BIMAP has generated interest in the project and has initiated activity in several companies. Unexplained delays in activity (from the company viewpoint) are being experienced, and DAIC is anxious to provide liaison services under some formal arrangement.

### 3.2.4 St. Vincent

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

The first project promotion visit was made to St. Vincent during the first quarter of 1984. The government requested additional information on the project and BIMAP provided this. BIMAP reported during the second quarter that the Memorandum of Agreement had been approved and was ready for signature. During the third quarter, there were several instances of telephone and written communication between BIMAP and government officials. Because of the change in government, the memorandum was undergoing a second review. The Memorandum was still under review during the fourth quarter and BIMAP did not visit St. Vincent during this time.

In the first half of 1985, BIMAP experienced difficulty in scheduling a project orientation seminar under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce. Two different dates were established, April 25 and May 15, and both were cancelled because the Chamber reported the unavailability of a suitable venue. BIMAP concluded that the Chamber was not well organized and noted that the Chamber experienced difficulty in organizing members to attend seminars and "even ordinary meetings."

Through the government contact person, BIMAP learned that the Prime Minister wanted the request for the project agreement to come from the Chamber of Commerce. This way, he could be sure that the private sector supported the project.

At the end of the third quarter of this year, BIMAP reported that it planned to undertake direct organization of the orientation seminar in St. Vincent "because of the lack of cohesiveness by the Chamber of Commerce to organize members for the seminar." BIMAP reports contacting the Chamber again in November 1985 and finding indications that the Chamber had taken no further action to secure the Government's signatures to the Memorandum. Further, the Chamber had taken no steps to arrange an orientation seminar, an action which would indicate the interest the Government requires, and which BIMAP had expected to be done.

#### Profile from site visit

The Evaluators met with a representative from the Government and one from the Chamber of Commerce. The government representative repeated the Prime Minister's position reported by BIMAP. He also noted concerns the government had with the project design. These were:

- o no indication of private sector role;
- o no indication of government role, how and why;
- o Memorandum was an agreement between BIMAP and the government and not between the government and USAID;

- o no indication of project continuity; that is, what was supposed to come out in terms of local capability for delivering that type of program.

The representative of the Chamber of Commerce reported that a BIMAP staffer last visited the Chamber in August of this year to discuss the organization of a project promotion seminar. She reported that she had no objection to the conduct of such a seminar but to date had received no further communication from BIMAP.

### 3.2.5 Grenada

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staff

BIMAP project staffers visited Grenada in the first quarter of 1984 to promote the project. In the second quarter, BIMAP reported that the Memorandum was "approved and ready for signature" in Grenada. The signature was completed in July 1984 and a three-person advisory committee was formed with representatives from the Government, Chamber of Commerce and Employers' Confederation. Private sector representatives were given a hundred copies of the project promotion brochure for distribution to their members.

By the end of the fourth quarter of 1984, nineteen companies had expressed interest in the project and seven of these had signed agreements with six paying the fees at once. Other companies said they would wait until after the general election, scheduled for early December. By the end of the first quarter of 1985, BIMAP reported recruitment of nine companies with assessments of required activity in each of the four areas of the program. All nine companies required management training and six required specialized participant training in areas such as Fashion Design, Automotive Repair and Hotel Operations. Consulting marketing and new ventures were required in five companies, four companies required help improving accounting and financial systems and four wanted advice on computer applications. Companies also requested on-site technical assistance in machine maintenance and production and operations in a garment factory.

BIMAP staffers reported a "holding pattern" in Grenada due to delays in meeting overseas short-term training requests from six of the nine companies and the non-finalization of a contract to recruit U.S. consultants for on-site technical assistance. The staffers reported that the Committee existed merely on paper and that liaison was done solely through the Chamber of Commerce. The Evaluators were provided with a list of twelve companies that had signed up for the program.

#### Profile from Site Visit

The Evaluators met with the full time Director of the Chamber of Commerce who expressed concern that the program had fallen apart. She stated that there was too little follow up activity and that the program needed monitoring. Her conclusions were that the program was being launched in too many territories and that BIMAP staffers were spreading themselves too thin. Yet she described BIMAP staffers as professionals, "knowledgeable in their area". She named one in particular as being competent with an approach that makes

him the most successful of the team.

The Chamber, she reported, was confused about the relationship between the Institute for International Education (IIE) program and BIMAP -- where BIMAP fits in. Her expectations were that long-term training was available under the project. This wasn't carefully spelled out to her. It seemed to her that a couple of the BIMAP staffers were only a little less confused than she was on this issue.

BIMAP, at the Chamber's request, paid for use of the audio-visual center and equipment. The Chamber wanted some financial arrangement with BIMAP to cover overhead costs. At this point, the Chamber is interested in assuming greater liaison responsibility. They also want more information on the progress of companies and scheduled activities during of BIMAP's visits.

The Evaluators visited eight companies participating in the program. In one company the owners reported that BIMAP had been a great help to them in 1982-1983 under the CIDA project. They had come to "love the name BIMAP" However, under the BIMAP/USAID project, they had not received the overseas training requested, and had written BIMAP requesting withdrawal from the program. The company did not pay a fee and was reluctant to do this as other owners they had spoken with stated that they had gotten nothing.

