**DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**FINAL EVALUATION**

**COMMUNITY DISASTER RISK REDUCTION FUND**

**1. BACKGROUND**

1.01 The Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRRF) is a multi-donor trust fund established by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) in March 2012 with resources being provided by the Government of Canada acting through Global Affairs Canada, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland acting through its Department for International Development and the European Union (EU) through resources provided to CDB under the African Caribbean Pacific-EU-CDB Natural Disaster Risk Management in CARIFORUM Countries Project. The purpose of CDRRF is to provide grant funding for disaster risk reduction (DRR) and/or climate change adaptation (CCA) initiatives at the community level in CDB Borrowing Member Countries (BMCs), except for Haiti. The DRR/CCA initiatives undertaken at the community level should seek to enhance livelihoods, resilience, and sustainability within the community.

The Fund aimed to assist Community-Based Organisations (CBOs) to:

1. Reduce risk at the community level through the implementation of natural hazard risk reduction, CCA and/or related livelihood demonstration sub-projects.
2. Develop experience-based knowledge from the pursuit of demonstration sub-projects to fill national and regional knowledge deficits on community-based DRR.

Funding was provided to individual community-level DRR and CCA projects up to a maximum of USD650,000.

A more complete description of the programme is available at Annex 1.

1.02 A final evaluation will assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness, and sustainability of CDRRF interventions. To this end, an external independent evaluation Consultant is to be recruited by OIE to assist in the conduct of the evaluation.

**2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

2.01 This final evaluation has clear accountability and learning purposes. As it comes at the endpoint of the currently configured CDRRF, it will provide an accounting of performance and results. At the same time, given that community level DRR will continue to be emphasized by CDB and other development funders, it will be important to learn what has worked well, and not well, to inform the design and implementation of future programmes.

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to assess CDRRF’s performance in relation to the project’s expected outputs and outcomes, and to learn lessons from that experience.

2.02 The specific objectives of the evaluation are:

1. To assess the relevance, coherence, efficiency, and effectiveness of the CDRRF and the sub-projects it has supported.
2. To assess results in relation to the CDRRF objectives as per the Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) presented in Annex 2.
3. To assess sub-project risk mitigation strategies, implementation challenges, and potential for sustainability.
4. To document lessons and make recommendations to guide and inform the strategy for, and implementation of, future community-level environment (DRR and CCA) projects.

**3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND QUESTIONS**

3.01 The consultant team is expected to undertake a summative evaluation that, in assessing overall performance, pays particular attention to the appropriateness of the design, institutional and management arrangements, and the results and potential sustainability of sub-projects. The assessment will cover the entire period of the intervention (2012-2020), the regional context at which it was directed, and the four BMCs[[1]](#footnote-1) and eight sub-projects that were supported.

Given the cultural, socio-economic, and other differences in the beneficiary communities of the four countries, it is expected that this multi-site/country data collection would contribute to learning about sub-project implementation in different settings and contexts.

