SYNTHESIS REPORT
EVALUATION OF CIDA'S REGIONAL
INTER-AMERICAN PROGRAM
(2004-2005 TO 2009-2010)

Evaluation Directorate

Strategic Policy and Performance Branch

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

July 2011

Acknowledgement

Table of Contents

Appendixes

Tables

Boxes

List of Acronyms

ARPEL	Regional Association of Oil and Natural Gas Companies in Latin America & the Caribbean
AEPIII	ARPEL Environment Project Phase III
AGP	ARPEL Governance Project
AIDS	Auto-Immune Deficiency Syndrome
APPR	Annual Project/Program Performance Report (CIDA)
CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CATRTA	Canada Americas Trade Related Technical Assistance Project
CBOC	Conference Board of Canada
CBSA	Canada Border Services Agency
CCI	Crosscutting Issue
CDPF	Country Development Programming Framework
CEAA	Canadian Environmental Assessment Act
CEJA	Justice Studies Centre for the Americas
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIII	Canadian International Immunization Project
CPHA	Canadian Public Health Association
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Canada)
DFID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
EC	European Commission
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EDRMS	Electronic Document and Records Management System (CIDA)
EEE	Economic Enabling Environment
ENV	Environment
ESAA	Environmental Services Association of Alberta
FOCAL	Canadian Foundation for the Americas
FTAA	Free Trade Area of the Americas
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GE	Gender Equality
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HRH	Human Resources for Health
IACHR	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
IAP	Inter-American Program (CIDA)
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IIHR	Inter-American Institute of Human Rights

IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPSAS	International Public Sector Accounting Standards
KARs	Key Agency Results (CIDA)
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OAS	Organization of American States
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PBA	Program-Based Approach
PAD	Project Approval Document (CIDA)
PAHO	Pan American Health Organization
PCCD	Prevention and Control of Communicable Disease Project
PHAC	Public Health Agency of Canada
PSD	Private Sector Development
RBM	Results Based Management
RDPF	Regional Development Programming Framework (CIDA)
RPE	Regional Program Evaluation
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TB	Tuberculosis
TRTA/CB	Trade-Related Technical Assistance/ Capacity Building
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WHO	World Health Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Executive Summary

This report provides the synthesis findings of the Regional Program Evaluation of CIDA's Inter-American Program (IAP or the Program). The review period extends over six (6) fiscal years, from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010. It is designed to support CIDA's accountability and learning objectives and to satisfy a requirement under the Federal accountability Act that all CIDA programs be evaluated within a five-year period to review program performance. The Program was assessed under eight standard evaluation criteria. Broadly speaking, the first four address achievement of development results – relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, and inclusion of crosscutting themes. The second four address management factors – coherence, efficiency, management principles, and performance management.

Approach and Methodology

Throughout the evaluation, the evaluation team maintained a three-level perspective: project, regional partner, and program. The nature of program evaluations require that the team rely upon project documentation including third-party evaluations, where these were available. Three separate sector studies were carried out which examined a sampling of projects in the health, governance and private sector development components of IAP's program in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).

The sample covered 24 projects across the three main sectors of activity and included one project covering 'multiple sectors' and one coded under the category 'other' sectors. The total value of IAP programming for the period from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010 was $242.5 million. Of this total, a sample of $145.5 million was reviewed representing approximately 66% of the value of projects (with budgets of $250,000 or more) which were active between April 2004 and March 2010.

Evaluation team members spoke in detail with responsible CIDA staff, examined project documentation, held interviews with key informants from the implementing partners and/or executing agencies and conducted a small number of site visits. A five-point scale (ranging from highly satisfactory to very unsatisfactory) was then applied to assess the projects in the sample and the Program on the basis of the eight

standard evaluation criteria. Sector findings were discussed in a workshop setting with IAP team members prior to the composition of this report.

Strategic Partners

Particular attention was given to two strategic partners in the IAP network – the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO). Both organizations were approved for grant funding mid-way through the evaluation period. This evaluation coincides with the renewal of both grant cycles. Accordingly, the evaluators were asked to include organizational assessments of each partner.

The organizational assessments of PAHO and OAS indicate that the first periods of grant funding have met the expectations that were set out for them. They confirm the strategic alignment of these two organizations to CIDA priorities. Both have carried out highly relevant activities under their grant agreements though, for reasons outlined under 'effectiveness' below, PAHO has been able to demonstrate its outcome level results more readily than has OAS. Both show that institutional strengthening support has yielded tangible improvements in such areas as human resource management, financial control and gender equality but could be improved regarding results-based management (RBM).

In both, the assessments point to the long-term nature of the various institutional transformations that have been started with the assistance of IAP. The assessments each conclude that there are no pressing reasons not to proceed to a second grant approvals process, provided that due diligence procedures are followed and care is taken to specify the terms of the agreement especially on expectations related to accountability. In both instances, these were not spelled out adequately in the first iteration.

Program Results – Findings

Overall, the evaluation assesses IAP's performance across the eight criteria to be "**satisfactory**" and the performance trends to be positive[1]. The evaluation finds IAP in the middle

---

[1] The evaluators used a project and program level assessment methodology that has become standard within CIDA over the past five years. Assessment is based on a 5 point scale where 4.1—5 is Highly Satisfactory, 3.1—4 is Satisfactory, 2.1—3 is Moderately Satisfactory, 1.1—2 is Unsatisfactory, and 0—1 Very Unsatisfactory. The ratings combine the program level assessments of the three sector studies prepared for this evaluation.

of a transition from being strategically unfocused and poorly understood five years ago to having its own strategic orientation and a value proposition that is well understood within CIDA, other Canadian constituencies and among regional organizations and donors in LAC.

IAP is not there yet, but there are some important ingredients already in the mix including: a) tested relationships with a host of regional partners including a handful of multilateral, hemispheric organizations each with substantial reach and influence in the region; b) a body of programming experience principally in health, governance and private sector development; c) a newly minted regional program strategy and framework, the first formal defining document for the Program; and d) a renewed program team with unified focus and strong leadership.

More specifically, the evaluators rate the key criteria as follows:

RELEVANCE – "highly satisfactory" – for IAP's programming when individually assessed in relation to Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Canada's priorities in the Americas and CIDA's priorities. All projects examined show a line of sight to key high level priorities or targets agreed to by the countries at the Summits of the Americas.

Broadly speaking, the three sectors that have emerged most strongly in the IAP portfolio – health, governance and private sector development – resonate well with what development analysts say are major challenges for the region in the coming years. That said, when looked at as a collection, the evaluators caution that the nature of the program mix and the lack of a strategic program focus over the evaluation period may have limited the Program's capacity to concentrate its efforts on the region's most pressing development needs.

With the launch of Canada's Americas Strategy in 2007 and more especially the advent of CIDA's thematic priorities and launch of IAP's Regional Development Programming Framework in 2009, the parameters have now narrowed to the point where the Americas Directorate and the IAP team have a point of reference for making strategic programming choices.

EFFECTIVENESS – "satisfactory" – In the health and private sector studies prepared for this evaluation, there is evidence of concrete outcome level results emanating from projects. National ministries and agencies along with industry groups are using skills, tools, connections, etc., to leverage additional resources, develop strategies, and institute new policies and management practices or to deliver improved or expanded public services. Alternatively, science based innovations for the public good are gaining recognition and being adapted, up-scaled and rolled out across multiple countries. The added value that regional programming approaches bring to development are manifest in: pooled knowledge and cross learning, resource sharing, joint advocacy and peer pressure.

In the governance sector, there is less evidence of the 'ripple' effects of regional activities reaching their targets in country, though here the specialist agencies (CEJA, IACHR/IIHR) have been more successful. At least three factors come to the fore: a) the subject matter itself – less tangible and often more politicized than is found in the other two sectors; b) the sovereignty challenge – the difficulty exerting influence on in-country policies and programs from a regional program vantage point – especially if there are competing or divergent stakeholder groups involved; and c) the quality and extent of results reporting.

The health and private sector studies offer insight about the power of good orchestration among complementary projects/activities to enhance effectiveness. The scope for improving this both within the IAP portfolio and within larger circles that include other parts of CIDA, other donors and regional organizations is great. Overall, partner institutions could improve their reporting on results.

SUSTAINABILITY – "satisfactory" – The statutory nature of two IAP strategic partners is key. Canada joins its hemispheric neighbours as members of PAHO and OAS. Beyond this factor, all sector studies point to partners maintaining substantial engagement with in-country national governments and/or civil society groups, and the private sector study comments on the management calibre and track record of the implementing organizations themselves. The evaluators found situations where IAP funded activities have continued after project funding has ended.

GENDER EQUALITY & ENVIRONMENT – "moderately satisfactory" – The Program has been less than stellar in bringing crosscutting issues (CCIs) to the

fore, though in all cases gender equality is assessed higher than the environment. The championship for both has come from CIDA.

In both cases, specialist staff provide design inputs as per policy. After this point, the onus rests on the program manager in CIDA and the partner to follow through in implementation and reporting. Results are mixed. The most promising gender equality results emerge from PAHO's own gender strengthening component and from an oil and gas industry group that appears to be experiencing a transformation in the way it integrates gender concepts into its management and industry programs.

In environment, a project that "does not raise issues that would trigger an environmental assessment" often implies letting go of the theme altogether – the idea that there may be scope to integrate environmental enhancements into the design of development initiatives has not been taken up in projects reviewed.

At a Program level, a gender strategy was developed to inform the creation of IAP's new Regional Development Programming Framework (RDPF) 2010-2015. As well, CIDA's new Gender Equality Action Plan (2010–2013) was recently published. The new RDPF integrates gender equality indicators into the performance measurement framework. These three developments bode well for re-invigorating the inclusion of gender equality in the Program.

On the environment side, an environmental assessment was carried out ahead of the new RDPF and discussions were held to integrate environmental considerations more fully in IAP's performance measurement framework, but this remains a work in progress.

Program Management Factors – Findings

COHERENCE – "moderately satisfactory" – Inside CIDA, IAP's Program is not well known; connections tend to be *ad-hoc*. Its use of whole-of-Government approaches has been functional but underwhelming to date. A constraining reality is that IAP tends to be the major funder but not the designated lead *vis-à-vis* the strategic partner. Coordinating around the formulation of positions at the partner table has been challenging, generally.

In health and governance, there also appear to be missed opportunities to extend engagement on

the Canada side beyond government to other interested parties (NGOs, private sector). Arguably, quality insight and much needed profile could be gained through broadening the tent, though in doing so, IAP would have to keep the process from becoming unwieldy. In the region, the arguments for being open to sub-regional programming are compelling. Indeed IAP's strategic partners already organize in this way. The principle of 'subsidiarity' should govern IAP's strategic thinking on this point.

The evaluators found no planned interaction between projects or partners across sectoral lines, though some instances were noted where this has emerged naturally. Intuitively, cross-hatching seems like a natural progression but there needs to be a way of engaging partners in such a way that possibilities come into view.

Regarding IAP's engagement with other donors, the Program has taken a lead role with PAHO and OAS in shifting to a program modality and from contribution agreement to a grant, but has yet to engage other donors in a dialogue about its actions. The evaluators learned that this was starting to happen, however.

EFFICIENCY – The evaluators assessed at a "satisfactory" level the efficiency in the health sector but were "unable to score" the governance and private sector areas given the difficulty and complexity of assessing 'institutional performance' as a whole within the limits of the current undertaking.

The health sector specialist assessed efficiency as "satisfactory" based on a cursory analysis – working with only one partner, the health sector specialist was able to gain more of a picture of how the organization functions. In PAHO sound management functions were observed along with the use of a funding gap analysis mechanism that allows PAHO to move funds to areas of programming need. The health sector study showed a marked increase in disbursement rate than occurred under earlier contribution agreements.

All three sector studies (health, governance, and private sector development components) showed IAP leveraging additional funds.

At a Program level, it appears that the IAP's single Washington D.C. based position is less than what is needed to maintain a liaison function with strategic partners and to perform intelligence

gathering and networking tasks. The DFID synthesis evaluation of regional programs stresses the importance of having an adequate staff presence along with the right combination of 'development diplomacy' skills – specifically analytic, negotiation and relationship management competencies.

MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES – "satisfactory" – As noted above, Canada is championing aid effectiveness principles in the way it is engaging with its key strategic partners. Its willingness to provide some partners with funding support under the more flexible grant mechanism and to invest in institutional strengthening activities has earned Canada a good reputation.

Going beyond the strategic partners (OAS and PAHO), several of the other partners in the governance and private sectors were observed to be ensuring local/member ownership in project initiatives.

The somewhat guarded way in which CIDA has developed its RDPF (2010-2015) in terms of dealing with stakeholders is of concern to the evaluators. Engagement with regional partners/governments is viewed by the World Bank as a determinant of success for regional programming. To be guarded is to be contrary to the Paris Principles of Aid Effectiveness.

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT – "moderately satisfactory" – Despite attempts to put in place a formal strategic management framework for IAP, it did not occur until late 2009. Now, for the first time, the story of IAP's performance and results can be organized around a common and reasonably specific interpretive framework. There are mixed signals over whether the RDPF can be adjusted over the five-year cycle. The evaluators suggest that the logic model and performance measurement framework inform and be refined through dialogue with key strategic partners.

Across the sample of projects reviewed, IAP gets a mixed assessment on the way RBM has been used to plan, manage and report on projects. Two of the five projects examined in the health sector study showed substantial application of RBM. In the governance sector, three out of five partners could be said to be using RBM competently in project design and reporting. In private sector development, partners in four of the seven projects demonstrated a strong understanding of RBM principles and provided quality reporting.

On evaluation, the evaluators lament the paucity of project evaluations undertaken during the evaluation period – four were encountered across the sample of 24 projects. They also note a gap in and opportunity for more knowledge capture that would fall outside of standard results-based reporting or evaluation.

Recommendations to the Program

The recommendations summarized below are offered as a) recommendations for IAP, and b) corporate considerations – suggestions to CIDA regarding the enabling environment for regional programming.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IAP

Recommendation #1 – IAP should intensify its information and coordination role with other CIDA and Canadian programs in the region in support of Canada's development cooperation efforts in LAC, by strengthening its analysis, networking and communication capability.

The key intent of this enhanced function would be to provide CIDA (at Headquarters and in the Field) and other government departments with up-to-date insight on emergent issues and opportunities, and on the status of key regional partners. It would also serve to sharpen IAP's value-added within CIDA and to the Canadian development community.

Recommendation #2 – IAP should strengthen the integration of gender equality and environment by developing its own action plans that each set out specifically how the Program will keep these cross cutting issues on the agenda with strategic partners and throughout the program/project cycle.

Action plans should be written with reference to relevant CIDA and IAP partner strategies. They should elaborate upon IAP's approach to handling these crosscutting issues (CCIs), taking into consideration aspects such as: staff accountability for results, training, partner performance monitoring and reporting expectations, and collegial bridging between CCI units/offices of strategic partners and of CIDA.

Recommendation #3 – IAP should invest in regional and sub-regional programming through new ideas, new players and new funding mechanisms (such as joint funding, public-private partnerships).

IAP should continue to equip itself with the methods, protocols and staffing configuration to be a nimble hemispheric funder. It should be ready to work with and independent from its current stable of trusted strategic partners such that it can rapidly identify and provide support for relevant programming and organizations regionally or sub-regionally. While cognizant of attendant risks, IAP should be ready to test out different funding mechanisms to the extent that they: a) build regional capacity to support development efforts, b) concentrate/coordinate donor resources, c) fit with partners' evolving strategies, and d) provide for appropriate levels of accountability.

Recommendation #4 – IAP should invest in performance management including the new Program-level performance measurement framework, developing an evaluation plan, and continuing to provide results-based management (RBM) support to partner organizations.

Among strategic partners, IAP should continue to provide RBM support, as needs are determined. This is top priority – the results story of IAP absolutely depends on this. Support could come in the form of continued training/mentoring, technical support for systems development, creation of best practice case examples, creation of planning, risk management and reporting templates.

At the Program level, IAP should use this first year of the new logic model and performance measurement framework to test and adjust Program level indicators, reporting tools and templates, as well as the methods required to roll up partner/project level reporting and convert this information into useful Program level performance information.

IAP should complement its new performance measurement system with a Program/project evaluation strategy in which, each year, IAP identifies those parts of its portfolio that should be subject to evaluation.

Recommendation #5 – IAP should continue to engage partner organizations regarding performance management (reporting on results, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) and take great care to spell out expectations and mitigate partner weaknesses in this and other areas, during up-front negotiations of funding agreements especially with grant recipients.

Where grant agreements appear to be the most appropriate funding mechanism through which to support the partner, IAP should continue to follow the due diligence assessment process set out in the Managers Guide to CIDA Grants, ensuring that there is an adequate basis for determining CIDA's risk exposure and proper performance management systems in place.

Further, in negotiating grant agreements, IAP should ensure that institutional strengthening aspects identified in the assessment – e.g. financial and results accountability, competencies related to gender equality and other crosscutting issues – are addressed in the agreement with strengthening activities and planned results.

Corporate Considerations

In the course of the evaluation, three issues of a corporate nature that would have a bearing on the effectiveness of the Program surfaced. These are identified below as corporate considerations instead of recommendations, in recognition that the Agency is aware of them and measures have already been taken, or are in progress, to alleviate the constraints posed.

Consideration #1 – It is important for IAP to enlarge the circle of actors involved in Program-level discussions in a transparent way to include strategic partners, key whole-of-government agencies, CIDA country programs, and a select group of other interested parties in Canada and LAC based on their potential to contribute to the regional cooperation effort.

Consideration #2 – It is important for IAP to have the flexibility to adjust its Program Strategy or RDPF, as may be required, in the context of major events arising in the region, and schedule the next programming cycle to benefit from Program evaluation feedback.

Consideration #3 – In pursuing high-level change management agendas focused on improving effectiveness and efficiency, it is important that CIDA place priority on minimizing disruption to partnerships and operations. This would include formulating and implementing strategies aimed at curbing project officer turnover, and allowing enough time and flexibility for IAP to make programming adjustments based on sound knowledge.

The advent of the new RDPF in 2009 provides much needed definition and desired Program level results to strive toward. For regional program partners, among other key parties, to share more fully in the perspective that it offers, IAP needs a relation with its regional program constituency of partners, its whole-of-Canada/Government constituency of interested groups and its CIDA colleagues that is transparent and perceived as such. It needs to allow these groups to be part of the larger program perspective from design through to implementation.

This does not appear to have been possible given CIDA protocols surrounding the formulation of these documents at the time IAP's new Program Strategy and RDPF were being developed. However, after the Government of Canada announced its Aid Effectiveness Agenda in 2009, the requirement for consultations with stakeholders when planning country/regional program strategies resumed throughout the Agency. In addition, to meet the commitments of its management response to the Auditor General's 2009 recommendations, the Agency is now posting summaries of country/regional strategies on its website.

The latitude to more fully engage stakeholders in Program development and share information with them would go a long way toward providing the IAP the enabling environment it needs to address the region's development challenges.

1.0   Evaluation Approach and Methodology

This synthesis report captures the key findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation of CIDA's Inter-American Program (IAP) from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010. It is largely built upon the findings of the sector studies in health, governance and private sector development – three key programming areas under the IAP – carried out as part of the evaluation. This section introduces the subject of the evaluation and summarizes the approach and methodology taken between July and December 2010.

1.1   Regional Program Evaluation – Objectives, Approach and Programming Context

This evaluation is designed to support CIDA's accountability and learning objectives, and satisfy a requirement under the Federal Accountability Act for the Agency to evaluate all programs within a five-year period. On July 5, 2010, CIDA's Evaluation Directorate launched the Regional Program Evaluation (RPE) of the Inter-American Program of CIDA's Americas Directorate. The evaluation covers a period of six (6) fiscal years from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010.

As set out in the Terms of Reference, an abridged version of which appears in Appendix A, the RPE of the Inter-American Program pursues the following objectives:

- To take stock of the results achieved by the IAP over the most recent programming period[2].

- To assess the IAP's overall performance in achieving these results (based on criteria of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence, efficiency, management principles, crosscutting issues, and performance management).

- To examine key issues pertaining to the IAP as a hemispheric program in the Americas, and assess, based on past experience, the relevance of implementing a regional approach in the Americas and its value compared to the classic bilateral approach.

- To assess the performance of the IAP's delivery models (core funding, directive programming, and responsive programming) including the types of contractual arrangements such as grants and contributions.

- To document and disseminate findings, success stories and lessons learned, and formulate recommendations to improve the performance of IAP's recently approved Program Strategy.

In the scheme of Latin America and the Caribbean's development challenges and of the tremendous flow of financial and technical support in place to address these challenges, a regional cooperation program such as the IAP represents a modest contribution.

The IAP is one of CIDA's middle-income regional programs according to the Agency's Program Activity Architecture (PAA 2009). The Americas is a region of great contrasts, from tiny/impoverished Haiti to geographic/economic giant Brazil. With only a few exceptions, the hemisphere is comprised of middle-income countries that show high levels of disparity in income both among and within countries. The region has experienced a dramatic transition to democracy and open markets in the past two decades, leading to increased political and economic stability.

The origins of the IAP can be traced to summitry in the Americas and to the turn of this Century. The Program was founded to address commitments made at the Summits of the Americas in Québec City in 2001, and in Mar del Plata, Argentina in 2005. Over the evaluation period, the IAP has supported initiatives to achieve better governance, improve health, promote private sector development, and to strengthen the institutions of key partners, such as the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), the Organization of American States (OAS) and its affiliated organizations, and members of the hemisphere's civil society.

Unlike traditional bilateral programs, which are characterized by ties between Canada and other countries, the IAP supports activities on a hemispheric scale that span several countries, and often several sub-regions of South America, Central America, and the Caribbean.

---

[2] The June 2005 Prospective Study of the Inter-American Program establishes the basis and the take off point for the current evaluation. This Study, commissioned by CIDA, included a retrospective review of the IAP since the Quebec City Summit of the Americas in 2001.

1.2   Evaluation Methodology

The methodology followed closely that set out in the Terms of Reference, an abridged version of which is provided in Appendix A. Key techniques were document reviews, interviews with key informants in partner organizations, site visits to selected countries in the Hemisphere, consultation with CIDA officials (IAP and Evaluation Directorate) and discussions within the independent external evaluation team. In mid-November 2010, the evaluation team submitted draft sector reports to the Evaluation Directorate and subsequently held a full day discussion with upwards of 20 CIDA staff attached to the Inter-American Program and the Evaluation Directorate. CIDA provided feedback to the evaluation specialists for incorporation into the final versions of the sector reports.

The Evaluation Directorate maintained a participatory approach with the IAP at all stages of the process. The evaluation was conducted with the IAP's full cooperation – the Program's complete team of managers, development officers, technical advisors, field representative and administrative staff was mobilized to support the exercise. The Evaluation Directorate and Plan:Net evaluation team worked together to ensure the review process would unfold within a very tight eight-month timeline so that the evaluation findings would feed into the IAP's process of renegotiating major agreements with their strategic partner organizations, and at the IAP's request, the sector studies were presented as three separate stand-alone documents. Plan:Net was demonstrably flexible in adapting field work itineraries to address coverage and complementarity matters of importance to IAP, as well as communications and planning issues by one of the partners.

Throughout, the evaluation team has maintained a three-tiered perspective while addressing the key evaluation criteria noted in point 2 of the evaluation objectives, above:

- Programmatic – an examination of delivery mechanisms/strategies – specifically the advantages and disadvantages of the grants and contributions mechanisms and application of a whole-of-government approach – as well as an examination of IAP results against expectations

- Institutional – an examination of the relevance of partner (principally OAS and PAHO) mandates to the IAP strategy, their performance in managing IAP funded activities, and the sustainability of the results flowing from these activities

- Project – design, delivery and results of IAP-funded initiatives

The terms of reference stipulated that:

- the sample size be approximately 25 projects representing about half of the IAP's total budget (of projects in the sampling pool)

- the project sample within each of the three sectors amount to at least 40% of the sectoral value within the sampling pool

- the sample include bilateral directive and responsive projects as well as program-based approaches (PBAs).

Table 1-1: Summary Table of IAP Projects Selected for the Evaluation Sample					
	Governance	**Health**	**Private Sector**	**Multi-sector or Other Sectors**	**Total**
Number of projects sampled	9 out of 22*	6 out of 6**	7 (plus 1 for special consideration****) out of 13	2 out of 15	24 (plus 1 for special consideration****) out of 56
Total value of projects in sector portfolio	~$69 million	~$42 million	~$75.5 million	~$56 million	~$242.5 million
Value of sampled projects (as % of sector or % of total)	~$39 million (56%)	~$42 million (100%)	~$42 million (55%)	~$22.5 million (40%)	~$145.5 million (66%)
Mix of modalities	1 Program 8 Projects 1 Grant+8 Contrib All Responsive	1 Program 5 Projects 6 Grants*** All Responsive	1 Institutional Support/Core Funding 1 Program 6 Projects 2 Grants+5 Contrib+1 Contract 7 Responsive+1 Directive.	1 Program 1 Project 2 Contrib 1 Resp.+1 Dir.	1 Inst. Support/Core Funding 4 Programs 20 Projects 9 Grants+15 Contrib+1 Contract 23 Responsive+2 Directive

Note: *In two cases (OAS Electoral Assistance and Focal Projects) were evaluated as one due to their similar nature.
   **In the health sector portfolio, the project Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases (PCCD) (A030833) is listed twice because it has two components: 003 for the grant portion and 001 for the contribution portion (the components were rated as one project).
   ***Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases (PCCD) (A030833) is listed as a 'grant' modality since its grant portion was larger than its contribution portion.
   ****The CATRTA project (A034331) was included in the sample for special consideration; but it was examined only in a cursory manner (not rated) due to its newness.

As shown in Table 1-1, the final sample contained 24 projects representing 64% of the value of the 56 projects (with budgets of over $250,000) listed in the sampling pool. One additional project was added to the sample for special consideration. This was the Canada-America's Trade Related Technical Assistance Project (CATRTA – A034331). However, it was not formally assessed due to its newness. The intent was to draw observations from the formation of a project under the new Regional Development Program Framework. Across the three main sectors, the sample also represented more than 40% of the value of the projects within those portfolios.

To ensure comparability, the evaluators applied the same evaluation questions, criteria, rating scale, and assessment grid to all projects in the sample. Each was given a quantitative rating (based on a 5-point rating scale, ranging from highly satisfactory to very unsatisfactory – see footnote 1) and a qualitative assessment. At the Program level, the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, crosscutting themes, coherence, efficiency, management principles, and performance management) were the same as for the projects, but with different indicators better suited to gauge the performance of a program. Program-Level Assessment Scores are included in Appendix B, the list and profile of the sample of projects that were reviewed are presented in Appendix C, and a tabulation of Project-Level Assessment Scores is provided in Appendix D.

A considerable amount of documentation was reviewed by the evaluation team. The evaluators have created a list of selected documents that were reviewed and utilized in the evaluation. Key documents are listed in Appendix H. Several of these have general relevance to the IAP, others relate to specific sectors represented in the IAP portfolio (the complete lists of project and sector specific documents are provided in the Sector Reports for the Health, Governance, and Private Sector Development Components).