At three other companies, the owners reported that they were waiting for action from BIMAP. One company had been helped to identify its computer needs and obtain prices on a system. The wait was for a review/selection of software with a BIMAP staffer. Another company reported getting excellent help in setting up an accounting system but was now waiting to get training in hotel management. A third owner was waiting for on-site assistance in machine operations. He had just received a letter stating that the contract for recruiting the consultant was finalized and action should take place in early 1986.

In another company, the owner had just received a letter from BIMAP stating that her daughter had been accepted for a three-month course in fashion design at a school in Texas. She had hoped it would be a longer term training course and that it would be conducted in New York. She had been waiting since November 1984 for such news and had even telephoned BIMAP in August asking for her money back.

At the largest business concern in Grenada, the Managing Director stated that the services his company received under the program was worth ten times what he had paid. Initially, he wanted management training under the project but the needs assessment showed computerized accounting as a priority. He had the "highest praise" for the assistance the company received in selecting and purchasing a system as well as in recruiting a director of the new operation.

He stated that there had been a lapse between the completion of the needs assessment and initiation of the system analysis. He even "thought BIMAP had forgotten about him". Now that the system will be installed, he is looking for in-house training from BIMAP and is willing to pay another fee for this.

At other companies the Evaluators interviewed participants in the supervisory management course. The agreement was that there was too much reading on the part of the instructor and participants did not feel as if they were truly participating. More discussion was needed as well adaptation of video tapes from Canadian to Caribbean setting.

Project activity in Grenada appears to have slowed down but the recent finalization of the consultants' contract promises renewed activity in early 1986.

### **3.2.6 St. Lucia**

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

Initial contact was made with a government representative during the first quarter of 1984 and the Memorandum of Agreement was reported as approved and ready for signature during the second quarter of 1984. During the third quarter, it was reported that the review of the memorandum was completed but that the government had requested information from USAID confirming the agreement with BIMAP and was awaiting this information. At the end of the year, the memorandum was still under review.

Toward the middle of 1985, BIMAP renewed contact in St. Lucia and in July, a project orientation seminar was conducted under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce. Of the fifty companies represented, thirty expressed interest in participating in the project. As a result of this seminar, the signature of the Memorandum of Understanding was completed.

The government representative took the view that the government would select companies for participation in the project. The Chamber of Commerce resisted and said if the government insisted, it would advise its members not to participate. BIMAP staffers visited St. Lucia in mid-November to discuss the issue and the government representative "backed off." The Chamber is now informing members to participate in the project.

### **3.2.7 Montserrat**

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

Initial contact was made with the government during the first quarter of 1984. In the second quarter, BIMAP reported that the Memorandum was under review and that the government had requested additional information. In the third quarter, a second visit was made to discuss the government's concerns. The Governor advised that Montserrat had changed its policy in granting blanket exemptions as requested for a four-year period in the Memorandum. The government was willing to grant such exemptions for short periods, for example, quarterly "whenever BIMAP makes the appropriate applications." As such, the Memorandum was to be amended.

During the fourth quarter, the Governor was assigned to home duty and a new Governor was appointed. In the first quarter of 1985, BIMAP made a promotional visit to Montserrat. An orientation seminar was conducted under the sponsorship of the Chamber of Commerce during the second quarter and

companies were recruited into the program.

At this time, BIMAP reports activities in four companies in Montserrat. All four companies have already received assistance in developing a financial reporting system.

### **3.2.8 St. Kitts-Nevis**

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

The first promotional visit was made during the first quarter of 1984. At the end of the second quarter, it was reported that the Memorandum was approved and ready for signature. The Memorandum was signed during the third quarter, but a committee was not yet established. Action to establish this committee was reported as still in progress during the last quarter of the year.

During the first quarter of 1985, BIMAP staffers visited St. Kitts-Nevis and focused attention on identifying potential candidates for participation on the Advisory Committee. In the second quarter, BIMAP reported renewed contact with personnel in the Chamber of Commerce. Difficulties were experienced in scheduling a date for conducting an orientation seminar and BIMAP concluded that the Chamber was not well organized.

In the third quarter, BIMAP reported that renewed contact was made in St. Kitts-Nevis and that a firm date for scheduling procedures was established. During the last quarter of 1985, the Chamber arranged meetings for BIMAP staff with ten large and medium size companies. Three companies joined the program during this time.

### **3.2.9 Tortolla, British Virgin Islands**

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

The initial visit to promote the project was made during the first quarter of 1985. By the end of the second quarter, BIMAP reported that personnel from the Chief Minister's Office had assisted in organizing a project orientation seminar, which was delivered to an audience of thirty persons.

At this time, BIMAP staffers report project activities in three companies.

### **3.2.10 Belize**

No activity to date.

### **3.2.11 Barbados**

#### Profile from Quarterly Reports and BIMAP Staffers

During the first quarter of 1985, initial action was taken to establish an advisory committee for implementation of the project in Barbados. A committee

consisting of representatives from the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association, the Hotel Association and the Central Bank met in February and identified three groups of businesses that the project should give emphasis to. These were 1) small and medium size hotels, 2) food-processing and related agri-businesses, and 3) small/medium manufacturers of potential export products. It was also decided that orientation seminars should be organized for companies in each of these three groups.

During the second quarter of the year, BIMAP initiated plans for an orientation seminar to small and medium size hotel owners, but postponed these plans as the Ministry of Tourism had organized a seminar on financial management for this group of business persons during the June/July period.

