CDEMA
The Caribbean Disaster
Emergency Management Agency

THE CARIBBEAN DISASTER EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (CDEMA)

Building #1, Manor Lodge Complex
Lodge Hill, St. Michael
Barbados
Tel. no. (246) 425-0386; Fax no. (246)425- 8854
E-mail: cdera@caribsurf.com; Website: www.cdera.org

THE REGIONAL DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN THE CARIBBEAN PROJECT

[THE REGIONAL PUBLIC GOOD]

[ATN/OC-10085-RG]

Manual for Baseline Data Collection at the Country Level

November 2007

[illegible]

[illegible]

5. Each with the cultural, non-possible [illegible] "no" or "yes" for all [illegible] and [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Glossary of Key Terms

Anthropogenic hazards
Hazards created through the action of human activity. (ISDR)

Capacity
Physical social, economic and institutional means as well as skilled personal or collective attributes such as leadership and management (ISDR). *In this manual, capacity often refers to the ability of particular persons, entities, or organizations to prepare, address, manage, respond to and recover from various disasters.*

Capacity building
Efforts aimed to develop human skills or societal infrastructures within a community or organization needed to reduce the level of risk. Capacity building also includes development of institutional, financial, political and other resources, such as technology at different levels and sectors of the society. (ISDR)

CARICOM Framework
Ten year (2005-2015) Framework for disaster management in the Caribbean presented through CDERA at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR), Kobe, Japan, 2005 as input to the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM)
Comprehensive Disaster Management which includes attention to all phases of the Disaster Management Cycle – prevention, mitigation, preparedness and response, recovery and rehabilitation (CDERA)

Coordination
Ongoing communication and collaboration between persons, organizations and institutions (in or among various sectors and at or among various levels, i.e. local, national, regional) for strategic planning, decision-making, procedures to be followed, and overall action to be taken in preparation for and response to disasters. (Baastel)

Coping Capacity
The means by which people or organizations use available resources and abilities to face adverse consequences that could lead to a disaster. In general, this involves managing resources, both in normal times as well as during crises or adverse conditions. The strengthening of coping capacities usually builds resilience to withstand the effects of natural and human-induced hazards (ISDR)

Disaster Risk Management (DRM)
The systematic process of using administrative decisions, organization, operational skills and capacities to implement policies, strategies and coping capacities of the society and communities to lessen the impacts of natural hazards and related environmental and technological disasters. This comprises all forms of activities, including structural and non-structural measures to avoid (prevention) or to limit (mitigation and preparedness) adverse effects of hazards. (ISDR)

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)
The conceptual framework of elements considered with the possibilities to minimize vulnerabilities and disaster risks throughout a society, to avoid (prevention) or to limit (mitigation and preparedness) the adverse impacts of hazards, within the broad context of sustainable development. DRR involves:

- Risk awareness and assessment including hazard analysis and vulnerability/capacity analysis;
- Knowledge development including education, training, research and information;
- Public commitment and institutional frameworks, including organizational, policy, legislation and community action;

- Application of measures including environmental management, land-use and urban planning, protection of critical facilities, application of science and technology, partnership and networking, and financial instruments;
- Early warning systems including forecasting, dissemination of warnings, preparedness measures and reaction capacities (ISDR)

Early Warning
The provision of the means by which people or organizations use available resources and abilities to face adverse consequences that could lead to a disaster. In general, this involves managing resources, both in normal times as well as during crises or adverse conditions. The strengthening of coping capacities usually builds resilience to withstand the effects of natural and human-induced hazards (ISDR)

Hazard
A potentially damaging physical event, phenomenon or human activity that may cause the loss of life or injury, property damage, social and economic disruption or environmental degradation. Hazards can include latent conditions that may represent future threats and can have different origins: natural (geological, hydrometeorological and biological) or induced by human processes (environmental degradation and technological hazards). Hazards can be single, sequential or combined in their origin and effects. Each hazard is characterised by its location, intensity, frequency and probability. (ISDR)

Mainstreaming
Making disaster risk management an integral dimension of the policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres (BCPR)

Mitigation
Structural and non-structural measures undertaken to limit the adverse impact of natural hazards, environmental degradation and technological hazards (ISDR)

National Disaster Committee
These national level committees include representation from various government ministries and organizations, the private sector and civil society and is focused on coordinating national preparations for and response to disasters. (OAS/CDERA/CTO)

National Disaster Organization (NDO)
The NDO is the government agency with focal responsibility for disaster management in the respective country. It is generally headed by the country's Disaster coordinator and coordinates the institutional and operational aspects of disaster prevention and mitigation, preparedness and response and recovery and rehabilitation. (CDERA)

National Emergency Operations Center (NEOC)
The NEOC acts as the operational center for national coordination and control of emergency and disaster response and relief operations. It has four functional areas: executive policy, operations, communications and emergency public information. (OAS/CDERA/CTO)

National Tourism Organizations (NTOs)
These organizations are the organizations representing the tourism sector in the project. This will usually include the Ministry of Tourism (or equivalent), the Tourism Board, and can also sometimes include Hotel and Tourism Associations, in some cases. (CDERA)

Outcomes
Targets to be achieved in the Medium-term in the results-based management project framework. Outcomes result from an amalgam of short- term outputs (OECD-DAC)

Outputs
Short-term Results from activities undertaken toward the medium-term outcome (OECD-DAC)

Preparedness
Activities and measures taken in advance to ensure effective response to the impact of hazards, including the issuance of timely and effective early warnings and the temporary evacuation of people and property from threatened locations (ISDR)

Prevention
Activities to provide outright avoidance of the adverse impact of hazards and means to minimize related environmental, technological and biological disasters. Depending on social and technical feasibility and cost/benefit considerations, investing in preventive measures is justified in areas frequently affected by disasters. In the context of public awareness and education, related to disaster risk reduction changing attitudes and behaviour contribute to promoting a "culture of prevention". (ISDR)

Recovery
Decisions and actions taken after a disaster with a view to restoring or improving the pre-disaster living conditions of the stricken community, while encouraging and facilitating necessary adjustments to reduce disaster risk. Recovery (rehabilitation and reconstruction) affords an opportunity to develop and apply disaster risk reduction measures (ISDR)

Relief / response
The provision of assistance or intervention during or immediately after a disaster to meet the life preservation and basic subsistence needs of those people affected. It can be of an immediate, short-term, or protracted duration. (ISDR)

Resilience
The capacity of a system, community or society potentially exposed to hazards to adapt, by resisting or changing in order to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning and structure. This is determined by the degree to which the social system is capable of organizing itself to increase its capacity for learning from past disasters for better future protection and to improve risk reduction measures. (ISDR)

Results Based Management
"Rather than focusing programme/project management efforts on the monitoring of inputs, activities and processes, an RBM approach concentrates on 'results' and places emphasis on the following dimensions: **Defining realistic results** based on appropriate analysis and context; **Clearly identifying programme beneficiaries** and designing programmes/projects that meet their needs and priorities; Using results information to **make effective management decisions**; **Monitoring the progress made towards expected results** with the use of appropriate indicators. (Baastel)

Risk
The probability of harmful consequences, or expected losses (deaths, injuries, property, livelihoods, economic activity disrupted or environment damaged) resulting from interactions between natural or human-induced hazards and vulnerable conditions. Conventionally risk is expressed by the notation Risk = Hazards x Vulnerability. Some disciplines also include the concept of exposure to refer particularly to the physical aspects of vulnerability. Beyond expressing a possibility of physical harm, it is crucial to recognize that risks are inherent or can be created or exist within social systems. It is important to consider the social contexts in which risks occur and that people therefore do not necessarily share the same perceptions of risk and their underlying causes. (ISDR)

Risk assessment / analysis
A methodology to determine the nature and extent of risk by analysing potential hazards and evaluating existing conditions of vulnerability that could pose a potential threat or harm to people, property, livelihoods and the environment on which they depend. The process of conducting a risk assessment is based on a review of both the technical features of hazards such as their location, intensity, frequency and probability; and also the analysis of the physical, social, economic and environmental dimensions of vulnerability and exposure, while taking particular account of the coping capabilities pertinent to the risk scenarios. (ISDR)

Tourism Emergency Management Committee (TEMCs)
The TEMC is a specific committee for coordination of disaster management activities within the tourism sector. It should include key stakeholders from the tourism sector, NDOs and other relevant organizations and stakeholders involved in disaster management and response. (OAS/CDERA/CTO)

Tourism Emergency Operations Center (TEOC)
The TEOC is established by the TEMC and serves as the emergency operations center for coordination of the tourism sector's response during emergencies and disasters. The TEOC should include representations from the Ministry of Tourism, the hotel and tourism association, the tourism board, police and tour operators. The TEOC should establish a command center. (OAS/CDERA/CTO)

Tourism Emergency Response Clusters (TERC)
A TERC is comprised of multiple tourism establishments that are physically located nearby to one another. The members of the cluster can work cooperatively and collaboratively to assess, organize, combine and control their collective capabilities and resources to prepare for disasters and to respond and recover from these events. (OAS/CDERA/CTO)

Vulnerability
The conditions determined by physical, social, economic, and environmental factors or processes, which increase the susceptibility of a community to the impact of hazards (ISDR)

1. Introduction

1. The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Response Agency (CDERA) signed a Letter of Agreement in February 2007, which formalized the terms of a Grant in the amount of US$800,000 in support of the Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean Project, which is being implemented by CDERA through the support of the IDB and in collaboration with the Caribbean Tourism Organization (CTO), CARICOM Regional Organization for Standards and Quality (CROSQ) and the University of the West Indies (UWI).

