

EVALUATION REPORT

12/3/2010

In-depth Evaluation of the Role of
the Economic Commission for Latin
America and the Caribbean
(ECLAC) in the Caribbean



NACIONES UNIDAS

CEPAL

Evaluation Team

Dame Billie Miller, Evaluation Consultant

Alexa Khan, Evaluation Consultant and Expert

Juan Carlos Peña, Evaluation Coordinator and Manager,
Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit - ECLAC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The in-depth evaluation of ECLAC's role in the Caribbean was conducted at the request of the ECLAC Executive Secretary as part of a wider periodic evaluation strategy managed by the Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit (PPEU) of the Programme Planning and Operations Division (PPOD). The remit of the Evaluation Team was to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of ECLAC involvement in the Caribbean and more particularly, its contribution to strengthening economic and social development, promoting regional integration and also cooperation between the Caribbean and Latin America which is the substance of subprogramme 12 of the ECLAC's biennial programme plan.

In pursuance of this objective the Team reviewed and examined ECLAC's role and especially that of the SRH-POS its institutional partnerships and management practices including its interface with ECLAC Headquarters in Santiago, through a multiplicity of data collection methodologies such as surveys of SRH-POS staff and regional stakeholders, over 130 in-depth interviews, focus groups, field visits to five countries and extensive document review, among other data collection methods.

The Evaluation Team found that as one of the longest standing institutions of its kind in the Caribbean, ECLAC is highly regarded by a range of stakeholders including high level policy makers, technocrats and regional development partner organizations. Its major contribution and comparative advantage is its work in development research, statistics, trade and poverty assessment which was deemed invaluable. Its role as a bridge between the Caribbean and Latin America is also seen as critical to promoting cooperation and integration.

In more recent times, there has been increasing demands by Caribbean member states for ECLAC's services related to (a) economic and social analyses of development issues, (b) capacity building in statistics and (c) methodologies in disaster and loss assessment and economics of climate change. ECLAC has also been instrumental in regional and international conference preparation as well. The publication of analyses, studies and statistics have been well received and sought after by governments and social, economic and financial institutions. As such, the SRH-POS has effected some influence on regional decision and policy making.

Yet , stakeholders in the Caribbean have expressed some concern about the extent to which ECLAC outputs have informed 'practical' solutions to perennial social and economic issues faced by the region. The quality and depth of the analyses are not thought to respond fully to Caribbean needs and realities. This has given rise to queries about generous outputs in contradistinction to useful outcomes.

The Evaluation Team is mindful of the constraints of human and financial resources but found that results based management is not well established in the SRH-POS. RBM needs to be seen as an opportunity rather than a challenge.

The SRH might have lost much of its relevance and competitive edge to younger and better resourced regional and international organizations, including other UN agencies,

which have related mandates. It must seek to reinforce its position through a revitalized policy entrepreneurship strategy and further engagement, cooperation and collaboration with partners such as the CARICOM and OECS Secretariats who want to be supportive and are willing to work with the SRH-POS and with ECLAC Headquarters.

The Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee (CDCC) which is a subsidiary body of the Commission and serviced by the SRH-POS is found to be even more 'remote' and under-utilized given its mandate to promote development cooperation and collaboration within the Caribbean as well as Latin America. The CDCC requires the effective support and commitment of more of its Member States.

The Evaluation Team found that despite the very obvious limitations and difficulties which beset the SRH-POS and the CDCC, stakeholders still have considerable expectations of ECLAC and CDCC's potential to assist the region in negotiating its way through the present global recession and plan for recovery.

The recommendations of the Evaluation Team point up the urgent need for a comprehensive engagement strategy for the SRH-POS involving the major regional and international institutions. At the earliest opportunity it must be launched by the ECLAC Executive Secretary, in the Caribbean and at the highest level of engagement. It is further recommended that ECLAC should take the lead in the development of a think tank in the form of a "Caribbean Development Round Table" which would help to set the agenda for the future socio-economic development and integration process in the Caribbean and forge greater cooperation with Latin America. Additionally, a review of its work programme and publication portfolio to revitalize its policy entrepreneurial role and promote it with a strong communications strategy would be instrumental in the overall revitalizing effort. In respect of the CDCC, the recommendation is for a total rethinking of its role and function in regional and inter and intra-regional cooperation.

Other recommendations speak to the immediate re-definition and upgrading of the institutional management of the SRH-POS which would need to be RBM driven. Prioritizing those areas where the SRH already has a comparative advantage would be a point of departure. The establishment of closer and improved working relationships with the other subregional offices of ECLAC and with the Santiago Headquarters are thought to be integral to this exercise. This capacity building is central to the effort of the SRH in its quest to become a contributing partner in the southern hemisphere of the Americas.

ACRONYMS

ACS	Association of Caribbean States
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CARIFTA	Caribbean Free Trade Area
CARIFORUM	Caribbean Forum
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDCC	Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee
CDEMA	Caribbean Disaster and Emergency Management Agency
CEPAL	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
COHSOD	Council for Human and Social Development
COTED	Council for Trade and Economic Development
CSME	Caribbean Single Market and Economy
CTO	Caribbean Tourism Organization
DALA	Disaster and Loss Assessment
DFID	Department for International Development
ECOSOC	United Nations Economic and Social Council
ECLA	Economic Commission for Latin America
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EPA	Economic Partnership Agreement
EPAS	Employee Performance Assessment System
EU	European Union
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
ICT	Information and Communications Technologies
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NICs	Non Independent Countries
NIHERST	National Institute for Higher Education, Research, Science and Technology
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECS	Organization of Eastern Caribbean States

PPBME	The rules and regulations governing programme Planning, Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation
PPEU	Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit
PPOD	Programme Planning and Operations Division
PSU	Programme Support Unit
RBM	Results Based Management
RCM	Regional Consultation Mechanism
SELA	Sistema Económico de Latino America
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SRH	Sub Regional Headquarters
SRH-POS	Sub Regional Headquarters Port of Spain
SRO	Sub Regional office
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UWI	University of the West Indies

CONTENTS

Contents	7
INTRODUCTION	8
BACKGROUND	9
A. Evaluation objective and scope	9
B. Methodology and limitations	10
C. Constraints and limitations of the evaluation	11
D. Mandate, Organization and Resources of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean – Subregional Headquarters - Port of Spain.	13
EVALUATION FINDINGS	15
A. Assessment of programme outcomes	15
B. Management and Governance	43
CONCLUSIONS	45
RECOMMENDATIONS	46
SUGGESTED ACTIONS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CDCC	51
APPENDICES	52

INTRODUCTION

1. This evaluation is in accordance with the General Assembly resolutions 54/236 of December 1999 and 54/474 of April 2000 which endorsed the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (PPBME).¹ In this context the General Assembly requested that programmes be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis covering all areas of work under their purview. As part of the general strengthening of the evaluation function to support and inform the decision-making cycle in the United Nations Secretariat in general and ECLAC in particular and within the normative recommendations made by different oversight bodies² endorsed by the General Assembly³, ECLAC's Executive Secretary is implementing an evaluation strategy that includes periodic evaluations of different areas of ECLAC's work. This is therefore a discretionary internal evaluation managed by the Programme Planning and Evaluation Unit (PPEU) of the Programme Planning and Operations division (PPOD).

2. This evaluation is undertaken as a result of ECLAC's round of strategic planning meetings (April 8-15, 2009) through which the Executive Secretary requested an in-depth evaluation of ECLAC's presence in the Caribbean to assess its relevance and effectiveness. In light of the evaluation, ECLAC should be able to rethink its engagement with the subregion and strengthen its role, strategies and priorities in order to respond to the Caribbean development needs more effectively.

¹ ST/SGB/2000/8 Articles II, IV and VII.

² OIOS report entitled "Assessment of Evaluation Capacities and Needs in the United Nations Secretariat" (IED-2006-006, 24 August 2007); The Joint Inspection Unit report entitled "Oversight Lacunae in the United Nations System" (JIU/REP/2006/2)

³ Including GA resolutions 54/236 and 54/474 endorsing the PPBME rules and regulations (ST/SGB/2000/8)

BACKGROUND

A. Evaluation objective and scope

3. The overall objective⁴ of the evaluation objective is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of ECLAC's presence and contribution to the economic and social development of the Caribbean. More specifically, the evaluation objectives are to:
 - a.) Review ECLAC's institutional partnership in the Caribbean and assess the levels of credibility, relevance and ownership Member Countries have in the organization,
 - b.) Determine the strategic role of ECLAC and specifically the ECLAC subregional Headquarters in Port of Spain (SRH-POS) in support of the Caribbean development needs and how it is supported by the ECLAC programme of work.
 - c.) Examine the management practices and coordination arrangements, identify strengths and weaknesses in planning, implementation, monitoring, and assessment of the programme of work in the Caribbean, including the management of human and financial resources and to make recommendations for improvements, if and where necessary.
4. Within this framework the evaluation sought to determine, the actual progress towards ECLAC's mandate in the region, the degree to which desired outcomes have occurred, the extent to which ECLAC has contributed to outcomes in the sub region either intended or unintended, the efficiency with which outputs were delivered, and the validity of strategy and partnership arrangements.
5. The evaluation process followed six different steps towards its completion:
 - (a) Conception and scoping
 - (b) Data and document review

⁴ The objectives for this evaluation are framed in conformity with the PPBME, Regulation 7.1.⁴, regulation 7.2 and Rule 107.2, ST/SGB./2000/8, p.12, Regulation 7.2 notes that all activities programme shall be evaluated over a fixed time period, and Rule 107.2 notes that all programmes shall be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis.

- (c) Development of data collection instruments and field visit strategy
- (d) Data collection and field visits
- (e) Data review and analysis, and finally
- (f) Report drafting and sharing;

B. Methodology and limitations

6. The evaluation methodology utilized mixed methods as follows:

- a) **Desk Review:** The desk review included reports related to the 22 Sessions of the CDCC held between 1975 and 2008, 12 sessions of the CDCC Monitoring Committee held between 1989 and 2009, ECLAC session reports, including work programme performance of Sub-programmes 11 and 12, CDCC assessment reports over the period 1980 to 2008; resolutions of the CDCC and related documents⁵.
- b) **Surveys:** ⁶ Two types of surveys were used: (i) A self administered stakeholder electronic survey targeting Member States and regional organizations was launched on September 20, 2009, with a response rate of 10%; (ii) A self administered survey targeting ECLAC staff within the Caribbean Office was launched on 8th August and achieved a response rate of 53% (24 responses).
- c) **In depth interviews:** A total of 138 in-depth interviews⁷ were conducted during the three month evaluation process, including all the staff of subprogramme 12; staff of key ECLAC Divisions in Santiago; staff of regional and interregional organizations as well as United Nations entities, High level policy makers representing CDCC Member States, including representatives from Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Barbados , St. Lucia, Belize, Cuba, Jamaica, and USVI;

⁵ See Appendix I

⁶ See Appendix II

⁷ See Appendix III for the list of organizations and personnel interviewed.

- d) **Field Visits**⁸ were made to Antigua and Barbuda, Trinidad and Tobago, **Guyana, St. Lucia and Barbados.**
- e) **Observation:** The Evaluation Team was also able to observe the proceedings of the 14th session of the CDCC Monitoring Committee held in Port of Spain from 7-8 September, 2009.
- f) **Review of documents and content analysis:** Additionally, the Evaluation Team reviewed an extensive number of documents related to ECLAC support to the Caribbean, programme budgets of the past 3 biennia, and the next one (2010-2011), performance reviews, documents produced, newsletters, websites and other databases.

C. Constraints and limitations of the evaluation

7. In terms of **constraints**, it is important to note the following:

- a) Given the short time frame of the evaluation process (approximately 3 months), and while ECLAC has had presence in the Caribbean since 1966, the evaluation focused on evidence and perceptions of ECLAC's contribution to the economic and social development of the region generally through more recent interventions rather than the range of technical assistance, capacity building and technical reports produced over almost 43 years of its existence;
- b) The rigid timelines for the evaluation meant that the desk review component had to be more focused and that not all possible and relevant stakeholders in the countries could be contacted. While all member countries were given the opportunity to respond through the on-line survey of stakeholders, all the planned visits to countries and 'follow up' interviews could not be finalized. In addition, efforts to ensure feedback from stakeholders who have had limited contact with ECLAC within the region, including several Associate member states, had to be curtailed.

⁸ See Appendix IV Organization of field mission dates.

