



UNITED NATIONS



Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean  
Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean

---

Training workshop on the use of the MAGIC Plus  
and Trade CAN 2009 software  
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago  
19-20 October 2009

Distr. LIMITED  
LC/CAR/L.240  
17 December 2009  
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**EVALUATION REPORT OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP ON THE USE OF THE  
MODULE TO ANALYSE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE (MAGIC  
PLUS) AND THE COMPETITIVE ANALYSIS OF NATIONS (TRADECAN 2009)  
SOFTWARE**

---

This report has been reproduced without formal editing.



## Table of contents

Introduction.....	1
Details of the evaluation .....	2
Demographics of the participants.....	2
General opinion of the course.....	2
Design and contents of the course .....	2
Training material .....	3
Impact of the course .....	3
Administration of the course .....	3
Professors .....	4
Environment of the course .....	4
Other comments and suggestions received from open-ended questions.....	5
Annex IL List of participants.....	7
Annex II: Programme .....	9
Annex III: Data table .....	11



# **EVALUATION REPORT OF THE TRAINING WORKSHOP ON THE USE OF THE MODULE TO ANALYSE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE (MAGIC PLUS) AND THE COMPETITIVE ANALYSIS OF NATIONS (TRADECAN 2009) SOFTWARE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, and secretariat of the Caribbean Development Cooperation Committee (CDCC) convened a training workshop on the use of the module to analyze growth of international commerce (MAGIC Plus) and the competitive analysis of nations (Trade CAN 2009) software, two robust and versatile packages for analyzing trade performance. The workshop was held in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago on 19-20 October 2009.

The aim of the workshop was to provide a functional overview of the software package, to enable participants to use the software in order to inform more evidence-based trade strategies, and build capacity for researchers and trade negotiators to provide more rigorous, analytical policy research to inform future trade negotiations. Participants came from the ministries of trade of the following CDCC member countries: Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago. Representatives of the following regional institutions were represented: the Caribbean Community/Caribbean Regional Negotiating Mechanism (CARICOM/CRNM); the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS); the University of Guyana, University of Suriname and the University of the West Indies (UWI). It was hoped the workshop would be a stepping stone towards more advanced trade analysis training. The list of participants appears as Annex I.

## **DETAILS OF THE EVALUATION**

### **Demographics of the participants**

Of the 12 participants that submitted an evaluation form at the end of the workshop, both men and women comprised 50%, respectively. The participants came from the public sector, non-governmental organizations and academic institutions, with the public sector accounting for 58.3% of participants. Regional universities collectively accounted for 33.3% of participants, and non-governmental organizations accounted 8.3%.

### **General opinion of the course**

Respondents were asked to give their opinion of the course on a scale on 1 to 10, with 1 being bad and 10 being very good.

The respondents rated the course as a generally good one, with 75% of respondents giving a rating of between 7 and 10. The highest frequency rating received was 8, by 33.3% of the respondents.

Respondents were also asked if the course had met their initial expectations on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 little and 10 representing fully. The ratings for this question were distributed more evenly, as the spread of choices ranged from 3 to 10. Options 5, 6, 7 and 8 out of 10 were chosen by 16.6% of respondents. Because most people chose mid to high values, it was inferred that the course generally met initial expectations. Also, while 25% of the participants found the time frame for the course appropriate, 66.6% indicated that the time frame was inadequate, and 8.3% even felt the timeframe was too long.

### **Design and contents of the course**

Respondents were asked to rate the design and contents of the course on a scale on 1 to 10 with 1 being bad and 10, representing very good.

Opinion was also diverse concerning the sequence and integration of subjects for the course. While 58.3% gave a rating of between 6 to 10, sequencing and integration could be considered successful, however, a significant portion, 41.7%, gave a rating between 1 and 5. Choices ranged from 3 to 9, with the options 5 and 8 receiving 25% each of responses.

Concerning time distribution among subjects, 66.6% of the respondents gave a rating of between 6 to 10, with the modal score being 7, which was chosen by 33.3% of the respondents. Only 33.3% of respondents rated time distribution from 1 to 5, so timing could be considered successful.