In the third quarter, BIMAP reported a meeting with the President of the Hotel Association, and a plan to conduct an orientation seminar to the full membership towards the end of the year.

### 3.3 Progress in Project Implementation -- Project Component by Component

The following section discusses the findings of the evaluation team by the various components of the project, over the region as a whole.

#### 3.3.1 Memorandum of Understanding

The Memorandum of Understanding is intended as the formal permission of the Governments involved for BIMAP to offer and promote the program in those countries. It also generally includes blanket approvals for necessary visas, currency transactions and imports. (In Montserrat, the Memo is being amended to grant this approval on a case by case basis.)

While obtaining this kind of governmental collaboration is a new type of activity for BIMAP, in most cases obtaining the necessary agreement has not been a problem though it has often taken considerable amounts of time and effort. Governments generally have seen the program as an opportunity which they welcome. Their signing the memo does not impose participation on anyone. It only provides the legal opportunity for the activities to be introduced. Generally, responsibility was quickly passed to the appropriate private sector organization for more in-depth consideration of the program's relevance to the business community and, if advisable to them, its promotion.

As was demonstrated most clearly in Antigua, the signing of the memo (and even the official formation of the advisory committee) did not ensure that the program would actually get off the ground, only that government itself would not be a barrier. One Government (St. Vincent) expressed concerns regarding the memo (and the project) and has not yet signed. Those concerns included the following:

- a) The clear support and involvement of the private sector. (e.g. through the Chamber of Commerce)
- b) The long-term benefits of the program to the organizations and infra-structure of St. Vincent (i.e. follow-up after the four years of the project).
- c) The actual parties to the agreement (i.e. the Government of St. Vincent, with a Barbadian business organization, as opposed to AID or the Governments of Barbados or the United States).
- d) Lack of clarity in the extent of government involvement.

Also, as previously stated, Montserrat approved an amended form of the Memo which agreed to give approval of special considerations (e.g. imports) on a case by case basis. In other cases, those sites visited reported the signing of the Memo with few if any reservations, and BIMAP reports similarly in the remainder of the territories of the Project.

### 3.3.2 Advisory Committees

The Advisory Committees were intended to be an administrative and political umbrella which would provide the project direct linkage to the appropriate public and private organizations and useful political and promotional support. While committees exist, in a technical sense, in all territories where the project is legally operative (except perhaps Antigua), they have generally not played the role envisioned, or in most cases been active at all in a practical sense.

The committee structure has created a vehicle for the formal authorization of the powers that be for the activities of the program, both government and private. Even in Grand Cayman Island, where the committee has never formally met, it is considered by its principal promoter (the former president of the Chamber of Commerce) useful, in case of any issue arising which is in need of formal action. As a loosely structured and potentially formal body, it has provided an initial vehicle, for contact, for formal acceptance, for legitimacy, and for promotion in the various territories. As a structure for formal action, however, it has more often than not slowed things down. This has occurred for several reasons.

Committees of the type envisioned are generally not equipped to carry out the kinds of administrative activities which the promotion of the project requires. Even the already existing organizations, such as Chambers of Commerce or Associations of Manufacturers, sometimes do not have regular staff, but depend on the voluntary work of the active members. Also, unless an individual member takes a personal interest in the project, there may not be sufficient personal motivation for extra time and effort on already demanding schedules. This situation is exacerbated in some cases by peoples' perception of BIMAP as a for-profit business organization, perhaps less deserving of volunteer assistance.

In a few cases, the promotion of the BIMAP program actually conflicted with other ongoing interests of some committee members. Antigua was a notable example, where one very influential committee member was the local CAIC representative, and quite committed to the expansion of CAIC activities in that country, unfortunately seen as competitive with the USAID/BIMAP program. Another of the original principal members recently left his position as Executive Director of the Antiguan Chamber of Commerce to become the Director of the local office of the National Development Foundation and begin seeking his own funding for providing training services to small businesses. These people could not generally be expected to launch a concerted effort to promote this project. It appears to have been very difficult for BIMAP to get the program a full and objective hearing among Antiguan businesses, though the current Director of the Chamber and the Director of the Manufacturers' Association say that membership lists are and have been available for BIMAP to use to make their own entry. Two businesspersons in Antigua who were members of the Chamber during the "publicity" regarding the program report no recollection of it or of BIMAP in this context. In any case, the committee was not helpful, in the ways envisioned in the Project Paper. This is perhaps an extreme example, but does demonstrate some more general weaknesses in the committee role.

In Dominica, Grenada and Grand Cayman, where the most successful promotion has

taken place, the committee does not meet. In Grand Cayman, it exists on paper only. In these places, all those concerned, including government, do not see that as a problem. In Antigua, it exists, and has met with BIMAP on at least one occasion, but has led no effective promotion of the program. As can be seen in the section on promotion, recruitment has taken place directly through a local organization (e.g. Chamber of Commerce) or, in some cases, by BIMAP itself.

### **3.3.3 BIMAP's Institution Building Activities**

One of the purposes of the project is the development of BIMAP as an institution capable of providing assistance to businesses and organizations in the Caribbean. This development was intended to have several aspects: higher education for staff; short term training for staff; and more general enhancement of BIMAP's capabilities as a consulting and training institution.