- c) The Evaluation Team could not visit any Spanish speaking countries in the Caribbean which are served through the Mexico office and as such those countries assessments were not given enough weight in the evaluation findings and assessments. Given that Subprogramme 11 is the only other sub-regional office and also shares responsibility for three countries with Sub-programme 12, some valuable comparative analysis may have shed light on issues related to management and mandate.

- d) The anticipated administrative support from the SRH-POS did not materialize. The Programme Officer in the PSU retired at the end of the first week of the assignment and no other staff could be assigned. Therefore the Evaluation Team was required to spend valuable time on administrative tasks related to scheduling of meetings and follow up. This resulted in a reduction in the already improbable timeframe for completion of activities such as interview summaries, teleconference interviews and a thorough document review.

- e) The stakeholder survey returns marked a rather low response rate of 10%. This potential constraint was supplemented by numerous in person and telephone interviews with the relevant ECLAC stakeholders in the region.

D. Mandate, Organization and Resources of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean – Subregional Headquarters - Port of Spain.

8. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) is one of five regional commissions of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). It was created in 1948 to support Latin American governments in the economic and social development of that region. Subsequently, in 1966, the Commission (ECLA, at that time) established the Sub regional Headquarters for the Caribbean in Port of Spain to serve the newly independent countries in the Caribbean making it one of the first United Nations offices in the sub region.

9. At its sixteenth session in 1975, the Commission agreed to create the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee (CDCC) as a permanent subsidiary body, which would function within the then ECLA structure to promote development cooperation with and among Caribbean countries, including Cuba, Dominican Republic and Haiti. One of the most important roles of the CDCC is to ensure that the SRH in Port of Spain remains relevant to the needs of the countries and to ensure that the work programme is conducted in an efficient and effective manner. In April 2005 CDCC adopted its revised constituent declaration and rules of procedure.

10. The ECLAC sub-regional Office in the Caribbean carries out sub-programme 12 of ECLAC's biennial programme plan and priorities.⁹ The main objective of the subprogramme 12 on subregional activities in the Caribbean is ***“to strengthen economic and social development, to promote the integration processes among the countries of the Caribbean and to enhance cooperation within the Caribbean sub region with Latin America and with the broader international community”*** by increasing the knowledge of policymakers, researchers and the general public in the sub-region of issues related to sustainable development and integration in the context of the Caribbean Basin, and by improved human resource capacity and technical expertise for economic and social policymaking in the Caribbean.” The specifics of ECLAC results framework of the Caribbean are reflected in the following results matrix developed for subprogramme 12.

⁹ For the biennium 2008-2009 ECLAC's programme budget is reflected in A/62/6 (Section 20)

Table 1. Results Framework for the SRH-POS	
<i>Objective of the organization:</i> To promote and further strengthen the development process within the Caribbean and enhance the sub-region's cooperation with Latin American Countries	
<i>Expected accomplishments of the Secretariat</i>	<i>Indicators of Achievement</i>
1. Strengthened capacity of policy makers and other ECLAC stakeholders in the sub-region to formulate and implement economic and social development measures and improve integration in the Caribbean and the wider Latin American Region.	(i) Increased number of countries formulating or adopting policies and measures in the areas of economic and social development, trade and integration in line with ECLAC recommendations; (ii) Number of references in policy documents, academic literature and mass media to ECLAC publications and data whose contents provide analysis and policy recommendations on development in the Caribbean.
2. Enhanced capacity and technical expertise to follow-up on the major international programmes of action in the economic, social and environmental fields, particularly related to SIDS and the Mauritius Strategy	(i) Increased number of policies and programmes adopted by Caribbean countries to follow up on the relevant international programmes of action

11. Sub programme 12 of ECLAC has an estimated total budget of US \$6.1 million dollars, as per the 2008-2009 programme budget and 34 staff members, which is 27% higher than the US \$4.8 million of the biennium 2006-2007. For the biennium 2010-2011, subprogramme 12 will receive an estimated total budget of US \$6.7 million which is approximately 10% higher than the 2008-2009 biennium.¹⁰ The programme of work is organized thematically and functionally in 6 areas/units, i.e. Office of the Director, including Programme Support Unit; Economic Development Unit; Statistics and Social Development Unit; Sustainable Development Unit; Caribbean Knowledge Management Centre; and the Administration Unit. The Offices serves 17 Member States¹¹ and 8 Associate Members.¹² It should be noted that Cuba, Dominican Republic and Haiti are also served by sub-programme 11 SRH for Mexico and Central America.

¹⁰ A/64/6 (Sect. 20), A/60/6 (Sect. 20)

¹¹ Antigua and Barbuda; The Bahamas; Barbados; Belize; Cuba; Dominica; Dominican Republic; Grenada; Guyana; Haiti; Jamaica; St. Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; St. Vincent and the Grenadines; Suriname; Trinidad and Tobago.

¹² These include Anguilla; Aruba; British Virgin Islands; Montserrat; Netherlands Antilles; Puerto Rico; Turks and Caicos Islands; United States Virgin Islands.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

A. Assessment of programme outcomes

Finding 1: ECLAC's publications, analyses and statistics are widely used by Caribbean Countries, and the methodologies developed including the disaster and loss assessment are invaluable to the region

12. The Evaluation Team confirmed that Caribbean Countries appreciated the publications, analysis and statistics developed and disseminated including the various methodologies developed in support of data analysis collection efforts. Feedback from stakeholders, particularly economists within Ministries, Development Banks and Research Institutions indicated that publications such as the “Economic Survey of the Caribbean”, “Foreign Investment in Latin America and the Caribbean” and “Latin America and the Caribbean in the World Economy” were very useful for the insights provided on economic development and the comparative analysis of Latin America and the Caribbean. In addition the economic, trade and statistical databases were also highly valued¹³ and have constituted another area where the SRH and ECLAC are making headway in the Caribbean.
13. Stakeholders maintained that ECLAC was generally the first agency to produce statistics and analyses of Caribbean countries and emerging issues and often published information that could not be obtained from other institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF. Stakeholders asserted that this constituted one of its most significant contributions to the region. In addition, ECLAC's tradition of ‘alternative development’ thinking generally meant that a perspective other than the mainstream was reflected in its technical papers and this ‘alternative development’ perspective was also highly valued. This is clearly reaffirmed by the 63% of staff survey respondents who also indicated that ECLAC was ‘effective to extremely effective’ in the conduct of social and economic research studies¹⁴ which ultimately inform and contribute to the Caribbean development analysis processes and decision-making.
14. Stakeholders use of the following ECLAC outputs is indicative of the organization's contribution to the region:

¹³ The trade statistics database is somewhat dated; trade statistics are only available up to 2003. It is therefore unclear as to whether persons who spoke about valuable trade data had used the data base recently or were speaking from past experience.

¹⁴ Staff Survey Question 29

- a. The series of studies on the Yachting Industry was used by the Commonwealth Secretariat as the basis for development of a course on Coastal Recreational Tourism;
 - b. DFID used the Gender and the Economic Partnership Agreement study to inform its gender strategy in the region;
 - c. Several agencies such as the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), Caribbean Community(CARICOM), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and the University of the West Indies (UWI) mentioned the significance of the CARIFORUM-EU Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) study during the EPA negotiation process;
 - d. The St. Lucia Government used findings of a study on crime in four Caribbean countries to inform its Medium Term Development Plan;
 - e. The OECS indicated that the Government of St. Kitts continues to use the study on the social impact of the closure of the sugar industry in St. Kitts and Nevis in its development planning;
 - f. Trinidad and Tobago respondents noted that ECLAC's work on ICT indicators had been critical to the country's efforts to develop ICT indicators and monitor progress on the National ICT Strategy.
 - g. The report "Financial intermediation and its impact on capital formation in the context of the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME)" facilitated and informed the establishment of the CARICOM Regional Development Fund.
15. Stakeholders noted that ECLAC had a significant impact on the development of methodologies related to:
- poverty assessment within the region,
 - development of the social vulnerability index and
 - adaptation of the methodology for disaster and loss assessment related to the economic and social impact evaluations of natural disasters.

This latter methodology and the related technical assistance to member states were often cited as the most significant contribution of ECLAC to the region. One stakeholder who formerly worked on the Asian Tsunami noted that, ECLAC's methodology was the only available methodology for assessing damage and loss within the UN system during the Tsunami crisis and is currently widely benefiting the Caribbean. The Economic Commission for Asia and the Pacific did not have this methodology. Incidentally, the initiative taken by the SRH-POS to facilitate translation of the ECLAC Disaster and Loss Assessment manual was instrumental in facilitating its use in the Caribbean (and possibly elsewhere) over the

last 10 years. Recent examples of Caribbean countries where these evaluations have produced recommendations for action by the Governments include Guyana and St. Lucia.

16. Another important contribution of ECLAC to the region was noted at the recently held ECLAC “Development Policy Seminar”¹⁵ hosted by the SRH in Port of Spain. Professor Norman Girvan reminded participants and other stakeholders that the work of Raul Prebisch and Celso Furtado significantly influenced the theses of Lloyd Best, Kari Levitt and George Beckford on the Plantation Economy.

¹⁵ 21st October 2009

Finding 2: ECLAC's technical assistance is highly valued particularly its capacity building in support for global conferences and its work in disaster impact assessment which has informed donor decisions on funding for reconstruction and rehabilitation

17. ECLAC's work on disaster assessment and the responsiveness of the organization in times of crisis was cited across all stakeholder groups as one of the organization's most significant contributions to the region. Stakeholders in Guyana and St. Lucia as well as the OECS Secretariat noted that ECLAC's economic and social impact assessments after hurricane disasters in the region have been instrumental in countries' efforts to secure funding for reconstruction and rehabilitation. Additionally, it has greatly influenced their decision making in different areas towards mitigation and preparation for future disasters. Several policy/programme interventions have been influenced by this technical cooperation work which has informed and impacted many countries including at least six (6) in the last biennium, e.g. Haiti, Turks and Caicos Islands, Belize, Dominica, St Lucia and Cayman Islands. In Belize for example, those measures included the refurbishment of community centres and the expansion of planning regulations for the construction of schools to include the concepts of 'set back' and 'step-up'. In the Cayman Islands, expanded planning regulations were adopted as well as the hurricane strapping of the roofs of schools. Furthermore, an expanded Assessment of the damage from Hurricane Gustav, was submitted to the World Bank Group, who subsequently provided grant funding to the Government of Jamaica.¹⁶ Findings from the staff survey reflect that 56% of respondents believe that ECLAC has been 'effective to extremely effective' in providing technical cooperation to countries and institutions in the sub region¹⁷ which is in line with the responses from stakeholders.

18. In addition, the technical assistance provided in support to Member States in preparation for global conferences through the development of Caribbean positions on population and development, gender and ageing, support to Small Island Developing States and the implementation of the Mauritius Strategy, which is in line with the SRH's overall expected accomplishments among others, was often cited as important and valued. Perusal of ECLAC's technical assistance missions and projects funded from extra budgetary resources revealed that over the years extensive support has been provided to member governments and regional agencies such as the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) (Caribbean Sea Initiative), CARICOM (gender, trade, statistics, sustainable development) OECS, as well as UN agencies. However, interviewees from these organizations did not generally recall the range of assistance provided by ECLAC, perhaps reflecting the loss of institutional memory in these institutions, coupled with the lack of a system within the SRH to document and follow-up with technical assistance beneficiaries. This might also be illustrative of the lack of a distinctive dissemination effort that would highlight ECLAC as a significant partner organization in the subregion.

¹⁶ Sub Programme 12 Report Biennium 2008-2009.

¹⁷ Staff survey Question 29

19. ECLAC's efforts to build the capacity of Member States especially in the area of statistics and disaster and loss assessment methodology were also highly valued and have expanded widely from approximately 248 to approximately 569 technical staff and Member State representatives receiving capacity building programmes. However, such positive feedback was not obtained from stakeholders regarding economic and social development measures which might be an area where more dissemination and promotion might be necessary to allow Caribbean countries to take full advantage of ECLAC's services in those areas. Several stakeholders noted, however, that a critical mass of persons needed to be trained in each country to reduce dependence on ECLAC personnel for post crisis assessment work and to be able to respond to crises more swiftly. Although ECLAC is currently engaged in training Caribbean nationals in the methodology, there does not appear to be any system for identifying persons who have been trained and coordinating their participation in the event of a disaster.¹⁸

20. Similarly, in the area of statistics, ECLAC needs to re-examine its strategy given the persistent weakness in Member States capacity, including countries data collection systems and technical capability. This is an area where some improvements are being made in cooperation with the CARICOM, but where clearly more efforts and support are needed to achieve concrete results. In addition, the ageing public sector coupled with reduced numbers of graduates specializing in the field of demography and lack of interest in joining the public sector, means that the region may soon face an even greater 'statistical' capacity challenge.