About 250 individuals were interviewed during the evaluation. The list of contacts is presented in Appendix I. Most of the interviews were conducted in Canada (Ottawa and Gatineau), in Washington D.C., and within the countries chosen for site visits. These are set out in Table 1-2. Most of the data gathering interviews took place between September 15 and October 15, 2010, and the great majority of these were conducted in face-to-face meetings.

Table 1-2: Countries in which the Evaluation Team Undertook Site Visits		
Governance	Health	Private Sector Development
Colombia	Colombia	Colombia
Bolivia	Bolivia	St-Lucia
Chile	Barbados	Barbados

1.3   Evaluation Challenges and Limitations

CIDA provided the evaluation team with some project documentation for each of the sampled projects. In the case of six of the 24 projects the information was well rounded – i.e. with design documents, a series of reports (Annual Program/Project Performance Reports up to 2008-2009 and project narratives), and some third party monitoring or evaluation assessment. For the rest of the sampled projects, the initial round-up of information yielded sets that could not be considered complete – this despite the best efforts of IAP and Evaluation Directorate staff. Data capture through CIDA's Electronic Document and Records Management System (EDRMS) was time consuming and the evaluators learned of instances where key documents referenced in the system were not actually archived. As it turns out, the evaluators were able to fill information gaps through documents provided by IAP partners/executing agencies. The absence of CIDA Annual Program/Project Performance Reports for 2009-2010 as a result of the Agency's transition in reporting methodologies reduced the amount of up-to-date information on current projects.

Particular mention should be made of the general lack of project evaluations upon which to draw for this exercise. Completed project evaluations were only available for four (4) of the 24 projects in the sample. Not having access to project level evaluation data made it necessary for the evaluators to take insights from regular project reporting which is clearly a second best to having independent assessments to draw upon.

There was no formally approved performance framework at the Program-level against which to assess sector results – this meant that the evaluator assessments deferred upwards (to the objectives of the Americas Directorate) or downwards to individual partner or project level results.

2.0   CIDA's Inter-American Program

2.1   Regional Context

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL TRENDS

The Prospective Study of the Inter-American Program (2005) commissioned by CIDA observed that Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) had enjoyed a period of economic growth and democratic development but that quality-of-life improvements were limited to only a small segment of the 534 million inhabitants. It highlighted that nearly half of the population continued to live in poverty. Further, it noted that the poverty gap was widening, that frustration and civil unrest were growing in the region and that these conditions were fuelling a loss in public confidence in democratic institutions and systems of governance, thus eroding progress towards democratization.

Five years later, LAC observers interviewed for this evaluation describe the region today in much the same way. UNDP's Human Development Report 2010 shows with an array of human development indicators that LAC is hampered by income distribution that is still the most acutely skewed in the world despite considerable economic, social and political gains[3].

At least until the global economic crisis of late 2008, most LAC economies continued to grow, in some cases impressively. At the same time, the distancing trend away from past dictatorships continues, albeit challenged through political conflict, persistent bureaucratic ineffectiveness, and illegitimate behaviour among some in powerful political roles. As The Economist magazine noted in its September 2010 feature on Latin America, "Democracy may have replaced the dictators of old – everywhere except Castro's' Cuba – but other Latin American vices such as corruption and injustice seem as entrenched as ever" (p.13). Observers also point to a deepening in civil unrest suggesting that it has intensified and become more organized especially in areas experiencing drug-related violence.

> **Box 1: Key Development Achievements and Cautionary Signs for LAC Over Four Decades (1970 to 2010) – UNDP Human Development Report 2011**
>
> **On the bright side…**
>
> Life expectancy increased from 60 to 74 years
>
> School enrolment rose from 52% to 83%
>
> Literacy jumped from 65% to 92%
>
> Per capita income of $11,092 (purchasing power in 2008 US$) represented an increase of 88% since 1970
>
> Military regimes and ruling-party monopolies were replaced by democratically elected governments and greater civic empowerment in almost every country
>
> **Cautionary signals…**
>
> The 2011 report shows that inequality in health, education and income reduces the region's Human Development Index (HDI) performance by 25%. Haiti, Bolivia, Guatemala, Peru and Panama experienced the greatest losses because of substantial inequalities in health, education and income
>
> Nine of 15 countries with the largest HDI losses from income inequality are from LAC countries
>
> Gender discrimination is well above the world average, mainly due to high rates of childbirth among adolescents and low participation by women in the paid labour force

An economic snapshot provided in an extensive 2010 Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC) survey of the LAC Region's Progress against the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) reveals that in the period 2003-2008 most countries experienced the following…

- Economic growth – measured by regional Gross Domestic Product (GDP) – grew by an average annual rate of 4.9% (as compared to 2.6% between 1990 and 2002).

- Unemployment declined from 11% to 8% (over 2002-2007) and GDP per capita grew by 3.5% annually.

- Trade liberalization, foreign investment and favourable pricing for top exports are noted as the key drivers behind this growth.

- Social spending increased by an average annual rate of 6.1%, a trend stemming from improved policy commitment – taxation, social security – and a greater fiscal latitude to spend.

- Poverty reduction has been helped by increased remittances (in some countries).

- Growth trends were dampened by the economic crisis of 2009-2010 (GDP growth expected to be negative). Specifics: unemployment up, greater reliance on informal work, reduced coverage by social security systems, reduced latitude to implement social policy.

---

[3] The Human Development Index (HDI) is a new element in UNDP's Human Development Report. It is a composite measure of health, education and income. This enables assessment of progress using a concept of development that is broader than that allowed by income alone. The latest edition of the HDR can be downloaded from http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2010/.

- Observers are quick to point out that aggregate trends mask major variances within the region. There are significant socio-economic variances within (core – periphery) and between countries (middle – less developed). Haiti, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Bolivia, El Salvador and Paraguay experience "general loss of economic dynamism."

- Income distribution improved in 10 of 20 countries (tending toward the middle income countries), and remained static in the rest. Latin America remains the most unequal region in the world: wealthiest 10% receive between 40% and 47% of total income; poorest 20% receive between 2% and 4%. This inequality manifests most forcefully in: income distribution, land ownership, access to credit, and in health and education status.

- Improved social security coverage for formal sector "contributors" has exacerbated differences between higher and lower income "non-contributing" population segments.

- Experience suggests recovery will be accompanied by a lag between improvements in economic and social indicators.

According to the OECD's Latin America Economic Outlook for 2011, the 2008-2009 global crisis significantly affected Latin American economies, in large part to due to LAC countries' deepening integration into international markets for both trade and finance. Recovery prospects are bright, however.

- The OECD points to China's sustained demand for the commodity exports of the region and to the timely monetary action of the international community, including IMF liquidity provisions as mitigating factors. Positive internal factors also played a role in LAC's post-crisis recovery. The presence of reformed, stronger financial institutions, greater macro policy resilience, stabilized aggregate balance sheets and, for some countries, the ability to adopt counter-cyclical fiscal policies are given as contributing factors.

- World Bank monitoring of LAC's post-economic crisis recovery notes positive trends in the level of remittances flowing to the region after a 12% decline in 2009. In 2010, according to the World Bank, remittances are expected to grow by 2% and by a further 7.6 % in 2011.

In the Caribbean Region, the key economic issues are somewhat different and the cultural overlay is more complex, compared to Latin America.

- On the economic side, external indebtedness, relative to GDP, is greater in the Caribbean.

- Acknowledging the weakness of their economies and global trends towards integration, many Caribbean nations have expressed a commitment to proceed with economic integration through the Caribbean Community and, within the last decade, through the CARICOM Single Market and Economy (CSME).

- In spite of strong national interests and other obstacles, steady progress is being made at harmonizing policies and regulations of member states, especially with respect to free movement of skills, services and travel, social security, and taxation.

POLITICAL/PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION TRENDS

A political/public administration snapshot of the region points to the following:

- A continuing trend toward democratization. Nearly all Latin American elections are now "free and fair" with two key challenges: (i) Sharpening differences in political and economic orientations challenge regional integration (tendency toward bilateralism), and (ii) Tendency toward autocracy in some countries – strong charismatic leaders with disregard for the judiciary and other democratic institutions.

- Continuing frustration with the various institutions of government – In an Inter-American Development Bank survey conducted in 2006, six challenges to democracy in Latin America were identified (in order of priority): "Little real enforcement of rules and accountability for politicians", "Weak democratic culture", "Crisis of representation", "Political intimidation and violence", "Traditional parties losing traditional constituencies", and "No real separation of powers."

- Mixed success with the implementation of decentralization strategies that have accompanied the process of democratization started in the 80s and 90s.[4]

---

[4] There is evidence of innovation in democratic participation at the sub-national levels yielding policy responses in some settings, but tendencies also to recreate localized and sometimes undemocratic power structures (Tulchin and Selee, 24-26)

- While democracy has largely been achieved using free and fair elections as a key indicator, there remain structural issues that must be further addressed if the gains made are to be sustained. Chief amongst them is the continued need to develop the underlying pillars of successful democracy, that is to say, institutions of the state that are the foundations of effective democratic governance.

The lack of good governance is well recognized by the LAC populace. A study commissioned by the Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL) – through the CIDA-funded *Knowledge for Development* Project[5] – canvassed ordinary citizens in 26 countries throughout the hemisphere asking them to identify and prioritize the most critical issues affecting their daily lives. Respondents identified issues relating to the economy as the most pressing concern, followed closely by threats to their individual security from violence and crime. Corruption amongst public officials was ranked third.

From the literature and from key informants alike, the message is that while there have been many gains in democratic governance over the past decade, the main challenge the LAC region faces now is consolidating these gains and expanding successes and best practices at the regional level as well as within regions of individual states. Projects and initiatives aimed at developing and strengthening the capacity of those institutions that are pillars of effective democratic governance – state bodies that provide services and access to human rights and rule of law for their populations, for example – are of paramount importance.

2.2   Development Assistance to the Region

OFFICIAL AID AS PART OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM OF DEVELOPMENT FINANCE

In addition to CIDA, there are more than 100 bilateral cooperation agencies from 23 donor countries operating in the region. Official aid – that provided by the bilateral and regional cooperation agencies – continues to decline in importance relative to private financing. Between 1950 and 1972, official flows accounted for between 60% and 70% of financial flows. Today private flows account for over 90% of the total amount. Grants and technical cooperation (non-reimbursable aid) to the region has remained between US$6 billion and US$8 billion (constant 2007 dollars).

CANADA'S POSITION AMONG OTHER DONORS

Since 2006, Canada has been the fourth biggest donor to the LAC region with an 8% share of the total Official Development Assistance (ODA) contribution by DAC countries. It sits behind Germany (10%), Spain (23%) and the US (31%). Between 2006 and 2008, Canada's annual ODA contribution averaged approximately US$440 million, according to OECD figures[6].

Table 2-1 illustrates Canada's ODA to LAC compared to its global commitment from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009. Canada's ODA shows a pattern of modest growth over the four-year period. Increasing support to programs in Haiti is given as the main contributing factor (OAS "Effectiveness of Hemispheric Cooperation" p.11).

Table 2-1: Share of Canada's ODA to LAC between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 Compared to Canada's Total ODA (Cdn$ millions)			
Fiscal Year	Canada's ODA to LAC	Canada's ODA Globally	Canada's ODA to LAC as a Share of the Total
2005-2006	404.85	4,635.00	8.7%
2006-2007	453.71	4,581.22	9.9%
2007-2008	451.23	4,539.77	9.9%
2008-2009	537.53	5,429.19	9.9%
Source: CIDA Statistical Reports on International Assistance for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 (Not adjusted for Inflation)			

Between 2005-2009, CIDA's ODA share for LAC hovers at about 10% of total ODA. More globally, key trends in international donor cooperation are: an increased attention toward the poor, growing critique of aid effectiveness, sustained focus on progress against the MDGs, a push by Latin American countries for the international community to consider development cooperation efforts more in the context of middle income programming contexts. There is also increasing impetus to respond to global phenomena including: climate change, terrorism, economic recessions, etc.

Major international actors such as the World Bank and DFID have recently reviewed their regional programs; they found clear value added and identified five contributing factors to successful regional programming:

---

[5] The Evaluator was able to obtain an advance draft copy of this study (September 2010), *What Troubles Citizens of the Americas,* however, it has not as yet been officially released. Official release is anticipated for January 2011.

[6] See Development Aid at a Glance, Statistics by Region – 3. America (2010 edition) at www.oecd.org (as of December17, 2010)

1) Strong country commitment to regional cooperation

2) Programming scope matched to national and regional capacities

3) Clear delineation and coordination of roles of national and regional institutions

4) Accountable governance arrangements

5) Planning for sustainability of outcomes and activities at the national and regional level.

Appendix F provides additional commentary on the regional program evaluations of the World Bank, DFID and European Commission regarding the determinants of successful regional programming.

2.3   CIDA in Latin America and the Caribbean

CIDA programming in LAC is set against a backdrop of an ever more complex international system of development finance in the region and the global call to rationalize and leverage the proportionally modest flow of official aid for greater impact. There is an imperative – certainly acknowledged in the IAP's most recent program design documents – to program strategically, to maximize complementarity among LAC initiatives carried out by parts of CIDA with bilateral, multilateral/global and partnership responsibilities as well as those carried out by other government agencies.

CIDA AID FLOWS TO LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Table 2-2: Breakdown of Canada's ODA to LAC between 2005-2006 and 2008-2009 (Cdn$ millions – not adjusted for inflation)							
Fiscal Year	CIDA				Total CIDA	Other Government Departments	Total
	Americas Directorate*	Partnerships with Canadians	Multilateral and Global Programs	Other Branches			
2005-2006	227.42	70.01	42.66	21.97	360.67**	44.19	404.85
2006-2007	256.23	72.23	45.42	18.49	389.63***	64.09	453.71
2007-2008	248.07	58.67	50.65	19.9	377.28	73.95	451.23
2008-2009	287.31	64.92	64.72	9.5	426.46	111.07	537.53
Average (% of ODA to LAC)	254.76 (55.1%)	66.46 (14.4%)	50.86 (11.0%)	17.46 (3.7%)	388.51 (84.1%)	73.33 (15.8%)	461.83 (100%)

Source: CIDA Statistical Reports on International Assistance for 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 20072008, 2008-2009.
Notes: *Americas Directorate expenditures include Canada Fund for Local Initiatives funding.
    **Adjusted for a loan repayment amount of $1.39 million.   ***Adjusted for a loan repayment amount of $2.75 million.

Table 2-2 shows Canada's program support to LAC by different cooperation channels[7]. Among Canadian actors, CIDA is by far the largest contributor to the region accounting for nearly 85% of expenditures. Other government departments account for the remainder, and within CIDA the America's Directorate allocates the largest portion (over 50%) of the Agency's contribution to the region. The table shows some fluctuation and a small increase in aid flows over the period. Up to this time, there is no detectable shifting of resources toward the region with the launch of the Government of Canada's 2007 Americas Strategy (see Section 2.3).

 Table 2-3 sets out IAP expenditures as a share of Americas Directorate expenditures. Americas Branch disbursements over the period 2004-2005 to 2009-2010 oscillate between about $200 million and $265 million. Responses to emergencies – floods, earthquakes, mudslides and hurricanes, mostly – have shaped funding patterns from year to year. The relatively small IAP expenditure shown in 2004-2005 reflects the Program in

Table 2-3: Americas Directorate Disbursement, 2004-2005 to 2009-2010 (in Cdn$ millions)			
Fiscal Year	Americas Directorate* Disbursement	IAP Disbursement	IAP as a Share of Americas Directorate Funding
2004-2005	203.55*	14.20	7.0%
2005-2006	212.18	22.62	10.6%
2006-2007	240.65	30.84	12.8%
2007-2008	235.82	27.73	11.8%
2008-2009	267.91	25.59	10.0%
2009-2010	257.14	34.91	13.6%
6 Yr Total	1,417.26	155.88	11.0%

Sources: CIDA Chief Financial Officer Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting – Americas Directorate data 2010-11-05, IAP data 2010-23-07.
Note: *Americas Directorate expenditures do not include Canada Fund for Local Initiatives funding (contrary to Table 2-2)

---

[7] The reporting format for 2004-2005 does not lend itself to easy comparison with subsequent years. Data for 2009-2010 was not available at the time of writing.

its nascent stages with many programs/projects just coming on stream. In 2004-2005 there were 22 projects on the books, the following year there were 48. Conversely, the peak year for expenditures (2009-2010) coincides with the renewal of IAP under its first official strategic programming framework and an overall increase in the number of staff on the IAP team.

CIDA PROGRAMMING TRENDS IN LAC (2004-2005 TO 2009-2010)

The IAP was seen as CIDA's primary vehicle for supporting key institutions like the OAS, PAHO and Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). In 2004-2005, the beginning of this evaluation period, country and regional programming at the Americas Directorate addressed three strategic issues:

- **Fostering Good Governance** – described as instrumental to improving stability, security and public confidence – all foundational to development in the region.

- **Tackling Inequality** – named as a fundamental constraint on the ability of countries to take full advantage of economic, political and social opportunities for sustainable development.

- **Promoting Economic Prosperity** – requiring improved access by all citizens, and especially the poor, to resources and opportunities for sustainable economic growth.

These issues were under the spotlight at the Fourth Summit of the Americas in Mar del Plata, Argentina (2005). A change in government in early 2006 occasioned several changes to Canada's position *vis-à-vis* LAC and to CIDA's programming globally and within the region:

- Launch of an Americas Strategy (July 2007) – billed as a priority foreign policy initiative of the Government of Canada to "re-engage with Latin America" in pursuit of the following objectives: to strengthen democratic institutions, to build dynamic and growing economies, and to enhance regional stability and security (this objective included among others, addressing the threats of health pandemics).

- These objectives were to be pursued through: reinforcing bilateral relationships; strengthening regional organizations such as the OAS, IDB, and the Summit of the Americas; bolstering partnerships involving other organizations outside the federal government; and expanding Canada's diplomatic presence.

- CIDA's reorganization and launch of its Aid Effectiveness Action Plan 2009-2012 intended to bring CIDA closer in line to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Accra Agenda for Action (2008).

- Currently, six of CIDA's twenty named "countries of concentration" are in the LAC region: Bolivia, Caribbean, Colombia, Haiti, Honduras, and Peru – a development widely observed to be demonstrating Canada's shift in focus from Africa to the Americas[8]. In 2009, CIDA unveiled three thematic priorities to undergird the Agency's future programming, globally: (i) Increasing food security, (ii) Securing the future of children and youth, and (iii) Stimulating sustainable economic growth.

Each CIDA priority has subsequently been elaborated in a strategy document. Under this new programming frame, CIDA considers "helping to strengthen governance institutions and practices" as a crosscutting theme, along with "promoting equality between women and men" and "increasing environmental sustainability". In keeping with the mandated changes itemized above, the Americas Directorate has developed Country Development Programming Frameworks (CDPFs) for the six "countries of concentration". IAP's Regional Development Programming Framework (RDPF) was approved in 2009.

2.4 Program Considerations

THE EMERGENCE OF REGIONAL PROGRAMMING

IAP is one of six regional cooperation programs of CIDA. A relatively new programming phenomenon globally, regional programming has been gaining presence and definition over the evaluation period. A 2007 study on the potential of regional programs authored by the World Bank, noted that regional programs make up only 3% of all international cooperation support. By far the largest portion of this support is concentrated at a country level. Across CIDA's geographic programs in 2008, regional program disbursements (including IAP) totalled about 14% of total spending[9]. Within CIDA's Americas Directorate, IAP has made up an average of 10.5% of bilateral funding to the region on an annual basis between 2004-2005 and 2008-2009[10].

---

[8] The evaluator has not seen this shift borne out in CIDA's aid statistics up to the 2008-2009.

[9] According to CIDA's Annual Statistical Report for 2008-2009, regional program disbursements were as follows: Inter-American Program - $44.9M, Caribbean - $37.17M, Asia Inter-Regional - $38.01M, Middle East - $14.38M, Maghreb - $15.08M, Eastern and Southern Africa - $8.95M, West and

The 2008 CIDA Transformation for Results Study Group on Regional Programming defined this form of cooperation as

> "…unique and distinct from country-to-country, multilateral and Canadian Partnership programming. It promotes integration and cooperation among countries in a given hemisphere or region to address trans-boundary and shared issues that are critical to sustainable development and that are more effectively dealt with regionally. It builds capacity to address these challenges and generally involves fostering, strengthening and maintaining key and viable regional institutions, organizations and networks.

THE EMERGENCE OF CIDA'S INTER-AMERICAN PROGRAM

From its inception in 1999, IAP was intended to fulfill commitments made during the Summit of the Americas process and in other international fora. Key influences on IAP programming came from positions taken by the Government of Canada at various Summits of the Americas, namely:

- the Third Summit of the Americas in Québec City (2001) that resulted in the preparation and adoption in September 2001 in Lima (Peru) of an Inter-American Democratic Charter to reinforce the OAS instruments for the active defence of representative democracy;

- the Fourth Summit in Mar del Plata, Argentina (2005) that took a narrower focus and concentrated on confronting the major challenges of the region in job creation to fight poverty and strengthening democratic governance, from the three perspectives of national commitments, hemispheric cooperation, and international organizations;

- and most recently, the Fifth Summit in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad (2009) that focused on securing the future of the region's citizens by promoting human prosperity, energy security and environmental sustainability.

Table 3-1: IAP Budget by Sector (2004-2005 to 2009-2010)		
Sectors	Budget	%
1 Governance	$74,426,841.21	34.5%
2 Private Sector Development	$53,920,900.25	25.0%
3 Health	$41,791,264.50	19.4%
4 Other	$21,927,909.71	10.2%
5 Emergency Assistance	$13,249,999.94	6.1%
5 Environment	$6,178,942.88	2.9%
6 Basic Education	$2,314,532.69	1.1%
7 Peace and Security	$2,000,000.00	0.9%
Total	$215,810,391.17	100.0%

Source: CIDA Chief Financial Officer Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting, 2009-12-22

IAP supports regional activities in most of the 33 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. IAP addresses issues that are regional in scope or need a regional approach such as increasing benefits from trade and controlling the spread of disease. It contributes to the Government of Canada's Americas Strategy and strengthens key inter-American institutions such as the OAS and PAHO. IAP supports donor harmonization and coordination at the regional level. Canada is the second largest donor to the OAS and the third largest-donor to PAHO. CIDA also encourages its regional partners to apply and promote the principles of aid effectiveness with their country members.

Table 3-1 shows IAP's budget allocation by sector over the evaluation period. Among other things, the IAP has supported projects to achieve better governance (35% of the Program), develop the private sector (25%) and to improve health (19%). The 'Other' category, representing 10% of the Program masks additional sectoral breadth to the portfolio. IAP has maintained a duel focus on sector-based programming and on strengthening the institutions of key delivery partners such as PAHO, the OAS and its affiliated organizations, and members of the hemisphere's civil society.

By 2004 – the beginning of this evaluation review period – IAP expenditures had grown from $5 million in 1999-2000 to nearly $20 million, spread across as many as 40 initiatives and funds of various types. The 2005 evaluation of the IAP described the Program as being "generally scattered *vis-à-vis* expenditures and budgetary allocations" (CIDA "Prospective Study" p.2).

Central Africa - $19.47M, and Sub-Saharan Africa - $70.99M. Across all regional programs, disbursements were about $249M. Total disbursements under Country and Regional Programs in 2008-2009 amounted to $1,759.47M. A glance at regional programming flows for 2005-2006 shows a similar total outlay of about $235M.

[10] In 2004-2005, IAP's share of total bilateral program support to the region was about 7% (the program was still in its nascent stages). In 2009-2010 its share was 13.6%, according to the office of the Chief Financial Officer (see Table 2-3).

The defining characteristics of the Program remained scant until 2009. IAP operated without an approved strategy of its own, in spite of attempts to prepare one in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Then, in 2009, CIDA approved the RDPF 2010-2015 that aligns IAP's mandate to CIDA's thematic priorities and new Aid Effectiveness Action Plan. For the 2010-2015 period, IAP's programming focus narrows considerably within the three primary sectors – private sector development, health, and governance.

As set out in the new RDPF stated commitments are to:

- Contribute to a more accountable, equitable and regionally harmonized national environment for business, investment and trade;

- Strengthen national health systems for the benefit of women and men, girls and boys;

- Strengthen regional and national management/monitoring of electoral processes and human rights instruments.

3.0   Profile and Assessment of Key Strategic Partners

This section profiles IAP's two strategic partners – PAHO and OAS – and provides a summary assessment of IAP's partnership with them within the past five years. **A short description of the IAP's other partner organizations in the region is provided in Appendix E.**

3.1   Pan American Health Organization (PAHO)

The Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) is an international public health agency with over 100 years of experience in combating disease and promoting equity in health to improve the quality of life for people in the Americas. It serves as the regional Office for the Americas of the World Health Organization (WHO) and enjoys international recognition as part of the UN system. It is also the health organization of the Inter-American system under a special agreement with the OAS. All states of the hemisphere are members, and represented on its Directing Council. PAHO provides strategic direction and technical cooperation on health issues and health systems with and for member states, through their Ministries of Health.

In the most recent reorganization, reflecting the current strategic plan, the four technical areas are: i) family and community health, ii) health surveillance and prevention and control of communicable diseases, iii) sustainable development and environmental health, and iv) health systems based on primary health care. A technical office of Gender, Diversity and Human Rights supports the four technical areas and the planning function. PAHO maintains a network of country and sub-regional offices. Country offices are responsible for developing and implementing country-level biennial work plan and budgets, providing technical cooperation on areas agreed upon with national governments and sub-regional fora as part of those plans.

PAHO receives support from Canada through two main channels. As a member state of PAHO, Canada as all other countries in the Americas has an annual quota (or "assessed") contribution to the operations of the organization. Canada is the second largest contributor to PAHO after the United States, accounting for approximately 12% of total assessed contributions (~ $11.5 million in 2009).

Assessed contributions from the member states make up approximately 30% of the program budget. Close to 70% of PAHO's operating budget derives from "voluntary" contributions, with a smaller percentage from WHO. Canada ranks third in voluntary contributions to PAHO, after the United States and Spain. Ninety-six percent of Canada's voluntary (or development) contributions come through CIDA, with small amounts from Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC), IDRC, and DFAIT.

RELEVANCE OF PAHO AS AN INSTITUTION

PAHO has stood as CIDA's main development partner in health in the hemisphere for more than two decades. The IAP's relationship with PAHO has matured into a more strategic partnership with its program grant arrangement during this review period.

The evaluation confirms that CIDA and PAHO share a strong commitment towards the achievement of the health-related MDGs, the plans of action from the Summits of the Americas, and the *Health Agenda for the Americas 2008-2017* (that was launched by the hemisphere's top health policy authorities to orient the development of future health plans and the strategic plans of those organizations interested in cooperating in health with the countries of the Americas, including PAHO/WHO).   PAHO's focus on communicable disease prevention and control in the region addresses public health security as described in Canada's *Strategy for the Americas*. Strategic Objectives (#1, 2, 7, 10, 13) and PAHO's current 2008-2012 *Strategic Plan* align directly with the IAP's RDPF 2010-2015 immediate outcomes for the health

> **Box 2: Eradicating Rubella in the Americas —
> PAHO acknowledges CIDA's contribution**
>
> In 2010, CIDA received an award from PAHO in recognition of its sustained contribution at the regional level, which resulted in rubella elimination in the Americas. Health Canada, PHAC and CPHA were also commended for their efforts.
>
> With CIDA's support, today all countries and territories in the Americas administer rubella vaccines to their populations through routine childhood vaccination programs. A rubella infection during pregnancy can lead to blindness, deafness, and cardiac defects—known as CRS. Before wide-scale rubella vaccination, an estimated 20,000 CRS-affected children were born each year in the Americas.
>
> For more than a decade, CIDA, through the Inter-American Program (IAP), has supported the expansion and strengthening of regional surveillance networks for vaccine-preventable diseases. These networks have helped the Americas generate critical data on disease burden for decision making. The collaboration between CIDA and PAHO has helped harness the support of political leaders, engage new partners, strengthen laboratories, improve routine immunization access and coverage, and expand information systems to protect the health of mothers, newborns, and children.
>
> http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/ACDI-CIDA.nsf/eng/NAT-11874035-GVF

sector, namely strengthened national health systems and communicable disease prevention and control[11].

