



Strengthening Resilience and Coping Capacities in the Caribbean Through Integrated Early Warning Systems

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Job Title	Evaluation Consultant
Contract Type	Individual Contract
Duty Station	Home Country Based, Barbados, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Dominica, Saint Lucia
Contracting Authority	United Nations Development Programme
Period Date	10 October 2016 – 15 December 2016

1. CONTEXT

In the region, climate change and increasingly severe annual natural hazards continue to threaten development gains. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) sub-regional analysis confirms the paradox of rapid destruction and deterioration of natural resources juxtaposed with their underutilization. While these resources form the cornerstone of social and economic development, unsustainable exploitation and pollution increase the vulnerability to climate change and natural hazards. Moreover, the nexus between poverty, environment and livelihoods is inextricably linked to ownership of and/or access to land and natural resources and to equity in their access, use and benefits. Furthermore, while the potential contribution of renewable energy sources is high, monopolization, limited research, and lack of technology, capital and skills are among the main barriers to expansion. Countries will need to sustain focus on climate change adaptation and build a sustainable energy sector, which is critical to growth and development in the region.

UNDP will therefore continue to build on the support to the Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) Strategy led by the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) and the Sendai Framework to advance DRR through regional, sub-regional and national initiatives. This will include investments in critical components of DRR such as hazard mapping and vulnerability assessments; support to early warning systems; and continued capacity development of DRR infrastructure. Where necessary, the development and implementation of recovery strategies will also be central to DRR mainstreaming and will be formulated around poverty reduction and democratic governance strategies, with emphasis on sustainable livelihoods and inclusive consultative processes. Also central to activities for the period will be strengthening the links between the DRR and climate change adaptation agendas at both the national and regional levels. Strengthening disaster response and assessment capabilities at the national and regional levels will also be a priority area.



2. INTRODUCTION

This Action represents another step in the focus of UNDP on strengthening community and national resilience through improving the early warning systems (EWS) across the region. This focus started through the EU-funded Regional Risk Reduction Initiative (R3I), which as one of its components developed a Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) based EWS in four Overseas Countries and Territories. Through the ECHO-funded Community Alerts Project 2013-2014, UNDP Barbados and the OECS expanded the countries with CAP-based EWS by three to include Dominica, Grenada and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. This current Action seeks to create an enabling environment that can facilitate the adoption of CAP EWS by other countries in the region through systemisation of the process, by adding two (Barbados and Saint Lucia) additional territories to the Caribbean network of established all-hazard CAP-based EWS, and upscaling to end-to-end automated CAP systems.

Additionally this Action therefore seeks to reduce the vulnerability of communities facing multiple natural hazard risks in Caribbean small islands by helping communities become better informed about natural hazards and their vulnerability, with a system being implemented to allow the automated receipt of hazard notifications and dissemination of alerts via an integrated Common Alerting Protocol (CAP)-based all-hazard EWS. One of the strengths of the CAP lies in its ability to be adaptable. Ultimately the system can be expanded and improved with time as local and national capacities strengthen and confidence in the system continues to grow.

The specific results of this Action include:

Result 1: Regional harmonisation and knowledge sharing for EWS

Result 2: Knowledge of risk and vulnerability enhanced in communities to improve preparedness and response

Result 3: Framework for CAP-compliant all-hazard early warning systems integrated at national and community levels

3. EVALUATION PURPOSE

Evaluations are critical for UNDP to progress towards advancing human development. Through the generation of 'evidence' and objective information, evaluations enable managers to make informed decisions and plan strategically. This exercise is the final project evaluation, which is intended to:

- Demonstrate the level of change in the measured variables and level of success of the outputs achieved and contributions to outcome level changes. Promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments.



- Synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP activities or projects.
- Provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.
- Gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD).

4. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This evaluation will identify the outputs produced and the contributions to results at outcome level and positive or negative changes produced along the way, including possible unexpected results. The evaluation will also seek to identify the key lessons learned and best practices.

