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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLME</td>
<td>Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABS</td>
<td>Finance and Budget System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOS</td>
<td>Global Ocean Observing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB-ANCA</td>
<td>Caribbean regional network of the Harmful Algal Bloom Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAM</td>
<td>Integrated Coastal Area Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG/CARIBE EWS</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination Group for the Tsunami and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal Hazards Warning System for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGO</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>International Oceanographic Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOCAFRICA</td>
<td>IOC Sub-Commission for Africa and the Adjacent Island States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOCARIBE</td>
<td>IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODINCARSA</td>
<td>Ocean Data and Information Network in the Caribbean and South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Regular Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCT</td>
<td>United Nations Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>United Nations Office for Project Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTPAC</td>
<td>IOC Sub-Commission for the Western Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>World Meteorological Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Upon request of the IOC Secretariat, IOS carried out a review exercise of the regional structure of the IOCARIBE Secretariat. The purpose of the review was to identify operational constraints and recommendations for the future. The review was carried out in the period February-May 2012 and is based on a desk study, interviews with staff and stakeholders, and visits to the Cartagena and Kingston Offices, which jointly host the IOCARIBE Secretariat. The main findings and recommendations are presented below.

Findings

- The current division of the Secretariat between two locations is inefficient and the underlying rationale is not valid anymore.
  - The division of the Secretariat between Cartagena and Kingston leads to higher costs and efficiency losses.
  - The rationale for having the Secretary position in the Kingston Office is less clear than before.
  - The potential strategic advantages of Cartagena as the location of the IOCARIBE Secretariat (and UNESCO as a whole) are currently not fully exploited.
- There are a number of positive achievements of IOCARIBE, yet the current situation is not sustainable in terms of (future) performance and results.
  - The main comparative advantage of IOCARIBE is its networking function. While this is still considered to be a strength, the Secretariat does not have the capacities to properly nurture IOCARIBE’s networks.
  - There are a number of successful programmes managed by IOCARIBE. However, resources are spread thinly which affects several of the programmes.
  - IOCARIBE is well-positioned to attract extrabudgetary resources, yet has been unable to develop this potential.
  - Overall, the visibility of IOCARIBE’s programme activities, outputs and results in the region is low.
  - The collaboration between IOC Secretariat at HQ and the IOCARIBE Secretariat is less than optimal.
- The Secretariat’s lack of technical staff is the core cause undermining its effectiveness and sustainability.

Overall, it can be concluded that the current situation of the IOCARIBE Secretariat is unsustainable. Consequently, the following fundamental question should be posed. Is the current structure underlying IOCARIBE worthwhile strengthening, or is it something which should be fundamentally restructured, (partially) disbanded and/or integrated into existing institutional structures? Taking into account the time and data constraints of this exercise, and using triangulated evidence from stakeholder interviews and documentary evidence as a basis, the review concludes that there are sufficient arguments for justifying and indeed favoring the scenario of strengthening the IOCARIBE Secretariat on a trial basis.

Recommendations

- The main recommendation of the review is the following: The IOCARIBE Secretariat should be granted a trial period of two years to demonstrate enhanced
performance, effectiveness and develop a strong basis for financial sustainability of the Secretariat’s operations in the future. During this period, the Secretariat in Cartagena should be reinforced and operate with a full-time IOCARIBE Secretary.

- More specific guidelines on how to operationalize this recommendation are provided in the report.
- The report also highlights a number of additional recommendations related to improving IOCARIBE’s performance and effectiveness. Most importantly, there should be a more transparent and constructive collaboration between the IOCARIBE Secretariat and IOC Secretariat at HQ.
- Finally, one recommendation which concerns an audience beyond IOC is the following: The current underutilization of the Cartagena location should be brought to the attention of the Senior Management Team and scenarios for a more optimal use of the location by different UNESCO entities should be explored.
INTRODUCTION

Background

As a body with functional autonomy within UNESCO, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) has its own Governing Bodies, the Assembly and the Executive Council. For the most effective implementation of the IOC programme, the Governing Bodies can establish Primary Subsidiary Bodies (Committees, Sub-Commissions, and Regional Committees) and Secondary Subsidiary Bodies (Groups of Experts and Task Teams).¹

Among the Primary Subsidiary Bodies are the Sub-Commissions, intergovernmental Subsidiary Bodies of the Commission responsible for the promotion, development and coordination of the Commission’s marine scientific research programmes, the ocean services, the ocean operational observing systems and related activities, including Capacity Development,² in their respective regions. In establishing their programmes, they should take into account the specific interests and needs of the Member States in the region.³ There are currently three Sub-Commissions: IOCARIPE WESTPAC, and the recently established IOCAFIRICA.

The IOC Sub-commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIPE), established in 1982,⁴ is responsible for the promotion, development and coordination of the IOC’s global scientific and research programmes and ocean services in the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions. IOCARIPE has 32 Member States and 15 Territories. IOCARIPE is supported by a Secretariat, established in Cartagena, Colombia in 1985.⁵

The current Secretary (head of the Secretariat of IOCARIPE) until 2009 was based in Cartagena but then was transferred to the UNESCO Kingston Office. The reason for the move of the Secretary position in 2009 is twofold. First of all, the Cartagena Office did not have the required certified administrative support to manage (large) extrabudgetary projects,⁶ in contrast to the UNESCO Kingston Office which has an AO. Second, due to budgetary constraints, IOC encountered difficulties in covering the costs of the Secretary position. As a result, the Secretary position and the international (P3) post for the Science portfolio in the Kingston Office were combined to resolve this situation.