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP WITH PAHO

Given the fit with between PAHO and IAP's strategic objectives and the substantial development results achieved by PAHO regionally and in member countries – through projects/programs supported by CIDA (see Box 2) – maintaining a programmatic approach with PAHO that would include the continuation of institutional strengthening would arguably contribute to the effectiveness and sustainability of health outcomes in the region.

3.2   Organization of American States (OAS)

The Organization of American States (OAS) is the world's oldest regional organization. It was formally established in 1948. The organization comprises 35 independent member states, of which 33 are currently active members (i.e. memberships of Cuba and Honduras have been suspended). The OAS is the principal political, juridical, and social governmental forum in the hemisphere. Since 1994, the OAS has played a central role in the organization of the Summits of the Americas process, which bring together leaders of member states within the organization every 3-4 years to discuss hemispheric topics as well as to develop strategies for the region. The mission of the OAS is to foster political dialogue and cooperation amongst member states in four key pillars: democracy, human rights, development (including trade), and security. Day to day operations are organized through the General Secretariat, which is comprised of six Secretariats: Political Affairs, Integral Development, Multidimensional Security, Administration and Finance, Legal Affairs, and External Relations. CIDA's support to the OAS is managed through the first four of the six Secretariats.

RELEVANCE OF THE OAS

The OAS is the lone political organization in the hemisphere that can claim to represent the interests of every country in an impartial manner. It has achieved this trusted position by demonstrating its impartiality, deference to the primacy of the sovereignty of its member states, and by continually advocating its core mandate (as outlined in the 2001 Inter-American Development Charter) to promote and reinforce democratic governance in all countries in the hemisphere.

There are certainly challenges facing the organization. The OAS is a political collective, and as such, represents a diverse membership. As a high-level official within the OAS noted to the evaluator, the organization has "thirty-four owners and thirty-four customers". This has made agenda setting problematic. At the Fifth Summit of the Americas in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad (2009), there were over one hundred priorities identified by member states for the OAS to address exceeding the handling capacity of the organization.

The OAS has faced chronic funding difficulties over the past decade: a situation that has been exacerbated by the global economic downturn. While quota funding from member states has been slightly increased for 2010, they are not regularly adjusted for inflation. For now the shortfall has been bridged by an increase in voluntary funding (to $80 million, of which Canada contributes one quarter).

At the organizational level, the OAS remains without a strategic plan. Inter-secretariat cooperation and communication remains problematic. In his discussions with several OAS staff, the evaluator noted that crucial information relating to project development and results was not being shared between Secretariats. The predominating view among those interviewed for this evaluation is that, for all its shortcomings, the **OAS remains the lone hemispheric organization** that possesses the ability to bring together diverse constituencies in advocating and speaking for democratic principles and governance. Arguably, the more the body can be enhanced through strategic partnerships the greater the benefit to the OAS, its members, and to donors like Canada who view the organization as important to their foreign policy objectives.

STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP WITH OAS

OAS is a key institution for coordination and policy dialogue in the Americas. Development effectiveness and sustainability would arguably be enhanced through the IAP's targeted support to specific governance initiatives in areas of expertise where the OAS' regional status provides added value and where tangible development results can be achieved and measured.

---

[11] Strategic Objectives of Canada's Strategy for the Americas: #1 Reduce burden of communicable disease; #2 HIV; #7 Gender responsive programming; #10 Health services; #13 Health human resources

4.0 Major Program Results by Sector and Crosscutting Issue

As with most evaluations, there are two key questions to be addressed: one dealing with results, the other with the means by which these were achieved. This section addresses the first question.

What has been achieved by the IAP during the evaluation period? – This is addressed through an examination of Program performance against the following evaluation criteria:

- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities, and partners' and donors' policies.

- Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

- Sustainability: The continuation of the benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

- Crosscutting Issues: The treatment of the crosscutting issues the Program established, namely gender equality, environment, HIV/AIDS, and capacity development.

4.1 Relevance

RELEVANCE TO STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES

The evaluation criteria set out the expectation that the program activities of the implementing entities are consistent with the governing parameters in place at the time of their inception. **The evaluators assess IAP's relevance to be "highly satisfactory".**

Until the Program developed a strategic orientation, first with the advent of Canada's Americas Strategy and more recently with the launch of the RDPF (2010-2015), IAP was in the position of responding to the vast range of Summit objectives and mandates agreed to by the participating countries, while staying within CIDA's development parameters, MDGs, and principles of aid effectiveness. The 2005 evaluation made this observation and concluded that the Program was relevant – principally because it was responding to the objectives and mandates of the Summits but also because the parameters of the day were both broad in nature and transient. A wide range of programming can be rationalized under the MDGs. That said, the 2005 evaluators went on to assert that being aligned to high-level strategies and priorities does not assure good strategic positioning, and warned that without tighter parameters, IAP would continue to be subject to programming pressures emanating from summitry that could limit the Program's capacity to concentrate its resources on the region's most pressing development needs.

> "It seems evident that, without a precise strategic direction, the IAP is subject to pressures from a wide variety of interests and political declarations, very few of which result in concrete actions given the limited resources allocated to meet their broad and highly dispersed engagements". (CIDA Prospective Study – Synthesis Report, June 2005, p.3)

The sector studies show a Program that has continued without that clear strategic definition that was called for in 2005, at least until the launch of Canada's Americas Strategy in 2007 and more especially the advent of CIDA's thematic priorities and launch of IAP's RDPF in 2009. With these, the parameters have now narrowed to the point where the Americas Directorate and the IAP team have a point of reference for making strategic programming choices. It is important to note that efforts to create a strategic framework were made by IAP managers in the immediate aftermath of the 2005 evaluation. Strategy documents were drafted and refined between 2006 and 2008 but were never approved for reasons mostly external to the Program[12]. One staffer in a management role during this time recalled, "we wanted a tool that could allow us to say "no" – to make a case for not taking on initiatives that were coming our way".

---

[12] The evaluators understand that it was a particularly dynamic period for the program with CIDA. The change in government in early 2007 precipitated foreign policy developments that yielded the Americas Strategy as well as a series changes in business processes at CIDA.

RELEVANCE TO PARTNER NEEDS AND DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

The sector reports prepared for this evaluation uniformly signal a high degree of alignment between funded initiatives and the various objective and priority statements named above. A few sector study insights are in order. These underscore the relevance of partner institutions and funded initiatives but also suggest scope for refinement:

- **In the health sector** – IAP has collaborated exclusively with the hemisphere's primary public health organization, PAHO. IAP health programming support has centred on the prevention and control of communicable diseases. This focus is consistent with IAP's adherence to the three pillars of Canada's Americas Strategy, specifically the placement of health sector activity under the Strategy's "security" objective. It aligns mainly with three MDGs: #4 (reduce child mortality), #6 (combat HIV, malaria and other diseases), and #8 (global partnership for development). A focus on prevention and control of communicable diseases is consistent with PAHO's historic role and technical expertise, and PAHO's earlier strategic plans.

- **In the private sector development (PSD) portfolio** – There have been no less than ten different bodies serving as executing agencies for the 14 projects active during the review period. Eight related to trade and competitiveness (referred to as "Trade Related Technical Assistance/Capacity Building" or "TRTA/CB") and six are in the "Other PSD/Enabling Economic Environment" or "PSD/EEE" category. The latter designation recognizes the disparate nature of the non-TRTA projects, as illustrated by the selected projects in agriculture/food security/nutrition and oil & gas/environmental protection/governance. All are anchored into CIDA strategy/policy documents and to the MDGs; and as such can be considered relevant in their own right. However, the six PSD/EEE projects lack a common strategic purpose beyond the broad notion that each are, in their own corners, paving the way for sustainable economic development.

- **In the governance sector** – Programming aligns well with aid effectiveness principles – in particular the premium placed on local ownership – all but one partner originates in LAC. The OAS, IAP's key partner in the sector is, like PAHO, an hemispheric entity comprised of LAC member states (including Canada). It is widely recognized as the primary instrument for promoting governance in the hemisphere. Canada's relationship with OAS runs long and deep with lots of room for policy dialogue, program support and institutional strengthening.

  The newly-approved IAP regional strategy for 2010-2015 focuses on democracy (specifically, support for electoral systems) and human rights as chief governance sub-priorities for the Program. This represents an overall narrowing in scope for IAP in the governance sector and has important implications for several of the current partner organizations and the projects they are implementing. Strategic choices are required. The sector study suggests that consideration be given to supporting activities related to: (i) "rule of law" given that from a democratic governance perspective, it is critical that the institutions that support the democratic process themselves be accountable, transparent and credible in the public eye; and (ii) "civil registration" given that without being properly registered, citizens cannot gain access to human rights protection.

Above all, what is apparent to the evaluators is that the exercise of creating a Program framework to guide regional programming strategy is a delicate one. It would also appear that substantive engagement with governments, hemispheric organizations, civil society and the donor community is also crucial. Drawing from the experience of the World Bank, DFID and the EU, a (regional program) framework building exercise would ideally build from clarity on its own priorities and competencies; a sound hemispheric analysis; an understanding of and fluid dialogue with stakeholder groups that would have roles to play (government and civil society); and a common understanding of program management principles and results expectations.

As the evaluators understand it, IAP's new RDPF was formulated and approved within a time frame that did not allow for all of the steps outlined above. Dialogue between CIDA and participating institutions such as the OAS and PAHO has centred on the specifics of those partnerships, while the larger expression of CIDA's regional programming intent – the Program Strategy 2009 – remains a protected document, and the RDPF 2010-2015 – that outlines how the Strategy will be implemented in the region – was not shared with partners.

Commenting more generally on the emergence of CIDA's new planning process for country and regional programs in mid-2008, the Auditor General voiced some concern about its rapid introduction, cursory attention to sectoral analysis and guardedness in dealing with stakeholders.

> "The absence of a well defined and transparent planning process and formally approved and public plans impedes communications with donors and recipient governments, leaving them unclear about the Agency's direction and long term commitment in individual countries and regions". (Report of the Auditor General of Canada 2009, Chapter 8, p.18)

Good progress has been made with the introduction of the Program Strategy (2009) and RDPF (2010-2015) in creating a strategic filter for the IAP – there is now, more than before, potential to channel resources to maximize regional impact. That said further work is required to attune the RDPF to maximize the Program's relevance to LAC's development challenges. The extent to which the RDPF can be attuned within its lifecycle remains unclear to the evaluators. Those in senior management roles at the Americas Directorate understand that the document is largely fixed. CIDA's management response to the Auditor General's 2009 report on CIDA expressed a different view:

> Country strategies (evaluator's note: presumably this extends to regional strategies) will be reviewed annually to assess any significant changes to the country's development context and program performance. If required, adjustments will be made and reflected in changes to the CDPFs, and the country strategies posted on the Agency's website (Report of the Auditor General of Canada 2009, Chapter 8, p.19).

To meet the commitments of its management response to the Auditor General's 2009 recommendations, the Agency is now posting summaries of country/regional strategies on its website. In addition, the requirement to consult with stakeholders during the planning process for country program strategies resumed throughout the Agency after the Government of Canada announced its Aid Effectiveness Agenda in 2009.

4.2 Effectiveness

It is difficult to assess "achievement of results at the Program level" without a programming framework and the necessary performance management framework. Therefore the following assessment of effectiveness is mainly based on "project, sector and institutional" assessments.

The sector studies show that, overall, the IAP has made "satisfactory" progress in forging Program effectiveness. In the health and private sectors, in particular, IAP support has transpired into country level policy and program changes geared toward improving the livelihoods of the poor. The same degree of effect is not evident in the findings of the governance sector study, a situation which is explained by the political nature of the work being undertaken.

RESULTS – HEALTH SECTOR

In the health sector, outcome-level results at PAHO centre on the utilization/coverage of health services and on the level of interruption of communicable diseases. Overall, the Program is assessed to have achieved a "**satisfactory**" level of results. Examining the results of IAP-supported programming as reported by PAHO in documents published between 2004 and 2010 and by interviews with PAHO personnel, the evaluators found evidence of results as described below:

- improved immunization coverage in poor marginalized areas and indigenous populations, albeit to a limited extent;

- increased detection, coverage, quality of treatment and increased cure rates for tuberculosis among indigenous populations in Colombia;

- culturally sensitive adaptation of community-based Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) yielded improved utilization of health services by indigenous communities in targeted areas of Colombia, Peru, Paraguay and Ecuador;

- the interruption of the vector for Chagas Disease in two regions of Peru by 2010 (see Box 3);

> **Box 3: Chagas Disease (Peru) – Inter-Sectoral Success Story from the Health Sector**
>
> **A major public health milestone** – the interruption of vector transmission for Chagas in two Departments in Peru, required an inter-sectoral approach and strong community involvement:
>
> **Health** – design and implementation of surveillance systems, including Chagas as part of Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses (IMCI).
>
> **Environment** – improve environmental sanitation around homes and domestic animals which attract vectors.
>
> **Education** – primary school students regularly participate in surveillance activities; community surveillance posts; IMCI included in curricula for 17 Schools of Medicine, Nursing, Public Health.
>
> **Local Government** – mayors have included funding for Chagas in municipal development plans, and signed commitments to integrate it into health and education.
>
> **Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI)** – incorporated into Peru's national Poverty Reduction Plan (CRECER).

- the elimination of rubella and congenital rubella syndrome in the Americas as of 2009 (see Box 2); and

- reduced hospitalization rates for children where the pneumococcal vaccine is in use.

In keeping with PAHO's technical assistance mandate to build capacity with member states, IAP health sector effectiveness is largely reflected at the meso or institutional level. There is evidence that member states are building capacity in most programming areas as well as building sustainability into national public health systems. Two examples are:

- Ministries of Health in Colombia, Peru, Paraguay and Ecuador effectively using Integrated Management for Childhood Illness (IMCI) protocols for implementing and monitoring programs for communicable and other childhood diseases.

- National Influenza Pandemic Preparedness Plans (NIPPPs) in line with international guidelines in seven targeted countries managed moderately well when put to the test in the H1N1 influenza in 2009.

Within the partner institution itself, IAP support has been instrumental in creating enhancements to the way PAHO addresses: gender equality, indigenous health programming, results-based management, and multi-party dialogue.

- **Gender Equality (GE)** – programming focus to support implementation of PAHO's 2005 GE policy. Results include: (i) GE Plan of Action (2010-2015) approved by member states in 2009, with agreed national monitoring indicators[13]. (ii) Gender and ethnicity included in PAHO Biennial RBM planning processes and work plans of all entities (country offices and PAHO technical units), and in governing body documents; and (iii)Technical capacity: 25 GE Focal Points trained for country offices.

- **Results-Based Management (RBM)** – programming focus to assist PAHO embed RBM approaches in support of planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting of agency results. Here, results exceed expectations in the establishment of systems and tools for planning and monitoring.

- **Multi-Party Dialogue** – programming focus to enhance PAHO's competencies in the area of donor coordination particularly around programmatic approaches. Only output level results – preliminary multi-party discussions – are showing to date. Overall, PAHO remains to define its role or expected results for donor coordination on health programming in the Americas. Until that happens, it will be difficult to define strategies and activities.

RESULTS – PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

Overall, IAP is assessed to have achieved a "**satisfactory**" level of results, though the effects of IAP interventions are demonstrably further reaching among the EEE initiatives.

Within the PSD component of the IAP. Outcome-level results are evident in both the Trade Related Technical Training and Capacity Building (TRTA/CB) and Enabling Economic Environment (EEE) groupings.

- The sector study reviewed the OAS sponsored Masters Degree Program in Trade Policy which has provided comprehensive training in critical areas of trade policy theory and practice. A significant number of participants have been promoted to higher-level positions, and some have served their country as chief trade negotiators, vice-ministers and even ministers.

- The Baastel/WCC evaluation found signals of knowledge uptake and application in the behaviour of the secondary partners (p.20). The report notes that, "Initially, the countries requested assistance to fulfill needs regarding the negotiation and administration of trade agreements, whereas later they began asking for help with the promotion of and development of exports".

However, as the Baastel/WCC 2009 evaluation[14] of the eight TRTA/CB projects administered by the IDB noted, few TRTA/CB projects have addressed poverty reduction directly (p.41). Also, the sector study found that some TRTA/CB activities were encountering problems with "absorptive capacity" of secondary institutions, high levels of staff turnover and incidents of political interference. This was most notable in an initiative to reform customs administrations in several LAC countries.

---

[13] Member states agreed to report progress on a number of key indicators, including 1) disaggregating data by sex, 2) advances on inclusion of GE in health system, and 3) development of inter-sectoral groups for integrating GE, with the inclusion of civil society.

[14] This evaluation was conducted by Le Groupe-conseil Baastel Ltée and Washington Consulting Corporation (WCC)

In IAP's "oil and gas" sub-sector engagements, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and environmental stewardship practices are taking hold among the region's petroleum companies (public and private sector)[15].

- Even though implementation of the ARPEL[16] Governance Project is only about 50% complete, several outcome-level results are reported in the 2009 Project Summary Report. These included: CSR implementation, education of responsible leaders in industry and governments, gender equality improvements, and several Direct Technical Assistances.

- Referring to the End-of-Project Evaluation of the ARPEL Environmental Protection Project authored by John Carter in 2005…

  "there is some evidence for project impacts, especially with regard to the industry operating with sound environmental protection technologies" (p.82).

  "there is clear evidence of institutional change in most ARPEL member companies which can be related back to specific project activities and themes. Especially evident is the relationship between the development of guidelines and application of at least some of the principles and approaches by most member companies" (p.66).

Beyond TRTA/CB activities, the sector study identified robust outcome level results in the $20 million International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) project, the sector portfolio's largest undertaking. Here:

- The project's plant breeders have made significant breeding progress with increasing the micronutrient concentration of target crops.

- The project has distinguished itself with its incorporation of a "reaching end users" component. Dissemination and adoption of improved varieties has occurred with farmers/rural populations in several countries. In addition, several biofortified food products have been developed and, in an alliance with private industry, such products are now being marketed to urban consumers.

- A series of scientific studies has been published by CIAT which show the agronomic, economic and nutritional impacts of specific biofortified foods which have been developed by the project.

> **Box 4: ESAA-ARPEL Environment Project Phase III and ARPEL Governance Project – An Enviable Mix of Success Factors**
>
> The ESAA-administered ARPEL Environment Project Phase III (AEPIII) was a $3.7 million almost-seven-year bilateral responsive project financed through a contribution agreement which ended in 2007. It was followed by the current, similarly structured five-year ARPEL Governance Project. Both projects have benefited from a partnership between CIDA, ESAA and ARPEL which extends back to 1996.
>
> Bold project design coupled with a highly productive long-term three-way partnership has led to hemispheric change in a key resource sector and put ARPEL squarely in the top league of industry fora dealing with social-environmental issues in relation to sustainable development. The ARPEL projects have consistently addressed tough issues in a dynamic industry and political-economic-social setting using an approach that is highly participatory, multi-channelled and backed by utilization-focused monitoring and evaluation.
>
> Taken together these two projects fit well with most of the GOC/CIDA policy/strategic guidance that could apply to a PSD project. In some instances they have shown themselves to be ahead of the surge of official interest shown in topics such as climate change/carbon credits, and corporate social responsibility including mainstreaming of gender equality and building relationships with affected indigenous peoples.
>
> The ESAA-ARPEL projects have generated a body of guidelines (23 of them in AEPIII) that is comprehensive, publicly available, practical and contextualized in the industry. There has been a growing track record of their utilization by member companies and in other diverse circumstances (including BP's recent major deepwater drilling accident in the Gulf of Mexico).

RESULTS – GOVERNANCE SECTOR

While there are certainly skill sets and technologies to take on board in building governance capacity, the whole effort largely hinges upon creating a culture of democracy within institutions and in society as a whole. The study describes, on the one hand, a region moving towards improvements in democratic governance in part through the many projects supported by the IAP and other donor organizations. As noted in Chapter 2, Latin American dictatorships are mostly a remnant of history. On the other hand, the sector study points to some sobering time series data around the following governance indicators: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability and Absence of Violence, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, and Control of Corruption. It shows that since 1996, little progress has been made in these areas and that, in

---

[15] ARPEL member companies include producers, refining/marketing entities and integrated (i.e. upstream and downstream) companies

[16] Regional Association of Oil and Natural Gas Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean

some cases, LAC countries have taken steps backward despite the outward appearance of progress. Interestingly, this trend has been observed within both middle-income and poor countries (Kaufmann, Daniel, Kraay, Aart, Mastruzzi, Massimo).

Overall, the Program is assessed to have achieved a "**satisfactory**" level of results, understanding that expectations need to be cognizant of the constraints of transforming knowledge and tools acquired into application, institutionalization and, ultimately, improved governance.

Regarding expectations of the OAS *vis-à-vis* its ability to advance democratic governance agendas with respect to human rights, rule of law, gender equality, and strengthened public sector institutions, the sector study finds that the institution has assisted in advancing these substantial agendas amongst member states by generating discussion and promoting democratic principles in line with Summit of

> **Box 5: IACHR/IIHR – Protection and Promotion of Human Rights in the Americas**
>
> One of the primary focuses of the OAS, through the Inter-American system, is the push for human rights in the hemisphere. The main official body responsible for investigating and advancing human rights abuses in the Americas is the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR).
>
> Together with the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR), the IACHR took on a five year, $3.2 million project aimed at reducing the human rights case backlog and strengthening the case system, and raising the visibility and profile of the inter-American human rights system in the region through advocacy and training activities.
>
> Prior to the start of this IAP funded project, a typical human rights complaint submitted to the IACHR would take up to ten years to be evaluated
>
> Through the hiring of additional lawyers, the case backlog has been significantly reduced whereby by the end of 2010, petitions from 2008 will begin to be reviewed. For the first time, the IACHR was able to reverse the trend of incoming versus outgoing human rights petitions. Such improvements in due process of law are a significant element of good democratic governance.
>
> The creation of an active human rights outreach unit and press office, which promotes human rights issues in the region, has served to dramatically increase the level of transparency in the case investigation proves, a key element of good democratic governance.

the Americas priorities. However, the evaluation found limited evidence that OAS activities have resulted in altered policies or laws at the state level. This stems, in part, from the lack of documentation on results and from the constrained ability of the OAS itself to bring change to bear at a country level. As was explained to the evaluator several times by OAS officials and commentators, the OAS, as a multilateral organization may supply the tools and influence to leverage change, but ultimately it is the responsibility of individual states to make progressive choices in democratic governance.

The IAP has commented that influencing policies and laws through policy dialogue is only one element of the OAS's work in governance: it also plays a significant role in providing technical assistance and resources to member states to implement policies/laws after they have been adopted (e.g. biometric registry in Bolivia).

By contrast, the study notes, the Justice Studies Centre for the Americas (CEJA) and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) – both autonomous, specialist bodies of the OAS – have been able to demonstrate not just the uptake of skills and tools, but also their application in-country.

- CEJA can point to direct legal alterations that address rule of law and human rights concerns in at least Peru, Mexico, Colombia, Panama, and Argentina.

- Likewise, the IACHR, by lessening the case backlog in the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and advocating for adherence to human rights principles in member states, has also been effective in delivering concrete results.

The Indigenous Peoples Participation Program (IPPP) – unique to IAP in that it was instigated more by Canada than by LAC and up to this point has been managed directly by IAP – has been squarely focused on building capacities among LAC and Canadian indigenous groups to determine their own development agendas across a range of sectors.

The OAS itself has been the focus of a considerable amount of institutional strengthening support during the evaluation period. Since 2007 the support package was embedded as a ($2.7 million) component under CIDA's Grant Arrangement with the OAS. Support was distributed across the following categories: human resources management, financial management, results-based management, monitoring and evaluation, reporting, and internal communication. The sector study highlights results in the following areas:

- **Human Resources Management –** Processes are being implemented to streamline and standardize hiring practices and methods throughout all secretariats of the OAS.

- **Financial Management –** Two key challenges identified by a CIDA commissioned assessment relating to financial management (Cowater Report, 2007) were a lack of conformity within the OAS to

International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) and weak oversight and control processes in budgetary matters (Cowater).

- **Results-Based Management –** Historically OAS operated with "very low quality project management and reporting and where projects were managed in an ad-hoc manner" according to a key informant. He noted that the RBM project has since developed a uniform results focused project management system for use by all OAS project managers and has uploaded it over the organization's intranet.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation –** At present, monitoring and evaluating OAS projects, whether CIDA-related or otherwise, is not a strong suit of the OAS. There are currently no defined monitoring systems in place within the OAS to assess the progress of projects.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPROVING EFFECTIVENESS

The sector studies underscore the loss of influence a regional program like IAP experiences on its capacity building work as the ripple effect of its activities passes from the primary partners to the secondary (usually country level) partners. In the context of IAP, the challenge is especially notable in the governance sector, but is also evident in the other two sectors. On this, IAP's experience is consistent with that of DFID and the World Bank. DFID cautions that multilateral organizations, while likely strategically potent and organizationally competent, are particularly prone to experiencing a disjuncture between country commitments and actual follow-through on home turf.

The evaluators take from their interviews and document reviews a caution that the choice between bilateral, regional or sub-regional programming requires a careful examination of both programming topic and context.

Drawing upon the experience of DFID, the World Bank and the wisdom of key informants inside and surrounding IAP, three core ideas emerge:

1) **Concentrate program resources around a few strategically relevant programming nodes with a unifying and well-publicized regional objective** – This has certainly been the intent of IAP program managers since 2005, and now it begins to manifest in the RDPF 2010-2015 though with room for refinement as discussed in Section 4.2 (Relevance).

2) **Sharpen program coherence** – In part, this involves ensuring coordination of effort among a range of actors. In the context of CIDA 'complementarity' is the catchword – as a means to improved coherence, complementarity refers to the synergies that can be created between different programming arms of the Agency (multilateral, geographic programs, and partnership programs). Commentary on the status of this dimension of complementarity is set out in Section 5.2. Suffice it to say, it is well recognized within IAP that there is unexplored potential to build bridges with other parts of the Agency and the intent is noted in the new RDPF.

3) **Go 'sub-regional' if that is where there is 'energy' and 'alignment'** – The hemisphere as a geographic whole easily lends itself to sub-regional cleavages, usually delineated as: the Andean Region, Central America, the Caribbean, and the Southern Cone. Each of these sub-regions, while still internally diverse, tends to have a greater degree of homogeneity. Of course, hemispheric/regional approaches lend themselves to rich policy debate and information sharing and the cross-fertilization of ideas. However, where development needs are common and pressing among small groupings of countries, there may be strategic merit for a regional program like IAP to provide support at this level. Sub-regional programming can sharpen relevance; and as discussed in Section 4.3 below, the approach can lead toward sustainability.

