



Community Alerts Project (CAP)

RFQ141017-1630

Evaluation Consultancy

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Job Title	CAP Evaluation Consultant
Contract Type	Individual Contract (IC)
Duty Station	Home Country Based, Barbados, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Dominica, Grenada
Contracting Authority	United Nations Development Programme
Contract Duration	1 November – 30 December 2014
Start Date	1 November 2014

1. CONTEXT

In the region, climate change and increasingly severe annual natural disasters 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) Framework led by the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA) and the Hyogo Framework for Action 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

The communities targeted under the present action are located in low lying coastal areas, and are therefore particularly vulnerable to rapidly forming events generating flood both from rainfall and from coastal hazards such as storm surges. Tsunamis are also a threat which tends to be overlooked. The Caribbean is a region prone to Earthquakes, and other phenomenon such as submarine landslides and underwater volcanoes (Kick'em Jenny offshore of Grenada and the Grenadines) are potentially tsunamigenic. In addition to a particular exposure, these communities have comparatively higher vulnerabilities caused by their lack of preparedness. Economic risks are also important since assets are concentrated in low-lying areas subject to flooding and coastal hazards.

It is therefore up to community stakeholders to take an active role in enhancing their state of readiness, on a long term basis, as well as during disasters lead-time. Unfortunately, incentives for community action are still largely dominated by the impact of disasters themselves. Currently, communication at the national level and in particular between, national disaster management authorities and communities is not efficient nor robust as there is not the necessary redundancy to support emergency situations. This has implications for effective preparation for and response to hazard events and related disasters. Their specificities (disabled, minority groups, languages etc.) are not adequately considered by usual medias such as the radio broadcast. The challenge of alerting communities is multiple: an effective alert must be issued in multiple formats to reach the larger proportion of the population. Most importantly, it must be robust (consistent), intelligible and trusted. If a tsunami approaches, the lead-time can be of the order of a few minutes to an hour, and minutes spared can save lives. Currently existing systems are challenged to reach all publics segments in all time and in a coherent and effective manner. While "scientific" components of the EWS are being addressed by several regional projects reinforcing forecasting capacities such as the CIMH-lead ERC project and the DEWETRA platform, much remains to be done to achieve a risk information flow from forecaster to population at risk, through coordinated national mechanism.

This Community Alert Project, financed by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection will be implemented in six pilot communities within three countries (Grenada, Dominica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines) to enhance community resilience and demonstrate a coherent approach to emergency alerting. This project will seek to specifically:

- Improve awareness to natural hazards and the associated preparation and response protocols in 6 pilot communities.
- Demonstrate the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) as a process to improve community alerting with a view to wider application within the pilot countries and other Caribbean states

These outputs, covering a broad range of Comprehensive Disaster Management elements, aim to contribute to the intended UNDAF outcome of "Enhanced capacity of national, sub-regional and regional institutions and stakeholders to effectively manage natural resources, build resilience to the adverse impacts of climate



change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.

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. 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, UNDP and ECHO) 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.

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
- ECHO and UNDP's performance as development partners
- 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 (e.g. if it covers all of intervention components, one component of the intervention, a sample based on one technical justification for the selection or if a thematic or cross-cutting issue is being evaluated).



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- The time frame or phase to be covered.
- The geographical coverage: the unit of analysis cover a determined number of country

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 UNDP as the Implementing partner in a Caribbean regional programme in the field of disaster risk reduction
- Potential and effective contribution by beneficiary countries 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.

6. 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:



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

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?

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.)?



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

- 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 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 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.⁴ The evaluator may use the following to ascertain the empirically based evidence:

- Comprehensive Desk review (indicative but not necessary complete list of documentation at Appendix 1). All needed documentation can be obtained directly from the CAP Project Coordinator and UNDP.
- Field visits will be conducted in the beneficiary countries. The evaluator can also use the final CAP meeting tentatively planned for December 2014 to meet country representatives as well as other stakeholders.
- Consultations with CAP contacts outside of the beneficiary countries 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.
- The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

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 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

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:

7.1. A brief inception report

This report will be submitted to UNDP at the end of the five day 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](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcome-Level%20Evaluation_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
- Recommendations
- Lessons Learnt and Best Practices

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 biographies 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 (approximately 10 -15 business days). It is thus essential that main findings and recommendations are shared informally during the mission with the relevant stakeholders.

7.3 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



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

7.4 Specific Deliverables

- Conduct consultations with CAP focal points/contacts based in Barbados (see section 4)
- Conduct consultations with CAP focal points/contacts in beneficiary countries through site visits, online mediums or telephone (see section 4)
- Conduct consultations with CAP regional and international partners/contacts through online mediums or telephone (see section 4)
- Attend final CAP meeting during December 2014
- Produce an inception report, draft report and final report for the evaluation

8 EVALUATION MEMBERS

UNDP Barbados and the OECS anticipate that this service can be undertaken by one individual. The evaluator 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.

The evaluator shall provide a detailed résumé as well as work samples and references where available.

