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**MID-TERM EVALUATION OF REGIONAL PROGRAM IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

Date: November 2011

**Overall comments:** The mainpurpose of this MTE was to assess the main achievements made and lessons learnt during the current Regional Programme (RP). This evaluation, which covered the period from inception of the RP to the end of 2010, focused on three objectives searching to provide recommendations on how to improve performance during the remaining and future regional programming: Firstly, to **provide an assessment of the results achieved in partnership with key development actors with a focus on key results in the level of outputs and outcomes;** secondly, **present key findings, lessons learnt and good practices based on this assessment, which are useful** for the Regional Bureau, Country Offices, corporate units and main regional and national counterparts of the programme. Thirdly, **revise the relevance and coherence of the results framework of the RP** to allow an effective basis for monitoring and evaluation for development results. As a special issue, it assessed the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and sustainability of initiatives financed by the **Spain-UNDP Trust Fund**, including the coherence and alignment with the rest of the Regional Programme.

A comprehensive and outcome oriented evaluation was especially important, since no outcome evaluations had been commissioned for the RP before. **Together with independent thematic evaluations and outcome oriented project evaluations of the RP this evaluation provides relevant evaluative evidence to the necessary adjustments for the remaining of the RP period and for the preparation of the future RP**.

Since the formulation of the RP, important changes have occurred. The regionalization process in LAC has taken an important impulse, and the Regional Service Centre in Panama (RSC-LAC) is now fully functional, assuming also the implementation of the RP. **The evaluation recognizes that the programme management changes have contributed to the effectiveness**. With the creation of the Regional Center (RSC), Cluster Leaders became responsible for technically conducting the implementation of the RP, thus aligning priorities to better respond to the needs of COs and enhancing interactions with COs and UN Agencies. RP implementation also complied with the principles established in the RPD and the recommendations made by the II RCF evaluation: elimination of project dispersion, focus upon priorities inserted in a cohesive programming framework; and improving gender mainstreaming in programmatic activities as it was practically missing from the previous programme. Likewise, one of the found lessons states that the strengthening of networks as Communities of Practice is paramount for sharing and exchanging best-practices and knowledge products. The RSCLAC recognizes there has been a significant shift from a focal point system towards a knowledge management networking through the activation of the regional communities of practice.

The evaluation confirms that the RP **has supported the right priorities** working towards outcomes aligned with LAC fundamental development issues, the UNDP Strategy Plan and UNDP comparative capacities. **The evaluation has proved that the RP has made clear progress towards the expected outcomes, resulting in a better strategic positioning of the UNDP, notably in areas of DG, Poverty Reduction, and MDGs; Citizen Security, policy dialogue in CC and Biodiversity, and amplified trust in Gender Equality.** The evaluation also finds that **the role of partnerships in achievement of development results was pivotal**. The RP worked in close relationship with UN agencies in the spirit of “One-UN”, as well as with an array of regional and national networks and actors, including new actors such as indigenous and Afro organizations. Coherently with its strong political engagement in Latin America, the Government of **Spain was RP’s major strategic partner.** The RSCLAC, due to its actual financial situation and medium-term perspectives, confronts the challenge of maintaining the level of cost-sharing resources within a context of scarce resources in the Donor community not only to sustain the financing levels of the thematic areas but particularly to support cross-cutting services which mobilized lesser resources and were more adversely affected with TRAC reductions. Hence, the RSCLAC recognizes that most probably it will need to revise the key programmatic priorities for LAC of the RP.

On the other hand, UNDP is in a moment of important transformations as an organization. The UNDP Strategic Plan is under revision. In April 2011 the Administrator launched “*An Agenda for Organizational Change – Lifting UNDP Performance from Good to Great*”, which provides the organization with a blueprint to achieve central changes pushing for an even stronger and better UNDP to respond to the key development challenges of the 21st century.