2. This regional project is expected to develop and adopt a Regional Public Good (RPG) that is a regional risk management framework for the tourism sector in the Caribbean, which contributes to the overall goal of reducing the vulnerability of the tourism sector to natural hazards. Specifically, the Grant will finance the development of *a regional disaster risk management Strategy for sustainable tourism* including *the formulation of Standards for vulnerability assessments and risk mapping applied to the tourism sector*; and *institutional strengthening* of CDERA, CTO, and other stakeholders in disaster risk management for sustainable tourism. The initiative takes place within the context of, and is intended to be linked to the regional Comprehensive Disaster Management (CDM) Framework. An overview of the CDM Strategy expected results is found in ***Annex VII***.

3. The consultant, Evan Green, was engaged by the CDERA for a mandate to establish a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (M&E Framework) for the Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean Project. As part of the establishment of the M&E Framework, the consultant was expected to develop a Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) for the overall monitoring of the project, and this was to include some baseline data that outlined the 'state of affairs' of key aspects as they pertain to the expected results of the project.

4. Of the five members of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) - Barbados, The Bahamas, The Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and the Turks and Caicos Islands (TCI) - two were selected (Jamaica and TCI) to be Baseline data collection pilot countries for development of the project's M&E Framework, due to budget constraints. The consultant visited the two pilot countries in August 2007 and was expected to then produce a brief guide or manual to assist other participating countries to undertake their own baseline data collection.

5. This document represents a brief manual for baseline data collection, with a view to providing guidance for individual countries to undertake their own baseline data collection so as to inform the project's overarching 'baseline'.

2. Approach and Methodology for M&E Framework Development and Baseline Data Collection

6. As detailed in the consultant's 'Inception Report'[1], the key steps involved in the establishment of the M&E Framework overall for the project included first a *'revision, refinement and agreement on the project Logical Framework, including key expected results and performance measurement indicators, with the participation of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC)'*. In June 2007, the consultant facilitated a workshop in Barbados at the CDERA Coordinating Unit (CU) with the PAC, wherein the group discussed and agreed to some revised and additional expected results and performance indicators. The revised results and indicators were then discussed, reviewed and agreed to at the 2nd PAC workshop in November 2007. These revised tools would allow for more in-depth monitoring and reporting for the project and allowed various aspects of the project's actual undertaking to be better fleshed out in detail. The revised project LFA is found in ***Annex I***.

[1] The Inception Report was the first major deliverable for this M&E Framework Development and Baseline Data Collection consultancy. This report was presented to and accepted by CDERA and the IDB in June 2007.

7. Based on the revised project LFA, the consultant proceeded with the 'development of a performance measurement framework (PMF) and related tool(s) for the collection of baseline data and ongoing monitoring and reporting for the project'. The results and indicators, as agreed to with participants at the workshop, form the basis for this monitoring and reporting tool. The PMF will be the overarching guiding tool for both project monitoring and reporting, as well as for the baseline data collection, as it represents a simple, yet effective tool for managing this kind of process and the related information.

8. During the workshop, the consultant introduced this tool to the PAC and explained its importance in project management, monitoring and reporting. The discussion also clarified the link between the need for baseline data collection in pilot countries – as mentioned above– and the overall establishment of the PMF for the Project. The baseline data collected in the two pilot countries helps to complete the development of the PMF as a whole, as the 'baseline data' forms the 'starting point' for each result and each indicator in the project.

9. Linked to each expected result and indicator for the Project, the PMF details the baseline data, the source of data, the method of data collection, the frequency of data collection and the person/organization responsible for data collection. The PMF for the project is found in ***Annex II***.

10. After receiving national submissions based on the revised LFA and countries' input on available data, project management then continued with the *'selection of the two countries as the pilots for baseline data collection'*. When Jamaica and TCI were selected, the consultant proceeded with the '*collection of baseline data in the two pilot countries for testing the tool(s) and for establishing a preliminary example baseline of data for the* project', in August 2007.

11. Using the LFA developed and agreed with CDERA Project Execution Unit (PEU) and the PAC, the draft PMF for the project overall, and the national submissions of the selected pilot countries, the consultant developed specific PMFs for the two countries that would guide overall baseline data collection. Based on these 'national PMFs', the consultant then developed specific data collection tools for each country. These tools include an overarching questionnaire and essentially a series of questions to be answered by national counterparts, and to be utilized in reviewing key documentation and reports from the appropriate sources. Interview protocols deal specifically with the project's impact – enhanced capacity for disaster management in the tourism sector in the Caribbean, and its main expected outcomes: (i) improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors; and (ii) improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address disaster risk management in the tourism sector. The methods for applying the tools include document review and analysis, individual interviews and focus groups, and site visits.

12. The consultant undertook 4-day missions to Jamaica and TCI, and logistical arrangements were made by the relevant PAC representatives in each country. The consultant then *presented the findings of the baseline data collection missions in a report* submitted to CDERA for comments at the end of September 2007. This baseline data (from Jamaica and TCI) together with *the baseline data to be collected from the remaining participating countries will help to form the baseline data for the project as a whole and to finalize the PMF*. To this end, the consultant herein presents a guide for countries to follow in undertaking their own baseline data collection.

3. Guidance for Baseline Data Collection

13. This portion of the document presents guidance and represents a manual for countries for the purposes of undertaking baseline data collection in their respective countries for the project's expected results. This data will then represent a 'starting point' for each expected result, from which the project will then be able to monitor, measure and report on progress being made over time. In this way, performance measurement becomes more results-based and concrete and will allow for progress to be demonstrated well in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

3.1 Baseline Data Collection – Based on Project Expected Results and Indicators

14. The revised expected results and indicators as agreed to at the PAC workshop in June 2007 formed the basis of the revised project LFA – found in ***Annex I*** - as well as the project PMF. These results and indicators also pointed to what areas of baseline data were required for the project's M&E framework. As a demonstrative example, pertaining to Outcome 2: 'Improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors', the revised indicators agreed to include the following:

- Level of coordination between tourism and disaster management organizations and institutions in the country for disaster management;
- Number and % of organizations and institutions involved in collaboration and coordination for disaster risk management in the tourism sector; and,
- Level of communication and information sharing between national level and local level tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management.

15. The Outputs related to Outcome 2 sated above included: 2a. 'Established or Enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector' and 2b 'Strengthened collaboration between National Disaster Offices (NDOs) and National Tourism Organizations (NTOs)'. The revised or developed indicators for these outputs included the following:

- 2a.i *Number/% of committee established or enhanced*
- 2a.ii Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally)
- 2a.iii Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees

- 2b.i Number/type of initiatives on which NDOs and NTOs collaborate
- 2b.ii Level of effectiveness of collaboration
- 2b.iii Perception of stakeholders on level of collaboration with the other

16. Therefore, baseline data collection mission meetings include asking the relevant stakeholders about data that would inform the current state of affairs in both Jamaica and the TCI, as they pertain to these aspects above. For example, pertaining to indicator 2a.i '*Number/% of committee established or enhanced*', pilot baseline data collection missions sought out existing multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector in countries visited (Jamaica and TCI). Findings were briefly as follows:

➢ In *Jamaica:*
  - Local 'parish disaster management committees' were found and exist in several (if not all) parishes and include a multitude of key local disaster management stakeholders. However, some of these committees did not yet include locally-based tourism stakeholders such as hotels, the hotel association or the tourism board.
  - At the national level, Tourism Emergency Management Committees (TEMCs) have been discussed and they are being formed, and at the more local levels Tourism Emergency Response Clusters (TERCs).

- For this aspect, the baseline rating was summarized as 'Medium'.

➢ In TCI:
  - No committees that include both disaster management and tourism stakeholders exist for ongoing coordination in the tourism sector for disaster risk management.
  - For this aspect, the baseline rating was summarized as 'Low'.

➢ From other interviews:
  - It would seem that Barbados has a TEMC at the national level that has been existence for a while and has been functioning.

17. An explanation of these 'ratings' (i.e. 'low' and 'medium') is provided below in **section 3.2, subsection G**.

18. It is in this manner that baseline data will be sought out in participating countries – seeking out data related to each relevant expected result and indicator of the project. *The example used above will be referred to throughout this guidance section.*

3.2 Baseline Data Collection Steps

A. Responsibility for Baseline Data Collection

19. **It is assumed that each country will put one person in charge of and responsible for the baseline data collection.** This person will come from the tourism sector and could therefore be a representative of the Ministry of Tourism (or equivalent), the Tourism Board or another relevant tourism entity. For those countries on the PAC, the assigned NFP – a representative of the tourism sector of the country – is the responsible person for baseline data collection.

B. Get to know the Project PMF

20. The PMF will be the overarching guiding tool for both project monitoring and reporting, as well as for the baseline data collection, as it represents a simple, yet effective tool for managing this kind of process and the related information. Linked to each expected result and indicator for the project, the PMF details the baseline data, the targets or milestones to be achieved for a given time period, the source of data, the method of data collection, the frequency of data collection and the person/organization responsible for data collection. While the concepts of expected results, indicator and baseline data should now be clear, the other PMF aspects include:

➢ Target(s)/Milestone(s): *What* are the project's mid-term objectives/goals? (I.e. what must be achieved by the mid-term point in order to hope to attain the related outputs and outcomes?)
➢ Source of Data: *Where* will information necessary for measuring progress towards results be obtained? (Examples: Individuals, organizations, sites, documents, reports etc…)
➢ Method of data Collection: *How* will data be collected? (i.e. through interviews, site visits, document review, etc…)
➢ Frequency: *How often* will the data be collected and/or monitored?
➢ Responsibility: *Who* will collect the data?

