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<td>RTAC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
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<td>SC</td>
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<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
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<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
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<td>VAT</td>
<td>Value Added Tax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Brief description of programme evaluated

CARTAC was established based on a request to the IMF from the CARICOM Council of Ministers of Finance and Planning (COFAP) for technical assistance to build regional capacity to address the emerging challenges to fiscal and debt sustainability, financial sector development and overall macroeconomic management for sustained growth and development. The CARTAC Office opened in Barbados in November 2001. During its first three phases, CARTAC operated as a UNDP project, executed by the IMF and financed through bilateral and multilateral donors as well as through in-kind and annual contributions from participating countries.

CARTAC programme activities have been demand-led and focused on the delivery of technical assistance and assessments at the regional and national levels. CARTAC has provided technical assistance in five core areas at the request of 21 participating countries in the Caribbean region. These five areas are: 1. Public finance management; 2. Revenue administration; 3. Financial sector regulation and supervision; 4. Production and analysis of economic statistics; and 5. Financial programming.

Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to conduct a results-oriented, end-of-project assessment of CARTAC. This evaluation draws from and builds upon the comprehensive mid-term reviews previously completed for CARTAC (2003, 2006 and 2009) which contain detailed information with respect to the results attained under each phase of the programme. Ultimately, this evaluation will be used by UNDP and other partner organizations to assess how CARTAC results have contributed to the overall programme outcomes envisaged in the creation and establishment of CARTAC as a UNDP project and as agreed to by funding organizations and participating Caribbean States.

The primary audience for this evaluation is the UNDP Sub-regional Office – Barbados and Eastern Caribbean UNDP/RBLAC, UNDP RSC – Panama, UNDP Executing Agency – IMF, CARTAC and the principal partner and donor organizations that support the establishment and development of the CARTAC Programme.

Description of key aspect of the evaluation approach and methods

Evaluation data collection processes consisted of both qualitative and quantitative methods and was gathered by means of both secondary and primary data, using three lines of evidence: (1) Secondary data in the form of a file, document and literature review; (2) primary data comprising of key informant interviews and (3) primary data
drawn from an electronic survey covering an additional sample of countries and organizations involved with the programme.

**Summary of main findings, conclusions, and recommendations**

Key findings from the evaluation include the following:

**Relevance.** Overall, the programme is regarded as relevant and useful. However, from the point of view of the countries’ institutions there are “grey areas” in the way the technical assistance, especially the training, is determined.

**Effectiveness.** Key findings in relation to the UNCP partnership strategy include:

- Improved relationship between Countries and CARTAC / IMF;
- higher awareness among regional bodies of capacity development and financial management issues in region; and
- greater conscience-raising among donor organizations as a result of working together in spite of varying levels of contribution and support to the programme.

Key findings in relation to the results-based management of CARTAC include:

- End-of-project survey responses were mixed with respect to whether the CARTAC results based management (RBM) framework had been effective in supporting programme results;
- Initial resistance from IMF and particularly CARTAC to adopt and implement RBM was broken especially during the third phase, due to the persistence of donors, especially CIDA, UNDP and DFID, in demanding its use; and
- The adoption of RBM procedures is still seen as a nuisance rather than a tool for strategic planning, both at the CARTAC level and the country level. There is little clarity among participating countries and other stakeholders about the role of the RBM in the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of their institutional needs.

**Efficiency.** Conclusions made in the first mid-term review of CARTAC suggest that participating countries believed that interventions were made with due regard to costs and benefits, while findings from the second mid-term review confirmed that CARTAC was efficient in terms of location and timely response to regional and country needs. More recently, at the request of the donors, CARTAC’s Steering Committee is currently undertaking an evaluation of Phase IV with the key objective to assess the overall cost-effectiveness of CARTAC activities for the first year under the Fund modality. This specific evaluation will provide more detailed findings with respect to programme efficiency.
Key conclusions of the evaluation are:

- UNDP has contributed to the establishment of a relationship between the countries, the regional bodies, the donors, and CARTAC with the backstopping\(^\text{1}\) of the IMF. Despite on-going challenges, the cost-shared multi-donor scheme has resulted in the most successful intervention of the RTACs out of the eight centres currently found globally, to support financial management technical assistance in 21 countries of the Caribbean.

- Evaluation findings suggest that the UNDP has held an important role in its contribution to the success of CARTAC, especially through the creation of a firewall between the Fund and the region, and by defining clearly the importance of Human Development, poverty reduction and pressing for the adoption of result based monitoring and reporting tools to ensure the achievement of the expected outcomes of CARTAC.

A series of recommendations have been drafted based on evaluation findings. They are as follows:

- UNDP should leverage its position in the region by moving into more “substantive”, less administrative opportunities, capitalizing on experience gained from administering programmes such as CARTAC.

- UNDP should enhance its strategic positioning of the sub-regional programme to further build on the reduction of human and social vulnerabilities (ADR implementation report), improve south-south cooperation strategies and work to a greater extent with the private sector.

- In line with recommendation No.11 of the ADR, greater efforts should be made to strengthen the capacity of the UNDP Barbados office to utilise and manage RBM procedures.

- Respondents suggest that the UNDP office in New York (RBLAC) should offer greater levels of administrative support and not leave the regional office alone to administer all programme and management tasks on its own.

Evaluation recommendations for other donor organizations include:

- Donors should clarify their positions and priorities with respect to their roles and expectations for outcomes.

\(^\text{1}\) “Backstopping is the core work carried out by IMF staff economists in their direct support of the expert in the field. It is this distinctive feature to the IMF TA delivery approach that stands it apart from other TA providers who typically do not have an institutional framework to provide the systematic backstopping undertaken by the IMF”. Definitions, Annex VI, Phase IV, 2011-16
Sharing knowledge, experience, and participation among donors can result in a valuable experience with significant positive outcomes to organizations and participating countries.

In order to contribute to the efficient development of the project, donors should harmonize their request for report.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description of the Intervention

During the 1990’s, Caribbean Community and Common Market Member States (CARICOM) were increasingly aware that financial instability and high levels of debt represented a significant challenge to development in the region. In response, the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre (CARTAC) was established in 2001 as a result of a Caribbean Community Council of Ministers of Finance and Planning (COFAP) decision. Overall, CARTAC was established as a capacity building technical assistance intervention to strengthen skills and institutional capacities at national and regional levels to contribute to the development of economic and financial governance practices, improved macroeconomic management.

Since its inception, CARTAC programme activities have been demand-led and focused on the delivery of technical assistance and assessments at the regional and national levels. CARTAC has provided technical assistance in five core areas at the request of 20 participating countries in the Caribbean region. These five areas are: 1. Public finance management; 2. Revenue administration; 3. Financial sector regulation and supervision; 4. Production and analysis of economic statistics; and 5. Financial programming. This technical assistance is delivered by an in-house team of CARTAC advisors at its Barbados based offices, by short-term consultants, and in-country attachments.

During its first three phases, CARTAC operated as a UNDP project, executed by the IMF and financed through bilateral and multilateral donors as well as through in-kind and annual contributions from participating countries. Throughout its history, CARTAC has been governed by a Steering Committee, chaired by a Central Bank Governor with representation from donor agencies, CARICOM, OECS and the CDB. UNDP’s role has been negotiating donor agreements, receiving and managing cost-sharing contributions, disbursements to the IMF and validating the budget and the accounts for the Programme. Additionally, in fulfilling its role as executing agency, the IMF has been responsible for administrative and financial arrangements with respect to the delivery of technical assistance and the drafting of contracts for staff and activities.

---

2 Source: CARTAC mid-term evaluation final report, Phase III, 2009, p.18
3 Annexed is the Executing Agency Role and functions
4 Source: Ibid, p. 20
1.2 Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

This document was prepared by the Evaluation Consultant as a Final Report of the end-of-project evaluation of the Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre (CARTAC). The purpose of this evaluation is to conduct a results-oriented, end-of-project assessment of CARTAC. This evaluation draws from and builds upon the comprehensive mid-term reviews previously completed for CARTAC (2003, 2006 and 2009) which contain detailed information with respect to the results attained under each phase of the programme. Ultimately, this evaluation will be used by UNDP and other partner organizations to assess how CARTAC results have contributed to the overall programme outcomes envisaged in the creation and establishment of CARTAC as a UNDP project and as agreed to by funding organizations and participating Caribbean States.

The scope of the evaluation covered the specific activities and administration of CARTAC and how this programme supported UNDP outcomes. This evaluation reviewed CARTAC activities since its inception in 2001 through to the end of Phase III which was further extended to December 2011. It also consists of a brief cost-benefit analysis of CARTAC activities in relation to the overall programme intervention expenditures5.

1.2.1 Evaluation Objectives

This evaluation is a results-oriented end-of-project evaluation with the following four objectives:6

1. To determine whether the results as identified by each of the three phases were achieved;

2. To identify lessons learned for wider UNDP project management and delivery application of Agency Executed Projects, specifically providing recommendations for the future use of UNDP Agency Executed guidelines and modalities for cost-shared regional projects with national outcomes;

3. To review the role and added value of the UNDP support to the CARTAC project vis-à-vis UNDP’s capacity building mandate; and

4. To assess the appropriateness of UNDP’s partnership strategy to the regional project modality.

5 A complete and thorough Cost-Effectiveness analysis is being conducted simultaneously by a team led by Dr. Kenneth Watson and contracted by CARTAC.
6 Source: Evaluation TOR
1.2.2 Primary Audience and Users of the Evaluation

The primary audience for this evaluation is the UNDP Sub-regional Office - Barbados and Eastern Caribbean UNDP/RBLAC, UNDP RSC - Panama, UNDP Executing Agency – IMF, CARTAC and the principal partner and donor organizations that support the establishment and development of the CARTAC Programme. These organizations include, but are not limited to CIDA, DFID, EU, CDB, as well as the 21 Caribbean countries participating in CARTAC.

1.2.3 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation assessed the following four criteria in relation to the CARTAC project and its contribution to UNDP outcome level results:

- Relevance of UNDP role, assistance and support to create a new regional initiative and sustainability of results related to the project;
- Effectiveness of this cost-shared development assistance initiative and related partnership strategies to the Caribbean;
- Efficiency of the delivery of development assistance and partnerships; and
- Level of regional and national ownership demonstrated and national capacity enhanced by the CARTAC programme of support.

1.3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

1.3.1 Evaluation Process, Sources and Stakeholder Participation

Evaluation data collection processes consisted of both qualitative and quantitative methods and was gathered by means of both secondary and primary data, using three lines of evidence: (1) Secondary data in the form of a file, document and literature review; (2) primary data comprising of key informant interviews and (3) primary data drawn from an electronic survey covering an additional sample of countries and organizations involved with the programme.

Key files, documents and literature relevant to CARTAC programming and administration were collected and assessed. These documents can be viewed in the listing attached to the annex 4 of this report. The following listing outlines those documents reviewed:

- Annual activity reports, meeting reports and work plans;
- Project financial records and donor organization contribution agreements;
- Results-based Management monitoring data and programming databases;
Final Report. End-of-project Evaluation of CARTAC

- Project strategic planning and steering committee files;
- Past mid-term evaluation reports;
- Any key documentation for the CARTAC, especially the results framework to fully understand the programme’s underlying logic and expected results;
- Full UNDP’s Project document and its results framework and all substantive revisions the initiative may have had; and
- Other documents and associated research as identified by the project contacts.

The secondary data also included the results from the on-going results-based management (RBM) performance measurement processes initiated by CARTAC and results from the periodic mid-term previous evaluations conducted at conclusion of each of the first three phases of CARTAC (2003, 2006, 2009). For further detail with respect to the documents reviewed, see the full documentation list in the report annex 4.

Primary data collection included semi-structured interviews in-person or by telephone / Skype conducted during teleconferences, meetings and a site-visit mission between January 16th and February 3rd, 2012. Further interviews were conducted until February 29th. The individuals interviewed were selected from an indicative list provided by the UNDP and from others that the evaluator considered relevant to the purpose of the evaluation. The main groups of key informants included the following:

- Caribbean National Governments
- Central Banks
- Ministries of Finance
- Statistical Offices
- UNDP Offices
- IMF
- IADB
- ECCB
- European Union
- CIDA
- DFID
- CARTAC
- CARTAC Steering Committee members
- Caribbean Development Bank
- Regional universities
- CARICOM
- OECS

A full list summarizing those individuals interviewed during the evaluation as key stakeholders can be found in Annex 3 of this report.

Considering the large geographical and institutional dispersion of informants, an electronic survey was also conducted among a sample from all the stakeholders. With a combination of multiple choice and open-ended space for comments, the survey was administered ensuring the anonymity of the respondents and confidentiality of the information provided.
1.3.2 Evaluation Matrix and Focus of the Data Collection Process

An evaluation matrix was used to present evaluation findings in association with their connection to project results in each of the three phases, relevant lessons learned, UN value added and partnership strategies. A copy of this matrix can be viewed in the report Annex 7.

The rationale for data collection, analysis and reporting methodologies selected is based on recognition of the previous use by CARTAC of a results-based management (RBM) approach. As noted in the CARTAC document titled *Towards the Establishment of a Results-Based Monitoring Framework for CARTAC*, it is suggested that a RBM process should include “assessment of the mandate of the organization, the stakeholders of the organization and the deliverables of the organization.”

Through a series of consultations, this report assessed the reporting framework for CARTAC at the time to determine the extent to which a results-based approach had been adopted.

Overall, consultation responses suggested that the existing framework should be adjusted to provide more information on the results of CARTAC programs and that reporting should focus less on activities and more on results. Taking this into account, the evaluation data collection, analysis and reporting reflects a RBM approach and complements the reporting processes proposed in the above report. As well, this evaluation has been conducted according to the requirements outlined in the UNDP Companion Guide to Evaluations with a corresponding focus on a review of programme results at outcome level.

1.3.3 Data Collection

There were three main data elements within this evaluation: a document review, interviews and an on-line survey.

**Document Review:** The documentation collected for this evaluation was a key source of data for determining whether the results of Phases I to III were achieved. Document content analysis was used to extract data during the document review.

**Interviews:** Thirty semi-structured interviews were conducted both face-to-face during a mission to Barbados and later in Canada, and by telephone or Skype.

**On-line Survey:** An electronic survey was also designed and delivered using the on-line application, Survey Monkey. This survey was distributed to a total of 67 individuals.