better UNDP.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 1:**  ***The Regional Service Centre, the work by Practice Areas, and coordination between UNDP departments should be consolidated as a crucial management mechanism to ensure a relevant, effective and efficient Regional Programme.*** | | | | |
| **Management Response:**  This recommendation is in line with findings and recommendations of other evaluations, especially the recent evaluation on UNDP´s Contribution to Development Results at Regional Level, which finds that “*In a situation where all country offices cannot be strengthened, provision of technical support services*  *from regional service centres has proved to be a relevant and appropriate option*”, and “*The establishment of regional service centres has contributed to an improvement in cross-practice collaboration although there are institutional constraints that limit cooperation across practice areas*”, and recommends that “*UNDP should retain the system of regional service centres under the purview of the regional bureaus*”. In case of RSCLAC the formal long term agreements to define roles and responsibilities for funding, operation and management between the RBLAC and other Bureaus (BDP, BCPR, BOM) have not been signed. The implementation of the Regional Programme has been delegated to the RSCLAC since 2009. In April 2011 the Administrator launched “*An Agenda for Organizational Change – Lifting UNDP Performance from Good to Great*” which outlines the next phase of the program of change to shift UNDP to a future state where the organization is positioned at headquarters and Regional Service Centres to more effectively support our country offices to deliver visible, consistent impact on the ground. Given this background, is evident that the full implementation of this recommendation in not only in the hands of the RBLAC, but has to be implemented in close coordination of other Bureaus in the frame of the priorities and the change process of the organization. It is also crucial to establish the “right balance” between priority support to UNDP COs and management of regional initiatives, as the MTE concludes. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 1.1 Assure the definition of the future role of the RSCLAC under the “Agenda for Organizational Change” is based on the value added and strengths of the RSCLAC identified in evaluations and other sources and on the requirements expressed by the RSC-LAC Board. | Mid 2012 | RBLAC directorate in close coordination with SMT of the RSCLAC |  |  |
| 1.2 Further strengthen the implementation of the Regional Programme by increasing its results orientation, focus and the articulation of the services (policy and technical advice and others) of the different thematic areas with the implementation of the RP. | ongoing | SMT and area coordinators responsible of the implementation of the regional initiatives |  |  |
| 1.3 Revise and finalize the existing LTAs and adjust them as needed to respond to the agreed organizational changes. | By mid 2012 | RBLAC and RSCLAC directorate in coordination with the other Bureaus´ directors |  |  |
| 1.4 Increase inter-cluster collaboration in the implementation of the RP to effectively respond to the multidisciplinary development challenges in the region. | Ongoing | SMT and area coordinators |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 2:**  ***Expand certain thematic priorities, particularly Citizen Security in middle-income countries, Climate Change experience, and South-South cooperation. The latter should encompass LAC and go beyond to other world regions as well as beyond the traditional exchange of experts to defining priority sectors of intervention, fostering dialogue spaces, disseminating best-practices and building networks. Selected well-known LAC institutions and networks of experts in countries of high and middle level human development can be mobilized to participate in the program.*** | | | | |
| **Management Response:** According to the evaluation, the RP has been successful in supporting the right priorities and through high quality advocacy reports has been able to introduce new conceptual frameworks. The strategic positioning of UNDP has improved during the current programme in many priority areas such as Democratic Governance, Poverty Reduction, and the MDGs, Citizen Security, policy dialogue in CC and Biodiversity, and amplified trust in Gender Equality. Besides these advances, as was also pointed out by the RSCLAC Board members in the Annual Board session in early May, there is need to carefully analyze where are the key issues in LAC, and assure that “UNDP would be ahead of the curve” when tackling the priority challenges of the region.  