## Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 stakeholders participated</th>
<th>Evaluation Period</th>
<th>Intended Evaluation Users</th>
<th>Evaluation Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face, telephone calls, Skype calls</td>
<td>November 2016 - July 2017</td>
<td>US Permanent Mission to the OAS, the OAS Department of Planning and Evaluation and Secretariat for Integral Development, and project stakeholders</td>
<td>To evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the Cultural Heritage in the Caribbean – Phase II project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation Results

### Relevance
- Strongly relevant to and aligned with the OAS mandates
- Responded to the expressed needs of heritage sector professionals in the Caribbean for the development of the regional cultural heritage sector
- Results achievement was affected by four contextual factors:
  - Insufficient time for relationship building
  - Very low project ownership by Member States
  - Limited capacities in Member States for project implementation
  - Weak project design

### Sustainability
- As a result of the lack of evidence on the project’s achievement of its expected results, it is difficult for the evaluation to generate conclusive findings on results sustainability

### Efficiency
- Minimal achievement of its anticipated results, but adjustments to project design and management can potentially lead to socio-economic growth in Member States
- Greater percentage of available funding was allocated towards the hiring of non-regional external consultants and project management support, at the expense of project activities
- Data suggests that project funds were managed appropriately
- Suitable project monitoring mechanism for tracking implementation progress. Nevertheless, its monitoring capacity was weakened by gaps in project reporting on implementation activities and financial management

### Effectiveness
- Disbursement rate of 74%, but the project had not yet achieved many of the expected outputs and outcomes of the logical framework matrix.
- Online portal for the Caribbean Heritage Network launched successfully, though not fully operationalized as its activities are at a standstill
- Finalization and dissemination of the official Register Process not achieved, and considerably delayed as a result of internal issues at the level of the implementation partner
- Endorsement criteria developed for engaging the public in sustainable heritage tourism, though yet to finalize the development of a list of heritage tourism products and services.
- Online courses in cultural heritage were successfully launched after some delay, but it is too early to assess the quality and effectiveness of course offerings

## 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/DPE, in collaboration with the US Mission, should decide whether it will continue to invest resources in ESPECH Phase II to enable the project to achieve its target objectives as outlined in the logical framework matrix.
2. If the project is to be continued, the OAS (Programme) should revise project design and update the budget (component by component).
3. The OAS should review (and improve) its approach to ensuring Quality at Entry and quality project management throughout the project cycle.