4.3 Sustainability

Across the range of IAP partnerships and initiatives, the evaluators found a mixed degree of attention being paid to sustainability and prospects for sustainable development results. Sustainability considerations are most noticeable in the way the partner institutions plan and implement projects in the health and private sectors. Here, the sector studies observed an anchoring of funded initiatives to larger, longer-term processes that provide assurances of sustainability. Sustainability considerations are also manifest in IAP's choice of institutional partners and in its working style with these organizations.

Overall, the evaluation assesses IAP's performance on sustainability as "satisfactory".

- Canada through the IAP stands out among other donors for its willingness to invest in the development of each sector's primary hemispheric bodies – PAHO and OAS. Both are representative bodies of LAC country governments giving them an additional degree of permanence and relevance[17].

- According to key informants in both institutions, Canada has earned credibility and influence for its willingness to lead other donors in exercising Paris Declaration commitments by: a) providing flexible program support and b) investing in institutional strengthening initiatives.

- Across the private sector portfolio, executing agencies of IAP-supported initiatives are longstanding bodies exhibiting both stability and ability to adapt. Sustainability has (appropriately) become a driver of project design among PSD projects sampled.

- Across the health and private sectors, the evaluators found examples of funded initiatives being linked to larger, long-term programs, policies or plans. This appears to be an important sustainability strategy:

  - The 2008-2017 Health Agenda for the Americas (HAA) is the regional driver or imperative developed and agreed upon by all member states, including Canada, as the way forward for health development. Progress on this hemispheric plan is in turn driven by the MDGs.

  - In the area of trade-related technical assistance, one mechanism used to ensure local ownership of project initiatives is the drawing of direct links to the National Trade Capacity Building Strategy (NTCBS) prepared by each country interested in receiving specific assistance in this topic area.

The sector studies and commentaries of DFID and the World Bank on regional approaches also show, not surprisingly perhaps, a relationship between national need/demand and sustainability. The suggestion is that where the demand emanates more from the multilateral table, prospects for sustainable results are reduced; however where the locus of demand for an initiative is centred within national ministries or agencies and is grounded in development realities that affect at least a segment of the population, the prospects for sustainable results are strong.

- The IAP-supported Geoscience for Andean Poor Communities project offers a case in point (see Box 6).

As noted above, sustainability in the context of governance sector initiatives has been harder to pin down. At an institutional level, IAP partners have not specified their own institutional sustainability plans and targets, with one exception (CEJA). The governance sector study observes

> **Box 6: Geoscience for Andean Poor Communities**
>
> IAP's Geoscience for Andean Poor Communities project ($12.5 million) was designed around the institutional needs of the national agencies vis-a-vis hazard mitigation in seven Andean countries.
>
> It also focused attention on local communities threatened by natural hazards, which provided the basis for applied research and the development of pilot mitigation strategies. These were then used as the basis for national dissemination of information on how to make communities ready to address geo-seismic events when they occur.
>
> The project aimed at connecting community, government, industry and scientific stakeholders to play their variegated seismic hazard management roles in an informed manner. In addition, it sought to strengthen institutional cooperation at the local, national and regional levels. At the close of the project, these agencies, having formed collegial relationships, continue to engage in mutual assistance initiatives.

that initiatives setting out to augment electoral and human rights processes and the rule of law within member states are most often designed with an understanding that their sustainability is at risk by virtue of the socio-political dynamics within the individual state. In this scenario, striving for sustainability is most definitely an exercise in risk mitigation.

The health and private sector studies found evidence of sustainability in government ownership of programs initiated at the regional level – manifestation of this came in the form of organizations investing further in project activities after the project has closed. The studies observed capacity for leveraging additional funds for initiatives.

- In the health sector, for example, Colombia is in the process of scaling up the successful tuberculosis program with indigenous communities to all relevant provinces, and doing so with its own funds. Ecuador, Paraguay and Peru have been successful in accessing Global Fund support for TB and HIV, building on the success of the Prevention and Control of Communicable Disease (PCCD) project and PAHO's assistance with proposal development.

---

[17] It is also the case that these organizations are subject variable degrees of financial support. Both institutions are dependent on a mix of quota and voluntary contributions. The actual flow of resources from each member country varies from year to year according their political and economic realities – this generates an element of uncertainty for program planning.

- In the private sector, three IAP partners within the sampled PSD projects have reported on their ability to use CIDA funds to attract financing from other sources.

- This trend is also noted in governance sector findings (CEJA, IACHR/IIHR).

Relevant to the discussion is the PAHO's sub-regional focus to programming emerges as a significant contributor to sustainability in all IAP-supported initiatives[18]. The health study draws attention to:

- Sub-regional groupings for economic, political and health development, e.g. CARICOM, CONOSUR, ANDEAN – these act as platforms for ministries of health, ministries of women's affairs and others to form working groups on shared sub-regional issues, with PAHO frequently playing a facilitation role.

- Sub-regional laboratories - these provide reciprocal technical assistance, link databases for analysis and provide a cost-effective solution to economies of scale for vaccines and supplies.

- Sub-regional observatories (gender equality, human resources for health) – these bring together researchers and policy makers on a regular basis to drive and sustain efforts on sub-regional agendas.

4.4   Crosscutting Themes

Overall, the evaluation assesses IAP's performance on both gender equality and on environment as "moderately satisfactory". The evaluators note a general pattern regarding the incorporation of both themes:

- There is recognition within the IAP team of guiding policies

- Program officers with the assistance of gender and environment specialists have screened Program and project designs as part of the approvals process; attention to gender equality (GE) and environment considerations is greatest in this phase, though often analysis begins late in design.

- Attention to GE and environment considerations falls off in implementation. Program officers hold responsibility for explaining management and reporting expectations vis-à-vis crosscutting themes to partners – they tend not to call upon the specialists. Successful integration of the themes largely depends on the extent to which there is championship for such in IAP, the partner institution or the executing agency.

- As part of the design of the RDPF 2010-2015, gender and environmental assessments were carried out which have provided analysis and clarified expectations on the IAP team and on CIDA's partners surrounding the incorporation of GE and environment considerations in the Program as a whole. The new RDPF explicitly links gender results to health, and environment results to PSD.

GENDER EQUALITY (GE)

The sector studies uniformly describe intermittent and inconsistent attention to GE considerations over the evaluation period by IAP. In IAP, attention is given to design aspects more than any other part of the management cycle. Even so, the studies find that IAP partner programs are approved with Logical Framework Analyses (LFAs) that lack comprehensive GE indicators and results. Attention to GE in the mid and latter stages of the program cycle where gender sensitive monitoring, reporting, and evaluation are critical are found to be weak in all three sectors.

As part of the formulation of the Program's RDPF 2010-2015, a gender equality strategy was developed. This document lists the expected results and describes the approaches and mechanisms, the roles and responsibilities of staff and partners, and the required monitoring and reporting expected from this point onwards. It refers to the RDPF document itself. In discussions with CIDA staff who have played gender support roles at different times in the evaluation period, there is mention of the strategic importance of having GE indicators embedded within the program framework of the RDPF.

In 2008, an evaluation was conducted of CIDA's implementation of its 1999 Policy on Gender Equality. The findings included: that GE is taken into account in the early stages of the project cycle, but then attention weakens throughout implementation; that the quality of GE reporting in core-funded/institutional support investments is generally weak; that commitment to GE is inconsistent and dependent on individual

---

18 PAHO has found sub regional placements of focal persons to be an effective method for many of its programs, and is increasingly working in this way, including placing Regional technical advisors at the sub-regional level: Chagas technical advisor in Uruguay; PAHO HIV Co-ordination office in Trinidad; Regional Gender Advisor in Panama.

commitment and initiative. These findings are consistent with what this evaluation finds on the incorporation of gender equality within the IAP.

The IAP partners vary in their strength and commitment to GE.

- From the evaluation, it is evident that PAHO management has made a strong commitment to achieving gender equality, with the Director of Gender, Diversity and Human Rights Office as an equal member of the management team, reporting directly to the Associate Director. PAHO's Gender Equality Plan of Action 2010-2015 is a significant shift for GE within the institutional culture.

- The private sector partners' commitment is improving; gender policies are being developed or revised, tough dialogue is taking place, and in-house expertise is being utilized.

- As it stands, only one of the governance partners (CEJA) has a formalized gender strategy. The governance partners lag behind the other two sectors in their appreciation of GE as a critical factor in achieving their institutional goals of good governance, human rights, electoral reform, etc. Interestingly, this finding aligns with the findings of the Evaluation of CIDA's Gender Policy that states the weakest performance from institutional support is in girls and women's realization of their human rights (Bytown Consulting/C.A.C International p.15).

In all three sectors, gender equality programming appears to be improving primarily from receiving support and assistance from the partners' own in-house expertise including their gender equality units. This type of internal support appears to be in its infancy in many of the partner organizations but there are indicators it is already reaping results with improved gender sensitivity programming.

ENVIRONMENT

CIDA is bound by the provisions of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act (CEAA)[19]. In accordance with the 1999 Cabinet Directive on the Environmental Assessment of Policy, Plan and Program Proposals, CIDA must conduct and apply strategic environmental assessments on its proposed policies, plans, and programs. CIDA policy and guidelines make this operational within the Agency. Environmental specialists assigned to work with IAP indicate that within the evaluation period they have routinely assessed proposals ahead of approval and provided feedback to the program officers in charge of the file. They lament that this usually happens at a stage in the design process when it is too late to make substantive adjustments, though they note that because their screening intervention is backed by the Cabinet Directive and ultimately by the CEAA they do retain an influence that their gender counterparts do not have. Once a program or project is approved, responsibility rests with the program officer to ensure that environmental considerations are integrated into delivery and reporting.

Environment and Resource Management was retained as an Americas Directorate programming priority during the early part of this evaluation period and IAP housed projects under this category. With the advent of CIDA's thematic priorities in 2009 and the expression of these in the new RDPF, environmental sustainability became solely a crosscutting theme.

In the same way that the IAP itself has operated without an official strategic framework until 2009, the Program has carried out its work without a strategic environmental analysis, at least until now. As a consequence, environmental analysis (and strategy) has been applied mostly at the individual program/project level, without the benefit of a big picture understanding of what LAC environment related considerations – and most notably those related to climate change – IAP should champion and with whom.

According to ECLAC data on environmental monitoring, there is a lot of environmental data being collected in the region. Of the 28 national entities recently surveyed, 14 have units dedicated to the collection of environmental statistics (21 have programs). Twenty-six countries have at least one environmental statistics publication: 15 in Latin America and 11 in the Caribbean (Development of Official Statistics in the Region).

IAP's 2009 Environment Sustainability Analysis (RDPF 2010-2015, Appendix E) now provides a foundation for a dialogue among IAP partners. As the evaluators understand environmental assessment practice, the

---

[19] The Canadian government's and CIDA's commitment to the environment is reflected in Canada's foreign policy statement, Canada in the World (1995). CIDA must comply with the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEAA). One key purpose of the CEAA is "to ensure that projects are considered in a careful and precautionary manner before federal authorities take action in connection with them, in order to ensure that such projects do not cause significant adverse environmental effects" (article 4(1)).

theory is that 'assessment' shapes decisions about program/project-level content. The reality has been that environmental considerations are at best, used to temper programming content. Arguably the application of environmental sustainability driven by a program analysis and by the shared intent of strategic partners will go further in rectifying this, than by simply continuing to rely upon the CEAA and its various supporting directives, policies and guidelines as the driver. Of course, the combination of the two would be ideal.

The centrality of IAP program officers in their handling of the environment crosscutting theme is inescapable. Looking forward, continued training/orientation of staff emerges as an important practical measure that can be taken to increase the potency of IAP's environmental programming. This could allow the team to internalize and begin to carry forward the content of the two strategy level documents, the 2008 Strategic Environmental Assessment and the 2009 Environmental Sustainability Analysis.

Another way to improve the attention to environmental considerations is to ensure that environmental indicators are substantively incorporated into the RDPF results framework. This remains a work in progress.

5.0   Major Findings on the Program Management Factors

This section deals with the second of the two key questions addressed in standard program evaluation.

How were the intended results achieved? – This is addressed through an examination of program performance against the following evaluation criteria:

- Coherence: Consistency of development interventions in a given sector, region or country, as well as coordination among development actors including governmental, non-governmental and international organizations.

- Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) are converted to results.

- Management Principles: In relation to Paris Declaration principles of ownership, alignment and harmonization.

- Performance Management: Including results-based management (RBM) and the monitoring and evaluation functions at the project and program levels.

5.1   Coherence

The 2005 evaluation of IAP observed that the Program played an "ambiguous role" *vis-à-vis* other parts of the Americas Directorate and CIDA as a whole. It was not well known and its value proposition to the Agency was not (yet) recognized. Externally, the evaluation found IAP's whole-of-Canada approach to be pursued without good clarity of roles and responsibilities. Today's evaluation finds only modest improvement in the Program's coherence internally and externally, the staff team recognize there is still much to do to build complementarity with other parts of the Agency and to optimize the value a whole-of-Canada approach can bring to policy dialogue and program support. They also note that the road to complementarity is bi-directional – it should not fall on the regional Inter-American Program to resolve.

Overall, the evaluators assess IAP's coherence as "moderately satisfactory" with the prospects for improvement strong under the new RDPF.

WHOLE-OF-AGENCY…

All three sector reports observed variable levels of awareness of IAP's role and programming details across other parts of CIDA. All three reports describe the patterns of relationship as *ad hoc*, largely dependent on the accumulated knowledge of the program officers themselves:

- In the health sector – there has been limited formal and informal communication and knowledge sharing on WHO and PAHO related initiatives between the Multilateral and Global Programs Branch and IAP; at least three missed opportunities to convene on matters of relevance to both are noted. CIDA representatives on the Honduras and Bolivia desks in Canada are aware that the IAP supports PAHO initiatives, but know little beyond that. Personnel at the Canadian Embassy in La Paz, Bolivia are aware of IAP; they commented that they were organizing a multi-party meeting to discuss bilateral strategic planning in the health sector at the end of November 2010 that would include PAHO.

- Representatives of PAHO senior management visit Canada annually to meet with partners, including CIDA, Health Canada, PHAC, IDRC (2009, 2010), an exercise highly valued by PAHO. The IAP staff arrange the CIDA meetings which are apparently held separately for each bilateral desk, the Multilateral Branch, etc.

- In the private sector development component – At the High Commission in Bridgetown, where CIDA officials are part of a decentralized Caribbean Regional Program, there was little or no knowledge of portfolio activities within the region. Awareness of the IAP and its activities was much greater at the Canadian Embassy in Bogotá. This was due in part to a recent visit by the IAP's project officer.

In at least two instances the sector specialists observed substantive interest in learning more about IAP and IAP partner undertakings in the region with a view to engaging in exploratory discussion. They took this as a signal that there is a role for IAP to play in disseminating information about regional trends and sector-based opportunities:

- Interviewees in Bridgetown and Bogota both showed awareness of the new trade facilitation (CATRTA) program and expressed interest in seeing it become fully operational. One interviewee noted that

CATRTA should lead to more complementarity between the IAP and his program as it contains features which make it "a natural continuum between bilateral and hemispheric work."

- The CIDA Bolivia program team was considering an end-of-year grant to PAHO in Bolivia for two initiatives and indicated that they would discuss these with the IAP project officer. The Bolivia desk representative noted that they would like more access to the IAP's regional perspective and analysis.

None of the sector studies found examples of intentional complementarity. Nor did they encounter clear cases where efforts are being duplicated. All found examples of related work with strong potential for knowledge sharing and possible downstream collaboration. For example:

- In the health sector – PAHO, the Ministry of Health and CIDA sit together at Honduras's Health Sector Donor Coordination table. One point of convergence surfaces around the health campaign to address Chagas disease. Here, PAHO provides technical expertise and regional lessons learned from, among others, the Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases Program (PCCD), with IAP support.

- In the governance sector – There are governance projects taking place in Haiti and Bolivia within CIDA's bilateral programs and there is human rights programming embedded within CIDA's Colombia bilateral program. These cases illustrate that there are potential synergies between IAP and bilateral democratic governance programming within CIDA. Based on conversations with key officials, the sector specialist concluded that there is potential for information exchange, at the very least.

The evaluators did encounter three funded initiatives in the sample that appeared to be 'outliers' in the Program portfolio. One is the CIAT Combating Hidden Hunger in Latin America Project. The second is the Geosciences for Andean Poor Communities: Multilateral Andean Project (GAC-MAP). The third is the Indigenous Peoples Participation Program (IPPP) managed directly by BMI. In all three cases these projects were taken on early in IAP's life and today fall at least somewhat outside of current programming foci.

- For its part, IPPP operates at a vastly different scale than other IAP supported activities. IPPP has linked aboriginal communities/organizations in short term, small-scale exploratory projects, usually within specific countries. To date, IPPP has supported 70 "micro" projects. IPPP has largely stood alone.

- The sector specialists observed that the Geosciences and CIAT initiatives, at least, are even less well known to various parts of CIDA than are the other initiatives in the portfolio, and that the Program has generally not made a point of connecting them to donors and implementers in the region that might be interested. The evaluators suggest that there may be other partners and projects like this in the "other" or "multi" sector categories of the full IAP portfolio, but this was not checked.

All CIDA respondents acknowledged the need for more communication between IAP and other desks and the lack of formal/informal mechanisms to do so. Respondents also noted their lack of time to have face-to-face discussions or even to read memos. Better communication among IAP and the other CIDA programs/desks focused on Latin America and the Caribbean would likely contribute to IAP's value-added role and mutual complementarity in the region. Suggestions that emerged from discussions for improvement of coordination and cooperation mechanisms with other CIDA programs include the following:

- IAP share/ask for comments regarding complementarity as part of the renewal discussions with key strategic partners (PAHO and OAS)

- IAP share key regional strategies, policies and funded activities with bilateral desks

- Bilateral desk officers keep IAP appraised of country level policy and programming with regional implications

- Americas Directorate sector specialists engage in the networking and cross-fertilization of ideas inside CIDA and beyond

- IAP convene a "whole-of-Agency" joint meeting that includes the Americas Directorate, as well as Multilateral and Partnership and Policy branches as appropriate during strategic partner (OAS, PAHO, other) visits to Canada

- IAP draw upon CIDA specialists (health, gender and governance) as a resource team to provide advice on cross-sectoral program design and management.

In short, the sector reports conclude that IAP could have an important role to play as a communications hub for other bilateral programs, particularly those programming with major institutional partners such as the OAS and PAHO.

WHOLE-OF-GOVERNMENT…

The whole-of-government approach aims to address the Government of Canada's development priorities by employing the collective expertise and wisdom that different government departments bring to the table. To date in the IAP it has proven to be functional but most key informants indicate that it has fallen short of expectations. While cordial and at times cooperative, the agency configurations for both the PAHO and OAS – where the approach is most in evidence – generate less than the desired level of shared policy or strategic orientation to the partners.

- Health Sector, Canada-PAHO Configuration – While Health Canada is generally aware of IAP program components, PHAC representatives acknowledged that they have a limited understanding of the IAP program and its support to PAHO. IAP staff also are not generally conversant with the range of technical assistance PHAC and Health Canada provide in the region, or with PAHO[20]. The whole-of-Canada "approach" is largely applied to the task of preparing Canada's positions for PAHO's Directing Council meetings. The three organizations hold one or two face-to-face consultation meetings of technical level representatives and Directors. Canada's documents/positions for the meeting are drafted by Health Canada, with feedback sought from CIDA and PHAC. What is missing is a regular strategic policy dialogue amongst these government departments.

- Governance Sector, Canada-OAS Configuration – In the context of governance programming in the LAC region, this mainly involves CIDA and DFAIT, as the latter is the lead agency and is responsible for Canada's foreign policy agenda as well as liaising with international institutions such as the OAS. IAP and DFAIT do periodically meet to exchange information, and the relationship has been characterized by both as very good.

- As noted above, a key factor constraining the ability of IAP to foster better whole-of-government working relationships is that they do not take the lead role in the partnership. With PAHO and OAS, Health Canada and DFAIT are the lead representatives respectively. In these scenarios, IAP has the voluntary contributions to spend but not the overriding influence. According to key informants within CIDA, the best they can do in their non-lead role is to model collegial practices.

Virtually all stakeholders, both government and civil society, expressed this sentiment. PAHO senior management further suggests that they would like see the "the whole-of-Canada table" expanded to include representatives from key WHO Collaborating Centres who have been working with PAHO and selected Provincial Ministries of Health. This sentiment is consistent with the insights provided through the DFID, World Bank and EU commentaries on regional programming.

EXTERNAL COHERENCE

IAP is constrained in its ability to simultaneously place emphasis on the assurance of coherence with other related development actors in the region, and on management of the program, due to limited financial and staff resources. This is also true on the Canadian side where, as noted above, there are opportunities in the waiting to engage with key civil society organizations or development actors. According to one IAP representative, LAC regional analysis and networking are both functions that should be done more fully than can be managed with current match of staff to work load. For example, last year, approximately 70% of the Washington-based position was spent in a liaison role with strategic partners (OAS and PAHO mainly). The rest was available to scan the programming landscape for emergent possibilities. The DFID study highlights the importance of having properly skilled regional programming team resources in place to analyse, network and negotiate (see Section 4.1).

IAP has taken the lead internationally in the promotion of a programmatic approach in PAHO, the OAS among a few other entities. This action is consistent with the Paris Declaration principle of alignment. It is also borne out of an analysis of the practical complications associated with maintaining the funding relationship with strategic partners like PAHO and OAS on a project-by-project basis using a contribution agreement mechanism (See discussion in Chapter 5).

---

[20] The "whole-of-Government" approach to PAHO typically refers to Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) and CIDA-IAP. Health Canada officially represents the Government of Canada at the PAHO Directing Council. Representatives of PHAC and CIDA-IAP, plus DFAIT, are included in Canada's official delegation to the Directing Council.

The Americas Directorate/IAP has led by example, rather than waiting for a coordinated commitment by donors to shift from their traditional project-by-project orientation. IAP's rationale is straightforward – a change of this nature among donor organizations needs a champion and demonstration. As one IAP representative put it, "if we don't make the move, it is not clear that anyone else will". Of course, this comes with risks – by introducing the grant mechanism, CIDA has created a new way of working in the organization to which staff need to become accustomed. However, the demonstration effect of a granting approach is beginning to be noticed by other donors in both partner institutions according to several informants and IAP is starting to discuss its experience to date. Spain, for example, is reportedly moving toward a multi-year funding mechanism *vis-à-vis* the OAS. Even the U.S., historically a staunch advocate of project-based funding, is taking a closer look. As Canada/IAP engages with other donors on funding mechanisms, as is planned, there will be an opportunity for the Program to determine what role it will play in enabling PAHO and OAS to develop their donor coordination strategies.

Regarding the challenge of donor coordination, the governance sector specialist gleaned a cautionary perspective from his interviews at the OAS, CIDA and other governance partners. There is, he was told, a plethora of donors (both state and multilateral bodies) that support programming in democratic governance in the Americas. While many countries and institutions support these kinds of programs, the appetite for communication and coordination between them has traditionally been low, and there are few systems in place to ensure that duplication of programming does not take place. Notwithstanding, Canada as the largest voluntary contributor to OAS is probably best placed among donors to wade into a leadership role.

On the upside, both the governance and health sector studies find that Canada enjoys strong credibility within PAHO and OAS by virtue of its championship of the more flexible granting mechanism, its relatively generous support for institutional strengthening and its foreign policy disposition that continues to be seen as distinct from that of the U.S. From the Canadian side of the fence, several informants also volunteered that being a member of the partner organizations gives an additional level of potency to the arrangements. For better or worse, it allows the donor to exercise its agenda more forcefully than it might were it simply an external interested party. Such an assertion needs to be tempered with the experience put forward by DFID and the World Bank that suggests for success in regional programming donors should allow themselves both to influence and be influenced (see Section 4.1).

5.2   Efficiency

The evaluators were concerned about the following key aspects of efficiency:

- Program Management Aspects – IAP's movement from project to program focused programming, its deployment of staff and the effects of corporate level change exercises on IAP management decisions
- Institutional Aspects – the extent of efficiencies observed among IAP's strategic partners

Given the complexity of assessing efficiency of large institutions such as PAHO and OAS and lack of comparability with others, **the evaluators were unable to arrive upon a single assessment score**. However, they have made comments of the aspects noted above.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The 2005 evaluation commented on IAP for its exclusive reliance on project-based funding. As argued by the 2005 evaluators, project level funding yields fragmentation of effort and inefficiency (i.e. high transaction costs). And separate in-depth studies that examined the feasibility of programmatic funding to PAHO and OAS went further in stressing the deleterious effect the restrictive contribution agreement mechanism can have on the management and programming of multilateral organizations. In advocating for a shift toward a program focus, the evaluation pointed out attendant risks to the donor. Notable among them was the caution that, "BMI [IAP] cannot count on its partners to carry out [monitoring and evaluation activities] since many of them have yet to integrate efficient results based management and monitoring systems." The evaluation recommended that any shift toward a programmatic approach be accompanied by a substantial dose of institutional capacity building support.

Since 2005 the shift from project to programmatic funding has been substantial. Regarding the latter observation, about half of IAP's whole portfolio (2004-2005 to 2009-2010) is comprised of funds allocated through grants. The risks noted above have manifested in the quality of reporting though. As the sector studies found, the difficulties in establishing appropriate levels of accountability have hinged on both institutional capacity and on procedural understanding. Regarding the latter, expectations agreed upon in

cooperation agreements have neither been clear nor commonly understood. As it stands, the sector studies show that IAP's institutional strengthening activities are starting to generate efficiency (and effectiveness) dividends, though they are cautionary on the pace of change. And there is a unanimous agreement among key officials in CIDA and strategic partners that future wording on accountability expectations needs to be more explicit. As interpreted by the evaluators, key discussion points might include:

- Programming scope in relation to the institutions' programming suite and strategic priorities (to the extent that these exist) – discussion of elements common to the partner and to IAP

- The structure of the granting agreement

- Specificity on reporting expectations, content areas and levels (program, project, sub-project), focus (results vs activities), expectations around the inclusion of crosscutting themes, frequency, feedback expectations

- Use of evaluation as an accountability and learning tool, and responsibilities (CIDA, shared or joint) and support requirements for carrying them out

- Functional links between IAP and the strategic partner – roles and responsibilities

The sector studies pointed out two other factors that appear to have negatively influenced program efficiencies:

- The first is the level of staff turnover within IAP. In what is perhaps a more extreme case, the managers of one funded initiative reviewed for this evaluation dealt with seven program officers over the life of what was a seven-year program. For them the lack of continuity manifested in the shifting management styles and what appeared to be shifting reporting requirements. The evaluators understand that staff turnover is a corporate issue requiring a corporate response, however it is important to point out the dislocating effect of staff discontinuity when it is observed.

