

Annex I A: Description of the Action: European Union-Caribbean-Resilient programme (EU-CA-RES)

1. The rationale

1.1 Context

The multiple dimensions of vulnerability of the Caribbean have been exacerbated in the last years, triggered primarily by the combination of four major humanitarian and development challenges at once: (i) the COVID-19 pandemic; (ii) increased migration due to political and governance crises coupled with economic crises (Haiti, Cuba and the Venezuelan forced migration and refugee crisis) (iii) the regular Atlantic hurricane seasons, and (iv) a wide range of recurrent natural, social and socio-natural hazards, many of which are exacerbated by climate change, (floods, droughts, but also volcanic eruptions, earthquakes and oil spills) posing intensified and new sources of volatility through impacts on land and marine ecosystems, health, food security and livelihoods, infrastructure and coastal landscapes.

Caribbean countries, made up of mostly Small Island Developing States (SIDS), have a history of dealing with large shocks. The region is threatened by multiple hazards. Nations have specialized in tourism and commodity exports, disproportionately exposing them to global economic cycles through changes in tourism demand and commodity prices. They are also located in a region that is highly exposed to a range of natural hazards—from volcanic eruptions to earthquakes and hurricanes as well as epidemics and pandemics—which damage their infrastructure stock, reduce tourism demand, and destroy agricultural production. Hazards have often caused severe damage to economies and livelihoods in the region, affecting disproportionately the most at risk groups, including the older persons, persons with disabilities, women and children.

Disasters caused by natural, social and socio-natural hazards and severe vulnerability conditions (social and physical) are a threat to development, and their costs are rising. The annual average cost of disasters in developing countries has risen from US\$23 billion to US\$150 billion over the past 30 years, and the number of affected people has tripled to 2 billion (Hallegatte et al. 2017). Population growth, rapid and unplanned urbanization, poor-quality infrastructure, and ineffective disaster risk governance have contributed to these increased damages from multiple hazards.

In the Caribbean, direct damages due to the negative impact of disasters triggered only by natural hazards have averaged almost US\$1.6 billion per year over the last 20 years. In 2017, Irma and Maria, two Category 5 hurricanes, hit the Caribbean in the same week, causing severe damages on small island states and territories. In Dominica, losses and damages amounted to 226% of its gross domestic product (GDP). During the 2020-2021 period, more than 30 severe weather events impacted the economy of countries in the region. With the eruption of the La Soufriere volcano in 2021, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines counted losses amounting to more than \$400 million. Similarly, the 2021 earthquake in Haiti caused losses totalling \$1.6 billion and hurricane Elsa affected several Caribbean countries.

Declining freshwater availability, rising sea levels, coastal erosion, and flooding are common throughout the region due to environmental degradation and climate change further exacerbate economic losses due to damage to critical infrastructure during disasters. Due to global warming, global climate models predict hurricanes will likely cause more intense rainfall and have an increased coastal flood risk due to higher storm surge caused by rising

seas. Additionally, hurricanes that form are more likely to become intense as recently witnessed in the case of the Hurricane Beryl; the strongest Hurricane ever recorded for the month of June.

The impact and severity of disasters depend on the choices made over time by governments, the private sector, and others. Even though disaster risk reduction renders a benefit of at least four times the costs in terms of avoided and reduced loss, investment in Disaster Risk Management (DRM) has been very low in most countries and represents a tiny proportion of international development assistance. The majority of DRM related development financing remains for emergency response. This is because decision makers tend not to prioritize investment in resilience due to lack of immediate gains or benefits. Innovative and efficient financing approaches are also needed in order to ensure that systems in place are fit for purpose across the spectrum of comprehensive disaster risk management.

Disaster risk reduction is more effective when national social protection systems are equipped to identify, target and deliver support to the most vulnerable populations, particularly in the aftermath of disasters. Protecting people from shocks and risks is an inherent function of social protection, but social protection institutions, programmes and systems in the Caribbean need to be strengthened and prepared to more effectively respond to disasters and build resilience (Beazley et al. 2020). Inequities in access to services, including during times of shocks, often leave the most at-risk groups—such as older persons, persons with disabilities, women, and children—disproportionately affected. A fair and inclusive approach that ensures no one is left behind is crucial in mitigating these impacts. By integrating social protection systems into disaster risk reduction and response strategies, countries can better address these inequities and provide timely support to those who need it most, thereby enhancing overall resilience and recovery efforts. This approach not only reduces the immediate human and economic toll of disasters but also strengthens long-term development by fostering social cohesion and protecting the most vulnerable from being further marginalized.