¹⁸ There is an assumption that having trained personnel within a country, National Disaster Agencies will do the necessary follow up work to ensure that systems are in place. However, in some cases, for example St. Lucia, the disaster agency NEMO is not involved in the ECLAC training initiatives and also uses a different methodology for the assessment of damage and loss.

Finding 3: ECLAC's capacity to produce a high volume of publications annually was noted as unparalleled in the region; however the depth of analysis and incorporation of the Caribbean reality is still insufficient and hinders the relevance and impact of some of the most important work done by ECLAC

21. ECLAC has done an excellent job in producing a high volume of reports and studies¹⁹, however **the quality and depth of some of the reports was still considered insufficient to be used to respond fully to Caribbean realities.** The general view was that ECLAC needs to go beyond the production of statistical reports to the generation of deeper analysis and suggestion of practical options, solutions and recommendations to some of the pressing issues faced by small island developing states, for example particularly in the area of trade and economic transformation. Trade in and of itself has been an area that has been not fully covered in some of the publications despite the fact that it constitutes one of the major engines of growth for the Caribbean. The Evaluation Team noted that while there is sufficient potential for trade related issues to be integrated and better coordinated within ECLAC to provide relevant services to the Caribbean, trade related projects, studies and analysis do not yet trickle down to specific Caribbean countries. This is an area of need that must to be considered in earnest.
22. Stakeholders suggested that the quality and depth of analyses reflected in studies produced in Latin America also needed to be produced for the Caribbean. The outputs of several of ECLAC staff members, some of whom are no longer in service²⁰ were cited for their high quality. Respondents also noted that there appeared to be a capacity gap within the SRH reflected in the fact that there were a few high quality officers at the top (P4 level) and a noticeable gap in the capacity of professionals below that level. It was suggested that this may account for the variable quality of the work.
23. There was a general consensus that some of the most important flagship ECLAC publications do not generally reflect the situation of the Caribbean such as the Social Panorama or the PANINSAL or are given marginal attention. As one stakeholder noted, "...ECLAC puts the Caribbean in a Box in most of its publications". As such, many of the flagship reports have reduced utility for policy makers as the analyses generally reflect the situation pertaining to Latin America and not the Caribbean. The widely held view was that the focus on the Caribbean has always been negligible. On the other hand, the evaluation team also noted that there might be instances in which relevant data has not been fully forthcoming from Caribbean countries adding to the difficulty in utilizing the data for comparable analysis in the different ECLAC reports.

¹⁹ Respondents noted that ECLAC was the only agency in the region that produced such a high volume of technical reports.

²⁰ Esteban Perez, Erik Bloomstein, Silbourne Clarke, Swinburne Lestrade, Asha Kambon and Lance Busby among others

24. This lack of coordination and insufficient coverage has resulted in some reluctance on the part of Member States to submit data to the SRH for inclusion in the reports and some 'hostility' towards ECLAC generally. However, in order to ensure that Caribbean data is included, it was widely acknowledged that the **quality and reliability of the data needed to be improved**. A more strategic approach to improving data quality across the region could be included as a priority in the 2012-2013 work programme and also concerted efforts to start considering the inclusion of Caribbean data in those flagship publications where this has not been the case.

Finding 4: While ECLAC's efforts in the Caribbean have generated a large number of research and analytical outputs and provided technical assistance in a wide range of areas since inception, the contribution of these to the social and economic development of the region cannot be readily substantiated in many areas due to a weak RBM approach

25. Since the establishment of the now Sub-Regional Headquarters in Port of Spain in 1966 and the creation of the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee (CDCC) as a permanent subsidiary body of ECLAC in 1975, close to 2000 publications²¹ covering fifty (50) distinct subject areas have been produced. However, data reflecting the extent to which issues, trends or recommendations from these publications have informed policy or programme formulation at the regional or national level are limited to the number of references to ECLAC documents in the media and various Government and other reports²². Although 'citations' suggest some level of utilization they do not reflect::

- The perceived significance of specific ECLAC publications to the relevant development issue;
- The extent to which recommendations have been incorporated in policy decisions;
- The user perceptions of the quality and timeliness of reports; or
- The extent to which further work is necessary on the specific development issue.

Using the SRH logical framework as a reference to determine its success in measuring results, the Evaluation Team observed that for the biennium 2008-2009:

- half of the targets were not met (two indicators out of the four established),
- the methodologies used in collecting the data were impractical and insufficient to substantiate progress against the expected results, and
- the data collected in some instances did not correspond to the indicator selected.

For instance, one of the indicator targets used to measure enhanced capacity of policy makers was "600 participants rating the meetings organized by the sub-programme as

²¹ See 'ECLAC CDCC through the Years: Twenty Five Years of Caribbean Research' LC/CAR/G.604, 23 March 2000. Data on publications compiled by the SRO-POS between 2000 to September 2009 was provided by the Caribbean Knowledge Management Centre-SRO POS.

²² Identification of ECLAC 'citations' is conducted via a search of media houses websites twice per year.

useful”, when in fact, only 504 participants were recorded to have rated the courses as useful. In addition, the team could not corroborate that the records and feedback collected supported such an assessment. Similarly, the indicator on 400 technical assistance requests satisfactorily fulfilled, are reported as only partially achieved, as only 245 technical assistance missions were given, but without a clear data and indication as to how useful these missions were for Member Countries. The Evaluation Team is absolutely cognizant of the difficulties management has gone through in the previous two years with the vacancy rates and the little support that could be expected from the Programme Support Unit, but it finds that having clear, consistent and well designed data collection mechanisms in place that everyone delivering the work programme can implement is of extreme importance in reinforcing the evidence based results orientation of ECLAC and helps to enhance its visibility, credibility and relevance to the region in all areas of work. This is an effort in which all staff in the Office should participate.

26. Evidence from the staff speaks to the fact that “...the production of studies is seen as an end rather than as a means to an end”. And clearly there has been no proper mechanism in place to periodically and consistently monitor the influence of ECLAC’s policy advice across the Caribbean, despite the fact that there are some indicators set for the biennium that could help in this regard. Although 39% of respondents rated ECLAC as ‘effective’ in the delivery of its mandate, respondents appeared to experience some difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of ECLAC on the 9 different dimensions identified in the staff survey. Between 30% to 50% of respondents cited “no basis for judgment”²³ when asked to assess ECLAC’s effectiveness in delivering regular services provided by ECLAC such as secretariat services to intergovernmental bodies, technical cooperation and enhancing the capacities of policy makers. This difficulty may be related to the lack of credible measures of effectiveness, or simply to the lack of knowledge some staff members have on the commitments set for the biennium in terms of results and indicators and the mechanisms they could use to help substantiate and follow-up on the impact achieved by the office. As respondents noted:

“I think it is very difficult to really measure our effectiveness. Also, given the fact that we have been losing relevance we also have less impact on what is going on in the region, there are other drivers that are much stronger than we are!”²⁴

“To my knowledge, there are no clear benchmarks for measuring effectiveness or success of outputs or activities nor relevance

²³ See Question 19 of the staff survey and question 20 of the stakeholder survey.

²⁴ Staff Survey Respondent.

particularly because the Work Programme is developed 3 years in advance”²⁵

27. This ‘output’ orientation is reflected in performance reports on implementation of the SRH-POS work programme ‘...the headquarters accomplished 98% of the 119 outputs earmarked for the period...staff members completed 36 technical papers plus the reports of meetings and workshops...523 persons...participated in 18 intergovernmental meetings...the sub-programme convened 15 workshops/seminars which offered training for 446 persons’.²⁶ This focus on outputs is not sufficiently complemented with outcome and results data that can be verified and validated. While an effort is made to identify country level policies or strategies that have been informed by ECLAC publications, in that report²⁷, attempts to corroborate results related to Sub-programme 12²⁸ were inconclusive. Evidence that “...analytical inputs and technical assistance of ECLAC CDCC contributed to changes in 22 governmental policies in member countries of the Caribbean”²⁹ could not be readily identified and thus the results reported therein are not yet conclusive. Similarly, evidence of results related to the extensive³⁰ technical assistance provided by the SRH-POS and other ECLAC offices to the Caribbean is also limited. The Evaluation Team could not retrieve mission reports or feedback instruments that would allow follow up on work undertaken by the SRH in a consistent fashion. Data collection efforts that showed progress and incidence of the technical cooperation missions other than in the areas described above (disaster evaluation, statistics, etc) were only available sporadically and were not recorded in the relevant databases and systems such as IMDIS. The Team also noted the lack of a comprehensive and participatory process to review the subprogramme’s performance which could also help to collect all available information regarding results.

²⁵ Staff Survey Respondent

²⁶ “Report of the Implementation of the ECLAC Work Programme Sub regional activities for the Caribbean: 2006-2007 Biennium”. LC/CAR/L.162

²⁷ See page 17 of the “Report of the Activities of the Commission from January 2006 to December 2007”, LC/G.2372 (SES.32/8) 14th May, 2008.

²⁸ Ibid. See pg. 77 Box. “Technical Cooperation Highlights”

²⁹ Ibid. Feedback from the PSU suggested that this information would have been gleaned from country representatives contributions at CDCC meetings, however there is no readily available list of polices that were informed by ECLAC studies.

³⁰ Though data on the total number of technical assistance initiatives was not readily available, the Report of the 19th Session of the CDCC noted that the number of technical assistance missions increased by over 152% between 1996-1997 and 2000 to 2001. During the period 2002 to 2005 there was a noticeable decline in technical assistance requests received from 333 in 1996/1997 to an average of 50 in the 2002-2005 period. This decline may have been due to the absence of a Director at the SRO-POS during this period.

The lack of an outcome focus was deemed by some respondents to be a function of the traditional 'compliance' orientation of the UN system. Despite the introduction of RBM in the UN and its continuous strengthening, staff performance is still measured on the basis of completed outputs rather than results achieved. Consequently, the shift to outcomes continues to be challenging. In the case of the SRH, this issue is further exacerbated due to the limited RBM capacity available within the Programme Support Unit (PSU) as well as across the SRH-POS³¹.

28. In order to achieve the required outcome orientation within the SRH, a sustained effort by trained staff in RBM is critical. Staff of the PSU must not only be able to develop the systems to collect and analyze performance data at the outcome level, but must also be able to sensitize and train staff within the SRH, including managers, to the merits of results based management and outcome orientation. As such, strengthening of the PSU needs to be accorded high priority. The Evaluation Team noted that besides the report to the CDCC, the SRH does not have an annual or biennial report on its activities used for accountability and self-promotion purposes. This clearly hinders its visibility and relevance. On a positive note, the Evaluation Team confirmed that an additional P3 position has been approved for the PSU.

³¹ The recent retirement of the only P2 in that department dealing with RBM and programme support issues means that until that position is filled (it has been vacant for almost four months) no professional staff member will be available to steer and guide the necessary RBM activities within the SRH, including the input for the SRH's work programme for Biennium 2012 -2013.