- The second has to do with the meshing of change management agendas; the overall efficiency of the IAP may have suffered during the review period as a result of pressures from the Government of Canada or from CIDA's senior management to undertake change management exercises which (to an outsider's viewpoint) might more logically have been undertaken at a different time. Three such instances came to the evaluator's attention:

    (i) IAP's Program Strategy 2009 and RDPF 2010-2015 were prepared prior to an evaluation being conducted of the Inter-American Program, and in the absence of any substantial external feedback on the IAP's performance in preceding years.

    (ii) The Annual Project/Program Performance Report (APPR) used for reporting on the progress of projects/programs, was abandoned by CIDA in 2009-2010 before it was replaced by another reporting vehicle. Interim measures, such as the abbreviated Management Summary Report, only partially compensated for this "information loss."

    (iii) The $18-million, five-year CATRTA Program was designed/approved in late 2009 and initiated at the start of 2010, prior to the completion – i.e. without the benefit – of the Baastel/WCC evaluation of the portfolio of TRTA projects.

INSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS

The sector studies made the following efficiency related observations about partner and about IAP-partner interactions. The examples below show a flexibility in program management which the evaluators judge to be very important for efficiency and ultimately aid effectiveness:

- Among private sector partners – at least half of the executing agencies have internal mechanisms geared to benchmarking and ensuring efficiency. In two of the sampled projects, the evaluator noted that partner agencies had achieved savings from investment of project funds, appreciation of the Canadian dollar, and (in one case) from the substitution of the agency's own resources for previously budgeted outside resources. With CIDA's approval, the savings were used for the implementation of additional activities which responded to requests for newly received assistance but which were totally unanticipated in the project design.

- In the health sector – the Planning, Budget and Resource Allocation office (PBR) provided detailed documentation on the process of the "funding gap analysis" that PAHO uses for its annual work plans, allocating funds which come in from different sources at varying intervals.

5.3   Management Principles

This evaluation criterion relates to three of the aid effectiveness principles, specifically:

- Ownership – developing countries set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions and tackle corruption.
- Alignment – donor countries align behind these objectives and use local systems.
- Harmonisation – donor countries coordinate, simplify procedures and share information to avoid duplication.

In 2005, IAP's evaluators concluded that the IAP was unable to maximize on the principles of aid effectiveness because of its lack of strategic orientation. The key, they proposed, was to focus on coherence, to increase chances of uptake by countries, and to continue to foster RBM. **Today, the evaluation finds IAP performance as "satisfactory" in relation to management principles.**

Indeed, the very nature of the IAP regional programming, particularly that focused on hemispheric partners, provides value added against the criteria of aid effectiveness. CIDA's engagement with these partners (OAS and PAHO principally) hinges on the Agency buying-in to the mandates, programs and systems of these regional organizations. IAP then uses a range of instruments to move toward regional goals, including engaging in policy dialogue, providing flexible resources through grant funding, and committing to institutional strengthening of key partner to enable them to fulfill their leadership roles in the region.

Other recipients of IAP funding are also ultimately responsible for setting their own agendas for addressing democratic governance priorities. Governance partners, CEJA and FOCAL for example, conduct institutional strengthening and policy dialogue initiatives following needs-assessment (formal and informal) discussions with allied institutions in the LAC region. The role of IAP has been to support these processes; the evaluators did not encounter any situations where the Program directed partner institutions to undertake specific projects.

In the private sector where there is no one partner institution to act as a focal point, the sector study finds implementing agencies making strenuous efforts to foster:

- localized involvement in design and implementation, as well as regional coordination mechanisms such as the Tripartite Committee (OAS, IDB, ECLAC)
- transfer of "ownership" or buy-in to projects by partners and beneficiaries, especially in the larger-value projects (ARPEL, CIAT)

Commentary on donor harmonization is addressed as a matter of external coherence in Section 5.1.

5.4   Performance Management

This section examines the strengths and weaknesses of IAP´s application of RBM – as per CIDA guidelines – to project design, rolling up and reporting on results, remedial action, and monitoring and evaluation.

The 2005 evaluation was unable to comment much on the application of performance management within IAP citing the still nascent state of the Program, the lack of a results framework to report against and the paucity of program level reporting. Today, the evaluators find in the IAP five more years of accumulated program experience across multiple sectors, a newly minted though largely untested results framework and an uneven body of reporting – some results focused, some not, some rich in description and analysis, some packed with generalizations, and all appealing to planned results at different levels. Furthermore, the evaluators find a Program with very little independent assessment through evaluation.

Overall, the evaluators assess the performance of IAP on performance management as "moderately satisfactory", though showing promising signs of improvement since 2009.

RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT (RBM) – PLANNING AND REPORTING

Across the sample of projects reviewed for the evaluation, IAP gets a mixed assessment on the way RBM has been used to plan, manage and report on projects.

Two of the five projects examined in the health sector study showed substantial application of RBM, and one showed some attention to results but did not develop indicators and the means to track progress. Significantly, one of the two projects that has used RBM reasonably well is the programmatic grant (Support to PAHO Health Program 2007-2010). The grant was developed through a series of consultations between

PAHO and the IAP. By all accounts it was an open, participatory and successful process, yielding a program basically aligned with both organizations' strategic priorities. The results and indicators for most of the program and institutional strengthening components appear to be well crafted. Reporting on the grant remains problematic for PAHO – there is a tendency to focus on activities and the procedure for combining data across programming areas is proving complicated.

In the governance sector the general picture is similar; three out of five partners could be said to be using RBM competently in the design of and reporting on projects. In this instance, the key strategic partner (OAS) is not one of them, at least not yet. Both plans and reports are substantially inconsistent in quality and the organization, like PAHO, struggles with the exercise of abstracting results from sub-project level upwards.

Noted as an efficiency issue, the health and governance sector studies discovered a high degree of confusion both on the CIDA side and in PAHO and OAS over reporting expectations under their respective granting arrangements.

CIDA has provided input to the OAS on a format for reporting on results. This has resulted in improved reporting in the second year of the grant. CIDA appears to have been reluctant to impose a reporting format beyond what was included in the initial grant agreements, and given unclear communication channels, these reporting inputs have not always been passed to all those involved in reporting on results. IAP recognizes the difficulty of bringing new performance management systems and approaches to organizations as large and complex as the OAS and PAHO. Efforts have been made but results have not been up to expectations.

According to the private sector development study, partners in four of the seven projects examined could be said to demonstrated a strong understanding of RBM principles and provided quality reporting, namely ECLAC, CBSA, and the two ARPEL projects (ESSA-AGP and ESSA-AEPIII).

Regarding the sometimes perceived "hands-off" nature of grants, direction is available from CIDA's Business Process Roadmap document. The 2007 version of this document advises that:

> "Although strictly speaking, a grant recipient does not have to account for the funds provided (the grant is unconditional), CIDA has decided as a matter of policy that all grant and contribution recipients are required to report on the progress and results achieved at either the project or program level". (CIDA "Business Process Roadmap" p.46)

This clause remains in effect at the time of writing. Clearer instruction on results-based reporting to strategic partners from CIDA is necessary and would be welcomed. The development of future programmatic grants will provide an opportunity for IAP to engage key program managers in an applied results-based exercise, which should include clear expectations, guidelines and examples on reporting.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The IAP has given little attention to evaluation over the review period. The evaluators are aware of the following evaluation activities, by sector:

- In the health sector – only one health project, the PCCD, underwent a mid-term evaluation in 2006. In this instance, the evaluation was built into the project plan with sufficient funds allocated for the activity.

- In the private sector – only one of the sampled projects (out of six which were closed or approaching termination) had undergone a project evaluation; this was the ARPEL Environment Project Phase III, a project with seasoned leadership and a budget which had sufficient funds allocated for such an exercise. A second evaluation was carried out (by Baastel/WCC) of a collection of trade related technical assistance projects, however project level detail was not provided, as the main intent was to inform CIDA and other donors at a higher program level.

- In the governance sector – the IAP commissioned a mid-term evaluation of the Indigenous Peoples Participation Program in 2008 as a pre-cursor for launching a final round of partnership projects before the program winds down in 2011. Beyond this, there is only one other evaluation within the sample: a mid-term evaluation of the Improvement of Justice Systems in Latin America CEJA project.

Regarding monitoring, the evaluators did not encounter any systematic monitoring process over the evaluation period. The evaluators learned of Program staff and external monitors making visits to partners in LAC but did not find much documentation to show what came from these interactions. There is one

exception to note in this regard. The health sector study reports that for the past three years, there has been an annual IAP visit[21] to PAHO Washington. This has constituted an informal monitoring exercise for the programmatic grant (Support to PAHO Health Program 2007-2010) as well as the other three projects. In these annual meetings, PAHO program managers present results to date as well as their proposed work plans for the coming year. By all reports, this has been a worthwhile exercise and the visit is seen as a valued aspect of the partnership, one which may serve as a model for other strategic partnerships to follow.

The principal format used by Project Officers for reporting on the progress of their projects, the Annual Project/Program Performance Report (APPR) was abandoned in the 2009-2010 fiscal year before it was replaced by another reporting vehicle. This meant that some information at the project level was lost from view in 2009-2010. Commentaries presented by some project officers for some projects using the abbreviated Management Summary Report format, and the material given in the Inter-American Program's Annual Program Performance Report for 2009-2010, only partially compensated for this "information loss".

The evaluators have become aware that the IAP story is much richer than can be captured by formal results based reports and that there are several examples where additional knowledge capture would be strategically helpful to CIDA and its partners. In some cases, knowledge capture outside of normal reporting rigours is important because the reporting requirements themselves often hinder the transfer of insight – perhaps results-based concepts are simply not understood or the frameworks are too prescriptive, too abstract or just out of step with reality.

RBM has proven to be a difficult package of tools and processes for many project proponents in the Indigenous Peoples Participation Program, for example. One consequence of this is that the program lacks a rounded picture of what has been achieved among the nearly 70 projects that have been completed to date. Where there appears to be a knowledge deficit in a program, it would seem sensible to put in place a knowledge capture exercise. The governance specialist is aware of at least a third of the projects under the OAS grant that could benefit from being better documented, and then showcased and networked both regionally and in specific country contexts. Of course, a knowledge capture exercise would have to have some purpose and direction that is relevant to the program, but the methodologies employed would be appropriate for capturing essential program insights.

And, speaking of "telling the story", the evaluators note that the IAP as a whole has not told its story to the extent that it could. Arguably this is important, first to raise the profile of IAP within CIDA and the aid community, but second to demonstrate through revealing stories the potential of regional programming (when done well) to enhance aid effectiveness and accelerate country development.

THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK (RDPF) 2010-2015

The Program Strategy 2009, a document approved by the Minister, guides the IAP's strategic orientation. The RDPF 2010-2015, approved by CIDA Senior Management, provides the IAP with a way to describe both its logic for implementing the Strategy, and its actual performance in comparison to that logic. It shows a considerable narrowing of the funding parameters for IAP. And it places Canada's and CIDA's agenda for the Americas front and centre. Drawing from the insights on regional programming of DFID, the World Bank and the EU, the clarity and focus that CIDA now brings to regional programming in LAC is helpful. This change could be classed as a determinant for success.

However, there are other important determinants including the willingness to engage in dialogue (see Section 4.1). Herein lies a concern for the evaluators. The RDPF was approved by senior management on the basis of general consultations with strategic partners but without direct engagement on the logic model, performance measurement framework and risk register. As protected documents these – along with the RDPF's main document – have not been formally presented to partners. Mostly, dialogue with partners centres on the specifics of that IAP-partner relationship. Several people consulted on this during the evaluation wonder whether the practice of keeping these program design documents in confidence is in keeping the Paris Principles. Without an open dialogue on the discussion of IAP's strategic priorities, its expected results and its measures of success, the evaluators fear that the IAP will not be able to maximize its potential, with its partners, to contribute to LAC's greatest development challenges. The high level

---

[21] Typically the visit includes the IAP Director, Program Manager, and Health Sector Specialist.

statements (the ultimate impact and intermediate outcome statements in the logic model) will not serve their purpose as drivers and shapers of program level activities – where there is no knowledge, there is no buy in.

Looking at the RDPF logic model, the evaluator suggests that the results claims as stated could provide substantial grist for strategy discussions with key partners. Not to use it with partners and not to be informed by partners on how to refine it would be a missed opportunity.

When actively used to manage programs and track their progress, logic models, performance measurement frameworks, and risk registers, can become more ever more attuned to the realities of the programming context. As compelling the current package of tools appears in its present form, the evaluators offer a few comments for consideration.

While gender equality is well spelled out, there is only one direct reference to environmental considerations and that is with reference to the relatively narrow field of TRTA. According to IAP, it is by design that their strategy for crosscutting issues links GE to the health sector, and environment to private sector development. However, if CIDA is serious about integrating environment as a crosscutting issue then some modification might be necessary to the performance measurement framework to ensure that these considerations remain on the radar while programs/projects are being implemented (see Section 4.4 for discussion).

Moving beyond the logic model and indicators to the IAP's risk register, the evaluators offer the following comments:

- The following risk is itemized as a 'development risk' – "there is a risk that there will be limited implementation and monitoring capacity or commitment of partner organizations that may hinder the partner's ability to achieve results". This is ranked as the number one risk. Here, the evaluators question why this is posited as a development risk. The assumption in the rest of the RDPF is that partners are to be "strategic hemispheric institutional associates" and as such sharing in the activities of the Program. If this is correct then the risk noted above should be considered an operational risk.

- The following risk is itemized as a 'development risk' – "there is a risk that the Inter-American Program will lose its strategic focus to meet emerging pressures in the Americas". This is ranked as number 9 risk. With the new Program Strategy 2009 and RDPF 2010-2015, the IAP is better equipped now than before to examine any emerging pressures (ideas or initiatives) along the more strategic lines of IAP's sharpened programming focus.

Similar to the argument posed above, a substantive risk analysis exercise could greatly assist IAP and its partners address the development challenges they face together. In turn, the discussion that emerges could enhance the rigour of such tools as the risk register.

6.0   Major Findings by Delivery Mechanism and Channel

This Chapter looks to see how the various means by which CIDA delivers the regional Program have influenced performance.   It specifically discusses the differentiation between grants and contributions agreements and the way that IAP has shifted toward the former over the evaluation period.

6.1   Background

All of the funding that IAP obtains for programs and projects comes from the Americas Directorate of the Geographic Programs Branch. CIDA has coined the term "multi-bi" to describe this channelling of bilateral funds through multilateral or regional organizations. Regarding delivery models, there is a mix of projects and programs that are mostly responsive in nature. Regarding funding mechanisms, the IAP uses grants and contributions mostly (either the contribution agreement or the contribution arrangement[22]), with the larger investments with multilateral organizations usually structured as grants.

Outliers in the pattern described above include:

- the Indigenous Peoples Partnership Program (IPPP) which up until its suspension in 2008 was administered as a development fund directly from CIDA

- the new program in trade related technical training/capacity building (which was approved in late 2009 and initiated in January 2010. The new CATRTA program is predominantly directive in nature, meaning that much of the programming is expected to originate from officials belonging to the technical cooperation committees which are engaged in negotiating bilateral or regional FTA agreements with Canada. In addition, responsibility for administration has been contracted out using a competitive bidding process, a move which bears many of the hallmarks of outsourcing.

6.2   Ratings by Delivery Model and Funding Mechanism

Table 6-1 indicates the specific characteristics of the sampled projects with respect to delivery model and funding mechanism.

Table 6-1: Characterization of Sampled IAP Projects – by Delivery Model and Funding Mechanism (current status)				
Implementing Agency	Health (6)	Private Sector (8)	Governance (9)	Multi- & Other (2)
Delivery Model	Responsive - 6	Responsive - 7 Directive - 1	Responsive -9	Responsive - 1 Directive - 1*
Funding Mechanism	Grant** - 6	Grant - 2 Contributions - 5 Contract - 1	Grant - 1 Contribution - 8	Contribution - 2

Sources: CIDA Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting – IAP Data 2010-23-07.
Notes: *There appears to be some conflicting information on this. The IPPP's PAD lists the project as Responsive, but the CFO Branch lists the project as Directive.
   **In the health sector, all contribution agreements were converted into grants in 2008 with the exception of one sub-component of one project (see Appendix C – Prevention and Control of Communicable Disease (PCCD) A030833-003).

From the calculation of simple averages based on project scoring data (see Appendix B), it has been possible in Table 6-2 to present summary project scores for responsive/directive delivery models and grant/contribution/contract funding mechanisms. It would be folly to draw any hard conclusions from the scores above.   Nevertheless, a few observations could be made in light of the findings elsewhere in evaluation:

- Scoring configurations show a general assessment rating for the IAP sample of projects in the "moderately satisfactory" category.

- There is no differential between "development results" scores (referring to the first four evaluation criteria) and the "management factors" category.

- There is a slight differential between projects funded by grants and those funded through contribution agreements. Regarding the latter, it is possible that the slightly higher average score for projects under the Contribution Agreement category speaks to the noted challenges in implementing a grant arrangement for the first time – notably the challenge of obtaining clearer results data for projects. The

---

[22] According to CIDA's own documentation, "contribution arrangement" is used by CIDA when dealing with foreign governments, international financial institutions and multilateral organizations such as the UN system. The word "agreement" implies the signing of a treaty or similar document. All the requirements of the Treasury Board Policy on Transfer Payments still apply to contribution arrangements.

lower score on both development results and on management factors would be affected by the quality of data being reported.

Table 6-2: Summary of Project Assessment Scores for the Projects in the IAP Sample – by Delivery Model and Funding Mechanism			
Delivery Model	Responsive (n=20)	Directive (n=1)	
Development Results – Average Score	3.8	2.3	
Management Factors – Average Score	3.9	2.0	
Funding Mechanism	Grant (n=9)	Contribution (n=12)	Other (n=1)
Development Results – Average Score	3.7	3.9	2.3
Management Factors – Average Score	3.7	4.0	2.4
Rating scale: 0 – 1 Not demonstrated, 1.1 – 2.0 = Unsatisfactory, 2.1 – 3.0 = Moderately Satisfactory, 3.1 – 4.0 = Satisfactory and 4.1 – 5.0 = Highly Satisfactory. Note: Of the 24 projects in the sample, 21 were scored (three were integrated into other projects for scoring purpose – see Appendix C) One additional project (CATRTA – A034331) was added to the sample for "special consideration" but was not formally assessed nor rated due to its newness.			

6.3 Funding Mechanisms and Due Diligence

As already noted, the 2005 evaluation of IAP argued for a shift from project to program centred activity. At about the same time an examination of the funding relationship between PAHO and IAP commented on the constraints imposed by the contribution agreement, which to that point, had been the sole transfer payment arrangement[23]. These two reports precipitated a trend within IAP toward a programmatic approach and an opening up of the possibility of issuing grants rather than the more restrictive contribution agreements. This 2010 evaluation finds that just under half (47.5%) of the funds disbursed between the beginning of 2004 and the end of 2009 have been administered as grants. In the project sample, the evaluators encountered nine grants across four institutions, including what have been recognized as IAP's key strategic partners (OAS and PAHO).

Grants are defined by the Treasury Board of Canada as…

> "…an unconditional transfer payment made to an individual or organization, which is not subject to being accounted for or audited but for which eligibility and entitlement may be verified or for which the recipient may need to meet pre-conditions" (CIDA Management Guide, February 2005, p.6).

CIDA is at liberty to use the grant, as opposed to the contribution agreement under the responsive delivery model. Historically within the Agency, grants have been considered the more appropriate mechanism for multilateral organizations though their use is not restricted to this type of recipient. A key here is that there must be a strong consistency between CIDA's policy and programming priorities, on the one hand, and the mandate and programs of the recipient, on the other. Approval of the grant agreement or arrangement is conditional upon a) meeting eligibility criteria, and b) an organizational assessment which determines that use of the grant mechanism will not expose CIDA to an unacceptable level of risk[24].

It is the responsibility of CIDA managers to perform a due diligence exercise on the candidate to determine whether or not they adequately match granting guidelines. There are thirteen criteria listed in the *Manager's Guide*. Four of these specifically focus on the internal capacity of the organization to competently deliver results. Phrased as questions they are:

- Does the organization have an acceptable reporting culture, and is it willing to provide regular financial and narrative reports that would permit CIDA to satisfy its accountabilities to Parliament and to the Canadian taxpayer for reporting on results?

- Has the organization been successful in achieving expected development cooperation results over at least the previous three years?

- Does the organization have adequate and appropriate management and financial systems in place to support the effective management and use of the funds transferred?

---

[23] See Lindores, Douglas (October 15, 2004), Report on the CIDA Americas Branch/PAHO Working Relationship.

[24] According to CIDA's own documentation, "contribution arrangement" is used by CIDA when dealing with foreign governments, international financial institutions and multilateral organizations such as the UN system. The word "agreement" implies the signing of a treaty or similar document. All the requirements of the Treasury Board Policy on Transfer Payments still apply to contribution arrangements.

- Are there competent managers and staff deployed by the organization, using the management and financial systems in an effective manner?

The evaluation is able to confirm that due diligence exercises were carried out on PAHO, OAS and IDB before they were approved for grant funding. They did not encounter relevant documentation with regard to CIAT, but that is not to say that such an exercise was not done. What is instructive about the due diligence exercise, as observed in the cases of PAHO and OAS, is that the question of what constitutes acceptable risk remains largely an open question, and perhaps necessarily so. There are many case-by-case aspects to be taken into consideration and argued.

With OAS, for example, the recommendation from the consultant to proceed with a grant came with an acknowledgement that the organization operated with significant deficiencies in its administrative make up – items that would have showed up in addressing the four questions above. The case for proceeding with the grant hinged on the argument that, for many reasons specific to OAS, to place on the organization the restrictive and "cumbersome" contribution agreement mechanism would yield less benefit (and possibly more grief through non-compliance) than to offer a grant with support for addressing the deficiencies.

The evaluators can see that there are clearly pro's and con's to which arrangement is better and will not weigh in on the debate with anything more than the observation that decision-making wherever it is located should be both observant of guidelines/criteria and sensitive to the inevitable nuances that will present in each case.

7.0   Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

The report closes with concluding remarks, an offering of key insights gained through the evaluation that may be of relevance to development practitioners engaged in regional programming, and a set of recommendations to guide the IAP on its onward journey.

7.1   Conclusions

Complex Challenging Regional Context: The regional context in which the IAP has been operating is complex and dynamic. Despite economic growth during the period of this evaluation, progress across the region remains variable across and within countries. In spite of the region's proliferation of middle-income countries, income inequality – notoriously high on a global scale – persists, albeit with signs of moderation. Improvement trends shown on most health indicators, while welcomed, bring attention to those marginalized groups yet to feel the benefits – indigenous and African-descendent populations in particular. Overtly, democratization proceeds but with continuing concerns that the fundamentals of good governance – all that is required to build a culture of democracy – remain to take hold in most parts of the hemisphere.

The Big Picture of Development Assistance is Evolving: At the same time, broad patterns of development cooperation have been evolving, as has Canada's positioning in this global endeavour. It has become clear that official development assistance is a small player in the big picture of development finance. This has brought poignancy to the question of what ODA can most usefully contribute to the region's development. It is a question of leverage, one of many leverage questions of interest to this evaluation.

Dynamic Interaction with Multiple Players: The IAP's institutional context is marked by a multiplicity of players. Within CIDA, IAP takes its place as one of six regional cooperation programs in an Agency, indeed an ODA community, which has historically channelled its support to country groupings or to global organizations. Since inception and up to this day IAP has struggled to define and show its value proposition. Up until the middle of the evaluation period the Program was ensconced in the role of responding to Canada's commitments emerging from the Summits of the Americas process. Indeed, some have characterized the IAP as a convenient place to park projects that did not fit elsewhere. Despite the efforts of its program managers, post 2005, to give the Program a strategic backbone, this only began to take shape in 2009 when CIDA mandated programs like IAP to take on a strategic focus. And so, the evaluation finds IAP strengthened with its newfound strategy, built up as a newly constituted team and seeking ways to show its contribution and maximize its leverage within the America's Directorate, among other parts of the Agency at headquarters, among its whole-of-government colleagues, and at the CIDA offices across the region.

From Unfocused to Key Strategic Programming: Among other things, the 2005 evaluation described IAP as being unfocused and project-centred. Since then, the Program has narrowed its scope of programming and shifted a great deal of its portfolio of projects into a programmatic mode of delivery. At the time of writing, IAP is concluding a first grant cycle with two key hemispheric organizations – OAS and PAHO. The evaluation concludes that under the granting structure, both have generated development dividends in their respective sectors. CIDA assumed some risk in moving to a programming approach with grants – in the LAC ODA context, Canada is at the forefront among donors in modeling the types of development relationships advocated for in the Paris Declaration. On balance, the evaluation concludes that it has been worthwhile, though it recognizes there have been shortcomings. Moving forward, the evaluators could find no reason not to pursue another grant cycle with each partner provided that all parties pay attention to detail in the up-front negotiation process, particularly as it pertains to accountability expectations and the articulation of institutional strengthening priorities for the next cycle. In wishing to build strong hemispheric partnerships, CIDA should be emboldened by recent assessments of regional programming by DFID, the EU and the World Bank that assert the importance of building strong multi-faceted relationships with regional partners.

Development Performance is "Satisfactory": This takes into consideration: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and the incorporation of GE and environment considerations. In the sample, the evaluators encountered regional partners with mandates well attuned to the CIDA priorities and producing an array of output and outcome results more or less in keeping with the expectations of each funding agreement. In no instance did the evaluators encounter projects operating at substantial variance to expectations, though the governance sector study drew attention to the OAS's difficulty claiming and then tracking governance enhancing results within member countries. On the whole, prospects for sustainability of program results are strong by virtue of IAP's choice of regional partners – all partners are well established within the region, most show strong connections to their key constituency groups, and many show high or improving levels of

management competency. The OAS and PAHO are hemispheric bodies with relatively permanent mandates and Canadian member engagement. Regarding the integration of CIDA's crosscutting themes, IAP's performance has been generally poor to date. Up-front attention to GE and environment by CIDA specialists and program staff has not translated into a pattern of sustained attention in the lives of the projects.

Management Performance is "Satisfactory": This takes into consideration management factors such as: coherence, efficiency, management principles (Paris Declaration), and performance management. Regarding management aspects – and the coherence of IAP within CIDA and outwards across the spectrum of interested parties – the evaluation finds IAP making solid attempts to raise its profile in CIDA at home and in the field, and it appears to be making headway as its defining qualities have now become clearer under the RDPF. By all accounts it remains an uphill battle – many staff encountered during the evaluation remain unsure what IAP and regional programming in general brings to the table. Beyond CIDA, IAP has engaged in whole-of-government exercises and while functional the approach has yet to meet expectations regarding shared strategic focus. Reconciling different agendas and power differentials, busy timetables and different organizational cultures is challenging. While IAP may participate in whole-of-government configurations with the largest tranche of funds, it does not lead the whole-of-government approach *vis-à-vis* its partners, it can only model the practices it would like to see amongst its organizational colleagues.

Whole-of-Canada Approach Not Yet There: Extending beyond government, there appear to be missed opportunities to engage other interested parties in the relationship – to extend to a whole-of-Canada approach. As noted most strongly in the health sector study, there appear to be other policy and programming perspectives out there that could usefully be brought to the table. In the region, the historically scattered nature of the program portfolio has yielded less cross-fertilization than would be desirable; what has been witnessed has happened more by circumstance than by design. One potentially instructive exception from the private sector component is the collaborative work observed by three partners in the delivery of TRTA projects. There appears to be plenty of scope to orchestrate complementarity among partners and projects as well as between IAP and other parts of CIDA. The drive for complementarity should follow the principle that regional programming initiatives have sufficient grounding in-country to ensure expected results meet their mark.