The Cartagena Office is composed of one temporary G staff and one fixed-term extrabudgetary G staff (see Annex 2).⁷ ⁸ Additional administrative support is provided by the Kingston Office. Apart from harboring the IOCARIPE Secretariat, since 2009 The Cartagena

² IOC Committee for Training, Education, and Mutual Assistance in the Marine Sciences.
³ IOC Manual (1989), Section 5.2; Guidelines for the Structure and Responsibilities of the Subsidiary Bodies of the Commission, and for the Establishment of Decentralized Offices (IOC/INF-1193, 2005), Section 1.2.
⁴ Resolution IOC XII-16.
⁵ Resolution IOC XIII-14.
⁶ In general, the Cartagena Office did not have the administrative mandate to function as a full-fledged Office.
⁷ It should be noted that the two G staff have been employed in the Cartagena Office with different types of contracts for over twenty years.
⁸ In addition, there is a cleaning lady on a local contract and, on a rotational basis, two interns from a university in Canada.
Office has been hosting the coordinating unit (staffed by UNOPS) of a GEF-funded project, the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Project (CLME).9

In the last years IOC has been optimizing its presence in the field aligning its regional presence more closely with UNESCO field structure. The IOC Guidelines for the Structure and Responsibilities of the Subsidiary Bodies of the Commission, and for the Establishment of Decentralized Offices (IOC/INF-1193, 2005) recommend that: “The outposted IOC staff providing secretariat services to a regional Sub-Commission shall be located in an appropriate office of UNESCO or of any organization of the United Nations system in the region of the regional Sub-Commission, or elsewhere in a Member State of the region, provided that such a State offers facilities considered adequate by the regional Sub-Commission and approved by a governing body of the Commission.”

Several reviews on IOC Regional Subsidiary Bodies were undertaken in recent years,10 including the issues of administrative and Secretariat support to such bodies. The present review stems from the conclusions of some of those previous efforts focusing on the special situation of the IOCARIBE Secretariat.

**Principal functions and tasks to be carried out by the IOCARIBE Secretariat**

According to the IOCARIBE website and in line with official documents,11 the main function of IOCARIBE is to act as an international networking system created by the Governments of Member States, for the co-ordination and promotion of marine and coastal sciences and associated operational services in the region.

Its major objectives are to:
- Reinforce and broaden scientific co-operation, regionally and internationally through networking and institutional arrangements with organizations operating within and without the region, for example, UN bodies, IGOs, NGOs, the scientific community;
- Provide regional inputs to global ocean sciences and observation programmes;
- Promote and facilitate implementation of IOC global science programmes and ocean services at the regional level;
- Foster the generation of knowledge, sharing of information, expertise and experience on the wider Caribbean and its coastlines; and to
- Assist Member States to develop their capacity to formulate national policies and plans to meet their needs in marine science and technology.

These activities are implemented by different groups of actors within the IOCARIBE and wider IOC structure, mainly:
- IOC staff from HQ who manage particular global IOC programmes as well as programmes in the region such as ICG/CARIBE EWS;
- Focal points (of Member States), who liaise between national actors and activities and IOCARIBE, they also participate in the biennial sessions of IOCARIBE;

---

9 IOCARIBE formulated this project in collaboration with different partners, implemented the pdf-b phase of the project, negotiated and obtained GEF funding, and is now co-responsible for its implementation. The project will be completed in 2013.
11 E.g. IOC/EC-XLI/2 Annex 5.
Committees (ODINCARSA), Groups of experts (HAB-ANCA) and other (scientific) experts who are involved in the implementation of particular programmes;
- National (i.e. of Member States) and international institutions involved in co-funding and co-implementation of programmes;
- IOCARIBE Officers (chair and vice-chairs) who are responsible for chairing the sessions of the Sub-Commission, providing strategic guidance on IOCARIBE’s programmes and promoting IOCARIBE’s mission in the region;
- The Secretariat (see below).

The Secretariat has the following key tasks in supporting the mission of IOCARIBE:
- Serve as the Technical Secretariat for the Sub-Commission and for the regional committees as and when required by coordinating regional components of the global programmes and activities of the IOC;
- Promote the development and use, at the regional level, of ocean services and related supporting activities, coordinated or maintained by IOC;
- Facilitate the exchange of scientific data and information and the transfer of knowledge resulting from marine scientific research, especially to developing countries in the region;
- Assist with the identification of capacity-development (formerly Training, Education and Mutual Assistance/TEMA) needs in the region, especially those related to the programmes of the Sub-Commission, when appropriate, and promote the required capacity-development activities;
- Report on the progress of the Sub-Commission’s to the Chair of the IOC Sub-Commission, the IOC Executive Secretary and participating Member States, on a regular basis;
- Organize major scientific/technical conferences, including meetings of the corresponding Sub-Commission, as defined in the Programme Work Plan;
- Liaise and maintain links with all IOC programmes and relevant IOC projects;
- Establish and maintain links with other relevant organizations, institutions and programmes in order to promote cooperation with the Programme;
- Seek partnerships and potential sources of funding to strengthen Programme implementation.

Purpose

Upon request of the IOC Secretariat, IOS carried out a review exercise of the regional structure of the IOCARIBE. The purpose of the review was to identify operational constraints and recommendations for the future.

It is not the purpose of the review to provide an assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of IOCARIBE’s programmatic activities. This would have required a different and more elaborate approach. Having said this, in order to develop credible and useful recommendations about the future of the Secretariat, the evaluation team deemed it necessary to develop a synthetic assessment of the overall merit and worth of IOCARIBE’s programmatic performance and effectiveness. This assessment is presented below and is based on the following premises:
- it represents the evaluation team’s independent appreciation of the merit and worth of IOCARIBE’s presence in the region based on triangulation of available data sources, and taking into account time and data constraints;
- it does not involve any comparison with the relevance and effectiveness of IOC’s activities in other regions and therefore cannot inform discussions on the relative allocation of (regular programme) budgets to (regional) Subsidiary Bodies of IOC.

**Approach**

The review is designed to answer the following basic question. Given the merit and worth of IOCARIBE’s activities in the region, and given the strategic priority that IOC attaches to IOCARIBE’s presence in the region, and finally taking into account the current financial constraints, what should be the optimal structure for the IOCARIBE Secretariat in the region?

More specifically, the review addressed the following questions:

**Descriptive questions:**
1. What are the principal functions and tasks to be carried out by the IOCARIBE Secretariat?
2. What is the current structure of the IOCARIBE Secretariat, including available capacities and the division of labor between Kingston and Cartagena?