The evaluation will assess:

- The relevance of the project, and in particular its regional dimensions
- The effectiveness for the achievement of the results at output level and efficiency with which the ECHO resources have been used
- The usefulness and sustainability of the results/project targets for the beneficiaries
- UNDP performance as a development partner
- ECHO and UNDP's added value to the expected results

5. EVALUATION SCOPE AND CRITERIA

Evaluation Scope seeks to focus the evaluation exercise and establish the boundaries of what is covered in the evaluation. Specifically:

- The unit of analysis - The evaluation should cover all the intervention components under the Strengthening Resilience and Coping Capacities in the Caribbean Through Integrated Early Warning Systems project. In essence all the project outputs should be evaluated.
- The time frame or phase to be covered - This should be observed as 1 April 2015 to 30 November 2016
- The geographical coverage – Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Barbados and Dominica
- Target groups to be considered - See Appendix 2



The scope also includes documentation of lessons learned, findings and recommendations in the following areas:

- Opportunities and challenges brought by key Stakeholders (See Appendix 2) including UNDP as the Implementing partner in a Caribbean regional programme in the field of disaster risk reduction
- Potential and effective contribution by beneficiary countries (Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Barbados and Dominica) to their own development and to the development of other countries in the field of interest.

Evaluation Criteria

Relevant: concerns the extent to which a development initiative and its intended outputs or outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. Relevance also considers the extent to which the initiative is responsive to UNDP corporate plan and human development priorities of empowerment and gender equality issues. Relevance concerns the congruency between the perception of what is needed as envisioned by the initiative planners and the reality of what is needed from the perspective of intended beneficiaries. It also incorporated the concept of responsiveness – that is, the extent to which UNDP was able to respond to changing and emerging development priorities and needs in a responsive manner.

Effectiveness: is a measure of the extent to which the initiative’s intended results (outputs or outcomes) have been achieved or the extent to which (progress toward outputs or outcomes has been achieved).

Efficiency: measures how economically resources or inputs (such as funds, expertise and time) are converted to results. An initiative is efficient when it uses resources appropriately and economically to produce the desired outputs. Efficiency is important in ensuring that resources have been used appropriately and in highlighting more effective uses of resources.

Sustainability: measures the extent to which benefits of initiatives continue after external development assistance has come to an end. Assessing sustainability involves evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future.

It should be noted that “impacts” should not be included as part of the criteria for this evaluation. Impacts describes changes in people’s lives and development conditions at global, regional and national levels and are usually beyond the scope of UNDP evaluations. As such, it is particularly difficult to assess the extent to which UNDP may have contributed to the achievement of impacts on the part of primary stakeholders, bearing in mind the vast array of factors that may have influenced development in an area in which UNDP provides support



Evaluation Rating

The following rating criteria should also be included as part of the evaluation

Ratings for Relevance	Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency,	Ratings for Sustainability ratings
<p>2. Relevant (R)</p> <p>1. Not relevant (NR)</p>	<p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>5: Satisfactory (S): There were only minor shortcomings</p> <p>4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS): there were moderate shortcomings</p> <p>3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): the project had significant shortcomings</p> <p>2. Unsatisfactory (U): there were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency</p> <p>1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings</p>	<p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability</p> <p>3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks</p> <p>2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks</p> <p>1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		



6. EVALUATION QUESTIONS¹

The evaluation should answer, at least, the following questions. However, the evaluator shall complement this listing in its methodological proposal in order to comply with the objectives and scope of the evaluation. Additionally the evaluator should propose how the gender aspect will be covered.

The following questions should be answered:

In assessing **relevance**:

- i. To what extent is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in this particular development context and its comparative advantage?
- ii. To what extent is the initiative in line with UNDP's mandate, national priorities and the results of targeted women and men
- iii. To what extent was the projects selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
- iv. Is the initiative/project aligned with national and sub-regional strategies, UNDPs and ECHO mandate?
- v. Is it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the countries and sub-region?

In assessing **effectiveness**:

- i. What have been the observed changes at the outcome level?
- ii. To what extent have expected outputs been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement?
- iii. How has the project contributed to outcome level changes? Did it at least set dynamic changes and processes that move towards the long-term outcomes?
- iv. What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and contributions to outcomes?
- v. If applicable, has the partnerships strategy developed for this project been appropriate and effective?
- vi. What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations, especially beneficiary countries organizations, to the outcome, and how effective have been the project partnerships in contributing to achieving the outcome?
- vii. What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by the project?
- viii. Has the project built on recommendations from previous related project evaluations? How effective was the project in implementing these recommendations?

