UNITED NATIONS
ECLAC

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

Regional dialogue on energy efficiency and renewable energy policy in the Caribbean
17 May 2016
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago

LIMITED
LC/CAR/L.499
18 July 2016
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

# EVALUATION REPORT OF THE REGIONAL DIALOGUE ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY POLICY IN THE CARIBBEAN

---

This report has been reproduced without formal editing.

**CONTENTS**

## A. INTRODUCTION

1. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) have partnered to support Caribbean countries' initiatives to improve energy sustainability in the subregion. In addition, the Caribbean faces serious climate change related challenges; therefore this initiative contributes to mitigating the harmful effects of greenhouse gases.

2. The "Regional dialogue on energy efficiency and renewable energy policy" aimed at presenting one of the key targeted outputs of the GIZ/ECLAC project titled: "Sustainable energy in the Caribbean: Reducing the carbon footprint in the Caribbean through the promotion of energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy technologies."

3. The objective of the meeting was to foster dialogue and to share experiences among Caribbean countries on issues related to energy efficiency and renewable energy policy, with a view towards crafting better strategies for enhancing the subregion's energy security in the face of the challenge of global climate change. The meeting sought to take advantage of the current global energy transition in which the imperatives of climate change, the thrust for greater global energy security, and the high costs of meeting national energy requirements have now conspired to place energy efficiency and renewable energy more central to the development discourse.

4. The issues of energy efficiency and renewable energy are especially relevant to the Caribbean, which holds substantial renewable energy potential, in relation to solar, wind, and geothermal energy, but remains highly dependent on fossil energy for its energy needs. The meeting intended to foster a dialogue to continue to examine how, in the light of the ongoing global energy transition, the subregion could best position itself to take better advantage of these changes, for the ultimate sustainable development of our region.

5. The meeting was designed to promote a dialogue between representatives from national governments, as well as with representatives from regional and international organizations. In order to strengthen the participants' technical knowledge and tools, the meeting was followed by a one-day training on methodologies for evaluating energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, with a view towards enhancing financing feasibility.

## B. ATTENDANCE

### 1. Place and date of the meeting

6. The "Regional dialogue on energy efficiency and renewable energy policy" was held on 17 May 2016 in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.

### 2. Attendance

7. The meeting targeted national officials from the energy sector, as well as specialized representatives from regional and international organizations in the Caribbean. Participants represented the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, and the Cayman Islands.

8. The regional and international organizations represented in the dialogue were the Association of Caribbean States, the Caribbean Community, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, GIZ Caribbean, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and VSL Consultants.

9. The dialogue was introduced by the Minister of Energy and Energy Industries of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and representatives from GIZ Caribbean; subsequently, ACS, CAF, CARICOM, ECLAC, IDB and OECS moderated the discussions and introduced a series of topics and presentations to promote the dialogue.

## C. SUMMARY OF KEY OUTCOMES OF THE MEETING

10. In order to promote the dialogue on energy efficiency and renewable energy, several substantive presentations were introduced by ECLAC and other supporting stakeholders. Discussions were started by a policy review on energy policies in the Caribbean to analyze the energy situation in the Caribbean with respect to the current energy mix, prevailing strategies, and national and regional energy policies.

11. Subsequent sessions examined the barriers to successful implementation of renewable energy and energy efficiency projects and approaches and fiscal implications for implementing energy efficiency in public buildings in the Caribbean. The final session focused on country case studies and presented the energy policies of Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and the Cayman Islands.

12. As a measure to strengthen participants' knowledge on the subject and to provide them with technical tools to develop energy efficiency and renewable energy projects, the meeting was followed by one day of training/workshop on introduction to financial analysis of energy efficiency and renewable energy projects in the Caribbean.

## D. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

13. This section of the report presents a summary of the comments provided by participants at the end of the dialogue. To elicit participants' feedback on diverse aspects of the meeting, an evaluation questionnaire was administered. The summary presents an account of all responses received from the participants.

14. A total of 28 online invitations to the evaluation process were sent. Eleven evaluation forms were collected, 10 were received via online facilities and one hard copy. This indicated that 43 per cent of the participants completed the evaluation for the policy dialogue. The male to female composition of the respondents were 54.55 per cent female, while the other 45.45 per cent were male.

15. The respondents were asked to further specify the type of organization they represented. Most of them were from national ministries, 54.55 per cent; 18.18 per cent were from a subregional institution, 9 per cent represented an international organization, and 9 per cent an independent consultancy.