---

8 UNDP, *Outcome-level evaluation: A companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators*. December, 2011
associated with CARTAC programming in various participating countries and organizations. In total, there were 43 respondents with three opting-out for a response rate of 64%. The survey frame was drawn from a listing of individuals for participation in the evaluation supplied by CARTAC as potential respondents. Data collected from the online survey was used to supplement and verify interview data, with 24 individuals from this frame list interviewed directly by the evaluator. Just over half of survey respondents worked for a government (55%) while 17% stated that they worked for an international organization and 11% worked for CARTAC.

Figure 1. Results from Key Informant Survey on Respondents’ Places of Work

Specific questions within the key stakeholder interviews and survey were used to identify lessons learned from CARTAC for wider UNDP project management and delivery application. An interview guide was prepared and sent to all potential respondents and survey templates were prepared (see Report Annex 6). Targeted questions were also included in the interviews and survey to collect data corresponding to a review of the role and added value of the UNDP support and to assess the appropriateness of UNDP’s partnership strategy to the regional project modality. Responses to both the interviews and survey were collated and analysed using a structure based on the evaluation criteria and questions, while data from the survey were analysed using frequency distribution.

---

9 Note: Survey and interview questions are included as attachments in the report annexes.
The overall analysis and triangulation of data obtained from the document review, survey and interviews was conducted with the use of an evaluation matrix and thematic mapping.

1.3.4 Data Analysis and Reporting
Data analysis required the following steps: (1) The analysis of administrative documents and literature based on the data recorded in the coding structure; (2) the analysis of responses to interviews and a survey; and (3) the integration of the data from all three lines of evidence, and the resulting findings, in an evaluation evidence matrix. The interview responses were entered into an Excel internal Interview Response Matrix, and the data analysed thematically, first by interviewee group for each evaluation question, and then the data from all groups aggregated by interview question. Analysis will be completed using the evaluation matrix associated with the evaluation questions and sub-questions.

1.3.5 Ethical Considerations
This evaluation has adhered to the highest standards of ethics and confidentiality, from the literature review exercise to the completion of interviews and the survey. Specifically, this evaluation has abided by the UN ethical code of conduct as signed by the evaluator at the outset of the project (see Annex 2). Accordingly, no results have been attributed to any person or institution throughout the evaluation, as data from different lines of evidence have been cross referenced and combined into the presentation of findings or conclusions.

1.4 Limitations and Challenges to the Evaluation
The evaluability of this review was assessed in discussion with three key informant interviewees, one in each organization (CARTAC, UNDP and CIDA). As part of this early consultation process, adjustments were made to the interview protocols, as well as in the survey questions (see Annex 5).

Overall, the evaluability of CARTAC programming was deemed satisfactory with respect to access to documentation on key programming developments over the history of the programme and availability of a sample of stakeholders for interviews. In contrast, absence of consolidated financial data, inconsistencies of indicators, changing results frameworks between phases and the lack of comprehensive baseline data engendered difficulties for evaluating results between phases and end-of-project outcomes.

As a result, the following key challenges to this evaluation as noted by the evaluator include:
A lack of consistency between documentation on CARTAC results attainment between phases which in turn did not allow for clear analysis of indicators between phases and at end-of-project;

Limited budget and timeline for travelling to other countries apart from Barbados, to get hands-on perspective from the local beneficiaries. This limitation was attenuated with telephone interviews and with an electronic survey which helped to the completion of the evaluation;

Resistance and surprise from many stakeholders, due to the character of the evaluation, being from UNDP; and

Need to explain and contextualize that this evaluation was being completed simultaneous to the cost effective assessment.

2 Description of the Intervention

2.1 Regional and Country Context Development Challenges

With the exception of Haiti, the participating CARTAC CARICOM Member States are categorized as Small Island Developing States (SIDS) (MDG8) with most classified as middle income countries (MIC), due income earned from tourism and financial sectors. On the Global HDI, the region has maintained high to medium human development rankings, however there have been declines in regional competitiveness and with increasingly high levels of public debt—external and domestic—and the global economic recession impacted negatively regional and national economic and social development.

Regional programmes were put in place by CARICOM and OECS providing macroeconomic policy, economic diversification and social development programme support to stem to declines in the high levels of human development achieved.

Inequitable economic and social distribution of resources, natural hazard vulnerabilities further limit governments’ capacity to improve fiscal soundness and to fund social protection programmes. UNDP research on MIC highlights that “concessional debt as a proportion of total public debt has declined considerably in many countries over the last

10 [www.undp.org/mdg/goal8.shtml](http://www.undp.org/mdg/goal8.shtml) - Target 8.C: Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing States (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly)
decade. This has been substituted with more costly, private external and/or domestic debt”.

### 2.2 Current UNDP Development Strategies

The CARTAC initiative corresponds to the UNDP Caribbean regional programme for capacity development and technological support for economic and financial management, and its expected outcomes of Public Sector Reform and Modernization. These expected outcomes are organized under the overall themes:

- Cross cutting issues such as gender equality and capacity development;
- Poverty reduction and MDG achievement;
- Governance;
- Environment, Energy, and Climate Change; and
- Disaster Risk Reduction.

CARTAC activities under these themes also correspond with the sub-regional and regional priorities and UNDAF outcomes as outlined in the tables supplied within the draft country programme document for Barbados and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) (2005-2009 extended to 2011).

The first Sub-regional Cooperation Framework 2001-2004 (SCF) for the OECS and Barbados was formulated by UNDP to address the priorities of (a) sub-regional cooperation and integration, (b) social policy and development planning; (c) capacity development; and (d) employment creation. Gender, environmental management and HIV/AIDS were also cross-cutting programming issues addressed within this framework. The second Sub-regional Cooperation Framework 2005-2009 associated with the programming of CARTAC was formulated to address the following four mutually reinforcing priority programming areas:

(a) Governance reform and institutional development;
(b) Poverty reduction and social sector development;
(c) Capacity building for environmental and natural resources management; and
(d) Risk reduction and disaster management.

Supported by the UNDP sub-regional office for Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, this framework was informed by interrelated national, regional and international policies,

---

11 Source: Evaluation TOR document, p.2
programmes and activities, the national development plans, and various international sustainable development agreements.\textsuperscript{12}

\subsection*{2.2.1 UNDP Capacity Development Mandate}

Another UNDP policy mandate that informs the work of CARTAC is that which covers capacity development. This capacity development mandate is covered under the document \textit{Capacity Development: A UNDP primer}, which summarizes the UNDP Capacity Development Approach for the benefit of development practitioners. As outlined in this document, UNDP sees capacity development as the process through which individuals, organizations and societies obtain, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their own development objectives over time.\textsuperscript{13}

\section*{2.3 Overview of CARTAC}

\subsection*{2.3.1 Purpose of CARTAC}

The goal of CARTAC is to assist member countries to build technical capacity to effect improved macroeconomic management, thereby achieving stable macroeconomic environments for sustained growth.\textsuperscript{14} When established, CARTAC was the first sector wide, pooled funding programme in the Caribbean Region designed to deliver macroeconomic, fiscal and financial sector inputs to support institutional and human capacity development: reflected in the mission of CARTAC “to enhance the institutional and human capacities of the countries in the Caribbean region to achieve their macroeconomic, fiscal, and monetary policy objectives.”\textsuperscript{15}

\subsection*{2.3.2 Origin and History}

Based on the experience of the Pacific Financial Technical Assistance Center (PFTAC), established in 1993 to serve Pacific Island countries, the IMF aimed to assist member countries to strengthen institutions and develop the skills needed for effective economic and financial management. CARTAC was established based on a request to the IMF from the CARICOM Council of Ministers of Finance and Planning (COFAP) for technical assistance to build regional capacity to address the emerging challenges to fiscal and debt sustainability, financial sector development and overall macroeconomic management for

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{12} Source: Draft sub-regional programme document for the countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and Barbados (2005-2009), p.6
\textsuperscript{15} Source: CARTAC evaluation TOR document
\end{flushleft}
sustained growth and development.\textsuperscript{16} With COFAP agreement, UNDP was approach to facilitate and assist the establishment of the Centre in September 1999. As a result of a UNDP/ CARICOM agreement and signed Project Document with funding support from the Government of Barbados CARTAC Office opened in Barbados in November 2001.

CARTAC was established for an initial three year period (2001-2004) and then extended for two further periods between 2004-2007 and 2007-2010, and additionally onto December 2011. During its first decade of operations, CARTAC was a UNDP project with a unique structure in contrast to other IMF Regional Technical Assistance Centres (RTAC) (Pacific, Africa, and Middle East) which were established as Fund Projects. Currently in Phase IV, CARTAC now has the same structure as other RTACs as a result of being directly managed by the IMF.\textsuperscript{17}

The following table summarizes the delivery coverage for CARTAC activities within countries in the Caribbean region. It also lists the membership status of those countries in key related organizations working in the field.

Table 1. \textit{Country coverage of CARTAC and membership of other related organizations}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{17} Source: Evaluation TOR
Final Report. End-of-project Evaluation of CARTAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts and Nevis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = member, AM = associate member  
CARTAC delivery coverage sources: Mid-term evaluations for Phases I, II and III  
*= delivery offered during first 3 Phases.

2.3.3 CARTAC Delivery Approach

The purpose of CARTAC is to improve member countries’ capacity to manage macroeconomic and fiscal policies, to strengthen financial supervision and development, and to support economic growth and poverty reduction in the region. CARTAC provides technical services and training in five core areas:

1. Public finance management, including budgeting, treasury operations and debt management;
2. Revenue administration, including the introduction of VATs and addressing the challenges associated with regional harmonization;
3. Financial sector regulation and supervision, emphasizing the supervision of non-bank institutions and assistance in enhancing the region’s capital markets;
4. Production and analysis of economic statistics, with a focus on supporting macroeconomic policies and National Accounts; and
5. Financial programming; the formulation of macroeconomic projections and a framework for policy analysis.

CARTAC was not expected to take on a policy advisory role unless requested by beneficiary members. Overall, the project delivered assistance through advisory missions by a small team of advisors based in the region, as well as through a series of short-term consultancy assignments, in-country workshops, regional training seminars, and a series

---

of short-term consultancy assignments of national staff to similar organizations in the region. CARTAC also worked with other development partners, technical assistance agencies, and regional organizations\(^{20}\) and continue to doing so in phase IV.

### 2.3.4 Overall Logic of Intervention

The logic underpinning the CARTAC model is particularly strong given the large number of small and interlinked Caribbean economies facing similar issues and challenges, but with particular differences as well. CARTAC is able to leverage on regional issues and provide solutions at the country level.\(^{21}\) The overall mission of CARTAC, which emphasizes the delivery of technical assistance, links with the UNDP goal of governance reform and institutional development which in turn works toward the consolidation and acceleration of current sub-regional integration processes – particularly the OECSEU and the CSME – with strategic national-level inputs and the requisite governance and institutional development reviews, mechanisms and tools.\(^{22}\)

Figure 2. CARTAC logic of intervention.
Figure 3: Connections between CARTAC, participating Caribbean countries and other participating organizations

2.3.5 CARTAC Expected Results Phases I, II, and III

As outlined in the UNDP programme support documents for 2001 to 2004 and 2005 to 2009 which was extended to 2011, CARTAC was tasked with conducting activities that were to reach expected results under the following objectives\(^{23}\):

- Public Financial Management
- Revenue Administration
- Financial Sector Supervision and Capital Market Development
- Macroeconomic Statistics
- Financial Programming and Macroeconomic Analysis

Specific outputs under these five objective areas corresponded with the specific CARTAC activities for completion. As observed within programme support documents, these outputs changed slightly according modifications of the phase work plans and modifications of programme results to more reflect the RBM efforts in the later stages of the programme.

---

\(^{23}\) Source: UNDP programme support document for CARTAC, 2001, p.15
The UNDP programme support document for CARTAC tabled in 2004 further outlines the link between CARTAC programming expectations and the formal outcomes of the UNDP sub-regional programme. The key outcome is referred to as BRB_OUTCOME6 and speaks to "Public Sector Reform and modernization as well as OECS Economic Union strengthened by training, public/private dialogues, ICT- enhanced transparency and accountability."

The following section outlines expected results for Phase III as drawn from the proposed priorities and activities summarized in the programme components section of the CARTAC Programme Support Document, 2008. Expected results are listed below according to the five core areas for technical assistance offered by the Centre. These outputs also correspond with earlier expected results in Phases I and II.

Public Financial Management

Result Priorities

- Provide technical assistance in integrating capital and current budgets.
- Develop training course on the topic of budget preparation using revenue modelling tools.
- Support regional training seminars and workshops including meetings with the region’s Accountant Generals, Budget Directors, Debt Managers and Smartstream Users.
- Assist in developing training courses in internal audit and other topics in conjunction with regional institutions, including in-country workshops.
- Collaborate with Statistics department to introduce the GFS Manual and collaborate with other TA providers in the PFM area in general.

Revenue Administration

Result Priorities

- Completing VAT implementation across countries and support more comprehensive reorganization plans
- Increasing coordination and emphasizing regional approaches
- Assisting countries with more complex revenue administration structures
- Delivery of training programs on best practices and advanced tax topics.
- Reviewing tax and customs policies and legislation support coordination between regional institutions and inland revenue and customs departments.

Financial Sector Supervision and Capital Market Development

Financial Sector Result Priorities

- Deliver technical assistance on legislative upgrades, supervisory processes, reporting requirements, guidelines to industry, training of supervisors and industry participants, and anti-money laundering training and procedures.
- Support offsite monitoring and onsite inspection of credit unions and insurance companies. TA will reflect international best practices.
- Delivery of technical assistance in financial soundness indicators (FSIs) and consolidated supervision.

Capital Market Development Result Priorities

- Improve securities regulation through drafting legislation, preparing simplified and transparent procedures and training staff.
- Formulate country and regional plans to enhance market depth and liquidity through more products, dealers, investment banks and institutional investors, as well as analyse obstacles and propose alternatives.
- Work with governments and CARICOM on a regional plan to promote the following: harmonized regulations and implementation, training, investor education and business development.
- Deliver workshops and seminars to highlight regional issues through case studies and include hands-on technical assistance through attachments and the use of short-term consultants.

Macroeconomic Statistics

Result Priorities

- Continue to design work plans that integrate with national priorities – encompassing legislation, institutional organization, statistical planning and a core data set.
- Country needs fall into five areas: national accounts, price statistics, external sector statistics, monetary and financial statistics and government finance statistics (GFS).
- Delivery of technical assistance for strengthening institutional capacity in organizational restructuring, the use of information technology, human resource management and upgrading management skills.
- Country specific training in the form of on-the-job instruction, short-term professional attachments and regional workshops, training for middle-level staff and persons at lower skill levels.
Design of training modules on the five core areas in addition to data analysis, sampling and survey procedures and preparing metadata.