**Evaluative questions:**
1. What is the performance of the Secretariat in terms of delivery upon its key functions and tasks? What are key constraints or shortcomings?
2. Is the current structure of the Secretariat, particularly the division of labor between Kingston and Cartagena, optimal in terms of:
   a. the Secretariat’s capacity to carry out its functions and tasks
   b. efficiency of operations (e.g. financial, human resources, logistics)
   c. sustainability of operations (e.g. funding, staffing)

The review relied on the following methods:

- desk study of key documents
- semi-structured interviews with IOC staff in Cartagena and Kingston and (to the extent possible) external stakeholders

**REVIEW FINDINGS**

This section presents the findings of the review. These findings correspond to the two major evaluative questions presented above. Overall, the review would like to reiterate the following message formulated by the working group on IOC regional activities (IOC-XXVI/RSB/3s, p. 4): “The Working Group identified the following common characteristics found in both the Sub-Commissions: IOCARIBE and WESTPAC, which are the most successful of the regional Subsidiary Bodies: [1] Secretariat support and dedicated staff who are able to provide liaison between the Member States, organisations and institutions in the regions, [2] Willingness of Member States in these regions to contribute both in-kind and cash toward the implementation of activities.” The present review concurs with this message in the sense that these two factors (out of three mentioned by the working group) have indeed been key factors underlying successful activities and results (of IOCARIBE). Yet, in the case of IOCARIBE, the review has found clear limitations in both factors (staffing, contributions from Member States) which in turn limit the scope and extent of achievement to the point of compromising (on several accounts) the quality and quantity of IOCARIBE’s work.
1 The current division of the Secretariat between two locations is inefficient and the underlying rationale is not valid anymore.

The division of the Secretariat between Cartagena and Kingston leads to higher costs and efficiency losses. The fact that the Secretary of IOCARIBE is located in Kingston in practice means that he has to travel to Cartagena to oversee and carry out the Secretariat’s work plan. Apart from the financial costs, another negative implication is suboptimal coordination and oversight of the Secretariat’s activities, resulting in efficiency losses.

The rationale for having the Secretary position in the Kingston Office is less clear than before. In 2009, there were justifiable reasons why the post of the Secretary was moved to Kingston. Nowadays, the two main justifications, adequate administrative support and combining the Secretary post with the Science post in Kingston, have weakened and are less valid than before. Regarding the first argument, it is important for IOCARIBE to have adequate administrative support in conformity with UNESCO regulations. In that sense, the transfer of administrative responsibilities to the AO in Kingston, given the absence of a certified AO in Cartagena, has been a positive one. However, this transfer does not require that the Secretary is present in the same location as the AO. In fact, there are good examples of antenna offices (e.g. Sarajevo) operating with a non-resident AO. With the roll-out of FABS completed, many of the administrative tasks performed by the Secretariat can be easily performed with support of a non-resident AO. Regarding the second argument, the management of the Science portfolio (de jure constituting 80% of the workload of the incumbent of the IOCARIBE Secretary post) indeed would justify the location of the post being in Kingston. However, in the current biennium there is very little budget for developing Science activities. Consequently (and for other reasons as well), from a scarcity perspective one could develop a strong argument that the strategic importance of IOC activities in the region predominates the importance of managing the SC portfolio. Or, in other words, the negative effects (for IOC) of having a part-time Secretary physically located outside of Cartagena, outweigh the benefits of managing the Science portfolio from the Kingston Office. In fact, given the current budgetary situation, and the strategic positioning of UNESCO in the region, it would make sense to reconsider the balance of importance between allocating x resources to a Science position in Kingston versus y resources to a IOC position in the region.

The potential strategic advantages of Cartagena as the location of the IOCARIBE Secretariat (and UNESCO as a whole) are currently not fully exploited. First, the building in which the IOCARIBE Secretariat is based is underutilized. The IOCARIBE Secretariat is located in a beautiful building, one of the most famous colonial buildings (Casa del Marqués de Valdehoyos) in the historical center of Cartagena, a World Heritage Site. Consequently, there is a real strategic potential for developing other UNESCO activities in the building. Second, the current host country agreement between the Colombian government and IOC stipulates a number of benefits for IOCARIBE. The Secretariat can make use of the building free of rent and receives an additional annual 17,000 USD (approximately at this time; the amount increases by inflation factor) from the Colombian Government for operating costs. Despite these benefits, the current host country agreement with the Colombian government, which was signed in 1988, is outdated. It does not comply with the minimum requirements of support from a host country government as set out in the guidelines for the establishment of decentralized offices.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) IOC/INF-1193.
Table 1. pros and cons of uniting the IOCARIBE Secretariat in Kingston or Cartagena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cartagena</th>
<th>Kingston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial implications</td>
<td>Efficiency gains but recurrent staff costs of present Secretariat remain</td>
<td>Cost savings due to closure of Cartagena office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications for IOCARIBE programmes and activities</td>
<td>Close proximity of CLME project unit</td>
<td>Location issue of CLME project unit has to be addressed, loss of capacities in secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International connectivity</td>
<td>Not good *</td>
<td>Not good *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic advantages location</td>
<td>Proximity of two national institutions in marine research</td>
<td>Proximity of UNEP office for the Caribbean region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Potential to provide other benefits to UNESCO | IOCARIBE Secretariat has assisted other UNESCO entities in organizing events in Cartagena which is a popular international venue for international meetings, the building offers potential for developing other UNESCO activities
13 | Potential for alignment of IOCARIBE activities with Kingston Office (not happening currently) |
| Presence of AO                        | No                                                                         | Yes                                                                      |
| Language                              | Bi-lingual (English-Spanish) local staff available                        | Mostly English-speaking environment                                      |
| Security issues                       | None                                                                      | Security is a concern                                                    |
| Sharing IOC and SC portfolios14       | Possible (see discussion in text)                                         | Possible (see discussion in text)                                        |
| Host country agreement                | Building free of charge, financial allocation of US$ 17,000 per year (increases in line with inflation) for operating costs, potential for developing a new host country agreement | Building is provided rent-free but there are service charges             |

* The number of flights from both locations to other Latin American and Caribbean countries is rather limited, especially when compared to other locations such as Miami or Panama.

Table 1 provides an overview of the pros and cons of uniting the Secretariat in one location, either Cartagena or Kingston. Concentration in either one of these locations is preferable to the current situation. Overall, in the short to medium term15 the Cartagena location is the best option from a strategic and efficiency perspective.

2 There are a number of positive achievements of IOCARIBE,16 yet the current situation is not sustainable in terms of (future) performance and results.