21. As stated above, the full PMF for the project is found in ***Annex II***. However, for one of the example results and set of indicators (as presented above), the PMF looks like this:

Table I - Project PMF – Example Result and Indicators

Result	Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible
2a. Established or Enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector	• Number/% of committee established or enhanced • Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally)	**Jamaica: Medium** – In addition to the National Disaster Committee, there are parish level disaster management committees, but some do not adequately integrate the tourism sector. An interesting pilot possibility exists. **TCI: Low** – There are no functional committees for this aspect, other than the National Disaster Committee	5 functional NPICs established (in the PAC countries)	- Tourism stakeholders in the country/NTOs - Meeting/Workshop reports - NFPs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -NDOs -National multi-stakeholder committees - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - Relevant ministries - Outputs produced by the committees	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs National Project Implementation Committees NFPs
	• Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees	**Jamaica: Medium** Many of both DRM and tourism stakeholders find the effectiveness of such committees to have significant room for improvement, while some noted that they function quite well. **TCI: Low** -No such committees to speak of. **In Bahamas:** Not yet known.					

22. The country baseline data is only available at this stage (November 2007 for Jamaica and TCI, while the rest of the baseline will be informed as countries undertake their own baseline data collection in the weeks or months ahead. This explains why data for these two countries only is presented above.

23. Essentially, the baseline data collection to be undertaken by each country will help to complete the 'baseline data' column of the PMF and establish the 'baseline' or 'starting point' for each expected result of the project.

C. Assess Initial National Data Availability

24. In order to gather preliminary baseline data related to the expected results and indicators of the project from the LFA, project management prepared a *National Data Availability Form*, which is found in ***Annex III***. All PAC countries have already completed and submitted this form. For these countries who have already submitted a *National Data Availability Form*, a thorough review of the submission should take place.

25. **For countries who have not submitted this National Data Availability Form (i.e. are not part of the PAC), this form should be completed**; this can be done in a brief discussion (or via email) with relevant colleagues in the Ministry of Tourism, the tourism board and with brief involvement of the NDO. Indeed, the first step in the baseline data collection to hold an initial discussion or meeting with the relevant NDO representative(s) and representatives of the Ministry of Tourism or tourism board. It will be important to ask these counterparts to be very specific about the information provided on the availability of this indicative data.

26. As was the case with PAC countries who filled out the form, much of data may not be readily available, but this in itself helps to form some of the baseline data, by pointing to unknown areas of capacity and coordination, or overall preparedness for disaster risk management in the tourism sector in the country. As much as possible, persons responsible for the data collection should work with this initial small contingent of disaster management and tourism counterparts to get a better sense of whether the data is available, whether further data collection meetings will be necessary and where such data can be obtained.

27. The following is presented as an example of the kind of information that may be available or may be found in national submissions:

Table II - Example of National Data Submission

Result	Indicators	Submission (Data to be confirmed)
2a. Established or Enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector	• Number/% of committee established or enhanced • Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally) • Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees	***From Jamaica:*** ▪ A Tourism Emergency Operations Centre (TEOC) was activated in response to the disaster/emergency (Hurricane Ivan), headed by the Ministry of Tourism, Entertainment and Culture (MTEC). ▪ MTEC in association with the Jamaican Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management (ODPEM-Jamaica's NDO) will formally establish the Tourism Emergency Management Committees (TEMC) and a TEOC as well as holding workshops with the tourism sector on the implementation of the associated response procedures for the various entities in the sector.

28. For this result and set of indicators, **the ensuing baseline data collection would then need to seek out whether the information (as presented in the 'submission' column) is accurate or not**. If no data were found in the submission on this result, then information on the existence of such committees and the degree to which they address coordination for disaster risk management in the tourism sector should be assessed from a variety of sources. The baseline data collection would then hopefully be able to allow this information to come to light.

29. Remember that the inexistence of such a committee is also a baseline data 'finding'. This does not reflect negatively on the country, but simply represents the current state of affairs as they pertain to the expected result of the project for 'establishing or (where they exist) enhancing these committees'.

30. **These submissions should also point to 'sources of information'; i.e. where the information could be verified or where further information on the result and issue could be found.** This initial phase should begin the process of listing persons to be met or organizations to be visited for further information.

D. Develop a Country-level PMF to Guide Baseline Data Collection

31. Once the preliminary data has been discussed, collected or simply reviewed, **the next step is to develop a country level PMF for baseline data collection.** It will be useful to slightly modify the standard PMF format and add other columns, such as 'submission data' – that is to be confirmed. Columns such as 'targets', 'frequency' and 'responsible' can be *removed* for the country baseline data collection PMF, as there are no 'targets' to speak of, the 'frequency' is this one time during baseline data collection, and 'responsibility' has already been assigned for data collection in each country: NFPs for PAC members and the designated tourism sector representative for other countries.

32. Columns that could then be *added* to assist in the baseline data collection process include:

- Submission (data to be verified by baseline data collection) – This refers to information found in the national submission for that result (and those indicators), that should now be verified (confirmed or contradicted, or perhaps nuanced) in the baseline data collection process. Where there is no national data availability form available, this column would contain the preliminary information found for the expected result in question – as a result of the preliminary discussion with key stakeholders.
- Questions for key stakeholders – Based on the submission or preliminary data for each result (and the expected result and indicators themselves), the person responsible may want to begin thinking about the

- In *Jamaica:*
  - Local 'parish disaster management committees' were found and exist in several (if not all) parishes and include a multitude of key local disaster management stakeholders. However, some of these committees did not yet include locally-based tourism stakeholders such as hotels, the hotel association or the tourism board.
  - At the national level, Tourism Emergency Management Committees (TEMCs) have been discussed and they are being formed, and at the more local levels Tourism Emergency Response Clusters (TERCs).
  - For this aspect, the baseline rating was summarized as 'Medium'.

- In TCI:
  - No committees that include both disaster management and tourism stakeholders exist for ongoing coordination in the tourism sector for disaster risk management.
  - For this aspect, the baseline rating was summarized as 'Low'.

60. This same process should be followed for all data collected. Much of the data will not find its way into the PMF per se, but will nonetheless be useful for the country itself and the project as a whole. Of course, the ratings assigned do not represent a definitive or comprehensive overall rating for a particular aspect for the country as a whole. It is understood that ratings do not come as a result of comprehensive assessments, but rather reflect data collected, as possible.

61. The report would then be a more detailed accompanying document to the PMF, allowing for further detailed information related to each of the ratings for expected results of the project.

62. Pertaining to the example used above, the country-level PMF for baseline data collection looks as follows, after data was collected and summarized in the PMF:

Table IV - Completed Country-level PMF for Jamaica – Example Result and Indicators

Result	Indicators	Submission (Data to be verified by baseline data collection)	Questions for Stakeholders	Actual Baseline Data	Sources of Data	Method of Data Collection
2a. Established or Enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector	• Number/% of committee established or enhanced • Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally) • Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees	▪ TEOC activated in response to emergency, headed by the MTEC, was activated during Hurricane Ivan ▪ The Ministry of Tourism, Entertainment & Culture in association with ODPEM will formally establish the Tourism Emergency Management Committees (TEMCs), Tourism Emergency Operation Centres (TEOC) as well as holding workshops with the tourism sector on the implementation of the associated response procedures for the various entities in the sector.	▪ Can you explain the process in activating the TEOC? How often do you meet? What do you do as a body? What are your main activities and outputs? What have been the successes and challenges of the TEOC? ▪ Can the TEOC serve as the Tourism Emergency Management Committee, or the multi-stakeholder disaster committee, as envisaged by the project? What is required for this to occur? If not, who will make up these committees? ▪ How effective do you feel the TEOC or TEMC (or any other committee) is at addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector? ▪ What is the status of the TEMC? Who is on, or who is envisaged to be on these committees? What should its role be? ▪ Are there current training materials prepared for the disaster risk management workshops in the tourism sector? What do or will these workshops specifically address? Who is or will be invited to attend? How many do you, or do you plan on offering?	**Jamaica: Medium** Local 'parish disaster management committees' were found and exist in several (if not all) parishes and include a multitude of key local disaster management stakeholders. However, some of these committees did not yet include locally-based tourism stakeholders such as hotels, the hotel association or the tourism board. At the national level, TEMCs have been discussed and they are being formed, and at the more local levels Tourism Emergency Response Clusters (TERCs). **Jamaica: Medium** Many of both DRM and tourism stakeholders find the effectiveness of such committees to have significant room for improvement, while some noted that they function quite well.	-Ministry of Tourism, Entertainment and Culture (MTEC) -Office of Disaster Preparedness and Emergency Management (ODPEM) -Jamaican Tourism Board (JTB) -Jamaica Hotel and Tourist Association (JHTA) - Tourism Product Development Company Ltd. (TPDCo) -Airports Authority of Jamaica - Representatives of ground transportation organizations -Any other members of the TEOC and TEMC Docs to Review: - TEOC docs if any -Presentation made by Ms. Carrole Guntley – OAS Disaster Management Workshop 2007. *"Jamaica's Disaster Preparedness and Response Efforts for the Tourism Sector to Hurricane Ivan – Jamaica's Unwelcome Visitor"*	- Document Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups

63. In addition to information requested above, any 'lessons' that may emerge during the baseline data collection process in the country could also be captured and shared in the report. The brief section below presents some lessons learned from baseline data collection that has taken place thus far (for Jamaica and TCI).