Finding 5: A perennial challenge for ECLAC in the Caribbean has been the facilitation of evidence based policy, in a region that has not traditionally placed a high value on evidence as a basis for policy formulation. The global movement toward managing for development results presents an opportunity to improve this situation

29. The SRH-POS has had to contend with the challenges implicit in facilitating evidence based policy in a region and political culture that has not generally been characterized by a practice of evidence based policy formulation. As such, the facilitation of evidence to policy requires much more than simply producing a report and uploading it onto a website. As noted by a recent Overseas Development Institute report, staff of think tanks “...need to be policy entrepreneurs: able to distil convincing policy messages from complex research, to use networks and build policy coalitions, to maintain long term programmes, and to operate effectively in the highly political environment of policy making”.³²
30. In the case of the SRH-POS, the concept of policy entrepreneurship is not yet fully grasped and consistently practiced as a strategy to enhance ELCAC’s impact in the region. While there are instances in which the SRH has played a significant role in providing evidence that would later direct and guide the adoption of policy such as the support of the Regional Coordination Mechanism for the Mauritius Strategy, or the provision of support to the establishment of the Caribbean Sea Commission (CSC) through the preparation of the CSC work Programme and Strategic Research Priorities and the finalization of its Statutes, this type of approach can only be illustrated in an handful of instances and is currently not a driver of ECLAC’s work in the Caribbean. Given the difficult operating environment in the subregion, the need for strengthening the role of policy entrepreneurship is even more critical to the Office, if it is to clearly regain a leadership role in the support of sustainable development in the subregion. In recent years adequate engagement and follow through has been a challenge resulting in reduced visibility and relevance of ECLAC in the sub region.
31. Several respondents noted that in its early years (1975-1990) ECLAC was intimately involved in the policy process of regional governments through its representation on several national committees and councils. The Evaluation Team was also informed that ECLAC was in fact the driver of a number of fundamental initiatives including the development of systems for the collection and collation of agricultural and other statistics throughout the region, establishment of population councils, development of libraries and the concept of information systems³³, creation of the patent development unit, development of the Trade Procedures Manual and the restructuring of the Customs function through the introduction of the ASYCUDA system, among others. In the words of one respondent,

³² “The 21st Century Think Tank” ODI Annual Report 2008 www.odi.org.uk

³³ Through the Caribbean Information Systems project funded by IDRC

“...ECLAC not only informed policy...we drove policy in the region”. ECLAC was also a founding member of the ACS and provided a great deal of support for the establishment of CARICOM mechanisms such as the Council for Trade and Economic Development (COTED) and the Council for Human and Social Development (COHSOD) as well as the revision of the Caribbean Free Trade Association (CARIFTA). The return and consolidation of this ‘entrepreneurial approach’ may be the cornerstone of ECLAC’s revitalization efforts in the region. This should be a key aspect of the revitalization process.

Finding 6: Caribbean stakeholders do not perceive ECLAC as a 'think tank'

33. ECLAC is not generally perceived as a “think tank” in the Caribbean. Through the different surveys and interviews, the evaluation team found that ECLAC is perceived as an institution that produces research but does not necessarily provide clear policy options or concrete solutions to development issues or problems. Whereas ECLAC Headquarters has had a tradition of high quality research and analysis as well as a perspective that provides an alternative to mainstream development thinking, the same cannot be said of SRH-POS. As a result, SRH-POS is not perceived as an entity that studies and identifies critical emerging issues and suggests feasible options for governments, institutions and civil society organizations. However, given the rich ECLAC legacy and traditions, respondents generally agreed that ECLAC was still best placed to play this role in the Caribbean.

34. The dearth of technical capacity in the region, coupled with the enduring challenges of debt management, economic diversification, trade facilitation and poverty as well as emerging issues with serious implications for the region such as climate change, means that the need for a ‘think tank’ of the caliber and reputation of ECLAC is needed more than ever. ECLAC needs to draw on the intellectual capital available in the Caribbean as well as Latin America to develop solutions based on shared experiences and ideas. ECLAC will also need to develop innovative advocacy strategies that will allow it to be heard by policy makers. If any, this is the biggest challenge identified by the evaluation team for any serious ECLAC revitalization efforts in the Caribbean.

35. The Overseas Development Institute noted in a recent report that, “...the critical function of a think tank is to lock together credible, independent research-based evidence with policy advice and public affairs. Staff need to be ‘policy entrepreneurs’, able to distil convincing policy messages from complex research, to use networks and build policy coalitions, to maintain long-term programmes, and to operate effectively in the highly political environment of policy-making”³⁴ Any effort to forge an ECLAC think tank brand in the Caribbean will require a very different orientation by staff than that which currently pertains. The completion and subsequent website upload of issue briefs and publications must be complemented by active engagement and dialogue with stakeholders, either in virtual communities or through seminars and symposia, and the location where these take place need to be further away than Port of Spain. Regarding member governments, the movement toward evidence based policy in the region presents an opportunity that can be further optimized with a new policy entrepreneurial approach, discussed in the previous finding.

³⁴ “The 21st Century Think Tank” ODI Annual Report, 2008

Finding 7: Despite the considerable volume of work produced by ECLAC since inception, knowledge and awareness of its services and outputs is generally low; including the key role of the CDCC in guiding the work of ECLAC in the region.

36. The Evaluation Team confirmed that knowledge, awareness and visibility of ECLAC and its services is low across the range of stakeholder groups interviewed, including policy-makers, high level officials and decision-making staff within governments as well as middle level, and technical staff within the most important subregional organizations, despite the fact that it is one of the oldest organizations at the service of the Caribbean. Respondents used terms such as “remote”, “does not come to mind”, “far away from”, “don’t immediately think of”, “not the first place that you think of” to describe ECLAC and its role, immediate relevance and impact in the Caribbean. In addition, over 90% of key stakeholders³⁵ interviewed were not aware of the mandate or breadth of services and outputs of ECLAC³⁶. Respondents who were directly involved in an initiative sponsored by ECLAC had a better understanding of what ECLAC could provide, but only related to the event at hand. In other areas and the overall breath of ECLAC’s activities, the organization’s overarching mandate, functions and objectives, they also had a limited understanding.

37. Stakeholders who were primarily involved in research had the best overall understanding and appreciation of ECLAC, both historically and in terms of its current service provisions. However, others at the appropriate technical and professional levels from various governments were not directly appreciative or in full understanding of ECLAC’s role, even though theoretically given its functions and thematic areas they should have been.

38. It is instructive that, with the exception of persons and/or organizations that have participated in CDCC meetings, **the majority of stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation, including high level officials from governments, were completely unaware of the CDCC, its mandate, function and relationship to ECLAC.** Respondents were often confused and referred to “ECLAC/CDCC” as though it was a single entity. It was a rare circumstance when a respondent knew the meaning of ‘CDCC’ and its relationship with ECLAC. As mentioned, this included high level staff within the Caribbean Development Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, UN agencies outside of Trinidad and Tobago and high level representatives of Member States across the region including Trinidad and Tobago.

³⁵ In addition, more than 50% of staff members were unaware ECLAC’s mandate or the activities and services of units outside of their own units. The need for staff orientation sessions, given the high turnover of staff seems to be required.

³⁶ Several respondents were also unaware of the existence of the Santiago Headquarters.

39. In the case of Member States, the mechanism of focal points³⁷ which was expected to be the conduit and facilitator of the work programme and priorities of the CDCC within respective Member States has been less than effective³⁸ in ensuring that the overall relevance and importance of the CDCC remains high on the agenda of member governments. Comments from the evaluation survey also support this assessment:

“I have the impression that the CDCC has been losing ground in the region. There are more regional development agencies and intergovernmental bodies (with more financial resources). We also have not been able to carve out a niche that is unique to us - with the exception of a few areas, such as disaster assessment or economic survey.”

“Every year there is a problem convening a CDCC meeting... Also, do we really take into account the recommendations of the CDCC or do we note them and then continue as usual? I think the latter! ECLAC is not perceived to be anything special to the region.”

40. Respondents with some institutional memory suggest that the reduced visibility and low profile of ECLAC and with it the CDCC may have begun in the early 1990s with the change in leadership at the SRH-POS and the shift from its operational focus to one characterized by research and analysis. As a result of this change, ECLAC became more ‘inward focused’ and relinquished ownership of key functions such as development of the Trade Procedures Manual and agricultural statistics (to CARICOM.) and the patent development and repository function to NIHERST, among other things. As a result, the SRO linkages with Governments and organizations within the region appear to have diminished over time and ECLAC faded from the consciousness of the region. This assessment appears to be consistent with the fact that ECLAC is now primarily known for its “on the ground” work in disaster and loss assessment. The Evaluation Team noted that some of this diminished importance or attention to the role of the CDCC might reside mainly in the political contentiousness of its origin, and other assessments point to the numerous commitments and the proliferation of subregional organizations that need governments’ feedback and participation. Whatever the source of it, ECLAC needs to strengthen the visibility of its work and Member States need to ensure that the CDCC is revitalized in earnest.

³⁷ These are usually Ministries of Foreign Affairs or Economic Planning.

³⁸ In at least one case, a Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was unaware that his Ministry was a focal point for the CDCC.

Finding 8: While its research capability and intellectual assets are acknowledged as unrivaled in the region, strangely, ECLAC is not perceived as a significant partner. Current development challenges therefore present a clear opportunity for ECLAC to engage partners and beneficiaries in identifying feasible solutions to the region's problems

41. Though ECLAC is not now perceived as a significant partner, its significant research capability and superior intellectual assets present a clear opportunity to engage partners in identifying feasible solutions to the region's current development challenges. Feedback from stakeholders within regional organizations and intergovernmental agencies, as well as UN partner agencies across the region confirm that "... ECLAC is not seen as an integral or organic part of the Caribbean family of systems" as quoted by one respondent, "it is still seen as a semi alien body"³⁹. Significantly, interviews with UN agency stakeholders revealed that ECLAC is very removed from the rest of UN agencies and does not appear to appreciate that it should be the "intellectual nucleus" of the UN in the region, providing the analysis and appraisal of options that can feed into the programming of the specialist programmes. Stakeholders generally agree that ECLAC's research capability and intellectual assets are not resident in any other organization in the region and that given the dearth of such capacity across the region greater efforts should be made to build programme interventions on the basis of the 'evidence' that ECLAC can further generate and that respond more directly and visibly to the needs of countries in the region.

42. This notwithstanding, as noted earlier, while there have been numerous efforts by the SRH at solidifying and establishing new partnerships, through the CDCC and other initiatives, these have not yielded sufficient results. The challenges experienced with forging effective partnerships appear to be related to the plethora of agencies in the region with overlapping mandates and work programmes, even within the UN, the different accountability mechanisms and structures makes the coordination effort much more complicated. For example, concerns about the extent to which ECLAC was duplicating mandates of existing organizations were being raised as early as 1975 with respect to CARICOM and SELA. The mandates of ECLAC and UNDP have also been described as 'blurred' given their thematic focus areas of disaster assessment, gender, sustainable development and MDGs, among others. In such a scenario, agencies including natural partners such as the specialized UN programmes are more driven by the need to justify their existence rather than the benefits of collaboration. In addition, the institutionalization of results based management has meant an increased focus on achieving individual organizational targets that do not generally include indicators or targets measuring inter-agency cooperation, or an effort to formulate common goals for the subregion, despite the Paris Declaration. This is an issue that calls for an urgent solution especially within the UN organizations in the region. In this respect, while UNDP is supposed to lead efforts at the country level, only ECLAC has a mandate for regional coordination through already existing mechanisms such as the Regional Coordination Mechanism (RCM). In this respect, it would be desirable for ECLAC to explore the potential of leading this

³⁹ Comment taken from interview with a High Level Caribbean Academic/Intellectual

coordination role at the subregional level, within the existing mechanisms it has at its disposal and at the appropriate levels.

43. In this period of dwindling resource allocation to the Caribbean region, the need for institutional coherence is crucial. A clear engagement and/or partnership strategy is necessary if ECLAC is to continue to be relevant in this region. Respondents generally acknowledged that the responsibility for initiating such partnerships did not only lie with ECLAC, but with Member States and intergovernmental agencies equally.

Finding 9: The emergence of new intergovernmental organizations and the difficulties in coordination and follow-up with them have weakened ECLAC and CDCC's leadership role in the Caribbean

44. The emergence of a range of well resourced intergovernmental organizations as well as donor organizations and the UN family of agencies, has contributed to the decline of ECLAC and CDCC in the Caribbean. During its early days in the region, ECLAC was a driver of development thinking, well known for the work of Raul Prebisch and others. It was also well known for the quality of its analysis on development issues and was the only entity of its kind engaged in such work. Over time, however, a range of well resourced agencies and institutions emerged with the capacity to undertake research and analysis with closer linkages to Caribbean governments and with the capability to provide sizeable grants, technical assistance and a diversity of services and resources. CARICOM, the CDB and the IDB are examples.

45. In this environment characterized by new players, the SRH-POS has made several attempts to forge partnerships; however even where formal mechanisms guiding cooperation are in place, operationalization of these has been sometimes protracted and problematic. On the 24th January, 1995 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between ECLAC (acting on behalf of the CDCC) and CARICOM providing for "...expanded cooperation in matters of common interest... holding of periodic consultations on all matters of common interest for the purpose of achieving their respective objectives and of coordinating activities relating to the economic, social, cultural and scientific development of their respective members. Consultations can extend to issues relating to the joint development and prioritization of work programmes"⁴⁰. To date, ECLAC has provided a great deal of support to issues of mutual interest including the processes associated with the FTAA, CSME and EPA among others, including ECLAC's involvement in the UN-CARICOM General Meeting. However, feedback from the Secretary General of CARICOM and key staff in CARICOM indicates that little has been done in terms of joint programming.

