

The prioritization of policy suggestions was a very difficult exercise as the four members of the Eminent Panel were asked to rank 85 proposed solutions which all touched urgent priorities. These solutions had been assessed using cost-benefit analysis, and the resulting reports shared with panel members. Each member then undertook an assessment of the projects to arrive at their own ranking of the proposed solutions. These rankings were refined during the course of three days of presentations and discussions with researchers. The median of the final individual rankings of the four panel members made up the collective list of priorities.

The cost-benefit analysis results, in conjunction with the researchers' detailed papers and verbal responses to the panel's questions, were helpful in identifying the most urgent and potentially efficient solutions from among the set of excellent ideas. Notably, the majority of the panel's top 20 solutions had double digit BCRs and were all among the first eight¹ of the 15 groupings the suggestions were organized around. Also, most of the retained solutions have the highest ranking in their sectoral groupings. My own top 20 list follows a similar pattern and included more than half of the priorities of the collective list.

In my own deliberation of the papers and initiatives I also took consideration of the following to inform my ranking.

1. The clarity, completeness and rigor of the research, with particular attention to the assumptions to identify whether there were any aspects of costs or benefits which were not included in the analysis, or which may not have been adequately "measured".
2. The extent of anticipated impact on the problem identified, on poverty and well-being, and the overall importance of the subject matter within what could be very long list national priorities, based on past and current professional experience.
3. The potential positive and negative externalities as well as the potential effects of cultural norms and practices on the feasibility of implementing the proposals and the impact on macroeconomic balances such as on the balance of payments.

Consistent with the collective list, proposals that sought to address problems of nutrition, health and health infrastructure and to a certain extent education were among my top 20 priorities. These were followed by a concern for gender equality, including an intervention considered as part of the "justice sector" in the Cost Benefit Analysis: providing shelters for women and children. In my view, the panel's as well as my own high ranking of infrastructure projects such as the mobile broadband and the electronic

¹ Nutrition, Electricity and energy, equality, education, health infrastructure, justice, health, infrastructure.

port custom system signals the need to also promote growth and development while addressing social issues.

Since I had recused myself from the deliberations on energy, (and requested that my recusal be placed on record), reforms of the public electricity company (EDH) is not included in my top 20 list.² Nevertheless, it is important to underscore that I acknowledge that reforms in the energy sector are essential for development even if all parties/stakeholders do not necessarily agree on the way forward.

It is also important to touch on my inclusion of the road from Port-au-Prince to Gonaives in my top 20 solutions. While this proposal had only had a BCR of 2.3, I believe this is an instance where the benefits were undervalued. My positive assessment was reinforced by the youths' strong arguments during their deliberations and as they reported their top 10 rankings which included the road to Gonaives-Port- au-Prince

Finally, I must highlight an issue with two thematic areas which led me and fellow panel members from Haiti to insist on the inclusion of a clarification. These areas were *domestic violence* and *domestic workers' wages*. With respect to these we insisted that care be taken to signal that our ranking of the proposals reflected only the fact that the analyses did not present convincing cases for the specific initiatives as the right ones to alleviate the problems identified, and not the level of importance of the subject matter. In fact I am convinced that these two areas require urgent and effective intervention.

² My recusal reflects the fact that I perceived a potential conflict of interest given my current role as advisor to the Executive Directors for Haiti at the World Bank and at the International Monetary Fund, and considering the ongoing discussions and negotiations on energy issues between these institutions and the Haitian Government as well as the state of play of discussions on the energy sector in-country.