3.3 Lessons Learned through Baseline Data Collection

64. In undertaking missions to Jamaica and TCI, the consultant gained some useful insights that may assist those responsible for undertaking the baseline data collection in their respective countries. Much of the lessons learned have been shared throughout this guide while imparting the information pertaining to how to undertake the data collection, the development of the tools and guiding framework etc. However, in addition to the above, the following may also provide useful:

- ***Ensure adequate coverage of tourism facilities and stakeholders***, including many hotels, resorts and tourism operators, in order to gain as many perspectives as possible with time and resources available, and to potentially learn of some best practices, key gaps and existing ways of addressing disaster risk management in the sector.

- ***Ask different entities and stakeholders the same*** question in order to gain another perspective, to corroborate or even to counter data collected from others on all issues of disaster management preparedness capacity and coordination. This is true in particular for issues related to strategic planning. Triangulate findings from various sources. Things may not be being done as they should be or as they are written on paper. In addition, read documentation available on the issue to help further discern between implementation and stated or intended action.

- ***Try to identify persons with good knowledge of disaster risk management*** and related issues in the country, to gain their perspective.

- In order to gain honest, open, and useful information, ***approach this process not as an 'evaluation' or 'assessment' but as a learning exercise*** – with a view to improvement and to potentially utilizing the project to address identified areas requiring assistance, or building in successes.

- ***Ask the right questions to the right persons and do not be afraid to ask the difficult questions!***

- ***Ensure that questions asked and discussions seek out information on the broad understanding of 'disasters and hazards' as understood in the context of the regional CDM Framework.*** For example, do not limit discussions on capacity, coordination and preparedness to hurricanes only.

- ***Ensure that questions asked and discussions seek out information related to all subsectors of the 'tourism sector', including accommodation, attractions, events, food and beverage, shopping/retail, crafts and tour operators/travel agents.*** For example, do not only ask questions about the accommodation sector.

65. In addition to lessons learned in terms of undertaking the baseline data collection mission, the pilot baseline data collection missions and interviews shed some light on some interesting issues for the project as a whole. In particular, it seems **the baseline data collection process itself is very useful for particular countries as a first step in addressing disaster risk management in a more acute manner in the tourism sector.** Illuminating lessons included the following:

- Meetings in the country can help to serve in identifying (even unforeseen) individuals, organizations or even companies with good experience in disaster risk management planning and preparedness that could be useful for the country and the project. In this light, the meetings themselves have proven useful for allowing

for some interesting exchanges and learning between and among key stakeholders in the sector and for disaster risk management more generally.

- The interviews and focus groups themselves often served to catalyze discussion on the issue of disaster preparedness in the sector and in some cases, seemed to have catalyzed some follow-up action. The baseline data collection initiative therefore raised awareness about the issue overall and about particular challenges, gaps and sometimes strengths to be found within the sector. In this sense, the baseline study can serve as a catalyst to move things forward, and this bodes well for the potential of the project itself, building on and utilizing insight in through these missions.

- The baseline studies served to point to the need to capture as much existing information as possible before moving forward too quickly in project implementation. The envisioned process of having each country undertake its own modest 'baseline data collection' is indeed going to prove extremely useful for the project. Although it will not act as an overarching assessment of the tourism sector in the region, it will add to the project's growing body of knowledge on the issue and serve to further replenish a growing set of existing (and perhaps 'best') practices, that other countries could learn from.

Scope of Data Collected

66. It is important to reiterate the overarching parameters of this baseline data collection initiative in this context of lessons learned. Information gathered begins to 'scratch the surface' of the overall preparedness and key gaps and challenges in terms of coordination and capacity for DRM in the tourism sector in participating countries. **Data collected cannot therefore be considered comprehensive or definitive;** It will likely provide a general baseline scenario of the present contextual situations as they pertain specifically to the results and indicators of the regional IDB initiative. However, this initiative should not be viewed as an overarching situational analysis of the overall preparedness of the tourism sector in these countries, although some preliminary findings on this aspect will be learned and are to be shared as possible. The data collected should not be considered as any sort of comprehensive 'assessment' or 'evaluation' of the tourism sector's overall preparedness, as that would require much more in-depth study, documentation review and field visits. Nonetheless, the data collected through these baseline studies serve a crucial function for project monitoring and management more generally and the process is very useful; the information will enlighten project stakeholders as to the particular situation in the country as it relates to particular expected results of the project, prior to the commencement of project activities.

4. Review of Baseline Data Collection Steps

67. This Manual should be viewed and utilized as guidance for countries to undertake their own baseline data collection for the regional IDB RPG project. The main steps are summarized below:

A. Responsibility for Baseline Data Collection - Each country will put one person in charge of and responsible for the baseline data collection.

B. Get to know the Project PMF

C. Assess Initial National Data Availability - For countries who have not submitted the National Data Availability Form (i.e. are not part of the PAC), this form should be completed; the ensuing baseline data collection would then need to seek out whether the information (as presented in the 'submission' column) is accurate or not. These submissions should also point to 'sources of information'; i.e. where the information could be verified or where further information on the result and issue could be found.

D. Develop a Country-level PMF to Guide Baseline Data Collection - Once the preliminary data has been discussed, collected or simply reviewed, the next step is to develop a country level PMF for baseline data collection. One aspect in this process is to identify the key stakeholders to be met for data collection. Unlike

the project PMF, the country-level PMF should identify and name *specific* sources for data collection for each result and indicator.

E. Develop Data Collection Tools - Based on the country-level PMF developed, the next step is to develop specific data collection tools. Generally, these tools include an overarching questionnaire that would guide both document review and interviews/focus groups. Specific interview protocols (i.e. sets of questions) should be developed that would present the main questions to be answered by each stakeholder group, as identified in the country-level PMF. The 'source of data' column names different specific persons to be met, and questions should be prepared for each of these. Depending on the issue or questions, you may want to get the *perspectives of different stakeholder groups* on a variety of issues related to coordination, capacity, preparedness etc. It will not be necessary to develop separate interview protocols for all stakeholders, as likely some can be grouped together. Ensure that you can triangulate findings from different perspectives through document review, interviews, focus group and site visits.

F. Arrange for Individual and Focus Group Interviews - Based on 'sources of data' selected or identified, linked to questions pertaining to the baseline data of expected results, specific individuals, organizations, or institutions should be identified for individual or focus groups interviews.

G. Capture Data and Report to the CDERA PEU and PAC - It will be important to take good notes while in interviews, at site visits, or while reviewing documentation. Data collected related to each relevant expected result and indicator of the project should then be captured by group of expected results. In this way, it will be linked well to the PMF and therefore easier to integrate summary baseline data information into the PMF itself. Provide a summary rating for each set of data as it relates to expected results and indicators in the PMF – using ratings such as 'low', 'medium', and 'high' - along with brief summary information. The report would then be a more detailed accompanying document to the PMF, allowing for further detailed information related to each of the ratings for expected results of the project.

68. For baseline data collection, keep some key lessons learned in mind, such as the following:

- Ensuring wide and adequate coverage of tourism stakeholders (i.e. individual hotels, resorts and operators);
- Asking various entities the same questions to get different perspectives on the same issue; and,
- Approaching interviews and persons in a spirit of leaning, and not as an 'evaluation' per se.
- Ensuring that information is collected related to 'all hazards' as understood in the CDM Framework, and not just hurricanes. In addition, ensuring that information is collected related to all subsectors of the tourism sector, and not just the accommodation subsector.

Annex I – Revised Logical Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	EXPECTED RESULTS	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (examples)	ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS
GOAL: To contribute to the reduction of the vulnerability of the tourism sector in the Caribbean to natural hazards.	**IMPACT:** Enhanced capacity for disaster management in the tourism sector in the Caribbean.	Amount/% of the direct damages and indirect losses associated with natural hazard impacts on the tourism sector in countries implementing the risk management framework. Number of tourism entities adapting/utilizing the disaster risk management in the tourism sector strategy and plan of action for planning and development Overall % of the sector considered vulnerable in the country and region Perception of level of vulnerability of the tourism sector, according to stakeholders in the tourism sector	*Key Assumptions:* Countries involved implement the strategy at the national level.
PURPOSE: To develop and adopt a Regional Public Good that is a regional disaster risk management framework for the tourism sector in the Caribbean.	**OUTCOMES:** 1. Regional disaster risk management strategy for the tourism sector in the Caribbean adopted by the countries that sit at CDERA's and CTO boards 2. Improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors 3. Improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address disaster risk management in the tourism sector	1.i Adoption of the Strategy by CDERA's and CTO's boards. 1.ii Clarity of guidance provided and available to tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management in tourist industry, in their view 1.iii Perception of stakeholders on the usefulness and effectiveness of the strategy 2.i Level of coordination between regional tourism and disaster management organizations and institutions in the country for disaster management. 2.ii Number and % of organizations and institutions involved in collaboration and coordination for disaster risk management in the tourism sector 2.iii Level of communication and information sharing between national level and local level tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management 2.iv Level of coordination between tourism and disaster management institutions and organizations at the regional level 3.i Degree to which CDERA CU and NDOs are recognized as leaders in addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector 3.ii Degree to which NTOs are recognized as leading the process of mainstreaming disaster risk management and the developed strategy in the tourism sector by other stakeholders in the country 3.iii Number, type and Quality of instituted training programs developed or enhanced and implemented in these organizations 3.iv Level of understanding of CDERA CU and NDOs of disaster risk management issues in the tourism sector	*Key Assumptions:* The national legal framework (enabling environment) favours or facilitates adoption of the Strategy and Plan of Action Governments provide continued support to sustain coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors. National tourism institutions integrate and sustain disaster risk management into their operations after the project ends. *Key risks:* The guidance provided to tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management in not clear enough and not easily executed in the countries. The respective governments of participating countries do not provide adequate support to sustain coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors. Lead national tourism stakeholders do not adequately integrate and sustain disaster risk management into their operations.
Component I	**OUTPUTS:** 1a. Regional Disaster Risk Management Strategy for the tourism	1a/b.i Number and Quality of Strategies and Action Plans developed 1a/b.ii Degree to which Strategy and Plan of Action detail and address: *-the processes for countries to follow for developing their own strategies and action plans and for integrating disaster management into tourism plans and strategies*	*Key Assumptions:* There is institutional commitment for development of the Strategy