¹ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/handbook/english/documents/pme-handbook.pdf>



- ix. How did the project contribute to the objectives laid out in the Harmonised Implementation Plan (HIP) from ECHO?

In assessing **efficiency**:

- i. To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
- ii. Has the project been implemented within deadline and cost estimates?
- iii. Have UNDP, the Project Board, and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
- iv. What impact has political instability had on delivery timelines?
- v. Were the projects resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?
- vi. How did UNDP promote gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?

In assessing **sustainability**:

- i. What indications are there that the achieved results (both at output and outcome levels) will be sustained, e.g. through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- ii. To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national and regional stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- iii. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- iv. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- v. What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
- vi. How has the implementing partner addressed the challenge of building national capacity in the face of high turnover of government officials?

7. METHODOLOGY



The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with the UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations², UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results³, and in particular UNDP outcome-level evaluation a companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators⁴. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The central focus of the evaluation should be on analysing the contribution of the project (outputs) to the outcomes.

The evaluator will define the final methodology to be applied and it should include methodologies as outlined in the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results.⁵ The following can be used to ascertain the empirically based evidence:

- Desk review (indicative but not necessary complete list of documentation at Appendix 1). All needed documentation can be obtained directly from the Project Coordinator and UNDP.
- Visits to some beneficiary countries (St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Barbados).
- Consultations with project contacts via online mediums (skype etc) or telephone. The evaluator can also use the final project meeting tentatively planned for November 2016 to meet country representatives as well as other stakeholders.
- The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

The first draft of the evaluation report will be reviewed by commissioned agencies/areas to ensure that the evaluation meets the expectations and quality criteria. This draft will also be shared with the other partners and stakeholders to validate the findings, recommendations and lessons.

7.1 Results Framework and Indicators to consider

² Available at UNEG Webpage: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

³ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>

⁴ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20Evaluation_2011.pdf

⁵ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>



Indicators are specified in the Results and Resources Framework of the Project annexed to the present Terms of Reference. In addition the evaluation should take into account the relevant Sub-regional Programme outcome(s), outputs and related indicators.

While this evaluation should be pitched at outcome level, it should be noted that indicators found in the Project Document at output (and at activity level at least to some degree to cover the most strategic activities) level may be completed/specified with the indicators, which may give a better measure of the project's outputs and most strategic activities.

8. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES/OUTPUTS)

The evaluator shall produce, in English:

8.1 Inception Report

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators to detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of:

- a. Proposed Methods
- b. Proposed sources of data and data collection procedures

The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables.

This report provides the UNDP programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that the same understanding is shared about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstandings at the outset.

8.2 Draft Evaluation Report

A draft evaluation report shall be submitted. This draft evaluation report shall at least include the following elements as detailed in the Annex 7 of the PME Handbook, and shall not surpass 50 pages:

- The title and opening pages
- Table of contents
- List of acronyms and abbreviations
- Draft executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the intervention
- Evaluation scope and objectives
- Evaluation approach and methods
- Data analysis
- Findings and Conclusions



- Recommendations
- Lessons Learnt and Best Practices
- Report Annexes

The report annexes may be partly provided at the level of submission of the draft report:

- ToR for the evaluation
- Additional methodology related documentation
- List of individuals or groups consulted
- List of supporting documents reviewed
- Results and Resources Framework
- Summary table of findings
- Short biography of the evaluator
- Code of conduct signed by evaluators

The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by UNDP and key partners as well as country focal points during the period of time. It is thus essential that main findings and recommendations are shared informally during the mission with the relevant stakeholders.

8.2 Final evaluation report

The final Evaluation report must comply with the quality standards set up in Annex 7 of the PME Handbook and key standards for UN evaluators.

The reports shall be written and structured in a way that they can also be read and edited independently from the final evaluation report. All reports produced must be in modifiable word format, Times New Roman 12 point font, numbered pages and have all images compressed.