46. In the area of climate change, where ECLAC has technical expertise in the economics of climate change, an invitation has not been extended for the organization's participation in the CARICOM Task Force on Climate Change. No clear explanation for this situation has been given by CARICOM, but it does illustrate the perceived lack of clear leadership on the part of ECLAC in respect of its comparative advantage which should be exercised whenever possible. While there are also positive examples to show work in this area such as the finalization of MOUs with the Caribbean Catastrophic Risk Insurance Facility (CCRIF), the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) and the finalization of the MOU with the CDB which took two years to complete; some of these are not yet fully operational.

⁴⁰ Draft MOU for Cooperation between the CARICOM and UN-ECLAC/CDCC Secretariat

Despite the above, all stakeholders involved recognize that there is a need for better coordination and collaboration so that each organization can maximize its potential for the benefit of the region. None of the current initiatives has actually been instrumental in achieving this goal.

47. Though efforts have been made to strengthen cooperation with the UN agencies within Trinidad and Tobago and specific countries in the region (Suriname, Guyana, Jamaica, Barbados) through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) which is the UN mechanism for coordination and collaboration at the country level, more defined and specific work needs to be put in place to ensure collaboration and coordination is properly defined and is followed-up to achieve concrete outcomes at the regional level, as mentioned earlier. This is ECLAC's comparative advantage and one which has not yet been fully exercised. A clear example of the leadership role that could expand to other areas is the role that ECLAC SRH-POS is playing in managing the Regional Coordination Mechanism for the SIDS POA/Mauritius Strategy. A review of the ECLAC work programme reflects several joint initiatives with UNDP, UNEP, UNFPA and UNIFEM, showing mixed results in the work with some agencies, but not in a consistent fashion. There is need for further collaboration on cost containment initiatives and other aspects of UN reform though, including joint programming within the parameters of the separate accountability structures of the UN agencies and through the mechanisms available for this such as the Regional Consultation Mechanism (RCM) which has not yet trickled down at the subregional level. The current effectiveness of the regional coordination mechanism in place within the UN system is unclear, to say the least, with the Regional Directors Team led by UNDP not really operating in line with the RCM which is mandated to provide the leadership in coordination of UN activities at the regional level. This is an issue for which all UN agencies have responsibility. It might be an area to explore in the near future, considering that ECLAC possesses the regional mandate and it has subregional offices both in the Caribbean as well as Central America. The UN agencies need to identify synergies in their services and work programme or else, as one key informant noted, "...the UN is racing toward irrelevance in high middle income countries such as in this region".

Finding 10: The CDCC's effectiveness as the primary mechanism for promoting integration and cooperation has been limited to date

48. Established by ECLA resolution 358 (XVI) in 1975, the CDCC was believed to be the ideal mechanism to facilitate cooperation among the newly independent as well as non-independent states of the Caribbean including Cuba. Further, by bringing together independent and non-independent countries with agencies of the UN system and regional institutions such as CDB and CARICOM, it was anticipated that the NICs would have access to and benefit from the UN system and that greater coordination as well as resource optimization would be the result⁴¹. CDCC session reports⁴² attest to the three priority areas:

- a. Assistance in the promotion of social and economic development;
- b. Stimulation of better coordination within the Caribbean;
- c. The promotion of cooperation between member countries of the Committee and other members of ECLAC as well as with the integration groupings of Latin America

49. The Declaration of Santo Domingo⁴³ specifically noted that projects and proposals should be "...directed to regional initiatives compatible with current integration activities and with the potential to yield collective benefits; the utilization of resources on a regional basis to enable all CDCC countries to participate and to benefit and as far as feasible the utilization of indigenous expertise in the region including methodology and technology".⁴⁴

50. From the outset it was envisaged that integration and cooperation would be the primary mandate of the CDCC. Stakeholders generally agree that the CDCC has contributed to some aspects of regional cooperation given that:

- It is the only body within the UN system in which both independent and non-independent states participate on the basis of equality;

⁴¹ Significantly, this orientation toward improved coordination came decades before the institution of the UNDAF in this region.

⁴² See Reports of the First, Second and Third Sessions of the CDCC 1975 to 1977

⁴³ E/CEPAL/CDCC/21/Rev.1 E/CEPAL/1039- Report of the Second Session of the CDCC.

⁴⁴ "The Role and Functioning of the CDCC 1975-1980" Fifth Session of the CDCC, Kingston Jamaica, 4-10 June 1980

- It has also facilitated access and participation by non-independent states to a number of global forums;
- It has facilitated dialogue, cooperation and interaction between Caribbean countries and Cuba;
- As a result, the integration process between CARICOM and non-CARICOM countries has achieved some level of progress as has the interaction between the English Speaking Caribbean and Latin America;⁴⁵

51. Beyond these general achievements, the CDCC has experienced several challenges from its very inception. Assessments⁴⁶ of the CDCC's performance since 1975 have identified several issues which were summarized in a 2008 Report⁴⁷ "...the CDCC had been handicapped due to (a) a loss of its original vision and mission as a result of its changing operational context; (b) institutional overload in the regional institutional architecture as a result of the deepening of CARICOM and the creation of the ACS; (c) difficulties in securing high-level representation at meetings; and (d) continuing concerns by the English- and Dutch-speaking Caribbean about their lack of representation/inclusion in the work of the wider ECLAC system".⁴⁸ These issues were also identified by respondents during the evaluation process and need to be integrated into an overall revamping of the CDCC which is still considered relevant, but revitalization of which has not been taken seriously by all parties concerned.

⁴⁵ Also reflected in the findings of the working group on "Redefining and Revitalizing the Role of the CDCC in Caribbean Regional Development".

⁴⁶ Assessments of the role and functioning of the CDCC were included in CDCC sessions in 1976, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1992, 2000 and 2008. Appendixdetails the specific reports

⁴⁷ CDCC 22/5 LC/CAR/L.163, "Redefining and Revitalizing the Role of the CDCC in Caribbean Regional Development", 9 April 2008.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

Finding 11: Despite limited effectiveness, the CDCC is still relevant to cooperation and integration, particularly as a mechanism for generating a regional (Latin American and Caribbean) perspective to global development dialogue

52. Though the original circumstances, vision and mandate that facilitated its establishment have disappeared and institutions such as CARICOM, the OECS and the ACS (to a limited extent) are more visible than the CDCC, it is also clear that there is a niche for the CDCC in facilitating Latin American and Caribbean cooperation. The need to re-focus the CDCC on issues related to regional cooperation has been made in CDCC session reports since 1976⁴⁹ and as recently as the 14th Monitoring Committee meeting held on 8th September 2009. The statement from the Cuban representative queried, "...since the CDCC was established and its Constituent Declaration and Rules of Procedure updated in order to match our current realities, why do we not draw up a programme especially for the CDCC that is more closely linked to cooperation and integration than to analysis and study, which are also necessary?"⁵⁰

53. The representative's statement also reiterated the need for action to improve cooperation on several fronts which had been identified in previous sessions of the CDCC. These included:

- The need to identify sources of extra-budgetary funding to finance concrete activities and projects in member countries;
- That CDCC meetings should be convened prior to major UN conferences in areas of interest to the sub region in order to determine the Caribbean position;
- Need to optimize regular financial resources of ECLAC as well as extra-budgetary resources on areas of common interest to the sub-region;
- That the Secretariat must consult with countries on their particular areas of interest and develop concrete proposals that respond to these concerns;
- That the integration processes occurring in Latin America and the potential implications for the Caribbean should be analysed.

⁴⁹ A comprehensive analysis of the CDCC is detailed in "The CDCC into the New Millennium: Meeting the Challenges of the Future- A Discussion paper" 2nd January 2000.

⁵⁰ Statement by the representative of Cuba at the 13th Meeting of the Monitoring Committee of the CDCC

54. Despite this very clear and focused set of priorities, the Evaluation Team noted that very little has been done in any of the above areas to promote regional cooperation and integration. Several respondents shared the view that that the CDCC and ECLAC's true comparative advantage is its strategic position, bridging Latin America and the Caribbean within the UN. This comparative advantage has not been fully optimized to date, however the opportunity to facilitate cooperation and integration between Latin America and the Caribbean is as critical at this juncture as any other challenge for regional development. While the Evaluation Team recognizes that some progress on the implementation of the recommendations above might have been made since the launching of the evaluation, it would be ideal if concrete progress would be presented to the next session of the CDCC in March of 2010.

Finding 12: CDCC members have demonstrated insufficient political commitment to cooperation activities and support to the implementation of the CDCC work programme

55. The need for Caribbean Member States to exercise 'effective' support for the implementation of the work programme has been made in CDCC session reports almost from inception as well as in the assessments of the performance of the CDCC noted earlier.

For example, the fifth session of the CDCC noted seven elements detailed in E/CEPAL/CDC/59 relevant to optimizing resources available for cooperation including:

- Assignment of experts from governments to the Secretariat;
- Provision in national budgets to cover expenses of country experts and officials participating in meetings and working groups;
- The need for governments to make representations to ensure that CDCC activities are supported in UN bodies;
- Utilizing all resources which could be provided under TCDC;
- Allocating a part of the UNDP IPF for the CDCC work programme
- Augmenting UN resources for the CEPAL office for the Caribbean
- Identifying national resources available for establishing mechanisms for regional co-operation projects.

With the exception of Cuba, the representative of which routinely offers technical assistance through the assignment of expertise, there is little evidence that Member States have provided support as specified.

56. At the 11th Session of the CDCC, the outgoing Chairman noted that, "...the promotion of co-operation among its membership and particularly CARICOM and non-CARICOM states has always been and continues to remain one of the major objectives of the CDCC. Perhaps the record of the Committee in this area has not been as outstanding and successful as we would wish. Our reaction to this should not be to neglect the CDCC. Rather, it is up to the membership to shape and mold the organization so as to make it more responsive to our needs and aspirations...member states need to have their current needs and priorities reflected".

57. Subsequent reports⁵¹ have reiterated the need for Member States' political commitment to the CDCC's regional cooperation agenda. ECLAC also indicated a level of frustration with CDCC member countries lack of responsiveness to contributing to ECLAC fora as illustrated by the difficulties faced when trying to secure an adequate level of Members' participation in the annual meetings of the Monitoring Committee or the CDCC itself. This lack of interest displayed by Caribbean states is not limited to ECLAC but is also experienced by many other UN agencies, and intergovernmental organizations such as the CARICOM and the ACS.

58. One reason posited for the disinterestedness is the fact that many of the aforementioned agencies are not as well resourced as the Caribbean Development Bank, the IDB and the World Bank. Secondary to this may be countries limited understanding of the benefits to be derived from the UN system. Caribbean states need to be re-educated about the benefits to be derived from the UN in general and ECLAC in particular and how these can be maximized. As from the evidence presented above, countries do not seem to have sufficient clarity as to the mandate, goals, objectives and potential assistance that ECLAC could bring and how it could assist the countries' development needs.

⁵¹ CDCC in the new Millennium (2000) and Redefining and Revitalizing the CDCC (2008) among others.

Finding 13: ECLAC's role as a bridge between the Caribbean and Latin America has been noted as one of its most obvious comparative advantages vis a vis other subregional organizations, but one that has so far not been fully taken advantage of

59. The perception expressed by over 90% of respondents interviewed (including staff of SRO/ Government/Regional organizations/key informants) is that ECLAC is first and foremost a Latin American institution in which the needs of the Caribbean are marginal at best. As such, the situation of the Caribbean is not fully reflected in flagship reports, in particular the Social Panorama and Foreign Investment in Latin America and the Caribbean produced by Headquarters, even when the data have been produced, collected and sent to HQ. As several respondents have noted "analyses of issues and trends reflect the Latin American perspective" and as noted earlier in the report, "...the Caribbean is in a box..." This sense of marginalization is strongly felt across each of the stakeholder groups and has been a recurring theme in the assessments of CDCC completed to date. Similarly, with the same vehemence, Caribbean stakeholders believe that ECLAC's most significant comparative advantage lies in the fact that it is the only organizations that includes Caribbean and Latin American countries within one platform where common issues, interest and problems can be discussed and where regional solutions can be found to these challenges. This uniqueness has not been capitalized to its potentials and has rather served as a mechanism to note differences rather than complementarities and similarities. The differences in culture and language have been cited as contributing factors as well as the fact that the Caribbean is yet to develop a policy on Caribbean/ Latin American relations. Respondents also suggested that the declining participation in CDCC meetings may also be a symptom of this perception of marginalization.

60. The Evaluation Team noted the same kind of trend in other important publications such as for example, the CEPAL Review. An examination of such publications from 1976 to the present indicated only eleven (11) articles on the Caribbean.⁵² As more than one stakeholder noted the relative absence of Caribbean intellectual input in flagship publications such as the CEPAL Review is of grave concern in a region that has produced three Nobel Laureates⁵³; one in Economics. The Evaluation Team was not able to determine whether the lack of representation in the CEPAL Review was due to lack of interest on the part of Caribbean intellectuals or other reasons. The SRO's effort to produce the new journal, "The Caribbean Development Report" has been well received so far, though staff of the SRO pointed out that there was a great deal of resistance from ECLAC Headquarters to the efforts of the SRH to produce the publication. The process was initiated on 23rd June 2006 with the development

⁵² Three articles were by Trevor Harker and two by Jean Casimir. Other authors included Wilfred Whitingham, Eduardo Valenzuela, Meryl James Bryan and Richard Bernal.

⁵³ Sir Vidya Naipaul and Derek Walcott won the Nobel prize for Literature and Sir Arthur Lewis for Economics.

of an initial outline and discussion paper and came to fruition with the publication of the Caribbean Development Report Volume 1 in September 2009, some 3 years later.

61. Regardless of whether the issue of Caribbean marginalization is real or imagined, this pervasive view needs to be addressed by ECLAC in any effort to revitalize the organization in this sub-region. Respondents, who identified language as a contributing factor, also acknowledged that the Caribbean is as much at fault and needs to bridge the language divide if Latin American and Caribbean relations are to be improved. Several respondents noted that the issue of marginalization is 'deeper' than the language issue and more proactive engagement of the region will need to be instituted to redress the situation. Whatever the situation, the reality is that both regions need to accentuate efforts and strengths in working on what brings them together rather than on the differences, acknowledging that ECLAC is one organization at the service of both Latin American and the Caribbean.

62. On a positive note, several recent visits by the Executive Secretary herself, representatives of the Programme Planning and Operations Division, the Human Resources Section and staff from CEPAL Review to the SRH-POS in 2009, was perceived as a step in the right direction and very much welcomed by staff and other stakeholders. In addition, interviews across the region revealed that within the last year the increased responsiveness and interest demonstrated by ECLAC Santiago staff, especially the Executive Director, who has been more engaged than the previous leadership in ensuring that the Caribbean is reflected, visible and present has been a welcome improvement and seems to indicate a genuine interest in improving collaboration and consolidating ECLAC's role.

63. ECLAC's effectiveness as a bridge between the Caribbean and Latin America will require concrete strategies promoting closer collaboration and cooperation. In addition, a sustained campaign to redress perceptions of marginalization will be critical to overcoming the difficulties that have been present in the past few years.

B. Management and Governance

Finding 14: SRH-POS has experienced a great deal of difficulty in balancing the increasing demands of Member States and regional organizations for bilateral technical assistance and capacity building with a mandate and organizational structure that follow a regional approach to the Caribbean's development issues

64 As noted earlier, there was a general consensus and demand for a greater level of bilateral assistance from ECLAC by all stakeholders. The view was expressed that such direct assistance would facilitate the attainment of critical capacity development goals in areas such as statistics and disaster assessment as well as trade and economic modeling. An assessment of performance reports for the SRH-POS over the period 1996/1997-2006/2007 reveals a consistently high number of requests for technical assistance. As detailed in the table below, the number of requests to the SRH were considerably higher than those made to the Mexico SRH over the period 1996 to 2001. The period 2002 to 2005 coincides with the period during which the SRH was without a Director and this may account for the reduction in the number of requests. Subsequently, as detailed in Table 3, the number of requests received and executed continued to increase over the last two Biennia, 2006-2007 and 2008 and 2009.

Table 2. Technical Assistance Requests to Sub Programme 11 and 12 between 1996 and 2005.

Sub Programmes	Technical Assistance 1996-1997		Technical Assistance 1998-1999		Technical Assistance 2000-2001		Technical Assistance 2002-2003		Technical Assistance 2004-2005	
	Request Received	Request Executed	Request Received	Request Executed	Request Received	Request Executed	Request Received	Request Executed	Request Received	Request Executed
Sub regional Activities in Mexico and Central America	38	38	58	53	61	61	272	272	347	347
Sub regional Activities in the Caribbean	333	314	86	75	95	95	51	50	48	48

Table 3. Technical Assistance Requests to Sub Programme 12, 2006 to 2009

Sub programme 12	Technical Assistance 2006-2007		Technical Assistance 2008-2009	
	Request Received	Request Executed	Request Received	Request Executed
SRO in the Caribbean	61	61	90	90

65. The SRH is constrained by its small staff compliment and mandate to pursue regional solutions to national problems. Specifically, the SRH does not have the required quantum of staff necessary to provide ongoing technical assistance to 25 member countries. The diversity of the region-English, Dutch and Spanish Speaking, Independent and Non-Independent countries with several intergovernmental organizations including CARICOM, OECS, ACS as well as the UN family of agencies also poses challenges to the small resource base of the SRH. The fact that technical assistance is generally based on extra-budgetary resources presents another constraint to provide the full support required by the ever increasing country requests for technical assistance.

66. Regarding this apparent lack of resources, the Evaluation Team could not confirm that the SRH had actually conveyed this point through the regular planning process or any other similar type of planning meeting where the resources needed to deliver SRH-POS' work programme was put into context. Given the perceptions of lack of understanding and apparent imbalance between resources, capacities and requirements to respond to the sub regions' need, it is suggested that a comprehensive assessment of the resources required to provide ECLAC's core services to the subregion be conducted to dispel or confirm the actual needs of the Caribbean for ECLAC services.

67. ECLAC's role as a think tank and mechanism for the discussion of development problems common to the region, means that its primary mandate is to address regional issues and regional solutions. That is undoubtedly the essence of ECLAC's mandate. Unless this situation is clearly reconciled with the continuous requests for technical assistance, ECLAC will continue to be perceived as having limited value to the social and economic development of the region. Ideally, a more strategic focus, taking into account available expertise and resources coupled with priorities as defined by Member States, should inform a redefined work programme that is more closely aligned with the SRO's resource base.

CONCLUSIONS

68. The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean has been characterized as the ‘best kept secret’ in the region. The organization has made wide ranging contributions to Caribbean development through technical publications, provision of technical assistance to member governments, regional institutions and the UN family of agencies in the region and capacity building initiatives. Its pioneering work in statistics, economic development and trade, poverty and vulnerability assessment and disaster and loss assessment has been invaluable to the region. At the same time, apart from those in the technical and scientific community, ECLAC does not ‘come to mind’ or is marginal to many in the field of policy. The mechanism of the CDCC - created to ensure the interface with governments across the region, including the non independent states and the UN system - has not fulfilled its potential despite several efforts to renew, refine and revitalize it.

69. It is generally acknowledged though, that despite the challenges and issues faced by the CDCC and its Secretariat, there remains a critical role for both entities in the future development of the region, particularly as it pertains to Caribbean and Latin American relations. The enduring challenges of fiscal sustainability and economic and social vulnerability coupled with emerging issues such as climate change means that the services of a ‘think tank’ are more necessary than ever. The rapidly changing geopolitical landscape suggests that integration and cooperation are deemed high priority. Within the context of reduced resources to middle income countries of this region, coordination across the UN system and the donor community is imperative.

70. A range of assessments to date, have focused on the CDCC and how it can be made more effective. The Evaluation Team would suggest that development of a strategy aimed at re-orienting and repositioning ECLAC in the Caribbean will serve a threefold purpose: it will raise awareness and knowledge of ECLAC’s capacity, re-establish ECLAC as an integral component of regional development and as a result, renew Member States’ interest in CDCC. Member States do not appear to understand the benefits to be derived from the UN system and their role in ensuring that the region reaps those benefits. This effort to reposition ECLAC must in the first instance be spearheaded by the Executive Secretary with the support of SRH-POS staff. The Secretary General of CARICOM, the Director General of the OECS and other high level representatives have already indicated their support to any such effort. This initiative must be complemented by an outreach/advocacy/communications campaign to, as several stakeholders suggested “insert ECLAC into the consciousness of Caribbean institutions”.

RECOMMENDATIONS

71. The following recommendations have been developed to build on ECLAC's comparative advantage as the intellectual nucleus of the UN system in this region as well as mitigate several of the challenges identified. The recommendations are grouped based on strategic interventions and overall programme governance and administration.

STRATEGIC INTERVENTIONS

Recommendation 1:

A comprehensive engagement strategy targeting Member States, regional organizations such as CARICOM, OECS, CDB, SELA and IDB as well as UN agencies needs to be developed by the SRH-POS. This engagement strategy requires the leadership, participation and strategic intervention of the Executive Secretary at the level of CARICOM and OECS meetings and/or Board of Governor Meetings of the CDB.

72. Findings 7, 8 and 9 each underscores one of the most significant findings of this evaluation: that is, the near 'invisibility' of ECLAC in the Caribbean. Unless ECLAC expends the necessary time and human resources to address this issue, it will continue to fall short of its mandate of facilitating the economic and social development of the region. The need to actively engage member states as well as key regional partners such as the OECS, CARICOM, CDB and IDB as well as the UN family of agencies means that the effort needs to be spearheaded by the Executive Secretary with the support of senior management of the SRH. The involvement of the Executive Secretary will be a clear indication of the importance that ECLAC attaches to the development of the region. The engagement strategy should also send a strong message about the need for political commitment on the part of Member States if ECLAC and the CDCC are to effectively support the social and economic development of the region. The mitigation of the perception of 'Caribbean marginalization' would also need to be factored into the strategy. Finally, as noted in the report, this evaluation has also resulted in a degree of reflection on the part of regional partners and a re-think of the role that "the intellectual nucleus" that is ECLAC can play in Caribbean regional development. The time is therefore appropriate for implementation of a coherent engagement strategy.

Recommendation 2:

ECLAC should spearhead the development of a mechanism to support development thinking in this region such as a “Caribbean Development Round Table”.

73. Findings 3, 5 and 6 have highlighted the need for greater depth in ECLAC’s policy outputs as well as the need for sustained dialogue and the engagement of Latin American and Caribbean intellectuals in the re-think of development. A “Caribbean Development Round Table” chaired by ECLAC and involving the representatives of key government and partner agencies as well as Caribbean intellectuals and Latin American counterparts to address the medium to long term development challenges of the Caribbean should be established. This will facilitate reclamation of ECLAC’s think tank function in the Caribbean and catalyze the long dormant but necessary discourse on Caribbean Development

74. Convening of an annual or biennial “Caribbean Development Round Table” aimed at a closer alignment of ECLAC’s work programme with the priority needs of the region would not only facilitate collaboration but also bring refinement and strategic focus to the work programme based on the region’s needs. Theoretically, CDCC Member States should inform the development of the work programme as well as the regional priorities set by organizations such as CARICOM and the OECS. However, feedback suggests that there is no clear strategy to obtain Member States input during the development of the work programme. The work programme is developed within the SRH and then presented for CDCC approval. The development of ECLAC’s work programme presents an ideal opportunity for forging closer links with Member States, intergovernmental organizations and UN agency partners. The “Round Table” will also support development thinking around many of the enduring challenges faced by Small Island Developing States as well as emerging challenges such as climate change, among others.

Recommendation 3:

ECLAC and SRH-POS should undertake a thorough review of the publication portfolio for the Caribbean with the aim of identifying the areas where it would make most sense to strengthen its role as a policy entrepreneur and to devise a clear and detailed action plan to regain its intellectual leadership in the subregion to provide credible, independent, research based policy options to Caribbean countries.