	sector developed. 1b. Regional Plan of Action to reduce the vulnerability of the tourism sector to natural hazards is developed. 1c. Regional Disaster Risk Management Strategy and Plan of Action Validated by key stakeholders. 1d. Standards for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment for the tourism sector developed and endorsed by CROSQ. 2a. Established or Enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector 2b. Strengthened collaboration between National Disaster Offices and National Tourism Organizations	*-the broad understanding of 'disasters and hazards' as understood in the context of the regional CDM* *-other new or existing strategies in the region and at national levels for DRM in the sector* *-all subsectors of the 'tourism sector', including accommodation, attractions, events, food and beverage, shopping/retail, crafts and tour operators/travel agents.* *-the processes for countries to follow for coordinated disaster risk management in the tourism sector at the national and local level* *-adequate communications planning and systems (for ongoing monitoring and for emergencies)* *-hotel/resort requirements for preparedness (including back communication systems, shelters, available food, water etc, staff training programs (for emergencies, first aid, etc), availability of information for tourists, planning for utilities like electricity and water)* *-evacuation planning at local, resort and national levels* 1a/b.iii Number and quality of tools developed for adapting the regional strategy at the national level 1c.i Number, %, type of stakeholders who validated the Strategy and Plan of Action 1c.ii Level of satisfaction of project stakeholders with the strategy development process 1d.i Number and Quality of standardized methodologies (and data models) for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment in the tourism sector in the Caribbean 1d.ii Tourism stakeholders' level of satisfaction with the quality of the standards 1d.iii Number and Quality of cartographic standards for the presentation of hazard maps 1d.iv Level of endorsements and satisfaction of the CROSQ (and other regional institutions) with the standardized methodologies/models developed 1d.v Number, Quality and Level of effectiveness of tools and information products developed for risk mapping and vulnerability assessments 2a.i Number/% of committee established or enhanced 2a.ii Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally) 2a.iii Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees 2b.i Number/type of initiatives on which NDOs and NTOs collaborate 2b.ii Level of effectiveness of collaboration 2b.iii Perception of stakeholders on level of collaboration with the other	*Key Risks:* Inadequate institutional commitment for development of the Strategy The development of the Regional Strategy does not adequately take into account existing strategies being developed in the sector and region. The Strategy and Action Plan developed is not easily adaptable at the country level; or inadequate guidance is provided for this aspect. *Key Assumptions:* Governments provide adequate support for these multi-stakeholder coordination committees after the project ends. NDOs and NTOs continue to collaborate beyond the project's end. NTO commitment to sustaining the integration or mainstreaming of disaster risk management into their operations.
Component II	3a.I NDOs' capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk	3a.Ii Level of NTO recognition of NDO as institutional partner for providing disaster risk management technical assistance in the tourist sector	*Key Risks:* The needed government support for these committees is not forthcoming, thereby negatively affecting sustainability.

	management in the tourism sector enhanced. 3a.II CDERA CU capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced. 3b. Enhanced capacity of National Tourism Organizations for disaster risk management	3a.Iii Level of tourism-specific disaster risk management knowledge and expertise in NDO 3a.IIi Level of CTO recognition of CDERA CU as institutional partner for providing disaster risk management technical expertise in the tourist sector 3a.IIii Number of formal agreements between regional partner institutions in disaster risk management for the tourism sector 3a.IIiii Level of tourism-specific disaster risk management knowledge and expertise in CDERA CU 3b.i Level of disaster management knowledge and expertise in these NTOs 3b.ii Number and % of NTOs with enhanced capacity for disaster risk management 3b.iii Number, type and quality of actions taken by the NTOs, following trainings 3b.iv Perception of relevant stakeholders of the level of capacity of NTOs for disaster risk management	The created or enhanced committees are duplicative of existing bodies and this has a negative effect on commitment and sustainability. The catalyzed collaboration between NDOs and NTOs is not sustained or institutionalized beyond the project. NDOs do not have adequate resources to fulfill their role of providing technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector. NTOs do not institutionalize disaster risk management capacity or responsibility in their organizations.

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
Outcomes							
1. Regional disaster risk management strategy for the tourism sector in the Caribbean adopted by the countries that sit at CDERA's and CTO boards	▪ Adoption of the strategy by both CDERA's and CTO's boards. ▪ Clarity of guidance provided and available to tourism stakeholders for mitigation of the effects of natural disasters on tourist industry, in their view ▪ Perception of stakeholders on the usefulness and effectiveness of the strategy	0 Countries N/A N/A N/A	N/A N/A N/A N/A	- Country/Country reports - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports - Minutes of CDERA and CTO Council and Board Meetings announcing adoption of the strategy. - Tourism stakeholders - NFPs - NDOs	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews - Focus Groups	Twice per year (beginning after mid-term point)	CDERA Project Executing Unit (PEU) CTO NDOs
2. Improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors	▪ Level of coordination between regional tourism and disaster management organizations and institutions in the country for disaster management. ▪ Number and % of organizations and institutions involved in collaboration and coordination for disaster risk management in the tourism sector	**Jamaica: Medium -** - Although some coordination exists, there is significant room for improvement, in particular for ongoing coordination and strategic planning **TCI: Low -** Almost no coordination exists in the country for this purpose (other then hurricane preparation) **Jamaica: Low/Medium -** - Although some collaboration/coordination takes place, the majority of tourism stakeholders do not work with ODPEM nor coordinate/collaborate overall for DRM **TCI:** Low – Very few organizations coordinate/collaborate overall for DRM in the sector	No mid-term targets set for Outcomes	- Tourism stakeholders in the country/NTOs - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - Country/Country reports - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports - Qualitative analysis of the participant's evaluation at the regional meetings - NFPs - NDOs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -National multi-stakeholder committees - Relevant ministries	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Twice per year	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs National Project Implementing Committees (NPICs) NFPs

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
	▪ Level of communication and information sharing between national level and local level tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management ▪ Level of coordination between tourism and disaster management institutions and organizations at the regional level	**Jamaica: Medium** - Some communication/ information sharing exists, though significant room for improvement exists **TCI:** Low – There is very little communication and information sharing **Low/Medium** – Although regional coordination recently begun, there is room for improvement.					
3. Improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address disaster risk management in the tourism sector	• Degree to which CDERA CU and NDOs are recognized as leaders in addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector ▪ Degree to which NTOs are recognized as leading the process of mainstreaming disaster risk management and the developed strategy in the tourism sector by other stakeholders in the country ▪ Number, type and Quality of developed or enhanced and implemented training programs in these organizations	**Regional: Medium/High** – CDERA is already recognized highly as an effective partner for DRM in the tourism sector **National:** **Jamaica: High** – NTOs in Jamaica view ODPEM as leading DRM in the sector **TCI: Medium** – Some NTOs view DDME as leading DRM in the sector, while others do not. **Jamaica: Low/Medium** – NTOs are generally not leading the process of mainstreaming DRM in the sector, with some exceptions such as the role played by and TDPCo. **TCI: Low** - NTOs are not leading the process of	No mid-term targets set for Outcomes	- Workshop/Meeting/ Progress reports - Tourism stakeholders/ NTOs - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - NFPs - NDOs - CDERA PEU/ CTO - National multi-stakeholder committees - CDERA/CTO programming documentation - Relevant ministries	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Twice per year	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs National Project Implementing Committees (NPICs) NFPs

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
	▪ Level of understanding of CDERA CU and NDOs of disaster risk management issues in the tourism sector	mainstreaming DRM in the sector **CDERA CU: Medium –** Although capacity exists in the CU, there is room to improve capacity for provision of technical assistance for DRM in the sector. **NDOs** **Jamaica: Medium/High** **TCI: Medium -** Although significant capacity exists in ODPEM and DDME, there is room to improve capacity for provision of technical assistance for DRM in the sector.					
Outputs							
1a. Regional Disaster Risk Management Strategy for the tourism sector developed. 1b. Regional Plan of Action to reduce the vulnerability of the tourism sector to natural hazards is developed.	• Number and Quality of Strategies and Action Plans developed • Degree to which Strategy and Plan of Action detail and address: • the processes for countries to follow for developing their own strategies and action plans and for integrating disaster management into tourism plans and strategies • the broad understanding of 'disasters and hazards' as understood in the context of the regional CDM • other new or existing strategies in the region and at national levels for DRM in the sector • all subsectors of the 'tourism sector', including accommodation, attractions, events, food and beverage, shopping/retail, crafts and tour operators/travel agents. • the processes for countries to follow for coordinated disaster risk management in the tourism sector at the national and local level	There is no Regional DRM Strategy for the tourism sector There is no Regional Plan of Action	Draft Outline Completed, including the input of the 5 PAC countries	- Tourism stakeholders/NTOs - NFPs - NDOs - CDERA PEU/ CTO - The Strategy and Plan of Action - CROSQ - National multi-stakeholder committees - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly (beginning after mid-term point)	CDERA PEU CTO NFPs