Delivery of technical assistance for reviewing Statistics Acts

Continue collaboration with national statistical offices, central banks, ministries of finance and other providers of economic data in government departments.

Financial Programming and Macroeconomic Analysis

Result Priorities

- Further CARTAC training including exposure to the complete cycle of designing, rolling out, monitoring, reporting, formulating policy, evaluating and implementing programmes.
- Inclusion of public sector in training.
- Preparation and presentation of technical and operational manuals on processes and procedures.
- Stakeholder engagement for implementation review.
- Provide regional training in Financial Programming and Policy, Macroeconomic Analysis and Management, Debt Seminars and on the new GFS system.
- Respond to requests from non-ECCU countries for training in new areas such as: macro-management tools, regional courses for middle and junior technical personnel, updating legislation, modelling, financial management reform, budget reform, and debt management.
- Continue collaboration with central banks and other designated agencies to strengthen capacity in the macroeconomic area.
- Facilitate attachments from and to countries in the region particularly in macro programmes and analysing national accounts.

Expected CARTAC Contribution to UNDAF Sub-regional Programme Outcomes

It was also anticipated that CARTAC would contribute to the following expected outcomes for the CARTAC programme drawn from the document, Draft sub-regional programme document for the countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and Barbados (2005-2009). This document suggests that at the end of the CARTAC programming period the following outcomes will have been achieved:

a) Appropriate constitutional, policy and institutional arrangements at the national and regional levels established;

b) Regional policy and strategy for advancing the establishment of the OECSEU and for guiding the changes required at the national and regional levels approved;
c) System of multi-stakeholder dialogue and participation in national and regional decision-making processes that include the contribution of CSOs to attaining the MDGs institutionalized;

d) Outreach mechanisms, communication and network services enhanced through expanded contribution of ICT, sports and culture to the sub-regional integration process; and

e) Public sector capacity of some OECS countries enhanced with respect to PSIP and project cycle formulation, management and implementation.

2.3.6 Governance Structure and Key Partners

The Governance structure of CARTAC is a Regional Steering Committee, which is currently chaired by the Governor of the Central Bank of Jamaica and includes representatives from five other participating countries, two representatives from the bilateral donors, and five from multilateral agencies. The Programme Coordinator functions as the Secretary to the Steering committee and is responsible for the day to day administration of CARTAC’s work programme.

The steering committee meets approximately two times per year. The roles and responsibilities of the steering committee are:

- To provide general guidance to CARTAC;
- To suggest regional priorities with respect to the delivery of programmes;
- Advise on issues which may need to be addressed;
- To suggest which issues need to have a regional focus or a country focus; and
- To review progress every 6 months and recommend adjustments.

2.3.7 Project Resources

CARTAC is a multi-donor and Caribbean country funded programme designed to provide technical assistance (TA) in fiscal, monetary and statistical areas to most countries in the region with a total budget of US$ 64.6 million dollars over 10 years (preliminary figures corresponding to phases I, II and III) with UNDP contributing USD $50,000 per year as well as HQ and field office support as Administrative Agent. As indicated in figure 2 below, CARTAC received contributions over the three phases, with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) offering the largest share of funding at 64% (US$37‘819,475) between 2001 and 2010.

---

26 Phase IV is now in execution under IMF administration with a budget of US$62.2, from which Canada contributes with the equivalent to CDN$20 million.
Other donors including the Department for International Development (DFID), EU, IDB, World Bank, CARICOM, USAID, UNDP and the Government of Ireland providing funding of US$21’731,555. The Caribbean Development Bank provided inputs by seconding a full time macroeconomist to the Centre. As host, the Government of Barbados provided office accommodation and in-kind contributions for the project, while other participating countries provide annual contributions.\textsuperscript{27} CARTAC’s office facility costs were approximately US $70,000 a year or $750,000 in total (roughly 1% of total project costs) between 2001 and 2010.\textsuperscript{28}

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) offers in kind contributions of just under US$ 500,000 per year.\textsuperscript{29} The IMF manages and monitors all administrative and financial arrangements in connection with running CARTAC and the technical assistance (TA) delivery offered.\textsuperscript{30} The total in-kind contributions are valued at US$8’859,146 and come from the Government of Barbados, IMF and CDB (see Table 2).

Figure 4. CARTAC Cash Revenues, 2001 - 2010

---

\textsuperscript{27} Source: Evaluation TOR
\textsuperscript{28} Source: Evaluation TOR
\textsuperscript{29} Source: CARTAC Programme Support Document, Phase III, January 2008, p.32.
\textsuperscript{30} Source: Ibid
are engaged by the Centre.\textsuperscript{31} The areas of largest expenditure between 2008 and 2010 were for short-term experts at approximately US$ 8,400,000 over three years (roughly 26\% of total costs during the phase), followed by costs towards the core team of resident advisors at US$ 3,900,000 over three years (12\% of total phase costs) and additional advisors at US$ 3,500,000 over three years (11\% of total phase costs).\textsuperscript{32}

Table 2. \textit{Contributions to CARTAC by Donor and by Phase (USD), 2001-2011}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions by Phase</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>2,664,000</td>
<td>3,362,684</td>
<td>1,423,470</td>
<td>7,450,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados (Host Country)</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>324,646</td>
<td>34,345</td>
<td>658,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total In-kind</strong></td>
<td>3,174,000</td>
<td>3,927,330</td>
<td>1,757,815</td>
<td>8,859,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>584,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>2,190,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>5,095,541</td>
<td>8,386,816</td>
<td>24,337,118</td>
<td>37,819,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>199,014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>313,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>948,000</td>
<td>107,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,055,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>1,348,015</td>
<td>3,952,107</td>
<td>4,149,017</td>
<td>9,449,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>336,911</td>
<td>270,015</td>
<td>1,256,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>1,974,857</td>
<td>733,000</td>
<td>699,196</td>
<td>3,407,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Countries</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>1,875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Income</strong></td>
<td>13,100,413</td>
<td>15,485,648</td>
<td>30,964,969</td>
<td>59,551,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,274,413</td>
<td>19,412,978</td>
<td>32,722,784</td>
<td>68,410,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contributions in-kind and cash from all donors during the first three phases are presented in Table 3. The major contribution came from CIDA (55.3%), followed by DFID (13.8%), the IMF (10.9%), the EU (5%), the World Bank (4.7%) and the individual contributions of participating countries 2.70%. Then the CDB (1.9%), IDB (1.80%), USAID (1.50%) and Barbados (Host Country) (1.10%), UNDP (1%) and Ireland (0.5%).

Table 3. Participation of Total Contributions (In-kind and cash) to CARTAC by donor, 2001-2010 (Phases I, II and III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind Contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>7,450,154</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados (Host Country)</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>658,991</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total In-kind</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,859,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>584,623</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>3,190,000</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>37,819,475</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>313,014</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>1,055,800</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>9,449,139</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>1,256,926</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>3,407,053</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating Countries</td>
<td>1,875,000</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,551,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,410,175</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CARTAC financial documentation. Note: due to rounding, percentages may not equal 100.

2.3.8 UNDP Contributions
During the first three phases of CARTAC, UNDP contributed $600,000 in funding. These financial contributions have been maintained during the CARTAC Phase IV with an additional pledge of $200,000. Technical contributions by UNDP included working as project manager with institutional support in the form of administrative, reporting and
consular activities such as tracking of contributions, and preparation of registration, customs permits and travel documentation.

Under these activities, UNDP cost recovery procedures were applied according to the prevailing UNDP cost recovery policies. With UNDP receiving 5% of the total donor contributed funds as a management fee (roughly $1.2 million for Phase III)\textsuperscript{33}. It is noteworthy that as of June 2007, UNDP adopted a rate of 7% for the recovery of indirect general management support (GMS) costs for new third party contributions and trust funds. At the same time, a basic 3% recovery rate of indirect support costs for all new programme country contributions (government cost sharing) was maintained.

As stated in its policy, UNDP decisions on cost-recovery are made by the UNDP Executive Board and periodically reviewed and reassessed. UNDP's Executive Board reflected in its Policy on Cost Recovery from Other Resources (2007) recommended that all donors increase contributions o regular resources.\textsuperscript{34} Inter-agency consultations resulted in a common approach to multi-donor trust funds and joint programmes to harmonise the cost recovery rate to 7% for indirect costs. During the period of CARTAC’s life as a cost-shared project the approved rates were 3%, 5% and 7%. IMF Agency executing arrangements accrued approved rates of 10%

In the context of enhanced coherence and efficiency at the country level and increasing joint UN activities, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), through its Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office (MDTF Office) is often called upon to play the role of Administrative Agent (AA) for Multi-Donor Trust Funds (MDTFs) and Joint Programmes (JPs) that use the pass-through fund management model, established by the UN system, national authorities and donors in the context of humanitarian, transition, reconstruction and development programmes. In their governance structure and operations, MDTFs are consistent with several principles of the "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness" and the "Accra Agenda for Action", including national ownership and alignment with national priorities; harmonization and coordination; effective and inclusive partnerships; and achieving development results and accounting for them.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} Source: CARTAC mid-term review final report, Phase III, p.78
\textsuperscript{34} Source: UNDP June 2007 Decisions adopted by the Executive Board at its annual session 2007 (11 to 22 June 2007)
\textsuperscript{35} Note: http://www.undp.org/mdtf/overview.shtml
3 KEY FINDINGS

3.1 Relevance

3.1.1 Overall Relevance

As per the terms of reference, a review of the relevance of the program puts emphasis on the context and review of assumptions of the program in order to respond to the question “have the right things been done?” In order to assess for this question, the evaluation focused on two aspects of relevance of CARTAC: (i) in terms of attending the needs of the countries and (ii) attending the regional needs, pointing at the supranational aspects of the programme Caribbean beneficiary countries as a whole.

The general economic and financial conditions globally, regionally and nationally have changed dramatically in many ways since 2001 when CARTAC started due in large part
to the recent global recession and financial crisis in a number of regions. This crisis has led to a number of challenges including the fall in GDP growth due to the crisis mentioned above, the impact on most tourism dependent economies, longer-term investments falling concomitantly with short term vacation arrivals, remittances falling from 16% of GDP in 2008 to less than 10% in 2010. The economic downturn has also resulted in a significant fiscal deterioration in most countries of the region leading to implementation of tax relief measures and/or increased spending.

As a result, debt levels increased by 12% of GDP between 2007 and 2009, with St. Kitts and Nevis reaching debt levels close to 190% of GDP. Some countries with high debt burdens have already started to take measures to moderate the weakening in their fiscal stance. The region’s financial system has generally shown some resilience to the global crisis, but the collapse of two Financial Groups have exposed key vulnerabilities across the Caribbean financial sector. Continuing challenges and opportunities ahead include improving the growth potential, and further strengthening policy frameworks to better absorb future shocks.

While it remains too early to gauge the region’s effects to confront these challenges, after ten years of work for CARTAC in the region, it is important to monitor the success of CARTAC technical assistance and training in relation to these challenges.

**Overall, evaluation findings suggest that the programme is regarded as relevant and useful. However, from the point of view of participating countries’ institutions “grey areas” exist in the way the technical assistance, especially the training, is determined.** Although it is presented as a “demand driven” process, according to several key informants, in reality, countries’ lack of capacity in the areas covered by technical assistance, and their diverse macroeconomic or financial policies approaches, makes them in some cases unable to determine which the most appropriate specific needs are. Technical assistance is also highly oriented by the supply side since CARTAC, its advisors and consultants, can define what courses will be administered in each country and institution. As a result, there is notable logic behind this approach, since there is dialogue and interactive selection of key priorities for specific countries, addressing the key issues. Overall, the approach is tailored according to the different conditions of the countries and the Steering Committee, in which UNDP also participates, plays an important role in the selection and determination of general activities.

This approach is useful especially within a context in which the recent global economic and financial crisis has produced significant challenges for Caribbean countries. For example, this crisis has led to a real GDP growth decline in most countries in which the average real GDP growth in the region declined from 2% in 2008 to -2.2% in 2009, with the ECCU countries facing the steepest decline. A key contributing factor associated with
this decline has been a decrease in key sources for foreign exchange and growth such as tourism and remittances. Additionally, this crisis has exposed vulnerabilities associated with policy frameworks and institutions within the region.  

Respondents to the end-of-project survey were asked to comment on the extent to which CARTAC has delivered and responded to the needs of the countries. Of the 16 respondents that answered this question, eleven (69%) stated that CARTAC had covered ‘most’ or ‘all’ of the needs. Three additional respondents (19%) suggested that ‘some’ of the needs had been met, while only one respondent believed that it did not cover any of the needs. Another respondent described efforts to meet needs such that “CARTAC cannot and should not respond to all the needs of all the countries. There should be needs analysis and priority setting for strategic interventions for the most vulnerable states and lesser developed in terms of financial and fiscal management capacity”.

At the regional level there are different sets of priorities, dictated by regional organizations such as CARICOM and other bodies, as well as by the UN with a strong presence in most beneficiary countries. Since all are represented in the Steering Committee (SC) there is no clash of interest.

The prioritization of topics is up to the IMF, for instance the banking system was at the bottom while the first priority was the insurance supervision and second the support to credit unions. There were also instances where the countries have been pushed to receive TA, including a number of countries that were not adequately prepared for receiving the TA. As a reply, CARTAC suggests that it was responding to those countries’ priority needs.

As drawn from an analysis of evaluation evidence, the following findings can be summarized:

- **CARTAC’s services are considered highly relevant for a number of specific countries; however this is not the same conclusion for the region, as a whole.** Regional bodies, have previously established financial, public finance and monetary tools in place, but do not have the resources and the capability of CARTAC to respond as quickly to the needs of the countries. Therefore, as put by some of their representatives interviewed, IMF and other donors should involve these regional organizations in delivering TA and keeping records and standards for sustainability.

- **CARTAC covered a large range of needs, but it was too eager to deliver workshops and TA, without a clear strategic approach.** When asked if

---

CARTAC had responded to the needs of the region (as a whole), 44% of those that answered to this question in the end-of-project survey stated that CARTAC had covered ‘most’ or ‘all’ of the needs. Additionally, four respondents noted that CARTAC had covered ‘some’ of the needs, while one stated that it had ‘not covered any of the needs’. These responses were followed by one comment noting that “there are varying levels of need across the region, but as a regional institution, CARTAC is one of the most responsive and successful of regional organizations in delivering much-needed technical assistance in PFM; if anything, perhaps too responsive and less strategic in some of its technical assistance”.