It is expected that the final evaluation report would be shared with UNDP electronically

8.3 Specific Deliverables

- Produce an inception report
- Conduct consultations with project focal points in person, through online mediums or telephone (see section 4)
- Online Presentation of evaluation report at Final Project Board meeting
- Online Presentation of evaluation report at final review meeting
- Produce a draft evaluation report
- Final evaluation report produced and agreed by UNDP



9. QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCIES

- MSc in environmental science, natural resource management, agriculture, rural development, economics, management, planning, statistics or similar
- At least five (5) years' documented experience in monitoring and evaluating projects and programmes, utilizing participatory approaches.
- At least three (3) years' documented experience in disaster risk reduction or related field within the Caribbean or Small Island Developing States (SIDS).
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods to projects and/or programmes.
- Knowledge of UNDP Barbados and the OECS participating states context, specifically Saint Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Barbados; and institutional frameworks for addressing Disaster Risk Reduction.
- Good presentation, interpersonal and communication skills
- Ability to meet deadlines and prioritise multiple tasks
- Excellent report writing and editing skills
- Excellent working knowledge (written and oral) of English is required
- Plans and produces quality results to meet established goals; responds positively to critical feedback and differing points of view.
- Previous experience evaluating ECHO, UNDP or UN system projects will be an asset
- Good computer skills including use of technical software for evaluation purposes.

10. EVALUATION ETHICS

Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'¹ and the evaluation team is expected to sign the UN ethical code of conduct on evaluations as part of his/her contract

In particular, the team shall apply anonymity and confidentiality protocols to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers.

Specific attention will also be brought to the potential interaction between the evaluation team and the media, and information disseminated to the public. Information related to disaster risk reduction can be potentially sensitive in economies highly reliant on tourism.

<http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

12. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS



A pre-evaluation briefing will be provided after which the team is expected to conduct consultations with key stakeholders in different countries. The team will then provide a de-briefing to UNDP after these consultations have been completed.

Timeframe: 10 October 2016 – 15 December 2016

Period to Consider: 1 April 2015 – 30 November 2016. However prospects for sustainability and potential for longer term impact will be made far beyond this period.

The evaluation team should organise meetings with the following agencies in person or via online mediums (See appendix 3)

Barbados:

- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA)
- Project Coordinator at UNDP
- EU Office
- Department of Emergency Management (DEM)
- Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology (CIMH)
- Red Cross Caribbean Disaster Risk Management Reference Centre (CADRIM)
- Education Coordinator
- Beneficiary community representatives

Dominica:

- Office of Disaster Management
- National Red Cross Society
- Beneficiary community representatives
- Education Coordinators
- National stakeholders as determined relevant by the designated project focal point in country

Saint Lucia:

- National Disaster Management Agency



-
- National Red Cross Society
 - Education Coordinator
 - Beneficiary community representatives
 - National stakeholders as determined relevant by the designated project focal point in country

St. Vincent & the Grenadines:

- National Emergency Management Organisation
- National Red Cross Society
- French Red Cross
- Education Coordinators
- Beneficiary community representatives
- National stakeholders as determined relevant by the designated project focal point in country

Regional:

- International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
- ECHO

A possible schedule is proposed as follows:

Task	Number of Working Days	Expected Results
Desk review of project document, reports and other background documents	5	Inception Report
Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; Debriefing (last day of the mission) <i>Travel is recommended to Barbados and St. Vincent and the Grenadines</i>	18	Data from major stakeholders collected; One presentation of the preliminary findings at the ending of field mission (last day as debriefing meeting), as part of the participatory and validation process that encourages the use and usefulness of the evaluation
Data analysis and preparation of the draft report	5	Draft evaluation report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to UNDP for review
Collating comments on draft report from UNDP and partners	3	
Online Presentation of evaluation report at final Project Board Meeting	1	Evaluation report presented
Online Participation in final review meeting of project	1	
Finalization of the report on the basis of final comments received and presentation of final evaluation report	2	Evaluation report



Total working days(incl. travel)	35	
----------------------------------	----	--

The evaluation team must be equipped with a laptop and cellular communication means. The evaluation team will report directly to the Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP Barbados and the OECS through the Project Coordinator.