3.03 The evaluation will seek to answer the following questions, which will be further refined at the inception stage:

| **Criteria** | **Key Evaluation Questions** |
| --- | --- |
| Relevance  | 1. To what extent did the design of the CDRRF respond to community contexts and their priority needs for reduction of disaster risks?
2. Given the CDB’s DRR objectives as expressed in its Disaster Management Strategy and Operational Guidelines, and the approved Board Paper and Corrigendum for the CDRRF, to what extent did the project design respond to their intended purpose?
3. Did the Project Performance Measurement Framework accurately reflect the objective and intended outcomes of the Fund?
4. Was the project’s theory of change clear to stakeholders?
 |
| Coherence | 1. To what extent was the CDRRF consistent and aligned with the priorities of: (1) national disaster management agencies; (2) community-based organisations; and (3) other regional entities including CARICOM and CDEMA?
2. How well did the project fit and forge synergies with similar CDB implemented projects or programmes?
3. Was consideration given to executing the CDRRF through alternative or already existing programmes or implementation mechanisms. Should it have been?
 |
| Effectiveness | 1. Did the CDRRF produce the intended results in the short and medium? If so, for whom, to what extent and in what circumstances?
2. Were the results sufficient to make a difference at the community, national, or regional level? Were they of a pilot nature, which may suggest how to appropriately scale up in future?
3. What unintended results – positive and negative – did the CDRRF produce? How did these occur?
4. What were the barriers and enablers that made the difference between successful and disappointing CDRRF implementation and results?
5. How well did sub-projects incorporate gender equality considerations, with what results, and how well did CDB support this effort?
 |
| Efficiency | 1. To what extent did CDRRF implementation and management represent the best possible use of available resources to achieve results of the greatest possible value to BMCs and their beneficiary communities? (Value for money.)
2. To what extent did project management arrangements enable or hinder implementation? Would another structure have enabled better results? Were the project management processes the best suited for community based sub-projects? Are there lessons to be learned regarding management arrangements for future trust fund arrangements executed by CDB?
3. Were the findings of the mid-term evaluation taken into account to improve implementation?
4. Were there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
5. To what extent has coordination/communication been effective within and between the implementation team, partners and participants, and donors? To what extent did the Trust Fund Steering Committee and Technical Review Committee provide the expected support to project implementation?
 |
| Sustainability | 1. Are any positive results likely to be sustained? In what circumstances?
2. Is there evidence that steps were taken by the project to ensure the desired long-term positive impacts of the project?
3. Are there lessons for replicability and scale-up of community DRR initiatives? Were there innovations in sub-projects that provide useful learning, including in climate action, RE/EE and awareness?
 |

3.04 The consultancy should be undertaken over a 6-month period commencing January 2021.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation must provide triangulated, evidence-based findings that are valid, credible, reliable, and useful, leading to logical conclusions and recommendations. Consultants will be asked to propose an appropriate methodology for the scope and questions of this evaluation, that may include, but not be limited to:

1. Comprehensive desk review including design and approval documents, contribution agreements, annual reports, sub-project progress reports, minutes of meetings, and other related documentation.
2. An evaluation matrix and data collection tools to be used at the project and sub-project levels to assess relevance; coherence, efficiency; effectiveness, and sustainability, as well as the cross-cutting theme of gender equality.
3. Interviews, meetings, and focus group discussions with Donors, CDB personnel, sub-project beneficiaries, and other relevant stakeholders, including selected Ministries, Department, Agencies, Community Based Organisations, and Non-Governmental Organisations.
4. Site visits as feasible.

4.02 Depending on pandemic related travel restrictions at the time of data collection, consideration will need to be given to the extent to which virtual methods will complement in-person ones. In addition to on-line instruments, consultants based in one or more of the BMCs who can undertake site visits and stakeholder interviews within existing travel “bubbles” may be a good option. Another may be to phase work so that in-country visits can be undertaken at a later stage when travel restrictions are eased. OIE will be flexible in its consideration of both the overall duration of the assignment, and the most effective means of gathering data given pandemic circumstances.

4.03 It will also be important to consider innovative and participatory approaches to ensure engagement with the project stakeholders and other relevant CDB staff, BMC’s beneficiary community groups, subproject government counterparts, and other key stakeholders in a COVID-19 environment.

**5. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

5.01 Under the supervision of OIE, CDB’s Coordinator, Environmental Sustainability Unit or his/her designate, will be responsible for coordinating the administrative and logistic arrangements for the consultancy, assisting with resolving any operational issues which may arise and generally facilitating the work of the Consultant. With the assistance of ESU, OIE will make arrangements for the Consultant’s introduction to the donors, CDB’s management and staff, members of the CDRRF Team, sub-project PMUs and the beneficiaries and stakeholders, and regional development partners. ESU will provide the Consultant with the background information on CDRRF, the sub-projects, data and reports relevant to the completion of the assignment. The PMU of each sub-project will provide administrative and logistical support for arranging virtual or on-site meetings with the sub-project beneficiaries and other relevant stakeholders.