3.1.2 Relevance Proxy - Factors Influencing Access to CARTAC Technical Assistance

Based on a review of findings from the programme mid-term reviews, a number of factors influencing access to CARTAC technical assistance were observed. These factors are significant to the overall relevance of the programme since they outline how member countries are accessing assistance and whether this assistance is relevant to the strategies and processes in place in those countries. As summarized in the first mid-term review of CARTAC (2003), all respondents indicated some familiarity with CARTAC’s services, although the degree of familiarity varied from one country to another. The following related findings are drawn from the first mid-term review (2003):

- All of the respondents regarded the turn-around time to be quite quick, usually within a few weeks or even a few days of making the initial telephone enquiry a concrete proposal regarding assistance was in place;

- All respondents that received assistance were pleased with the quality, including the training, which they noted is being put to good use;

- Those who used CARTAC noted that as a result of the favourable experience, including the ease with which request can be made, they are likely to request more assistance in the future;

- Lack of knowledge regarding CARTAC is not the primary reason that some countries are not using CARTAC at all or not as much as others. While all countries are generally aware of CARTAC, it is not clear in some instances that all of the government departments that could benefit from CARTAC’s services are aware of how CARTAC can help them. This is an internal government issue and relates to an issue of lack of communication across government departments. Communications among government officials in various departments was not as effective as it should have been and information that was useful about CARTAC’s activities was not passed on from one department to other departments;
The reasons for countries not participating were quite varied. Some initial reluctance to participate related to CARTAC’s newness and the jurisdictions were not aware of the range and quality of services and how to go about requesting such services;

- Some countries did not immediately have the capacity to absorb some of the services on offer. Others had more pressing problems that had to be attended to and were not able to plan their work effectively to integrate CARTAC’s assistance into their work plans;

- Some countries were in the process of formulating overall plans and did not want to get involved with CARTAC until their own plans were clear; and

- Some countries have greater capacity than others to resolve their own issues and those who have greater capacity have been slower than others in utilising CARTAC’s assistance.37

### 3.2 Effectiveness

This evaluation focused on two aspects of the effectiveness of CARTAC: (i) the effectiveness of the cost-shared development assistance initiative including the development of a Results Based Management framework and attainment of expected results and (ii) the related effectiveness of partnership strategies to the Caribbean.

#### 3.2.1 Review of Results Based Management Framework

With regards to the development of a Results Based Management Framework, it is widely recognised that CARTAC has been focused on the activities, rather than on a result based monitoring and reporting approach. During the years of the project, especially during the second and third phases, donors have been insisting on applying a Result Based Monitoring and Reporting scheme. In the Program Document for Phase IV the IMF introduces the concepts and tools.

A key finding in relation to effectiveness includes: **End-of-project survey responses were mixed with respect to whether the CARTAC results based management (RBM) framework had been effective in supporting programme results.** Of the survey respondents that commented on this issue, 21% suggested that it had been effective, while another 21% stated that it had not, with a larger group stating that they did not know (more than half). Furthermore, additional comments to this question indicate that the RBM approach is still in the process of being fully implemented, with one respondent stating that RBM was “not fully operational”, while another two

---

37 Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p. 17
respondents indicated that “CARTAC and the IMF have been slow to adopt RBM approaches in their planning, implementation and reporting to stakeholders” and “to date, CARTAC has not really used a formal RBM approach”.

These findings were mirrored by respondents interviewed during the second evaluation of CARTAC in 2006. Respondents at that time noted that a particular weakness of CARTAC was the extended period taken to develop management reporting in a manner that would enable stakeholders to easily see its strategic direction and the results from its activities. Reporting was seen as too input oriented. Furthermore, the second mid-term review noted CARTAC’s lack of a suitable performance management process and its focus on low level inputs limits its ability to be able to regularly demonstrate to all stakeholders that it is doing a good job.

The third finding relating to RBM was that there is no clarity among participating countries and other stakeholders about the role of the RBM in the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of their institutional needs.

3.2.2 Results Relating to Phase I Indicators and Outcomes

Overall, the first mid-term evaluation found that CARTAC was “well designed, management and governance is good and it has struck a good balance between national and regional activities…and its outputs are prodigious, professional and popular in the region”. However, findings from this 2003 review also found that “longer term and higher level results and impacts will take time to develop and will be a challenge to measure”. Accordingly, data were unavailable at the first mid-term review completed in 2003 that outlined outcomes or impacts of CARTAC programming.

In the place of data on outcomes, key outputs can be used to gauge results. After the first phase as drawn from the 2003 evaluation, CARTAC outputs included:

- The largest number of long-term advisor activities is found within the OECS, ECCB and OECS countries. Roughly 25 activities were in OECS and ECCB and were classified as sub-regional. Another 36 were in individual OECS countries;
- The second largest number of long-term advisor activities (23) was classified as regional (i.e. not associated with any one individual country or sub-region but were for the whole region);
- The third largest number of long-term advisor activities was recorded for Barbados followed closely by Guyana;
- The remaining activities were spread out over the region with five countries participating in one or less activities;

---

38 Source: CARTAC Evaluation II Final Report, p. 2
39 Source: CARTAC Evaluation III Final Report, p. 6
40 Source: CARTAC Evaluation I Final Report, p.40
41 Source: CARTAC Evaluation I Final Report, p.15
More activities were recorded in Financial Services but this likely reflects that there were two long-term Advisors working in this area;

By and large, if CARTAC was active in one technical area in a country or region, it was also active in other technical areas in that country or region; and

The total number of participants in the TA offered during the first phase was 1596.

3.2.3 Results Relating to Phase II Indicators and Outcomes

Findings of the second mid-term evaluation (2006) point to CARTAC “a highly valued partner of countries in the Caribbean seeking to enhance capacity for sound economic management”. The report goes on to state that “users stress its closeness, readiness to listen, rapidity of response and practical advice as key characteristics that have enabled this program of technical assistance to gain high acceptance and to be embraced as a key promoter of the interests of countries striving to cope with structural changes…” Beneficiaries believe that there is more useful work for CARTAC to do.

During the period reviewed the Centre reported some 230 missions, 218 of which included regional or foreign consultants and 74 of which were training activities. In addition 57 persons were supported on 65 attachments for a total of 340 days, and some 1,627 persons attended CARTAC sponsored training and workshop sessions. CARTAC activity during this phase was primarily concentrated in the core assistance area of revenue policy and administration (99 = 37%) area. The areas of regulation of financial institutions, public expenditure management and related statistics reported similar levels of activity at roughly 20% each, while the macro-economic area undertook the fewest at 14 missions (5%). At the country level, Dominica (25%), Antigua and Barbuda (16%) and St. Kitts and Nevis (9%) enjoyed the largest individual shares of this activity.

The following list summarizes key outputs of CARTAC activities as of the end of phase II.

- Clients expressed great satisfaction with the CARTAC approach involving direct implementation, hands-on support, practical systems and building regional networks;
- New Personal Income Tax in Antigua and Barbuda generating more revenues than estimated at planning;

---

42 Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p. 5
43 Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p. 58 Annex C
44 Source: CARTAC evaluation II, p. 53
45 Source: CARTAC evaluation II, p. 15
46 Source: CARTAC evaluation II, p. 59
- New Value Added Tax systems established in Belize and Dominica, with Grenada, Antigua & Barbuda close to implementing their own;
- St. Kitts and Nevis tax collections improved by 20% after restructuring of assessments and collections procedures; and
- Improved expenditure control led to better management of arrears and enhanced accountability for budget implementation in St. Kitts and Nevis.

3.2.4 Results Relating to Phase III Indicators and Outcomes

Findings of the mid-term evaluation of Phase III (2009) suggest that CARTAC is “making a positive contribution to addressing the region’s problems through engagement with regional organizations, country reform programmes and at the organizational level […] CARTAC is adaptive and responsive to the needs of the region”. The report also noted that “CARTAC TA is effective in the areas of its core expertise…and the ability to make visits at short notice received strong endorsement from the stakeholders”.

The evaluation of Phase III indicates that at total of 1265 missions and activities occurred between April 2006 and April 2009 with Tax-related activities accounting for over 47 per cent at 599 missions. These findings also suggested that a majority of the country visits were to higher income countries, the largest number of country visits was conducted under the theme of Public Financial Management, and that Financial Services Supervision had the greatest level of regional body interaction. As of the end of the third phase (2009), 105 individuals were supported on attachments for a total of 1099 days with approximately 4,087 individuals attending 200 CARTAC sponsored training activities. Overall, this evaluation suggested that technical assistance, attachments and mission activity significantly increased compared to those levels reported in the first and second mid-term evaluations (2003 and 2006).

The following table summarizes key output statistics drawn from the mid-term evaluations for each of the first three CARTAC phases. In total, CARTAC organized 1638 missions, 323 training sessions and 7,311 persons were trained in the 10 years under UNDP management. An analysis of these data suggests that the number of missions and attachment days has substantially increased over the course of the program period. For example, with respect to attachment days in phase I the average was 15.27 days per person, while in phase II it was 5.54 days and in phase III, 10.47 days per attachment.

47 Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p. 82
48 Source: Ibid, p.82
49 Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p.25
50 Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p.26
person. The number of training days and persons trained has also substantially increased from 49 training sessions completed during the first phase to 200 in the third phase and from 1,613 persons trained to 4,087 persons in the same time period.

Table 5. **Output statistics for CARTAC phases I, II and III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Missions</th>
<th>Training Sessions</th>
<th>Persons Trained</th>
<th>Attachment persons</th>
<th>Attachment days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I (2001 – 2003)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II (2004 – 2006)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III (2006 – 2009)</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4,087</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (2001 – 2009)</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>7,311</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key output level results from Phase III, as drawn from the CARTAC programme support document for Phase IV, include the following:

- Reform of the indirect tax system in five countries—Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Dominica, Grenada and St. Vincent and the Grenadines all introduced simpler and more efficient broad-based value-added taxes (VAT) and excise tax systems;
- Customs modernization in six countries—Belize, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines;
- CARTAC provided significant TA in seven countries in order to build capacity within their respective VAT implementation teams (Dominica, Belize, Antigua and Barbuda, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis and St. Lucia);
- Developed a practical cash management model to support daily, weekly and monthly reporting on the cash position of the governments in Anguilla and St Kitts and Nevis;
- Developed an automated bank reconciliation process, eliminating cumbersome manual processes in St Vincent and the Grenadines;
- Provided advice to Anguilla regarding the adoption of the International Public Sector Accounting Standard on a Cash Basis;
- Supported the development of insurance supervisory expertise in ten countries—Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines;
- Support toward the establishment of a single regulatory unit for nonbanks in St. Kitts and Nevis, “The St. Kitts and Nevis Financial Services Commission”;
- Developed a consistent liabilities valuation methodology for the insurance industry, instituted a capital adequacy framework for insurance companies, and built an insurance actuarial infrastructure with the Central Bank of Trinidad and Tobago;
- Created bank stress-testing models for banking supervisors in Guyana, The Bahamas, the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank (ECCU), and Trinidad and Tobago;
- Enhanced the supervision of credit unions in The Bahamas;
- Supported the Caribbean Association of Insurance Regulators (CAIR) and Caribbean Association of Pension Fund Supervisors (CAPS) to serve as the capacity building body for insurance supervision and pension funds supervision;
- Developed regulatory reporting forms for all nonbanking sectors in Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines;
- Developed a regulation for a Market Risk Capital Charge and engaged in training on market risk and its impact on capital with Belize, the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank, and Guyana;
- Rebased national accounts statistics to a recent base year with the ECCB countries and Guyana; and
- Supported the revision of consumer price indexes to more current market baskets with Jamaica, the Bahamas, Belize, Antigua and Barbuda, Anguilla, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Based on the data summarized above, it can be concluded that the increasing volume on the support combined by concrete advances on the output level results contributed to achieve the following outcomes:

Table 6. Evaluation Findings with Respect to key CARTAC Results and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
<td>Higher levels of effective public finance management along with greater oversight of budgets and debt management</td>
<td>Contributions to public finance management, macroeconomic, fiscal and monetary policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Administration</td>
<td>More effective revenue administration at the individual country level and increasing harmonization of regional strategies</td>
<td>VAT established in several countries new approach towards revenue administration and fiscal policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sector Supervision and Capital Market Development</td>
<td>Greater financial sector regulation and supervision</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVES | RESULTS | OUTCOMES
---|---|---
Macroeconomic Statistics | More regular production of relevant economic statistics at the country and regional levels and the increase in the number of national policy efforts to support macroeconomic conditions in the region | macroeconomic, fiscal and monetary policy

Financial Programming and Macroeconomic Analysis | Development of increasingly effective financial programming and further use of policy analysis to support national initiatives. | Macroeconomic, fiscal and monetary policy

With regard to the assessment of outcomes, it should be noted that the UNDP approach to outcome-level evaluations uses a “contribution analysis” that “does not expect to firmly establish causality but rather seeks to achieve a plausible association”. Among the examples of the value added by CARTAC, with its advisers and the backstopping of the IMF, are the technical skills transferred to the countries and expertise that were not available before, at least with such consistency and quality. The value added of other partners such as the donors, especially CIDA and DFID, at the Steering Committee level, in strategic guidance. It has been explained above that UNDP played an important role in the inception of CARTAC in the region at the onset of the program. That situation has evolved and now phase IV is under the Fund modality, as part of a sustainable process after UNDP’s intervention. UNDP facilitated the programme administration and added value to more effective process, through reducing procurement times and executing all contractual processes of international consultants and resident advisers.

In several instances, according to key informants, UNDP (primarily through the Caribbean Regional office has contributed to knowledge management, by tracking experience and good practice in the countries and regionally with neutrality and regional approach.

Based on the outputs and outcomes outlined above, findings suggest that an effective relationship has been established between participating countries, regional bodies in the financial sector, donor organizations, and CARTAC with the backstopping of the IMF. Furthermore, interview respondents suggested that the cost-shared multi-donor approach has resulted in one of the most successful interventions of the RTACs to support financial management technical assistance.

