

Suriname

ICP (3i)

Thank you Chair,

Suriname likes to align itself with all except the first statement (regarding acceptance) that has been said by Barbados.

Chair, unlike Tuesday when we praised and commended the FOC group on “Broader Measures of Progress” for their Participatory and Transparent Approach, we have to note that in our opinion the ICP FOC Group is lacking both Transparency and Participation of the membership. It seems that only the co-chairs and (for want of a better formulation) their privileged partners were involved in the evaluation and even though Suriname is a member of the FOC Group **we cannot align ourselves with this report!! Which is a pity for ICP is too important.**

Chair, Suriname has a few specific issues some of which involve recommendations from the CARICOM Standing Committee of Caribbean Statisticians (which will be submitted by e-mail, to reinforce what has already been submitted by Barbados our Representative in your Bureau) and which will also support some statements made by China and South Africa.

1- In the first paragraph on page 1, the “Advisory Group on Statistics is mentioned. If this is meant to be the CARICOM Advisory Group on Statistics (CARICOM AGS), which we are currently chairing we would like to see this properly mentioned. Even better, since the CARICOM AGS is a subsidiary body of the CARICOM Standing Committee of Caribbean Statisticians it would be better to reference the SCCS instead of the AGS.

2- **The second paragraph begs one to ask the question when the other FOC members will be involved in the activities.**

3- We only recognized Paragraph 61 on page 15 as a contribution from the CARICOM and consider that an affront!

4- The following Recommendations from the CARICOM Standing COMMITTEE OF Caribbean Statisticians (SCCS) can be shared with the Statistical Commission That the World Bank/Global Office or the responsible coordinating agency involve in the next ICP Round, the CARICOM Secretariat / CARICOM Experts in the Region relative to them having a greater coordinating and technical role in the conduct of the ICP process in CARICOM. If these experts were allowed to play a greater role in the ICP process during the recently concluded round, this would imply less dependency by the Region on experts from outside in the coordination and execution of the technical work in the next Round;

(i). Related to the point (i) above, a Training of trainers programme for experts in the region should be undertaken prior to the next round of ICP in order to enable a sound understanding of the entire process by these experts. This would further reinforce capacity within the region relative to ICP coordination and execution.

(ii). There is need to strengthen capacity in the area of National accounts, in particular the expenditure of the GDP up to the Basic Headings. And the Private Final Consumption Expenditure which is often estimated as a residual. This will enable better estimation of the Basic Headings in the next ICP round.

(iii). It is recommended that there be a change in the organisational structure and administration in the conduct of the ICP in the CARICOM region with specific roles in the administering and technical conduct of the ICP residing in CARICOM

It is clear from the above that we would like to see a Paragraph inserted at the end of B 87 on page 20 to read:

“It is recommended that homogeneous ‘Subregional Organizations such as CARICOM are acknowledged and included in the Governance Structure.

THANK YOU CHAIR.