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
	• adequate communications planning and systems (for ongoing monitoring and for emergencies) • hotel/resort requirements for preparedness (including back communication systems, shelters, available food, water etc, staff training programs (for emergencies, first aid, etc), availability of information for tourists, planning for utilities like electricity and water) • evacuation planning at local, resort and national levels • Number and quality of tools developed for adapting the regional strategy at the national level						
1c. Regional Disaster Risk Management Strategy and Plan of Action Validated by key stakeholders.	• Number and % of stakeholders who validated the Strategy and Plan of Action • Level of satisfaction of project stakeholders with the strategy development process	There is no Regional DRM Strategy for the tourism sector There is no Regional Plan of Action	N/A	-CDERA/CTO -NFPs -NDOs -Tourism stakeholders/NTOs -Meeting/ Workshop/ Progress reports & Minutes - Assessment on perception by stakeholders (information gathered from surveys and feedbacks from workshops)	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly (beginning after mid-term point)	CDERA PEU CTO NFPs NDOs and NTOs
1d. Standards for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment for the tourism sector developed and endorsed by CROSQ.	• Number and Quality of standardized methodologies (and data models) for Risk Mapping and Vulnerability Assessment in the tourism sector in the Caribbean • Tourism stakeholders' level of satisfaction with the quality of the standards • Number and Quality of cartographic standards for the presentation of hazard maps • Level of endorsements and satisfaction of the CROSQ (and other regional institutions) with the standardized methodologies/models developed • Number, Quality and Level of effectiveness of tools and information products developed for risk mapping and vulnerability assessments	There are no standards for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment for the tourism sector	Draft 'proposal for a new field of technical activity' completed	- CDERA PEU/ CTO - Developed standards and methodologies - Minutes of the CROSQ Technical Management Committee, Council Meetings - Developed tools - CROSQ - UWI - National multi-stakeholder committees - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports - Tourism stakeholders/NTOs - NFPs - NDOs	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly	CDERA PEU CROSQ CTO NFPs
2a. Established or Enhanced	• Number/% of committee established or enhanced	**Jamaica: Medium** – In	5 functional	- Tourism stakeholders in the	- Doc. Review	Quarterly	CDERA PEU

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector	• Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally) • Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees	addition to the National Disaster Committee, there are parish level disaster management committees, but some do not adequately integrate the tourism sector. An interesting pilot possibility exists. **TCI: Low** – There are no functional committees for this aspect, other than the National Disaster Committee **Jamaica: Medium** Many of both DRM and tourism stakeholders find the effectiveness of such committees to have significant room for improvement, while some noted that they function quite well. **TCI: Low** -No such committees to speak of.	NPICs established (in the PAC countries)	country/NTOs - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports - NFPs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -NDOs -National multi-stakeholder committees - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - Relevant ministries - Outputs produced by the committees	-Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups		CTO NDOs and NTOs National Project Implementing Committees (NPICs) NFPs
2b. Strengthened collaboration between National Disaster Offices and National Tourism Organizations	• Number/type of initiatives on which NDOs and NTOs collaborate	**Jamaica: Low/Medium** **TCI: Low** – Although some collaboration for strategic planning and capacity building exists in both countries (more so in Jamaica), NDOs and NTOs do not collaborate often enough, in both of their views.	Some progress made on this output by mid-term	- Tourism stakeholders in the country/NTOs - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports - NFPs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -NDOs -National multi-stakeholder committees - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs National Project Implementing Committees (NPICs) NFPs

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
	• Level of effectiveness of collaboration • Perception of stakeholders on level of collaboration with the other	**Jamaica: Low** **TCI: Low** – Both DRM and tourism stakeholders in both countries find that there is significant room for improvement in terms of collaboration.					
3a.I NDOs' capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced.	• Level of NTO recognition of NDO as institutional partner for providing disaster risk management technical assistance in the tourism sector • Level of tourism-specific disaster risk management knowledge and expertise in NDO	**Jamaica: High** – NTOs in Jamaica view ODPEM well in terms of capacity **TCI: Medium** – Some NTOs view DDME as very capable and effective, while others do not. **Jamaica: Medium** **TCI: Medium** Although significant capacity exists in ODPEM and DDME, there is room to improve capacity for provision of technical assistance for DRM in the sector.	Increased recognition of NDOs as institutional partners providing DRM technical assistance in the tourism sector	- Tourism stakeholders in the country/NTOs - NFPs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -NDOs -National multi-stakeholder committees - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - Agreements between regional institutions - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports	- Doc. Review -Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs NFPs
3a.II CDERA CU capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced.	• Level of CTO recognition of CDERA CU as institutional partner for providing disaster risk management technical expertise in the tourist sector • Level of tourism-specific disaster risk management knowledge and expertise in CDERA CU	**Medium/High** – CDERA CU is already recognized highly as an effective partner for DRM in the tourism sector. Although capacity exists in the CU, there is room to improve capacity for provision of technical assistance for DRM in the					

Annex II - Performance Measurement Framework - Regional Disaster Risk Management for Sustainable Tourism in the Caribbean

Results	Performance Indicators	Baseline Data	Targets (By Mid-Term)	Source of Data	Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Responsible (need names)
	• Number of formal agreements between regional partner institutions in disaster risk management for the tourism sector	sector. **Medium/High** – A formal agreement is already in place between CDERA and CTO					
3b. Enhanced capacity of National Tourism Organizations for disaster risk management	• Level of disaster management knowledge and expertise in these NTOs • Number and % of NTOs with enhanced capacity for disaster risk management • Number, type and quality of actions taken by the NTOs, following trainings • Perception of relevant stakeholders of the level of capacity of NTOs for disaster risk management	**Jamaica: Low/Medium** – The NTOs have room for improvement in capacity for DRM in the sector Many hotels have plans, committees and capacity in place for DRM, through room for improvement exists and more hotels require more capacity **TCI: Low** – Both NTOs like the Tourism Board and TCHTA, and hotels themselves (with some exceptions) have low capacity for DRM in the sector.		- Tourism stakeholders in the country/NTOs - NFPs - CDERA PEU/ CTO -NDOs -National multi-stakeholder committees - Disaster management stakeholders and NGOs - Meeting/Workshop/ Progress reports	-Meetings/ Interviews/ Teleconferences - Focus Groups	Quarterly	CDERA PEU CTO NDOs and NTOs NFPs

Annex III - National Data Availability Form for Base Data Collection

NARRATIVE SUMMARY[2]	EXPECTED RESULTS	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	DATA AVAILABILITY	
			Degree of availability (be specific)	Potential source (e.g. institution)
GOAL: To contribute to the reduction of the vulnerability of the tourism sector in the Caribbean to natural hazards.	**IMPACT:** Enhanced capacity for disaster management in the tourism sector in the Caribbean.	Overall quality of countries' response, readiness and recovery mechanisms/plans in the country(ies) and region for disaster risk management in the tourism sector Extent of risk to key infrastructure and human resources in the tourism sector in the country and region Overall % of the sector considered vulnerable in the country and region Perception of level of vulnerability of the tourism sector, according to stakeholders in the tourism sector		
PURPOSE: To develop and adopt a Regional Public Good that is a regional disaster risk management framework for the tourism sector in the Caribbean.	**OUTCOMES:** Improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors Improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address	2.i Level of coordination between tourism and disaster management organizations and institutions in the country for disaster management 2.ii Number and % of organizations and institutions involved in collaboration and coordination for disaster risk management in the tourism sector 2.iii Level of communication and information sharing between national level and local level tourism stakeholders for disaster risk management 3.ii Degree to which NTOs are recognized as leading the process of mainstreaming disaster risk management and the developed strategy in the tourism sector by other stakeholders in the country 3.iii Degree to which CDERA is recognized as a leader in addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector (at regional level – CU, and national level – NDOs) 3.iv Number, type and Quality of instituted training programs developed or enhanced and implemented in these organizations 3.v Level of understanding of CDERA (at regional level – CU, and national level – NDOs) and NTOs of disaster risk management issues in the tourism sector		

[2] The Narrative Summary, Expected Results and Performance Indicators were all extracted from the Project PMF.

NARRATIVE SUMMARY[2]	EXPECTED RESULTS	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	DATA AVAILABILITY	
			Degree of availability (be specific)	Potential source (e.g. institution)
	disaster risk management in the tourism sector			
Component I	**OUTPUTS:** 1a. Regional Disaster Risk Management Strategy for the tourism sector developed. 1b. Regional Plan of Action to reduce the vulnerability of the tourism sector to natural hazards is developed. 2a. Established or Enhanced multi-	1a/b.i Number and Quality of Regional Tourism Strategies and Action Plans developed (or national strategies, plans and policies) 1a/b.ii Degree to which Strategy and Plan of Action detail and address: • *the processes for countries to follow for developing their own strategies and action plans and for integrating disaster management into tourism plans and strategies* • *the processes for countries to follow for coordinated disaster risk management at the national and local level* • *adequate communications planning and systems (for ongoing monitoring and for emergencies)* • *hotel/resort requirements for preparedness (including back communication systems, shelters, available food, water etc, staff training programs (for emergencies, first aid, etc), availability of information for tourists, planning for utilities like electricity and water)* • *evacuation planning at local, resort and national levels* • *comprehensive disaster management (preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation) and multi hazard issues related to the eight tourism operations (e.g. attractions, etc.)* 2a.i Number/% of committee established or enhanced 2a.ii Quality of outputs of the committees (for the project or more generally) 2a.iii Perception of tourism stakeholders of the effectiveness of the committees		

NARRATIVE SUMMARY[2]	EXPECTED RESULTS	PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	DATA AVAILABILITY	
			Degree of availability (be specific)	Potential source (e.g. institution)
Component II	stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector 2b. Strengthened collaboration between National Disaster Offices and National Tourism Organizations 3a. CDERA's capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced. 3b. Enhanced capacity of National Tourism Organizations for disaster risk management	2b.i Number/type of initiatives on which NDOs and NTOs collaborate 2b.ii Level of effectiveness of collaboration 2b.iii Perception of stakeholders on level of collaboration with the other 3a.ii CTO/NTO perception of CDERA capacity (at regional level – CU, and national level – NDOs) for disaster risk management in the tourism sector 3a.iv Level of tourism-specific disaster risk management knowledge and expertise in CDERA (at regional level – CU, and national level – NDOs) 3b.i Level of disaster management knowledge and expertise in these NTOs 3b.iv Perception of relevant stakeholders of the level of capacity of NTOs for disaster risk management		

Table of Contents

.....3

.....7

FOR M&E FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT AND BASELINE
.....7

COLLECTION.....9

SED ON PROJECT EXPECTED RESULTS AND INDICATORS 9
S 10
.....10
.....10
.....12
line Data Collection 13
.....16
he 'Tourism' Sector 19
rviews.....19
EU and PAC.....20
ELINE DATA COLLECTION 24

LLECTION STEPS.....25

WORK - REGIONAL DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT FOR
BBEAN 27

MENT FRAMEWORK - REGIONAL DISASTER RISK
OURISM IN THE CARIBBEAN.....30

BILITY FORM FOR BASE DATA COLLECTION.....37

XAMPLES.....40

IET - JAMAICA.....46

MET - TURKS AND CAICOS 48

PECTED RESULTS.....49

GLOSSARY OF KEY TERMS.....