Additionally, relating to the outcomes discussed above, a number of recommendations were offered from the mid-term evaluation of phase III to support to continued improvement of results relating to outcomes.
These recommendations are:

- Streamline reporting requirements to IMF;
- Country strategy meetings should be formalized and followed by a clear process for the resident advisors to integrate the outcomes into their respective work plans;
- CARTAC should develop a country-level window on its website to summarize what it is doing and planning for each of the participating countries;
- The website should be updated to reflect the core objectives and mission of CARTAC;
- CARTAC should develop a coherent strategy to increase TA delivery in Haiti;
- Consider a more equitable approach to cost recovery for TA delivery in middle income countries;
- Develop an exit strategy for CARTAC in terms of donor support;
- Improved management of Steering Committee meetings and communications;
- Adopt a basic performance management reporting structure that aligns activities to the goal and programme objectives;
- Modernization of financial reporting and management information;
- Assume all administrative, reporting and consular activities currently undertaken by UNDP with a portion of the existing management fee used to cover increased administrative and management costs; and
- UNDP continues to engage with CARTAC on the Steering Committee.

3.2.5 Implications on Effectiveness of Cost-sharing Project Modality with UNDP Participation

By the end of Phase III, the total contributions to CARTAC were $34,106,113.71. The largest single contributor was the Canadian International Development Agency with a contribution of $24,337,118 or 73.4%. Overall, as of 2010, the total annual budget for CARTAC was $11,720,931. Of this total, $3,538,338 or 30.2% was designated for CARTAC project staff salaries and costs, while $9,943,589 or 54.7% went toward short-term experts costs.

The first evaluation finding relating to the effectiveness of the cost-sharing project modality with UNDP suggests that the advantages and benefits of the multi-donor scheme greatly outnumbered the risks and difficulties along the path to establishing a relatively consistent funding strategy. The participation of a wide range of donors made the program more consistent with the Paris declaration. This theme also relates to how it was suggested that discussion at the Steering Committee level was open with respect to the plans, commitments and use of contributions, and the coordination of planning and transparency at all fronts of the programme.
A second finding is that **the role played by UNDP in harmonising the programme with multiple donors and country partners has been regarded as outstanding by most of those interviewed and survey respondents.** This is due in part to its presence and recognition in the region and also by the sense of ownership that was felt by the countries and regionally of the programme in general.

The Phase III mid-term review findings also suggested that UNDP had contributed to the success of the CARTAC model by facilitating the management of multi-donor pooled funding to the point where CARTAC, supported by the Fund, is now capable of managing those responsibilities at the commencement of Phase IV.\(^{51}\)

This finding was similarly echoed within survey responses collected within the end-of-project evaluation. Survey respondents were asked to define the value-added of the multi-donor cost shared arrangement of the CARTAC programme in comparison with single donor projects. Responses from respondents (71%) suggest that this modality offered ‘greater value’, while only one respondent suggested that it offered ‘less value’. One respondent describe this added value by noting that “involvement of many donors enables more input into program design and provides assurances of non-duplication and also adds to overall transparency”. Another respondent suggested that CARTAC offered “much greater value than several donor stand-alone projects” and outlined the role UNDP played “which greatly contributed to a harmonized programme with multiple donors and multiple country partners”.

As early as the first evaluation of CARTAC, it was noted that there were significant delays, in some cases of several weeks, between when funds were received by UNDP and when they were recorded in the financial system. It was thus difficult, at any given moment in time, to get an accurate picture of the status of total contributions.\(^{52}\) In part as a result of this issue, a new clearance process was initiated as of July 2007 in order to shorten the clearance period for EU contributions to UNDP. Based on a process of consultations, the new clearance procedure was put in place and expected to reduce the clearance time from an average of three weeks to less than one week.\(^{53}\)

In addition to the clearance, several other factors may have contributed to the issue of delays: (i) resources were transferred by the donors’ accounts to the UNDP account in HQ, and then, sent to the programme, while the UNDP regional office did not have direct involvement in the transfer other than processing, requesting and following up funds; (ii) the introduction of ATLAS in 2004 as the new accounting system of UNDP worldwide and its officially adopted in 2005 caused significant delays and interrupted processes; and

---

\(^{51}\) Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p.9  
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(iii) rotation of administrative and financial personnel, both in HQ and in the Barbados office affected follow up and the smooth transition between systems. As a result, clear incompatibilities between the IMF and UNDP accounting/financial systems caused tension and discomfort among these partners.

### 3.2.6 Results Associated with Cross-cutting Theme (Gender, Knowledge Management, and Environment)

In spite of the introduction of expected outcomes relating to gender, knowledge management and the environment by UNDP and CIDA, little evidence existed of activity by CARTAC specifically relating to these themes, with the exception of short-term, introductory courses about gender sensitivity within the budgeting process. Besides the general approach by UNDP as part of its institutional development role played in the region and at the countries, there was no indication that in the design phase the issue of gender was taken into account. As a result of this overall lack of evidence, this evaluation was unable to conduct a comprehensive analysis of cross-cutting themes such as gender, knowledge management and environment.

### 3.2.7 Summary Results for the Effectiveness of the Project

The first evaluation finding relating to contributions to key outcomes relates to the fact that along the different phases there was reference to the achievement of some or most of the outputs (as a result of the activities), but little clarity with respect to actual key outcomes of CARTAC’s mission (“to enhance the institutional and human capacities of the countries in the Caribbean region to achieve their macroeconomic, fiscal, and monetary policy objectives.”).

The second finding relating to the outcomes of CARTAC technical assistance focuses on the high rotation of personnel in public offices hindering the efforts to achieve key outcomes for long-term capacity development. A tracer study was not in place and the absence of baseline data made it difficult to establish clear indicators of performance. However, there is indication of the creation of a critical mass of professionals in the areas covered by the programme that may in turn benefit the overall formation of qualified HR in the region, with the exception of those that emigrate out of the region.

Respondents to the end-of-project survey conducted for the end-of-project evaluation were asked to comment on the extent to which CARTAC had contributed to key outcome level results, especially the establishment of VAT in five countries, the development of stabilization and growth programmes (ECCB/SATAP) for OECS countries, updating banking regulations and their application, and the modernization of PFM processes. Of the 14 respondents that answered this question, five (36%) stated that CARTAC covered ‘most’ or ‘all’ of the key outcome level results, while a larger group (6 respondents or
43%) stated that CARTAC contributed to ‘some’ of the key outcome level results. One respondent described this contribution as “mixed”, while another respondent suggested that contributions were made specifically under finance related outcomes since “CARTAC has done an excellent job in developing the framework and skills of the regional regulators, in banking, insurance, securities markets, pensions and most recently credit unions”.

3.2.8 Review of UNDP Partnership Strategy

An analysis of evaluation evidence points to a number of key findings relating to the UNDP partnership strategy. The findings include:

- Improved working relationship between participating countries in the region and CARTAC-IMF based on the long-term connection built through the delivery of technical assistance programs;
- Increased awareness among regional bodies of the key capacity development and financial management issues facing countries in the region; and
- Greater conscience-raising among donor organizations as a result of working together in spite of varying levels of contribution and support to the programme.

Results from the first CARTAC mid-term review (2003) suggest that CARTAC overall was generally perceived as a stand-alone organisation. An early issue relating to the partnership strategy noted in 2003 was the tension at the outset with the possibility of a misunderstanding regarding the role of the Steering Committee and the role of the IMF in setting CARTAC policies, programs and work plans.

Respondents to the end-of-project evaluation survey were also asked to remark on whether the partnership strategy had been appropriate for the Caribbean context. Just under half of the respondents (7) indicated that it had been ‘very appropriate’ with one respondent suggesting that it represented a “world-class model of partnership”. Additionally, another five respondents (28%) had stated that the partnership strategy had been ‘somewhat appropriate’.

The Regional Bureau of Latin American and the Caribbean of the UNDP (RBLAC) should have been more supportive of the Region by allocating more technical resources, providing TA, to help not only in the implementation, but also positioning itself as a clear interlocutor in the sub-region as well as in HQ and with the IMF. This finding was based on evaluation responses which suggested that the
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RBLAC in many instances left the Regional UNDP office without sufficient backstopping and upper administration support.

As a result of the CARTAC Steering Committee terms and conditions, not all the country members participate in all SC sessions. As a result, a smaller group of countries were more frequently represented on the committee, due to the alternation system and to limitations for their participation. Respondents suggest that the lack of other participants from additional Caribbean countries in the composition of the Steering Committee limits the overall participation and representation of the region in the project, both in scope and in number. In response, it was suggested that a greater number of participating countries should have been participating on the Steering Committee.

Different stakeholders stressed on the importance of the role of UNDP in its contribution to the success of CARTAC, fundamentally at the beginning through the creation of the conditions between the Fund and the region. In addition, UNDP clearly and constantly impulse the importance of Human Development, poverty reduction and pressing for the adoption of results based monitoring and reporting tools to guide and measure the achievement of the expected outcomes of the program.

### 3.3 Efficiency

#### 3.3.1 Cost Benefit and Technical Assistance Delivery Analysis

The following section will outline findings associated with the cost efficiency for CARTAC programs. These findings are structured under the appropriate research question covered in the evaluation. To assess CARTAC cost efficiency the following evaluation questions were presented:

- Is the mode of delivery of technical assistance appropriate and best use of resources? (Comparing costs with budgets) (how CARTAC/ Fund’s TA delivers added value)
- Has the project been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated?
- Was there effective use of regional partnerships to optimize pooled resources?
- From a financial perspective, were there benefits from use of the multi-donor modality toward achievement of the desired outcomes? (How to improve cost effectiveness, while maintaining quality)
- Did this effectively leverage the substantive capacities of the partners involved?
Was the multi-donor cost-sharing the best approach to support the delivery of the project?

Question 1: Is the mode of delivery for technical assistance appropriate and best use of resources?

The categories of costs that have been identified are: (i) trust fund management fee, (ii) delivery of TA, (iii) IMF backstopping, and (iv) project management. However, significant constraints have affected attempts to collect reliable data and analyse cost against outputs in this evaluation and previous reviews. These constraints are based on difficulties benchmarking the Fund TA against that of other providers, given differences in TA model, delivery modality, focus, and quality. An additional constraint includes the type of TA delivered by Fund being unique as it focuses on macroeconomic analysis, data, and policies, as well as the underlying infrastructure and legal frameworks that support this macroeconomic work.”.56

As outlined in the CARTAC mid-term reviews, two further constraints exist with respect to assessing programme cost effectiveness in a comprehensive manner: its integration with monitoring, which is country-specific and backstopping is not considered to be an output in itself but part of the TA product.

Question 2: Has the project been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated?

While the constraints on collecting reliable data are a significant limitation, a general impression of the cost effectiveness of the CARTAC delivery process can be drawn from informant responses found in the mid-term reviews. These reviews suggest that the mode of delivery for technical assistance has in most cases been appropriate with a number of challenges still to address. More specifically, conclusions made in the first mid-term review of CARTAC suggest that participating countries felt that all interventions were made with due regard to costs and benefits.57 While findings from the second mid-term review confirmed that CARTAC was efficient in terms of location and timely response to regional and country needs.58

Ultimately, a clearer assessment is a key criteria for establishing whether the project has been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated. In response to a lack of comprehensive data, CARTAC is presently making efforts to improve the review of cost-effectiveness, while maintaining the high quality of outputs. For example, by the request of donors, CARTAC’s Steering Committee is undertaking an evaluation as of phase IV.

56 Cost Effectiveness evaluation TOR p.3
57 Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p.16
58 Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p.6
with the key objective to assess the overall cost effectiveness of CARTAC activities for the first year under the Fund modality. This study is being conducted to assess if all expenses are cost effective.\(^{59}\) That evaluation will address three key evaluation questions, with appropriate sub-questions: (i) To what extent have CARTAC activities and outputs in the first year *(of Phase IV)* been implemented in an efficient manner and in line with the work plan?; (ii) To what extent has the Fund delivered added value to TA outputs through backstopping and other means?; (iii) To what extent has TA been cost-effective?

**Question 3: Was there effective use of regional partnerships to optimize pooled resources?**

After the analysis of the different lines of evidence, it can be concluded that although regional bodies were involved in different stages of the programme, such as the CDB and OECS, an effective and complete regional partnership was not achieved. Two reasons were presented, the limited TA delivery capacity and the differences in regional coverage of the country members (see table 1).

**Question 4: Were there benefits from the use of the multi-donor modality toward achievement of the desired outcomes?**

One of the key issues raised by evaluation respondents with respect to the cost efficiency of the multi-donor modality was the difference between costs incurred through efforts at the national level for individual countries and the costs associated with the fees and expenses at CARTAC, UNDP, IMF and other international organizations. For example, the 10% fee drawn by the IMF in Washington was noted as high, while several interviewees indicated their discomfort at the high cost of CARTAC’s personnel and staff travel (which was in first class) and high costs for staff meetings. Key informants also noted the significant remuneration disparity between resident advisors, international consultants and regional/local consultants. Furthermore, it was suggested that the difference, if had used economy travel and more frugal event sites, could have been expended instead toward training, increasing local capacity, or have gone directly to strengthen national institutions. Overall, more transparency in the use of funds has been requested by a number of respondents.

\(^{59}\) Note: See Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness of CARTAC, First Year of Phase IV—Terms of Reference—They include similar requirements, but in a more exhaustive degree of detail. For example, one of the questions of those TOR is “To what extent has TA been cost-effective?”. And two sub-questions: - Could the same activities and outputs have been delivered more cost effectively? - To what extent does TA delivery under the RTAC model by CARTAC provide value for donors/beneficiaries?
Another issue in relation to the use of a multi-donor modality was the challenge of maintaining an effective budget balance. For example, the resources for the first years of CARTAC before the implementation of the ATLAS system, indicate that there was balance due of $1.4 million, that is 13% from what it was pledged ($10.57 million) and the amount received ($9.16 million) (See Annex 9, Status of Cost-sharing, 2004)

**Question 5: Did the modality effectively leverage the substantive capacities of the partners involved?**

Evaluation findings suggest that multi-donor modality has in fact leveraged capacities among partners, especially in terms of working in a collective effort towards a common understanding and approach to improve the economic conditions of the region; and complementing capacities by participating in the SC and through specific activities. However a number of issues were noted. For example, one issue indicated by respondents in relation to modality was that the TA programme implemented by the IMF has been ‘too expensive’.

Similar, the difference in fees charged by the various organizations were also seen as a limitation to the effective distribution of costs. In the early stages of CARTAC, UNDP charged a lower fee than usually authorized, because of the initial cost-shared donors arrangement agreed to in 2001. Such an arrangement required a 3% fee initially (Phases I and II) and then, for phase III, a fee of 5%. In contrast, the European Union had a different arrangement (See Annex 9, Status of Cost-sharing, 2004) than the UNDP implementation fee of 7%.