To this point, one BIMAP staff member has earned a master's degree; and a staff member has taken two months of short-term training. Also, BIMAP as an organization had gained valuable new experience with a wide variety of clients in the region, including, according to one staff member, larger companies, as well as more companies in more territories. BIMAP has developed new linkages among some government officials as well as presidents and directors of Chambers of Commerce and other private sector organizations. It has gained experience in many of the sometimes demanding requirements of being a regional training/consulting organization. As the project continues, this experience should be perhaps the most valuable benefit in moving toward this expressed project objective.

### **3.3.4. Project Promotion and Infrastructure**

Since the project was responsible for generating participants in each of the (ultimately eleven) territories, program promotion has been and continues to be crucial to its success. Many different approaches have been used, mostly at the initiation of a local liaison group, generally the Chamber of Commerce.

The program has been successful at signing on significant numbers of participating businesses in three territories - Grand Cayman, Dominica and Grenada. In these countries, the program was promoted principally through local counterparts - in the cases of Dominica and Grenada by two very energetic and resourceful staff directors/managers of the local Chambers, in the case of Grand Cayman by a very active and well connected local store owner (and at the time of initial introduction, Chamber President) and himself a program participant.

This individual had been introduced to BIMAP activities previously through their work with Cable and Wireless on Grand Cayman and favourably impressed. It seems it was he who actually introduced the program to the government for signing the initial memo. Most participants on Grand Cayman associated the program with him, though he made a point of staying out of issues between BIMAP and participants, once signed up. He has maintained his active interest, though he is no longer President, of the Chamber. Through this individual there have been radio announcements, and newspaper coverage of the program's activities. All participants interviewed had indicated hearing of the program, directly or indirectly from this person's work in addition to

other means, in some cases. The BIMAP project promotional material was generally not seen as effective in generating interest.

According to most participants in most countries, the fee was not a barrier to participation. Many of those interviewed indicated that the fee was well worth it for the services and possibilities of the program, as presented to them by BIMAP staff. However, in many cases, participants had not yet paid; and according to the project coordinator, the project staff did not consider pursuing fees part of their responsibility. In the one case where someone was interviewed who was considering signing up but had not yet done so, the fee was mentioned as an issue, due mainly to a tight cash flow situation for that particular business. Only in Antigua was the fee mentioned consistently by representatives of the advisory committee as a deterrence to participation (in relation to other free services); there is some evidence of other issues influencing that particular situation.

Also, in both Dominica and Grenada, some concerns were raised by the Chambers of Commerce regarding their relationship with the project. In both cases, the Chambers have been active in promoting the program, helpful in keeping their members informed of project activities, and useful as a base for project staff on their site visits. There is no compensation for these services built into the project, though the project paper clearly indicates their role in the fulfillment of project goals (as it also does for other members of the advisory committee).

Chamber representatives in both cases expressed interest in being even more involved in project activities, at least for their members. They also indicated a need for some compensation for their services and the use of their staff and facilities. They indicated concern regarding the lack of plan for such compensation and the lack of ongoing information from BIMAP regarding activities in their region. BIMAP indicates willingness to pay them for specific services and some difficulty with RDO/C in doing so through the project. BIMAP staff also indicates disinterest in having other groups overly involved with what it sees as private client/consulting relationships. They are receptive to the need for on-site collaboration, but would prefer to develop their own network for meeting this need.

### 3.3.5. Consulting Activities

The initial and principal vehicle for assistance to business organizations participating in the project has been the consulting by BIMAP staff to individual firms. This consulting is designed to be the initial and principal source of assistance to the organizations in question. It is also designed as a vehicle through which other of the firm's technical assistance needs are to be identified, for example, as the initial step for arranging participant training, extra-regional on-site technical assistance and/or more general training activities.

Typically when a firm signed up for the program, it was visited by one or two BIMAP staff for the purpose of identifying the principal areas of need of the firm in question. This initial interview generally followed the form of a BIMAP needs assessment questionnaire. Some companies were very clear on their reasons for joining (e.g. computerization, accounting, management training, costing, etc.). In some cases, this immediate sense changed over the course

of this initial meeting (e.g. in one case from management training to computerization). In a few cases, the firms were clear that their principal reason for signing on was to be eligible for foreign participant training or on-site consulting assistance. In these cases the firms in question understood that these possibilities would be open to them in return for the fee. (For BIMAP, these possibilities were to be at the discretion of the consultant.) This initial needs diagnosis has then generally been followed by a more in-depth gathering of data on a second (or possibly additional) visit(s). This data gathering has then been followed by a set of written recommendations or proposals which are mailed, or sometimes hand delivered, to the client organizations. In some instances this has been followed by some further contact, written or personal.

BIMAP staff often received praise individually for their approach, professionalism and knowledge of the subject during contact time with the client. Many specific benefits were mentioned as a result of work with them, particularly in the computerization area, and in accounting (mainly on Grand Cayman Island). In two reported cases, computer recommendations from BIMAP were passed directly along to suppliers for further action. Situations in which clients report the most satisfaction with the extent of implementation seemed to be those in which there had been significant personal contact after the recommendations had been made, or in some cases those in which clients themselves were happy with a slow pace of change.