The main comparative advantage of IOCARIBE is its networking function. While this is still considered to be a strength, the Secretariat does not have the capacities to properly nurture IOCARIBE’s networks. IOCARIBE has few financial resources but has the (potential to develop)

---

13 The IOCARIBE Secretariat is located in a beautiful building, one of the most famous colonial buildings in the historical center of Cartagena (Casa del Marqués de Valdehoyos), the latter of which is listed as a World Heritage Site.
14 Below it is argued that it is not desirable to continue this modality.
15 Pending the UNESCO field office network reform in Latin America and the Caribbean.
16 Results-reporting on IOCARIBE activities is very weak. There are recurrent reports on activities and outputs, yet very little documentation on the relevance, effectiveness and impact of IOCARIBE is available.
institutional capital and convening power to bring together different Member States and (inter)national institutions in the area of marine research. According to several IOCARIBE focal points the regional bodies of IOC are very important for IOC, because programs are much more attuned to local priorities in contrast to the globally managed IOC programs. Member States, at least those which are active in IOCARIBE, feel that they have real ownership over the Sub-Commission. This is in contrast to many of the other internationally set-up programs and institutional frameworks.

The commitment of Member States to IOCARIBE differs substantially; whereas there are some Member States which have a relatively high-level representation, many others do not. Some of the latter, though members of IOCARIBE, are inactive. Overall, member state focal points are very positive about the capacities and quality of support of the current staff of the secretariat. At the same time focal points agree on the fact that in relation to the ambitious mandate of IOCARIBE and its underlying programmes, the staffing levels of the Secretariat are insufficient. There is a shared feeling among focal points that presently the Secretariat has insufficient capacity to actively liaise with Member States, raise the level of participation of those who are not or less involved, and strengthen the overall visibility and political importance of the IOCARIBE platform in the region, which would be necessary to raise the profile of joint marine research activities.

IOCARIBE has successfully developed a number of partnerships with international organizations such as UNEP, UNDP, FAO, WMO, NOAA and others. Of particular importance is the strategic partnership between IOC and the UNEP office for the Caribbean. For example, in the GEF-funded CLME project which was formulated by IOCARIBE, UNEP is one of the agencies managing one of the sub projects. In turn, a new project to be funded by the GEF in the area of ICAM (Integrated Coastal Area Management) which is currently in the development phase, UNEP will be the implementing agency with IOCARIBE as a partner. There is a complementarity between UNEP’s and IOCARIBE’s mandate in the region which is also appreciated by Member States. UNEP has a normative mandate in several areas and in the implementation of this mandate (to the extent that it overlaps with IOCARIBE’s mission) IOCARIBE can bring in scientific knowledge and capacities through its networks in the region (including the US). IOCARIBE has played a role in at least one UNCT (Colombia), but could play a much larger role in the UN system in the region.

According to several focal points, the weakest component in IOCARIBE’s networks is contacts with universities in the region. Given the key importance of universities in marine research activities, there is scope for enhancing the number and nature of partnerships with universities.

There are a number of successful programmes managed by IOCARIBE. However, resources are spread thinly which affects several of the programmes. IOCARIBE is responsible for implementing a number of regional programmes as well as regional components of global programmes managed by HQ. One of the programmes of high importance and interest for the Caribbean is ICAM (Integrated Coastal Area Management). As mentioned above, a new project is under development within the framework of this programme. In addition, IOCARIBE was instrumental in setting up ICG/CARIBE EWS, the intergovernmental coordinating group for tsunami warning systems, which has been quite successful. The Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystems Project (GEF grant of 7.1 million USD plus co-funding) is

---

17 As worded by one respondent, the Secretariat’s staffing levels are ‘embarrassingly’ low.
18 These organizations do not provide funding to the Secretariat, but provide financial and/or in kind contributions to IOCARIBE’s activities.
the largest project co-managed by IOCARIPE. The Project Coordinating Unit was established in the offices of the IOCCARIBE Secretariat in May 2009. UNDP is the implementing agency, UNOPS is in charge of administrative aspects of the project and the IOC, through IOCARIPE, is the lead technical agency. It is important that the CLME project is successfully implemented and generates the expected results, as it will set a precedent for the future. Examples of programmes which are less successful are the HAB-ANCA (Harmful Algae Bloom programme component for the Caribbean region) and IOCARIPE-GOOS (Global Ocean Observing System programme component for the Caribbean) programmes which are regional components of global IOC programmes.

In general, high-quality support from the IOCARIPE Secretariat is stretched very thinly. The strategic focus of IOCARIPE’s resources and capacities somewhat improved over the last five years or so after the clean-up of programmes roughly 3 (bi-annual) meetings of the Sub-Commission ago (some programmes existed on paper only). However, it should be noted that there is little activity in several of the programmes managed by IOCARIPE, which is not surprising given the limited human resources available to coordinate, stimulate, and raise funds for activities within the programmes.19

**IOCARIBE is well-positioned to attract extrabudgetary resources, yet has been unable to develop this potential.** The convening power of IOCARIPE in the region in principle constitutes a key strategic advantage for mobilizing funds. The successful acquisition of the CLME project which is a large full-size GEF-funded project as well as the ongoing development of the new GEF project called “Demonstrate Approaches for Nutrient and Sediment Reduction at Selected Pilot Study Areas in the Wider Caribbean”, give evidence of a potential for attracting considerable extrabudgetary funding. However, the process of project formulation, including eliciting and coordinating the involvement of and endorsement by Member States, is very time-intensive. The current part-time post of Secretary does not allow for sufficient time to be allocated to such processes.

Despite some successes in fundraising, there are reasons for concern, not only on the acquisition (capacity) side, but also on the supply side. Member States’ focal points which were consulted in this review tend to be quite appreciative of IOCARIPE’s role and accomplishments in the region. Yet this appreciation has not translated into major gestures of support (in kind or with financial resources). There is no obligation for Member States to financially contribute to IOCARIPE and the feasibility for introducing a system of obligatory membership contributions appears to be low. The departure of traditional ODA donors from the Latin American and Caribbean Region has lowered the prospects for attracting money from the international community. The recent withdrawal of US financial support to UNESCO is quite problematic, as the US has been a key partner in IOCARIPE’s programmes. Fortunately, there are still ways in which the US can indirectly (via partners) support IOCARIPE’s mandate in the region.20

Several options for fundraising have not been sufficiently explored:

---

19 Not only lack of staffing in the Secretariat, but also lack of funding is making it difficult for example for groups of scientists to meet and work together on research programmes.