**On RBM**

The first evaluation finding relating to RBM is that **an initial resistance from IMF and particularly CARTAC to adopt and implement RBM was broken especially during the third phase, due to the persistence of donors, especially CIDA, UNDP and DFID, in demanding its use.** In addition, explicit references to the possibility of reducing or suspending cooperation if such a system was not implemented tamed opposed to RBM.

Several reasons for the resistance were presented by interviewees and surveyed participants:

- The organizational culture of the Fund that for years has been used to doing rather than reporting;
- Each department has a different style and procedures that permeate the projects around the world;
Consultants are particularly reticent to fill forms in trying to link activities with outputs and results; and

Due to the high, specialised level of expertise of the permanent advisors, as well as many short term consultants, they prefer to continue designing their courses rather than filling in forms.

The second finding with respect to RBM drawn from this evaluation is that, regardless of the efforts to introduce RBM as mentioned in the Polius Report (2008), Steering Committee documents and by the working group in Washington with participation of Canadian and other international consultants, the move to adopt RBM is still seen as a nuance rather than a tool for strategic planning, both at the CARTAC level and the country level. Time is a major constraint, due to the multiple activities and requests, those responsible would prefer to avoid the burden of preparing the RBM reports.

**Question 6: Was the multi-donor cost-sharing the best approach to support the delivery of the project?**

The evaluation findings point to the multi-donor cost-sharing approach as having been a suitable and effective method of supporting the delivery of CARTAC programming. This statement was noted by a number of key informants during the evaluation.

*Finding:* Effective interaction by the backstopping from IMF to CARTAC, demonstrating that this was an institutional priority, regardless of the variety of inner approaches in the Fund by department.

Finding: Organizations in most of the countries are now better equipped with now management and technical tools to perform their activities in their fields. A critical mass of trained staff and professionals in different areas has been created by CARTAC, however, due to the separation of some of those trained persons from their positions, the new personnel has to be trained which causes delays in the application of modern tools in their countries, and creates the need of reprogramming the sessions, consequently increasing the costs and causing inefficiencies.

### 3.3.2 Regional Partnership Analysis

A regional approach presents the advantage of flexibility when applying resources according to changing country circumstances. It would be difficult to attract the high quality of technical assistance for a small country that would be available under a regional program. In a small country such expertise would likely be considerably underutilised and would be prohibitively expensive. Successes in a particular country in a region could be a model which could be a showcase for the whole region. Another major
advantage of having people in the field is that it enables CARTAC to build a partnership with both the beneficiary countries and the donors that sit on the Steering Committee. It allows CARTAC to respond to countries’ technical assistance needs in a flexible and timely manner.60

When asked – in this summative evaluation- if they thought that there was an effective use of regional partnerships to optimize use and application of pooled resources within CARTAC, respondents to the end-of-project evaluation survey (71%) said ‘yes’, while 21% specified that it had been a ‘limited use’ of regional partnerships.

3.3.3 Project Delivery Issues

Based on the first mid-term review, the following conclusions were made with respect to delivery.

- Participating countries were impressed at how quickly and how well CARTAC had become integrated into the region. As a result of this integration, CARTAC did not duplicate the work of other multinational or bilateral agencies and their projects. CARTAC has tried to complement the work of other agencies and is able to use both its ability to move quickly, its resources and its technical capacity to fill a niche that other agencies are unable to fill;

- Participating countries all agreed that CARTAC’s activities were all more effective when the country had a well-developed strategy and action plan which was owned by the country. This action plan could have been developed prior to the creation of CARTAC or with the assistance of a CARTAC long-term Advisor; and61

- The composition and dynamic of the Steering Committee is uneven and somehow donor-led, with limited participation to the country members62 should be better defined to clarify the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders, and in order to strengthen their role in providing guidance, setting priorities, and monitoring the performance of the RTACs.

Respondents to the end-of-project evaluation survey were asked to indicate whether the CARTAC mode of delivery of technical assistance was the best use of resources. Fifty seven per cent of those that responded stated that they ‘completely’ agree that it had been the best use of resources, while five (36%) stated that they ‘somewhat agree’. One respondent noting that CARTAC’s “great strength is in leveraging regional expertise”.

60 Source: CARTAC evaluation I , p.31
61 Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p. 10
62 See Review of CARTAC Governance, prepared by Carla Barnett, October 2007
One respondent proved further detail to the delivery model by suggesting that “technical assistance can be delivered through a variety of mechanisms, and it is not certain that the CARTAC model is the only model. A mix of short, medium and longer term TA may work in some cases”. When asked if there were any project delivery issues, eight of 13 respondents (62%) stated ‘no’. One respondent specified that “the high UNDP management fees came at the expense of project delivery”.

3.4 Sustainability

This evaluation has focus on sustainability in three ways: (i) in terms of continuation of funding by donors in successive phases and (ii) the possibility of countries assuming more of the costs of the programme and (iii) ensuring ownership by the countries, willing to maintain and multiply the tools and products acquired through the years.

When asked how they would qualify the sustainability of the programme, survey responses during the end-of-project evaluation were mixed, with 46% of the respondents stating that it was sustainable and 31% indicating that it was not. A number of detailed factors were offered in relation to capacity sustainability and financial sustainability. In relation to financial sustainability, one respondent noted that CARTAC is “highly dependent on a small pool of donors, which could potentially be a problem”, while another two addressed the low level of support from countries indicating that “at the end of the last phase of CARTAC (Phase III), resources offered from the region were extremely low” and that CARTAC needs “adequate contributions from countries” in order to be sustainable. In relation to sustainability of outcomes, one respondent mentioned that “it is hard to imagine a time in the foreseeable future when institutions and capacity in member countries will have been strengthened to the point when there will no longer be a need for CARTAC”, while another respondent noted that “it is difficult to say whether a combination of short, medium and longer term TA may work better in some cases, and whether the mix may or may not be more sustainable”.

Survey respondents were also asked if there were sustainability issues. Nine of 13 respondents (69%) that answered this question stated ‘yes’. Respondents offered comments describing additional issues not outlined above such as “the cost of overheads now that the IMF manages CARTAC absorbing the entire contribution of the participating countries” and sustainability issues associated with CARTAC’s “focus on short term TA”.

Respondents to the first mid-term review generally believed that the improvements that were made in their country as a result of CARTAC’s assistance are sustainable. However, with respect to training, most indicated that another round of training will be needed as the department or agency is in the process of hiring additional staff to bolster its capacity
to carry out its functions. A plea was made to use local and regional experts where possible as this will lead to capacity building within the region.⁶³

3.4.1 Donor Support Sustainability

Because CIDA supplies such a large percentage of the funds for CARTAC, evaluation III suggested that there is a continuing need to attract further funding from new multilateral and bilateral sources.⁶⁴ Donors are accountable to their governments and constituencies, therefore, they need to provide with clear results, in this case, RBM to justify the continuation of support. There are several categories of donors in CARTAC, both because of the size of the contribution and the approach. Some donors have no problem in sharing the results and experiences of this project, while others are more inclined to keep doing the traditional business, asking for different reporting methods.

3.4.2 Beneficiary Countries Ownership

Ownership of the process by participating countries is key to project success, but sustainability depends also on the development and institutionalization of capacities at the regional and country level to carry on with the initiatives and/or maintain the benefits that have come as a result of it (existence of policy and regulatory frameworks; financial and economic mechanisms; key institutional systems, structures and human resources; etc.)

In general, the CARTAC evaluation II found in 2006 that Caribbean authorities claim full ownership of their programs with CARTAC. In a few instances, it was pointed out that authorities had even decided to pursue their priorities through other means rather than follow contrary indications from CARTAC. Of course, demand for particular services is often stimulated by exposure to best practice in seminars, workshops or in discussion with long-term advisers.⁶⁵

CARTAC was seen as a regional body, as “their” regional capacity building organization. However, it is evident for many of the stakeholders interviewed that is has been taken by the IMF after UNDP opened the doors and created the space (the Chinese wall as put in the Mid Term evaluation III) for them. **UNDP made possible the institutional agreements, based on the trust and presence in the region.** Now, the Fund’s presence in the region is through its *alter ego* in CARTAC, thanks to UNDP.

---

⁶³ Source: CARTAC evaluation I, p. 18  
⁶⁴ Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p.83  
⁶⁵ Source: CARTAC evaluation II, p. 8
3.4.3 Possibilities of Sustainable Technical Assistance Post-Project

As recommended in the CARTAC mid-term review for Phase III\textsuperscript{66}, CARTAC has continued into a Phase IV extension into 2012, with communications that the programme will continue into a Phase V.\textsuperscript{67}

The evaluator participated as observer in a meeting, and later conducted interviews with their participants, where the topic was the creation in the region of a “own” economic thought. Initiatives like this, as well as the increased participation of regional consultants as advisors, can improve this sense of ownership in the Caribbean, and the sustainability of similar programs.

As mentioned above (see 3.2.4) CARTAC is in the process of designing an exit strategy in terms of donor support, although premature, given the capacity needs and budget constraints. CARTAC may progressively become a regionally owned organization in the longer term. Recommendation #7 of the third phase midterm review suggested a budget of US$ 7 million that will be contributed by member countries, in line with other RTACs, where member countries contribute at least 5 per cent of the total budget.

\textsuperscript{66} Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p. 82
\textsuperscript{67} Source: CARTAC evaluation III, p. 82
CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.5 General Conclusions

At the closure of a decade of involvement in CARTAC’s management, UNDP can be assured that results are positive and that the UNDP has contributed to the establishment of a relationship between the countries, the regional bodies, the donors, and CARTAC with the backstopping of the IMF. Despite on-going challenges, the cost-shared multi-donor scheme has resulted in the most successful intervention of the RTACs out of the eight centres currently found globally, to support financial management technical assistance in 21 countries of the Caribbean.

CARTAC is now “flying solo”, under the close and growing presence of the IMF, that has built a new reputation and gained the confidence of the governments and regional economic authorities, due, in part, to the UNDP’s status and recognition in these countries. Donors are now confident and have agreed to continue financing the fourth phase directly to the IMF, who is managing the trust fund and performing the tasks that were responsibility of UNDP, saving some costs that can be redirected to continue the training in the beneficiary countries. It has been recognized the important role of UNDP in its contribution to the success of CARTAC, especially through the creation of a firewall between the Fund and the region, and by defining clearly the importance of Human Development, poverty reduction and pressing for the adoption of result based monitoring and reporting tools to ensure the achievement of the expected outcomes of CARTAC. UNDP, that has been a donor also, continues participating as a permanent member of the Steering Committee and is expected that it will be contributing even more in substantial matters to the definition of the future activities of CARTAC in the Caribbean.

Relevance

CARTAC’s relevance was seen in terms of attending the needs of the countries and attending the regional needs, pointing at the supranational aspects of the Caribbean. Overall, the programme is regarded as relevant and useful. However, from the point of view of the countries’ institutions there are “grey areas” in the way the technical assistance, especially the training, is determined.

Effectiveness
The cost-shared and pool of donors arrangement was, in general, effective in terms of achieving the expected results and well conducted, especially during the onset of the programme.

Although CARTAC is effective in its areas of expertise, and the rating is good, stakeholders expressed their doubts about the real increase of capacity and institutional strengthening due to the high rotation of personnel, the political influence in the economic decision making of the countries and brain drain. In some countries it should be necessary to keep training to four or five individuals for the same position or function. Said so, it is also true that many organizations are now in better position to perform their tasks with top of the line standards and that a critical mass of well trained professionals is being created in the region.

The initial resistance from IMF and particularly CARTAC to adopt and implement RBM was broken especially during the third phase, due to the persistence of donors, especially CIDA, PNUD and DFID, in demanding its use. In addition, explicit references to the possibility of reducing or suspending cooperation if such a system was not implemented tamed opposed to RBM.

The move to adopt RBM is still seen as a nuisance rather than a tool for strategic planning, both at the CARTAC level and the country level. Time is a major constraint, due to the multiple activities and requests, those responsible would prefer to avoid the burden of preparing the RBM reports on top of the IMF’s own reports, that are in the process of being reduced. Also, there is no clarity among participating countries and other stakeholders about the role of the RBM in the planning, implementation, monitoring and reporting of their institutional needs.

Efficiency

The programme is expensive due to the excessively higher salaries of the IMF staff, coordinator and resident advisors to the average standard positions in the region and even more to the highly educated local personnel. On top, the 10% administrative fee that the Fund has been charging and other luxury expenses make them look odd when the purpose is to mitigate the general economic and financial crisis of these small islands, plagued with inequality problems.

Sustainability

In terms of continuation of funding by donors in successive phases it has proven to be successful, due to the good performance of the project and to the presence of UNDP backing the inter-agencies agreements. However, it is essential to continue looking for alternative, more stable sources of funding.
In regards to the possibility of countries assuming more of the costs of the programme is seen challenging now, especially due to the crisis. It is expected that the countries that are already contributing will continue doing so, and those that are not, will not do so in the future. But thinking in establishing a cost-recovery process is still far from possible. So far, especially with UNDP’s involvement, and through the good, growing relationship of CARTAC with the countries and their organizations, has ensured ownership by the countries, they considered CARTAC their own. These countries are willing to maintain and multiply the tools and products acquired through the years, but this evaluation perceived a growing concern among the countries and regional bodies, in the sense of having each time less representation in the SC and that CARTAC is not creating “multipliers” in the region, rather transforming in a Fund’s training centre, costly backed up by the IMF in Washington. If not properly addressed, this issue can backfire on the programme, and the Fund as well, and there will be no “Chinese wall” to protect their relationship with the countries in the future.

3.5.1 Attainment of Results and Key Implementation Issues

Some of the main outcomes include the establishment of VAT in five countries, the development of stabilization and growth programme (ECCB/SATAP) for OECS countries, updating banking regulations and their application, and for PFM processes to be modernized, through training and building national capacities. These outcomes have contributed to the following key CARTAC objectives:

- More effective public finance management and revenue administration;
- Greater financial sector regulation and supervision;
- More regular production of relevant economic statistics at the country and regional levels; and
- Development of increasingly effective financial programming.

Respondents to the end-of-project survey were also asked to offer recommendations for improving programme implementation to enhance effectiveness. Examples included:

- “Greater interaction with beneficiary countries”;
- “Utilise more avenues for coordination with agencies”;
- “Look closely at the cost effectiveness of the CARTAC model, whether more strategic planning may be in order, and whether a mix of short and longer term TA may also be required”;
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“There is a serious gap in the policy debate and engagement at the political level in PFM reform, and these are areas where there needs to be more work done”;

“There may be a need for support with the functions of the Accountant General and Auditor General in the region, and it may be necessary to look at support for these key PFM functions”; and

“UNDP needs to be much more self-aware of the value added it is able to offer on such projects and tailor its management fees accordingly and in line with actual services provided to the project. A situation such as in CARTAC where the fees where much greater than the costs involved to oversee the project mean that CARTAC resources are cross-subsiding other UNDP activities and overheads. With a project that is so clearly delivering needed and valued support to the region to be seen to be profiting or skimming resources away from these activities carries very significant reputational risks for UNDP”.

### 3.5.2 Added Value of UNDP Support

In spite of what was mentioned above, UNDP support was of utmost importance to create coherent interaction amongst the key actors, especially at the country-level, taking into account its activities in governance reform and institutional development. Most interviewees and survey respondents recognized the benefits initially obtained thanks to the role of UNDP in creating a space for the initial years of CARTAC. Big effort through the years, prepared the agreements, defined the modalities and procedures, did the administrative, financial and human resources work, besides the consular tasks, which was recorded in many persons/day utilized for that purpose. However, the initial substantive approach was lost through time, due in part to the tension created with the IMF and CARTAC, that consumed time, energy and money to solve the problems, which were mostly not attributable to UNDP.

### 3.5.3 Appropriateness of UNDP Partnership Strategy

Excellent job done by UNDP at conveying all the varied institutional, bilateral and multilateral interests, in one programme with a clear partnership strategy that has been demonstrated it works. A combination of diplomacy, respect and knowledge of the real conditions of the region and its people; the global presence in many fields, especially the human development and institutional strengthening; contributed to the redesign of the partnership strategy, which prevails now in Phase IV after the UNDP direct involvement.
3.6 Lessons Learned

3.6.1 Regarding the Overall Intervention from an Outcome-oriented Perspective

The essence of the evaluation is to assess UNDPs added value and UNDP management/delivery approach for this kind of regional project with national outcomes. It will no doubt provide excellent lessons to be able to replicate this type of project modality in the future. However, at least some general lessons about the very essence/logic of this type of intervention (a regional technical assistance centre, etc.) should be drawn. Is this type of intervention in itself relevant and useful, and should be replicated? Going directly to administrative and management modalities seems to not question the usefulness of the intervention in itself. Most elements to determine this will be generated by the relevance and effectiveness assessments, and it would be interesting to include this reflection from a lessons learned perspective. What can we learn from this type of intervention from an outcome-oriented perspective?

3.6.2 Regarding UNDP Project Management and Delivery Application

The participation in a project management should not go beyond 5 years. By definition, the institutions should get the capacity to continue doing the tasks, while UNDP could assume a more specific role in substantive issues.

3.7 Recommendations

3.7.1 Recommendations to CARTAC

Based on an analysis of evaluation findings, the following recommendations have been provided and directed toward CARTAC for their consideration in the delivery and design of future technical assistance and administration of programming in the region.

1. CARTAC should continue to work as an institution within the region.

2. Strategic support to countries and regional institutions should prevail over urgency of delivery

3. Leave a space for the institutionalization of a regional critical-mass for sustainability in light of the design of an exit strategy. This process should be considered a priority, regardless of the eventuality of the extension of the program to a phase V or further.

4. Regardless of the special characteristics and privileges of the IMF, resident advisors and consultants, an effort should be made to reduce the expenses and try
to level to regional and national conditions. Not just to reducing costs, but to offer a closer image to the reality in which they act.

3.7.2 Recommendations to UNDP

As drawn from the analysis of evaluation findings, the following recommendations have been provided and directed toward UNDP for their consideration in the delivery and design of future programming in the region.

(a) UNDP should leverage its position in the region by moving into more “substantive”, less administrative opportunities, capitalizing on experience gained from administering programmes such as CARTAC. In a competitive world, it is necessary to continuously improve the quality and content of what has to offer in these partnership agreements and become a comprehensive player. It is also important to know the institutional limitations, and to focus the work within the scope of its mission. By the same token, if the commitment is to only serve in the administrative functions of the project or program, it needs to excel in doing so, at any cost.

(b) Determination of fees needs to be clear and transparent from the start, and apply uniformly to all participants of the cost-shared agreement. If, for any reason, this would have to be negotiated individually differently, all members should be aware of the conditions and consulted in the SC.

(c) UNDP should enhance its strategic positioning of the sub-regional programme to further build on the reduction of human and social vulnerabilities (as stated in the ADR implementation report), improve south-south cooperation strategies and work to a greater extent with the private sector.

(d) In line with recommendation No.11 of the ADR, greater efforts should be made to strengthen the capacity of the UNDP Barbados office to utilize and manage uniform RBM procedures. Furthermore, these efforts could lead to the UNDP-Barbados office delivering additional training to countries, organizations and regional bodies. Perhaps, this expertise could generate “value added” in future projects, alongside CARTAC’s current plans to adopt RBM.

(e) Respondents suggest that the UNDP office in New York (RBLAC) should have offered greater levels of administrative support and not leave the Regional Office alone to administer all programme and management tasks on its own. Respondents suggested that RBLAC could be made more aware of the realities of

68 This is an area where UNDP has moved on recently and at the regional level there are good examples of progress on the matter.
the regions and the countries, especially the Caribbean, which is regarded as “tourist islands”, especially at a time when human development, poverty, and debt issues are critical in the region. Overall, for future programs similar to this, it was suggested that RBLAC should be more sensitive and adopt similar mechanisms like the backstopping utilized by the Fund in CARTAC in which high quality technical support is offered to the regional office. This tool can help UNDP to position itself as a proactive and substantive player capable to interact technically with all counterparts, beyond its more traditional institutional development and administrative role.

Evaluation findings suggest that there are internal administrative issues at UNDP-Barbados Regional office that need to be addressed. For instance, the accounting system was not adequately introduced and trained, especially for new staff. Assigned personnel were under considerable pressure to attend to last minute requests from CARTAC, at a high personal and institutional cost. The evaluator could verify that most of the processes that caused conflicts were because of incomplete or wrong processing at CARTAC office, but in the end UNDP personnel were accused for causing the “delays”. UNDP’s officers ran to attend and solve the problems but in the end got blamed for the delayed process. This scenario points to the need for personnel to maintain compliance requisites and time requirements, regardless of the consequences (e.g. cancellation of a trip, course or meeting).

Survey respondents were asked to describe recommendations to UNDP for future multi-donor regional projects in the Middle-Income country context. Examples of recommendations include:

- “Define the medium term financing plan from the outset to ensure sustainability”;
- Allow for a “greater emphasis on capacity building”;
- “Give quick responses to needs, and make effective use of skills in appropriate ways”;
- “Look closely at the cost effectiveness of UNDP's role in managing a multi-donor regional initiative. UNDP may want to question their value-added in managing a programme such as CARTAC, and focus on where they can be most effective and efficient with limited donor resources”; and
- “Sustainability needs to be a much great consideration in project design since CARTAC was overwhelmingly financed by external donors whose presence with

---

69 Recent key policy documents of RBLAC are now taking the Caribbean into account as special priority and a special Caribbean unit has been established at headquarters level.
such volumes of support is clearly going to be time bound in a middle income region when there are fiscal pressures at home”.

3.7.3 Recommendations to Other Cooperating Organizations

The following section outlines recommendations for other cooperating organizations associated with CARTAC.

- **Donors should clarify their positions and priorities with respect to their roles and expectations for outcomes.** This does not mean that these cooperating organizations should tie their contributions, but in the context of a shared project, all should have a voice and be taken into account. For instance, the implementation of RBM has taken several years to implement and institutionalize as demonstrated by its introduction at the next CARTAC Steering Committee meeting in June 2012.

- **Sharing knowledge, experience, and participation among donors can result in a valuable experience with significant positive outcomes to organizations and participating countries.** Several interviewees at senior level positions in the countries indicated that they are not willing to accept further cooperation resources, since attending the priorities of each donor offering TA is a continued deviation from their own national objectives. Furthermore, in line with the Paris declaration, participating countries indicated that they do not want to be accused improperly using donations, due to the limited delivery capacity of some of their organizations.

- **In order to contribute to the efficient development of the project, donors should harmonize their request for reports** in order to minimize reporting duplication. Evaluation respondents suggested that considerable time is required to complete the forms and reports for each donor in compliance with the reporting requirements of donor governments and constituencies.

3.7.4 Recommendations to participating Caribbean Countries

Individual countries are the ultimate beneficiaries of the program, their institutions, sectors and the general population

- Create a regional think-tank to promote own thought on economic and social issues affecting the countries of the region, in line with regional organizations.
• Try to act beyond the traditional way of doing changes in their institutions when a new government or political party is in power. As much as possible try to maintain the technical personnel that has been trained in the different areas of CARTAC. Training again to new staff would have costly and timing consequences.

• Allocate in their budget the contributions to CARTAC

• Implement Mid-term budgeting
REPORT ANNEXES

Annex 1. Evaluation terms of reference

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

This UNDP project evaluation will be results-oriented end-of Project Evaluation which will address the key goals which will:

(i) determine whether the results as identified by each of the three phases were achieved;

(ii) identify lessons learned for wider UNDP project management and delivery application, specifically providing recommendations for the future use of UNDP agency executed guidelines and modalities for regional projects with national outcomes;

(iii) review the role and added value of the UNDP support to the CARTAC project vis-à-vis UNDP’s capacity building mandate;

(iv) Assess the appropriateness of UNDP’s partnership strategy to the regional project modality

The evaluation will take place between mid-November and end March 2012.

The evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability of the CARTAC project and its contribution to outcome level results. Specifically the evaluation will examine the following aspects:

- Changes in context and review of assumptions (relevance – have the right things been done?): The CARTAC project in its 4th Phase. The economic and political conditions that led to the original Project design and implementation have changed substantially. This phase takes account of COFAP decision to use IMF Fund modalities vis-à-vis the UNDP cost-sharing project modality. What are the implications of these changes at national and regional levels and has the project been able to respond to these changes? What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of beneficiary groups to fully utilize the technical assistance provided by CARTAC?

- Assessment of outcome/impact (effectiveness): The IMF executed CARTAC project provided the Caribbean Region with technical expertise designed to:

---

70 The evaluation should address the proposed evaluation questions, but not necessarily limit to them.
1. build capacity of beneficiary countries and support the improvement of the quality of policy-making and implementation

2. address the emerging challenges to fiscal and debt sustainability, financial sector development and overall macroeconomic management for sustained growth and development.

Therefore, this end-of-project evaluation will take into account the following:

1. What has been CARTAC’s performance with respect to the projected performance indicators and agreed responsibilities with respect to program implementation?

2. Is the results based management framework fully operational and effective?

3. What has been the impact of CARTAC? To what extent the CARTAC project has contributed to key outcome level results?

4. What progress towards the expected results has been achieved (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, problems, causes)?

5. How could the impact of CARTAC’s programme have been expanded within a capacity building framework? Within a Human Development framework? And with a RBM focused report framework?

6. The value-added of the CARTAC programme in comparison with single donor projects. To what extent gender issues have been incorporated in the CARTAC project?

7. Has the partnership strategy been appropriate? How effective has been the use of UNDP agency executed modality?

➢ Achievement of projected performance indicators and targets (efficiency):

1. Given that approximately USD 60 million has been expended over the lifetime of the project, this evaluation should include a cost/benefit and TA delivery efficiency analysis of the delivery of services and the effectiveness of the CARTAC model.

2. Has the project been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated? Was there effective use of regional partnerships to optimize pooled resources. From a financial perspective, were there benefits from use

---

71 Is the mode of delivery of technical assistance appropriate and best use of resources?
of the multi-donor modality toward achievement of the desired outcomes? Did this effectively leverage the substantive capacities of the partners involved?

- **Sustainability**: The evaluation will reflect on previous CARTAC’s review reports on sustainability and project delivery issues such as levels of delivery of technical assistance and donor support sustainability and proposals for cost recovery reviews that informed the formulation of Phase IV.

**Methodology**

The evaluators will design the methodology for the end-of-project evaluation. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

It is suggested that the evaluation methodology will build on the 2009 ADR for Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean\(^2^2\) which offers evidence-based research on UNDP’s context and contribution at the outcome level. It is expected that evaluators will conduct a participatory end of project results focused evaluation that will involve project implementers and stakeholder organizations (CARTAC, IMF, and UNDP, OECS and ECCB), key donors (CIDA, DFID, EU and CDB) and target beneficiaries in all key evaluation tasks.

The exercise will entail a combination of desk reviews and document analysis, and consultations with key stakeholders. In the case of the desk reviews and document analysis, particular emphasis will be paid to the Assessment of Development Results (2009) for the UNDP Office for Barbados and OECS, the three independent Mid-Term Reviews of the CARTAC project, the Polius and Jenson Reports on Results Based Monitoring and Reporting (2008) and the Report on the Review of CARTAC Governance and other recent CARTAC review reports as requested by the CARTAC Steering Committee.

The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should be validated. The evaluation should reflect the principles of Managing for Development Results (MfDR), and it is expected that the process supports planning, monitoring and evaluation capacity building. The conceptual framework for the evaluation should be in line with the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009). The evaluation should apply the ethical and quality principles of the United Nations Evaluation Group, and the evaluators are expected to agree with the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the UN System.

Deliverables

The deliverables are as follows:

**Inception Report - Evaluation framework/design and implementation plan**

An inception report should be prepared by the revision team before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. The report should contain an evaluation matrix that displays for each of the evaluation criteria, the questions and sub questions that the evaluation will answer, and for each question, the data that will be collected to inform that question and the methods that will be used to collect that data. In addition, the inception report should make explicit the underlying theory or assumptions about how each data element will contribute to understanding the development results—attribute, contribution, process, implementation and so forth—and the rationale for data collection, analysis and reporting methodologies selected. It should also include a proposed schedule of tasks/activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.

**Draft evaluation report**

**Final Evaluation Report** The final report should be a 50-page analytical report, excluding annexes, detailing key findings, good practices and clear recommendations. The report should be presented in English. The Evaluation report format should meet with the standard Evaluation Report Template of the UNDP and quality Standards established.
Annex 2 Evaluation ethical code of conduct

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)


Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: Cesar A. Guerrero

Name of Consultancy Organisation (where relevant):

I confirm that I have read and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date) Ottawa, Canada 30/05/2011

Signature: ___________________________
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Annex 5 Survey questions
## Survey of the CARTAC Project

### Profile

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** This UNDP end-of-project evaluation will review 3 phases of CARTAC (2001-2011) Phases I, II and III were supported as a UNDP cost-shared project. The evaluation does not refer to the current Phase IV which does not operate as a UNDP Project.