1.2 Problem Analysis

Caribbean countries are still in the transition from disaster management to disaster risk management, combined with limited preparedness for the new challenges posed by climate change, compounded by uncertainty on future tourism markets and a lack of fiscal space. The strategies that have worked in the past will not be enough in the future. Climate change threatens to intensify natural hazards and brings new sources of volatility through impacts on health, agriculture yields, and coastal landscapes. The post-COVID-19 world brings more uncertainty on prospects for tourism. Many countries have also depleted their fiscal space and coping capacity while dealing with past crises. Commonly used tools to deal with aftermath of shocks such as social protection, also have a low coverage in countries in the Caribbean, representing a challenge when governments need to respond and recover from natural hazards.

Social protection has a record dating back two decades of being used in response to shocks in the Caribbean, particularly given the region's vulnerability to disasters triggered by natural hazards, economic fluctuations, and other crises. These shocks often disproportionately affect the most vulnerable populations, pushing them further into poverty and exacerbating existing inequalities. Robust and shock-responsive social protection systems can protect households and provide a safety net that helps individuals and households to absorb and recover from shocks more quickly, reducing long-term socioeconomic damage. However, the current coverage of national social protection systems in the Caribbean remains limited, leaving many at risk without adequate support during crises. This low coverage is a significant challenge, as it hinders the ability of governments to provide timely and effective assistance to those in need, ultimately weakening the resilience of communities and their capacity to withstand and recover from future shocks.

While every country in the Caribbean has turned to social protection to respond to shocks, very few have put in place robust measures to use and modify routine delivery systems for this purpose.¹ A comprehensive approach to doing so requires strengthening preparedness measures to identify and reach impacted persons outside of existing social protection programmes with cash transfers and other support, adapting and augmenting routine social protection systems to enable those measures, and incorporating the responsive and resilience building roles of social protection in policies, strategies and legal frameworks. Significant lessons are being generated in the Caribbean on shock-responsive social protection that can inform these measures across different countries.

There is also a strong economic and social rationale to invest in disaster risk reduction (DRR) and in resilient and shock-responsive national social protection systems. Investing in resilient infrastructure, for example, can provide a net benefit of US\$4.2 trillion, with US\$4 in benefits for each US\$1 invested (Hallegatte, Rentschler, and Rozenberg 2019). When countries rebuild stronger and more inclusively after disasters, they can reduce the impact on livelihoods and well-being by as much as 31 percent (Hallegatte, Rentschler, and Walsh 2018).

One of the four pillars of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, 2015-2030 highlights the importance of multi-hazard early warning systems and draws attention to the fact that building effective recovery governance before a disaster occurs represents a critical opportunity to “Build Back Better”. One way of advancing this is to plan for effective response and recovery before hazards strike and disasters happen. The International Recovery Platform (IRP), 2012 noted that much can be done pre-disaster, that is pre-disaster recovery planning (PDRP) to alleviate recovery planning demands after the disaster.

Despite this, there has been insufficient investment in DRR and DRM, especially disaster risk mitigation and preparedness (United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction; World Bank). Between 2010 and 2020, only 6.5 percent of total official development assistance for disaster risk management was directed toward risk-reduction activities. The literature points to several reasons for this phenomenon: countries lack resources to invest in DRR and may have a limited understanding of disaster risks and vulnerabilities, and their governments tend to favour politically visible post-disaster initiatives over pre-disaster risk reduction, including through mitigation, adaptation and preparedness for effective response and recovery. In addition, fiscal space is limited in most of the Caribbean countries and increasing coverage of tools such as social protection is proven challenging and expensive.

Around 70 per cent of CDEMA Participating States indicated the absence of a national or sectoral PDRP or framework. The main barriers that have contributed to the absence of institutionalization of PDRP in the region stems from governance issues related to the existing legal frameworks for disaster risk management (DRM), financing for PDRP implementation, institutional capacities to support disaster risk reduction actions and recovery planning and the disconnect between PDRP as part of comprehensive DRM and the long-term development goals among decision-makers. Similarly, only a few countries in the region have developed and adopted National Social Protection Policies, rarely including shock responsiveness as one of the key areas.