20 From interviews with stakeholders in the US, it became clear that the US remains committed to supporting IOCARIPE’s mandate but is currently not in the position to provide funding.
- Raising the profile of IOCARIIBE among Member States, they can earmark funding for marine research in their own budgets, as well as, possibly, for direct contributions to activities managed by the IOCARIIBE Secretariat;
- Private sector contributions, e.g. within the framework of ‘markets’ for environmental services (e.g. conservation biodiversity as a benefit to the tourism sector);
- Funding from universities, or, in collaboration with universities, from research grant facilities in the region and beyond;
- Opportunities with the government and/or other institutions in Colombia.

An additional factor, affecting the prospects for fundraising, the development of institutional partnerships and IOCARIIBE’s profile among Member States, is the visibility of IOCARIIBE’s work. Overall, the visibility of IOCARIIBE’s programme activities, outputs and results in the region is low. There is a willingness among the Officers (chairs, vice-chairs) to enhance the visibility of IOCARIIBE, but this only works with the active collaboration of the Secretariat through the development of promotional materials, organization of events, and so on.

Currently, the collaboration between IOC Secretariat at HQ and the IOCARIIBE Secretariat is less than optimal. On the one hand there is insufficient transparency regarding the activities, outputs and budgetary decisions of the IOCARIIBE Secretariat vis-à-vis HQ. Moreover, IOCARIIBE should take more advantage of the knowledge repositories and networks in the wider IOC system to the benefit of the region. On the other hand, HQ could have done more to strengthen the programmatic functions of IOCARIIBE by providing more assistance in the design, fundraising and implementation of projects. For outsiders it is not quite clear how IOC functions in the region. Some programmes are managed by IOCARIIBE, others by HQ (sometimes, for example in the case of ICG/CARIBE EWS, with support from field offices (e.g. Haiti)). Some programmes are run with different levels of collaboration with UNESCO offices in Mexico, Haiti, San Jose, Kingston, Montevideo, Quito. Overall, the impression is one of a lack of clarity and, as confirmed by different sources, insufficient communication between the different IOC (and other UNESCO) staff members working on IOC programmes for the region.

3 The Secretariat’s lack of technical staff is the core cause undermining its effectiveness and sustainability.

Following the transfer of the PS post of Secretary of IOCARIIBE (1986-1993) to Headquarters, during several years the function of the IOCARIIBE Secretary was assumed by temporary employees with all sorts of contractual arrangements. From 2001 to 2008 a temporary extrabudgetary post P4 was established. Since 2009 until now, a fixed-term RP P4 funded post was established in the 34 C/S, supported 20% by IOC and 80% by the Natural Sciences Sector, and located in the UNESCO Office in Kingston, Jamaica. The current incumbent was appointed by the UNESCO Director General to continue as Head of the IOCARIIBE Secretariat and also assume responsibility for the UNESCO Science Programme for the Caribbean based

---

21 There is a growing number of middle income countries in the region with the capacity to fund marine research activities. In addition, there are regional interests of European countries such as France, the United Kingdom and The Netherlands.
22 IOC is mostly about the science of oceans. Science traditionally does not receive a lot of funding. If the link with the tourism sector, or (other) markets for environmental services (e.g. carbon sequestration, water regulation and quality), could be made then this could open up new channels of funding. This requires some work on making more explicit and visible the societal benefits of IOCARIIBE’s programmes. Moreover, it would require a decision from Member States to support such an initiative.
at the UNESCO Office in Kingston, Jamaica. The current incumbent was relocated to Kingston in January 2009.

The Secretariat has only one senior expert, the Secretary of IOCARIBE, who formally can dedicate only 20% of his time to IOC matters. Although in practice this percentage may be higher, it is still very low in comparison to the range of expected duties and responsibilities of a Secretary of a Sub-Commission. Moreover, as the only senior technical staff member, the prospects for providing high-level technical inputs to different programmes, networks, institutions within the IOCARIBE system is limited. Member States are aware of this and, although positive about the quality of support when given, stress the substantial gap between what is needed to perform adequately and what is provided in practice under the current constraints. Consequently, Member States have repeatedly expressed their concern regarding the lack of a full-time Secretary post.23

There are two experienced administrative staff members24 who, besides performing administrative and logistical tasks, in practice liaise effectively with different actors (scientists, focal points) within the IOCARIBE system. The rotational presence of two to three interns from a Canadian university is helpful in the reduction of the workload. However, given their level of experience, the steep learning curve regarding IOC programmes, and possible language barriers, interns are far less useful and effective than a professional staff member, such as a programme specialist.

With respect to staffing there is no clear budget or funding plan which stipulates how staff is to be funded in the short and medium term. In the previous biennium, IOCARIBE received more or less 74 000 USD from the RP budget, plus another 25 000 USD for statutory meetings of the Sub-Commission and some additional support to pay for the salary of the fixed-term administrative staff. Currently, it is unclear how fees from extrabudgetary programmes (e.g. CLME) are used to finance the Secretariat’s staff. Second, the ‘negotiated’ position between IOC HQ and IOCARIBE as to what proportion of staff costs should be covered by RP budget or decentralized extrabudgetary resources versus extrabudgetary resources raised in the region is unclear. Within the framework of this review it can be concluded that the current budgetary allocations from HQ are not sufficient to guarantee a high-quality and effective functioning of the Secretariat.25

More generally, the reality of having only a part-time Secretary for IOCARIBE and no programme staff (e.g. the absence of seconded technical experts or associate professional officers (funded by particular (donor) countries)) is cause for serious concern and jeopardizes IOCARIBE’s effectiveness and future sustainability as a serious player in the field of marine research in the Caribbean.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, it can be concluded that the current situation of the IOCARIBE Secretariat is unsustainable. Current staffing and associated RP resources are insufficient to ensure adequate delivery of the mandate of IOCARIBE into the future. Moreover, current (regular programme and extrabudgetary) resources cannot sustain a fully independent and effective

23 E.g. IOC/SC-IOCARIBE-XI/3s.
24 One of the administrative staff has a fixed-term position, the other has been on and off working under different types of contracts.
25 In the recommendation section, proposed actions are presented to address this point and related findings.
IOCARIBE Secretariat. At the same time, sufficient extrabudgetary resources cannot be obtained without the necessary capacities to build partnerships and formulate quality funding proposals. In other words, we are facing a classical circular argument: there are not enough resources for effective delivery of IOCARIBE’s mandate and current capacities do not allow for attracting sufficient resources. Having concluded that maintaining the status quo is not a desirable option, the following fundamental question should be posed. Is the current structure underlying IOCARIBE worthwhile strengthening, or is it something which should be fundamentally restructured, (partially) disbanded and/or integrated into existing institutional structures?