16. The designation of respondents included: advisor, economist, energy advisor, director, legal officer, program assistant, program officer, project development and implementation specialist, research associate and research officer.

## 1. Substantive content

17. In response to the usefulness and value of the conversations and exchange of ideas it was conceived as very useful by most participants, 72.72 per cent, another 27.27 per cent rated it as useful.

18. Regarding the relevance of the findings of the studies for developing financial proposals for energy efficient and renewable energy initiatives, it was generally stated that the four studies were relevant in defining a framework for developing proposals of energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives for their countries (54.55 per cent). Another 27.27 per cent considered the studies were very relevant.

19. In terms of the effectiveness of the project to strengthen policy, 72.72 per cent of respondents believed the meeting and project documents assisted in strengthening policy formulation of energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives in their countries, while 18.18 per cent were undecided (table 1).

**TABLE 1**
**PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 72.72 | 8 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not sure / no response | 18.18 | 2 |
| Not Answered | | 1 |

20. Almost all the countries, 90.91 per cent, engaged in initiatives or strategies in energy efficiency (EE), renewable energy (RE) or sustainable energy (SE) (table 2).

**TABLE 2**
**COUNTRY ENGAGEMENT IN ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY INITIATIVES**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 90.91 | 10 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not sure / no response | 9.09 | 1 |

21. In ranking the willingness of their countries to transition to EE/RE/SE, 36.36 per cent of respondents assigned their countries a rank of 10, 27.27 per cent ranked it at 6, 18.18 per cent ranked it as 8, 9 per cent ranked it at 7 and another 9 per cent ranked it as 4 (table 3).

**TABLE 3**
**RANKING OF COUNTRIES' WILLINGNESS TO TRANSITION TO EE/RE/SE**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 4 | 9.09 | 1 |
| 5 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 6 | 27.27 | 3 |
| 7 | 9.09 | 1 |
| 8 | 18.18 | 2 |
| 9 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 10 | 36.36 | 4 |

## 2. Engaging ECLAC

22. All eleven participants requested being included on the list to receive ECLAC publications.

23. Most participants showed interested in ECLAC being a part of their country's energy trajectory (81.81 per cent).

**TABLE 4**
**ENGAGING ECLAC**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 81.81 | 9 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not Answered | | 2 |

## 3. Responses and comments to open-ended questions

24. How do you see your country's energy sector evolving over the next 5 years?

- In the next 5 years we should have already been generating energy from wind and solar and should be at the beginning phase of geothermal energy production.
- While there is enthusiasm for renewable energy technology, there isn't the same gusto for energy efficiency and I don't see it changing dramatically over the next 5 years.
- Strong, independent regulation of the energy sector, with an innovative, flexible legislative framework, covering a wide range of energy issues.
- Saint Vincent hopes to become 80 per cent renewable by 2020. Our 12 MW geothermal project is schedule to be completed by 2018, which will cover 60 per cent of our peak load.
- Hopefully, there will be a greater and faster drive towards the implementation of RE and EE champions and foundational initiatives.
- Continued development of petroleum resources (mainly natural gas) with minimal introduction of renewable energy technologies.
- With the correct regulatory framework and political will. Utility scale generation from renewable energy may prove to be more achievable with direct support/demonstration from the government. Hopefully this will feed to distributed generation efforts.

25. What are your predictions for the direction of the regional energy landscape within the next 5 years?

- Based on current events, it is estimated that a significant portion of energy production will be coming from renewable sources.
- The region's policies will begin to coalesce even more than they have already.
- Strong, independent regulator; robust legislative framework; regulation of all independent power producers; regulation of self-regulators (both off and on the grid).
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines will have a diverse mix of renewable energy. We expect to have just under 2 MW in solar, in addition to 12 MW geothermal combined with the already installed 5.6 MW hydro. The energy unit continues to work towards national public awareness in energy efficiency, and this year we hope to implement building codes and appliance standards.
- There will be increased involvement of the private sector.
- Expanded use of renewables, natural gas and energy efficiency.