In Dominica, and to some extent in Grenada, participants consistently expressed disappointment and concern with the lack of follow-up and ongoing information and contact regarding their consulting with the program. In three cases, clients expected to receive visits from BIMAP staff after receipt of written recommendations, visits which had not yet taken place. In one case, there had been no contact since April. Staff of both Chambers of Commerce report frequent inquiries from participating members regarding BIMAP's services, and the lack of adequate information to respond.

Most participants did report some specific benefits from their work with BIMAP thus far, though often they were less than envisioned. Most reported contact time with BIMAP staff to be valuable and helpful; and most were hopeful that things would work out in a way that more work with them would be possible, as well as hopeful that other services envisioned (and previously described by BIMAP) would also become available to them.

In some cases, participants spoke of recommendations from BIMAP as good or excellent, even though they had not yet been implemented for a number of reasons. In some of these, the reason was the need for more on-site assistance on the part of BIMAP consultants. In others there were special factors which the consultant was not aware of which prevented the ideas from actually being used, as good as they were. In one case, the firm, for reasons of confidentiality, could not provide BIMAP with all information requested. In this case, the BIMAP staff person reports that lack of information as a major problem; the client reports the BIMAP staff member as stating at the time that it would not be a problem. In this case, the recommendations were criticized as too general as well as for the absence of expected follow-up by the BIMAP consultant. In a few cases, clients blamed themselves for the lack of follow through. Some actually felt guilty for not doing their part. One participant stated that what he and other participants might need was help and

support with their personal resistance to change.

### 3.3.6. Participant Training

According to plan, BIMAP, through its consulting and other work with the various business organizations, is to identify individuals who can benefit from intensive training outside their home territory. BIMAP then fills out appropriate forms, requests approval from IIE and RDO/C and, if and when approved, arrangements are made through IIE for the individual placement.

This aspect of the program has not yet really begun, though groundwork has been prepared in a number of situations. BIMAP staff has reported three individuals identified for participant training, one in photography and two in fashion design. The photography request had been turned down by either RDO/C or IIE and, at the time of the BIMAP staff interviews, the process for the other two applications (in fashion design) had not been completed. The letter denying permission gave no reason for the denial, and BIMAP reports not following the case further. BIMAP reported hearing some informal feedback about the photography area being seen more (by RDO/C) as a hobby than a profession. Conversations (by the evaluator) with RDO/C confirmed this case and the general sense that photography might not fit into categories eligible, or prioritized, for this type of training, particularly for training in the U.S. RDO/C also expressed some concern regarding communication in this area.

The evaluation team visited the business and individual in question (in Dominica) and found the situation for training apparently consistent with project goals as described. The individual was the principal photographer and assistant manager in a small, photographing business. Owners are interested in expanding and possibly moving into color. The person herself had not yet been informed that the application had been disapproved. This created a question on the part of the evaluation team concerning the communication situation between BIMAP, RDO/C, IIE and participants regarding this (and potentially other similar) case(s). The evaluation team visited two other participants (also in Dominica) who had submitted requests for participant training (in fashion design). At the time of the team's visit (December 2-3), one participant expressed some frustration over the wait, and had communicated to BIMAP their intention to reconsider participation in the program. Their daughter (the original person proposed for training) was already studying a related field in New York, through other means. The other had just received a letter from BIMAP, indicating acceptance of their proposed participant (also the owner's daughter) in a three-month program in Texas. The participant expressed some dissatisfaction with the proposal. She had wanted a longer training program, and in New York or London. She planned to discuss these issues with BIMAP. All these participants expressed some confusion over what the program could and could not offer regarding participant training.

Other participants expressed strong interest in the participant training aspect of the program. Many expressed concerns and uncertainty regarding the selection process, criteria for selection, application process, length of time necessary for arrangements, and the distribution of these (apparently limited) slots among the participating territories, and the individual participating organizations. A number of participants and liaison people expressed some frustration over the lack of feedback and other information regarding these procedures and policies, and the status of individual applications.

### 3.3.7. Outside Technical Assistance

According to plan, also available through RDT II is on-site training and other technical assistance from outside the region, and particularly from the United States. The Executive Trustee of BIMAP made two trips to the United States for the purpose of identifying appropriate firms for the identification and provision of consulting services, with some success according to BIMAP reports. Awareness of the need for this assistance would emerge from BIMAP's other consulting activities with these individual business organizations. Arrangements could then be made by BIMAP through the previously identified firms.

This aspect of the program also had not really begun at the time of the site visits. Much frustration and concern was expressed by participants regarding delays and lack of information. In actuality, this type of assistance, aside from emerging from other consulting activities, was in several cases a primary reason for a company's joining the program.

The possibility of high level technical assistance, on site, for a period of time, for training and consulting, was very appealing to many of the participants interviewed. They saw it as a way to train larger numbers of their employees and to gain the benefits of high level expertise applied directly to the realities of their own business situations. A number of individuals expressed disappointment and frustration over (a) these possibilities remaining unrealized and (b) the lack of information on progress and reasons for delay.

BIMAP staff had previously reported to the evaluation team on delays with this component of the program. They indicated a problem in the development of a contracting format for these consulting services which was acceptable to both BIMAP and RDO/C. According to initial plans, BIMAP was to develop a form and submit it to RDO/C for approval. Several back-and-forths and approximately one year later a consulting contract had been agreed upon - the week before the mid-term evaluation was to begin. This was the principal explanation by BIMAP staff for the delay. They attributed it principally to long turn around time in communication with the RDO/C offices.