5.02 The consultant undertaking the Evaluation should not have been involved in designing, executing or advising on the CDRRF project that is the subject of the review. This is to ensure objectivity and to avoid a real or a perceived conflict of interest.

**6. EVALUATION TEAM QUALIFICATIONS**

The team that carries out this evaluation should be comprised of a leader and key experts who bring the following capacities to the assignment:

* Leadership in the design and implementation of multi-country development evaluations
* Experience working with multilateral development banks and international development agencies
* Experience in evaluation of DRR, CCA, and community driven development projects
* Experience working in the Caribbean region
* Expertise in evaluation of gender equality initiatives, or evaluation of gender equality integration into development projects
* Strong stakeholder communication and report writing skills

**7. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

7.01 The consultant will be required to prepare and submit the following reports to CDB:

1. Inception Report: This should include an outline of the methodology/approach, an evaluation design matrix, data collection tools, and execution work plan responding to the scope of services at Section 3, one month after commencement of the assignment.
2. Draft Report of Findings: should be submitted to OIE for review and comment. OIE and the consultant will jointly conduct a fact-checking and validation process with stakeholders.
3. Draft Final Report: Revised/ Final report which incorporates comments provided by OIE along with annexed audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report. The Final Report should be submitted within five days of the acceptance of the Draft Final Report. An electronic format should be submitted to CDB.

1. PowerPoint: suitable for presenting the evaluation and its findings and recommendations to stakeholders.
2. **WORK PLAN AND SCHEDULE**
3. Contract signature – December 15
4. Inception report – January 30
5. Data gathering and possible field mission – February/March
6. Data analysis and draft findings report – April
7. Draft final report – May
8. Final report and PP presentation – June 15
9. **EXPECTED LEVEL OF EFFORT**

Proposing firms will be expected to specify a level of effort that deals adequately with the scope and lines of enquiry of this evaluation, providing good value for money. Based on past experience OIE would not expect this assignment to require more than 110 days of consultant effort.

**PROJECT BRIEF**

**1. BACKGROUND**

1.01 The Community Disaster Risk Reduction Fund (CDRRF) was established by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) in March 2012 with resources being provided by the Government of Canada acting through its Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD). The Trust Fund Administrative Agreement was amended in December 2012 to facilitate operations as a multi-donor trust fund to allow other bilateral donors to join and contribute to the project. Following the change, in December 2012, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland acting through its Department for International Development (DFID), joined CDRRF as a donor. The European Union’s (EU) funding for the CDRRF was subsequently provided in July 2014 via the African Caribbean Pacific (ACP) – EU/CDB (ACP-EU-CDB) Natural Disaster Risk Management (NDRM) in CARIFORUM Countries programme. DFID subsequently exited the Fund in 2017.

1.02 The Fund (CDRRF) is a 24 million United States Dollars (USD) programme, to which Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), now Global Affairs Canada contributed twenty million (20mn) Canadian dollars; the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID) contributed two million pounds sterling (GBP 2mn) ; and the European Union (EU) allocated 1.59 million Euros under the African Caribbean Pacific- European Union-Caribbean Development Bank (ACP-EU-CDB) Natural Disaster Risk Management in CARIFORUM Countries programme.

1.03 The purpose of the Fund is to finance, by non-reimbursable resources, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) initiatives at the community level across CDB Borrowing Member Countries (BMCs) with the exception of Haiti.[[2]](#footnote-2) CDRRF provides technical assistance and grant funding that ranges from USD400,000 up to a maximum of USD650,000 for gender-responsive community-based sub-projects.