Taking into account the time and data constraints of this exercise, and using triangulated evidence from stakeholder interviews and documentary evidence as a basis, the review concludes that there are sufficient arguments for justifying and indeed favoring the scenario of strengthening the IOCARIBE Secretariat on a trial basis.

Consequently, the review recommends that:

**The IOCARIBE Secretariat should be granted a trial period of two years to demonstrate enhanced performance, effectiveness and develop a strong basis for financial sustainability of the Secretariat’s operations in the future. During this period, the Secretariat in Cartagena should be reinforced and operate with a full-time IOCARIBE Secretary.**

The proposed model for the trial period, with implications for funding arrangements, would be the following:
- Establishing a full-time PA\(^{26}\) post in Cartagena (for a period of two years)\(^{27}\)

Funding of the new full-time post, the staffing costs of the Secretariat and other operational costs should ideally come from the following sources:
- Cost-sharing arrangements with the CLME project unit which is housed in the same premises as the Secretariat (and the future ‘GEF-ICAM’ project unit);
- Fees\(^{28}\) from extra-budgetary projects such as the CLME project, the future ‘GEF-ICAM’ project and other projects;
- In case of relocation of the current Secretary, the RP funds from IOC to finance 20% of the P4 post occupied by the Secretary\(^{29}\) could be used to fund the full-time post in Cartagena;
- Allocations from the UNESCO emergency fund for strengthening IOCARIBE’s outreach work in the Caribbean Region;
- Exploring other options for utilizing the vacant spaces in the current premises of the IOCARIBE Secretariat in Cartagena, which may generate new cost-sharing arrangements;

---

\(^{26}\) Recently, the new contractual modality of project appointment (PA) has been established which will replace the ALD modality, which will be phased out.

\(^{27}\) This may involve relocating the IOCARIBE Secretary from Kingston to Cartagena, or recruiting an additional full-time international programme staff to be posted in Cartagena. In the latter case, the duties and responsibilities of the IOCARIBE Secretary would be divided between the current Secretary and the new program staff which would report to the former.

\(^{28}\) Including cost recovery for inputs from RP-funded staff and direct costs for inputs from staff paid from extrabudgetary resources.

\(^{29}\) The other 80% of the P4 post, funded by SC, should remain in Kingston and converted back into the original 100% P3 post for the SC portfolio in the region.
- Developing a new host country agreement with the Colombian Government in conformity with the requirements set out in the guidelines for the establishment of decentralized offices.  

Taking into account the current financial constraints as well as a certain level of uncertainty regarding the contextual factors that affect the Secretariat’s financial sustainability, the future of the Secretariat should depend on whether or not specific targets in the two-year period have been achieved. The following criteria (with clearly established targets) should be considered to determine whether or not the trial period has been successful:

- Raising extrabudgetary resources (e.g. through a number of high-quality projects endorsed by Member States);
- Developing a new host country agreement with the Colombian government;
- Enhancing member state participation in IOCARIBE programmes and activities;
- Developing new and revitalizing existing partnerships with national institutions (in Member States) working in the area of marine research, including universities in the region;
- Developing agreements with partners from (inter)national institutions for secondments of experienced technical staff to the IOCARIBE Secretariat;
- Developing a clear and transparent medium-term funding plan on how to finance the different staff positions in the Secretariat.

A clear baseline should be established to assess the current situation using these criteria. This can be done in a rapid and efficient manner, using existing data. Consequently, clear and adequate targets for these criteria can be established.

In case of not meeting the established targets after the two-year trial period, the review recommends that the following options be explored:

- Fully integrate the Secretariat into an existing UNESCO Office, in alignment with the proposed UNESCO field reform in Latin America and the Caribbean. This would inevitably lead to closure of the Cartagena Office.
- Integrate the IOCARIBE Secretariat into the IOC Secretariat in Paris.

The staffing of the Secretariat would be reconsidered in view of the achievements and available resources and the new location. The option of merging the Secretariat with IOC staff capacities dedicated to ICG/CARIBE EWS in Haiti should also be considered.

In case of meeting the established targets after the two-year trial period, the review recommends the following:

- Comply with Member States demands (e.g. as expressed in IOC/SC-IOCARIBE-XI/3s) and convert the full-time PA post into a full-time (permanent) fixed-term post.
- Maintain the IOCARIBE Secretariat in Cartagena and further explore options for developing IOC and UNESCO activities in the premises.

Whether or not the targets have been achieved after two years should be assessed by an independent evaluator (e.g. IOS).

Other recommendations are the following:

---

30 IOC/INF-1193.
31 It is important to have strong champions of IOCARIBE in the region. Possibly, this could be one Member State.
32 See also the recommendations by the open-ended working group on IOC regional activities (IOC-XXVI/RSB/3s).
33 In case a UNESCO Regional Office would be established in Panama this location should certainly be considered.
- There should be a more transparent and constructive collaboration between the IOCARIBE Secretariat and IOC Secretariat at HQ;
- Relatedly, the organizational structure for the Caribbean region should be clarified both for internal purposes as well as towards external stakeholders;
- Again relatedly, regional and global fundraising strategies should be further developed and aligned to each other;\(^{34}\)
- IOCARIBE should strengthen the existing ties with universities in the region (and beyond) and explore new partnerships. This could involve looking for ways to connect its work to curricula of academic programs and identifying research programmes of joint interest.
- The current underutilization of the Cartagena location should be brought to the attention of the Senior Management Team and scenarios for a more optimal use of the location by different UNESCO entities should be explored.