- Significant progress on renewable energy projects particularly in non-oil producers. Geothermal energy projects in particular should also be near completion or completed in a few states. I think most states would have also liberalized their electricity markets and introduced feed in tariffs.
- A lumpy shift towards a cleaner regional energy economy.
- Regionally, with initiatives such as the Clinton Climate Initiative, I see there will be a transformation of the energy sector as it relates to the generation of electricity. Although this current period of low energy prices may cause the momentum to shift/slow down, once there are "champions" within the industry who see the benefit of investing in alternative forms of energy there will continue to be progress. Beyond 5 years, perhaps the region will be able to shake off the dependency of private developers and grants in order to develop the RE potential within the region.

26. What do you consider the most significant outcomes of the meeting?

- Exchange of information among country participants regarding their experiences in transitioning to more sustainable energy production and their efforts towards more efficient use of energy.
- Understanding the similarities as SIDS, not only regarding certain circumstance but also how similar policies are framed and structured.
- Sharing of experiences both at the country level and at the international level.
- Countries leading by examples. The actually findings of live examples within the Caribbean region. The enthusiasm and support from donor agencies.
- The shared experiences of various CARICOM member States.
- The opportunity to engage with CARICOM stakeholders and other partners. The GIZ tool was relevant - perhaps more time or an individual training program can be devoted to this where members of the private sector and banks are invited into the same room. This can be a tool which is used to drive further investment into alternative technologies.

27. Would you like to engage ECLAC in defining your energy trajectory?

- Through support for capacity building as it relates to energy efficiency.
- Defining a policy for RE in the transport sector.
- Technical assistance and best practice guidance.
- Analyzing and showcasing the benefits to be derived from the development of RE and EE initiatives in Trinidad and Tobago. Serious attention has not been paid to RE and EE because conventional energy supplies are cheap. A well-structured argument must be made to justify seriously focusing on RE and EE initiatives in light of the abundance of petroleum resources.
- To explore ways of funding macroeconomic studies on the role of cleaner use of indigenous energy resources for providing energy services in growing populations.

## E. CONCLUSIONS

28. The studies completed as part of the project outputs were categorized as being either very relevant or relevant. Thus, the project was largely assessed as being effective in strengthening policy formulation. Most countries indicated that they initiated or pursued some level of EE/RE/SE.

29. Participants anticipated that their countries would follow a particular energy path over the next five years which included: full transition, no change, change in the enabling environment – legislation, an

upsurge in implementation of EE and RE initiatives and selection of champions. Furthermore, the countries showed a healthy willingness to transition to EE/RE or SE.

30. Their general vision for the region over the next five years could be classified into four main areas: significant increase in renewable energy sources, mixed energy economies, further development of the legislation, and involvement of the private sector.

31. Most people were interested in engaging ECLAC to assist in defining their energy policy through three main areas: building capacity, working in the transportation sector, technical assistance and best practices.

Annex I

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

John Auguste, Senior Energy Officer, Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economic Development, Trade Energy and Cooperatives, Grenada. E-mail: john_auguste@yahoo.com

Macricia Auguste-Bushell, Economist, Department of Planning and National Development, Saint Lucia. E-mail: mauguste@gosl.gov.lc

Mali Barnes, Research Officer, Ministry of Tourism, Economic Development, Investment and Energy, Antigua and Barbuda. E-mail: mali.barnes@ab.gov.ag

Tomas Bermudez, Country Representative, Inter-American Development Bank, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: tomasb@iadb.org

Niebert Blair, Project Officer, Energy Unit, Caribbean Community (CARICOM). E-mail: niebert.blair@caricom.org

Sallyane Cotter, Legal Officer IV, Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy Science and Technology, Saint Lucia. E-mail: sallyane.cotter@govt.lc

Ellsworth Dacon, Director, Energy Unit, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. E-mail: edacon@gov.vc

Judith Ephraim, Programme Officer, Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States. E-mail: jephraim@oecs.org

Ramón Espinasa, Lead Oil and Gas Specialist, Inter-American Development Bank. E-mail: ramones@iadb.org

Andra Francis-Nicholas, Geophysicist, Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: afrancis@energy.gov.tt

Michael Freudenberg, Chargé d'affaires, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: v@ports.diplo.de

H.E. Lutz Görgens, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: l-vz1@ports.diplo.de

Miguel Jacques, Senior Policy Analyst, Ministry of Planning, Lands, Agriculture, Housing and Infrastructure, Cayman Islands. E-mail: miguel.jacques@gov.ky

Zindzi John, Project Development and Implementation Specialist, Economic Development Advisory Board, Ministry of Planning and Development, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: zindzij@gmail.com

Lyndrison Lincoln, Research Associate, VSL Consultants Ltd., Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: lyndri@hotmail.com

Gregory McGuire, Principal Consultant, VSL Consultants Ltd, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: mcguire.gregory@gmail.com

Nadia Mohammed, Sustainable Energy Development Analyst, Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: namohammed@energy.gov.tt

Glynn Morris, Energy Advisor - Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technical Assistance (REETA), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Caribbean Community (CARICOM). E-mail: glynn.morris@giz.de

Keron Niles, Business Unit Manager, Research and Policy, Economic Development Advisory Board, Ministry of Planning and Development, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: keron-niles@planning.gov.tt

Hon. Nicole Olivierre, Minister of Energy and Energy Industries, Trinidad and Tobago. E-mail: DBarzey@energy.gov.tt

Nnyeka Prescod, Advisor, Transport and Disaster Risk Reduction, Association of Caribbean States. E-mail: nprescod@acs-aec.org

Raye Sandy, Chief Administrator, Tobago House of Assembly. E-mail: raye.sandy@tha.gov.tt

Simon Zellner, Energy Advisor - Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technical Assistance (REETA), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH, Caribbean Development Bank (CDB). E-mail: simon.zellner@giz.de

**United Nations programmes and funds**

Rosemary Lall, Programme Officer, Energy, Environment and Disaster Management. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Email: rosemary.lall@undp.org

Yoachim Haynes, Programme Assistant, Energy, Environment and Disaster Management, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). E-mail: yoachim.haynes@undp.org

Rajiv Jalim, Programme Assistant, Energy, Environment and Disaster Management, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). E-mail: rajiv.jalim@undp.org

**United Nations specialized agencies**

Dagmar Walter, Deputy Director, International Labour Organization (ILO) Decent Work Team and Office for the Caribbean. Email: walter@ilo.org

Marissa Sheppard, Programme Assistant/ Gender Focal Point Alternate, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). Email: marissa.sheppard@fao.org

**Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean**

Andres Schuschny, Division of Natural Resources and Infrastructure. E-mail: andres.schuschny@cepal.org

**ECLAC subregional headquarters for the Caribbean**

Dillon Alleyne, Deputy Director. E-mail: dillon.alleyne@eclac.org

Sheila Stuart, Social Development Officer, Statistics and Social Development Unit. E-mail: sheila.stuart@eclac.org

Willard Phillips, Economic Affairs Officer, Sustainable Development and Disaster Unit. E-mail: willard.phillips@eclac.org

Candice Gonzales, Research Assistant, Statistics and Social Development Unit. E-mail: candice.gonzales@eclac.org

Sinovia Moonie, Research Assistant, Statistics and Social Development Unit. E-mail: sinovia.moonie@eclac.org

Elizabeth Thorne, Research Assistant, Sustainable Development and Disaster Unit. E-mail: elizabeth.thorne.@eclac.org

Esther Kissoon, On-the-Job Trainee, Sustainable Development and Disaster Unit. E-mail: esther.kissoon@eclac.org

Annex II

**EVALUATION FORM**

| |
|---|
| **ECLAC Internal Reference** |
| **Subprogramme: SRHC** |
| **17-18/May/2016** |

**REGIONAL DIALOGUE AND TRAINING WORKSHOP ON ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY POLICY IN THE CARIBBEAN**
**Sustainable Development and Disaster Unit**
**PORT OF SPAIN**
**17 – 18 May 2016**

# Evaluation form for Training Workshop

**Please answer the following questions** (to facilitate processing, please print answers to open-ended questions)**:**

**Identification**[1]

Sex

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male

Age (optional)

- ☐ 30 or under
- ☐ 31 - 40
- ☐ 41 - 50
- ☐ 51 or over

[1] NOTE: These details are requested for the sole purpose of assessing the demographic profile of meeting participants, and would not be factored into any other aspect of the overall evaluation.

Country of origin: _____

Institution(s) you represent: _____

Type of organization you represent, please circle accordingly:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| National ministry | □ | Subregional institution | □ |
| Other national institution (please specify): | □ | International organization | □ |
| _____ | □ | Independent consultant | □ |
| | □ | NGO | □ |
| Local / municipal institution | □ | Civil society (please specify): | □ |
| Academic institution / university | □ | _____ | □ |
| Private sector | | | □ |
| | | Other: _____ | |

Title / position: _____

**Substantive content and usefulness of the training workshop**

1. How would you rate the training workshop overall?

a. Excellent b. Good □ c. Regular □ d. Poor □ e. Very poor □ f. Not sure/ no response □

2. How would you rate the substantive content of the training workshop?

a. Excellent b. Good □ c. Regular □ d. Poor □ e. Very poor □ f. Not sure/no response

3. Did the training workshop live up to your initial expectations?

a. Yes b. No □ c. Not sure d. No response

4. How useful did you find the analyses and recommendations formulated at EE and RE training workshop?

a. Very useful □b. Useful □ c. Regular □d. Not very useful □e. Not useful at all □f. Not sure/ no response□

5. Did you think the training workshop was useful for strengthening the mechanisms for promoting EE and RE?

a. Very useful □b. Useful □ c. Regular □d. Not very useful □e. Not useful at all □f. Not sure/ no response

6. Did you think the training workshop expanded your capacity with regard to the preparation of financing proposals for the promotion of EE and RE?

a. Yes b. No □ c. Not sure d. No response

7. How useful were the subjects presented and discussed for the work of your institution?

a. Very useful b. Useful □ c. Regular □ d. Not very useful □e. Not useful at all □f. Not sure/ no response□

8. How relevant was the case study to the training exercise?

a. Very relevant b. Relevant c. Regular d. Not very relevant e. Not relevant at all □f. Not sure/ no response□

9. How would you improve this training workshop in terms of the areas addressed?

10. What do you consider the most significant outcomes of the training workshop?

*Thank you for your time.*

Annex III

## RESPONSES TO CLOSE-ENDED QUESTIONS

### Table 1: Identification/Sex

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Female | 54.55% | 6 |
| Male | 45.45 | 5 |

### Table 2: Age

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| 30 or under | 27.27% | 3 |
| 31 - 40 | 54.55% | 6 |
| 41 - 50 | 9.09% | 1 |
| 51 and over | 9.09% | 1 |

### Table 3: Type of organization

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| National ministry | 54.55% | 6 |
| Other national institution (please specify) | 9.09% | 1 |
| Subregional institution | 18.18% | 2 |
| International organization | 9.09% | 1 |
| Independent consultant | 9.09% | 1 |
| NGO | 0.0% | 0 |
| Civil Society (please specify) | 0.0% | 0 |
| Local / municipal institution | 0.0% | 0 |
| Academic institution / university | 0.0% | 0 |
| Private sector | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 0.0% | 0 |
| National ministry | 54.55% | 6 |
| Other national institution (please specify) | 9.09% | 1 |
| Subregional institution | 18.18% | 2 |
| International organization | 9.09% | 1 |
| Independent consultant | 9.09% | 1 |
| NGO | 0.0% | 0 |
| Civil Society (please specify) | 0.0% | 0 |
| Local / municipal institution | 0.0% | 0 |
| Academic institution / university | 0.0% | 0 |
| Private sector | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other (please specify) | 0.0% | 0 |

**Table 4: Relevance of studies**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Very relevant | 27.27% | 3 |
| Relevant | 54.55% | 6 |
| Regular | 9.09% | 1 |
| Not very relevant | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not relevant at all | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not sure / no response | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not Answered | | 1 |

**Table 5: Project effectiveness**

| | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 72.72 | 8 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not sure / no response | 18.18 | 2 |
| Not Answered | | 1 |

**Table 6: Country engagement in energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 90.91 | 10 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not sure / no response | 9.09 | 1 |

**Table 7: Ranking countries willingness to transition to EE/RE/SE**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 4 | 9.09 | 1 |
| 5 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 6 | 27.27 | 3 |
| 7 | 9.09 | 1 |
| 8 | 18.18 | 2 |
| 9 | 0.0 | 0 |
| 10 | 36.36 | 4 |

**Table 8: Usefulness of conversations and exchange of ideas**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Very useful | 72.72% | 8 |
| Useful | 27.27% | 3 |
| Regular | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not very useful | 0.0% | 0 |
| Not useful at all | 0.0% | 0 |

**Table 9: Engaging ECLAC**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 81.81 | 9 |
| No | 0.0 | 0 |
| Not Answered | | 2 |

**Table 10: Inclusion for ECLAC's publications**

| *Response* | *Frequency (%)* | *Count* |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.18% | 2 |
| No | 0.0% | 0 |
| If yes, please provide your email address: | 81.81% | 9 |