During a number of interviews with participants who had been awaiting word on this outside technical assistance, the evaluation team was shown recent letters from BIMAP, explaining that negotiations with AID were completed and that some action would soon be forthcoming on their requests. Most of these interviewed were still interested and hopeful that whatever was holding things up could be worked out. Concerns were also expressed regarding the lack of communication from BIMAP regarding their requests, and the process and criteria for the distribution of resources for these activities (among countries and companies) once they actually began. Another problem seemed to be the perception of many clients of these aspects of the program as highly desired and clearly helpful benefits, "a good deal" to be distributed somehow by the powers that be. They are perceived by BIMAP (and RDO/C) to be part of the array of program services to be applied when evidence indicates (primarily to the BIMAP consultant) that such help is appropriate to that situation. This differing perception has contributed also to participants' lack of satisfaction with this aspect of the program.

### **3.3.8. In-country Seminars**

It was intended that more general training activities be a part of the assistance to be offered by BIMAP through the project. These were to include both company specific and more general in-country training experiences.

Three general in-country seminars have been conducted by BIMAP thus far through the project - one in Grenada on Management and Supervision (11) and two in Dominica - one on Management and Supervision (15) and one on Customer Relations (29). These were generally promoted by the Chambers of Commerce in the countries involved. BIMAP reports attendance in the seminars in their respective quarterly reports (numbers in parentheses above). Names on these lists were confirmed on several occasions during site visits, and a number of seminar participants were interviewed by the evaluation team. There was to have been a second Customer Relations seminar also in Grenada, but it was postponed due to a previously scheduled CAIC seminar on the same subject, according to BIMAP reports.

The seminars were seen as a positive addition to the offerings of the program by most of those interviewed, particularly many supervisors of those attending. Several supervisors reported positive changes in both attitude and behaviour on the part of those attending. The Customer Relations seminar got consistent and enthusiastic praise from participants. Their responses indicated a very enjoyable as well as educationally worthwhile experience.

Although a number of benefits were reported from the Management and Supervision course, such as opening up new ways of thinking for several of the participants, the seminars were consistently criticized for having an overly lecturing style and lack of small- group, activity-oriented, and discussion-type activities. Participants also reported not feeling comfortable raising issues of seminar style within the seminar itself, though one participant in Grenada said she had stopped the Lecturer for discussion of certain points on a couple of occasions. There were also reports in Dominica of a last minute postponement of the Management and Supervision seminar lowering participation. Participants consistently expressed the desire for more opportunities for training, including specific activities for individual companies.

BIMAP reports disappointment at the low level of the participants in these seminars (mainly clerical) and attributes the need for using lecture style in the Management and Supervision course, and resulting critical reaction, to that fact. Staff also cite the lower level of individuals selected for participation as evidence of a lack of understanding on the part of the managers as to the goals of the program as a whole.

### **3.3.9. RDO/C and BIMAP Coordination**

Interviews data both at BIMAP and RDO/C suggested the absence of full collaboration between these organizations over the time of the project. BIMAP staff reported difficulties in conforming to USAID procedures with regard to financial reporting and monitoring. BIMAP also indicated requests for guidance from RDO/C with regard to related areas which were not responded to for extended periods.

RDO/C staff acknowledge problems on occasion with turn-around time for official correspondence, and report some rigidity and their sense of a lack of commitment on the part of BIMAP to fulfill certain responsibilities of the grant, some of which are included in the grant agreement.

Both groups also report some interpersonal issues as interfering with the efficient resolution of problems, and some frustration over the lack of authority at program levels to make necessary decisions.

There is also evidence of time lags and some lack of clarity between the organizations regarding some administrative areas (e.g. consultant contracting, spending authorization, accounting procedures).

## Appendix I

### The Project and RDO/C Regional Strategy

The Evaluators were asked to utilize the findings from the evaluation process to make some suggestions for the development of longer-run strategy of RDO/C for private sector development in the region. We will attempt to make a contribution to this process, though some limitations in using the evaluation for this purpose should be noted: 1) significant actors who are or would be involved in some strategy options (e.g. CAIC) were not part of the evaluation process; the perceptions and inclinations of these actors are known only through hearsay; 2) the RDO/C strategy for the region is not entirely clear or definite to the Evaluators, in terms specific and current enough to lead to concrete recommendations; however, some documents were reviewed and discussions conducted which have created some level of awareness of some issues and some possible plans. In addition to this short piece some aspects of the Conclusions and Recommendations (in the Executive Summary) also respond to this aspect of the Evaluation Scope of Work.

With this disclaimer, we will try to respond. The goal of such a strategy would appear to be a maximum efficient application of available resources to a specified goal, particularly in a region where needs are far greater than available assistance. The project thus far has been strongest in providing certain types of consulting services to individual clients, weakest in organizing itself to develop a regional infrastructure, to promote, schedule, and support their project activities on a regional basis. A part of the reason for difficulties in this area has been the large amount of uncoordinated systems and services available (or perceived to be available) to potential clients. If RDO/C moves ahead with current plans (under SEAP), to create another, potentially overriding, structure for the promotion and delivery of similar and related services, the task of the project and BIMAP to promote and institutionalize itself in the region as a distinct entity will become significantly more difficult. Some way will need to be found to integrate the project with the new system, if indeed it comes into being. Current relationships and political considerations in the region suggest that the most effective collaborative arrangements, which will make the best use of all available resources, cannot be expected to occur on their own, but must be structured into arrangements with all parties.

BIMAP has a potential contribution to make to whatever system is ultimately decided on. If the process for creating and finalizing the new system is handled sensitively, in a way which takes into account the concerns and interests of all parties, there may be significant support for potential changes even on the part of BIMAP and project staff which allow it to make that contribution in the best way possible.

As stated in the Recommendations of this report, it is the sense of this evaluation that progress already made (particularly in Dominica, Grenada and, perhaps, Grand Cayman) be consolidated, even at the expense of further promotion, and that everything possible be done to ensure that ongoing clients throughout the region are not abandoned. BIMAP will be in a position to build on that base in collaboration with the new system, if a system for doing so is established. BIMAP could be available to respond to requests for its services, which come directly from current or new clients, or from other

sources. Terms for any such collaboration must be worked out and defined clearly by RDO/C and the recommended parties involved. The renegotiation of expectations and timelines between BIMAP and RDO/C can also be used to support the strengths of the project and ensure the maximum integration of all the elements of the system for the immediate and longer range future.

## Appendix II

### Guidelines for Evaluation Interviews

COUNTRY: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF LAISION PERSON: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_ LOCATION: \_\_\_\_\_

DURATION: \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

- o How did you first hear of the project?
- o How useful/needed did you judge the project to be for businesses in the country?
- o What was your response (or the gov't's response) to the requested agreements?
- o Were there aspects of the project design that conflicted with the gov't's (or organization's) policies?

#### ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- o How was this formed?
- o How has this functioned to date?
- o What has been most useful about the committee approach?
- o Can you suggest other ways in which these same functions might be performed more efficiently?

#### BIMAP'S PROMOTION

- o What has BIMAP done to promote interest in the the program and to acquaint interested companies in the services that can be provided?
- o How does the cost of services affect demand? What are companies willing to pay for this kind of assistance?
- o How are BIMAP's services viewed in relation to similar

services available in the region?

#### BIMAP'S IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING AND CONSULTING PROGRAMS

- o Have you gotten any feedback on the activities BIMAP has undertaken in the various companies?

Feedback for example, relative to:

OD

- impact of approach (consulting/training mix)
- sensitivity with which BIMAP helps a company distinguish between its wants and needs

Management Training

- appropriateness of training methodology
- level of material (too high or too low)
- bias from upper management; Can BIMAP be expected to deal with top managers?

Provision of Special US Consultants

- identification of consulting help outside BIMAP

Recommendations for Participant Training

- identification of need for out-of-country training

#### PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- o What is your assessment of progress of the project?
- o What factors would you say have contributed to delays?

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF BIMAP'S ACTIVITIES

What different ways can you suggest for implementing project activities/strategies so as to realize more timely returns?

COUNTRY: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF COMPANY: \_\_\_\_\_ SIZE: S I L

NAME OF EMPLOYEE: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_ LOCATION: \_\_\_\_\_

DURATION: \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### BIMAP'S CONDUCT OF TRAINING AND CONSULTING PROGRAMS

- o What is your overall assessment of the training program?
- o What did you like and/or dislike about the program?

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF TRAINING

- o Is there anything that you can do now that you couldn't do as well (or not at all) before attending the training program?

COUNTRY: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME OF COMPANY: ----- SIZE: S I L

NAME OF MANAGER: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF INTERVIEW: \_\_\_\_\_ LOCATION: \_\_\_\_\_

DURATION: \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### BIMAP'S PROMOTION

- o How did you first hear of the project?
- o What did you find attractive?
- o Did you think the fee was reasonable?
- o Is there a more powerful way of promoting the project?
- o What has BIMAP done to promote interest in the the project and to acquaint interested companies in the services that can be provided?
- o Is cost of services affecting demand? What are companies willing to pay?
- o How are BIMAP's services viewed in relation to similar service available in the region?

#### BIMAP'S IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING AND CONSULTING PROGRAMS

- o What activities has BIMAP undertaken/completed in your company? or, What services has BIMAP provided to you?

If OD,

Are you satisfied that BIMAP has helped you to identify your company's needs?

- impact of approach (consulting/training mix)
- sensitivity with which BIMAP helped the company distinguish between its wants and needs

What changes have come about in the way you do tasks since BIMAP's OD effort?

Can you give any examples of how these changes reflected in the profits or productivity of the company?

If Management Training,

What feedback have you gotten about:

- appropriateness of training methodology
- level of material (too high or too low)?

Are there any noticeable differences in the productivity/efficiency of the employee(s) since completion of BIMAP's management training?

Would you attend a training course conducted by BIMAP for top managers?

What would be your requirements for such a training course?

If Intermediate Enterprise Assistance,

... questions similar to those under OD and management training ...

Have you ever expressed a need to BIMAP for special US consultants? Has BIMAP identified this as a need in your company?

Has anyone in your company been recommended for out-of-country training by BIMAP? Have you ever made a request to BIMAP for such training?

#### PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

- o What is your assessment of progress of BIMAP's activities in your company?
- o What factors would you say have contributed to delays?

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF BIMAP'S ACTIVITIES

- o Are you satisfied with the returns on your investment?
- o How would you rate the value of the services your company has received?

- o Would you recommend BIMAP's services under this project to other company heads?
- o Do you other company heads who are participating in the program or who have been approached by BIMAP? What feedback have you gotten from them about the program?
- o Can you suggest different ways for implementing project activities/strategies?

Appendix III

Persons Contacted

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>COMPANY/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
GRENADA	Mrs. Roy Defreitas	Roydon Guest House	Owner/Manager
	Mr. Austin James	Tectron	Manager/Part Owner
	Ms. Jenni Killum	Chamber of Commerce	Executive Director
	Mrs. Myra Wilson	Ecstasy Garments	Owner/Manager
	Matthew Theodore Simpson	Simpson's Muffler Service	Owner/Manager
	Alston Johnson	Johnson's Sportswear	Owner/Manager
	Marva James	Business Eye	Secretary/Asst. Manager
	Leslie Byer	Glean's Garage	Director/(Board) Secretary
	Merle Byer	Glean's Garage	General Assistant
	Pamela Steele	Ministry of Agriculture (formerly Min. of Finance/ Training Division)	Sen. Asst. Secretary
Mr. Fred Toppin	Jonas, Brown & Hubbard	Managing Director	
ST. VINCENT	Alice Cecille Richards	Chamber of Commerce	Manager
	Randy Cato	Ministry of Finance	Director of Planning
	Samuel Goodluck	The Development Corporation	(Chairman of the Board of Directors)
DOMINICA	Romualda Hyacinth	J.A.S. Garraway	Secretary
	Pat Inglis	Bank Francaise Dom. Chamber of Commerce	Manager President
	Hubert Charles	Ministry of Education	Permanent Secretary
	Cheryl Rolle	Dominica Association of Industry & Commerce	Executive Secretary

10/21

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>COMPANY/ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
<b>DOMINICA</b>	Curtis R. T. Tonge	Tonge Inc.	General Manager
	Rosie E. Mills	Busy Bee	Sales Manager
	Hector Blackman	Busy Bee	Managing Director
	Patrick A. Rolle	J.S. Garraway	Manager
	Myrtle Soloman	Dom. Broadcasting Corporation	General Manager
	Julietta Pascal	Dom. Broadcasting Corporation	Sales Manager
	Jack M. Astaphan	J. Astaphan & Co. Ltd.	Controller
	J. Anthony White	Tropical Printers	General Manager
	Edison James	Dom. Banana Marketing Corporation	General Manager
	Deidre Riviere	Photo One Services	Photographer/ Assistant Manager
<b>ANTIGUA</b>	Wrenford D. Ferrence	National Defence Foundation (formerly Antigua Chamber of Commerce)	Executive Director (Executive Director)
	Lionel Boulos	Antigua Chamber of Commerce	Executive Director
	Peter John Harker	Sealy Mattress Company Antigua Ltd. Antigua & Barbuda Manufacturers' Assoc.	Managing Director President
	Paul Sudolski	George W. Bennett, Bryson & Co. Ltd.	Managing Director
	Clarence Edwards	Antigua Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism and Energy	Permanent Secretary
<b>GRAND CAYMAN</b>	Bill Adam	Hobbies and Books (formerly Grand Cayman Chamber of Commerce)	Owner/Manager (President)
	James Terry	Villa Caribe	Owner/Manager
	Herbert Martin	Martex Bakery	Owner/Manager
	James Murry Hurlston	Murry's Enterprises	Owner/Manager
	Mrs. V. N. Scott	Champion House Restaurant	Owner/Manager
	Cresswell Powery	K C Variety Store, K C Laundermat & K C Apartments	Owner/Manager
	Hon. W. Norman Bodden M.B.E.	Cayman Islands Government	Executive Council Member Portfolio of Tourism, Aviation and Trade

64

Rudolph Gibbons	BIMAP	Executive Trustee
Lawrence Byer	BIMAP	Project Coordinator
Ivan Watson	BIMAP	Senior Management Counsellor
John Rudder	BIMAP	Senior Management Counsellor
Hallam Taylor	BIMAP	Management Counsellor
Michael Small	BIMAP	Management Counsellor
Mary Austin	BIMAP	Administrative Officer
Stafford Griffith	USAID	Project Officer
Peter Orr	USAID	Chief of the Project Development and Management Division
Kim Finan	USAID	Chief of the Project Development Division
Holly Weiss	USAID	Chief of the Health, Population and Education Division
Darwin Clarke	USAID	Evaluation Specialist
Elizabeth Warfield	USAID	Project Backstop Officer

## Appendix IV

### Acknowledgements

On behalf of the evaluation team, I would like to express my appreciation to BIMAP staff for their cooperation during this process. The project staff made themselves readily available throughout, to share information and discuss the many complex aspects of implementation. The project coordinator, Lawrence Byer, and others spent time and energy to help with the many logistical arrangements necessary for the process to take place. Administrative officer Mary Austin responded to the many additional administrative demands of incorporating the evaluation into the BIMAP system. I would like to express special thanks to Ms. Joan Harris for her extra assistance and support, on occasion late into the night, and to Cheryl Holder and Andy Simmons for their special help at the end of our visit in preparing the draft. I would also like to express my appreciation to Stafford Griffith for his guidance and to him and others at the mission for their support and openness in working with the evaluators during this sometimes complex exercise.