In the case of Environment, Rio 2012 will set forth the new agenda for an inclusive and sustainable development and will define future directions after 2015 with MDG-like targets. That said, in LAC there is still a need to integrate climate change into Ministries of Finance and Planning with a long term vision both for adaptation and mitigation, and consider that central planning will be needed to cope with prioritization of actions to adapt and make resilient all areas of physical and soft infrastructure, ie ecosystems and their services. This will lead to need for increased support to conserving ecosystems and biodiversity so that they can provide the services needed for our survival and growth. Accordingly, UNDP foresees prioritizing in the coming years: (i) **Help** countries report on, and work towards, Equitable and Sustainable Development at Rio+20 (UN Conference on Sustainable Development); (ii) Green, low carbon strategies for LAC countries (LECRDS), (iii)  national financial planning for biodiversity (iv) making the carbon market work for countries and (v) continued provision of ecosystem services in face of CC and integrating these efforts with disaster risk reduction . The assistance provided will be in line with agreed regional programme with any extra support provided to assist COs to implement Rio 2012 and other agreements.  Regarding *citizen security***,** the scope of the problem (and its evolution) in LAC has reached a point where the number of victims go beyond traditional wars, private security beyond national police staff, and countries are considering external support (.e.g. possible CICIG in El Salvador). Even in countries with lower levels of violence, the perceived insecurity is relatively high. Innovative approaches to the issue should be considered, in terms of advocating new perspectives to approach the problem, including its links with organized crime and narcotrafic, and to support government´s capacities to address these issues, not only in CA and Haiti, but also in other countries in LAC. In this regard, priorities of the RP will focus at the *regional level*, in improving knowledge, lessons learned and best practices in citizen security and conflict management in order to provide a set of recommendations and practical tools to government and nongovernmental actors, using as a platform the UNDP HDR for Central America 2009-2010 “Opening Spaces for Citizen Security and Human Development”, the upcoming HDR for the Caribbean 2011 on “Citizen security in the Caribbean”; and the RBLAC Human Development Regional Report 2012-2013, under production, on "Citizen Security in Latin America: Diagnosis, Experiences, and Policies".  South South Cooperation remains a strategic priority for RBLAC. Consequently, the regional program will deepen its support to this area by promoting a continuous development dialogue between countries in the South (with a special emphasis in the Arab States and African regions), and deepening the new corporate partnership framework (with the signature of new agreements between UNDP and other LAC countries - such as Mexico -, and their strategic implementation). In order for SSC to be more effective and efficient, RBLAC will support countries in their effort to develop national evaluation capacities, and stimulate enhanced systems and practices for evaluating MICs' policy and programme experiences, drawing evidence-based good practices and assessing their possible replication by and adaptation to other countries. Support will be provided to capacity development of SSC institutional framework in LAC, and a global network for more efficient and sustainable interventions, including triangular cooperation. Coordinated policies will need to be sought with other UN agencies to support countries with regards to SSC.  The responses provided in the above mentioned areas will be delivered considering a cross practice and multidisciplinary perspective. | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 2.1 Continue working with Carbon markets and explore through Sectoral mechanisms, NAMAs, NAPs and South-South cooperation | Ongoing | Energy and Environment Group (EEG) |  |  |
| 2.2.(i) Support the interagency report of LAC for Rio +20; and (ii) include prioritized needs of support for implementing Rio +20 agreements in the future revisions of the Regional Program Document. | (i) first semester 2012  (ii) first semester 2013 | EEG  RBLAC and RSCLAC Directorate in close coordination with EEG |  |  |
| 2.3 Support further work across LAC to get Low Carbon development strategies (LECRDS)  funded and implemented in countries | Ongoing | Energy and Environment Group (EEG) |  |  |
| 2.4 Develop new innovative and viable products and services to address citizen security, based on lessons learned in the region and considering the necessary adjustment to allow replication in different contexts. This works includes a regional HDR in Citizen Security in the Caribbean and in LA to be completed by 2011 and 2012 respectively | Ongoing | CPR Group and RBLAC, Regional CS HDR project |  |  |
| 2.5 Strengthen roster of experts and agreements with centers of excellence, including national and local key institutions. | Ongoing | All Areas |  |  |
| 2.6 Help identify ¨supply and demand¨ of SSC in LAC during the celebration of knowledge fairs or other exchange mechanisms. | April 2012 | CDLAC |  |  |
| 2.7 Facilitate South South Solutions in and across regions, including increased collaboration among regional bureaus | Ongoing | CDLAC |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 3:**  ***Maintain the present priorities for advocacy, social equality, and establish a permanent mechanism to monitor the impact of the global financial crisis on poverty and the MDGs.*** | | | | |
