**Annex III**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**OCTs Regional Risk Reduction Initiative (R3I)**

*Building capacity in disaster risk reduction in Caribbean OCTs*

*National outputs with regional integration*

Open International Competition

**Request for Proposals RFP121018**

**R3I Outcome Evaluation and Vulnerability Benchmarking Tool (B-tool) Exercise**

1. **INTRODUCTION**

Recognizing the need of Overseas Countries and Territories (OCTs), small islands in the Caribbean region (11 islands: Anguilla, Aruba, Bonaire, Cayman Islands, Curacao, Montserrat, Saba, Sint Eustatius, Sint Maarten, Turks and Caicos and The Virgin islands), to enhance their regional and national capacities for disaster risk reduction, the EU granted funds to UNDP Barbados and OECS to implement a Regional Risk Reduction Initiative (R3I).

Hence the Regional Risk Reduction Initiative (R3I) seeks to address the risk and exposure of the Dutch and British small island overseas countries and territories by developing the capacity, knowledge and tools to enable the mainstreaming of disaster risk management consistent with the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA).

Funded by the EU in the amount of €4.9m, the project is directly implemented (DIM) by UNDP Barbados and the OECS over the period 2009 to 2012. The initial 3-year period was extended by 1 year to run until 31 December 2012.

The project is organized around 5 outputs as follows:

* Output 1: Capacity of OCTs in CDM in relation to hazard mapping and vulnerability assessments increased
* Output 2: Early Warning System (EWS) feasibility study and pilot implemented
* Output 3: Capacity built in response, rescue and recovery
* Output 4: Technical assistance provided for local disaster management institutions and implementing partners
* Output 5: Coordination, training and dissemination

These outputs, covering a broad range of Comprehensive Disaster Management constitutive elements, aim to achieve the intended following outcome: “Enhanced regional and national capacities for disaster risk reduction associated with natural, environmental and technological hazards, within the broader context of climate change, and for effective recovery”.

The principal beneficiaries targeted were the stakeholders within the national disaster management system. This consisted mainly of the disaster management offices, which served as the project’s focal points for coordination of activities within the countries. Other stakeholders included the GIS-related departments, meteorological services, fire and police departments, hospitals and the Red Cross.

Partners which helped to implement or facilitate various activities included UNESCO-IHE, RAC REMPEITC, NASA and UCAR JOSS.

Given the complexity of the project, involving 11 islands, each at varying levels of capacities, and covering many different areas of expertise related to disaster management it was decided to benchmark countries’ overall national disaster management capacities through the use of the Vulnerability Benchmarking Tool (B-tool).

This comprehensive exercise, conducted during May-June 2010 in each beneficiary country, became an appropriate indicator of the project, allowing a comparative evaluation of countries progress towards the intended outcome of the project stated here above. Further, the scoring system of the B-tool allows a synthetic view of the results and serves, beyond the objective of the R3I’s evaluation, as a reference for the countries decision makers.

Hence the present Terms of Reference include specifically **an actualization of the B-tool exercise**, which shall result in new B-tool reports for each country. A substantive part of the evaluator’s work (estimated at approximately 50% of the budget) shall be dedicated to this second B-tool assessment.

It is worth noting that during the course of the project, 3 of the beneficiary islands: Bonaire, Saba and Sint Eustatius (BES islands), changed their political status to become municipalities of The Kingdom of the Netherlands. This important change, which took effect on 10/10/10 had deep reorganizational consequences in these three islands, which affected the ability of stakeholders there to adequately take advantage of the project. Today, the BES islands may be considered as 1 entity the Caribbean Netherlands.

It is foreseen that a team will be necessary to carry over the work required. The terms of reference below refer to this team as “the consultant” or “consultants” or “the evaluator” or “evaluators”

1. **OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

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 and outcome achieved.

This will contribute to an analysis and assessment of:

* The relevance of the project, and in particular its regional dimension
* The effectiveness and efficiency with which the EU’s resources have been used
* The usefulness and sustainability of the results for the beneficiaries
* UNDP’s performance as a development partner
* UNDP’s contribution to the expected result

In addition a substantial output from this evaluation will be the B-tool assessment, which will:

* Measure the evolution of project’s outcome indicator, and thus inform the overall evaluation.
* Provide countries with a second clear, comparable and informative benchmarking assessment of their respective disaster management capacities.

The evaluation will be used by all main parties (beneficiary countries, UNDP, EU) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions.

Recommendations are expected as to:

* The extents to which project’s outputs are sustainable and replicable.
* Orientations to take in the design of Caribbean regional projects in the field of disaster management.
1. **SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

Timeframe: 1 November to 24 December 2012

Period to consider: 1 January 2009 to 15 December 2012. However prospects for sustainability and impact will be made for beyond this period.

Geographic scope: The mission shall start and end in Barbados. Then, the 9 following islands must be visited: Anguilla, Aruba, Bonaire, Cayman Islands, Curacao, Montserrat, Sint Maarten, Turks and Caicos and The Virgin islands. Questions relevant to Saba and Sint Eustatius can be resolved remotely or through meetings in Bonaire.

Stakeholders to meet:

In Barbados: R3I team in UNDP (will provide all necessary contacts and documentation), EU Delegation, UKAID.

In beneficiary countries:

* The R3I focal point in the OCTs, i.e. the head of the disaster management department.
* The Project Board Chair (Financial Secretary of BVI) and the Project Board Alternate Chair (Territorial Authorizing Officer of Aruba)
* Other national stakeholders as determined relevant by R3I’s focal points.

Domain of interest: Disaster Risk Reduction

* 1. **Contribution to the outcome**

This evaluation will cover all outputs of the project since its inception in 2009 and for each of the beneficiary countries. Results delivered can be summarized as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Output 1 | Output 2 | Output 3 |
|  | **Hazard Mapping and Vulnerability Assessment** | **Early Warning Systems** | **Response, Rescue and Recovery** |
| Anguilla | Geodetic and aerial LIDAR survey. GIS technical assistance and trainings | Leading EWS country. New CAP server. Warning systems. Public outreach and education (POE) | Emergency telecommunication equipment. Oil spill training. BCM training |
| Aruba | Preliminary and structural vulnerability assessments. GIS training. | Pilot country for CAP-based early warning system. Integration assistance. POE | Emergency telecom equipment. Search and rescue (SAR) training and equipment. Oil spill and BCM training |
| Bonaire | Preliminary and structural vulnerability assessments. GIS training. | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | SAR capacity assessments. BCM training |
| Cayman Islands | Quantitative risk assessment and loss estimation studies. GIS training | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | SAR training and equipment. BCM training |
| Curacao | Preliminary and structural vulnerability assessments. GIS training. | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | Emergency telecom equipment. SAR training and equipment. BCM training |
| Montserrat | Preliminary and structural vulnerability assessments. GIS training. | Pilot country for CAP-based early warning system. Integration assistance. POE | Emergency Telecom Equipment and training. BCM training. |
| Saba | Capacity assessment and GIS training | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | SAR capacity assessments. BCM training |
| Sint Eustatius | Capacity assessment and GIS training | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | SAR capacity assessments. BCM training |
| Sint Maarten | Innovative bathymetric survey. Inland and coastal flood modeling. Landslide assessment. | Pilot country for CAP-based early warning system. Integration assistance. POE. Cell broadcast study | SAR capacity assessments. Oil spill and BCM training. |
| TCI | Preliminary and structural Vulnerability Assessments. GIS training. | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | SAR training and equipment. BCM training |
| Virgin Islands | Tsunami and storm surge modeling. Topographic and bathymetric data. Cut-slope assessments. GIS training | EWS capacity assessment and recommendations. | Emergency telecom equipment and training. BCM training. Provider of shelter management training. |

In addition, output 4 (Technical assistance) provided expertise in the fields of coastal hazard, early warning systems, geology and hydrology. Output 4 also provided the first benchmarking capacity assessment (B-tool) in 2010 and access to regional seminars and training.

Output 5 (Coordination, training, dissemination), provided visibility and knowledge products, as well as the project coordination team and regional coordination meetings (Technical Management Teams and Project Board)

The evaluation must encompass all results achieved under the project in order to evaluate their contribution to the outcome.

* 1. **Vulnerability Benchmarking Tool (B-Tool) exercise**

The evaluators will conduct a second B-tool exercise in all countries, hence assessing precisely the improved status of their capacities in terms of disaster management.

In order to perform the assessment more effectively:

* Some parts of the previous assessment (June 2010) may remain unchanged if the evaluator estimates that no evolution has occurred. In particular, the team may focus efforts on the Risk identification and disaster preparedness section of the B-tool
* The evaluation for Bonaire, St Eustatius and Saba and may be gathered in one, since BES islands are now, in theory, part of the same country.
	1. **Specific issues to consider**

The scope is also expected to include documentation of lessons learned, findings and recommendations in the following areas:

* Opportunities and challenges brought by UNDP as direct implementing partner in Caribbean regional programs in the field of disaster risk reduction (domain of interest)
* Potential and effective contribution by countries themselves to their own development and to the development of other countries in the field of interest.
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1. **EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The evaluation should answer, at least, the following orientation questions in the following matters. However, the evaluation team shall complement this listing in its methodological proposal (evaluation matrix) in order to comply with the objectives and scope of the evaluation.

The evaluators will seek to answer the following questions:

In assessing **relevance**:

* To what extent is UNDP’s engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP’s role in a particular development context and its comparative advantage?
* To what extent was UNDP’s selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
* Is the initiative aligned with national strategies?
* Is it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the country?

In assessing **effectiveness**:

* To what extent have outcomes been achieved or has progress been made towards their achievement?
* Did the project implementation contribute toward the stated outcome? Did it at least set dynamic changes and processes that move towards the long-term outcomes?
* How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affected the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective?
* What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations, especially beneficiary countries organizations, to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
* What were the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP’s work?
* Who are the main beneficiaries?

In assessing **efficiency**:

* To what extent were quality outputs delivered on time?
* Has the project been implemented within deadline and cost estimates?
* Have UNDP and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
* What impact has political instability had on delivery timelines?
* Were UNDP resources focused on the set of activities that were expected to produce significant results?

In assessing **sustainability**:

* What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g. through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
* To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
* To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
* To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
* What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? What were the corrective measures that were adopted?
* How has UNDP addressed the challenge of building national capacity in the face of high turnover of government officials?
1. **METHODOLOGY**

The consultant will propose and use a methodology taking into account the following points:

* The methodology of the B-tool will be used to obtain B-tool results. The B-tool results will be used as an indicator of progress towards the project’s outcome.
* Field visits must be conducted to Barbados and at least 9 countries.
* All needed documentation can be obtained directly from the UNDP project team. Hence no gathering of data or document is necessary from the countries.
* In-country visits will include meetings, interviews and potentially site visits. The existence of some project outputs may also be verified in-country, thus implying some field visits or visits to departments other than disaster management.
* R3I’s focal points in each country may provide assistance for additional in-country contacts and meetings. The revision of the countries’ capacity according to the B-tool may require the participation of persons from agencies other than disaster management.
* While it is considered a good practice to inform countries in advance of the coming of evaluators and to give them advanced notice as to the work to be accomplished, it is recommended to avoid asking countries’ stakeholders to answer lengthy questionnaires remotely. Evaluators are responsible for the cohesiveness of the B-tool answers and other evaluation answers. Evaluators must limit the uncertainties linked to the interpretation of question. Hence face-to-face meetings are preferred to remote communication.
* The contracted firm is responsible for evaluators’ logistical arrangements. The consultant should start and end work in Barbados.
* The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results (PME Handbook)[[1]](#footnote-1)
	1. **Indicators to consider**

Indicators are specified in the Results and Resources Framework of the Project Document annexed to the present terms of references.

It should however be noted that for the purpose of this evaluation, the outcome level indicator may be developed as follows:

* % increase in risk management index for risk identification (RMIRI)
* % increase in risk management index for disaster preparedness (RMIDP)
* % increase in total disaster risk management index (TDRMI)

The baseline will be the results of the Vulnerability Benchmarking tool (B-tool) 2010 in OCTs.

The targets:

* 15% average increase in RMIRI across all OCTs (i.e. 50% to 65%)
* 15% average increase in RMIDP across all OCTs (i.e. 61% to 76%)
* 10% average increase in TDRMI across all OCTs (i.e. 51% to 61%)

While this evaluation is pitched at outcome level, it may also be useful to consider that indicators found in the Project Document at output level may be completed/specified with the following indicators, which may give a better measure of project’s outputs:

Output 1:

* Number of national GIS databases updated with geospatial datasets and vulnerability information
* Number of national personnel trained to collect and manage geospatial data

Output 2:

* Number of countries with operational EWS pilots

Output 3:

* Number of training activities completed to improve local capacities
* Number of national policies formulated or revised

Output 5:

* Number of new joint activities executed based on common priorities
1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)**

The evaluation team shall produce, in English:

1. A brief inception report

This report will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the preparatory period in Barbados. It shall confirm the schedule of visits, the methodology adopted and the assumptions made.

The inception report shall provide an opportunity to verify that that UNDP and the evaluators share the same understanding about the evaluation, and shall clarify any issues at the outset.

This represents a general planning document of the Evaluation Mission, which includes a calendar of the main stages and activities planned and deliverables. This report shall detail the understanding of the evaluators on what are they going to evaluate and why, showing how each evaluation question shall be answered and by which means: the proposed methodology, the proposed information sources, and the data recollection procedures. This information shall be reflected in an evaluation matrix, for example:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Evaluation questions** | **Performance indicators** | **Data sources** | **Approach and design** | **Sampling methods** | **Methods and tools for data collection** | **Methods for data analysis** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Draft evaluation report

A draft evaluation report shall be submitted upon return to Barbados (or preferably before). 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
* Draft table of contents
* List of acronyms and abbreviations
* Draft executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the intervention
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and methods

The following elements may be started or in very draft version before return to Barbados:

* Data analysis (B-tool)
* Findings and conclusions
* Lessons learned

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

* ToR for the evaluation
* B-tool reports for each country
* Regional B-tool synthesis
* List of stakeholders interviewed
* List of supporting documents reviewed
* Results and Resources Framework
* Short biographies of evaluators and team composition
* Code of conduct signed by evaluators
1. Final evaluation report

The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by UNDP and countries’ focal points during the period of time (3-5 days estimated) which the evaluators will take to write the complete evaluation report. It is thus essential that main findings and recommendations are shared informally during the mission with the relevant stakeholders.

The final Evaluation report must comply with the quality standards set up in Annex 7 of the PME Handbook.

The final report shall also address the following:

* A rating on progress towards outcomes and progress towards outputs;
* A rating on the relevance of the outcomes.

The Final evaluation report shall include in annex:

* Each country’s B-tool report
* A regional synthesis of the B-tool results (refer to the Executive Summary of the B-Tool 2010)

These reports shall be written and structured in a way that they can also be read and edited independently from the final evaluation report.

It is expected that at the conclusion of the exercise, the evaluation team will produce 15 CD copies containing a single document of the above reports, as well as separate documents of each national B-Tool report and the regional synthesis.

1. **EVALUATION TEAM**

The composition and size of the team is largely at the discretion of the consultant, who will detail it in the offer, taking into consideration the following:

* UNDP Barbados and OECS anticipates that the team will include two individuals with a minimum of 7 years’ experience each of evaluating projects and programmes, preferably at outcome level and as per UNDP’s guidelines, with a strong emphasis on disaster risk reduction or within the Caribbean region
* The team must include at least one member with at least 3 years of experience in disaster risk reduction or related field, preferably in the Caribbean or small island developing states (SIDS).
* The short timeframe of the project, and the number of deliverables to be produced, including the extensive B-tool vulnerability assessments, may justify larger teams, and a distribution of countries among team members.
* Each member shall be fluent in English, with excellent writing and analytical skills.
* Recruitment of local consultants for facilitating the review, and knowledge of Dutch and Papiamento are assets.

The consultant shall provide detailed résumés for each team member, as well as work samples and references when available. Work sample and references are not compulsory; however they will support the bid.

Evaluators must be entirely independent from any organization or firm that has been involved in designing, executing or advising the R3I project. Statements of independence from the project shall be included in for each evaluator.

1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluations in UNDP shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’[[2]](#footnote-2)

In particular, evaluators 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 evaluators 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.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

UNDP will provide a pre-evaluation briefing to the evaluation team, after which the consultants are expected to conduct evaluation activities in countries. Consultants will then provide a de-briefing to UNDP upon return from the countries.

A suggested schedule is proposed as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Place** | **Activities** | **Duration in working days** |
| Inception | UNDP to provide contacts  | 5 days |
| Barbados  | * Meeting with the UNDP team
* Review of documentation
* Finalization of logistical arrangements
 | 2 to 3 days |
| Countries | * Meeting with R3I focal points
* Meeting with Project Board Chairs
* Site visits, interviews and potential meetings with other local stakeholders (e.g. Land Registry, Planning, GIS, first responders, etc)
* National B-tool review with a committee set up in collaboration with the R3I focal point
* B-tool report writing
* Ongoing draft report writing
 | 30 days |
| Barbados | * Ultimate information meeting with UNDP
* Debriefing with UNDP and EU
* Final report writing
* Integration of comments on draft report
* Delivery of Final report
 | 4 to 5 days |

During their stay in Barbados, UNDP will provide office space and desk for a maximum of 2 evaluators.

The team members must be equipped with their own laptops and cellular communication means.

1. **BUDGET**

The estimated budget for the evaluation and B-tool cannot be disclosed.

1. **DOCUMENTATION AVAILABLE ONLINE**

Project description: <http://www.bb.undp.org/regional-risk-reduction-initiative>

Video documentary on R3I outputs 2011: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-IH4r6OgtiI&feature=plcp>

R3I GIS data repository website: <http://r3i.gis-hmva.gesp.it/home>

B-tool methodology and 2010 B-tool assessment reports: <http://r3i.gis-hmva.gesp.it/documents/btools>

Online deliverables of the early warning system (Output 2) component

| **Country** | **Public website** | **Products for public outreach** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Anguilla | <https://www.anguilla-alerts.net/>  | <http://kynthiaart.com/ews/anguilla/>  |
| Aruba | <https://www.aruba-alerts.net/>  | <http://kynthiaart.com/ews/aruba/>  |
| Montserrat | <https://www.montserrat-alerts.net/>  | <http://kynthiaart.com/ews/montserrat/>  |
| Sint Maarten | <https://www.sint-maarten-alerts.net/>  | <http://kynthiaart.com/ews/sint-maarten/>  |

Facebook page:

<http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.105810792833505.12895.100002137554720&type=3#!/pages/R3i/154033841325133>

1. **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX 1 – Project Document, including the Results and Resources Framework

APPENDIX 2 – Key Documents List

APPENDIX 3 – Main R3I Stakeholders

**APPENDIX 2**

**Key Documents List**

The list below is a non-exhaustive list of documents available at UNDP Barbados and the OECS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Document** | **Level** | **Observation** |
| Subregional Programme Documents 2005-2011, 2012-2016 | Design | Frame the context of the cooperation between UNDP and the countries served for the designated programming period |
| R3I Project Document | Design | See Appendix 1. This document is the foundation of the project. It includes a Results and Resources Framework and indicators  |
| OCT R3I Contribution Agreement between the EU and UNDP | Design | Contract between the EU and UNDP for the implementation of the project |
| 2012 Revised Results and Resource Framework | Design | Revision of budget amounts put on respective outputs. Justification for this revision included. |
| Project Board and Technical Management Teams Terms of Reference | Design |  |
|  |
| Annual Progress Reports (2009, 2010, 2011) | Monitoring |  |
| Project Board minutes | Monitoring |  |
| Result Oriented Monitoring report (March 2011) | Monitoring |  |
| Country output sheets | Monitoring | These simple sheets have been developed to report at a given time and for each country deliverables achieved, ongoing and planned |
|  |
| 2010 Disaster Management Capacity Assessment - using the B-tool  | Output | Available online. This is an output from the project which serves as Benchmark and indicator of the project contribution to the outcome. |
| Project output reports | Output | A compilation of all final reports produced by the project will be shared with the evaluation team |
| Workshop documents | Output | All presentations made in workshop can be made available. Some are available online under the GIS data repository website. |
|  |
| Newspaper articles and documentary | Impact |  |

**APPENDIX 3**

**Main R3I Stakeholders**

| **Category** | **Name and position** | **Role and type of relationship** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project  Board | Mr Neil SmithFinancial Secretary, BVI | R3I Project Board Chair |
| Ms Maria Dijkhoff-PitaTerritorial Authorizing Officer (TAO), Aruba | R3I Project Board Co-Chair |
| Mr Andre Poucet (replaced by Anthony Robert)Former Head of Infrastructure, European Delegation for Barbados and the OECS | Donor representative, Project Board member |
| Mr Roger BellersDisaster Risk Reduction Advisor, Caribbean OTs, UKAID (DFID) Caribbean | Project Board member |
| Dr Tyrone Sutherland (represented by Mr Glendell De Souza)Director, Caribbean Meteorological Organization (CMO), Trinidad and Tobago | Project Board member |
| Mr Kenneth Jefferson (represented by Mr McCleary Frederick)TAO, Cayman Islands | Project Board member (rotational) |
| The Hon Sarah Wescot-Williams (represented by Mr Marc Arnold)Prime Minister and TAO, Sint Maarten | Project Board member (rotational) |
| Ms Angela Greenaway (represented by Mr Joseph Irish)TAO, Montserrat | Project Board member (rotational) |
| Country Focal Point | Ms Melissa MeadeDirector, Department of Disaster Management (DDM), Anguilla  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Jaime DonataDirector, Crisis Management Office, Aruba  | R3I focal point |
| Ms Nereida GonzalezIsland Secretary, Bonaire | R3I focal point |
| Ms Sharleen DaBreoDirector, Department of Disaster Management (DDM), BVI  | R3I focal point |
| Mr McCleary FrederickDirector, Hazard Management Cayman Islands (HMCI), Cayman Islands  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Elvin ReginaDisaster Manager/Fire Chief, Brandweer, Curacao  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Billy DarrouxDirector, Disaster Management Coordination Agency (DMCA), Montserrat  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Menno van der VeldeIsland Secretary, Saba  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Jan Helmond (represented by Mr Andre Bennett, Fire Chief)Island Secretary, Sint Eustatius  | R3I focal point |
| Mr Paul MartensHead, Section Disaster Management, Brandweer, Sint Maarten | R3I focal point |
| Ms Allison GordonInterim Director, Department of Disaster Management and Emergencies (DDME), TCI  | R3I focal point |
| Other instrumental OCT stakeholders | Dr Virginia ClerveauxDeputy Secretary, Ministry of Government Support Services, TCI | Oversight of disaster management |
| Mr Damian BarkerCommunications Officer, DDM, Anguilla | Expertise: early warning systems |
| Ms Garymar RiveraSenior Technical Planning Manager, DDM, BVI | GIS expertiseSpanish translation support |
| Mr Dale LakeCommunications Officer, DDM, BVI  | Expertise: emergency telecommunications |
| Mr Lee MadisonDeputy Director of Operations, HMCI, Cayman Islands | Expertise: emergency telecommunications |
| UNDP R3I team | Mr Ian KingProgramme Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction, UNDP | Programme management and oversight |
| Mr Alexandre VacherR3I Project Coordinator, UNDP  | R3I implementation  |
| Ms Danielle EvansonR3I Project Officer, UNDP  | R3I implementation |
| Some key contractors and experts | Prof Zoran VojinovicUNESCO-IHE  | Consultant/Team Leader: flood modeling and mapping |
| Mr Art BotterellConsultant | Expertise: early warning systems and telecommunication |
| Dr James JoyceUniversity of Puerto Rico | Expertise: geological hazards |
| Dr Aurelio MercadoUniversity of Puerto Rico | Expertise: coastal hazards modeling  |
| Ms Silvia GravaGESP | Consultant/Team Leader: GIS, hazard mapping and vulnerability assessment  |
| Prof Jacob OpadeyiUniversity of the West Indies (UWI), St Augustine Campus, Trinidad and Tobago | Consultant: GIS, HM and VA |
| Dr David SmithSmith Warner International Ltd (SWIL), Jamaica | Consultant/Team Leader: coastal hazard  modeling in BVI |
| Mr Philip WarnerSWIL, Canada | Consultant: coastal hazard  modeling in BVI |
| Ms Kathleen ImhoffBaastel Ltée/ASI | Consultant/Team Leader: EWS (Lot 1)  |
| Mr Evan GreenPartner, Baastel Ltée | Project oversight: EWS (Lot 1) |
| Mr Efraim PetelAlerting Solutions Inc (ASI) | Consultant/Team Leader: EWS (Lot2) |
| Mr Ron MobleyChief Operations Officer, Caribbean Emergency Responders Training Academy (CERTA) | Consultant/Team Leader: search and rescue |
| Mr Dwayne StrawnChief Executive Officer, CERTA | Consultant/Instructor: search and rescue |

1. Available at : <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)