12.1 Payment

Payments would be made upon submission and approval of the following deliverables as highlighted in section 6 above

- Inception report agreed by UNDP – (17 October 2016) – 20%
- Presentation of preliminary evaluation findings to UNDP – (7 November 2016) - 10%
- Draft evaluation report and presentation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations provided - (18 November 2016) – 40%
- Final evaluation report provided and agreed by UNDP – (9 December 2016) – 30%

Payments are contingent on performance which include:

- Timely achievement of satisfactory outputs
- Demonstrated reliability

12.2 Travel and allowances

Travel for 2 missions (Barbados and St. Vincent and the Grenadines) will be required as part of this assignment. Applicants must ensure that they have in their possession all the necessary visas to travel and must make all of the arrangements themselves to facilitate travel (airline ticket cost, hotel, meals, taxi services). Airline tickets must be the most economical option. The cost for travel and allowances (hotel, all meals, taxi etc) must be included as part of the overall cost to be provided in Appendix 1 below.

12.3 Reporting

The evaluator will report to the Climate Change and Disaster Risk Resilience Portfolio at UNDP through the Technical Coordinator.

13. INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS

13.1 Contents and Submission of Applications

Applications must include:

- Detailed resume outlining experience conducting evaluations
- Proposed approach for implementation of task
- Completed UNDP Personal History Form. This form is found on the UNDP website at <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/jobs/>

13.2 Selection, evaluation and negotiation

Submissions must fulfil the profile minimum requirements and comply with the application instructions in order to be evaluated.

Technical evaluation of offers (70 points)

A two-stage procedure will be utilized in evaluating the submissions, with evaluation of the technical component being completed prior to any price component being reviewed and compared. The price component will be reviewed only for those proposals whose Technical Component meets the requirements for the assignment. The minimum number of points to move to the second stage (evaluation of quotes/financial evaluation) is 49

The technical component, which has a total possible value of 70 points, will be evaluated using the following criteria:

- Quality of resume (15 points)** – [Excellent - 15 points; Good - 13.5 points; Satisfactory - 10.5 points; Poor - 6 points; Very Poor - 1.5 points; No submission - 0 points]
- Minimum of five (5) years’ documented experience in monitoring and evaluating projects (15 points)** - [Over 5 years - 15 points; 5 years - 13 points; 4 - 5 years - 11 points; 3 years - 9 points; 2 years - 5 points; 1 year or less - 3 points]
- Minimum of three (3) years’ documented experience in disaster risk reduction or related field within the Caribbean (10 points)** – [Over 3 years - 10 points; 3 years - 9 points; 2 years - 7 points; 1 year - 4 points; Less than 1 year - 2 points]

- d) **At least 2 documented cases of conducting previous project evaluations for UN agencies, regional or international organisations (10 points)** - [Over 2 cases - 10 points; 2 cases - 9 points; 1 case - 7 points; 0 documented cases - 1 point
- e) **The approach proposed for implementation of the tasks described (20 points)** - [Excellent - 20 points; Good - 18 points; Satisfactory - 14 points; Poor - 8 points; Very Poor - 2 points; No submission - 0 points

Evaluation of Quotes

If applicants receive more than 49 points in the technical evaluation, the competitiveness of the quotes will be taken into account in the following manner:

The overall evaluation score will be based either on a combination of the technical score and the financial offer (combined weighting).

The formula for the rating of the Proposals will be as follows:

<p><u>Rating the Technical Proposal (TP):</u></p> <p>TP Rating = (Total Score Obtained by the Offer / Max. Obtainable Score for TP) x 100</p> <p><u>Rating the Financial Proposal (FP):</u></p> <p>FP Rating = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100</p> <p><u>Total Combined Score:</u></p> $\frac{(TP \text{ Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of TP, e.g. 70\%}) + (FP \text{ Rating}) \times (\text{Weight of FP, e.g., 30\%})}{\text{Total Combined and Final Rating of the Proposal}}$
--

Deadline of Offers: The deadline for submission of offers is 12 September 2016.