Social protection is a critical component in the Caribbean’s efforts to build resilient communities and reduce poverty and inequality. However, the Caribbean faces challenges in designing and implementing shock-responsive social protection systems, owing to weakness with routine systems and

¹ See research by WFP/Oxford Policy Management on shock-responsive social protection in the Caribbean: <https://www.wfp.org/publications/research-programme-shock-responsive-social-protection-caribbean> and

measures needed to make them more adaptive. Many countries in the region struggle with limited financial resources, which constrains the reach and adequacy of social protection programmes. Additionally, the region's high vulnerability to disasters triggered by natural hazards exacerbates these challenges, as frequent shocks can overwhelm existing systems and disrupt the delivery of social services. Responses to these shocks through social protection require predictable and risk-layered financial strategies. There are also issues of inequity, where certain groups are excluded from accessing social protection benefits, further entrenching poverty and social divides. Finally, weak institutional capacities and fragmented governance structures hinder the coordination and implementation of comprehensive social protection policies.

Nevertheless, progress and efforts are ongoing. The establishment of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS) varies among regions, with some regions showing more advancement than others, particularly in the context of Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Since 2015, there has been notable progress, with most regions now having at least 40 percent of their countries equipped with MHEWS. However, disparities persist among regions, with Africa, the Americas, the Caribbean, and the Arab States having lower MHEWS coverage. Notably, SIDS and LDCs face significant challenges, as less than half of LDCs and only one-third of SIDS have reported having operational MHEWS in place (UNDRR, 2024).

In recent years though, the Caribbean has made notable advances in leveraging social protection as a tool to respond to emergencies. Governments across the region have increasingly recognized the importance of integrating social protection mechanisms into disaster risk management strategies. This has led to the development and implementation of more shock-responsive social protection measures designed to scale up in response to crises. For example, cash transfer programmes have been expanded or introduced during times of disaster, providing immediate relief to affected populations. Additionally, there has been progress in strengthening financing instruments, institutional frameworks and enhancing coordination between social protection and disaster response agencies, enabling more rapid and effective deployment of resources during emergencies. These advancements demonstrate a growing commitment to using social protection not only as a means of poverty alleviation but also as a crucial component of resilience building in the face of frequent and intensifying shocks.

During the aftermath of Hurricane Beryl that battered the islands of Grenada and St Vincent and the Grenadines in July 2024, efforts to establish a shock-responsive social protection response to affected households showed gaps in the routine social protection system that needed strengthening and coordination. The efforts to implement both a horizontal and a vertical expansion highlighted needs in several areas: coordination, design aspects, data collection and management, registration, targeting and delivery systems. In Grenada for example, the establishment of a Social Protection Working Group allowed the Government and UN partners to coordinate support and ensure that identified gaps are addressed both in the shorter and the long term, even when mechanisms are developed for the emergency response but can be later on institutionalized in an effort to continue improving national systems.

The new challenges experienced in the Caribbean call for more consistent approaches to resilience, building on stronger institutions, robust analytics, and more transparent prioritization. New measures need to be put in place and existing mechanisms strengthened to substantially reduce disaster risk and for before a hazard could trigger a disaster in order to protect lives and livelihoods. This is the objective of DRM and shock-responsive social protection, supported by this Action. To boost resilience and better prepare for the shocks and stresses of the future, Caribbean governments need to focus on three main areas:

- Increasing government efficiency by improving investment management and infrastructure maintenance, clarifying procurement rules for emergency situations, allocating budgets transparently, ensuring fiscal rules are robust, and layering risk financing strategies.
- Empowering and engaging with households and the private sector by increasing both the coverage and adequacy of social protection, strengthening worker skills for resilience, improving access to finance, ensuring continuity planning, and facilitating access to risk information.
- Reducing future physical risk by investing in multi-hazard early warning systems and critical infrastructure, better enforcing building codes and standards systematically and implementing widely nature-based coastal protection strategies.

1.3 Stakeholder and Target Groups

National stakeholders and target groups include:

- Governmental institutions at all levels (ministries in charge of national disaster risk management, climate change, biodiversity, planning and finance, health, education, social protection and other relevant government institutions, at regional, national and sub-national levels);
- Private sector (insurance companies, private sector investors, finance providers, business associations, small and medium enterprises)
- Non-governmental organizations and institutions (academia and civil society organizations (CSOs) and communities, including women, persons with disabilities and youth).

National governments and municipalities will need to support the inclusion of disaster risk-informed decision-making and social protection within their development agendas. Capacities in relation to the technical, legal, policy, and social protection aspects of disaster risk management will need to be enhanced to support, accelerate, and mainstream risk-informed and inclusive development in an efficient and timely manner. Regional, national, and local fora will need to be established or strengthened to ensure multisectoral and interdisciplinary coordination, including social protection systems that identify and support the most vulnerable populations during and after disasters.