Recommendation 4:

ECLAC needs to develop a well defined and practical communications and outreach strategy including a detailed action plan to implement it in support of the high level engagement strategy called for in Recommendation 1. This communication and outreach strategy should play a central role in promoting and disseminating the ECLAC mandate, vision, the services it provides to the region and its comparative advantages *vis-à-vis* other regional organizations and other UN agencies. The strategy should include action plans to promote ECLAC's work in the Caribbean at the different levels of government, as well as the revamping of the SRH-POS website, including the updating of distribution lists and the enlistment of a communications professional to support the overall effort.

Recommendation 5:

The role, function and mandate of the CDCC require immediate review to optimize its potential as a mechanism for the promotion of Latin American and Caribbean regional cooperation.

75. Findings 10 and 11 reflect the challenges experienced by the CDCC as a mechanism for the promotion of regional integration and cooperation. The evaluation also highlighted the continued relevance of the CDCC both as a bridge between Latin America and the Caribbean and as a coordinating mechanism for the UN system in the region. ECLAC however needs to determine its expectations of the CDCC and the anticipated contributions that CDCC can make to Caribbean cooperation. Once this is clearly articulated it must be communicated to Member states and regional partners, including the role that each of these is expected to play in a revitalized CDCC. Many of the recommendations that have been made in previous reports on the CDCC are still valid and these might constitute a starting point for the re-visioning exercise.

Recommendation 6:

(a) The ECLAC work programme needs to be reviewed and refined in line with the consultations and high level efforts of the previous recommendations and to bring it in line with resources available to the SRH-POS. A narrow, clearly defined and realistic set of priorities should be identified based on regional needs and the scope of ECLAC's thematic areas. 2010 should be a perfect opportunity to refine this work programme in preparation for the budget approval process that is to start at the end of next year.

(b) Additionally, a comprehensive fund raising strategy needs to complement this prioritizing effort to ensure that sufficient resources would be available to support the Caribbean priorities.

76. Recognizing the resource constraints faced by the United Nations system in general and UNECLAC specifically, and cognizant of the priority development needs of the region, the SRH-POS work programme must be critically reviewed with the aim of aligning available resources to development interventions most likely to yield optimal returns for the region. Therefore, rather than the piecemeal approach to building statistical capacity in the region, undertaken by CARICOM, CDB and ECLAC, among others, a more strategic approach aimed at ensuring sustained capacity, including systems and human resources, needs to be developed. Indeed, such a strategy may emerge from the "development roundtable" that will also consolidate donor funding and cooperation. In addition, a realistic set of priorities will permit deeper analysis and higher quality outputs with the potential for increased utility by policy makers. In addition, it will facilitate the need to focus efforts on the design of a fund raising strategy to tackle the most pressing needs of the Caribbean community.

Recommendation 7

A strategy to institutionalize results based management needs to be developed and implemented in the short to medium term.

77. Finding 4 noted the lack of an outcome orientation within ECLAC that seemed to be reflective of the UN tradition of compliance. Shifting such a deep seated culture will not occur in the short term, More specific outcome indicators that are more closely aligned with ECLAC's immediate goals in the region, as well as the consistent use of survey forms for every technical cooperation effort (Advisory services or training) to capture and document SRH-

POS outcomes and impact need to be developed. Finally, individual and organizational performance assessments should include indicators related to intra-organizational and inter-organizational cooperation.

Recommendation 8

ECLAC should seek to sustain the important work related to the development of methodologies and indices by expanding its assistance to building national capacities, including skills, processes and systems on disaster and loss assessment among other things.

78. Finding 2 reflected on ECLAC's excellent performance in the area of technical assistance to Member States, specifically in the areas of disaster assessment and statistical capacity. However, such ongoing assistance places additional burdens on ECLAC staff, not to mention the financial resources expended. ECLAC may need to review its approach to technical assistance, particularly in the area of post disaster assessment, to ensure that a critical mass of persons are trained in all aspects of the methodologies and that the necessary systems are developed and implemented so that in the event of a disaster, trained personnel can be located and utilized. Although an effort is being made to train persons in the DALA methodologies, some attention may need to be paid to the establishment of disaster management systems linked to the methodology.

SUGGESTED ACTIONS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CDCC

79. On the basis of the following report, it is recommended that the CDCC adopts the following measures:

a) CDCC should endorse the recommendations of the evaluation report and recommend their prompt implementation.

b) Recommend that a working group be created to make certain that the revitalization efforts of the CDCC are fully realized. This working group should be led and fully supported by Member States to ensure the highest level of representation and ownership possible and that the recommendations of this evaluation report are taken into consideration in the revitalization process.

c) CDCC should review the status of implementation of the recommendations in its next session

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Session Reports of the CDCC

ECLA 1976. *Report of the First Session of the CDCC*. Havana, Cuba:

.....1977. *Report of the Second Session of the CDCC*. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

.....1978. *Report of the Third Session of the CDCC*. Belize City, Belize

.....1979. *Report of the Fourth Session of the CDCC*. Paramaribo, Suriname (Vol. I and II)
Assessment of Some Aspects of realizing the CDCC Programme

..... 1980. *Report of the Fifth Session of the CDCC*. Kingston, Jamaica

1982. *Report of the Sixth Session of the CDCC*. St. George's Grenada and UN HQ

..... 1983. *Report of the Seventh Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago

..... 1984. *Report of the Eight Session of the CDCC*. Port Au Prince, Haiti

ECLAC 1985. *Report of the Ninth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago

1987 *Report of the Tenth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago

1988. *Report of the Eleventh Session of the CDCC*. St. Croix, USVI

1989 *Report of the Twelfth Session of the CDCC*. Curacao, Netherlands Antilles

1991 *Report of the Thirteenth Session of the CDCC*. Kingston Jamaica

1992. *Report of the Fourteenth Session of the CDCC*. St. Georges Grenada

1994. *Report of the Fifteenth Session of the CDCC*. Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic

1996. *Report of the Sixteenth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago

1998. *Report of the Seventeenth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago

- 2000.*Report of the Eighteenth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago
- 2002.*Report of the Nineteenth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago
- 2004.*Report of the Twentieth Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago
- 2006.*Report of the Twenty First Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago
- 2008.*Report of the Twenty Second Session of the CDCC*. Port of Spain Trinidad and Tobago

The CDCC into the new Millennium: Meeting the Challenges of the Future. Port of Spain: ECLAC.

-----, 2005. *Revised Text Constituent Declaration and Functions and Rules of Procedure of the Caribbean Development and Cooperation Committee*. Port of Spain: ECLAC.

.....2008. "Redefining and Revitalizing the Role of the CDCC in Caribbean Regional Development" Port of Spain, ECLAC

..... 2000. "ECLAC CDCC through the Years: Twenty Five Years of Caribbean Research", Port of Spain ECLAC

Report of the Implementation of the ECLAC Work Programme Sub regional activities for the Caribbean: 2006-2007 Biennium".

Report of the Activities of the Commission from January 2006 to December 2007", LC/G.2372 (SES.32/8) 14th May, 2008

"The 21st Century Think Tank" ODI Annual Report 2008. www.odi.org.uk

Introduction/Background

Briefly explain the evaluation background and purpose of the interview

The objective⁵⁴ of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of ECLAC's presence and contribution to the economic and social development in the Caribbean. In light of the evaluation, ECLAC should be able to rethink its engagement with the subregion and strengthen its role, strategies and priorities in order to respond to the Caribbean development needs more effectively.

The evaluation essentially seeks to:

- (a) To review ECLAC's institutional partnership in the Caribbean and assess the levels of ownership Member Countries have in the organization,
- (b) To determine the strategic role of SRO-PoS in support of the Caribbean development needs and how it is supported by the ECLAC' programme of work.

Questions:

- How long have you been with the Ministry? How does your Ministry engage with UNECLAC?
- In what ways – if at all – have you had direct contact with UNECLAC? Since when? Who are your key contacts in UNECLAC?
- Can you describe the core mandate of UNECLAC? What about the CDCC?
- What would you consider the main comparative advantages of UNECLAC/CDCC compared to other organizations or UN entities?
- In your opinion, is ECLAC/CDCC relevant to the development needs of the region? Why?

⁵⁴ The objectives for this evaluation are framed in conformity with the PPBME, Regulation 7.1.⁵⁴, regulation 7.2 and Rule 107.2, ST/SGB./2000/8, p.12, Regulation 7.2 notes that all activities programme shall be evaluated over a fixed time period, and Rule 107.2 notes that all programmes shall be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis.

Relevance and results

- What do you consider the 2-3 most important development issues to have impacted the Caribbean in the past 5 years?
- How would you assess the UNECLAC/CDCC approach to addressing these issues?
- What do you think are UNECLAC's strengths and major achievements to date in the region?
- What do you think are UNECLAC's shortcomings? And how can they be improved?

Member State

- What do you consider the 2-3 most important economic and social development issues to have emerged in your country in the past 5 years?
- What have been the main opportunities and challenges experienced in promoting your country's national development agenda in the past 5 years?
- How (if at all) has the UNECLAC supported your country's national (economic or social) development efforts? Can you give specific examples?
- Are there any examples of policies or programmes you have implemented or are considering as a result of a UNECLAC intervention?
- To what extent has your country been involved in UNECLAC led regional initiatives such as formulating policy proposal and recommendations or enhancing the knowledge of policymakers, researchers and the general public in the subregion on issues related to **sustainable development, integration and trade facilitation, statistics, climate change, macroeconomic analysis, gender, social development, population, etc**? What has been the effect of that participation in your country – for your staff, Ministry, government?
- In your view, what is the value added of UNECLAC to economic and social development, either within your country or across the region? What would be loss should ECLAC seek to exist?

Future

- Are there any particular regional issues that UNECLAC should work on that are not being addressed currently?
- What would be the 2-3 most significant changes that could be made to improve UNECLAC's service to the region?
- Is there anything you would like to add that we have not asked?

Thank You

Key Informant

Introduction/Background

Briefly explain the evaluation background and purpose of the interview

The objective⁵⁵ of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of ECLAC's presence and contribution to the economic and social development in the Caribbean. In light of the evaluation, ECLAC should be able to rethink its engagement with the subregion and strengthen its role, strategies and priorities in order to respond to the Caribbean development needs more effectively.

The evaluation essentially seeks to:

- (a) To review ECLAC's institutional partnership in the Caribbean and assess the levels of ownership Member Countries have in the organization,
- (b) To determine the strategic role of SRO-PoS in support of the Caribbean development needs and how it is supported by the ECLAC' programme of work.

Overall Strategy

- In what ways, if at all, have you had direct contact with ECLAC? Since when? Who are your key contacts?
- What is your understanding of the mandate and role of ECLAC in the Caribbean? What about the role of the CDCC?
- In your opinion, is ECLAC/CDCC relevant to the development needs of the Region? Why?
- What would you consider the main comparative advantages of ECLAC compared to other organizations or UN entities in the region?

Partnership Strategy

- From your general knowledge, how is ECLAC perceived by Member states? Are member states aware of the technical cooperation services/products provided by ECLAC?

⁵⁵ The objectives for this evaluation are framed in conformity with the PPBME, Regulation 7.1.⁵⁵, regulation 7.2 and Rule 107.2, ST/SGB./2000/8, p.12, Regulation 7.2 notes that all activities programme shall be evaluated over a fixed time period, and Rule 107.2 notes that all programmes shall be evaluated on a regular, periodic basis.

- How do you think ECLAC is perceived by organizations such as CARICOM, ACS, CDB, IDB?
- Have these perceptions, positive or negative, affected the level of cooperation or collaboration? How?

ECLAC Effectiveness in the Region

- Overall, to what extent has ECLAC effectively addressed the social and economic development issues facing the region? How effective has ECLAC been in promoting regional cooperation⁵⁶?
- What factors would you say have enabled or limited ECLAC's achievement of its objectives?
- What about the role of the CDCC, how effective has it been in facilitating regional cooperation and social and economic development?
- What do you consider to be the most significant contribution(s) of ECLAC to Caribbean Development and why?

Future

- In terms of the future of ECLAC in the region, what are the main opportunities and challenges?
- What changes/improvements should ECLAC make to more effectively serve the Caribbean?
- Other-Anything that you would like to add that we have not asked?

Thank You

⁵⁶ Including coordinated negotiation of agreements affecting the region; creation, development, adaptation of technology, technical and scientific info.; Coordination in transportation and communication, tourism, environmental conservation and optimization of energy resources, sustainable development, disaster mitigation, statistical capacity; think tank function.