| **Management Response:**  According to the Mid-Term evaluation of the Regional Programme in LAC the tools and outputs on such topics as the environment, social cohesion, and the economic crisis have been highly recognized for its quality and its awaited effects. The monitoring and institutional thinking on the economic crisis caused a change in work agendas by prioritizing the study of employment, social protection, and the monitoring of the advancement towards the MDGs and the impact of the global economic trends. This information has led to prioritizing fiscal policy and social protection and their relevance during crises, through empirical data that indicates how social indicators deteriorate significantly during economic downturns.  The MDGswill remain at the centre of UNDP’s development work over the next years, including the application of the MDG Acceleration  Framework (MAF), with the aim of helping to accelerate progress at the country level on those MDGs that are currently unlikely to be reached by 2015.Many of the activities that the Regional Programme is carrying out accompany this effort, contributing to make the Goals relevant in a region of middle income countries, and complementing and supporting Country Office efforts through the production of regional instruments.  During the recent crises, the Cluster generated knowledge sharing spaces to provide UNDP COs and government counterparts’ up-to-date information on the global crisis, fostering the debate on the role played by social policy to alleviate its effects. | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** |  |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 3.1Promotion of tools and methodologies to assess the impact of economic vulnerability and the impact of volatility on the well-being of households in countries of the region, including on the pace towards the MDGs. The monitoring on past trends is examined by analyzing information from national MDG Reports through a regional observatory on MDGRs, constantly updated.  Additional studies using general equilibrium models allow for the generation of scenarios that will provide input on policy alternatives at the country level that can promote and accelerate the achievement of the MDGs by 2015. | 2011-2013 | The Poverty Reduction, MDGs and Human Development practice area |  |  |
| 3.2 Produce simulation analyses of the impact of alternative fiscal policy scenarios on the distribution of income and resources in different countries, and establish an instrument and capacity at the national level to update these scenarios to assess the distributional impact of fiscal reform, promote progressivity and equity through fiscal policies, and reduce vulnerability. | 2011-2013 | The Poverty Reduction, MDGs and Human Development practice area |  |  |
| 3.3 Strengthen collaboration and partnership with regional partners and institutions to generate regional knowledge products on MDGs and social policy and to promote their implementation at the national and local levels through debates and advocacy, to improve policies, strengthen institutions and resilience to future crises. | 2011-2013 | The Poverty Reduction, MDGs and Human Development practice, Other thematic practices, KM and CD Teams? |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 4:**  ***It is advisable to have a differentiated approach in terms of sub-regions with their specific needs. In countries of higher human development levels, the program could tap think-tanks and experts networks for policy-dialogue.*** |
| **Management Response:**  The feedback received during the last RSC-LAC Board meeting, points at differentiating approaches to service delivery but based more on COs specific needs than on sub-regional specificities. In this respect, the RCs present in the last RSC-LAC Board meeting, expressed the need to award priority in this region to COs with shrinking substantive and operational capacities and to COs under complex political situation or organizationally weak. In addition, the Agenda for Organization Change, launched by the Administrator in April 2011, proposes differentiating services according to a country typology. In this respect, it was proposed that “UNDP services and programmes be configured to respond to the needs of different country settings – low income and least developed countries, middle income and net contributing countries as well as countries facing protracted and complex crisis”. Conversely, the service differentiation at UNDP is not about serving according to sub-regional differences but catering to a typology of countries. As part of the Agenda for Change, “a differentiated country typology business model will be developed to guide resource allocations and the best configuration of knowledge, policy, programme and corporate service to support effective delivery at the country level”. RBLAC and the RSC-LAC support this recommendation and will comply with it accordingly once it becomes a corporate policy. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 4.1Integrating the country typology business model, once it is defined, in the future Regional Programme Document, in the revision and formulation of regional projects and in the allocation of resources. | Subject to the enactment of the country typology as a corporate policy | RBLAC and RSCLAC directorate in close coordination with the SMT and area coordinators responsible of the regional initiatives |  |  |