Regional versus Sub-Regional: The IAP portfolio contains regional and sub-regional projects. Indeed the evaluators conclude that sub-regional initiatives have potential to enhance relevance to development challenges and sustainability of project benefits. It is critical to ensure that the principle of 'subsidiarity' is applied, i.e. that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority. The error would be in IAP supporting partners and projects to carry out activities that could best be implemented at a sub-regional or national level.

What Does Real Partnership Mean? The evaluation finds two conflicting trends *vis-à-vis* IAP's adherence to aid effectiveness principles. One the one hand, the Program has championed those principles in the way it has shifted from its historic use of project funding to an openness to entertain programmatic approaches, using grants. With both PAHO and OAS, CIDA's use of the grant mechanism places Canada as a leader among donors in applying the Paris principles. At the same time, the Program appears to have displayed a guarded disposition toward its partners in the development of its RDPF. For IAP's strategic partners not to be formally engaged in the full development of the program design arguably shows some disregard for those principles.

Much Improvement Needed Regarding Performance Management: Regarding IAP's application of performance management tools and processes, the evaluators point to the new RDPF as a hugely important step forward in giving the Program something concrete to report against. IAP is in a better position than it has ever been to draw together a compelling results story from its multifaceted investments. The prospects for doing this well hinge partly on partner competencies in RBM and partly on the capacity of IAP's own project officers to pull the story together from diverse sources. To this point, IAP has done well in supporting RBM capacity where it is seen to be weak. Related to the comment immediately above, the evaluators urge that the results framework become a tool to guide an IAP discourse on regional programming objectives and that it be influenced by this discourse over time.

7.2   Lessons Learned

The evaluators offer the following insights from their review of IAP, which will be incorporated in the Evaluation Directorate's dissemination of evaluation knowledge activities.

- **On Regional Programming in Governance…**

    Positive change in democratic governance at the state level is an incremental process that often requires more time to produce results than can be accommodated within a given project cycle. From a regional programming perspective – the changes sought require strong networking across organization/sector boundaries, application of strong analytical skills on the part of the implementors and in some instances careful orchestration of multiple, mutually reinforcing initiatives instigated regionally and/or in-country.

- **On the Merits of Sub-Regional Programming…**

    PAHO, the OAS and IDB have focused some of their programming at the sub-regional level. Above all, the approach allows these regional/hemispheric bodies to attune programming to context and to engage stakeholders more fully. This is instructive to IAP as a regional program with an historic bent on being hemispheric in its outlook. One could imagine that the more a regional program like IAP is attuned to sub-regional activities, the more likely it is that regional and country programs could reinforce each other – for true value added.

- **On Strategic Partnering and the Use of Grants…**

    When working through multidimensional multilateral organizations such as the OAS and PAHO, which carry out multiple initiatives and fit well with donor mandates and strategic directions, a grant arrangement appears to be the appropriate funding mechanism to manage the relationship. That said, due diligence requirements must be met and reviewed periodically. The donor must have assurance that resources are being used in accordance with agreed upon expectations. It is critically important that managers on both sides understand the terms of reference in the same way. Wording must be specific on accountability aspects – management and reporting systems –- and on institutional strengthening commitments (e.g. related to gender equality). A grant arrangement with an institution like PAHO and OAS – where the donor country is a member – allows the regional program to operate simultaneously at three levels: policy dialogue, programming and institutional strengthening. This has great advantages. The more that donor and host organization are mindful of the interplay of three levels, the more activities can be calibrated for mutually reinforcing benefits that contribute positively to development effectiveness.

- **On Institutional Strengthening…**

    Institutional strengthening initiatives on such topics as results-based management and gender equality involve organizational culture shifts. Such shifts are time consuming and resource intensive, particularly when undertaken in a complex and geographically dispersed organization such as PAHO or the OAS. While the policy documents, frameworks and technology adaptations are important, the human behavioural components often take the most time and effort. Lag times and the need for iterative training that is applied to real situations and program examples must be factored into any program design.

- **On the Importance of Maintaining Flexibility in Project Design and Management…**

    As demonstrated by some of the projects in the IAP's PSD component, substantial benefits can accrue from designing projects which have a certain amount of built-in malleability.   Such a feature permits implementing agencies and CIDA project officers to exercise adaptive management (over specific activities, timing and even partnering arrangements) in the face of changing circumstances in the project context and broader aid environment. A review of those IAP projects which are deemed to be the most successful would likely show, among other characteristics, project designs which are not over-specified and project leadership (both within the IAP unit and the implementing agencies) which is energized, capable and consistent over time.

7.3   Recommendations and Corporate Considerations

> **"Give me a lever long enough and a place to stand and I will move the earth" - Archimedes**

In this closing section, the evaluators identify eight aspects of program design and delivery that could be strengthened. Three items are offered to CIDA as a whole as corporate considerations, while the rest are addressed as recommendations to the IAP team within the Americas Directorate.

To invoke Archimedes' Principle of the Lever, these suggestions and recommendations represent ways the evaluation team believes CIDA and IAP can shift the fulcrum in a direction that gives what is a modestly funded program in the large schema of ODA greater leverage to address the development challenges of the region.

This report underlines what is in the literature about IAP's programming context. In the realm of hemispheric cooperation, official development assistance makes up a very small part of the development finance flowing into the region. Observers are asking, "how can it best be utilized to leverage sustainable development outcomes?" The question also rings true for IAP within the context of Canada's contribution.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IAP

Recommendation #1 – IAP should intensify its information and coordination role with other CIDA and Canadian programs in the region in support of Canada's development cooperation efforts in LAC, by strengthening its analysis, networking and communication capability.

The key intent of this enhanced function would be to provide CIDA (HQ and post) and other government departments with up-to-date insight on emergent issues and opportunities, and on the status of key regional partners. It would also serve to sharpen IAP's value-added to the development community.

To play this role, the Program would have to increase its allocation of operating funds to program-related analysis and networking. It may require an increased staff presence in Washington D.C or in LAC itself. This may have implications on how team resources are allocated between a) program management/liaison; b) policy dialogue; and c) research, analysis, networking and information dissemination. There is an assertion in the DFID synthesis evaluation of regional programming that attention to procedural aspects of regional programming is as important as the programming itself. This would suggest that a case could be argued for drawing modestly from Program spending to cover the costs required to play such role.

As gleaned from the regional programming experiences of the World Bank, DFID and EU the instigator of a regional program does well to listen and follow cues from the region, but that is not to say that the instigator should not also assert its own interests. Canada's/CIDAs foreign policy/foreign aid policy priorities for LAC have sharpened within the period of this evaluation and are likely to continue to be expressed in Canada's whole-of-government approaches. Strengthening IAPs presence with partners would contribute to this.

Recommendation #2 – IAP should strengthen the integration of gender equality and environment by developing its own action plans that each set out specifically how the Program will keep these cross cutting issues on the agenda with strategic partners and throughout the program/project cycle.

In the case of gender, the plan would be written with reference to IAP's Gender Strategy and the newly minted CIDA Gender Action Plan. It would elaborate upon IAPs approach to handling gender equality as a cross cutting issue and would specify the following kinds of actions for the IAP team:

- GE training and support for IAP staff at the middle and senior management levels, and implementation of accountability mechanisms such as inclusion of gender equality responsibilities in job descriptions and performance reviews which are based on gender equality results.

- Confirmation and clarification of partner monitoring and reporting expectations against agreed gender equality results including those itemized in IAP's Performance Measurement Framework.

- Collegial bridging between the gender units of strategic partners and CIDA for the purposes of: a) sharing gender equality tools and tips for gender mainstreaming as well as unit development strategies, b) extending technical support on specific programs/projects.

In the case of environment, the plan would be written with reference to the Cabinet Directive on the Environmental Assessment of Policy, Plan and Program Proposals and to CIDA's SEA Handbook. It would build upon the December 2009, Environmental Sustainability Analysis that was prepared for IAP, elaborate IAP's approach to handling environment as a crosscutting issue, and specify the following kinds of actions:

- Environment training and support for IAP staff at the middle and senior management levels

- Inclusion of environment related indicators in the IAP Performance Measurement Framework; confirmation and clarification of partner monitoring and reporting expectations against agreed environment results including those itemized in IAP's Performance Measurement Framework.

- Collegial bridging between the environmental units/offices of strategic partners and CIDA for the purposes of: a) sharing environment tools and tips as well as unit development strategies, b) extending technical support on specific programs/projects

Recommendation #3 – IAP should invest in regional and sub-regional programming through new ideas, new players and new funding mechanisms (such as joint funding, public-private partnerships).

IAP should continue to equip itself with the methods, protocols and staffing configuration to be a nimble hemispheric funder. It should be ready to work with and independent from its current stable of trusted strategic partners such that it can rapidly identify and provide support for relevant programming and organizations regionally or sub-regionally. Strong networking and analysis capacity will be essential.

In choosing where to allocate resources, IAP should pay special attention to the following regional programming considerations: a) potential for bolstering existing IAP supported initiatives or other CIDA supported programming, and b) the principle of subsidiarity (…that matters ought to be handled by the lowest, smallest or least centralized competent authority) and assurance that where resources are to placed within the region there is sufficient in-country capacity and readiness within government, the private sector or civil society to make use of the support. While cognizant of attendant risks, IAP should be ready to test out different funding mechanisms to the extent that they: a) build regional capacity to support development efforts, b) concentrate/coordinate donor resources, c) fit with partners' evolving strategies, and d) provide for appropriate levels of accountability.

Recommendation #4 – IAP should invest in performance management including the new Program-level performance measurement framework, developing an evaluation plan, and continuing to provide RBM support to partner organizations.

Among strategic partners, IAP should continue to provide RBM support, as needs are determined. This is top priority – the results story of IAP absolutely depends on this. Support could come in the form of continued training/mentoring, technical support for systems development, creation of best practice case examples, creation of planning, risk management and reporting templates. The focus should be on a) attaining acceptable levels of results reporting, and b) ensuring that results reporting is feeding management decision-making. At the Program level, IAP should use this first year of the new logic model and performance measurement framework to test and adjust: program level indicators, reporting tools and templates, the methods required to roll up partner/project level reporting and convert this information into useful program level performance information.

IAP should complement its new performance measurement system with a program/project evaluation strategy in which, each year, IAP identifies those parts of its portfolio that should be subject to evaluation. IAP program staff and strategic partner key contacts should have the same understanding of the scope for evaluation under program granting arrangements. This understanding should be specified in grant documents/cooperation agreements.

Finally, and of lesser priority, IAP should reserve a modest pool of resources to support applied research where no alternative sources of this support are readily available. This refers to information gathering that engenders program learning but that falls outside of evaluation or results based monitoring. To close the circle, IAP needs to know what it has achieved so that it can shape the regional Program agenda on the strength of LAC trends and Program evidence. The evaluation shows that, to date, IAP and its partners have

not told their results story in a consistent way through reporting and there has been little in the way of independent evaluation.

Recommendation #5 – IAP should continue to engage partner organizations regarding performance management (reporting on results, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) and take great care to spell out expectations and mitigate partner weaknesses in this and other areas, during up-front negotiations of funding agreements especially with grant recipients.

Where grant agreements appear to be the most appropriate funding mechanism through which to support the partner, IAP should follow the due diligence assessment process set out in the Managers Guide to CIDA Grants, ensuring that there is an adequate basis for determining CIDA's risk exposure. Further, in negotiating grant agreements, IAP should ensure that: a) institutional strengthening aspects identified in the assessment – e.g. financial and results accountability, competencies related to gender equality and other cross-cutting issues – are addressed in the agreement with strengthening activities and planned results, b) the wording of grant agreements is specific and commonly understood by the signators.

In a regional programming context, the mechanism benefits an institution that has a proven track record and the potential to extend reach and influence in a manner consistent with the donor's strategic interests. However, the granting procedure must be handled with care since what is agreed upon up front greatly conditions the donor-partner relationship from that point forward. A key lesson from one round of granting is that when the wording is not precise expectations become obscure.

CORPORATE CONSIDERATIONS

In the course of the evaluation, three issues of a corporate nature that would have a bearing on the effectiveness of the Program surfaced. These are identified below as corporate considerations instead of recommendations, in recognition that the Agency is aware of them and measures have already been taken, or are in progress, to alleviate the constraints posed.

Consideration #1 – It is important for IAP to enlarge the circle of actors involved in Program-level discussions in a transparent way to include strategic partners, key whole-of-government agencies, CIDA country programs, and a select group of other interested parties in Canada and LAC based on their potential to contribute to the regional cooperation effort.

Consideration #2 – It is important for IAP to have the flexibility to adjust its Program Strategy or RDPF, as may be required, in the context of major events arising in the region, and schedule the next programming cycle to benefit from Program evaluation feedback.

Consideration #3 – In pursuing high-level change management agendas focused on improving effectiveness and efficiency, it is important that CIDA place priority on minimizing disruption to partnerships and operations. This would include formulating and implementing strategies aimed at curbing project officer turnover, and allowing enough time and flexibility for IAP to make programming adjustments based on sound knowledge.

The advent of the new RDPF in 2009 provides much needed definition and desired Program level results to strive toward. For regional program partners, among other key parties, to share more fully in the perspective that it offers, IAP needs a relation with its regional program constituency of partners, its whole-of-Canada/Government constituency of interested groups and its CIDA colleagues that is transparent and perceived as such. It needs to allow these groups to be part of the larger program perspective from design through to implementation.

This does not appear to have been possible given CIDA protocols surrounding the formulation of these documents at the time IAP's new Program Strategy and RDPF were being developed. However, after the Government of Canada announced its Aid Effectiveness Agenda in 2009, the requirement for consultations with stakeholders when planning country/regional program strategies resumed throughout the Agency. In addition, to meet the commitments of its management response to the Auditor General's 2009 recommendations, the Agency is now posting summaries of country/regional strategies on its website.

The latitude to more fully engage stakeholders in Program development and share information with them would go a long way toward providing the IAP the enabling environment it needs to address the region's development challenges.

Appendix A: Terms of Reference Summary

Context

The Federal Accountability Act (2006) requires that all programs be evaluated every five years. The Inter-American Program (IAP) was established in 2001. CIDA commissioned a Prospective Study in 2005 that included a retrospective review of the IAP. However considering the IAP's short existence and lack of strategic structure at the time, the Study devoted efforts primarily to the prospective aspect, which provides a basis for the present Regional Program Evaluation (RPE). The IAP is one of CIDA's Middle-Income Regional Programs. This RPE, to be carried out between July 2010 and January 2011, covers a period of six (6) fiscal years from 2004-2005 to 2009-2010.

Objectives of the Evaluation

- To take stock of the results achieved by the IAP over the most recent programming period.
- To assess the IAP's overall performance in achieving these results
- To examine key issues pertaining to the IAP as a hemispheric program in the Americas, and assess, based on past experience, the relevance of implementing a regional approach in the Americas and its value compared to the classic bilateral approach.
- To assess the performance of the IAP's delivery models including grants and contributions.
- To document and disseminate findings, success stories and lessons learned, and formulate recommendations to improve the performance of IAP's recently approved Program Strategy.

This RPE will review IAP's regional program and will consider a sample of projects during the period under review (2004-2010) in order to be able to document results.

Scope and Channels of Cooperation

Bilateral expenditures coded under the 'hemispheric' heading have increased exponentially in recent years, from less than $4M per year before the 2001 Summit of the Americas (Québec City) to $10M-$20M after the Summit. Since the 2005 Summit (Mar del Plata) disbursements have ranged from $25M-$30M. The IAP's budget (April 2004 to Dec. 2009) totalled $215.8M. The governance sector accounted for 34.5% ($74.4M), private sector development for 25% ($53.9M), and health for 19.4% ($41.7M). These three sectors represented almost 80% of IAP's budget for the period under review.

Almost all of IAP's programming was responsive (92.5%) as opposed to directive (7.5%). Almost two-thirds was through projects (61.1%), one-third through programs (31.7%), a modest amount was institutional support/core funding (4.4%) a small percentage (2.8%) was PBAs (pooled funding).

Evaluation Key Questions and Criteria

The Evaluation will respond to two key questions and various criteria agreed upon internationally:

Question 1 – What has been achieved?

- Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of the development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities, and partners' and donors' policies.
- Effectiveness/Results: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- Sustainability and Risks: The continuation of the benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.
- Crosscutting Issues: The treatment of the crosscutting issues the Program established (gender equality, environment), and governance).

Question 2 – How were intended results achieved?

- Coherence: Consistency of development interventions among development actors including governmental, non-governmental and international organizations.
- Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) are converted to results.
- Management Principles: In relation to Paris Declaration principles of ownership, alignment and harmonization.
- Performance Management: Including results-based management (RBM) and the monitoring and evaluation functions.

Evaluation Methodology

Data Gathering and Analysis:

The RPE will maintain a three-tiered perspective in addressing the key evaluation questions:

- Programmatic – examination of delivery mechanisms and strategies (advantages and disadvantages of the grants and contributions mechanism) and IAP results against expectations.

- Institutional – examination of the relevance of partner (principally OAS and PAHO) mandates to the IAP strategy, their performance in managing IAP funded activities, and the sustainability of the results flowing from these activities.

- Project – design, delivery and results of IAP-funded initiatives.

Three main data gathering methods will be employed to ensure getting multiple lines of evidence:

- Document review: including past evaluations and Program/project documents from CIDA, partner institutions and the international community.

- Interviews: including CIDA, other Canadian government departments, local government officials, representatives from the partner organizations and international community.

- Project visits: of a selected number of projects in various sectors and areas in the Americas.

Sampling

The RPE cannot review all the projects supported by IAP during the period under review. The sampling methodology will be based on the following criteria:

- Sectoral and thematic coverage: The sample represents at least half of the Program's total budget, and a substantive proportion (40%-50%) of its sectoral and thematic value.

- Delivery mechanisms: The sample includes bilateral directive/responsive projects, and program-based approaches (PBAs).

- Channels of cooperation: Will be mainly bilateral (including "multi-bi").

- Evaluability: investments that are substantive enough (minimum approved budget of $250,000) and for which sources of information are available and accessible cost-effectively.

The sample will include 22 projects valued at about $141M (64%): 8 in governance, 7 in private sector development, 5 in health, 2 in multi/other-sectors. Interviews and site visits will take place in Washington D.C. (where OAS and PAHO are headquartered) and selected countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC).

Evaluation Team and Responsibilities

The CIDA Senior Evaluation Manager, Dr. Rémy Beaulieu will lead the process, assisted by Michèle Samné. The Inter-American Program will be fully involved. A team of professionals from Plan:Net Limited has been hired.

Plan:Net Limited

- Team Lead/Program-level issues – Philip Cox

- Health/PAHO institutional relationship – Sheila Robinson & Susan Smith

- Governance/OAS institutional relationship – Corin Chater

- Private Sector Development/economic reforms – Paul Cox

- Gender Specialist – Nicola Main-Thomson

- Environment Specialist – Bruce Smedley

CIDA – Evaluation Directorate

- Senior Evaluation Manager: Dr. Rémy Beaulieu

- Evaluation Manager: Michèle Samné

Calendar of activities

A tentative calendar of activities follows. It can be affected and modified according to administrative and political considerations:

- July 2010: First Evaluation Team meeting at CIDA

- August 2010: Draft Work Plan

- September 2010: Hold interviews in Canada (CIDA and other Canadian government departments)

- Sep. 19-Oct. 8, 2010: Visits (to Washington and selected countries in LAC) by CIDA Evaluation Directorate and Plan:Net Evaluation Team

- November 2010: Draft Technical Reports

- January 2011: Draft Synthesis Report

- February 2011: Management Response

- February 22, 2011: Presentation to the CIDA Evaluation Committee

- April-May 2011: Translation and publication of the Evaluation Report on the CIDA Web Site

43

Appendix B: Program-Level Assessment Scores (by Sector)

PROGRAM-LEVEL ASSESSMENT SCORES				
Evaluation Criteria*	**Health**	**Governance**	**Private Sector Development**	**Average Program-level Score**
1. Relevance	4.4	4.2	4.1	**4.23**
2. Effectiveness	3.7	3.7	3.4	**3.60**
3. Sustainability	3.6	3.7	4.2	**3.83**
4. Crosscutting Issues	2.6	2.6	3.1	**2.76**
5. Coherence	2.0	3.4	3.3	**2.90**
6. Efficiency	3.9	Unable to score	Unable to score	**3.90**
7. Management Principles	3.8	4.2	4.2	**4.06**
8. Performance Management	2.5	2.5	2.5	**2.50**
Overall Rating (by Sector)	**3.31**	**3.47**	**3.54**	**3.44**

Rating Scale: 4.1-5 Highly satisfactory, 3.1-4 Satisfactory, 2.1-3 Moderately satisfactory, 1.1-2 Unsatisfactory, 0-1: Very unsatisfactory
Source: Sector Reports on the Governance, Health, and Private Sector Development Components of CIDA's Inter-American Program– December 2010

Appendix C: List of Project Samples (by Sector)

				SAMPLE OF HEALTH SECTOR PROJECTS					
Project Number	Project Name	Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Investment Type	Modality	Funding Mechanism	Total Budget (2004-2005 to-2009-2010)	Disbursements (2004-2005 to 2009-2010)
A033041-001	Support To PAHO Health Program	2007/01/31	2011/04/29	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Grant	18,000,000	18,000,000
A032223-001	Cdn Intl Immunization Initiative (CIII)	2003/10/09	2010/06/30	Operational	Programs	Responsive	Grant	10,300,000	8,600,000
A030833-003	Prevention and Control of Communicable Disease (PCCD) *	2002/04/12	2010/12/31	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Grant	9,263,851	9,263,851
A030833-001	Prevention and Control Of Communicable Disease (PCCD) *	2002/04/12	2010/12/31	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	1,949,919	740,000
A034524-001	PAHO Immediate Response To H1N1 Pandemic	2009/11/20	2011/02/28	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Grant	2,000,000	2,000,000
A032875-001	Consultant Trust Fund	2005/12/01	2010/06/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Grant	500,000	500,000
Health Sector – Sub-total								**$42,013,771**	**$39,103,851**

Source: This table contains information supplied by CIDA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting, on 2010-07-23.
Notes: *Prevention and Control of Communicable Diseases (A030833) is one project; listed twice to delineate the grant and contribution components.

				SAMPLE OF "MULTI-SECTOR" AND "OTHER" SECTOR PROJECTS					
Project Number	Project Name	Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Investment Type	Modality	Funding Mechanism	Total Budget (2004-2005 to-2009-2010)	Disbursements (2004-2005 to 2009-2010)
A031825-001	Indigenous Peoples Partnership Program (IPPP)*	2001/02/26	2011/03/31	Operational	Programs	Directive	Contribution	9,780,000*	4,310,000
A031148-001	Geoscience for Andean Poor Communities	2001/04/02	2009/10/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	12,500,000	8,740,000
'Multi-' and 'Other' Sector – Sub-total								**$22,280,000**	**$13,050,000**

Source: This table contains information supplied by CIDA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting, on 2010-07-23.
Notes: *IPPP (A031825) was approved in 2002 (prior to the period covered by the evaluation) with a total budget of $10 million.

	SAMPLE OF GOVERNANCE SECTOR PROJECTS								
Project Number	Project Name	Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Investment Type	Modality	Funding Mechanism	Total Budget (2004-2005 to-2009-2010)	Disbursements (2004-2005 to 2009-2010)
A034258-001	Grant to OAS Programming	2008/02/07	2011/03/31	Operational	Programs	Responsive	Grant	20,000,000	13,000,000
A033159-001	Improvement of Justice Systems in L.A. (CEJA)	2007/01/26	2012/02/27	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	4,950,000	2,710,000
A032116-001	Inst Strength Criminal Justice ProcRef (CEJA)	2003/06/13	2006/06/13	Closed	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	2,039,236	1,410,000
A033107-001	Inter-Amer Inst & Comm Human Rights (IACHR/IIHR)	2005/12/08	2011/05/31	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	3,200,000	1,390,000
A032638-001	Knowledge for development (FOCAL) *	2005/06/01	2009/12/31	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	2,595,000	2,550,000
A034315-001	D2D - FOCAL Knowledge for Development 3 *	2008/04/01	2011/07/01	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	3,000,001	1,020,000
A033025-001	OAS Electoral Assistance Phase I	2005/10/14	2008/06/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	600,000	600,000
A033551-001	OAS - Electoral Assistance Phase II **	2006/12/18	2008/09/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	1,200,000	1,200,000
A033674-001	OAS Financial Systems **	2007/03/30	2009/06/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	1,200,000	1,200,000
Governance Sector – Sub-total								**$38,784,237**	**$25,080,000**

Source: This table contains information supplied by CIDA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting, on 2010-07-23.
Notes: *The FOCAL projects (A032638 and A034315) were rated as one.
**The OAS Electoral Assistance projects (A033025 and A033551) were rated as one.

	SAMPLE OF PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS								
Project Number	Project Name	Start Date	Completion Date	Status	Investment Type	Modality	Funding Mechanism	Total Budget (2004-2005 to-2009-2010)	Disbursements (2004-2005 to 2009-2010)
A032413-001	Combating Hidden Hunger in Latin America	2004/09/01	2010/12/31	Operational	Programs	Responsive	Grant	20,000,000	20,000,000
A032132-001	Canada Trade Fund *	2003/11/13	2011/12/30	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Grant	6,250,000	6,250,000*
A033338-001	ARPEL governance	2007/03/31	2012/03/13	Operational	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	4,900,000	2,080,000
A021651-001	4422/ARPEL Environment Project-PH III	2000/01/08	2007/06/30	Closed	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	3,659,017	1,360,000
A032179-001	Trade Related Customs Capacity Building **	2004/11/29	2010/03/13	Terminating	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	3,000,000	2,490,000
A032384-001	Technical Assistance for the FTAA	2005/01/06	2010/06/31	Terminating	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	2,500,000	2,500,000
A032383-001	Trade Related Technical Assistance Prjct	2005/04/05	2009/06/30	Closed	Projects	Responsive	Contribution	1,500,000	1,500,000
A034331-001	Canada-Americas Trade Related Technical Assistance (CATRTA) ***	2010/01/01	2014/12/31	Operational	Institutional Support/ Core Funding	Directive	Contribution	18,000,000	230,000
Private Sector Development – Sub-total (excluding CATRTA)								**$41,574,132**	**$36,180,000**
Private Sector Development – Sub-total (including CATRTA)								$59,574,132	$36,410,000
Source: This table contains information supplied by CIDA's Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Branch, Statistical Analysis and Reporting, on 2010-07-23. Notes: *The table shows a disbursement for the IDB Canada Trade Fund (A032132) which occurred in 2003-2004, before the period established for this evaluation. **The evaluators are aware that the budget value for the CBSA Customs Assistance Project (AO32179) was reduced from the original budget amount of $3,000,000 to $2,765,115. ***The CATRTA project (A034331) was included in the sample for special consideration; but it was examined only in a cursory manner (not rated) due to its newness. See Section 1.0 for fuller explanation.									