\(^{34}\) See also the recommendations by the open-ended working group on IOC regional activities (IOC-XXVI/RSB/3s). In practice, this would mean among other things that IOC HQ and IOCARIBE collaborate in funding proposals for global programmes (with regional components) and regional programmes that feed into global programme priorities.
Annex 1 - LIST OF STATES AND TERRITORIES MEMBERS OF IOCARIBE

1. ANTIGUA & BARBUDA
2. BAHAMAS
3. BARBADOS
4. BELIZE
5. BRAZIL
6. COLOMBIA
7. COSTA RICA
8. CUBA
9. DOMINICA
10. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
11. FRANCE
   - FRENCH GUYANA
   - GUADELOUPE
   - MARTINIQUE
   - ST. BARTHELEMY
   - ST. MARTIN
12. GRENADE
13. GUATEMALA
14. GUYANA
15. HAITI
16. HONDURAS
17. JAMAICA
18. MEXICO
19. NETHERLANDS
   - BONAIRE
   - SABA
   - ST. EUSTASIUS
20. ARUBA
21. CURACAO
22. ST. MAARTEN
23. NICARAGUA
24. PANAMA
25. ST. KITTS & NEVIS
26. ST. LUCIA
27. ST. VINCENT & GRENADINES
28. SURINAME
29. TRINIDAD & TOBAGO
30. UNITED KINGDOM
   - ANGUILLA
   - BERMUDA
   - BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS
   - CAYMAN ISLANDS
   - TURKS & CAICOS
31. UNITED STATES
   - PUERTO RICO
   - US VIRGIN ISLANDS
32. VENEZUELA
### Annex 2 - List of Staff of the IOCARIPE Secretariat in Cartagena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>UNESCO Staff</th>
<th>Period 2012</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cesar TORO</td>
<td>Head of the Office</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Posted to Kingston. Travelling often to Cartagena (almost every 45 days last 2 years). P4 RP fixed-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patricia WILLS</td>
<td>Secretary – Assistant to Dr. Toro</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>G6 XB fixed term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bianis PALACIOS</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>SSA contract XB (local support) temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jennifer STEELE</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jan 18 –June 30</td>
<td>Canadian Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brett ZITER</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jan 18 – June 30</td>
<td>Canadian Intern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rosiris del Carmen JULIO</td>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Local Contract Outsourcing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3 - People contacted within the framework of the review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ydalia Acevedo</td>
<td>Dominican Republic, National Focal Point and Vice-Minister of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardo Aliaga</td>
<td>Programme specialist IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Andrade</td>
<td>Coordinator Regional Coordinating Unit, Caribbean Environment Programme, UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Belfiore</td>
<td>Programme specialist IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitrasen Bhikajee</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Secretary of IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Brizuela</td>
<td>Mexico, National Focal Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Fischer</td>
<td>Head of section IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo García</td>
<td>Cuba, National Focal Point, Director Acuario Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Green</td>
<td>Jamaica, Coordinator, Ecosystems Management Branch, National Environment &amp; Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Inniss</td>
<td>Barbados, National Focal Point, Former IOCARIBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Mckenzie</td>
<td>Jamaica, Vice-chair, Manager Strategic Planning &amp; Policies, National Environment &amp; Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bianis Palacios</td>
<td>Administrative assistant IOCARIBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Paterson</td>
<td>USA, NOAA, Alternate National Focal Point for IOCARIBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Ponwith</td>
<td>USA, IOCARIBE Chairperson, Director NOAA Southeast Fisheries Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Proenza</td>
<td>USA, Regional Director National Weather Service – Southern Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Toro</td>
<td>IOC Secretary of IOCARIBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Luis Valdes</td>
<td>Chief, Ocean sciences section IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Watson-Wright</td>
<td>ADG IOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Wills</td>
<td>Administrative assistant IOCARIBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laverne Walker</td>
<td>Senior project officer CLME project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu Wenxi</td>
<td>Acting head of WESTPAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksenia Yvinec</td>
<td>Finance and administrative officer IOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4 - IOCARIBE BOARD OF OFFICERS 2011 - 2013

Chairperson
Ms. Bonnie J. Ponwith, PhD.
Director
NOAA Fisheries Southeast Fisheries Science Center
75 Virginia Beach Drive
Miami, FL 33149 – U.S.A.
Tel: 305-361-4264
Fax: 305-361-4219
bonnie.ponwith@noaa.gov

Vice-Chairperson
Ms. Pedzi Girigori (Curacao)
Sum Mahuma z/h
Curacao
Tel: (5999) 839 3364
pedzi.girigori@meteo.an

Vice-Chairperson (Reelected)
Mr. Anthony McKenzie (Jamaica)
Manager Strategic Planning & Policies
National Environment & Planning Agency
10 Caledonia Ave, Kingston, Jamaica
Tel: (876) 754 7545
Fax: (876) 754 7594
amckenzie@nepa.gov.jm

Vice-Chairperson
Mr. Francisco Brizuela Venegas
Asesor de la Coordinación Sectorial de Desarrollo Académico
Subsecretaría de Educación Media Superior
Secretaría de Educación Pública
Coordinación Sectorial de Desarrollo Académico
Mariano Escobedo 438
Colonia Casa Blanca
Delegación Miguel Hidalgo
C.P. 11590 México D.F.
Tel: (525) 36011000 Ext. 64, 364

The IOC’s Association for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE) was established in 1975 to take over the functions of Cooperative Investigations in the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (CICAR), which was coordinated by IOC and modeled on the International Indian Ocean Expedition. The IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE), which replaced the association, but retained the acronym, was created in 1982, to carry out the IOC global programmes on a regional basis for the Greater Caribbean. This was the first Sub-Commission established by IOC.

Membership: Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, France (French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, St. Barthelemy, St. Martin), Grenade, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands (Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao, Saba, St. Eustasius, St. Maarten), Nicaragua, Panama, St. Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago, United Kingdom (Anguilla, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Turks & Caicos), United States (Puerto Rico, US Virgin Islands), Venezuela.

The Sub-Commission has a secretariat in Cartagena, Colombia.