The evaluator must be entirely independent from any organization or firm that has been involved in designing, executing or advising the CAP 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 UNDP Barbados and the OECS participating states context, specifically Grenada, Dominica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines 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

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

Timeframe: 1 November 2014 – 31 December 2014

Period to Consider: 1 June 2013 – 30 November 2014. However prospects for sustainability and potential for longer term impact will be made far beyond this period

Geographic Scope: The mission will start in Barbados to allow the evaluators to gain an overview of the initiative. Barbados is also the location of some key partners of the project specifically UNDP, CDEMA and the European Union. 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
- CDEMA
- Project Coordinator
- EU Office

Dominica:

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



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Grenada:

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

St. Vincent & the Grenadines:

- National Emergency Management Organisation (Chair of the Project Board)
- National Red Cross Society
- Beneficiary community representatives as determined by the project focal point in country
- 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 (Office in the Dominican Republic)

DRAFT

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 containing work plan, key findings of desk review and evaluation methodology.
Development of evaluation methodology/inception report	3	
Comments to the Inception Report	2	
Site Visits, Meetings and interviews with stakeholders, beneficiaries and Partners; Debriefing (last day of the mission)	13	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	2	Draft evaluation report with findings, lessons learned and results submitted to UNDP for review
Collecting comments on draft report from UNDP and partners	6	
Presentation of final evaluation report Final Project Board Meeting	1	Evaluation report presented
Finalization of the report on the basis of final comments received	3	Evaluation report
Total working days(incl. travel)	35	

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 Deputy Resident Representative of 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 (10 November 2014) - 20%
- Draft evaluation report and presentation of the findings, conclusions and recommendations - (5 December 2014) – 40%
- Final evaluation report – (30 December 2014) – 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 (Section to be removed in final ToR noting that it will be someone internal to UNDP)

12.1 Deadline

Deadline for the receipt of applications is **Friday, 17 October, 2014 at 4:30 pm** (Eastern Caribbean time). Applications should be sent electronically to procurement.bb@undp.org using subject **“RFQ141017-1630 CAP Evaluation consultant.”** Submissions provided by email must contain an attachment called the “Confidential Financial Proposal” which should be password protected. The password must be provided as part of the submission.

Submissions received by mail must be provided in a sealed outer envelope containing a separate inner envelopes, marked “Confidential Technical Proposal.” The outer envelope shall be addressed to:

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

Attention: RFQ141017-1630

12.2 Contents and Submission of Applications

Applications must include:

- Detailed resume or company/organisation profile outlining experience conducting evaluations
- 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 lowest priced technically submissions will be proposed for the contract

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;

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

Please note that the UNDP is not bound to select any of the submissions 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.

Deadline 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/>



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

13 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 – Key Documents List

APPENDIX 2 – Main ERC Stakeholders

APPENDIX 3 – ERC Project Document

DRAFT

APPENDIX LIST 1

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		
CAP Project Document		
Signed Contribution Agreement with UN Agencies		
Project Board Terms of Reference		
Monthly Status updates (inclusive of risk logs)		
Intermediate Report		
Project Board meeting reports		
Workshop Reports		
Project Document 2014 Annual Workplan Mission Reports Assessment Reports Communications Strategy		
CAP Draft Sustainability Plan		



APPENDIX 2

Main ERC Stakeholders

Category	Name and position	Role and type of relationship
Project Board	Ms. Michelle Forbes Deputy Director National Emergency Management Organisation	Project Board Chair
	Ms. Lara Blanco Deputy Resident Representative UNDP Barbados and the OECS	Project Board member
	Mr. Jocelyn Lance ECHO	Donor representative, Project Board member
	Ms. Elizabeth Riley Deputy Executive Director, Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency (CDEMA)	Project Board member
	Kathy-Ann Morain National Emergency Management Agency Grenada	Project Board member
	Mr. Steve Joseph Office of Disaster Management - Dominica	Project Board member
	Mr. Cleve Smith Mayor of Portsmouth (Beneficiary community in Dominica)	Project Board member



	<p>Ms. Lorraine Mangwiro</p> <p>Regional Representative</p> <p>Head of Office</p> <p>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (Trinidad and Tobago)</p> <p>Mr. Terence Charles</p> <p>Director General Grenada National Red Cross Society</p> <p>N.B We invited Lorraine to be a member on the Board or her representative. The Grenada Red Cross was recommended in this regard but Lorraine is still copied on all project board related information.</p>	<p>Project Board member</p>
<p>Additional country Focal Points</p>	<p>Ms Howie Prince</p> <p>Director, National Emergency Management Organisation (NEMO) St. Vincent and the Grenadines</p> <p>Mr. Terence Walters</p> <p>Director National Disaster Management Agency (NaDMA) Grenada</p> <p>Mr. Don Corriette</p> <p>Director, Office of Disaster Management (ODM) Dominica</p> <p>Ms. Kathleen J. Pinard-Byrne</p> <p>Director General Dominica National Red Cross Society</p>	



	<p>Mr. Bernard Marksman</p> <p>Director General</p> <p>St. Vincent & the Grenadines Red Cross Society</p>	
	<p>Ms. Claudine Roberts</p> <p>CDEMA</p> <p>Community Disaster Specialist</p>	
	<p>Mr. Francis St. Hillaire</p> <p>National Disaster Management Agency (NaDMA) Grenada – Community Specialist</p>	
	<p>Mr. Stanford Coy</p> <p>Union Island</p> <p>Community Representative</p>	
	<p>Ms. Sherma Selby Adams</p> <p>Union Island</p> <p>Community Representative</p>	
	<p>Ms. Ingrid Lavia</p> <p>Community Representative</p>	
	<p>Mr. Andrew Liverpool</p> <p>Community Representative</p>	
	<p>Mr. Pierre Scholls or Marc Comas</p> <p>French Red Cross Society</p> <p>Volcanic Risk Reduction project</p>	
UNDP	<p>Mr Ian King</p> <p>Programme Manager, Disaster Risk Reduction,</p>	Initial Programme management and oversight (Now based in Panama)
	<p>Mr Marlon Clarke</p> <p>Project Coordinator</p>	CAP Implementation
Key Partners		



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

DRAFT



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

APPENDIX 3

CAP Project Document

DRAFT