APPENDIX III

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

“IN DEPTH EVALUATION OF UNECLAC’S PRESENCE IN THE CARIBBEAN”

ECLAC SRO-POS Staff

1. Neil Pierre, Director, SRO-POS
2. Ronald Williams, Economic Affairs Officer
3. A. Kambon, Regional Economic Adviser
4. Maureen Affoon, Meeting services Assistant
5. Dillon Alleyne, Economic Affairs Officer
6. Dale Alexander, Programme Officer
7. Sharon Alexander, Administrative Clerk
8. Sonja Affonso, Receptionist
9. Terry Boodram, Finance Assistant
10. Joanne D’abadie, Human Resources Assistant
11. Tricia Diaz, Library Assistant
12. Radcliffe Dookie, (retired Programme Assistant)
13. Juliet Edmund-Thompson, Administrative Clerk
14. Stefan Edwards, Research Assistant
15. Juda Francis, Security and Building Management Assistant
16. Taeke Gjaltema, Population Affairs Officer
17. Charmaine Gomes, Sustainable Development Officer
18. Sita Inglefield, Secretary

19. Wendy Jones, Library Assistant
20. Beverly Lugay, Research Assistant
21. Amoy Lum Kong, Economic Affairs Officer
22. Angela Martin Forbes, Secretary
23. Armando Mendoza, (Former Economic Affairs Officer)
24. Sinovia Moonie, Statistics Assistant
25. Phillipe Ramos, Computer Information System Assistant
26. Cindy Rodriguez, Computer information Systems Assistant
27. Jennifer Sankar Sooknarine, Copy Equipment Operator
28. Karoline Schmid, Social Affairs Officer
29. Gloria Subero, Secretary
30. Sheila Stuart, Social Affairs Officer and President Staff Association
31. Roberto Machado, Economic Affairs Officer
32. Marly Livia, Information Management Officer
33. Sylvan Roberts, Statistician
34. Njage Nthiga, Administrative Officer

ECLAC Headquarters Staff

35. Laura Lopez, Secretary to the Commission
36. Sonia Montano, Director Gender Division
37. Noel Reynaldo, HR Chief
38. Luis Becaria, Director Statistics
39. Salvador Marconi

Regional Organizations-Trinidad and Tobago

40. Ms Florita Kentish, Representative, Food and Agriculture Organization
41. Ana Teresa Romero, Director, International Labour Organization Sub Regional office for the Caribbean
42. Dr. Carol Boyd Scobie PAHO/WHO Representative
43. Ms. Angelica Hunt, Director , United Nations Information Centre
44. Marcia de Castro, Resident Co-ordinator and Resident Representative, UNDP

45. Ambassador Luis Falla, Representative, Association of Caribbean States
46. Luis Carpio, Director Transport, Association of Caribbean States
47. Iwan P. Sewberath, Misser, Representative, Inter-American Development bank
48. Riyad Insanally, Representative of the OAS

Ministry of Planning, Housing and the Environment (MPHE)

49. Mrs. Juliana Boodram,
50. Permanent Secretary, Mr. Joseph Howard, Deputy Permanent Secretary MPHE
51. Mrs. Vidiah. Ramkhelawan, Director Research
52. Ms. Carlene Wells, Ag. Director, Technical Cooperation MPHE
53. Mr. Dave Clement, Director Statistics, Central Statistical Office
54. Dr. David Persaud, Director, Environment Division
55. Mr. Kishan Kumarsingh, Environment Division
56. Mrs. Terry Ann Atkins, Socio-Economic Policy and Planning Division

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

57. Mrs. Margaret King Rousseau,
58. Foreign Service Officer
59. Foreign Service Officer
60. Foreign Service Officer

Ministry of Public Administration

61. Mr. John Gillette, National ICT Centre,

62. Shelly Ann Clarke Hinds, National ICT Centre, Ministry of Public Administration

Ministry of Trade and Industry

63. Mr. Wayne Punnetta Deputy Permanent Secretary,

64. Mr. Patrick Kanyimbo- Trade Policy Analyst

65. Mr. Neville Alexander- Trade Policy Specialist

66. Mr. Nyron Mohammed- Trade Policy Specialist

67. Mr. Videsh Maharaj- Trade Policy Specialist

68. Mrs. Christine Mahatoo-Senior Economist

Key Informants

69. Lenore Ragster, University of the US Virgin Islands

70. David Edgecombe, Adviser to the Governor, USVI

71. Dr. Paul Flowers, Government of Belize

72. HE Sharon Saunders, High Commissioner to Jamaica

73. Professor Dennis Pantin, Sustainable Development Unit University of the West Indies

74. Dr. Norman Girvan , International relations Department, University of the West Indies

75. Dave Seerattan, Centre for Finance and Monetary Studies, University of the West Indies

76. Dr. Barbara Bailey, UWI Mona

Government of Antigua

77. Mr. Whitfield Harris, Financial Secretary

78. Mr. Colin Murdoch, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce

CARICOM Secretariat

79. Dr. Edwin Carrington, Secretary General
80. Ambassador Lolita Applewhite, Deputy Secretary General
81. Collin Granderson, Assistant Secretary General
82. Dr. Edwin Green Assistant Secretary General
83. Ambassador Irwin Laroque, Assistant Secretary General
84. Dr. H Kassim, Deputy Programme Manager
85. Garfield Barnwell, Director Sustainable Development
86. Dr. Vincent Little, Coordinator, IICA's Caribbean Regional Technical Agenda
87. Dr. Maurice Odle, Economic Affairs Unit
88. Mrs. Bisember, Economic Affairs Unit
89. Valerie Alleyne Odle, Programme Manager, Foreign Policy And Community Relations
90. Dr. Philomen Harrison, Director, Statistics

Regional Organizations –Guyana

91. Mr. Marco Nicola, Representative Inter-American Development Bank, Guyana
92. Mr. Musheer Olatunji Kuman, Country Economist IADB
93. Mr Didier Trebuq, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Guyana
94. Laurence Williams, Governor, Central Bank of Guyana
95. Mr. Leslie Glen, Senior Economist Central Bank of Guyana

Government of Guyana

96. Ambassador Elizabeth Harper, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
97. Lennox Benjamin, Bureau of Statistics
98. Hymwattie Lagan, Administrator, Gender Affairs

Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS)

99. Dr. Len Ishmael, Director

100. Mr. Randolph Cato

101. Mr. Keith Nichols

Government of St. Lucia

102. Caroline Eugene, Sustainable Development and Environment Officer

103. Aviva Fredericks, Deputy Chief Economist

104. Mr. John Calixte, Deputy Permanent Secretary

Government of Barbados

105. Ms. Simone Rudder, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

106. Mr. Bentley Gibbs

107. Mr. Carson Browne

108. Ms. Ermnesta Drakes

109. Mrs. Angela Hunte, Barbados Statistical Office

Caribbean Development Bank

110. Mr. Desmond Brunton, VP Operations

111. Dr. Juliet Melville, Chief Country Economist

112. Mr. Clairvair O. Squires, Portfolio Manager, Social Sector Division

113. Ann Bramble, Deputy Director, Evaluation and Oversight Division

114. Mr. Adrian De Bique, Deputy Director, Corporate Planning Division

Regional Organizations-Barbados

115. Mr. Tom Olsen, Area Representative, UNICEF
116. Ms. Michelle Gyles-McDonnough, Resident Representative, UNDP
117. Roberta Clarke, Representative, UNIFEM
118. Mr. Phillip Cross, International Telecommunications Union
119. Mr. Vincent Sweeney, United Nations Environment Programme (St. Lucia)
120. Mr. Richard Carter, DFID
121. Mr. Roger Bellers, DFID
122. Dr. Gina Watson, PAHO
123. Mr. Douglas Williams, CIDA
124. Mr. Cam Bowes, CIDA
125. Phyllis Roette, CIDA
126. Mr. Francis McBarnette, OAS Country Representative
127. Ms Anneke Jessen, IDB Country Representative, Barbados
128. Emmerson L. Beckles, National Professional Officer, FAO Sub-Regional Office Barbados
129. Dr. Cedric Lazarus, Livestock Development Officer, FAO Sub Regional Office, Barbados
130. Daniel Boamah, Director Research, Central Bank of Barbados
131. Dr. Kevin Greenidge, Research Department, Central Bank of Barbados
132. Jeremy Collymore, Caribbean Disaster and Emergency Management Agency
133. Ms. Nicole Alleyne, CDEMA
134. Ms. Gail Henry, Caribbean Tourism Organization Barbados
135. Mr. Winfield Griffith, Caribbean Tourism Organization, Barbados
136. Professor Robin Mahon, UWI Cave Hill
137. Dr. Deryck Brown, Regional Director, CARICOM Development Fund
138. Ambassador Christopher Hackett, Permanent Representative to the UN, Barbados

APPENDIX IV

Field Visits to sample of countries

In reviewing available documentation related to requests for technical assistance by countries in the sub region (over the last five years) and in discussion with the Coordinator, Programme Support Unit , it would appear that the countries in which SRO-POS has provided the most assistance (outside of T&T) are **Guyana, St. Lucia, St. Kitts, Belize and Jamaica**. SRO-POS has **never provided assistance to Anguilla**, as that country has never made a request, however representatives have been invited to regional training workshops/meetings as deemed necessary. **BVI and USVI interventions appear to be limited** as well as Puerto Rico. One issue that was mentioned was the fact that Aruba and Bonaire often felt marginalized since SRO-POS interfaced with Curacao as the seat of Government for the Netherlands Antilles.

In terms of institutions, the most relevant for this evaluation appear to be CARICOM, ACS and OECS given the mandate of the CDCC. Finally the mechanisms guiding coordination and collaboration across UNECLAC as well as across the entire UN system (particularly UNDP, UNIFEM, UNFPA, UNEP) in the region require in depth exploration.

The selection of the 4-5 countries will be based on the balance of programme /project portfolio, geographic location of donor partners, representation of CDCC membership and the potential for lessons learned, the sample of countries for field visits should include Antigua and Barbuda, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, St. Lucia, Barbados, Netherland Antilles and Puerto Rico. Jamaica and the Dominican Republic may also be included as deemed necessary and based on the flexibility of the budget.

Ideally, at least two team members should spend 2-3 days in each country. The main purpose of the field visits will be to (a) determine the extent to which SRO-POS work is linked to country level priorities, (b) obtain the views of government, civil society, donor partners and UN agencies, (c) facilitate the development of findings and potential lessons that incorporate the specific contexts within which SRO-POS operates.

Table 1.

Countries	Size of Portfolio	Location of Donor Partners	Political Imp.	Member Country	Assoc. member	Sub 11
Antigua and Barbuda	M	L	L	H		
Barbados	M	H	H	H		
⁵⁷ Dominican Republic	L	L	L	H		H
Guyana	H	H	H	H		
Netherland Antilles	M	L	L		H	
Jamaica	M	H	H	H		
Puerto Rico	L	L	M		H	
St. Lucia	H	M	L	H		
Trinidad and Tobago	H	H	H	H		

Team Schedule and Field Missions:**Table 2**

	Countries	Team Members	Proposed Dates
Mission 1	Antigua and Barbuda	Dame Billie Miller	August 18 -19
Mission 2	Trinidad and Tobago Guyana	Juan Carlos Pena Dame Billie Miller Alexa Khan	T&T: September 7-11 Guyana: 16-18th September
Mission 3	Barbados St. Lucia	Dame Billie Miller Alexa Khan	28 September – 1st October

⁵⁷ It is anticipated that one of the team members may be able to visit key stakeholders in the DR in conjunction with another exercise.

Organization of the Field Missions

During the field missions the teams will collect data with stakeholders as presented in Table 3. Some of the meetings do not require the presence of both evaluation team members, as such, some meetings can be scheduled in parallel. However all group meetings/interviews do require the presence of both evaluation team members.

Table 3.

Stakeholder Categories	Personnel/Position	Data Collection
UNECLAC-SRO Staff	Senior Staff (Director, Deputy Director, Regional Adviser)	Individual Interview
UNECLAC-SRO Units		Group Interview
UN Agencies in Trinidad and Tobago	Heads of UN Agencies	Individual Interview
UN Agencies in the Region	Heads of UN Agencies	Individual Interview
Intergovernmental Agencies/Donors	Representatives and Staff	Individual Interview
Central Banks	Representatives	Individual Interviews
Member States (Field Visit)	CDCC representatives and technical staff	Individual Interview

Thematic Experts Civil Society	Key informants with expertise in UNECLAC thematic areas	Individual Interviews