| 4.2 RBLAC will contribute a position paper on middle income countries as a reference and input for the discussions of country typology. | Date June 2012 | RBLAC |  |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 5:** ***Support to COs would require an explicit regional strategy, not only responding to demands, clear communication about roles and streamlined information mechanisms.*** | | | | |
| **Management Response:** This recommendation is in line with one of the recommendations of the evaluation of UNDP´s Contribution to Development and Management Results at Regional level. At corporative level UNDP agrees on the need to establish clear corporative criteria for when to use regional programming as an appropriate modality. The key in setting the criteria is based on the value-added of regional programming at each region. Some identified elements include: (a) managing externalities; (b) dealing with economies of scale; (c) promoting regional public goods that cannot be addressed at the national level. In addition, the regional programme should add value to country programmes. In its management response to the above mentioned evaluation, UNDP commits itself to also seek to further clarify the overall concept of the regional programmes, including their role, scope and function, and will review the current programme guidelines as they apply to regional programmes, including the programme modalities, consultation process, regionalist criteria, management arrangements and review processes. In case of LAC, the MtE found a right balance between advisory and programmatic support, and the priority given to the CO support has been the right one. Nonetheless, further attention must be given to the recent advice received at the RCS-LAC Advisory Board, which emphasize the need for greater thematic focus and alignment of the regional initiatives with COs actual needs and with key regional challenges (inclusive growth, equity and sustainability). | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | **Responsible Unit(s)** | **Tracking\*** | |
| **Status** | **Comments** |
| 5.1 Support the definition process of regional programming (set of regionalist criteria) at the corporative level. | 2011 | RBLAC –RSCLAC |  |  |
| 5.2 Apply the regionalist criteria during the programme/ project/ soft assistance appraisal process (through PAC practice) | On-going | RSCLAC Team leaders |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 Revise the portfolio of regional initiatives and improve the methods and instruments of consultation and of communicating its scope to COs. This should include better use of ICT platforms like Teamworks and the Web Page for this purpose | Mid 2013 | KM Team |  |  |
| 5.5 Promote an active partnership strategy with key cooperation agencies, think tanks, regional and sub-regional organizations, academic centers, NGOS and other important partners to improve the quality of regional projects. | Ongoing | RBLAC and RSC-LAC |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 6:**  ***Mainstreaming of cross-cutting areas could go further with particular attention to gender equality and HIV/AIDS. KM’s approach has the potential to be transferred as a practice for institutional development. A clarification of the role of Capacity Development could help achieve a more effective delivery of assistance, particularly stressing its collaborative work with substantive practice areas.*** | | | | | | | | |
| **Management Response:**  Gender equality-and women´s empowerment- as well as UNDP responses to HIV, are corporate responsibilities of UNDP anchored in the regional implementation of the Global Gender Equality Strategy and MDG3, and in the cosponsored programme with UNAIDS. Accordingly, RBLAC efforts in gender mainstreaming emphasize: a) political and technical advice to country´s offices, their counterparts and associates and to other regional areas of the organization, to mainstream gender perspective in their results, development strategies and overall programming; b) implementing innovative strategies to strengthen the achievement of gender equality in the active projects and initiatives, and promoting joint work of current thematic practices with the Gender Practice Area. In the case of HIV, efforts are aimed to support COs to mainstream HIV in their national policies and plans and to prepare multisectoral responses that address the development and public health effects of the pandemic, respect of human rights of the most vulnerable and affected groups, and provide relief to those affected by the virus. Given the scope of both the gender and HIV work, cross practice collaboration and financial support are critical to broaden the results in these areas.  RBLAC acknowledges that knowledge management is crucial for defining and operationalizing conceptual frameworks, facilitating cross-practice work, leveraging UNDP expertise, documenting results and how were they achieved, and shortening the learning curve for more efficient programming. It is also critical in supporting the substantive preparation for South-South cooperation, providing knowledge-based advisory services that position UNDP in the upstream policy discussions, creating common understanding frameworks with UN Agencies, and fostering knowledge-centred partnerships with donors and centres of excellence. This is particularly relevant for MICs in general and for LAC in particular, as a fertile region where practical development approaches and solutions are developed by public institutions, local governments, academia and other sources.  