Appendix D: Project–Level Assessment Scores (by Sector)

HEALTH SECTOR – PROJECT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT SCORES

Project Number / Project Name	Ratings by Component for Support to PAHO Health Program (A033041)								Project-Level Ratings					
	Component #1	Component #2	Component #3	Component #4*	Subcomponents of Component #4				A033041	A032223	A034524	A030833	A032875	Average Project Score by Criteria
					A Gender Equality	B Indigenous Health	C Results based mgmt	D Multi-Party Dialogue	Support to PAHO Health Program**	Canadian Internati'l Immuniztn Initiative (CIII)	H1N1 Pandemic Preparedness	Prevent & Control of Communic Disease (PCCD)	Consultant Trust Fund	
	Pandemic Preparednss	HIV	Human Resources in Health	Institutional Strengthening										
Relevance	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.7	5.0	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.0	4.5	5.0	4.0	**4.4**
Effectiveness	4.0	4.0	2.2	2.9	4.2	2.5	3.5	1.5	3.3	3.5	4.0	4.8	3.6	**3.8**
Sustainability	3.9	3.5	2.5	3.0	3.5	2.5	4.0	2.0	3.2	3.9	3.9	4.1	n/a	**3.8**
CCI (GE and ENV✿)	2.5 / 1.0	3.5 / n/a	2.0 / n/a	3.8 / n/a	n/a / n/a	n/a / n/a	3.8 / n/a	n/a / n/a	3.0 / n/a	2.0 / 2.0	2.5 / 3.5	4.0 / n/a	2.0 / n/a	**GE 2.7 ENV n/a✿**
Average Scores (Development Results)	3.2	3.9	2.8	3.6	4.2	3.3	4.0	2.7	**3.5**	**3.1**	**3.7**	**4.5**	**3.2**	**3.7**
Coherence	4.2	4.5	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.0	4.0	2.5	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.2	**4.3**
Efficiency	4.1	4.5	2.5	3.6	4.5	3.0	4.5	2.5	3.7	2.1	4.1	4.8	4.0	**3.7**
Aid Effective	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.2	4.0	3.5	n/a	2.2	4.1	4.2	3.5	4.9	n/a	**4.2**
Perform. Mgt	3.5	2.5	2.0	2.8	3.0	2.0	4.5	1.5	2.7	2.1	2.5	4.5	2.0	**2.8**
Average Scores (Management Factors)	4.0	4.0	3.4	3.3	4.0	2.9	4.3	2.2	**3.7**	**3.2**	**3.7**	**4.6**	**3.4**	**3.3**
Total Average Scores (by Project)	3.5	3.9	3.1	3.4	4.1	3.1	4.1	2.4	**3.6**	**3.1**	**3.7**	**4.5**	**3.3**	**3.7**

Rating Scale: 4.1-5 Highly satisfactory, 3.1-4 Satisfactory, 2.1-3 Moderately satisfactory, 1.1-2 Unsatisfactory, 0-1: Very unsatisfactory
Notes: *The scores for the institutional strengthening sub-components were averaged before being combined with the other components, to keep the influence of component #4 proportionate with the three other health components (#1,2,3) of the Support to PAHO Health Program (A033041).
**The project-level scores for Support to PAHO Health Program (A033041) represent the average of components #1 to #4.
✿With only two scores available, the evaluators did not average the ENV (environment) score.

GOVERNANCE SECTOR – PROJECT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT SCORES (including "Multi" and "Other" Sectors)

Project Number / Project Name	Ratings by Component for Grant to OAS Programming (A034258)					Project-Level Rating Scores									Average Project Score by Criteria
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	A034258	A033107	A033159	A032116	A034315 A032638	A033674	A033551 A033025	A031825	A031148	
	Policy dialogue Summit followup	Strengthening Democ. Gov.	Strengthening Instit'ns for Dev	Gender Equality & Rights of Groups	OAS Institut'l Strengthening	Grant to OAS Program*	IACHR/ IIHR Human Rights	CEJA Justice Systems	CEJA Criminal Justice	FOCAL Knowledg for Dev.	OAS Financial Assistanc	OAS Electoral Assistanc	Indigen. Peoples Partner. IPPP	Geoscien for Poor Andean Commun	
Relevance	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	3.5	4.0	**4.3**
Effectiveness	4.3	4.4	3.7	3.7	4.2	4.1	4.8	4.5	4.5	3.9	4.5	4.5	2.5	4.0	**4.1**
Sustainability	3.7	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	3.5	4.5	4.4	1.5	4.0	**3.8**
CCI (GE and ENV✿)	3.0 n/a	3.0 n/a	3.0 n/a	4.3 n/a	3. n/a	3.4 n/a	3.8 n/a	4.0 n/a	4.0 n/a	3.0 n/a	3.0 n/a	3.0 n/a	2.0 2.0	2.0 3.5	**GE 3.1 ENV n/a✿**
Average Scores (Development Results)	**3.8**	**3.9**	**3.9**	**3.8**	**4.3**	**4.0**	**4.3**	**4.3**	**4.3**	**3.8**	**4.1**	**4.1**	**2.3**	**3.5**	**3.8**
Coherence	3.8	3.9	3.5	3.1	4.0	3.7	4.3	4.3	4.2	3.6	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.5	**3.7**
Efficiency	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to score	Unable to Score	Unable to Score	Unable to Score	Unable to Score	Unable to Score	1.5	4.0	**Unable to Score**
Management Principles	4.2	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.4	2.5	3.5	**4.2**
Performance Management	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	4.2	4.1	4.2	3.0	3.4	3.7	2.0	3.0	**3.3**
Average Scores (Management Factors)	**3.5**	**3.6**	**3.5**	**3.3**	**3.7**	**3.5**	**4.3**	**4.3**	**4.3**	**3.7**	**3.9**	**4.0**	**2.0**	**3.5**	**3.7**
Total Average Scores (by Project)	**3.6**	**3.8**	**3.6**	**3.8**	**4.0**	**3.8**	**4.3**	**4.3**	**3.7**	**3.7**	**4.0**	**4.0**	**2.2**	**3.5**	**3.8**

Rating Scale: 4.1-5 Highly satisfactory, 3.1-4 Satisfactory, 2.1-3 Moderately satisfactory, 1.1-2 Unsatisfactory, 0-1: Very unsatisfactory
Notes: *The project-level scores for Grant to OAS Programming (A034258) represent the average of components #1 to #5.
✿With only two scores available, the evaluators did not average the ENV (environment) score.

PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT SECTOR – PROJECT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT SCORES

Sector Category	"Other PSD/EEE"	"TRTA/CB"	"Other PSD/EEE"	"Other PSD/EEE"	"TRTA/CB"	"TRTA/CB"	"TRTA/CB"	
Project Number	A032413	A032132	A033338	A021651	A032179	A032384	A032383	**Average Project Score by Criteria**
Project Name	Combating Hidden Hunger (CIAT)	Canada Trade Fund (IDB)	ARPEL Governance (ESSA-AGP)	ARPEL Environment Project Ph. III (ESSA-AEPIII)	Trade Related Capacity Building (CBSA)	Technical Assistance for the FTAA (OAS)	Trade Related Technical Assistance Project (ECLAC)	
Relevance	4.4	4	4.3	4	4	4	4	**4.2**
Effectiveness	4.2	3.7	4	4.4	3.5	3.7	3.7	**3.9**
Sustainability	3.9	3.5	3.7	4.3	3.2	3.7	3.7	**3.7**
CCI (GE and ENV)*	3.7 / 3.7	3.0 / n/a	3.9 / 3.5	3.0 / 4.4	3.0 / n/a	3.0 / n/a	3.0 / n/a	**GE 3.2 / ENV 3.9**
Average Scores (Development Results)	**4.1**	**3.6**	**3.9**	**4.1**	**3.4**	**3.6**	**3.6**	**3.8**
Coherence	3.6	3.5	4.2	4.4	4	3.5	3.5	**3.8**
Efficiency	4.1	4.1	3.4	4.3	3.7	4.2	4.1	**4.0**
Management Principles	3.9	3.5	4.1	4.2	4.2	3.5	3.5	**3.8**
Performance Management	3.4	3.1	4	4.3	3.5	3	4	**3.6**
Average Scores (Management Results)	**3.8**	**3.6**	**3.9**	**4.3**	**3.9**	**3.6**	**3.8**	**3.8**
Total Average Scores (by Project)	**3.9**	**3.6**	**3.9**	**4.1**	**3.6**	**3.6**	**3.7**	**3.8**

Rating Scale: 4.1-5 Highly satisfactory, 3.1-4 Satisfactory, 2.1-3 Moderately satisfactory, 1.1-2 Unsatisfactory, 0-1: Very unsatisfactory
Note: The CATRTA project (A034331) was included in the sample for special consideration; but it was examined only in a cursory manner (not rated) due to its newness. See Section 1.0 for fuller explanation.

Appendix E: IAP's Other Partner Organizations in the Region

The **Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR)**, headquartered in Washington D.C., is one of two bodies in the inter-American system for the promotion and protection of human rights (the other being the Inter-American Court of Human Rights). It is considered an autonomous organ of the OAS, and was created in 1959 as essentially its judicial branch. IACHR's mandate is to raise public awareness regarding human rights in the Americas. It organizes and undertakes site-visits to observe and analyse the human rights context in OAS member states, publishes reports on the human rights situation in specific states, recommends to individual states the adoption of measures (non-binding) that will contribute to human rights protection, and perhaps most importantly, receives and processes petitions regarding human rights violations and submits accepted cases to the Inter-American Court. Petitions may be presented by an individual or NGO against a member state.

The **Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR)** is an autonomous international academic institution devoted to teaching, researching, and promoting human rights in order to strengthen respect for human rights principles outlined in the American Convention on Human Rights (the key hemispheric document). It was created in 1980 under an agreement between the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the state of Costa Rica, where it is headquartered in the capital San Jose. IIHR's mandate is to research, inform, and promote human rights, paying particular attention to human rights problems within the Americas. Unlike the IACHR, it does not investigate individual human rights cases against states. Its main activities revolve around organizing conferences and collaborative research programs on human rights issues, develop, compile, publish, and distribute publications on human rights, and provide advisory services to state governments upon request.

The **Justice Studies Centre for Latin America (CEJA)**, based in Santiago, Chile, was created in 1999 by a resolution of the OAS General Assembly in response to the recommendations made during the Second Summit of the Americas (1998). It is considered a part of the Inter-American system and is an autonomous body of the OAS. Unlike the IACHR, however, CEJA does not receive funding from the OAS itself. CEJA three main goals are to: conduct in-depth studies of justice systems and develop innovative approaches to discussions of judicial reform (research arm); promote regional cooperation and the exchange of experiences among key actors in the justice sector (networking arm); and generate and disseminate instruments designed to improve the quality and availability of information on justice in the Americas (training and dissemination arm). CEJA does this by fostering communication among public institutions and civil society organizations in the field of judicial reform, providing workshops for judicial institutions at the state and regional level, and serving as a permanent, active channel for generating, gathering and disseminating information, legislation and basic statistics on the operation of judicial systems in each country in the region.

The **Canadian Foundation for the Americas (FOCAL)**, based in Ottawa, is an independent, non-partisan think-tank dedicated to strengthening Canadian relations with LAC through policy dialogue and analysis. Its main purpose is to provide key stakeholders in the hemisphere (state governments, regional; organizations, and the non-governmental community) with solutions-oriented research on social, political and economic issues, striving to create new partnerships and policy options throughout the Americas. FOCAL focuses its work on issues of good governance, economic prosperity, and social justice by researching and presenting policy papers and briefs for consideration at major conferences (specifically the Summit of the Americas) and within various Departments at the state level. The organization is the only one of its kind in Canada that focuses exclusively on issues exclusively relating to the Americas.

The **Indigenous People's Partnership Program (IPPP)** supports the developmental priorities of indigenous peoples in LAC through the creation of mutually beneficial partnerships between their organizations and Canadian aboriginal counterparts. IPPP seeks to build the capacities of indigenous organizations in LAC to respond to the needs of their communities and promote economic, social, and cultural well-being. IPPP's overall goal is to contribute to sustainable development and poverty reduction for indigenous peoples in LAC. IPPP's five key themes are: sustainable development, knowledge exchange, gender equality, international policy dialogue, and youth. Since its inception, IPPP has supported 70 initiatives (concept phases and full projects) in 12 countries and at the regional level in LAC. A handful of projects are focused on encouraging

indigenous participation in policy dialogue (e.g. OAS deliberations). The April 2009 evaluation recommended a shift in delivery approach toward larger, longer term projects to be designed and delivered in a manner more integrated with CIDA supported activity in the region.

The **Geological Survey of Canada (GSC),** which is part of the Earth Sciences Sector of **Natural Resources Canada (NRCAN)**, implemented the Geosciences for Andean Poor Communities Project from 2002 to 2009 by. It set out to improve the quality of life of the peoples of the Andes by reducing the negative impact of natural hazards, such as volcanoes, earthquakes, and landslides. This was to be done through the transfer of Canadian technologies facilitated by the GSC. The aim was to enhance the capacity of national geosciences institutions in seven Andean countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela) to provide required services. These services included: supplying geoscience information to key decision-making bodies; contributing to the mitigation of the impact of natural disasters on local populations; increasing institutional capabilities to evaluate geological hazards; and assisting civil society organizations in incorporating geoscientific information into emergency planning. The project also sought to strengthen institutional cooperation at the local, national and regional levels. The project focused attention on pilot communities experiencing seismic hazards across participating countries, which provided the basis for applied research and development.

The **International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)** is a not-for-profit agricultural research institution established in 1974 by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). CIAT conducts socially and environmentally progressive research aimed at reducing hunger and poverty and preserving natural resources in developing countries. It is one of 15 CGIAR-affiliated food and environmental research centres working toward these goals around the world in partnership with farmers, scientists and policy makers. CIAT's head office is in Washington, D.C. and its principal research facilities are located on the outskirts of Cali, Colombia. CIAT was the convenor of the CGIAR global Biofortification Challenge Program (BCP) which sought to bring expertise from agriculture and nutrition science together to confront the persistent problem of micronutrient malnutrition. This initiative has subsequently become (with considerable Canadian backing) the Harvest Plus initiative. Over the past two years, CIAT has restated its mission in terms of more clearly supporting sustainable or eco-efficient agriculture, and this has been reflected in each of its main research areas.

The **Environmental Services Association of Alberta (ESAA)** is a not-for-profit industry association dedicated to building a strong environmental services industry through leadership in technology, human resources, quality improvement and market development. It was formed in 1987 and has its head office in Edmonton. The association's membership stands at over 250 companies, many of them active in Western Canada's vibrant oil and gas industry. ESAA has proven itself to be a capable project manager through its development cooperation work with CIDA and its longstanding relationship with the **Regional Association of Oil and Natural Gas Companies in Latin America and the Caribbean (ARPEL)**. ESAA was the Canadian Executing Agency for Phase II of CIDA's ARPEL Environment Project (1995-2000). This work continued prior efforts at developing environmental guidelines for oil and gas companies and expanded into 'occupational health and industrial safety' and 'environment, health and safety' management systems. ESAA performed a similar role for Phase III of the ARPEL Environment Project and is currently the implementing agency for the ARPEL Governance Project.

Initially, implementation of the Customs Administration Project was the responsibility of the **Canada Customs and Revenue Agency (CCRA)**, a Canadian Federal Government agency with origins dating back to 1841 and headquarters in Ottawa. The CCRA has a track record of experience delivering technical assistance programs in LAC, including a CIDA initiative known as the Central American Trade Readiness Technical Assistance Project. In 2003-2004, the CCRA was reorganized and the project was transferred to the **Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA)**. The CBSA's mandate is to ensure the security and prosperity of Canada by managing the access of people and goods to and from Canada. The CBSA is an active member of the Brussels-based World Customs Organization (WCO). The WCO has developed standards for customs management and a collaborative assistance approach, which relies heavily on the carrying out of a diagnostic backed up by political buy-in to a reform agenda. CBSA is committed to supporting the WCO in providing assistance on matters of customs reform and modernization.

The **United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)** is one of five regional commissions of the United Nations. It was founded in 1948 and is headquartered in Santiago, Chile. ECLAC was established to contribute to the economic development of Latin America, coordinating actions directed toward this end, and reinforcing economic ties among countries and with other nations of the world. The promotion of the region's social development was later included among its primary objectives. ECLAC's Division of International Trade is located in Santiago, Chile; the commission also has staff with trade interests at its Washington, DC and Mexico City offices. ECLAC is a member of the Tripartite Cooperation Committee, which it formed with the IDB and the OAS in 1960. Early in the present decade, the committee became associated with the proposed Free Trade Agreement of the Americas and efforts to provide Trade-Related Technical Assistance to countries involved in those negotiations. More recently, ECLAC and the other Tripartite Cooperation Committee members have been active in supporting countries engaged in negotiating and implementing a wide range of bilateral and regional trade agreements.

The **Conference Board of Canada (CBOC)** is an independent, not-for-profit applied research organization and is likely the premier such organization in Canada. It was founded in 1916. It's offices are located in Ottawa. The CBOC is funded exclusively through the fees it charges for services to the private and public sectors. Services include: organization of conferences; conducting, publishing and disseminating research; e-Library services; and provision of targeted assistance in networking, leadership and organizational capacity. The organization has in-house expertise in economic trends, organizational performance, public policy issues and many other knowledge areas. It also has senior staff experienced in managing complex projects, including development cooperation assignments for CIDA.

The **Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)** is an international financial institution serving the Americas. It was established in 1959 and is headquartered in Washington, D.C. The IDB is the largest source of development financing for LAC and it is committed to supporting economic, social and institutional development in the region. The Bank's shareholders are governments of 48 countries, including 26 Latin American and Caribbean borrowing members who have a majority ownership of the IDB. The IDB is a member of the Tripartite Cooperation Committee, which it formed with the OAS and ECLAC in 1960. Early in the present decade, the committee became associated with the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) and efforts to provide Trade-Related Technical Assistance (TRTA) to countries involved in those negotiations. More recently, the IDB and the other Tripartite Cooperation Committee members have been active in supporting countries engaged in negotiating and implementing a wide range of bilateral and regional trade agreements.

Appendix F: Determinants of Successful Regional Programming

Determinants of Successful Regional Programming: World Bank, DFID and European Commission Experience

A 2007 World Bank evaluation of regional programs identifies five contributing factors to successful regional programming ("The Development Potential of Regional Programs"). These are set out below, with additional commentary – mostly consistent – sourced from a 2008 synthesis of four recent DFID regional program evaluations and a summary assessment of European Commission (EC) regional programming between 2002-2006.

Strong country commitment to regional cooperation – an understanding of the added value a regional approach can bring to development (consistent with the principle of subsidiarity[25]), a willingness to accept the obligations involved in coordinating with other countries, a regional platform for negotiating agreements, sequencing activities to foster trust and informed participation by key stakeholders (analytical work, protocols).

- DFID's experience is that a regional programming perspective requires: regional identity, common agenda, shared perceptions and/or context, and clarity on the benefits that can only be achieved when countries work together (Thornton and Thornton 14).

- The EC evaluations of regional programming initiatives describe a need to: engage country governments more fully in program development and to obtain greater participation by region stakeholders – extending beyond the key partners ("Latin America Regional Programming" p.12).

Programming scope matched to national and regional capacities – assessment of policy and institutional capacities, and mobilization of resources to strengthen them. Choice of regional partners is critical.

DFID's synthesis evaluation notes that regional institutions have, "a critical role to play as fora for engaging with regional issues and as entry points for policy change". They caution that institutional assessment should pay attention to the "buy in" toward the mandate and program of the institution(s) by country governments (DFID, 2008, p. 56). The concern is that the nature of country commitment, regardless of the strategic relevance of the regional institution itself, will influence local development impact and be indicative of the type of country level engagement strategies required to make headway.

- DFID draws attention to the resource constraints regional program typically operate under and asserts that for best impact a programming mix should be concentrated sectorally within a strategic framework on policy level engagement and on "small scale, flexible interventions including strategic use of technical assistance" (Thornton and Thornton p.27-32).

- EC evaluations call for a stronger linkage between program activities and priorities of the broader EU-LAC partnership, and greater complementarity between regional programming and other forms of cooperation, and indicate the importance of program visibility through national communication campaigns; especially in countries where participation is lowest ("Latin America Regional Programming" p.12).

Clear delineation and coordination of roles of national and regional institutions – strong links between regional and national institutions, balanced and complementary participation of each in planning and implementation.

- DFID points to the merits of developing a "team" approach that engages relevant home government and non-government development partners along with country and relevant regional institutions in a shared analysis of conditions and possible ways of working. Drawing from experience of four regional programs, DFID observes that "the quality of engagement" is as, if not more, important that the "the quantum of investment" (Thornton and Thornton 58-59). It cautions that when working with multilateral organizations in a regional context, the program originator (e.g. DFID or, in the context of this evaluation, CIDA) should allow itself to be driven by the multilateral agenda as much as by its own. To this, DFID adds another key observation; ensuring a "quality" engagement requires that those delivering the program are equipped with what has been termed, "development diplomacy" skills – specifically analytic, negotiation and relationship management competencies – and that these be well placed within the constellation of partners to be properly exercised.

Accountable governance arrangements – significant country voice, appropriate level of representation, clear governance mandate and effective donor coordination (where appropriate).

- DFID's notion of a "team" approach extends to the creation of shared results frameworks and performance measurement systems to track progress and feed decision-making. Monitoring and evaluation of regional programming strategies, they note, should focus on results not inputs and activities (Thornton and Thornton p.24).

Planning for sustainability of outcomes and activities at the national and regional level – exit planning from early on with attention to future financing strategies and to shifting roles of regional and national partners.

DFID experience suggests that long term engagements with regional organizations which entail support for institutional strengthening are more likely to yield sustainable development results than shorter term, more superficial engagements (Thornton and Thornton p.52).

---

[25] "Subsidiarity" is an organizing principle that matters ought to be handled by the smallest, lowest or least centralized competent authority.

Appendix G: Prospective Study (2005) of the Inter-American Program

Key findings and Recommendation of CIDA's 2005 Prospective Study of the Inter-American Program.

Specifically the report pointed to a "scattering" in relation to:

- Initiatives – addressing a wide range of themes including health, education, the environment, energy, justice, corruption, child labour, trade, agriculture, elections, demining, peace building, gender equality, hunger alleviation, research, the establishment of statistical databases, etc.;

- A structural framework – that is unclear or essentially non-existent – from which it is virtually impossible to identify priorities;

- Fund allocation – that finances many small and medium-sized projects that, in most cases, have few common linkages;

- Fund agreements – with a high number of direct partners with widely varying objectives, in addition to several other indirect partners; and

- Funding sources and decisions – diverse in origin (Americas Directorate, Multilateral Branch, Central Agency etc.); and sometimes the result of highly political decisions.

Looking ahead, the 2005 evaluation called for a sharpening of the program. In a prospective framework, the evaluators envisioned IAP:

- supporting and, depending on the case, reinforcing inter-American and regional organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean that are working to strengthen the capacities of public and civil organizations in LAC countries.

- assisting regional partners in the implementation of concrete measures to fight effectively against poverty and social, economic and political inequalities, with governance as the principle sector of activity and cross cutting theme in the delivery of programs in the social and economic sectors

Within identified sectors, the 2005 evaluators called for:

- A strategic choice of integrated actions to strengthen public sector and civil society partners in LAC countries and, if applicable, of inter-American and regional cooperation and implementation partners, in order to increase their capacities to develop and implement concrete policies, programmes and measures to fight effectively against poverty and social, economic and political inequalities;

- Policy dialogue within inter-American organizations and Summits as a means to highlight Canada's vision, and to promote a concentrated and targeted approach relating to key issues in the priority sectors.

- The establishment of donor and partner committees to coordinate all actions from a hemispheric perspective, and the search for joint funding mechanisms to optimize the program's leverage effects.

- Post evaluation, CIDA asserted a strategic intent for IAP that was mainly consistent with the conclusions of the 2005 Prospective Study. In its annual reporting (2004-2005 and onward) BMI asserted that key programming elements – notably, environment and resource management, indigenous peoples' development, human security and conflict, corruption and transparency, trade-related capacity building, and public health and epidemiology – could be dealt with well through a regional programming approach. It noted that these elements cut across national boundaries and were common to several countries.

Appendix H: List of Selected Documents

Note to the Reader:

The evaluation team consulted a large number of project related documents. The list, too long to include here, is appended to each of the Sector Reports (for the Health, Governance, and Private Sector Development Components).

Canadian International Development Agency. *Aid Effectiveness Action Plan* (2009 – 2012).

Canadian International Development Agency. *Americas Branch Performance Report for 2004-2005 (and 2005-2006)Americas Branch input for CIDA's Departmental Performance Repor*t. Ottawa: CIDA, 2005. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Annual Performance Report Inter-American Program*. Geographic Programs Branch, July 9, 2010. (SGDE-EDRMS #5047782).

Canadian International Development Agency. *Annual Performance Report Inter-American Program, 2006-2007*. Ottawa: Geographic Programs Branch, July 9, 2010. (SGDE-EDRMS #201465). Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Caribbean Regional Program Synthesis Report*. April 2004. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Inter-American Program: Americas Directorate Regional Development Programming Framework, 2010 – 2015, Final Version for President's Approval*. Ottawa: CIDA, Dec. 2009. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *IAP Strategy Short Version 2.0, 2009* (SGDE-EDRMS #4106538).

Canadian International Development Agency. *Inter-American Program Summary of Programming Strategy: Priority Needs of the Hemisphere*. Ottawa: CIDA, 15 Aug 2008. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Manager's Guide to CIDA Grants*. Ottawa: CIDA, April. 2004. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Prospective Study of the Inter-American Program: Synthesis Report*. Ottawa: CIDA, June 2005. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Review of the Effectiveness of CIDA's Multilateral Delivery Channel*. March 2009. Print.

Canadian International Development Agency. *Statistical Report on International Assistance: Fiscal Year 2008-2009*. Ottawa: CIDA, Print.

Canadian International Development Agency website by the Government of Canada. Web. 1 Dec 2010 to 24 Jan 2011.

Carter, John. *ARPEL Environmental Project Phase III End of Project Review*. 5 Dec 2005. Print.

Cowater International Inc. *Final Report: Consultancy to Review the Organization of American States-CIDA Working Relationship*. June 2007. Print.

ECLAC. *2010 Millennium Development Goals: Achieving the Millennium Development Goals with Equality in Latin America and the Caribbean: Progress and Challenges.* 15 Sept 2010. web.

European Commission*. Latin America Regional Programming Document 2007-2013*. Print.

"Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2010". Development Initiatives. Sommerset, UK. Print.

Government of Canada. *Canada and the Americas: Priorities & Progress*. 2009. Print.

Government of Canada. "Chapter 8: Strengthening Aid Effectiveness-Canadian International Development Agency". *Report of the Auditor General of Canada to the House of Commons*. Ottawa. 2009. Print.

Government of Canada. Canadian Environmental Agency website. 11 Jan 2010. <http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/013/index_e.htm>

Inter-American Cooperation Network. Website. 21 Jan 2011.

Kaufmann, Daniel, Aart Kraay and Mastruzzi Massimo. *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues (September 2010). World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 5430*. Web. 10 Dec 2010

<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1682130>

Le Groupe-conseil Baastel Ltée, Washington Consulting Corporation (WCC). *Evaluation of CIDA's Americas Branch Trade Program (BMI Portion) (RG-T1583) Final Report. Inter-American Development Bank.* Mar. 2010. Print.