**Project Proposed Outcomes (Developmental Results)**

1.06 The CDRRF was designed to achieve intended outcomes in the immediate, intermediate and long term, as outlined in its revised (2019) project’s Performance Measurement Framework (PMF). These are:

1. Ultimate Outcome: Improved community-based security for men, women, and children across the Caribbean region in the advent of natural disasters and climate change (CC).
2. **Intermediate Outcome:**
3. Enhanced implementation of gender-responsive community level interventions to reduce natural disaster risk and climate change impacts in four Caribbean Development Bank Borrowing Member Countries
4. Improved integration of disaster risk and climate change impacts in Country Poverty Assessment and related support to BMCs
5. **Immediate Outcomes:**
6. Gender sensitive resilience to natural hazards and climate change in 12 beneficiaries communities increased Regional gender sensitive knowledge of reducing risk to natural disaster and climate change at community level improved amongst DRM, environment and, social sector practitioners, public sector agencies
7. Focused and up-scaled/enhanced regional level resourcing for building gender sensitive community level resilience to natural hazards and climate change impacts National skills and capacities to monitor and reduce natural hazard risk and climate change impact at community and household levels increased amongst social sector, environment and DRM practitioners, public sector representatives.

**Project Scope**

1.07 The CDRRF Project comprises the following components:

1. Community DRR/CCA Sub-Projects;
2. Knowledge Management/Public Education;
3. Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
4. Mainstreaming DRR/CCA considerations into Country Poverty Assessment (CPA) processes; and
5. Project Management Unit.

**Thematic Scope**

1.08 The CDRRF is designed to address DRR and CCA community issues, as well as a number of cross-cutting thematic such as gender responsiveness, environmental sustainability, broad-based participation and sustainable livelihoods. This is intended to be achieved via the implementation of CDRR sub-projects in the eligible BMCs.

**Spatial Scope**

1.09 The CDRRF project has regional scope as it is intended to develop experience-based knowledge from the pursuit of CDRR sub-projects to fill national and regional knowledge deficits on community DRR; and to develop DRM and CCA enhanced guidelines for country poverty assessments.

**2. BUILDING COMMUNITY RESILIENCE**

2.01 Building community resilience is an important approach to helping communities address new and existing risks presented by natural hazards and climate change (CC) impacts. One component of the CDRRF project focuses on improving infrastructure, enhancing livelihoods and increasing disaster risk management (DRM) and CCA capacity through the implementation of community-based resilience projects.

2.02 The DRR/CCA initiatives undertaken at the community level seek to enhance livelihoods, resilience and sustainability within the community.

 **Sub-project Pipeline**

2.03 One expected CDRRF project output is the development of a pipeline of community-based sub-projects. This was accomplished by the end of March 2017 as the DRR and CC sub-project pipeline consisted of 14 community-based initiatives distributed across seven CDB member countries. The Project Application Documents submitted by CBOs, non-governmental organisations (NGO) and public sector agencies were approved for appraisal by the Project Technical Review Committee (PTRC)[[3]](#footnote-3) and eight of these sub-projects were appraised by the end of July 2017.

2.04 In November 2017, the Trust Fund Steering Committee (TFSC) decided that the appraisal of six sub-projects in the pipeline which were spread across the following CDB BMCs should be cancelled:

(a) Belize.

1. Dominica.
2. Grenada.
3. Jamaica.
4. Saint Lucia.
5. St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG).

2.05 The TFSC’s decision was based on Global Affairs Canada’s proposed re-purposing of the financing allocated for the six sub-projects to support the reconstruction efforts, aimed at addressing the widespread damage arising from the passage of Hurricanes Irma and Maria in Antigua and Barbuda and Dominica during September 2017.

**Sub-Project Commitments**

2.06 Commitments to sub-projects in Jamaica account for the largest share of sub-project commitments - 62 percent (%) followed by Belize and the British Virgin Islands (BVI) which represented 13% and SVG 12%.

2.07 At the end of March 2018, eight gender-responsive sub-projects with a combined value of USD5.12 mn were under implementation in four CDB member countries. Table 1 provides a list of the sub-projects, their components, location, and implementing agencies.

**Table 1: LIST OF SUB-PROJECT IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES AND COMPONENTS**

| **BMC**  | **Implementing Agency and Project Name** | **Summary of Project Components** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Belize  | Humana People to People Belize (HPPB).Building Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change in Toledo, Southern Belize.  | 1. Rehabilitation of two emergency shelters.
2. Installation of early warning systems (EWS).
3. Improved farming systems through nine Farmers’ Clubs.
4. Improved DRR and CC public education and awareness.
 |
| BVI | DDM Establishing Flood-Resilient Smart Communities through NGO Partnerships | 1. Rehabilitation of two community buildings.
2. Improvements in the EWS on two islands.
3. Business Continuity Planning training for small and medium-sized enterprises.
4. Flood and CCA monitoring.
5. Preparation of a management plan for mangroves.
6. Design and construction of a drain on Tortola.
 |
| Jamaica  | EHF Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Change while Reducing Disaster Risk in Peckham and Surrounding Communities, Clarendon. | 1. Training of farmers in climate-smart agricultural practices and financial management.
2. Establishment of climate-smart agricultural demonstration plots.
3. Capacity building to improve the management and operations of farmers’ groups/associations.
4. Support for the reactivation of at least one female farmer’s group.
5. DRR and CCA public education and awareness.
 |
| Jeffrey Town Farmers Association Jeffrey Town Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction Project (JTIDRRP). | 1. Construction of climate resilient infrastructure.
2. Improved food security through the training of farmers and the planting of drought tolerant crops.
3. Upgrading of the Association’s agro-processing facility.
4. DRR and CCA public education and awareness.
 |
| Llandewey/Ramble Community Development Committee Benevolent Society (LRCDCBS).Llandewey/Ramble Community Environment and Disaster Mitigation Initiative. | 1. Rehabilitation of two community centres that serve as emergency shelters.
2. Installation of water harvesting facilities in six public buildings.
3. Improved livelihoods for the women’s group and training for local artisans.
4. DRM training.
5. DRR and CCA public education and awareness.
6. Capacity building for the Benevolent Society’s executive committee.
 |
| Trinityville Area Development Community Benevolent Society (TADCBS).Trinityville Area Integrated Land Management and Disaster Risk Reduction Project (TAILMDRRP). | 1. Training in and implementation of improved land management techniques.
2. Rehabilitation of one community centre to also function as an emergency shelter.
3. Reduced flood risk through improved drainage.
4. DRR and CC public education and awareness.
 |
| WMCClimate Change Adaptation and Risk Reduction Technology and Strategies to Improve Community Resilience Project. | 1. Preparation of a Floodwater Control Master Plan.
2. Installation of flood EWS to alert residents in the town of Savanna-la-Mar and three surrounding communities.
3. DRR and CCA public education and awareness.
4. Safety at sea training for fisherfolk.
5. Implementation of community-based livelihood pilot projects and DRR demonstration projects.
 |
| SVG | SRC/UWIVolcano Ready Communities Project. | 1. Development of protocols to inform and alert residents in the 12 target communities about the Soufriere Volcano and other related natural hazards.
2. Design and printing of gender sensitive multi-hazard DRR and CCA public education materials.
3. Preparation of contingency plans for communities in the Soufriere Volcano high risk zone and testing of the plans.
 |

**3. OPERATIONAL STRUCTURE**

2.08 The CDRRF is managed by the Trust Fund Steering Committee (TFSC), which has overall responsibility for the coordination and guidance of the project. The TFSC comprises representatives from Caribbean Development Bank, Global Affairs Canada, and EU. The TFSC is chaired by Global Affairs Canada and meetings are held at least twice per year. The TFSC makes decisions on the basis of (non-voting) consensus amongst official members of the TFSC (i.e. non-observer members).

2.09 The Project Technical Review Committee (PTRC) will serve principally as a technical review committee to the project, advising the Project Management Unit ((PMU) and recommending sub-projects for the approval of the TFSC.

2.10 CDRRF’s PMU is responsible for the management and implementation of the Project. The Unit is currently staffed by a Project Manager, an Administrative Assistant, a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and a Knowledge Management/Public Education Specialist.

2.11 CDB manages the overall process of sub-project proposal solicitation, appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation (M&E). CDB’s contributions to the administration of the Fund are made through its Loans Committee and several Operations Departments including the Environmental Sustainability Unit, the Procurement Policy Unit and the Finance and Corporate Planning Department.

**4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION ARRANGEMENTS**

2.11 The importance of managing for results has built in CDRRF’s mechanisms for quality assurance, and results monitoring and evaluation from the design phase to its completion. To this end, the Project is guided by a M&E Strategy and Plan. The M&E Strategy has two key objectives:

1. To ensure that the CDRRF and its sub-projects are results-oriented in their design, management and reporting; with the necessary quality assurance mechanisms and tools established; and

(b) To enhance M&E capacity specific to project design and reporting within the beneficiary communities.

2.12 These objectives are expected to derive activities that will be executed at the Project and Sub-project levels. The M&E Strategy and Plan are intended to guide how the Fund will be reviewed and assessed against its objectives, desired results, inputs, outputs, and operating assumptions. The focus of the strategy and related approaches will be to define realistic expected results, monitoring progress toward their achievement, reporting on performance and integrating lessons for knowledge management and decision-making.

2.13 The primary component of the M&E Strategy and Plan is the PMF. This framework is the guiding tool for the project and the sub-projects as it demonstrates the Fund’s logic and intended results, while considering the assumptions and risks associated with the operating contexts of the each of the beneficiary communities. Each sub-project will have a PMF designed to consider its specific activities and objectives and the associated results will feed into the CDRRF’s PMF. **An updated PMF showing results at August 2020 is included below:**

**COMMUNITY DISASTER RISK REDUCTION FUND (CDRRF**) - **PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT FRAMEWORK (PMF) Revised:** *August 2020*