Accordingly, RBLAC through its RP will strengthen the efforts towards the integration of knowledge management approaches in all development interventions via: (i) developing and strengthening core methodologies, (ii) engaging teams in country offices to integrate knowledge management in the provision of services and programs, (iii) building capacity in country offices and project teams on knowledge management methods and activities, (iv) supporting regional practice communities, their activities and knowledge products. RBLAC will also prioritize discussion with relevant practice areas in BDP to make progress towards the development of a corporate approach to knowledge management.    RBLAC acknowledges the need of better clarifying the role of Capacity Development (CD) and its interlinkages with other areas. CD in RBLAC aims to contribute to development by strengthening public institutions so that they may serve the needs of their respective populations effectively and efficiently and are resilient to shocks and crises. It does this by assessing the existent functional capacities: (i) the capacity to engage stakeholders, (ii) the capacity to assess a situation and define a vision, (iii) the capacity to formulate policies and strategies, (iv) the capacity to budget, manage and implement and (v) the capacity to evaluate capacities in four core areas: (i) institutional arrangements, (ii) leadership, (iii) knowledge and (iv) accountability. As public institutions have a large range of functions and offer diverse services, Capacity Development is best carried out in conjunction with other Practice Areas, as they have more expertise in thematic areas and understand the context; they can better visualize what the ideal functioning of an institution would be in their specific sector. In conjunction with other Practice Areas, the CD team identifies key stakeholders and adapts the assessment tool to measure key capacities in individual areas. | | | | | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | | **Time Frame** | | **Responsible Unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | |
| **Status** | | **Comments** |
| 6.1Explicit gender mainstreaming in every project and programme  document  (regional, national, UNDAF, interagency actions) and a key specific intervention in every Practice Area | | Ongoing | | Heads of clusters; regional experts; RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Director | |  | |  |
| 6.2 RPD (2014-2017) includes a thematic area that covers MDG3, and gender equality objectives in every Practice Area | | Mid 2013 | | Heads of clusters; regional experts; RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Director | |  | |  |
| 6.3 Progress in gender marker ratings for project budgets and expenditure for the 2011-13 financial years through: a pilot analysis on the gender marker ratings in LAC; new proposals includes at least one GEN 2 and GEN3 rated output; technical assistance to improve rating at COs | | Ongoing | | Heads of clusters; regional experts; RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Director | |  | |  |
| 6.4 Formulation of every regional report in close consultation with a gender team of experts (starting in 2012) | | Ongoing | | RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Director; RC | |  | |  |
| 6.5 Explicit mainstreaming of HIV issues in the UNDAFs signed with countries in LAC | | Ongoing | | RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Director; RC HIV Cluster | |  | |  |
| 6.6 Reporting system to track the contributions of RBLAC HIV assistance in national plans and to communicate it to the national counterparts, | | Ongoing | | RSC-LAC Directorate, HIV Cluster | |  | |  |
| 6.7 Enforce the communication to COs, and governments of the region about the importance of CD in achieving their development goals | | Ongoing | | CD Cluster; RBLAC Director; RSCLAC Directorate | |  | |  |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 7: *Strengthen mechanisms between RSC in Panama and the Caribbean countries to boost the Caribbean programme and include their practitioners and advisors in LAC networks and themes. To do so, the RP must take into consideration the specificities, challenges and constraints of the Caribbean sub-region. The great diversity and complexity of realities among Caribbean countries represents the main challenge for the RP. The adoption of strategic sub-regional activities in the region is critical in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.*** | | | | | | | | |
| **Management Response:**  As of February of 2011, RBLAC shifted its operations to the Caribbean to New York and to the RSC-LAC in Panama, closing the sub-office in Port of Spain. This decision abides to a request of Caribbean countries of re-establishing the relationship with Caricom from NY to strengthen their presence in HQs. The political aspects of the partnership with Caricom and the Caribbean countries will be managed from NY, while the technical support to development issues will be continued from the Panama Centre, making it a truly LAC Centre. Nonetheless, efforts are needed for the new arrangements to function and to continue catering to the specificities and development challenges of the region. | | | | | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | **Time Frame** | | **Responsible Unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | | |
| 7.1 RBLAC to strengthen its efforts in NY of supporting innate **Caribbean** development platforms. RSC-LAC to strengthen the articulation of Caribbean (SIDS) issues in regional projects/initiatives and in the Work Plans of the RSC-LAC thematic areas; RSC-LAC to prioritize its support towards the HDR of the Caribbean on CS and to CRMI. | On going | | RBLAC and RSCLAC directorate in close coordination with the SMT and area coordinators responsible of the regional initiatives | | **Status** | | **Comments** | |
| * 1. RBLAC to strengthen partnerships with key bilateral cooperation agencies and other institutions that have established links in the Caribbean (Dutch, French, British). | On going | | RBLAC | |  | |  | |
| * 1. RBLAC to ensure that the engagement strategy manage from HQs gives equal consideration to the development and political dialogue with CARICOM. | Mid 2012 | | RBLAC | |  | |  | |
| 7.4 RSC-LAC to take action to better cater to the language and development needs of English Caribbean countries, particularly of the Small Island Development States (SIDS). | On-going | | RSCLAC directorate in close coordination with the SMT and area coordinators responsible of the regional initiatives | |  | |  | |
| **Evaluation Recommendation or Issue 8:**  ***Mainstream the Results Based Management approach in RP operations and improve the M&E system for an effective decision-making and feedback, including baselines and outcome indicators. The move cannot be resolved in the short-time since it implies cultural change.*** | | | | | | | | |
| **Management Response:**  The RBLAC will undertake the integration of the new outcome architecture (the shadow outcomes elaborated during the MtE) to the existing M&E framework and will continue its efforts to establish a result based monitoring and evaluation system for the Regional Program. Additionally, RBLAC and RSC-LAC will enforce the implementation of the revised evaluation plan agreed with the different practices. It should be noted that as established in the evaluation plan, all RP outcomes have been assessed (MtE of the RP). In addition the updated plan includes several project level evaluations, which were not included in the original Evaluation Plan (for further details see: <http://erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/manageplans/viewplandetail.html?planid=951> )  RBLAC will enforce the alignment of the monitoring and evaluation framework and indicators of the regional projects with new shadow outcomes. For this purpose, each regional project should adequately adjust its M&E framework and indicators so that they are aligned with the indicators and targets identified in the Integrated Work Plan as a means to establish a system of monitoring progress towards the achievement of development results. The strengthening of monitoring at the regional project level will represent an important contribution to the increasing efforts to improve the monitoring of the regional programme. | | | | | | | | |
| **Key Action(s)** | | **Time Frame** | | **Responsible Unit(s)** | | **Tracking** | | |
| **Status** | | **Comments** |
| 8.1 Continue the planning and monitoring practice of consolidating in an Integrated Work Plan the activities of all practices, including the Regional Program, with a view of aligning the corporate, the regional and the local level priorities. | | ongoing | | RBLAC and RSCLAC directorate in close coordination with the SMT and area coordinators responsible of the regional initiatives | |  | |  |
| 8.2 Revision and full implementation of the Evaluation Plan (2008 – 2011, ext 2013) of the Regional Programme. Revision should be completed by End 2012 | | End 2013 | | Evaluation Unit | |  | |  |
| 8.3 Enforce alignment of the M&E framework of regional projects to the new shadow outcomes and enforce effective reporting and monitoring practices of regional projects | | End 2011 | | RSC-LAC practice team leaders | |  | |  |
| 8.4 All regional level Evaluations are uploaded onto the Evaluation Resource Center (ERC), along with their Management Responses. The key actions of the Management Responses are being periodically updated. | | Ongoing | | Evaluation Unit | |  | |  |
| 8.5 Outcome oriented monitoring and evaluation plan constructed as part of the formulation of the new RPD. | | Mid 2013 | | Evaluation Unit support the Directorate and the Team Leaders | |  | |  |
| 8.6 Thematic Boards every two years | | 2013 | | Deputy Regional Director RBLAC  Acting Director, RSC-LAC | |  | |  |
| 8.7 The Centre, in coordination with RBLAC, will clearly assign the responsibility for project assurance, i.e., project oversight, reviews, budget revisions, monitoring and lessons learned, and ensure it is exercised in compliance with UNDP’s project management milestones. | | February 2012 | | Acting Director RSC-LAC | |  | |  |

\* The implementation status is tracked in the ERC.