The following are high lights of some of the activities implemented in recent years:

The eleventh session of the IOC of UNESCO Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions SC-IOCARIBE-XI was held in Miami, USA, 17-20 May 2011. It was attended by 30 participants from nine countries of the Caribbean Region and two Organizations. The Session reviewed progress made during the Inter-sessional period 2009–2011. The Sub-Commission adopted seven recommendations concerning: (i) Programme Implementation; (ii) IOC Working Group on Harmful Algal Blooms in the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (HAB-ANCA); (iii) The Regular Process for the Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including socioeconomic aspects (Regular Process); (iv) Ocean Data and Information Network for the Caribbean and South American Regions (ODINCARSA-LA) and the Caribbean Marine Atlas Project (CMA); (v) The International Bathymetric Chart for the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico (IBCCA); (vi) IOCARIBE-GOOS; and, Programme and Budget for 2012–2013. A new Board of Officers for the IOCARIBE Sub-Commission was elected for the period 2011–2013. Dr. Bonnie Ponwith (United States) was elected as Chairperson, Mr. Anthony Mckenzie (Jamaica) was re-elected as Vice-Chairperson, Ms. Pedzi Girigori (Curacao) and Mr. Francisco Brizuela-Venegas (Mexico) were elected as Vice-chairpersons.

Appointment of Head of IOCARIBE to a permanent UNESCO position, consolidated with UNESCO Science Programme Officer for the Caribbean based at the UNESCO Regional Office in Kingston, Jamaica in January 2009.

Implementation of the CLME Project. It has a total budget of 56 USD million; comprising 7.2 USD million in GEF funding and 48.8 USD million in cash plus in-kind support by government and multilateral donor agencies. The Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) was established in the offices of the IOCCARIBE Secretariat in May 2009. UNDP is the implementing agency, UNOPS is in charge of administrative aspects of the project and the IOC, through IOCARIBE, is the lead technical agency.
The meeting of Project Advisory Group (PAG) and the 2nd CLME Steering Committee meetings were held in Panamá from 16th to-18th of November, 2010. During the SC meeting the role of the National Focal Points and the identification of possible national committees involving high level decision makers and Stakeholders in the CLME Strategic Action Programme was discussed. In a preliminary survey among 19 countries that were present at the meeting, 15 of them had already identified possible National Committees suitable for this purpose. Important milestones of the project were also defined such as the timeframe for the Transboundary Diagnosis Analysis that should be ready in the first quarter of 2011 and the Strategic Action Programme by December 2012.

The ICAM Project Demonstrate Approaches for Nutrient and Sediment Reduction at Selected Pilot Study Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region has focused on examining the effectiveness of best management practices in the watersheds of four member countries (Dominican Republic, Dominica, Grenada, and Trinidad and Tobago). The project is in its PDF-A phase and that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has been designated to act as the Implementing Agency for the Project and the IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions IOCARIBE is the Leading Technical Agency.

With the purpose of updating the ICAM management plan for the English speaking Caribbean SIDS; a Workshop was convened by IOC UNESCO in cooperation with the Barbados Coastal Zone Management Unit (CZMU). The Caribbean Regional Workshop on ICAM for the English Speaking Caribbean States was held in Bridgetown, Barbados, March 16 – 18, 2011. The meeting was attended by 22 participants representing Antigua & Barbuda, Barbados, Curacao, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and Trinity & Tobago. The main objective of the meeting was to assist Member States in building the resilience of SIDS economies mainly dependant on coastal tourism using knowledge and expertise of the CZMU of Barbados for developing their own capacity to manage coastal areas. The group agreed to complete a 10-year project document with a 5 year Implementation Plan to be coordinated jointly with the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC).

The Sub-Commission was involved in the CARIBE Wave 2011 and LANTEX 2011 exercise in the Western Atlantic, Caribbean and Adjacent Regions held March 23, 2011. The purpose of the exercise was to test the communications systems between the warning centers and the officially designated Tsunami Warning Focal Point (TWFP). Thirty-four countries and territories of the Caribbean participated in the first regional tsunami exercise, CARIBE WAVE 2011 which was held jointly with LANTEX and was conducted under the framework of the UNESCO IOC Intergovernmental Coordination Group for the Tsunami and Other Coastal Hazards Warning System for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (ICG/ CARIBE EWS).

A Sub-regional Planning meeting for ODINCARSA was held in the Universidad Autonoma de Baja California (UABC), Ensenada, December 7- 10, 2009. During the meeting the ODINCARSA Regional Project Coordinator for ODINCARSA was selected to replace Mr. Rodney Martinez who acted as Coordinator during 2001-2009. The meeting designated Mr Ariel Troisi from Argentina as ODINCARSA Regional Coordinator for Data Management for a period of two years.

The tenth session of the Editorial Board meeting for the Bathymetric Chart of the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico IBCCA was held in La Habana, Cuba, 13 February, 2009. The meeting was attended by members of the Editorial Board and a representative from the International Hydrographic Bureau of Monaco. During the meeting progress reports were presented from Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela and USA. It was agreed that Colombia will
remain on the Chairmanship of the IBCCA Editorial Board for another period and the INEGI will continue to be the leading editorial institution for the compilation of the chart. The Action Plan was also reviewed.

An IOCARIBE-GOOS Strategic Planning Meeting was convened in San Juan, Puerto Rico, March 7 – 8, 2011. The meeting was attended by 14 participants from 7 countries of the IOCARIBE Region. The meeting updated the IOCARIBE-GOOS governance component and decided the creation of an IOCARIBE GOOS Working Group composed of nominated state representatives with the possibility of inclusion of additional experts at discretion of the IOCARIBE GOOS Officers. The meeting discussed the new Terms of Reference for the working group. The meeting recommended developing a six year Implementation Plan that meets both the advice from the GOOS Advisory Panels and the needs of the region. It also was agreed the establishment of National GOOS Committees for the IOCARIBE Region. The role of the IOCARIBE-GOOS Steering Committee to be assumed by the IOC Sub-Commission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions IOCARIBE.

The planning meeting was organized in conjunction with the Third Regional Workshop in the Workshop Series of the GEO Coastal Zone Community of Practice (CZCP) held at the same venue from 9 – 11 March 2011. The Workshop focused on specific needs, challenges and capabilities related to sustainable tourism of SIDS in the Caribbean and was organized in partnership with the Caribbean Regional Association (CaRA) for the Caribbean Integrated Coastal Ocean Observing System (CarICOOS), the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS), the Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS), the United Nation Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC).