



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Enhancing Resilience to Reduce Vulnerability in the Caribbean (ERC) Project
RFQ130830-1630
Evaluation Consultancy

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Job Title	ERC Evaluation Consultancy
Contract Type	Individual Contract (IC)/Institutional Contract
Duty Station	Home Country Based
Contracting Authority	United Nations Development Programme
Contract Duration	16 September – 20 December 2013 with an estimated 45 working days
Start Date	16 September 2013

1. INTRODUCTION

Barbados and the OECS (Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Antigua and Barbuda, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Montserrat, Dominica, Saint Lucia, Grenada) territories are small islands, highly vulnerable to a range of natural hazards including earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, landslides, tsunamis and volcanic eruptions. Additionally natural hazards such as water contamination, oil spills, infectious diseases, and progressive environmental damage could affect the region.

Small islands face disproportionately greater risks due to high density shoreline development, settlements in hazardous areas such as volcanic slopes and flood prone areas. Hence, it is critical to promote effective disaster risk reduction. There is a real need for support in building capacity for information and diagnostic systems including damage and loss assessments, hazard and vulnerability mapping and response mechanisms to facilitate decision making for mitigation and early recovery; and to reinforce a culture of proactive planning and response in disaster mitigation and risk reduction.

Recognising this, the Enhancing Resilience to Reduce Vulnerability in the Caribbean (ERC) project was initiated and is currently being implemented by the Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology (CIMH) in partnership with the Executing Agency the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Barbados and the OECS; through the financial support of the Government of Italy. UNDP also provides technical and management support to this initiative.

Critical to the success of this project is the collaboration with critical stakeholders including the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (UNESCO/IOC), the Foundation International



Research Centre on Environmental Monitoring (CIMA Research Foundation) and the Italian Civil Protection Department (ICPD); as well as the linkages formed with other initiatives.

This project seeks to ***“Strengthen civil protection mechanisms through capacity development for early warning systems, information dissemination and institutional coordination for disaster management and response in Barbados and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) sub-region.”***

The project has two main outputs as follows:

- Output 1: Sustainable network of real time decision support centres to facilitate early warning and post disaster recovery established and fully integrated into national and regional planning.
- Output 2: Strengthened national disaster mechanisms to incorporate best practices in volunteerism; enhanced institutional capacities and; support to Tsunami public education programmes.

By enhancing the network of real-time decision support centres for Early Warning Systems (EWS) the Enhancing Resilience to Reduce Vulnerability in the Caribbean (ERC) project intends to achieve output 1 through the following strategic approaches:

- Facilitating real-time sharing of hydro-meteorological data across the sub-region through installation of equipment, integration in existing networks and development of a sustainable management strategy
- Capacity building for use of real-time hydro-meteorological data as a Decision Support System (DSS) for EWS and policies
- Creation or enhancement of a plan for acquisition of new hydro-meteorological data

National Disaster Management mechanisms (output 2) will be strengthened through:

- Building capacity for volunteerism based on the best practices both regionally and internationally, including the Italian experience
- Developing the capacities of the National Emergency Management Organisations (NEMO)
- Deepening and expanding the information and knowledge base through support of tsunami and other coastal hazards public awareness initiatives

These outputs, covering a broad range of Comprehensive Disaster Management elements, aim to contribute to the intended outcome of “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 focal points of the project are representatives from the National Emergency Management Organisations (NEMOs) and the National Meteorological Services who collaborate directly with the Implementing and Executing Agencies and coordinate project activities within the respective countries.

It should be noted that the initial project period lasted from 2009 to 2012 but was extended by one (1) year to run until 31 December 2013 due to a late start.



2. 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. In addition to the assessment of achievement of products, all UNDP managed evaluations should also assess the contribution of the project to the outcome level results, normally demonstrated as changes in the performance of institutions or behavioural changes.

The evaluation will be used by all main parties (Beneficiary countries, CIMH, UNDP and the Government of Italy) to assess their approaches to development assistance and to design future interventions. It is expected to serve for accountability purposes as well as generation of knowledge for wider use.

Evaluation results are expected to determine:

- The extents to which the project's outputs are sustainable and replicable.
- Design of future Caribbean regional projects in the field of disaster management.

3. 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 and efficiency with which the Government of Italy resources have been used
- The usefulness and sustainability of the results/project targets for the beneficiaries
- CIMH and UNDP's performance as development partners
- CIMH and UNDP's added value to the expected results

4. EVALUATION SCOPE AND CRITERIA

Timeframe: 16 September – 20 December 2013

Period to Consider: 1 January 2009 – 30 November 2013. However prospects for sustainability and potential for longer term impact will be made far beyond this period

The evaluator is expected to work a total of Forty five (45) days during the period 16 September – 20 December 2013.



Geographic Scope: The mission will start in Barbados given that this is the location of many of the key partners including CIMH, UNDP, CDEMA, Barbados Department of Emergency Management and Barbados National Meteorological Service as well as the location of Project Board meetings. Consultations/interviews relevant to partners in the OECS and outside of the region can be convened through online mediums or via phone.

The evaluator should organise meetings with the following agencies (See appendix 3)

- Barbados: UNDP, CIMH, CDEMA, Department of Emergency Management (DEM), National Meteorological Service
- OECS Territories:
 - National Emergency Management Organisation and the National Meteorological Services/airport authorities
 - Other national stakeholders as determined relevant by the designated ERC contacts/Focal Points in countries
- International:
 - Government of Italy Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 - CIMA Research Foundation of Italy
 - Italian Civil Protection Department (ICP)
 - United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (UNESCO IOC)

4.1 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 key Stakeholders including CIMH as the Implementing Partner and UNDP as the Executing Agency in a Caribbean regional programme in the field of disaster risk reduction
- Opportunities and challenges brought about by the additional agencies (UNDP, CDEMA, CIMA Research Foundation of Italy, ICP, UNESCO IOC) who assisted with implementation on particular activities of the project (see project document)
- Potential and effective contribution by beneficiary countries to their own development and to the development of other countries in the field of interest.



5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation should answer, at least, the following questions. However, the selected 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 evaluator will seek to answer the following questions:

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 was the projects selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?
- iii. Is the initiative/project aligned with national and sub-regional strategies and UNDPs mandate?
- iv. 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. 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?

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 CIMH, UNDP, Project Board, the project team 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. Were the monitoring practices efficient and did they permit for on-time adjustments in the implementation of the project



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?

6. METHODOLOGY

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies, including UN Standards and Norms for Evaluations¹, UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results², 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 evaluators³. 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 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.⁴ The evaluator will be expected to undertake:

- Comprehensive Desk review (indicative but not necessary complete list of documentation at Appendix 2). All needed documentation can be obtained directly from the ERC project team (CIMH and UNDP).
- Field visits will be conducted in Barbados and Jamaica. The evaluator shall also use the final ERC meeting in December at the CDM Conference in Montego Bay, Jamaica to meet country representatives from the islands of the OECS and other stakeholders.
- Consultations with ERC OECS contacts/focal points as well as those internationally can occur via online mediums (skype etc) or telephone
- Field visits will include semi-structured interviews and/or focus groups (or other data collection methods) and potentially site visits.

¹ Available at UNEG Webpage: http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/index.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4

² <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>

³ http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf

⁴ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/>



- The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

6.1 Results Framework and Indicators to consider

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

7. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES/OUTPUTS)

The evaluator shall produce, in English:

7.1. A brief inception report

This report will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the preparatory period in Barbados. It shall confirm any scheduled visits, the methodology adopted and the assumptions made to complete the assignment. The inception report should also include a brief assessment, identify possible limitations to the evaluation process; and the response of the evaluator to overcome these limitations to allow for a methodologically valid evaluation. Sample table of contents for the inception report format can be found at http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf page 31.

The Inception Report shall provide an opportunity to verify that UNDP and the evaluator share the same understanding about the evaluation, and shall clarify any issues at the outset. This report shall detail the understanding of the evaluator on what they are 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 as shown below.

SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX				
Criteria/Sub-criteria	(Examples of) questions to be addressed by outcome-level evaluation	What to look for (including the key indicators)	Data sources	Data collection methods



7.2 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

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

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

7.3 Final evaluation report

The draft evaluation report will be reviewed by CIMH, UNDP and key partners as well as country focal points during the period of time (approximately 10 -15 business days). 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 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 both UNDP and CIMH electronically



7.4 Specific Deliverables

- Participate in the ERC Project Board meeting on 19 September in Barbados and undertake consultations with Board Members
- Conduct consultations with ERC focal points/contacts based in Barbados
- Conduct consultations with ERC OECS focal points/contacts in countries via online mediums or telephone
- Conduct consultations with ERC international partners/contacts (CIMA, ICP, UNESCO IOC, Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
- Attend final ERC meeting in Montego Bay during December 2013
- Produce an inception report, draft report and final report for the evaluation

8 EVALUATION MEMBERS

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

- UNDP Barbados and the OECS anticipate that the service can be undertaken by one individual. However if a team is chosen it should not consist of more than two (2) individuals. Evaluator(s) should have a minimum of four (4) years' experience evaluating projects and programmes, preferably at outcome level and as per UNDP's guidelines, with a strong emphasis on disaster risk reduction.
- If a team is selected at least one member must possess at least three (3) years of experience in disaster risk reduction or related field, preferably in the Caribbean or Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

The evaluator(s) shall provide detailed résumés for each team member (if applicable), as well as work samples and references when available.

The evaluator(s) must be entirely independent from any organization or firm that has been involved in designing, executing or advising the ERC project.

9 QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCIES

- At least four (4) 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 CIMH and UNDP Barbados and the OECS participating states context 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 evaluation UNDP or UN system projects will be an asset

10 EVALUATION ETHICS

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

In particular, the evaluator 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

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



11 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

A possible schedule is proposed as follows:

Phase	Activities	Duration in working days
Inception (home based)	Desk review, preparation of the inception report UNDP and CIMH to provide contacts	5 days
Primary Data Collection – Field Mission Barbados	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting with the CIMH and UNDP teams Meeting with the ERC Project Board Chair at UNDP Meeting with CDEMA Meeting with the Barbados Department of Emergency Management and Meteorological Service Review of documentation 	5 days
Primary data collection and elaboration of the draft report (Home based with consultations with OECS Countries and a mission to Jamaica). <i>In addition to interviews other data collection methods like surveys may be considered</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skype or phone interview/consultation with ERC contacts/focal points Skype or phone interview/consultation with other local stakeholders Skype or phone interview/consultation with key partners (CIMA, Research Foundation, UNESCO IOC) involved in ERC project Skype or phone interview/consultation with donors (Government of Italy) Attend ERC final meeting (likely to be in Montego Bay Jamaica in December) On-going draft report writing. Submission of draft report for comments 	25 days (may be a bit less if more time is needed for the inception phase)
Barbados	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information meeting with CIMH and UNDP Debriefing with UNDP, CIMH and Government of Italy based on the draft report and the comments received Final report writing Integration of comments on draft report Delivery of Final report 	10 days

During the evaluator(s) stay in Barbados, 1 office space and desk at UNDP can be made available for a maximum of two evaluators.

The evaluator (s) must be equipped with a laptop and cellular communication means.

The evaluator will report directly to the Programme Manager Disaster and Climate Risk Management at UNDP Barbados and the OECS.



11.1 Payment

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

- Inception Report (27 September) - 20%
- Draft evaluation report and presentation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations - (8 November) – 40%
- Final evaluation report – (13 December) – 40%

Payments are contingent on performance which include:

- Timely achievement of satisfactory outputs
- Demonstrated reliability

11.2 Travel and allowances

Travel 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 INSTRUCTIONS TO APPLICANTS

12.1 Deadline

Deadline for the receipt of applications is **Friday, 30 August, 2013 at 4:30 pm** (Eastern Caribbean time). Applications should be sent electronically to procurement.bb@undp.org using subject **“RFQ130830-1630 ERC Evaluation consultant.”** Alternately hard copies of applications can be sent to:

Procurement Unit
United Nations Development Programme
UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados
Telephone number: (246) 467-6000
Telefax number (246) 429-2448
RFQ130830-1630

12.2 Contents and Submission of Applications

Applications must include:

- Detailed resume or company/organisation profile outlining experience conducting evaluations
- Total quoted amount for service (US Dollar amounts) using table in Appendix 1. This price must also include and itemise travel and allowance cost.



- The approach proposed for implementation of the tasks described
- Completed UNDP Personal History Form (For individual applicants only). This form is found on the UNDP website at <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/jobs/>

12.3 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 firms/institutions whose Technical Component meets the requirements for the assignment. The minimum number of points to move to the second stage (evaluation of quotes) is 49

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

- a) Quality of resume or organisations profile (15 points) – [Excellent 14 -15 points; Very good 11 - 13 points; Good 8 - 10 points; Fair or Average 6 – 7 points; Below standard 5 points]
- b) Minimum of four (4) years’ documented experience in monitoring and evaluating projects. (30 points) - [8 years and over 30 points; 7 years 26 points; 6 years 24 points; 5 years 22 points; 4 years 20 points; 3 years 15 points; 2 years 10 points; 1 year or less 7 points]
- c) Minimum of three (3) years’ documented experience in disaster risk reduction or related field within the Caribbean (10 points) – [6 years and over 10 points; 5 years 9 points; 4 years 8 points; 3 years 7 points; 2 years 6 points; 1 year or less 3 points]
- d) The approach proposed for implementation of the tasks described (15 points) - [Excellent 14 - 15 points; Very good 11-13 points; Good 8 - 10 points; Fair or Average 6 -7 points; Below standard 5 points]

Evaluation of Quotes (30 points)

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 total amount of points for this section is 30. The maximum number of points shall be allotted to the lowest fees proposed that is compared among those invited firms which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest fees; e.g;

$[30 \text{ Points}] \times [\text{US\$ lowest}]/[\text{US\$other}] = \text{points for other proposer's quote}$



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Please note that the UNDP is not bound to select any of quotations provided. Furthermore, since a contract will be awarded in respect of the quotation which is considered most responsive to the needs of the project concerned, due consideration being given to UNDP's general principles, including economy and efficiency, UNDP does not bind itself in any way to select the firm offering the lowest price.

13 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – Table for Submission of Quotation

APPENDIX 2 – Key Documents List

APPENDIX 3 – Main ERC Stakeholders

APPENDIX 4 – ERC Project Document



APPENDIX 1
SUPPLIER'S QUOTATION

Item No.	Description of Service	Unit Price	Quantity (No. Of Days)	Total Price
1	Rate			
2	Travel			
3	Allowances			
Total Price				
Total Final and All-Inclusive Price Quotation				

[Name and Signature of the Supplier's Authorized Person]

[Designation]

[Date]



APPENDIX LIST 2

Key Documents List

The list below is a non-exhaustive list of documents available for the ERC Project and the OECS

Document	Level	Observation
Subregional Programme Document 2005-2011, 2012-2016		
ERC Project Document		
Cost Sharing Agreement between Italy and UNDP		
Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and CIMH		
Memorandum of Understanding between CIMH and CIMA Research Foundation of Italy		
LoA between CIMH and CDEMA		
2012 Revised Results and Resource Framework		
Project Board Terms of Reference		
Quarterly financial and narrative reports (January 2011 – Dec 2013)		
Annual Reports (2011, 2012)		
Project Board meeting reports		
Workshop Reports		
National Implementation Audit Reports (Financial year 2011 and 2012)		
ERC Sustainability Plan		



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

SoPs for Maintenance of Automatic Weather Stations		
ToR for AWS Working Group		



APPENDIX 3

Main ERC Stakeholders

Category	Name and position	Role and type of relationship
Project Board	<p>Ms. Lara Blanco Deputy Resident Representative UNDP Barbados and the OECS</p>	ERC Project Board Chair
	Government of Italy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Donor representative, Project Board member
	<p>Dr Tyrone Sutherland (represented mostly by Mr Chester Layne) Coordinating Director, Caribbean Meteorological Organization (CMO), Trinidad and Tobago N.B Mr. Layne is resident in Barbados</p>	Project Board member
	<p>CDEMA Ms. Elizabeth Riley Deputy Executive Director, Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency N.B Joanne Persad, Sarah Lionel and Keisha Linton are also aligned to this project</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Bernardo Aliaga Technical Secretary, UNESCO IOC</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Sonia Nurse Deputy Director- Barbados Meteorological Service</p>	Project Board member
	<p>Terence Walters Director – National Emergency Management Agency Grenada</p>	Project Board member



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

	<p>Dr. Lorna Inniss</p> <p>Director a.i Coastal Zone Management Unit Barbados</p>	Project Board member
Country Focal Point	<p>Ms Melissa Meade</p> <p>Director, Department of Disaster Management (DDM), Anguilla</p>	ERCfocal point
	<p>Ms Helen Tonge-Richardson</p> <p>Director Anguilla Meteorological Service</p>	ERC focal point
	<p>Ms. Sharleen DaBreo</p> <p>Director, Department of Disaster Manager BVI</p>	
	<p>Mr. Denniston Fraser</p> <p>Director Airports Authority BVI</p>	
	<p>Mr. Alvah Guishard</p> <p>National Office of Disaster Services Antigua and Barbuda</p>	
	<p>Mr. Keithley Meade</p> <p>Director Meteorological Services Antigua and Barbuda</p>	
	<p>Mr. Carl Herbert</p> <p>National Disaster Coordinator, National Disaster Management Agency St. Kitts and Nevis</p>	
	<p>Mr. Delver Martin</p> <p>Meteorological Officer St. Kitts and Nevis</p>	
	<p>Mr. Billy Darroux</p> <p>Director Disaster Management Coordination Agency Montserrat</p>	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

	<p>Mr. Allan Barnett</p> <p>Airport Manager Montserrat</p>	
	<p>Mr. Don Corriette</p> <p>National Disaster Coordinator, Office of Disaster Manager Dominica</p>	
	<p>Senior Meteorologist Dominica</p>	
	<p>Ms. Dawn French</p> <p>Director National Emergency Management Organisation Saint Lucia</p>	
	<p>Mr. Thomas Auguste</p> <p>Meteorological Service Saint Lucia</p>	
	<p>Ms. Kerry Hinds</p> <p>Deputy Director Department of Emergency Management Barbados</p>	
	<p>Mr. Hampden Lovell</p> <p>Director Meteorological Service Barbados</p>	
	<p>Mr. Howie Prince</p> <p>Coordinator National Emergency Management Organisation St. Vincent & the Grenadines</p>	
	<p>Mrs. Corsel Robertson</p> <p>Director of Airports St. Vincent and the Grenadines</p>	
	<p>Mr. Hubert Whyte</p> <p>Manager of Meteorology Grenada</p>	
CIMH ERC team	<p>Dr David Farrell</p> <p>Principal Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology</p>	Project Supervisor



	Ms. Adanna Robertson Quimby ERC Project Manager	ERC Implementation
UNDP	Mr Ian King Programme Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction,	Programme management and oversight
	Ms. Paula Mohammed Programme Manager, Governance	Programme Manager responsible for the Youth-In project (initiative also funded by the Government of Italy)
	Mr Marlon Clarke Project Officer	ERC Implementation
Key Partners	Antonio Parodi ERC Project Lead – CIMA Research Foundation of Italy	Chief Consultant
	Davide Miozzo Output 2 Lead – CIMA Research Foundation of Italy	Chief Consultant
	Joanne Persad Mitigation and Preparedness Specialists CDEMA	Dewetra Platform focal point
	Paola Baldi Honorary Consul for Italy to Barbados	



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

APPENDIX 4
ERC Project Document