Respondents felt that the subject was covered in depth, as a score of between 7 to 10 was given by 83.3%. The modal score of 7 was chosen by 41.7% of respondents. Only 16.6% gave a rating between 1 to 5.

Respondents also felt that theory and practice were balanced well in the course, with 83.3% of responses between 6 and 10. The modal score was 7, which was chosen by 33% of participants, though 25% chose 6, and only 16.6% of participants rated the question from 1 to 5.

The diversity in the teaching methods was felt to be good, as 72.7% gave a rating of between 6 and 10. Once again, the modal score was 7, which was chosen by 40%. Only 27.3% of participants rated the question between 1 and 5.

The quality of topics was held in good regard by participants as 91% of the respondents rated the question between 6 and 10. No one rated the question below 5, and the modal score was 9, chosen by 27% of respondents.

Concerning topic length, 91% of respondents rated the question between 6 and 10, with only one participant (9%) giving a rating of 3 out of 10. These results could be interpreted as favourable. The scores of 6 and 7 were chosen by 27% of respondents.

Again, 91% of the participants found that in general the topics taught were relevant, as this amount of respondents rated the question between 6 and 10. The modal scores were 8 and 9 which were each chosen by 27% of respondents. A single respondent (9%) gave the rating 4 out of 10.

The distribution of responses concerning difficulty of topic was fairly even, with 30% feeling the themes were simple, 30% regarding them as difficult and 40% regarding them as complex.

None of the participants fully knew of the information given in the course beforehand, though 63.6% of respondents had partial knowledge of what they received in the course; 36.4% saw or received the information for the first time.

### **Training material**

Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which the training material was helpful as well as useful, on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being poor and 10 representing very good.

The majority of respondents (63.6%) found the training material to be helpful, as they rated the question between 6 and 10. The modal score was 8, chosen by 27% of respondents. A significant percentage of 36.3%, however, gave a rating between 1 and 5. It was noteworthy that 18.2% of respondents gave the question a rating of 100%.

The majority of respondents felt the training material was useful to their current work, as 81.8% of them rated the question between 6 and 10. The modal score was 7, chosen by 27% of respondents. Only 18.2% of respondents rated the question between 1 and 5 on the scale. It was noteworthy that 36.4% of respondents rated this question in the range of 9 to 10.

### **Impact of the course**

Respondents were asked to rate the impact of the course by looking at a number of factors, such as the applicability to their current work; the improvement in the quality of their work; as well as provision of more knowledge about methodologies and instruments and new ideas and concepts. Respondents had to rate these factors on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 representing little and 10 representing fully.

Respondents were asked to rate how the course would improve the quality of their work. A rating of 6 to 10 was given by 83.3% of participants who thought that the course provided them with more information, with 8, 9 and 10 being the modal scores for 25% of respondents. Only one respondent gave a rating of 4.

When asked if the course provided them with more knowledge about methodologies and instruments, 83.3% of respondents gave a rating between 6 and 10. The modal score was 10. Only 16.6% of respondents replied in the range of 1 to 5.

Concerning whether the course provided new ideas or concepts, 91.7% of respondents answered in the range of 6 to 10. The modal score was 9, which received from 25% of responses. A single respondent gave an answer in the range of 1 to 5.

### **Administration of the course**

Respondents were asked their opinion specifically about the administration of the course and they had to rate certain aspects on a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 representing bad, and 10 representing very good.

Respondents felt that support from the personnel of the course was generally good, with 91.7% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. It may be noteworthy that the modal score was 10, from

33.3% of respondents, and that a sole participant offered a score of 4, which was the only score in the range of 1 to 5.

Regarding use of equipment, respondents felt that it was generally good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. The modal score was 6, from 33.3% of responses, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

Participants felt that the workshop environment was generally good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. The modal score was 7, with 25% of responses, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

### **Professors**

Participants were asked to rate the facilitators on a scale of 1 to 10 with 1 being bad and 10, representing very good.

Respondents felt that support from the facilitators were very good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. The modal score, however, was 10 from 33.3% of respondents, and 16.6% scored in the range of 1 to 5.

### **Environment of the course**

Respondents were asked to rate the general environment of the course on a scale on 1 to 10 with 1 representing little and 10 representing fully.

Respondents felt that their involvement in the course was generally good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10. It was noteworthy that the modal score was 9, from 50% of respondents. However, 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

Respondents felt that points of view could be expressed easily, with 91.7% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. It was noteworthy that the modal score was 10, from 33.3% of respondents, and that only one participant offered a score of 5, which was the only score in the range of 1 to 5.

Respondents also felt that cooperation in group activities was good, with 91.7% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. Again, the modal score was 10, from 33.3% of respondents, and again, a single participant offered a score of 5, which was the only score in the range of 1 to 5.

When asked whether the activities in the course were productive, 91.7% of participants responded in the range of 6 to 10. This was further corroborated by the fact that the modal scores were 9 and 10 from 33.3%, equally, of respondents. Only 8.3% of respondents gave a score in the range of 1 to 5.

Participants felt that the topic was presented in a generally clear manner, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. The modal score was 9, from 25% of respondents, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

Concerning the topics covered in the course, participants felt they were generally good, evidenced by 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10 on the scale. The modal score was 9, from 33.3% of respondents, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.



Respondents felt that the ability of the facilitator to motivate them was generally good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10. The modal score was 8, from 50% of respondents, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

It was felt that the knowledge of teaching methods was generally good, with 83.3% of responses ranging from 6 to 10. The modal score was 9, from 33.3% of respondents, and 16.6% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

Finally, respondents felt that the ability of the facilitators to maintain interpersonal relationships, empathize and listen was generally good, with 91.7% of responses ranging from 6 to 10. The modal score was 8, from 41.7% of respondents, and 8.3% of responses scored in the range of 1 to 5.

## **OTHER COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS RECEIVED FROM OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

### **1. Aspects of the course that were most liked**

- (a) The practical aspects of the training allowed participants valuable hands-on experience.
- (b) The discourse on trade and competitiveness was described as rich.
- (c) TRADECAN's feature on specialization was innovative
- (d) Presenters were clear and concise.
- (e) The material was new and applicable to the work of some participants.

### **2. Aspects of the course least liked**

- (a) The main training materials were in Spanish, which was not the host country's language.
- (b) Multiple power and WLAN failures caused excessive delays on day one
- (c) There was not enough software CDs for all participants
- (d) MAGIC Plus had a serious limitation in that it only used the United States trade data as a reference base
- (e) There were too few practical exercises.

### **3. Suggestions for improving the course**

- (a) The training material should be in English and should be provided in advance
- (b) More time should be allocated for practice with the software
- (c) Presenters should ensure compatibility of the software with operating systems
- (d) There was a need to find a more adequate venue
- (e) There should be better preparation and contingency planning

## CONCLUSIONS

The course was generally well received with 72% of responses falling within the range of 7-10. The section of the questionnaire on the course's impact on the applicability and quality of participants' work received the most favourable ratings, with 83% of responses falling within the range of 7-10. The section on the participants' general opinion of the course was the least well received, specifically with regard to whether the course had met participants' initial expectations. Only 58% of responses fell within the range of 7-10 for this section.

Though the Spanish language training materials, software compatibility issues and multiple power outages at the venue initially hindered the proceedings, participants described the software as innovative and appreciated the opportunity to be exposed to practical uses for such a package. The discussions concerning trade and competitiveness were considered to be rewarding and the material was applicable to many participants' work.

## Annex I

### **List of participants**

#### **DOMINICA**

Mr. Eisenhower J. Douglas, Director of Trade, Ministry of Trade, Industry, Consumer and Diaspora Affairs, Government Headquarters, Roseau. Tel: 767-266-3266/3276; Fax: 767-448-5200; E-mail: [foreigntrade@cwdom.dm](mailto:foreigntrade@cwdom.dm) and [salguo2004@yahoo.com](mailto:salguo2004@yahoo.com)

#### **GRENADA**

Mr. Mervin Gene Haynes, Director Economic and Technical Cooperation, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economy, Financial Complex, St. George's. Tel: 473-440-2928/9480 or 473-435-8889; Fax: 473-440-4115; E-mail: [mervin.haynes@gov.gd](mailto:mervin.haynes@gov.gd) or [haynesgene@gmail.com](mailto:haynesgene@gmail.com)

#### **JAMAICA**

Ms. Joan T. Harris, Ag. Senior Director – Policy and Planning, Ministry of Industry, Investment and Commerce, 4 St Lucia Avenue, Kingston 5. Tel: 876-926-8488; E-mail: [jharris@miic.gov.jm](mailto:jharris@miic.gov.jm)

#### **SAINT LUCIA**

Ms Nadia Wells Hyacinth, Director, Investment, Ministry of Commerce, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Heraldine Rock Building, Waterfront, Castries. Tel: 758-463-4291/453-7295; Fax: 758-453-7314; E-mail: [nwells@gosl.gov.lc](mailto:nwells@gosl.gov.lc)

Mr. Peter Lorde, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Heraldine Rock Building, Waterfront, Castries. Tel: 758-468-4204; Fax: 758-453-7347; E-mail: [pelorde@gosl.gov.lc](mailto:pelorde@gosl.gov.lc)  
[peterlorde1959@yahoo.com](mailto:peterlorde1959@yahoo.com)

#### **SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS**

Mr. Charleton Ersdale Edwards, Trade Policy Officer, Ministry of International Trade, Basseterre. Tel: 869-465-2521; E-mail: [cepe1660@hotmail.com](mailto:cepe1660@hotmail.com)

#### **SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES**

Mr. Clarence Harry, Director of Trade, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Commerce and Trade, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Administrative Centre, Kingstown. Tel: 784-456-2442; Fax: 784-456-2610; E-mail: [clarenceharry@hotmail.com](mailto:clarenceharry@hotmail.com)

#### **TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

Ms Jeaniffer Flament, Statistical Officer III (Ag.), Ministry of Trade and Industry, Level 14, Nicholas Towers, #63-65 Independence Square, Port of Spain. Tel: 868-623-2931/4 ext. 2138; Fax: 868-624-9594; Email: [jflament@tradeind.gov.tt](mailto:jflament@tradeind.gov.tt)

Ms Julie David, Research Specialist, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Level 14, Nicholas Towers, #63-65 Independence Square, Port of Spain. Tel: 868-623-2931/4 ext. 2049; Fax: 868-624-9594; Email: [jdavid@tradeind.gov.tt](mailto:jdavid@tradeind.gov.tt)

## Regional institutions

### **Caribbean Regional Negotiating Mechanism/Caribbean Community (CRNM/CARICOM)**

Ms. Carol Lynch, Trade Data Expert, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Speedbird House, 11 Independence Square, Bridgetown, Barbados. Tel: 246-430-1670/79; Fax: 246-228-9528; E-mail: [carol.lynch@crnm.org](mailto:carol.lynch@crnm.org)

### **Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)**

Mr. Damien Sorhaindo, Business Development Officer, OECS Export Development Unit, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Financial Centre, Kennedy Avenue, Roseau, Dominica. Tel: 767-448-2240; Fax: 767-448-5554; E-mail: [dsorhaindo@oecs.org](mailto:dsorhaindo@oecs.org)

### **University of Guyana**

Ms Dianna Abiola Da Silva, Researcher I, Institute of Development Studies, P.O. Box 101110, Turkeyuen, Greater Georgetown,. Tel: 592-222-5409; Fax: 592-222-5551; E-mail: [diannabiola@yahoo.com](mailto:diannabiola@yahoo.com)

### **University of Suriname**

Ms. Sieglien Burleson, Lecturer, Company and Trade Law, Leysweg 79, University Complex, Paramaribo, Suriname. Tel: 597-871-2972/465-558 ext 383; Fax: 597-494-993; E-mail: [s.burleson@uvs.edu](mailto:s.burleson@uvs.edu)

### **University of the West Indies (UWI)**

Mr. Jeremy Haynes, Research Assistant, Sustainable Economic Development Unit (SEDU), Department of Economics, St Augustine Campus, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. Tel: 868-297-8689; Fax: 868-662-6555; E-mail: [jeremyanhaynes@gmail.com](mailto:jeremyanhaynes@gmail.com)

Mr. Neil C. A. Paul, Manager, Research and Development, Shridath Ramphal Centre for International Trade Law, Policy and Services, Cave Hill Campus, P.O. Box 64, Bridgetown Barbados. Tel: 246-417-4533; Fax: 246-425-1348; E-mail: [neil.paul@cavehill.uwi.edu](mailto:neil.paul@cavehill.uwi.edu)

## Secretariat

### **Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)**

**ECLAC Headquarters**, Dag Hammarskjold 3477, Vitacura, Santiago, Chile. Tel: 562-210-2000/471-2000; Fax: 562-208-0252/1946

Mr. Rene Hernandez, Economic Affairs Officer, E-mail: [rene.hernandez@cepal.org](mailto:rene.hernandez@cepal.org)

**Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean**, 1 Chancery Lane, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. Tel: 868-623-5595; Fax: 868-623-8485

Mr. Neil Pierre, Director, E-mail: [Neil.Pierre@eclac.org](mailto:Neil.Pierre@eclac.org)

Mr. Dillon Alleyne, Economic Affairs Officer, E-mail: [Dillon.Alleyne@eclac.org](mailto:Dillon.Alleyne@eclac.org)

Mr. Roberto Machado, Economic Affairs Officer, E-mail: [Roberto.Machado@eclac.org](mailto:Roberto.Machado@eclac.org)

**Subregional Headquarters in Mexico**, Av. Presidente Masaryk 29, Colonia Chapultepec Morales, Del Miguel Hidalgo, Mexico, Distrito Federal, CP. 11570. Tel: 5255-5263-9711; Fax: 5255-5531-1151

Ms. Indira Romero Marquez, Research Assistant, E-mail: [indira.romero@cepal.org](mailto:indira.romero@cepal.org)

Annex II

**PROGRAMME**

**DAY 1: MONDAY 19 OCTOBER 2009**

8:30 am Registration

9:00 am Opening remarks  
*Mr. Neil Pierre – Director, ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean*

**SESSION I**

9:10 am A methodological introduction to export competitiveness and measurement techniques  
*Mr. René A. Hernández – ECLAC*

10:15 am Coffee break

10:30 am The Trade CAN 2009 and MAGIC Plus methodology: The shift share analysis  
*Mr. René Hernández – ECLAC*

01:00 pm Lunch

**SESSION II**

2:30 pm MAGIC Plus indicators: volume, country share, market share, unit value, relative unit value, specialization, actual duty, duty rate, decomposition of change, product qualification  
*Ms. Indira Romero – ECLAC*

3:30 pm Coffee break

3:45 pm Examples and exercises

5:30 pm End of Session II

## DAY 2: TUESDAY 20 OCTOBER 2009

### SESSION I

- 9:10 a.m      Trade CAN 2009 indicators: market share, specialization, percentage of imports, percentage of exports, market share relative to a rival  
*Mr. René A. Hernández – ECLAC*
- 10:15 am      Coffee break
- 10:30 am      Examples and exercises  
*Ms. Indira Romero – ECLAC*
- 01:00 pm      Lunch

### SESSION II

- 2:30 pm      The competitiveness matrix, the adaptability index and the index of technological specialization  
*Mr. René A. Hernández – ECLAC*
- 3:30 pm      Coffee break
- 3:45 pm      The construction of a country's competitiveness profile based on Sanjaya Lall's classification of technological content of exports  
*Ms. Indira Romero – ECLAC*
- 5:30 pm      Wrap - up and closing remarks  
*Mr. Neil Pierre, Director, ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean*  
*Mr. René A. Hernández – ECLAC*



<b>VII.</b>										
Q1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3	4
<b>VIII.</b>										
Q1a.	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	6	1
Q1b.	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	4
Q1c.	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3	4
Q1d.	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	4
Q1e.	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	2
Q1f.	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	4	2
Q1g.	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	2	1
Q1h.	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	4	1
Q1i.	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	2	2