1. INTRODUCTION .....

2. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY
DATA COLLECTION.....

3. GUIDANCE FOR BASELINE DATA

3.1 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION – BA
3.2 BASELINE DATA COLLECTION STEP
A. Responsibility for Baseline Data Collection....
B. Get to know the Project PMF .....
C. Assess Initial National Data Availability....
D. Develop a Country-level PMF to Guide Base
E. Develop Data Collection Tools.....
Scope of 'Disaster' Information Being Sought in t
F. Arrange for Individual and Focus Group Inte
G. Capture Data and Report to the CDERA P
3.3 LESSONS LEARNED THROUGH BASE

4. REVIEW OF BASELINE DATA COL

Annexes

ANNEX I – REVISED LOGICAL FRAME
SUSTAINABLE TOURISM IN THE CARI

ANNEX II - PERFORMANCE MEASURE
MANAGEMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE TO

ANNEX III - NATIONAL DATA AVAILA

ANNEX IV – INTERVIEW PROTOCOL E

ANNEX V - LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS M

ANNEX VI - LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS

ANNEX VII - THE CDM STRATEGY EX

  - What is your role in these bodies? What degree of leadership do you have on this committee?
  - What is the level of participation and coordination among members? How do other tourism stakeholders (such as hotels, the Tourism Board, Ministry of Tourism) and others participate? What is the link between DDME and these teams/committees?
  - If not those stakeholders on the committee above, who will make up the TEMCs (at both national and local levels)? What should the role of the TEMC be? How would it function? Who would lead? Would they be useful?
  - What else is needed for any of these bodies to better undertake the role of mainstreaming disaster risk management issues into the tourism sector?

- How effective is the Tsunami Warning system? Who manages the system and updates information? Who utilizes it?
- What other collaborations take place beyond the warning system? How effective have these been?

- How is climatic monitoring and weather information managed and shared in the country? Who is in charge of early warning and how is the data processed and disseminated?
  - How effective are the Ministry and DDME (or THCTA/the Board) in communicating disaster related information to the tourism sector? Are others undertaking this?
  - How do you receive climatic monitoring information? Or do you coordinate sending it out?
  - Could this and warning systems be improved? How?

- How is the overall level of communication before and during disasters among key stakeholders?
  - Which tourism stakeholders are you in touch with on a regular basis?
  - Who do you first contact in times of emergencies? Who do they contact in those times?
  - Who utilizes the two-way radio system? Is it effective?

- How do hotels and tourism stakeholders coordinate with the airport and airlines for airlifts?

Outcome 3. Improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address disaster risk management in the tourism sector
Outputs: CDERA's capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced; Enhanced capacity of National Tourism Organizations for disaster risk management

- What is your level of knowledge and capacity of tourism sector-specific aspects of disaster risk management? How could this be improved?

- What is your view on the tourism sector stakeholders' current capacity to address and integrate disaster risk management into planning and management?
  - How well does the tourism sector integrate disaster risk management into planning, management and outreach?
  - Who is capable? What are the main gaps and challenges and how could they be addressed?
  - What is the number and percentage of hotels that subscribe to the CHA manual? What percentage of hotels and attractions has disaster management plans? What is the quality of these disaster management plans?
  - Are there hurricane preparedness workshops? Who undertakes these workshops? What is the quality of these workshops? Who attends? Is once every two years enough? What is the coverage?
  - What is the status of disaster risk management preparedness for key hotels and resorts, etc?
  - Do they have evacuation and emergency plans? What is the quality? Do you assist with or review these plans?
  - What is the level of capacity? How often do they undertake simulation exercises? Where and with whom? Do you provide any assistance or collaboration for these?
  - What else is in place for disaster risk management and preparedness?
  - Who monitors tourism stakeholders' readiness and application of requirements? Is this constant?

- What has been the effectiveness of your activities for disaster risk management in the tourism sector?

  - What is the quality of the risk management seminars offered? How many are there per year? What is the coverage? What other outreach/capacity building/assistance is offered by DDME for disaster risk management in the tourism sector?
  - What activities and workshops have taken place? What have tourism stakeholders learned or gained? What have they applied?

- What is the quality of the Ministry's outreach on disaster risk management for the tourism sector?
- To what extent is disaster risk management included in THCTA or the Board's (or your) outreach initiatives and information?
  - Who else is involved in outreach on disaster risk management in the tourism sector?
  - What is the quality and coverage/level of dissemination of the publications and media campaigns?
  - What is the quality of the Natural Disaster Preparedness Program offered by TCHTA? How many are there per year and what is the coverage thus far?
  - What is your perception of the assistance and guidance provided to the tourism for disaster risk management in the tourism sector by the THCTA, the Board or other relevant organizations?

- What is your experience with the CU? What do you know about the CDERA CU's role vis a vis your national emergencies? Do you interface with the Unit and do you know of any national entities that do? How would you rate or qualify CDERA CU's provision of assistance and advice in the area of disaster risk management in the tourism sector? What is needed?

Other Outputs: Standards for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment for the tourism sector developed and endorsed by CROSQ.

- What capacity for mapping and vulnerability assessments exist in the country?
- Do you know of any existing studies or reports which have been prepared? If so, how are they used?

B. Interview Protocol – Jamaican Tourism Stakeholders

Impacts: Enhanced capacity for disaster management in the tourism sector in the Caribbean.

- In your view, what is the overall quality of the countries' response, readiness and recovery to natural disasters?
- In your view, what is the extent of the risk to key infrastructure and human resources in the tourism sector in the country?
- In your view, what is the current level of vulnerability of the tourism sector?
- Is there a sub-sector considered more vulnerable than others?
- How is disaster management and preparedness mainstreamed within your operations?

Specific to Hotels, other tourism stakeholders and Jamaican Association of Villas/Apartments

- What is the status of disaster risk management preparedness for your business? Do you have evacuation plans and emergency plans? What is the level of capacity? How often do you undertake simulation exercises?

National Policy and Legislation Guiding Disaster Risk Management in the Tourism Sector

- What policy or law guides tourism and disaster risk management in the country?

Outcome 2: Improved coordination between stakeholders in the disaster risk management and tourism sectors

Outputs: Established or enhanced multi-stakeholder committees for disaster risk management in the tourism sector; Strengthened collaboration between NDOs and National Tourism Organizations

- What is the TEOC's role in coordination on tourism and disaster risk management?
    - Can you explain the process in utilizing and managing the TEOC? How often do you meet? What do you do as a body? What are your main activities and outputs? What have been the successes and challenges of the TEOC?
    - How effective do you feel the TEOC is at addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector?
    - What is your role in the TEOC? What degree of leadership?
    - What is the level of participation and coordination among of TEOC members? How do other tourism stakeholders, OPDEM, MTEC and others participate?
    - Are there workshop-s planned? How many and for whom? Are there current training materials prepared? What will these workshops specifically address?

- What is the NDC's role in coordination on tourism and disaster risk management?
    - Can you explain the process in utilizing and managing the NDC? How often do you meet? What do you do as a body? What are your main activities and outputs? What have been the successes and challenges of the NDC?
    - How effective do you feel the NDC is at addressing disaster risk management in the tourism sector?
    - What is your role in the NDC? What degree of leadership?
    - What is the level of participation and coordination among of NDC members? How do other tourism stakeholders, OPDEM, MTEC and others participate?
    - Are there workshop-s planned? How many and for whom? Are there current training materials prepared? What will these workshops specifically address?

- Can the TEOC/NDC serve as the Tourism Emergency Management Committee, as envisaged by the project? What is required for this to occur? If not, who will make up the TEMCs?
    - What is the status of the Tourism Emergency Management Committees, Tourism Emergency Response Centers, and Tourism Emergency Response Clusters? Who is envisaged on these committees?
    - What should the role of the TEMC be? How would it function and who would lead?

  - What else is needed for the TEOC/NDC and/or TEMC to better undertake the role of mainstreaming disaster risk management issues into the tourism sector in Jamaica?

- How is climatic monitoring and weather information managed and shared in Jamaica? Who is in charge of early warning and how is the data processed and disseminated?
  - How effective are MTEC and ODPEM in communicating disaster related information? Are others undertaking this?
  - How do you receive climatic monitoring information?
  - Could this be improved? How?