|  | **Expected Results** | **Performance****Indicators** | **Baseline** **Data (BL)** | **Targets** | **Data Source** | **Results at August 31st 2020** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Ultimate Outcome | 1000 - Improved community-based security for men, women and children across the Caribbean region in the advent of natural disasters and climate change. | 1001: Percent of households livelihood which are adversely impacted by natural hazard events in BMC beneficiary communities1002: Percent of death toll during times of a natural hazard in BMCs beneficiary communities | TBD via BLS(disaggregated by sex and age)TBD via BLS(disaggregated by sex and age) | Reduced by 50% by 2018 Reduced by 50% by 2020 |  |  |
| Intermediate Outcome | **1100** - Enhanced implementation of gender-responsive community level interventions to reduce natural disaster risk and climate change impacts in four Caribbean Development Bank Borrowing Member Countries  | 1101: Percent of approved BMC’s subprojects with a gender-sensitive focus (at least 25% are female beneficiaries)  | 0 | 80% of approved subprojects by 2018 | Progress Reports |  Target achieved in October 20178 sub-projects approved all with gender sensitive focus |
| 1102: Percent of approved subprojects whose design is informed by Community Vulnerable Risk Assessment, DRR/CCA KAP Studies and Vulnerable Livelihood Profiles. | 0 | 70% of approved subproject by 2018100% by 2020 | * Design of 6 approved sub-projects informed by RCCVA
* Design of 2 sub-projects informed by historical data on natural hazard events and climate data
* 2 KAP studies completed to inform design
 |
| **1200** - Improved integration of disaster risk and climate change impacts in Country Poverty Assessment and related support to BMCs | 1201: Number of BMCs that have disaster risk and CC impact considerations in CPA design | 0 | 3 by 20182020 | CPAs | One country using enhanced CPA tools |
| Immediate Outcome | **1110 –** Gender sensitive resilience to natural hazards and climate change in 12 beneficiaries communities increased | 1111: Percent of households growing crops that are resilient to climate hazards  | TBD via BLS(disaggregated by sex and age) | Increased by 35% by 2020 | Monthly and quarterly reports | * 71,336 Trees, Suckers and other crops planted by 1037 farmers (used as proxy for households)
* Belize and EHF(Jamaica)- check number of households in each (target communities/farmers clubs)
* 21 replication plots established with 10 acres of land planted with drought tolerant crops
 |
| 1112: Percent of households using conservation agriculture practices  | TBD via BLS(disaggregated by sex and age) | Increased by 35% by 2020 | * 1148 farmers were trained in climate smart agriculture (farmers used as a proxy for households)
 |
| 1113: Percent of persons who are aware of emergency procedures in the event of a hazard | TBD via BLSdisaggregated by sex and age | Increased by 50% by 2020 | * 206 persons trained in DRR
* 102 CERTs
* 11p trained in Light Search and Rescue
* 106 trained in First Aid
 |
| 1114: Percent of persons who know sources of information to describe weather variability and future climate patterns | TBD via BLSdisaggregated by sex and age) | 20% by 2020 | * 236 Community DRR and CCA events were held with 6118 persons in attendance
 |
| **1120-**Regional gender sensitive knowledge of reducing risk to natural disaster and climate change at community level improved amongst DRM, environment and, social sector practitioners, public sector agencies, regional development and training institutions | 1121: Percent of community level stakeholders (outreach personnel) who are able to link climate trends to impacts on livelihood. | TBD | Increased by 60% in 201860% by 2020 | Monthly and quarterly reports and report from CERT training | * Jamaica, May 2019 – the Social Development Commission (SDC) completed 32 draft community profiles and LBA
* St. Vincent and the Grenadines, October 2019 – Community Development Division (DRD) Completed 11 draft community profiles and LBAs
* Belize, October 2019 - Department for Rural Development (DRD) completed 11 draft community profiles and LBAs
 |
| 1122: Percent of community level stakeholders (outreach personnel) are aware of appropriate adaptation strategies for the local context  | TBD | Increased by 60% in 201860% 2020 | Monthly and quarterly reports and report from CERT training  | * 568 community residents and leaders participated in capacity building workshops
* 32 community groups drafted organisation’s vision, missions and objectives
* 28 community groups drafted community engagement plans
* 30 Caribbean Catastrophe Risk Insurance Facility community resilience concept notes prepared
* 14 Global Environmental Facility community resilience concept notes prepared
 |
| 1123: Number of national disaster risk management, environment, and social sector practitioners participating in regional DRR and CC knowledge building activities | TBD | 10 by 2020 | Workshop reports | * 1-day workshop held for members of 4 water catchment and tank management committees in Jeffrey town-
* 5-day workshop on project implementation and planning attended by 23 persons from national disaster offices in 15 CDB BMCs
* 44 participants from 8 BMCs provided with training in the preparation of livelihood profiles-
 |
| **1130 -** Focused and up-scaled/enhanced regional level resourcing for building gender sensitive community level resilience to natural hazards and climate change impacts | 1131: Value of investment (USD) for community-based, gender sensitive projects addressing DRR and climate change impacts | 0 | USD 5.12 Million by 2017 | CDRRF financial reports | Achieved: Commitments made to 8 sub-projects valued at USD5.12 million. All grant agreements signed by October 2017 |
| **1210** - National skills and capacities to monitor and reduce natural hazard risk and climate change impact at community and household levels increased amongst social sector, environment and DRM practitioners, public sector representatives. | 1211: Number of beneficiary communities with a revitalized or new Disaster Management Committee functional | TBD via BLS | At least 8 beneficiary communities by 2020 | CDRRRF grant agreements |  |

1. Jamaica, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Eligible CDB BMCs include: Anguilla, Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, the Turks and Caicos Islands and Suriname. Haiti, though a CDB BMC, is not eligible to apply to the CDRRF as it is served by a CIDA programme that is separate and distinct from CIDA’s Caribbean programme. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The PTRC serves as CDRRF’s technical review committee, recommends community-based sub-projects for the appraisal and provides technical advice to the Project Management Unit (PMU). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)