Lindores, Douglas. *Report on the CIDA Americas Branch/ PAHO Working Relationship.* Ottawa: Americas Branch, Canadian International Development Agency. 15 Oct. 2004. Print.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *2010a Latin American Economic Outlook 2011: How Middle Class is Latin America?* Paris: OECD Publishing. Web. 4 Dec. 2010 <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/development/latin-american-economic-outlook-2011_leo-2011-en>

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *2010b. Promoting Private Investment for Development: The Role of ODA.* Web. 4 Dec. 2010 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/23/40/36566902.pdf>

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *Development Aid at a Glance: Statistics by Region, 3. America. 2010 Edition.* OECD. Web. 12 Nov. 2010 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/39/50/42139289.pdf >

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). *Latin American Outlook 2011.* Web. 10 Jan 2011.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. 2005/2008.* Print.

Organization of American States. *The Effectiveness of Hemispheric Cooperation: A Perspective from the Americas.* Washington: OAS, March 2010. Print.

Oxhorn, Philip, Joseph S. Tulchin and Andrew D. Selee. *Decentralization, Democratic Governance, and Civil Society in Comparative Perspective: Africa, Asia, and Latin America.* Woodrow Wilson Press, 2004. Print.

Pan American Health Organization. *Gender, Health, and Development in the Americas: Basic Indicators 2009.* Washington. 2009. Print.

Pan American Health Organization. *Health Agenda for the Americas 2008-2017.* 3 June 2007. Print.

Pan American Health Organization. *Social Determinants of Health of the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas: Meeting Report. Quito.* 24 Oct. 2008. Print.

The Economist. *Nobody's backyard: The Rise of Latin America*. St. Louise, USA: The Economist Newspaper Limited. 11 Sept. 2010. Print.

Thornton, Paul and Hilary Thornton. *Synthesis of Regional Programme Evaluations 2007/2008: Evaluation Report EV694.* London: Department for International Development. Oct 2008. Print.

United National Development Programme (UNDP). *Human Development Report 2010.* New York. 2010. Print.

World Bank Independent Evaluation Group. *The Development Potential of Regional Programs: An Evaluation of World Bank Support of Multicountry Operations.* Washington: The World Bank. 2007. Print.

Appendix I: List of Selected Contacts

Contact organized by sector, then alphabetically by first name.

CIDA/GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

Amrita Paul, Team Leader, AIDS and Health Institution, Global Initiatives, Multi-lateral Branch
Anne-Marie Ready, First Secretary (Development), Canadian High Commission, Bridgetown, Barbados
Annick Amyot – Senior Development Officer, Strategic Partnerships – Inter-American Program
Benoit-Pierre Laramee – Director, Inter-American Program
Brian Phillips – Senior Advisor, Indigenous People, Democratic Governance and Human Rights, Strategic Policy and Performance Branch
Brigitte D'Aoust – Program Manager, Strategic Partnerships – Inter-American Program
Cam Bowes, Counsellor (Development), Canadian High Commission, Bridgetown, Barbados
Caroline Albert – Analyst; Regional Program, Southern and Eastern Africa Directorate
Carolyn Cudmore, Program Manager, New Partnerships, Inter-American Program
Darren Rogers Counsellor (Head of Cooperation), Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS
David Johnston, Agriculture Specialist and Project Officer, CIDA, Gatineau
Diana Merlini, Manager, Policy and Planning, Strategic Planning and Operations
Gaëtane Pouliot – Director, Inter-American Program (former), currently Manager, Colombia Program
Jenna Hendrix-Miljours – Development Officer, Inter-American Program
Joelle Barbot – Gender Equality Specialist; Planning, Results and Specialists Directorate
Jonathan Laine, Country Program Manager, Bolivia Program, CIDA
Joshua Tabah, Head of Aid, Canadian Embassy, Bogotá, Colombia
Julian Murray – Senior Director, Strategic Planning and Operations – Americas Branch
Louis Verret – Director, Inter-American Program (former), currently Director, CIDA West and Central Africa, Mali
Lucie Bazinet – Team Leader, Gender Equality, Planning, Results and Specialists Directorate
Luis Barnola, former Project Officer, Inter-American Program, CIDA, Gatineau
Mike Arnoni, Program Manager, Health, Honduras Desk, CIDA
Pascal Dehoux – Environment Specialist; Planning, Results and Specialists Directorate
Paul Ragusa, Oil & Gas Specialist and Project Officer, CIDA, Gatineau
Peter Unger – Environment Specialist; Planning, Results and Specialists Directorate
Sandra Gagnon, Performance Review Officer, Evaluation Division, CIDA
Sarada Leclerc, Health Advisor, Americas Branch
Zheng Zhang, First Secretary (Development), Canadian High Commission, Bridgetown, Barbados

HEALTH

Adriana Ivama, Sub-Regional Technical Advisor, OCCP – PAHO– Bridgetown, Barbados
Agnes Soares, Advisor, Environmental and Occupational Risks, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health (SDE) PAHO
Ana C. Nogueira, PWR, PAHO
Ann Marie Ready, First Secretary Development, CIDA, Barbados and Eastern Caribbean
Bernadette Theodore-Gandi, Caribbean Program Coordinator, OCCP – PAHO– Bridgetown, Barbados
Bertha Gomez, Subregional Advisor HIV, PAHO – Bogota, Colombia
Betzabe Butron Riveros, Family & Reproductive Health Advisor, OECC– Bridgetown, Barbados
Bryna Brennan, Senior Advisor, Risk and Outbreak Communication, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Carlos Arosquipa, Advisor, External Relations, Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (ERP) [On the phone] PAHO
Carlos Ayala, Development of Health Services, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Carlos Corvalan, Senior Advisor and Project Coordinator of Environmental and Occupational Risks, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health (SDE) PAHO
Carlos Eisner, Program Assistant II, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Carlos Samayoa, Senior Advisor, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR) PAHO
Carmen Estepa, Health Specialist, Canadian Embassy – La Paz, Bolivia
Carolina Bascones, Project Officer, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR), PAHO
Catalina Latorre, Professor, Univ. Rosario – Bogota, Colombia
Cecelia Cazaro, MPS – Bogota, Colombia
Charles Godue, Project Coordinator, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS) PAHO
Chris Rosene – Canadian Red Cross – Director, Development Programs
Christian Darras, PW Representative, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Cuauhtemoc Ruiz, Senior Advisor, Comprehensive Family Immunization (FCH), PAHO

Dale Babb, Senior Medical Officer Health, Ministry of Health – Bridgetown, Barbados
Daniel Gutierrez, Manager, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR) PAHO
Daniela Fernandez, Program Management Specialist, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Danny Gill, Director Planning, Policy, Ministry of Health– Bridgetown, Barbados
Darren Rogers, Alternate Representative, Permanent Mission of Canada to the OAS
Desiree Pastor, Immunization; Pandemic Influenza, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Diana Laeta, INS – Bogota, Colombia
Dionne Patz, Project Coordinator, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Dora Caballero, Non-Infectious Diseases; Human Behaviour; Gender Focal Point, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Priscilla Rivas-Loria, Senior Advisor, External Relations, Resources Mobilization, and Partnerships
Elizabeth Ferdinand, Senior Medical Officer Health, Ministry of Health– Bridgetown, Barbados
Ernesto Moreno, Public Health Pandemic, MPS – Bogota, Colombia
Floriza Gennari, Program Management Specialist, Gender, Diversity and Human Rights (GDR), PAHO
G. Guibovich, Health Evidence/ Prevention, PAHO
Gabriel Vivas, Healthy Systems and Services Advisor, OECC– Bridgetown, Barbados
Gerald Jacobson, Subreg. Advisor HIV/ STI EPI, PAHO – Bogota, Colombia
German Crespo Infantes, Director General, Planning, Ministry of Health – La Paz, Bolivia
Gina Tambini, Manager, Family and Community Health (FCH) PAHO
Giovanni Marquez, Program Management Specialist, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS) PAHO
Gloria Rey, Director, INS,
Hernan Montenegro, Senior Advisor, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS) PAHO
Hernan Rodriquez, Mat. Neonatal Health/ Gender, PAHO
Hernan Rosenberg, Senior Advisor, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR) PAHO
Hugo Prado, Senior Advisor, External Relations, Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (ERP) PAHO
Hugo Rivera, HRH; Indigenous Medicine/ Health; Interculturalism; Human Rights, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Humberto Munoz, Consultant in Immunizations, Family and Community Health (FCH) PAHO
Ian Stein, Project Officer, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR) PAHO
Iraidis Soto, Exec. Director , ACOFAEN – Bogota, Colombia
Ivelte Sondivo, Director, Health and Nutrition Sector, UNICEF – La Paz, Bolivia
James Chauvin – Canadian Public Health Agency (CPHA)– Director International Programs
James Fitzgerald, Coordinator in Medicines and Health Technologies, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS), PAHO
James Hill, Advisor, External Relations, Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (ERP) PAHO
Jan Hatcher-Roberts – Canadian Society for International Health – Executive Director
Jean-Luc Poncelet, Manager, Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief (PED) PAHO
Jens Flanding, Advisor, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination(PBR) PAHO
Jorge Jemio Ortuno, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Health – La Paz, Bolivia
Jose Di Fabio, Manager, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS) PAHO
Jose Milton Guzman, Territory Development, PAHO
Joy St. John, Director Planning, Policy, Chief Medical Officer, Ministry of Health– Bridgetown, Barbados
Juan Guhl, PAHO – Bogota, Colombia
Juan Manuel Sotelo, Manager External Relations, Resources Mobilization and Partnerships (ERP) PAHO
Julie Mauvernay, Consultant, External Relations, Resource Mobilization and Partnerships (ERP) PAHO
Karen Springer, Senior Medical Officer Health, Ministry of Health– Bridgetown, Barbados
Kate Dickson, Senior Policy Advisor/PAHO-Americas, Health Canada
Kathleen Israel, Project Coordination a.i., Family and Community Health (FCH) PAHO
Kira Fortune, Program Management & Partnership Specialist, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health (SDE) PAHO
Lealou Reballos, Disaster Risk Reduction Technical Officer, OCCP – PAHO– Bridgetown, Barbados
Lenis Urquijo, Director Gen., Public Health Pandemic, MPS – Bogota, Colombia
Luc St Laurent, First Secretary (Dev), Canadian Embassy – La Paz, Bolivia
Luis G. Bueno, National Micro. Lab, Researcher, INS
Luis Galvao, Manager, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health (SDE) PAHO
Luis Moreno Diaz, Coordinator, ONUSIDA/U.Col – Bogota, Colombia
Luz Elena Monsalve, Contract AIEPI, PAHO
M. Gonzalez Garcon, Director National Micro. Lab, INS
Marcos Espinal, Manager, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Marcos Suarez, Infectious Diseases, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Margaret (Peg) Marchall, Serior Advisor on Maternal Child Health and Infectious Diseases, Latin American and Caribbean Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
Maria de los Angeles Cortes-Castillo, Advisor, Vaccines and Immunization, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS), PAHO
Marie-Claude Lavoie, Advisor, Workers Health, Sustainable Development and Environmental Health (SDE) PAHO

Marie-Gloriose Ingabire, Senior Program Specialist, GEH – Governance, Equity and Health, International Development Research Centre (IDRC)
Marijke Velzeboer-Salcedo, Senior Advisor, Gender, Diversity and Human Rights (GDR), PAHO
Martha Valdivieso, ACOFAEN – Bogota, Colombia
Martha Velandia, Public Health Pandemic, MPS – Bogota, Colombia
Melania Flores, Program Management Specialist, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Miriam Gamboa, Human Resources Health (HRH), PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Monica Alonso, Advisor, HIV/STI Surveillance, Family and Community Health (FCH) PAHO
Susan Thollaug, Health team leader, LAC Bureau, USAID
Nicolas Lagomarsino, Project Officer, Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief (PED) PAHO
Otavio Oliva, Advisor Viral Diseases, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Patricia Cabrejo, Program Budget Specialist, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR)
Daniel Gutierrez, Manager, Planning, Budget and Resource Coordination (PBR) PAHO
Phyllis Roett, Senior Development Officer, CIDA, Barbados and Eastern Caribbean
Rafael Pardo, HIV-SIDA/ Adolescents, Contract Anthropologist PAHO – Bogota, Colombia
Ranu Sharma, Policy Analyst, International Public Health Division, Public Health Agency of Canada
Reynaldo Holder, Advisor, Health Systems based on Primary Health Care (HSS) PAHO
Roberto Montoya, Public Health Pandemic, PAHO – Bogota, Colombia
Rodolfo Rodriguez, Coordinator Communicable Diseases, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Rosina Salerno, Evaluation Advisor, Internal Oversight and Evaluation Services (IES) PAHO
Salim Sohani, Senior Health Advisor, Canadian Red Cross, International Operations
Sarah Lawley, Director, International Public Health Division, Public Health Agency of Canada
Sheila Samiel, HIV/AIDS Advisor, OECC – Bridgetown, Barbados
Sofia Angulo, Surveillance, INS
Susan Thollaug, Health Team Leader, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
Susana de Funes, External Relations Advisor, Spanish Cooperation with PAHO
Susana Hannover, Health Communication, PAHO – La Paz, Bolivia
Sylvain Aldighieri, Senior Advisor, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Thais Dos Santos, Specialist Influenza Surveillance, Health Surveillance, Disease Prevention and Control (HSD) PAHO
Violette Pedneeault, Program Director, Canadian Public Health Agency (CPHA)
Yaira Pardo, Contract AIEPI, PAHO

GOVERNANCE

Alfonso Quinonex, Secretary for External Relations, OAS, Washington, D.C.,USA
Amb. Adam Blackwell, Secretary for Multidimensional Security, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Carmen Moreno, Executive Secretary, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Clemencia Forero Ucros, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Government of Colombia
Cristian Riego Ramirez, Executive Director, Justice Studies Center of the Americas, Santiago, Chile
Eduardo Enrique Reina, OAS, Bolivia
Frank Almaguer, Secretaryfor Administration and Finance, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Jorge Sanin, Head Relations with Permanent Observers and Civil Society, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Joshua Tabah, Head of Aid (Counsellor),Embassy of Canada in Bogota, Colombia
Marcelo Alvarez, MAPP-OAS, Bogotá, Colombia
Peter Hakim, Inter-American Dialogue, Washington, D.C., USA
Ricardo Graziano, Director, Department of Planning and Evaluation, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Ricardo M. Domingues, Chief of Staf, Office of the Secretary General, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Sara D. Cohen, Counsellor (Politiacal), Government of Canada, Bogota, Colombia
Steve Jaltema, Embassy of Canada, La Paz, Bolivia

OAS Related Projects
Adriana Maldovado, Coordinator of US/Canada and the Summit of the Americas, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombia
Alejandra Kempff, Analista Relaciones Externas, Organizacion de los Estados Americanos, Bogota, Colombia
Alejandro Nato, Representante Permanente en Bolivia, Centro Carter, La Paz, Bolivia
Alfonso Ferrufino V., Senior Advisor, Bolivia Programme, La Paz Bolivia
Alfonso Quinonex, Secretary for External Relations, OAS, Washington, D.C.,USA
Amb. Adam Blackwell, Secretary for Multidimensional Security, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Ana Teresa Bernal, National Commission for Reintegration and Reparation, Bogota, Colombia
Antonio Costas, Former President of TSE, La Paz, Bolivia
Armando de la Parra, Director, FUNDAPPAC, La Paz, Bolivia
Birginia Beramendi Heine, Head of Mission, Bolivia Programme, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, La Paz, Bolivia

Camilo Ernesto Bernal Sarmiento, Justice Coordinator, International Centre for Transitional Justice, Bogota, Colombia
Carmen Moreno, Executive Secretary, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Charlotte McDowell, Specialist, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Christopher Hale, Coordinador Oficina Regional Medellin, Organizacion de los Estados Americanos,
Clemencia Forero Ucros, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Government of Colombia
Eduardo Enrique Reina, OAS, Bolivia
Faride Tirado Banuz, Red Participacion Y Justicia, La Paz, Bolivia
Fernando Jinete, Second Secretary at the Office of the Director of International Cooperation, Bogota, Colombia
Francisco Alberto Gonzalez, Adviser, Office of the Deputy Minister for Multilateral Affairs, Republic of Olombia, Bogota, Colombia
Frank Almaguer, Secretaryfor Administration and Finance, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Giselle Gomez,Political Adviser at UN?OAS Coordination Unit, Bogota, Colombia
Guido Riveros, Fundacion Boliviana para la Decocracia Multipartidaria, Bolivia
Heather H. Alsopp, Director, Budgetary and Financial Services, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Hilary Anderson, Gender Specialist, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Hugo Medina, OAS, Bolivia Office
Ing. Guido Riveros Franck, Director Ejecutivo, Fundacion Boliviana para la Democracia Multipartidaria, La Paz – Bolivia
Jaime Alvarez, President, Red Participacion Y Justicia, La Paz, Bolivia
Javier Hinojaso, Director of the Bolivian Civil Register, La Paz, Bolivia
Jorge Sanin, Head Relations with Permanent Observers and Civil Society, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Juan Francisco Diaz Puertas, Community Development Coordinator, Office of the President, Bogota, Colombia
Liliana Rodriguez Burgos, Confederacion Colombiana de ONG, Bogota, Colombia
Luz Amparo Mejia Garcia, Legal Representative, Corporacion Madres de la Candelaria Linea Fundadora
Ma. Antonieta Gaziola, Senior Specialist, Organization of American States, Washington, USA
Marcela Ordonez, UN/OAS Coordinator, Bogotá, Colombia
Marcelo Alvarez, MAPP-OAS, Bogotá, Colombia
Maria Andrea Alban, Director of International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia, Bogota, Colombia
Maria Celina Conte, M.A., Specialist, Inter-American Commission of Women (CIM), Washington, D.C., USA
Maria Claudia Pulido, Comision Interamericana de Derechos Humanos, OEA, Washington, D.C. USA
Pablo Gutierrez, Director, Electoral Cooperation and Observation, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Patricia Buritica, National Commission for Reintegration and Reparation, Bogotá, Colombia
Ricardo Graziano, Director, Department of Planning and Evaluation, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Ricardo M. Domingues, Chief of Staf, Office of the Secretary General, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Santiago A. Canton, Executive Secretary, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, OEA, Washington, D.C. USA
Sergio E. Martinez, Advisor General Secretariat, OAS, Washington, D.C., USA
Susana Saavedra Badani, Red Participacion Y Justicaia, La Paz, Bolivia
Virginia Verasmendi, Executive Director, IDEA International, La Paz Bolivia
Wilfredo Ovando, President Supreme Electoral Tribunal (TSE), La Paz, Bolivia

CEJA Projects
Cristian Riego Ramirez, Executive Director, Justice Studies Center of the Americas, Santiago, Chile
Javiera Blanco Suarez, Fundacion Paz Ciudadana, Santiago, Chile
Ramiro Orieas A., Director, Fundacion Construir, La Paz, Bolivia

FOCAL/Knowledge For Development
Adriana Maldovado, Coordinator of US/Canada and the Summit of the Americas, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Colombia
Clemencia Forero Ucros, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Government of Colombia
Ernesto Perez de Rada, Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, La Paz, Bolivia
Peter Hakim, Inter-American Dialogue, Washington, D.C., USA

IACHR/IIHR
Maria Claudia Pulido, OEA, Washington, D.C., USA
Santiago A. Canton, OEA, Washington, D.C., USA

PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

Combatting Hidden Hunger in Latin America Project
Albin Hubscher, Deputy Director General for Corporate Services, CIAT, Colombia
Bernardo Ospina Patiño, Executive Director, CLAYUCA, Colombia
Catherine Coleman, CGIAR and Harvest Plus Liaison Officer, Multilateral Branch, CIDA, Gatineau (by phone)
Cesar Martinez, Principal Investigator and Breeder, Rice, CIAT, Colombia

Felix San Vicente, Principal Investigator and Breeder, Maize, CIMMYT, Mexico (by phone)
Glenn Hyman, Geographic Targeting Specialist, CIAT, Colombia
Helena Pachon, Coordinator and Nutritionist, Agro Salud Project, CIAT, Colombia
Howarth Bouis, Director, Harvest Plus, an initiative of CIAT and IFPRI, Washington, D.C.
Joe Tohme, Agrobiodiversity and Biotechnology Research Leader, CIAT, Colombia
Luis Fernando Osorio, Financial Director, CIAT, Colombia
Marlene Rosero, Communications Specialist, CIAT, Colombia
Roger Urbina, Seed Dissemination Coordinator, CIAT Satellite Office, Nicaragua (by phone)
Sonia Gallego Castillo, Chemical Engineer, CLAYUCA, Colombia
Stephen Beebe, Principal Investigator and Breeder, Common Bean, CIAT, Colombia

IDB-Canada Trade Fund
Antonio Vives, Consultant, Professor, Stanford University, Former Manager, Sustainable Development, IDB
Lesley Cassar, Project Officer, IDB, Washington D.C.
Pamela Coke-Hamilton, former Senior Trade Advisor – Caribbean Region, IDB, Bridgetown, Barbados
Paolo Giordano, Lead Economist, Integration and Trade Sector, IDB, Washington D.C., USA

ARPEL Governance Project and ARPEL Environmental Protection Project Phase III
Miguel Moyano, Amanda Pereira and Irene Alfaro, Project Managers, ARPEL, Montevideo, Uruguay (by phone)
Oscar Gonzalez, Project Manager, ESAA, Edmonton

CBSA Customs Assistance Project
Angela Willows, Project Manager, International Affairs Directorate, CBSA, Ottawa
Herman St. Helen, Comptroller, Customs & Excise Department, Saint Lucia
Callixtus Andy Fernelon, Deputy Comptroller, Customs & Excise Department, Saint Lucia
Nigel Edwin, Actg. Deputy Comptroller, Customs & Excise Department, Saint Lucia
Trevor Springer, Assistant, Customs & Excise Department, Saint Lucia
Brian Jones, Customs Adviser, Caribbean Regional Technical Assistance Centre (CARTAC), Bridgetown, Barbados
Daniel Perrier, Operations Manager, Capacity Building Directorate, World Customs Organization (WCO), Brussels (by phone)

OAS Trade Unit Phase 3 Project
Carlos Wharton, Senior Trade Policy Adviser, Caribbean Export Development Agency (CEDA), Barbados
Deborah Hackshaw, One Stop Shop Investment Project, Castries, Saint Lucia (by phone)
Keith Nurse, MITP Program, University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus, Barbados
Malcolm Spence, Senior Coordinator, Intellectual Property, Science and Technology, Office of Trade Negotiations, CARICOM, Barbados (by phone)
Maryse Robert, Chief, Office of Trade, Department of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism, OAS, Washington D.C., USA
Pamela Coke-Hamilton, former head of Caribbean Technical Assistance for the OAS Trade Unit, Bridgetown, Barbados

ECLAC Trade Related Technical Assistance Project
Jorge Mario Martinez, Economic Affairs Office, ECLAC, Santiago, Chile (by phone)
Raquel Artecona, Economic Affairs Officer, ECLAC, Washington D.C., USA
Rex Garcia-Hidalgo, Program Officer, ECLAC, Washington D.C., USA

Canada Americas Trade Related Technical Assistance Program (CATRTA)
Joanne Warren, Program Director, The Conference Board of Canada, Ottawa

Appendix J: Management Response

INTER-AMERICAN PROGRAM: MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Recommendations	Commitments and Action	Responsibility Centre	Planned Completion Date	Progress
1. IAP should intensify its information and coordination role with other CIDA programs and promote coordination with other government departments active in the region in support of Canada's development cooperation efforts in LAC, by strengthening its analysis, networking and communication capability.	We agree, as a number of initiatives have been achieved to develop the IAP's complementarity with bilateral programs since the approval of the Program Strategy 2009. (a) The IAP will engage with other government departments on common issues related to programming and Canadian priorities for inter-american institutions on an ongoing basis, in the annual review of the Government of Canada Americas Strategy and during the preparation process of annual high level meetings of the regional institutions. (b) The integration of the regional programming and its analysis capacity will be improved with the creation of new analyst positions in FY 1011-2012 in the reorganization of the Americas Directorate and a new LES position at the permanent mission of Canada at the OAS. (c) A communication plan will be developed to share results achieved and lessons learned from regional programming. (d) Specific reporting on the complementarity issue will be included in the next Annual Program Performance Report.	(a) Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate) (b) Regional Director General (Americas Directorate) (c) and (d) Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate)	(a) To be completed by March 2012 (b) To be completed by December 2011 (c) To be completed by December 2011 (d) To be completed by September 2011	
2. IAP should strengthen the integration of gender equality and environment by developing its own action plans that each set out specifically how the Program will keep these crosscutting issues on the agenda with strategic partners and throughout the program/project cycle.	We agree. An action plan will be developed around the following actions: (a) The IAP will ensure that all new projects have GE results at the intermediate level (code level 2) or specifically target GE inequalities (code level 3) as indicated in the Gender Equality Action Plan. (b) A strategic approach at the program level is used in the Regional Development Programming Framework (RDPF) for crosscutting themes focusing on program immediate outcomes where expected impact will be greater. For instance, environment is fully integrated and focused on the enabling economic environment part of the RDPF. Gender is specifically focused on the health system part, in line with the UNDP Human Development Report (2010) which indicated that "Reproductive health is	Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate)	(a) To be completed by March 2012 (b) To be completed by March 2012	

Recommendations	Commitments and Action	Responsibility Centre	Planned Completion Date	Progress
	the largest contributor to gender inequality". Indicators in the Program Management Framework (PMF) will be reviewed, measurement will be done, and corrective actions will be taken.			
3. IAP should invest in regional and sub-regional programming through new ideas, new players and new funding mechanisms (such as joint funding, public-private partnerships).	We agree, as this is already identified in the IAP Program Strategy 2009. (a)The IAP will take a leadership role in donor coordination and harmonization through donor meetings for the funding of strategic partners in the region in order to improve the conditions for joint funding. (b)The IAP will engage and support partner organizations through our funding in the health sector in the development of new ideas and types of partnerships, including non-traditional development partners such as the private sector.	Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate)	(a)To be completed by March 2012 (b)To be completed by March 2012	
4. IAP should invest in performance management including the new program-level performance measurement framework, developing an evaluation plan, and continuing to provide results-based management (RBM) support to partner organizations.	We agree. (a) A performance management approach at the program level will be developed, including indicators linked to the Management, Resources and Results Structure (MRRS), key government commitments, thematic priorities and the Program Strategy's results. (b) Each new project will include a performance management strategy, linked to the program-level performance measurement framework and, appropriate resources will be allocated to partner organizations to implement it, including training.	Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate)	(a)To be completed by March 2012 (b) To be completed by March 2012	
5. IAP should continue to engage partner organizations regarding performance management (reporting on results, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) and take great care to spell out expectations and mitigate partner weaknesses in this and other areas, during up-front negotiations of funding agreements especially with grant recipients.	We agree. For each new agreement, the partner's performance management capacity will be assessed in regard of CIDA's accountability needs and a specific capacity building plan will be developed, implemented, monitored and evaluated.	Director Inter-American Program (Americas Directorate)	To be completed by March 2012	