- What is the quality of OPDEM's coordination with you, the tourist sector?
  - What about NEOC?

Outcome 3. Improved capacity of lead national and regional tourism and disaster management institutions to integrate and address disaster risk management in the tourism sector
Outputs: CDERA's capacity to provide technical assistance in disaster risk management in the tourism sector enhanced; Enhanced capacity of National Tourism Organizations for disaster risk management

- What is your level of understanding and capacity of disaster risk management in your tourism sector? What do you do to prepare and build capacity to reduce vulnerability?

- What has been the effectiveness of ODPEM strategies for disaster risk management in the tourism sector?
  - Does the OPDEM operational plan adequately integrate the tourism sector? Was OPDEM's strategy for disaster risk management in the tourism sector effective?
  - Please rate your collaboration with OPDEM and their programming?
  - How does OPDEM assist you in terms of addressing disaster risk management in your tourism activities/sector? Are the annual lectures adequate for hurricane preparation?
  - What measures or initiatives have you undertaken as a result of the lectures? What has been their role and degree of leadership provided on the TEOC/ NDC?
  - What activities and workshops have you attended? What have you learned or gained? What have you applied as a result of these activities?
  - How often did fire or earthquake drills take place?
  - How often did structural vulnerability assessments take place?
  - How can all this be improved?

- What is the quality of MTEC's outreach on disaster risk management for the tourism sector?
  - What have been the results of MTEC's collaboration with other Ministries to mainstream disaster management?

- How well does the tourism sector integrate disaster risk management into planning, management and outreach? Who is capable?
  - What is your view on the tourism sector stakeholders' current capacity (including your own) to address and integrate disaster risk management into planning and management? What else is required?

- To what extent is disaster risk management included in JTB's or your outreach initiatives and information?
  - Would you like to be more involved with tourism-related disaster risk management and coordination? How?
  - Who else is involved in outreach on disaster risk management in the tourism sector?

- Have you submitted a disaster and emergency plan to NEPA?

- Do all tourism entities have a health and fire certificate? What are the standards for receiving the certificate? How are these monitored, is it periodically under review?

Specific to TPDCo

- How many HACCP trainings have been conducted? How many and who are the main participants? Is there any follow-up on the trainings? Do you know of any measures or initiatives that have resulted from the trainings?
- What is your perception of the assistance and guidance provided to you for disaster risk management in the tourism sector by the JTB, JHTA and other relevant organizations?

Specific to Hotels, other tourism stakeholders and Jamaican Association of Villas/Apartments

- What is your perception of the assistance and guidance provided to you for disaster risk management in the tourism sector by the JTB, JHTA and other relevant organizations?
- Have you been applying the CHA Hurricane preparedness manual?

Other Outputs: Standards for risk mapping and vulnerability assessment for the tourism sector developed and endorsed by CROSQ.

- How effective are the SOP during a hurricane warning? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the SOP?
- What capacity for mapping and vulnerability assessments exist in the country?

Annex V - List of Stakeholders Met - Jamaica

NAME	ORGANIZATION (and ROLE)
Cecil Bailey	**ODPEM – Deputy Director General**
Kareema Mitchell	**ODPEM – Mitigation Program Officer**
Christopher Gayle	**ODPEM – Research Officer/Mitigation**
Michelle Edwards	**ODPEM - Mitigation Program Manager**
Tina Williams	**MTEC – Director of Tourism Facilitation**
Hassim Fulton	**MTEC – Policy, Strategic Planning and Evaluation**
Jodi Neil	**MTEC – Tourism Facilitation Monitoring Officer**
Barrington Payne	**TPDCo**
Fulton Peterson	**PIOJ**
Major Robert Hibbert	**Jamaica Defense Force**
Danny Neman	**Utilities – Director of DISASTER MANAGEMENT**
Mr. Macdowal	**National Water Commission**
Orane Bailey	**National Security – Responsible for Tourism Security**
Anthony Mackenzie	**NEPA – Manager for Strategic Policy and Planning**
Fabia	**Green Grotto Caves - Director**
Marion Bullock Bucasse	**Ministry of Health – Health Disaster Committee Coordinator**
Roger Williams	**NEPA**
Lisa Simpson	**Environmental Specialist – Sandals Resort**
Wayne Cummings	**JHTA**
Supt. Dave McLaughlin	**Jamaica Fire Brigade- St. James Division**
Roy Anderson	**Jamaica Association of Tour Operators**
Ludolph Mclaughlin	**Airports Authority of Jamaica**
Clive Taffe	**Jamaica Tourist Board**
Edna Facey	**Red Cross- St. James**
Coral Williams	**TPDCO**
Sophia Kerr- Reid	**St. James Parish Council**

NAME	ORGANIZATION (and ROLE)
Patrick Dunn	**Chukka Caribbean Adventures**
Georgette D'Aguillar	**Ministry of Mines and Geology**
Michelle Watts	**WRA**
Kareena	**Jamaican Constabulary Force**
Carole Guntley	**MTEC – Director General**

Annex VI - List of Stakeholders Met - Turks and Caicos

Department	Position	Name
Tourist Board	Product Development Officer	Ms. Daphne Farrington
Tourist Board	Product Development Officer	Mr. Brian Been
Department of Disaster Management & Emergency Services	Director	Mrs. Joyce Peters
Planning Department	Deputy Director	Ms. Carla Harrison
Planning Department	Director	Mr. Clyde Robinson
Government Information Services	Director	Ms. Ava-Dayne Kerr
Environmental Health	Health Officer	Mr. Leroy Adams
Environmental Health	Chief Health Officer	Mr. Lorne Robinson
Environmental Health	Veterinarian	Mr. Gavin Peters
Grand Turk Cruise Center	General Manager	Mr. Mike Reimers
Tourist Board	Director	Mr. Lindsey Musgrove
Governor's Office	Deputy Governor	Hon. Mahala Wynns
Red Cross	President	Mrs. Patronella Been
Red Cross	Deputy President	Mrs. Marilyn Forbes
Grand Turk Inn	Owner	Ms. Sandy Erb
The Arches - Grand Turk	Owner	Mrs. Cecile Wennick
Engineering Maintenance Services	Engineer	Mr. Roger Harvey
Digicel	CEO	E. Jay Saunders
Chamber of Commerce	President	Mrs. Tina Fenimore
National Trust	Director	Mrs. Ethlyn Gibbs - Williams
Provo Airport Company	General Manager	Mr. Alvin Maier
Airports Authority (Turks and Caicos Islands)	Deputy CEO	Mr. Emmanual Rigby
Fire Rescue Service	Chief Officer	Mr. Chris Ganon
Turks and Caicos Hotel and Tourism Association	CEO	Mr. Caesar Campbell

Annex VII – The CDM Strategy Expected Results

GOAL
Sustainable Development in the Caribbean

PURPOSE
'To strengthen regional, national and community level capacity for mitigation, management, and coordinated response to natural and technological hazards, and the effects of climate change.

OUTCOME 1:	OUTCOME 2:	OUTCOME 3:	OUTCOME 4:
Enhanced institutional support for CDM Program implementation at national and regional levels	**An effective mechanism and programme for management of comprehensive disaster management knowledge has been established**	**Disaster Risk Management has been mainstreamed at national levels and incorporated into key sectors of national economies (including tourism, health agriculture and nutrition)**	**Enhanced community resilience in CDERA states/ territories to mitigate and respond to the adverse effects of climate change and disasters**
OUTPUTS	**OUTPUTS**	**OUTPUTS**	**OUTPUTS**
1.1 National Disaster Organizations are strengthened for supporting CDM implementation and a CDM program is developed for implementation at the national level *1.2 CDERA CU is strengthened and restructured for effectively supporting the adoption of CDM in member countries* *1.3 Governments of participating states/ territories support CDM and have integrated CDM into national policies and strategies* *1.4 Donor programming integrates CDM into related environmental, climate change and disaster management programming in the region.* *1.5 Improved coordination at national and regional levels for disaster management* *1.6 Capacity for monitoring, evaluation and reporting being built*	*2.1 Establishment of a Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Network to include a Disaster Risk Reduction Centre and other centres of excellence for knowledge sharing and management in the region* *2.2 The utilization of ICT and other Infrastructure for fact-based policy and decision making is established /strengthened* *2.3 Improved under-standing and local /community-based knowledge sharing on priority hazards* *2.4 Existing educational and training materials for Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management are standardized in the region.* *2.5 A Strategy and curriculum for building a culture of safety is established in the region*	*3.1 CDRM is recognized as the roadmap for building resilience and Decision-makers in the public and private sectors understand and take action on Disaster Risk Management* *3.2 Disaster Risk Management capacity enhanced for lead sector agencies, National and regional insurance entities, and financial institutions* *3.3 Hazard information and Disaster Risk Management is integrated into sectoral policies, laws, development planning and operations, and decision-making in tourism, health, agriculture, planning and infrastructure* *3.4 Prevention, Mitigation, Preparedness, Response, recovery and Rehabilitation Procedures developed and Implemented in tourism, health, agriculture, planning and infrastructure*	*4.1 Preparedness, response and mitigation capacity (technical and managerial) is enhanced among public, private and civil sector entities for local level management and response* *4.2 Improved coordination and collaboration between community disaster organizations and other research/data partners including climate change entities for undertaking comprehensive disaster risk management* *4.3 Communities more aware and knowledgeable on disaster management and related procedures including safer building techniques* *4.4 Standardized holistic and gender-sensitive community methodologies for natural and anthropogenic hazard identification and mapping, vulnerability and risk assessments, and recovery and rehabilitation procedures developed and applied in selected communities.* *4.5 Early Warning Systems for disaster risk reduction enhanced at the community and national levels*