Extensions and amendments: UNDP may, at its discretion, extend the deadline for the submission of Quotations. UNDP also reserves the right to cancel any Request for Quotation (RFQ) previously published at any time. Potential bidders will be notified of deadline extensions, amendments or cancellations at <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/procurement/>



Clarification: Clarification on any details contained within this document must be sent to procurement.bb@undp.org. Responses to clarifications will be uploaded to <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/procurement/>

13 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – Key Documents List

APPENDIX 2 – Main Project Stakeholders

APPENDIX 3 – Project Document



APPENDIX LIST 1

Key Documents List

The list below is a non-exhaustive list of documents available for the **Strengthening Resilience and Coping Capacities in the Caribbean Through Integrated Early Warning Systems project**

Document	Level	Observation
Subregional Programme Document 2012 -2016		
Strengthening Resilience and Coping Capacities in the Caribbean Through Integrated Early Warning Systems Project Document		
Community Alerts Project Evaluation 2014		
Harmonised Implementation Plan (HIP) from ECHO		
Agreement between EU and UNDP (FAFA)		
Agreement between UNDP and CIMH		
Agreement between UNDP and IFRC		
Project Board Terms of Reference		
Monthly Status updates (inclusive of risk logs)		
Intermediate Report		
Project Board meeting reports		
Workshop Reports		



2015 and 2016 Annual Workplan Mission Reports Assessment Reports (Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment, Knowledge Attitude and Perception Surveys Education Coordinators Reports		

APPENDIX 2

Main Stakeholders

Category	Name and position	Role and type of relationship
Project Board	<p>Mr. Fitzroy Pascal Director Office of Disaster Management</p>	Project Board Chair
	<p>Ms. Chisa Mikami Deputy Resident Representative UNDP Barbados and the OECS</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Ms. Virginie Andre ECHO</p>	Donor representative, Project Board member
	<p>Ms. Donna Pierre Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) Ms. Elizabeth Riley Deputy Executive Director Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA)</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Ms. Michelle Forbes Deputy Director National Emergency Management Organisation St. Vincent and the Grenadines</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Ms. Velda Joseph Director - National Emergency Management Organisation Saint Lucia</p>	Project Board member

	<p>Ms. Kerry Hinds Director – Department of Emergency Management</p> <p>Ms. Joy-Ann Johnson Project Officer – Department of Emergency Management</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Ms. Rendal Allen Technical Officer Red Cross Caribbean Disaster Risk Management Reference Centre (CADRIM)</p> <p>Ms. Tamara Lovell Interim Coordinator Red Cross Caribbean Disaster Risk Management Reference Centre (CADRIM)</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Mr. John Haynes Chairperson District Emergency Organisation – Martin’s Bay</p>	Community Representative
Additional country Focal Points	<p>Mr. William King District Emergency Organisation – Martin’s Bay</p>	
	<p>Mrs. Rontae Johnson-Annius District Emergency Organisation – Shermans</p>	
	<p>Mrs. Kathleen Pinard-Byrne Dominica Red Cross</p>	

	<p>Mr. Bernard Marksman</p> <p>Director General</p> <p>St. Vincent & the Grenadines Red Cross Society</p>	
	<p>Mr. Raphael Hamoir</p> <p>French Red Cross</p>	
	<p>Mr. Fitzgerald John</p> <p>Education Coordinator Saint Lucia</p>	
	<p>Beneficiary Community and National Representatives based on recommendation from country focal points.</p>	
UNDP	<p>Ms. Danielle Evanson</p> <p>Programme Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction,</p>	
	<p>Mr Marlon Clarke</p> <p>Project Coordinator</p>	Project Implementation
Key Partners	<p>Mr. Shawn Boyce</p> <p>Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology</p>	
	<p>Ms. Sandra Amlang</p> <p>United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR)</p> <p>Ms. Rosendo Mesias</p> <p>United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Cuba</p>	



Funded by
European Union
Humanitarian Aid



Empowering lives.
Resilient nations.

APPENDIX 3

Strengthening Resilience and Coping Capacities in the Caribbean Through Integrated Early Warning Systems

Project Document