

ECLAC/UNIFEM/CIDA Expert Group
Meeting on Capacity Building in Gender
Analysis for Economic Planners in the Caribbean
6-7 December 2004
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago

LIMITED
LC/CAR/L.40
23 May 2005
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**REPORT OF THE ECLAC/UNIFEM/CIDA EXPERT GROUP
MEETING ON CAPACITY BUILDING IN GENDER ANALYSIS FOR
ECONOMIC PLANNERS IN THE CARIBBEAN**

Table of Contents

Agenda item 1: Welcome and opening	1
Agenda item 2: Background	2
Agenda item 3: Needs assessment of economic planning units in gender analysis in selected Caribbean countries.....	3
Agenda item 4: Identification of continuing education needs of economists in the Caribbean and the implications for gender	8
Agenda item 5: Experiences of gender and macroeconomics training	10
Agenda item 6: Mapping the curriculum content	12
Agenda item 7: Developing a work plan for module development and implementation	14
Agenda item 8: Any other business.....	14
Agenda item 9: Closure of the meeting	14
Annex: List of participants	15

REPORT OF THE ECLAC/UNIFEM/CIDA EXPERT GROUP MEETING ON CAPACITY BUILDING IN GENDER ANALYSIS FOR ECONOMIC PLANNERS IN THE CARIBBEAN

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean/Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee (CDCC) in collaboration with the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) Gender Equality Programme convened a meeting of experts to consider the findings of a needs assessment of economic planning units in gender analysis of selected Caribbean countries and to develop a training agenda for economic planners with the aim of incorporating gender into macroeconomic policy and economic planning.

The need for macroeconomic policies in the subregion which are compatible with the goals of gender equality is articulated in the Port of Spain Consensus adopted at the Third Caribbean Ministerial Conference on Women (1999) and is implicit in many of the recommendations of the Fourth Caribbean Ministerial Conference on Women (2004). The issue is also addressed in the Beijing Platform for Action which urges governments to review, adopt and maintain macroeconomic policies and development strategies that address the needs of women in poverty, and restated in the Outcome Document of the twenty-third United Nations General Assembly Special Session, "Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace" (the Beijing +5 review).

In order to assist Caribbean governments to meet these commitments, and following the recommendations of an ECLAC/CDCC expert meeting on gender and macroeconomics, the ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat developed a Gender and Macroeconomic Policies Project. The first phase of the project comprised two main activities: a needs assessment of economic planning units in the Caribbean to do gender analysis and an expert group meeting on capacity building in gender analysis for economic planners in the Caribbean. This report reflects the proceedings of that meeting.

The meeting was convened from 6-7 December 2004, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago and experts were drawn from a cross-section of regional institutions, national level institutions, United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The list of participants is annexed to this report.

Agenda item 1: Welcome and opening

Mr. Rudolf Buitelaar, Officer-in Charge, welcomed participants on behalf of the ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat. He thanked UNIFEM for its contribution in making the meeting possible and also thanked CIDA for its financial support of the Needs Assessment. In reviewing the objectives of the meeting, Mr. Buitelaar noted that macroeconomic policies in the subregion had failed to recognize women's substantive

contribution to economic development. The lack of integration of a gender perspective in macroeconomic policy that would take account of the relationship between women's empowerment and their access to resources meant that many women continued to remain on the fringes of the economy. He stated that it was particularly important for macroeconomic planning to take into account women's unpaid and caring work in families and communities since it was through this unpaid "reproductive labour" that women created and replenished much of the social capital that kept economies functioning well. Women performed this unpaid work almost exclusively which resulted in their exclusion from opportunities to develop their full potential and therefore to participate equally in development. From a gender equality perspective, incorporation of gender analysis in the formulation of economic policy would also guide economic planners in anticipating how reforms would impact on relations between men and women. The implementation of gender equitable macroeconomic policies, especially those that included overarching aims such as poverty reduction, social development and economic growth should be with a view to both equality of access to resources and to combating the effects of existing gender inequality and inequity in Caribbean society.

Mr. Buitelaar highlighted the importance of the needs assessment in advancing the Gender and Macroeconomic Policy Project and, more specifically, its usefulness in providing the context for the meeting's deliberations. He also stressed the need for continuing inter-agency collaboration and concluded by wishing participants a successful meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Background

Ms. Roberta Clarke, Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM, outlined the efforts of the ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat and UNIFEM thus far in fulfilling the mandate of developing gender-sensitive approaches to macroeconomic policy formulation in the Caribbean. She further noted that emerging empirical data in the Caribbean supported the need for such approaches. Studies had shown for example, that women and men had differential access to land and capital. Census data also revealed that the economic position of women in the labour force was inferior to that of men. In addition, households headed by women tended to have the lowest incomes. A "social infrastructure" that was predicated upon assumed roles of women in relationships, and more particularly their reproductive roles, led to women taking lower paying jobs and being more prone to poverty.

She stressed that the concept of "gender neutral economics" was neither possible nor desirable, since in many instances economic decisions were predicated upon the role that women and men played in the society. A striking example of this might be seen in the export processing zones. One of the factors of their 'success' was a recognition by investors that women accepted lower wages to assure maintenance of their families and so investors were assured of a labour supply, while young men, whose masculinity was tied up with their earning capacities preferred to stay idle rather than engage in such employment. Structural adjustment policies which took a

disproportionate toll on social services also intuitively assumed that females would somehow maintain the essential stability of familial structures threatened by the reduction of social benefits.

A “blindness” or indifference to the role of women in the development of the economy could lead to policies which perpetuated or created inequity between men and women. A recent example of this was seen in Grenada after the devastation wrought by Hurricane Ivan: aid and donor agencies were anxious to provide jobs in the construction and other sectors which were male-dominated, despite the fact that 45% of the households in Grenada were female-headed. Gender analysis was important therefore in efforts to promote equity planning and alleviate poverty.

Ms. Clarke noted, however, that research was still needed to show precisely how mainstream economics and gender could be integrated. Economic policies had eroded women’s livelihoods in ways which had yet not been made visible and this had particular relevance in the context of the upcoming Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Single Market and Economy (CSME). This was revealed for example in a recent UNIFEM review of an earlier ECLAC study which focused on women traders in the Caribbean. The review sought to determine the impact of the CSME on women traders in the Caribbean but what emerged was that these traders who had provided much needed social and economic support for their families, and who moved goods throughout the Caribbean islands had practically vanished, due to the changing economic policies and climate.

Ms. Clarke concluded by pointing to the necessity of a training agenda to assist in incorporating gender analysis into economic planning /macroeconomic policies and to build capacity within countries to carry out adequate gender studies. She also reiterated the need for continuing collaboration among the agencies and other partners both within and outside the region in advancing the project.

Agenda item 3: Needs assessment of economic planning units in gender analysis in selected Caribbean countries

Ms. Marsha Caddle, Consultant, presented the main findings and conclusions of the Needs Assessment which she carried out on behalf of the ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat. The assessment was done in Belize, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago and St Vincent and the Grenadines. Although it was a relatively small sample, she pointed out that the four countries nevertheless represented a diverse range of economic conditions. She also explained that the selection of Belize and Suriname was also influenced by the fact that gender budgeting exercises had been undertaken in these countries.

The research methodology involved interviews with key resource persons in each of the four countries including economists, planners, directors and ministers from planning, finance, and other strategic ministries; central banks; universities; the national

women's machineries; and relevant NGOs. The process also involved a review of government policy documents and of the literature on gender and macroeconomic policy in the subregion. The assessment considered the extent to which the countries under study had sought to integrate gender into macroeconomic planning and the institutional, human resource and attitudinal factors that facilitated or hindered such integration. The study therefore sought to answer the following questions:

- (a) What, for each country under study, was involved in integrating gender into macroeconomic policy?
- (b) What were the organizations or institutions which supported or could potentially support the work of the economic planning units and their capacity to lend such support?
- (c) What opportunities for integration of gender were provided by the institutional framework in which policy was developed?
- (d) What was the gap between the attitudes, levels of technical skill and theoretical knowledge required for the integration of gender into macroeconomic planning, and those observed in the countries under study?
- (e) Would training be sufficient to effect some substantial improvement in the way gender was currently integrated into planning processes and, if so, what general recommendations could be made for the design of such training?

For each country under study, therefore, Ms Caddle outlined the background issues, an analysis of the institutional framework within which macroeconomic planning was undertaken, an analysis of the capacity of these institutions to support the integration of gender into macroeconomic policy and specific recommendations. She also presented some general recommendations.

The findings of the study pointed to a systematic absence of gender analysis in macroeconomic policy formulation and, in some cases, the absence of a clearly defined planning machinery to support the integration of social and economic planning processes. In addition, awareness of the need to consider the gender and other social content of macroeconomic policies, as reflected in official documents, did not translate into policy. As such, planning remained a largely financial exercise based more on historical monetary values than on informed socio-economic research. Nevertheless, the study found that there were promising foundations on which efforts to integrate gender into macroeconomic policy could be built. These entry points ranged from efforts to collect time-use data (as in Trinidad and Tobago) to the construction of a gender sensitive social accounting matrix (as in Suriname).

A further finding was that generally, with the exception of Suriname (and to a lesser extent Trinidad and Tobago), both planning units and organizations which might potentially provide support lacked the capacity to mainstream gender into

macroeconomic planning. The need for training in basic concepts of the social construction of gender and the interaction of gender and the economy was evident. A need for country-specific training in gender budget analysis was also identified. It was posited, however, that given the difficulties in capacity being experienced by economic planning units and related institutions in the subregion, as an initial priority, focus should be placed on gender aware allocations of public expenditure within the budget process.

The study also highlighted the trend in the subregion to separate the issue of international trade negotiations from everyday macroeconomic planning and financial management. This separation resulted in planning being undertaken without consideration of all the factors which impacted upon economic and social well-being. Further, the broad reorientation of government resources towards the 'productive' sectors in light of trade policies demonstrated a lack of recognition of the productive nature of reproductive work and compromised economic growth and well-being. These issues needed to be borne in mind when designing a regional training programme in gender and macroeconomics.

Key recommendations of the study included:

(a) A need to build the capacity of economic planners in gender analysis. This ought to be based on country contexts to allow for the theories being presented to be grounded in the institutional and economic realities of each country and for participants to appreciate the relevance of their respective positions in bringing about any structural changes necessary to the functioning of their organizations and to the overall goal of creating an economy which operated to the benefit of all actors.

(b) Alternatively, training could take place at a regional level. Such training should be designed around the different public expenditure management systems represented in the subregion. Generalized training based solely on theoretical principles would not go far in changing the gender-blindness of current systems of budget formulation.

(c) A need for institutional strengthening and reform to support the integration of gender into macroeconomic policy. This related particularly to macroeconomic processes, government structures and supporting institutions and organizations. For instance, linkages between the economic planning departments and the departments responsible for women's/gender affairs were weak and needed to be built or strengthened.

(d) Countries should be encouraged to pull all economic planning processes into a transparent and unified activity whose centre was the national budget. Capacity building should focus as a matter of initial priority on public expenditures within the national budget, with emphasis being placed on the integration of the technical exercise of financial planning and other processes such as multi-annual development plans and macroeconomic modeling; and

(e) Regular internal training exercises that included the participation of NGOs and civil society for maintaining the importance of gender analysis in both the economic planning units as well as the line ministries should be implemented.

Roundtable discussion

In discussing the findings of the Needs Assessment, a number of issues and challenges facing a project of engendering macroeconomic policy in the Caribbean were raised.

Much discussion focused on the political will needed to facilitate the incorporation of gender analysis into macroeconomic policy and planning. Even though the findings of the Needs Assessment showed that there was some measure of political will at the institutional level, this was nevertheless needed at the highest levels of policy-making in order to bring about the fundamental shift that was required. In this regard, the meeting agreed that consensus building among key policy makers was of critical importance and creative methodologies needed to be developed for achieving such consensus. For example, the economic and efficiency benefits of mainstreaming gender into macroeconomic policy ought to be made visible and incorporated into the consensus building process.

Allocation of resources to facilitate gender mainstreaming and collection of relevant data would also be problematic in the absence of political will. Allocation of resources often depended on priorities established by the government and these did not always coincide with development priorities. A rigid system of line budgeting in most Caribbean countries also made it difficult to introduce new line items such as allocations for the conduct of research on gender and sex-disaggregated data. The case might be made that gender analysis could lead to greater efficiency and better targeting, but the countervailing force was the bureaucratic approach to budget expenditure whereby historically ministries tended to be judged less on their efficiency and more on whether they operated within their budget. Ministries also generally lacked the capacity to deal with new programmes, and the experience in the Caribbean was that gender mainstreaming was not accorded priority despite international and regional commitments. Another example of this was seen in the lack of an implementing framework for the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), notwithstanding that all countries in the Caribbean had signed on to the MDGs.

The meeting felt that despite these constraints, it was nevertheless important to understand the political process in each country and to use the opportunities provided to accelerate the assimilation of gender analysis and mainstreaming into all government policies, including macroeconomic policy. Gender mainstreaming needed to be viewed as a tool to complement the macroeconomic framework, making it more efficient, directed and holistic. This framework facilitated the re-ordering of priorities in a gender-sensitive manner.

In building consensus, the meeting stressed that it was important not to lose sight of the wider society and its role in the process of engendering macroeconomic policy. This was also highlighted in the Needs Assessment. The process needed to be as inclusive as possible and, as such, awareness-building and training needed to be undertaken at all levels of society. In particular, civil society needed to be involved in advocacy and consensus building at all levels.

The meeting agreed that both in the context of training and consensus-building, there was need for a clearer understanding of the gender analytical framework. Experience had shown that the framework had either been little understood or misinterpreted and gender often became synonymous with women. In developing awareness-building programmes, there might be a need to find alternative language to convey the message of gender and unequal gender relations. Most importantly, there was a need to ensure that the message resonated with a much wider cross-section of persons.

As highlighted in the needs assessment, a further challenge to be confronted was the prevailing economic ethos in the Caribbean. Most economic policies were based on classical tenets of globalization theory (e.g. the Washington Consensus), structural adjustment policies or fiscal targets which did not admit of a valuation of social impacts with respect to fiscal measures being taken. Traditional economists also tended to ignore social issues such as gender. Academic institutions such as the University of the West Indies (UWI) needed to be challenged to be more open to gender considerations in economic policy and to convey their findings to governmental institutions and civil society. This would open up important areas of enquiry such as the extent to which structural adjustment measures hindered the integration of gender into macroeconomic policy and planning and, consequently, the identification of possible entry points with respect to the policies of the international lending institutions.

With regard to the lack of linkages between trade and finance highlighted in the Needs Assessment, the meeting agreed that there was a need for rethinking the paradigm that trade was a private sector activity. In addition, the private sector was an important sector that needed to be targeted in the consensus-building process and the tripartite system which involved labour unions, the private sector and the government was identified as a starting point.

The Needs Assessment pointed to the need for the institutional framework to support the incorporation of gender into economic policy. Generally, the linkages between the trade and finance ministries were weak or non-existent and similarly between the finance ministries and the ministries with responsibility for women's /gender issues. The meeting also stressed that mechanisms to foster these linkages would also need to be developed.

The question of developing alternative frameworks within which gender could be situated was also explored. The meeting felt that within the current project it was more expedient to incorporate gender into the existing economic models in the Caribbean.

Nonetheless, the feasibility of developing alternative frameworks for the subregion ought to be explored.

Finally, there was a need for strategic research on gender and macroeconomics relevant to the Caribbean to support the awareness-building programmes and the more formal training that was recommended by the Needs Assessment.

**Agenda Item 4:
Identification of continuing education needs of economists
in the Caribbean and the implications for gender**

In his presentation, Professor Andrew Downes noted at the outset that most Caribbean economists had been trained at the three UWI campuses. As such, any analysis of the continuing education needs of Caribbean economists and the implications for gender had to begin with an examination of the programmes at the university. A review of the teaching programmes indicated that much of the teaching followed material in texts prepared by economists from more developed countries and these texts reflected a ‘traditional approach’. Both the undergraduate and graduate programmes at the three campuses adopted the scarcity concept of economics which essentially dealt with the efficient utilization of scarce resources to satisfy human wants. This training carried over into the work environment where the issues examined reflected the approach that economists had been exposed to during their formal training.

The point was also made that although there were always opportunities for informal learning in new areas, Caribbean economists had not been inclined to venture into new areas of enquiry. Thus, few economists were working in areas such as transportation economics, health economics, environmental economics, social economics, labour economics, and tourism economics.

Similarly, a review of economic research undertaken in the Caribbean indicated that although the output of research had increased, the areas of focus had remained relatively narrow and traditional, the tendency being to focus on international economics; monetary economics; public finance; agricultural economics and developmental economics.

Drawing on the following definition of ‘Economics’ by A. Gruchy (1947): Modern Economic Thought,

“... the study of the structure and functioning of the evolving field of human relations which is concerned with the provision of material goods and services for the satisfaction of human wants...it is the study of the changing patterns of cultural relations which deal with the creation and disposal of scarce goods and services by individuals and groups in light of their private and public aims,

Professor Downes noted that from the standpoint of evolving human relations, economic research and practice had not kept up to date. In the same vein, traditional economic analysis had not taken gender into consideration. However, it was precisely as a study of human behaviour and human relations that economics readily lent itself to gender analysis. In recent years, there had been efforts to 'engender' traditional areas of economic analysis. The international agencies had also developed programmes which sought to integrate gender into economic analysis. Nevertheless, the growing body of literature on the subject had had little impact on the teaching, research and practice of economics in the Caribbean. This also had to be viewed in a context where few persons were entering the economics profession and where new concerns competed for their time and interests.

In defining the way forward, Professor Downes noted that there were two ways of incorporating gender into economics:

- (a) A 'systematic integration' which went to the heart of economic analysis as a study of human behaviour; and
- (b) A tangential integration which saw gender as an 'add-on' to traditional concerns of economics.

The incorporation of gender into economic analysis in the Caribbean could proceed on both fronts. For practicing economists, short courses on gender and economics could be developed. These would show how gender issues could be incorporated in traditional areas of economics (international trade, public finance/ budgeting, etc). For students of economics at the UWI, two approaches might be adopted: development of a separate course in gender and economics and the incorporation of gender modules in established courses. The teaching and practice, however, were integrally linked.

Discussion

The following is a summary of the discussions:

The meeting felt that a re-visioning of the orthodox approach to economics, which prevailed at the UWI, to one that incorporated gender was a major challenge and needed to be supported by empirical data and case studies. Prior to any training course being mounted at the UWI, there was need therefore to build a body of Caribbean literature which would support the teaching and which would also assist in the consensus-building process. It was noted that the University of Utah course relied heavily on case studies but these were not relevant to the Caribbean.

Greater and ongoing collaboration between the Department of Economics and the Centres for Gender and Development Studies (CGDS) on the three campuses was also seen as important in helping to widen the research and teaching agenda in the Department of Economics to incorporate gender. It was also necessary to strengthen

the collaboration in those instances where it had already begun, for instance, the CGDS and the Department of Economics at the St Augustine Campus.

It was also important to identify the entry points within the existing teaching programme for the introduction of gender as a category of analysis and to work out the mechanics of how this was to be accomplished. Two possible entry points were proposed: introduce gender as a category of analysis for first year Economics students and in the MSc Course 'Development, Theory and Policy'. In terms of overcoming difficulties of staff recruitment, one possibility was to involve those persons at the University who already had an interest in 'Gender and Macroeconomics'.

Even within the university system, a wide variety of methodologies and tools should be considered. The approaches depended on the underlying rationale of the training and the target groups. There was also a need to address the lack of a structure within the university system for providing continuing education.

Agenda Item 5: Experiences of gender and macroeconomics training

Ms. Mireille Brunings presented a comprehensive overview of the course 'Engendering Macroeconomics and International Economics' taught at the University of Utah (which had also been attended by other experts present at the meeting) and examined its relevance to the Caribbean. She indicated that the immediate aim of that programme was to bring together economists from around the world who shared recognition of the importance of gender-equitable approaches to macroeconomics, international economics and globalization to assist them in:

- (a) gaining knowledge and familiarity with existing formulations of gender aware questions, research tools, and methodologies in macroeconomics and international economics;
- (b) enhancing capabilities in integrating gender analysis in teaching macroeconomics, international trade, international finance or economic development;
- (c) formulating gender-aware questions in research, teaching, policy making and advocacy in this area;
- (d) fostering a network among the participants;
- (e) strengthening the intellectual links of the participants to other knowledge-networks engaged with similar issues; and
- (f) enhancing their capability in connecting and networking in general with other practitioners, scholars and activists.

The course was hosted by the Department of Economics, University of Utah, targeted persons who had a Masters degree in economics. The basic modules in 2003 included:

- Economics and Gender Awareness
- Gender inequalities, Poverty and Globalization
- Gender and Macroeconomics
- Macroeconomic Modeling and Gender
- Gender Dimensions of Fiscal Policy
- Gender, International Trade and Trade Policies
- Gender Finance and Monetary Policy
- International Trade, Investment and Labour

She noted that the modules were presented at a fairly technical level and were supported, to a large extent, by research and case studies.

Other experts who had completed the course at the University of Utah also shared their experiences and it was concluded that while the basic principles were relevant to developing a training course for the Caribbean, it was important that the curriculum responded to the needs of the Caribbean. In this context, there was a need to develop relevant case studies to support the training. Additionally, in determining the content and the focus of the training, the primary objective of the training had to be borne in mind. The main objective was to build gender analytical capacity to advance the project of incorporating gender into macroeconomic policy and this required in-depth training along the lines of the Utah course. The objectives also assisted in defining the target group.

It was nevertheless emphasized that the project of incorporating gender into economic analysis was a much wider one involving consensus-building at all levels. Targeting policy makers, researchers and civil society was, therefore, critical to the process.

The meeting also agreed that a focus on gender and macroeconomics was limiting and should be broadened to 'Gender and Economics'. This would encompass macroeconomics as well as other relevant areas pertaining to economics.

Much discussion focused on the development of the training for Caribbean economic planners/economists in gender and macroeconomics and it was agreed that this should take place on a phased basis. The first phase should comprise a stock-taking exercise, an introductory awareness-building workshop to develop a research agenda and awareness-building seminars.

The stock-taking exercise should determine what literature existed on "Gender and Economics" in the Caribbean as well as any ongoing work. Based on this, possible research areas should be identified for producing the case studies. It was agreed that

a consultant should be engaged to carry out the review and to develop an annotated bibliography.

An awareness-building/trainer of trainers workshop should then be convened with the aim of bringing together a body of economic researchers/economic planners from the central banks, the UWI and other institutions in the Caribbean engaged in economic research to present the findings of the stock-taking exercise and to develop a research agenda based on the gaps identified. The workshop would essentially be a dialogue to identify potential areas of research and to get commitment from participants to undertake the research. The workshop would also provide a forum for building awareness of the value of the work to the subregion.

A common theme which emerged throughout the discussions of the meeting thus far was the more broad-based nature of the project and the need therefore for advocacy and consensus building at all levels of society. To achieve this, the meeting proposed that a series of awareness-building seminars/roundtables be undertaken simultaneously with the research phase. These could target different groups and focus on specific themes as 'Gender and Macroeconomics' or 'Gender in the Labour Market'.

Phase two should then comprise the actual development of the Gender and Economics Course which The Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES) should mount as part of its programme. This effort should also involve the CGDS and the Economics Departments at UWI. The University should also be able to spearhead some of the research projects identified in the research phase.

It was agreed that a project proposal titled 'Gender and Economics' needed to be developed and presented to funding agencies. A budget should be developed for each of the four main components of the project: the stocktaking exercise; the introductory/training of trainers workshop; the awareness building seminars/roundtables and the training course. It was also agreed that ECLAC should assume responsibility for this task but that the widest possible collaboration should be sought in the implementation of the project. Regional institutions that should be involved included: ECLAC, UNIFEM, the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), CARICOM, Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), the Regional Negotiating Machinery (RNM), UWI and Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES).

Agenda Item 6: Mapping the curriculum content

Discussions focused on the length of the training course, the minimum qualifications of participants and the curriculum content. It was recommended that the course duration should be two weeks and that it be mounted as part of the summer programme of SALISES. It was also proposed that the minimum qualifications should be a first degree in economics or equivalent or substantial working experience in the field of gender and/or economics.

It was felt that the specific objectives of the training ought to guide the mapping out of the curriculum content and that these should be spelt out quite clearly. The meeting agreed that the primary objective was to build capacity in gender analysis in the areas of economic planning, economic analysis and economic policy formulation. At a very concrete level, the training should aim to:

- (a) Expose students to ways of incorporating gender into economic planning and policy formulation.
- (b) Develop skills in the application of gender analysis in project design, evaluation and implementation within the project cycle. This allowed for a more integrated approach and targeted economists who were involved in project development.
- (c) Promote research in the area of gender and economics.
- (d) Foster collaboration between researchers and practitioners.

A clear definition of the concrete objectives would also allow participants to be more effectively targeted. The need to build synergies between researchers and practitioners was also stressed and, in this regard, it was agreed that a secondary objective of the training should be to foster a network of Caribbean economists working in the area of gender and economics.

Course content

The meeting identified seven broad modules as follows:

- (a) Labour;
- (b) Finance;
- (c) Trade;
- (d) Development;
- (e) Poverty;
- (f) Project evaluation; and
- (g) Macroeconomic policy.

The importance of continuing the project was emphasized by the meeting and to facilitate this, an Ad Hoc Working Group comprising the experts/agency representatives present at the meeting, as well as CARICOM and the RNM was formed. It was

proposed that the ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat should have responsibility for coordinating the Working Group.

**Agenda item 7:
Developing a work plan for module development and implementation**

Timelines proposed for the follow-up phase of the project were agreed upon as follows:

Phase1

Activity 1: Stocktaking/Review exercise [2 months].

Activity 2: Introductory 'Training of Trainers' Workshop.

Activity 3: Development of case studies [1 year].

Activity 4: Awareness-Building seminars [Ongoing].

Phase 2

Development and conduct of the first training course. The aim should be to mount the course as part of SALISES 2006 Summer Programme.

**Agenda item 8:
Any other business**

No other business was raised.

**Agenda item 9:
Closure of the meeting**

The ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat thanked the delegates for giving of their time at this meeting and the meeting ended with the usual exchange of courtesies.

Annex

List of Participants

Ms. Camille Antoine, Outreach and Research Officer, Centre for Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago. Telephone: 868-662-2002 ext. 3549/3572, Facsimile: 868-663-9684, E-mail: cgds@centre.uwi.tt or cantoine@cgds.uwi.tt

Ms. Marsha Caddle, Gender Economist (Consultant), Barbados. Telephone: 246-429-2805, E-mail: marsha.caddle@undp.org or caddlewash@hotmail.com

Ms. Roberta Clarke, Regional Programme Director, United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados. Telephone: 246-467-6000/6126, Facsimile: 246-437-6596, E-mail: Roberta.clarke@undp.org

Ms. Denise de Souza, Assistant Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme, 42 Brickdam Road, Georgetown, Guyana. Telephone: 592-226-4040, Facsimile: 592-226-2942, E-mail: denise.desouza@undp.org

Dr. Andrew S. Downes, Professor and University Director, Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies (SALISES), University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus, P.O. Box 64, St Michael, Barbados. Telephone: 246-417-4476/78, Facsimile: 246-424-7291, E-mail: asdownes@uwichill.edu.bb

Ms. Sharon Gillard, Research Assistant, Health Economics Unit, University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago. Telephone: 868-662-9459, Facsimile: 868-662-5555, E-mail: sharongillard@yahoo.com

Ms. Kimberly-Ann Gittens-Baynes, Research Assistant, Health Economics Unit, University of the West Indies, St Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago. Telephone: 868-662-9459, Facsimile: 868-662-5555, E-mail: kimbytt@yahoo.com

Mr. Jason Jackson, Research Economist, Caribbean Development Bank, P.O. Box 408, Wildley, St Michael, Barbados. Telephone: 246-431-1600/1951, Facsimile: 246-426-7269, E-mail: jacksoj@caribank.org or jjackson@alumni.princeton.edu

Ms. Denise Noel De Bique, Gender Specialist, Basic Needs Trust Fund, Caribbean Development Bank, P.O. Box 408, Wildley, St Michael, Barbados. Telephone: 246-431-1741, Facsimile: 246-431-1601, E-mail: debiqud@caribank.org

Ms. Mireille Brunings-Stolz, Virolastraat 48, Paramaribo, Suriname. Telephone: 597-465-707, E-mail: brunings@sr.net or mbrunings@cbvs.sr

Ms. Judith Wedderburn, Director, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2¼ Ruthven Road, Kingston 10, Jamaica. Telephone: 876-960-6580, Facsimile: 876-960-7297, E-mail: fes@cwjamaica.com

ECLAC system

Mr. Rudolf Buitelaar, Officer-in-Charge, ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, 1 Chancery Lane, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. Telephone (868) 623-5595, Facsimile: (868) 623-8485, E mail: rudolf.buitelaar@cepal.org

Ms. Asha Kambon, Social Affairs Officer, E-mail: asha.kambon@cepal.org

Ms. Helen McBain, Economic Affairs Officer, E-mail: helen.mcbain@cepal.org

Ms. Gaietry Pargass, Social Affairs Officer, E-mail: gaietry.pargass@cepal.org

Mr. Anthony Mitchell, Research Assistant, E-mail: anthony.mitchell@cepal.org

Ms. Joanne Mora, Technical Cooperation Assistant, E-mail: joanne.mora@cepal.org