This is a voluntary survey. All opinions will remain completely anonymous. In order to learn from the programme implementation, we hope that your responses will provide your perceptions on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the CARTAC project.

The stated overall objectives of the CARTAC project is to strengthen CARICOM Member States capacity to manage macroeconomic and fiscal policies, to improve financial supervision and development, and to support economic growth and poverty reduction in the region. During Phases I, II and III of the Project, CARTAC has provided technical services and training in five core areas:

1. Public Finance management, including budgeting, treasury operations and debt management;
2. Revenue administration, including the introduction of VATs and addressing the challenges associated with regional harmonization;
3. Financial sector regulation and supervision, emphasizing the supervision of non-bank institutions and assistance in enhancing the region’s capital markets;
4. Production and analysis of economic statistics, with a focus on supporting macroeconomic policies; and
5. Financial programming; the formulation of macroeconomic projections and a framework for policy analysis.

Please tell us about you and your work

**1. SOX**
- [ ] Male
- [ ] Female

**2. At which level do you work?**
- [ ] Regional
- [ ] National

Specify the country or countries where you work for (optional)

**3. What type of organization do you work for?**
- [ ] Work for an international organization
- [ ] Work for a regional body
- [ ] Work for a government
- [ ] Work for a financial institution
- [ ] Work for CARTAC
- [ ] Other


### Survey of the CARTAC Project

#### Relevance

**4. To what extent has CARTAC delivered and responded to the needs of the countries?**

- [ ] Cover all the needs of the countries
- [ ] Cover most of the needs
- [ ] Cover some of the needs
- [ ] Cover few needs
- [ ] Do not cover any of the needs
- [ ] I don't know/No comment

Explain your response (optional)

---

**5. To what extent has CARTAC delivered and responded to the needs of the region (as a whole)?**

- [ ] Cover all the needs
- [ ] Cover most of the needs
- [ ] Cover some of the needs
- [ ] Cover few needs
- [ ] Do not cover any of the needs
- [ ] I don't know/No comment

Explain your response (optional)
Survey of the CARTAC Project

Effectiveness

*6. Has the CARTAC results based management (RBM) framework been effective in supporting your programme results? Ee2

- Yes
- No
- I don’t know/no comment

Explain your response (optional)

*7. To what extent has the CARTAC project contributed to key outcome level results of your programme? Ee3b

- Covered all the key outcome level results
- Covered most of the key outcome level results
- Covered some of the key outcome level results
- Covered few key outcome level results
- Did not cover any of the key outcome level results
- I don’t know/no comment

Explain your response (optional)
Survey of the CARTAC Project

8. In your opinion, what was the value-added of the CARTAC programme in comparison with single donor projects? (Three phases under UNDP 2001-2011) Ee6a

- Greater value
- Same value
- Smaller value
- I don’t know/no comment

Explain your answer (optional)

9. Do you think that the partnership strategy (international multi-donor and Caribbean countries) has been appropriate for the multi-island context of the Caribbean? Partnership strategy meaning multiple countries, several donors and pooled resources. Ee7a

- Very appropriate
- Somewhat appropriate
- Neutral
- Somewhat inappropriate
- Very inappropriate
- I don’t know/no comment

Explain your response (optional)
**Survey of the CARTAC Project**

**Efficiency**

*10. Do you believe that the CARTAC mode of delivery of technical assistance is the best use of resources? Ei1*

- [ ] Completely agree
- [ ] Somewhat agree
- [ ] I don’t agree
- [ ] I don’t know/no comment

*Explain your response (optional)*

---

*11. Do you think that there was an effective use of regional partnerships to optimize use and application of pooled resources? Ei2b*

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Limited use
- [ ] I don’t know/no comment

*Explain your response (optional)*

---
Survey of the CARTAC Project

Sustainability

*12. How would you qualify the sustainability of the programme?

- Sustainable
- Unsustainable
- I don't know/No comment

Explain your response (optional)

*13. Do you consider that there were sustainability issues? S1a

- Yes
- No
- I don't know/No comment

Explain your response
### Survey of the CARTAC Project

**14. Do you consider that there were project delivery issues? S1b**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] I don't know/no comment

*Explain your response*

---
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### Survey of the CARTAC Project

**Recommendations and final comments**

15. What recommendations would you give to UNDP for future multi-donor regional in the Middle-Income context projects?

16. What recommendations would you give to improve the programme implementation?

17. Any other additional comment?
## Annex 6 Interview guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong> Relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4 [1a] Has CARTAC responded to needs of the countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1b] Has CARTAC responded to need of the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 [2] What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of beneficiary groups to fully utilize the technical assistance provided by CARTAC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 [3] How did the management of the project changed in response to the new scheme (cost-sharing)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ee</strong> Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee1 [5] What has been CARTAC’s performance with respect to the projected performance indicators and agreed responsibilities for program implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee2 [6] When did the results based management framework become fully operational and effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee3a [7a] What have been the key contributions of CARTAC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee3b [7b] To what extent the CARTAC project has contributed to key outcome level results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee4 [8] What progress towards the expected results has been achieved (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, problems, causes)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5a [9a] How could the impact of CARTAC’s programme have been expanded within a capacity building framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5b [9b] Which types of capacity building approaches were used during CARTAC activities? (e.g. hiring foreign staff, mentoring, coaching, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5c [9c] To what extent was local expert capacity strengthened as a result of CARTAC activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5d [9d] Within a Human Development framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5e [9e] And with a RBM focused report framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ee6a</strong> 10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ee6b</strong> 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ee7a</strong> 11a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ee7b</strong> 11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei</strong> Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei1</strong> 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei2a</strong> 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei2b</strong> 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei2c</strong> 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei2d</strong> 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ei2e</strong> 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S1</strong> 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2</strong> 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 7 Validation Matrix of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Lines of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>[1] What were the implications of project cost-sharing changes at national and regional levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>[2] Was the project able to respond to these changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>[3] What internal and external factors have influenced the ability of beneficiary groups to fully utilize the technical assistance provided by CARTAC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>[4] Has CARTAC responded to needs of the countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee1</td>
<td>[5] What has been CARTAC’s performance with respect to the projected performance indicators and agreed responsibilities with respect to program implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee2</td>
<td>[6] Is the results based management framework fully operational and effective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee3a</td>
<td>[7a] What has been the impact of CARTAC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee3b</td>
<td>[7b] To what extent the CARTAC project has contributed to key outcome level results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee4</td>
<td>[8] What progress towards the expected results has been achieved (strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, problems, causes)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5a</td>
<td>[9a] How could the impact of CARTAC’s programme have been expanded within a capacity building framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5b</td>
<td>[9b] Which types of capacity building approaches were used during CARTAC activities? (e.g. hiring foreign staff, mentoring, coaching, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5c</td>
<td>[9c] To what extent was local expert capacity strengthened as a result of CARTAC activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5d</td>
<td>[9d] Within a Human Development framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines of Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Review</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key Informant Interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee5e</td>
<td>[9e] And with a RBM focused report framework?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee6a</td>
<td>[10a] What was the value-added of the CARTAC programme in comparison with single donor projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee6b</td>
<td>[10b] To what extent have gender issues been incorporated in the CARTAC project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee7a</td>
<td>[11a] Has the partnership strategy been appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee7b</td>
<td>[11b] How effective has been the use of UNDP agency executed modality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei</td>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei1</td>
<td>[12] Is the mode of delivery of technical assistance appropriate and best use of resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei2a</td>
<td>[13] Has the project been implemented according to the time line and costs estimated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei2b</td>
<td>[14] Was there effective use of regional partnerships to optimize pooled resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei2c</td>
<td>[15] From a financial perspective, were there benefits from use of the multi-donor modality toward achievement of the desired outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ei2d</td>
<td>[16] Did this effectively leverage the substantive capacities of the partners involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>[17] Are there sustainability and project delivery issues?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex 8 CARTAC Phase III Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase III PD Budget</th>
<th>Phase III Revised Total</th>
<th>2008 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>2009 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>2010 Actual Expenditures</th>
<th>2011 Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Staff and Regional Travel</td>
<td>10,501,429</td>
<td>10,915,703</td>
<td>3,040,380</td>
<td>4,043,149</td>
<td>3,538,338</td>
<td>293,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term Experts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Expenditure Expert(s)</td>
<td>970,200</td>
<td>2,344,217</td>
<td>693,916</td>
<td>538,377</td>
<td>1,042,060</td>
<td>69,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Administration &amp; Policy Expert(s)</td>
<td>4,770,150</td>
<td>4,364,245</td>
<td>1,807,551</td>
<td>1,220,614</td>
<td>1,166,566</td>
<td>169,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs Expert(s)</td>
<td>2,588,740</td>
<td>428,078</td>
<td>1,356,293</td>
<td>597,108</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sector Supervision Expert(s)</td>
<td>1,295,910</td>
<td>2,252,283</td>
<td>540,883</td>
<td>933,115</td>
<td>734,524</td>
<td>43,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Management Expert(s)</td>
<td>291,060</td>
<td>110,519</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,153</td>
<td>82,341</td>
<td>5,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAX &amp; Customs (DFID)</td>
<td>1,602,482</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,121,990</td>
<td>480,492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Programming Expert(s)</td>
<td>970,200</td>
<td>1,106,939</td>
<td>334,871</td>
<td>260,644</td>
<td>463,685</td>
<td>47,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic Expert(s)</td>
<td>429,660</td>
<td>374,521</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>340,671</td>
<td>33,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Statistics Expert(s)</td>
<td>970,200</td>
<td>1,363,783</td>
<td>442,408</td>
<td>474,399</td>
<td>433,314</td>
<td>13,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Markets Expert(s)</td>
<td>886,416</td>
<td>101,928</td>
<td>458,639</td>
<td>240,331</td>
<td>85,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCF Govt of Grenada VAT</td>
<td>15,471</td>
<td>15,471</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>213,675</td>
<td>522,788</td>
<td>36,879</td>
<td>303,248</td>
<td>182,662</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT PERSONNEL</td>
<td>20,412,484</td>
<td>28,248,106</td>
<td>7,442,364</td>
<td>9,611,631</td>
<td>9,443,589</td>
<td>1,250,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINING</td>
<td>2,321,550</td>
<td>6,002,020</td>
<td>2,085,885</td>
<td>2,195,996</td>
<td>1,639,377</td>
<td>80,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>57,750</td>
<td>108,337</td>
<td>61,240</td>
<td>30,156</td>
<td>15,120</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS/OPERATIONS</td>
<td>115,500</td>
<td>402,471</td>
<td>143,747</td>
<td>129,016</td>
<td>122,844</td>
<td>6,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUDGET TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>22,907,284</td>
<td>34,760,934</td>
<td>9,733,237</td>
<td>11,966,799</td>
<td>11,720,931</td>
<td>1,339,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures include all overhead charges.
## Annex 8 Status of Contributions

### Phase III - Project ID 00011326

**Status of Contributions**  
(As confirmed by UNDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONORS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24,337,118.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry-over from Phase II</td>
<td>3,386,338.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>584,623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>4,149,017.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td>270,015.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU (Special assign SVG)</td>
<td>699,196.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>479,806.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,106,113.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>IN KIND CONTRIBUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>1,423,470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>34,345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,757,815.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>10,000.00 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kitts &amp; Nevis</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent &amp; the Grenadines</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>725,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRIBUTIONS NOT PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Caicos Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total**  
36,648,928.71

* Dominican Republic is no longer a contributing member
## Annex 10  Status of Cost Sharing Pledged, Received and Apportioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DONOR</th>
<th>RECEIPT OF C/S CONTRIBUTION</th>
<th>PLEDGED</th>
<th>RECEIVED</th>
<th>APPORTIONED (EXPENDITURE)</th>
<th>INCOME C/F 2001</th>
<th>INCOME C/F 2002</th>
<th>INCOME C/F 2003</th>
<th>INCOME C/F 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,059,999</td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td>588,445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td></td>
<td>730,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>19-Sep-01</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>5,095,541</td>
<td>361,994</td>
<td>920,149</td>
<td>1,562,551</td>
<td>2,250,847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRELAND</td>
<td>21-Dec-01</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,594</td>
<td>22,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>17-Jul-02</td>
<td>1,148,000</td>
<td>382,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>348,293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>19-Nov-02</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,738</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>25-Jun-04</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>04-Sep-02</td>
<td>1,452,477</td>
<td>71,429</td>
<td>57,583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>13-Dec-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>156,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>05-Dec-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>170,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>13-Dec-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,934</td>
<td></td>
<td>504,385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>26-Jan-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>373,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>373,002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFiD</td>
<td>01-Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>255,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>255,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUILLA</td>
<td>30-May-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGUILLA</td>
<td>13-Feb-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBADOS</td>
<td>07-Oct-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBADOS</td>
<td>05-Sep-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAHAMAS</td>
<td>27-Feb-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELIZE</td>
<td>23-Aug-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUYANA</td>
<td>30-May-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRENADA</td>
<td>02-Aug-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. KITTS</td>
<td>04-Sep-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. KITTS</td>
<td>19-May-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LUCIA</td>
<td>11-Jul-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LUCIA</td>
<td>05-Mar-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. LUCIA</td>
<td>16-Jun-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. VINCENT</td>
<td>07-Jun-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. VINCENT</td>
<td>09-May-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST. VINCENT</td>
<td>28-Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTSEERRAT</td>
<td>09-Oct-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM REP</td>
<td>17-Oct-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM REP</td>
<td>23-Feb-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD &amp; TOB</td>
<td>05-Sep-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,061</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINIDAD &amp; TOB</td>
<td>07-Jul-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAYMAN ISLANDS</td>
<td>04-Sep-02</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,118</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAYMAN ISLANDS</td>
<td>10-Mar-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH VI</td>
<td>27-Jun-03</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRITISH VI</td>
<td>19-May-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAICA</td>
<td>19-Jun-03</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAICA</td>
<td>07-Apr-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIGUA &amp; BARB</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICA</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURNAME</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TURKS &amp; CAICOS</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,574,476</td>
<td>9,167,988</td>
<td>361,994</td>
<td>2,111,414</td>
<td>2,910,586</td>
<td>3,783,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALANCE DUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,406,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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