





## Evaluation Process

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>24 stakeholders participated</b><br>Interviews through telephone or Skype calls<br> | <b>Evaluation Period</b><br><b>February to June 2020</b><br>Interviews and Document Review<br> | <b>Intended Evaluation Users</b><br>US Permanent Mission to the OAS, the OAS Department of Planning and Evaluation, Department of Economic Development, and project stakeholders<br> | <b>Evaluation Purpose</b><br>To assess the performance of Phase III and to determine to what extent lessons learned and recommendations were taken into account.<br> |
|---|---|--|---|

## Evaluation Results

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Relevance</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remains well aligned with the development pillar of the OAS, the OAS Charter, and the Strategic Plan 2016-2020.</li> <li>The reliance of Caribbean Member States on the tourism industry further supports the relevance of the EFDHEC. Its focus on Heritage Tourism aims to build the capacities of Member States to differentiate themselves in the tourism sector.</li> <li>COVID 19 is negatively affecting the tourism sector of the Caribbean region. In the medium-term, Member States are aiming at increasing investments in the tourism industry but not necessarily in Heritage Tourism.</li> </ul> | <b>Efficiency</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall quality of Project design was somewhat improved in Phase III due to the evaluation of Phase II.</li> <li>At the project level, EFDHEC design compares well with other global initiatives aimed at supporting a heritage economy. However, the quality of design of specific EFDHEC activities varies.</li> <li>Reporting done through the RPPI in a timely manner and according to plan. Results monitored were sometimes outputs rather than outcomes and this affects the ability to say if change has really occurred.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Sustainability</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Varies by categories of activities but is modest overall.</li> <li>12/13 recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation were accepted and most have been addressed.</li> <li>The budget allocations for EFDHEC outputs remain within normal ranges but highlight the high price of conducting in-person regional activities.</li> </ul>   | <b>Gender Integration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is some anecdotal evidence of a gender integration perspective in the EFDHEC Project, but gender integration was not part of the design, nor of the reporting.</li> </ul>  |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Effectiveness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Built the capacities of the Caribbean Heritage Network. 3/5 planned outputs have been achieved with success. Other outputs are on hold due to the pandemic.</li> <li>Engaged officials from Member States in a workshop on the potential of the CHN. However, expected outcomes of this activity have not been achieved and the design and value for money of this activity are questioned.</li> <li>The proposal for sustaining the CHN has been developed.</li> <li>The ARCHES software system was installed in Jamaica and Barbados to support the development of national registers of Heritage sites. The Jamaica Register is operational and successful, but Barbados has failed to make progress in operationalizing its Register.</li> <li>Provided training to build country capacities to map Heritage sites and conducted a mission to expand Caribbean knowledge of Heritage economies. While participants appreciated these activities, the Project has not assessed the knowledge acquired.</li> <li>Cultural authorities from Jamaica, Guyana, and Saint Lucia were trained on how to engage communities in identifying authentic Heritage values. The training was of high quality and in high demand and led to comprehensive baseline assessment reports in the three countries.</li> <li>Experienced challenges in establishing a sustainable endorsement program, aggravated by insufficient buy-in from Member States, evidenced by insufficient financial assistance to businesses for an endorsement program. Missed the opportunity to learn from other OAS projects offered to small- and medium-sized businesses.</li> <li>Despite delays on the part of the Open Campus of the University of the West Indies, two online courses were revised and delivered and were rated favorably by participants. However, the quality of the revisions is poor and does not meet academic standards.</li> <li>Majority of participants in online courses passed the final exams and self-reported that they increased their knowledge. However, the design of the courses did not include pre- and post-testing to measure increases in knowledge.</li> <li>Some participants have applied their newly acquired knowledge to inform their work in developing or nuancing legislation on Heritage protection.</li> <li>By the end of Project execution, almost all Project outputs results will have been achieved. The scope of actual changes (outcomes) deriving from these outputs is modest.</li> </ul> |
|---|

## Lessons Learned

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Country buy-in, through an identified alignment of project activities with national-level priority areas, is required to inform project design and subsequent implementation. | The internal capacity of implementation partners should be carefully weighed against the project scope, objectives and intended results prior to partner selection. |
|---|---|

## Recommendations

|  |   |   |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1. The OAS should take stock of lessons learned in the EFDHEC project to inform future project design. | 2. The OAS should reflect on and consider alternative approaches to deliver its regional activities that are less resource-intensive. | 3. In projects that include training activities, the OAS should verify that both learning acquired and learning application post-training will be measured. | 4. To demonstrate project knowledge management and enhance project effectiveness, the OAS should foster synergies between all its activities undertaken in the same country and in the region. | 5. At the outset of any future project, the OAS should consider trade-offs between expected outcomes and project scope within the context of a fixed budget. |
|--|---|---|--|--|