Regional institutions such as CDEMA, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Commission, and the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) will benefit through the programme and will collaborate closely on regional actions to improve resilience. In particular, CDEMA will play a key role in mainstreaming the regional Comprehensive Disaster Mechanism into country policies and will support National Disaster Management Offices in implementing related policies while promoting the exchange of good practices among CARICOM countries, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba. Since 2020, CDEMA, in collaboration with UNDP, has been working to operationalize the Caribbean Resilient Recovery Facility (CRRF), launched in 2021. Under this new dispensation, resilient recovery is recognized as a proactive exercise with programmatic interventions and an increased role in the coordination and mobilization of recovery actions, including social protection measures.

UNDP's component of this project will continue supporting the pillars of the CRRF through capacity building for recovery (post disaster assessments, disaster recovery planning), including the building of a pool of (human) resources in the countries targeted by the project (except Cuba and the DR) that can be drawn on to support recovery efforts in wider CDEMA and OECS participant states. The project will also produce public goods that can be utilized by the CRRF such as the scenario tools that can be scaled up to inform recovery planning in the wider Caribbean.

UNDRR will also offer surge capacity to CDEMA and the OECS Commission to assess disaster impacts in member states, contributing to Damage Assessment Teams and facilitating detailed sectoral analyses - aligning to CRRF priorities. Furthermore, support will be provided to develop early

recovery strategies for affected states in alignment with CDEMA's and the OECS's recovery efforts. In preparedness, we will continue to enhance situational analysis and risk snapshots for participating states, advancing the establishment of risk-informed policies and practices through Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS). To further bolster national and regional disaster management capabilities, countries will be assisted in developing their disaster risk management platforms, connecting to CDEMA's Caribbean Risk Information Virtual Library, and enhancing the region's capacity for impact-based forecasting and risk management.

OECS and CDB, as key institutions for the countries in the region, will be involved in strategies at the regional, sub-regional, and national levels, ensuring that social protection is integrated as a core component of resilience-building efforts. Specifically, the OECS Commission will continue to be a critical partner to bring together Eastern Caribbean Countries to discuss priority areas for governments, facilitating knowledge-sharing events and the sharing of best practices and lessons learned coming out of the project. Strong coordination in this area will also be done with CDEMA, which has played an important role in research, guidance and exchanges, supporting the institution's efforts to strengthen disaster management and social protection systems.

This project also builds strongly from previous investments in Disaster Preparedness especially through previous and ongoing projects in partnership with the Humanitarian Aid department of the European Commission (ECHO), where cash transfers programmes for emergency response were developed and civil society partners were trained whilst improving the coordination among civil society and governments in disaster management and response. Notwithstanding, the institutionalization of disaster preparedness into national social protection and the further incorporation of programmatic features that were either developed or strengthened for emergency response is a key component of what the project aims to achieve now drawing from all the previous efforts.

Over the last five/six years, ECHO has helped better understand challenges and opportunities for shock-responsive social protection, successfully identifying strategies to support at national level (including in priority countries) and designing models of interventions that have allowed to capitalise on existing social protection systems across various fronts. This includes in-depth analysis of programme adaptability, beneficiary registration processes, refining distribution mechanisms to technical assistance in vulnerability and risk analysis, adopting risk-layered disaster risk financing instruments linked to social protection, enhancing coordination between disaster risk management and social protection actors to better support people in need, ultimately enabling rapid assistance before or after a shock. These investments have enabled us to think through how social protection can be more strategically used for responding to disasters. This project will build on lessons and achievements to explore further ways to bridge the humanitarian-development nexus and to move towards climate adaptive social protection.

The ECHO partnership has therefore been instrumental in advancing research, advocacy, knowledge exchange and the piloting of critical investment areas in shock-responsive social protection in the English-speaking Caribbean. The project will not only further expand the number of countries that can further benefit from support to strengthen social protection for disaster response, but also focus on deepening the institutionalization of best practices and specific areas of investment to increase sustainability of project outcomes. Further, a focus on these investments in routine function in social protection allows for a wider lens of adaptive social protection to increase climate resilience of vulnerable people through strengthened systems and institutions. Similarly, the project is aligned with EU GGIA actions at regional level related to social cohesion – stronger linkages among academia, research, and partnerships to reduce inequalities and reinforce social policies.

The private sector will play an important role for the definition and operation of risk-informed development mechanisms as well as sustainability mechanisms for Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems and Recovery processes in the region (output led by UNDRR). The Caribbean private sector has also actively engaged in disaster risk reduction initiatives, particularly following the hurricanes in 2017, with organizations like CARICHAM supporting businesses in adapting to challenges like the COVID-19 pandemic and digitalizing operations to enhance economic resilience. CARICHAM, a network of national chambers of commerce in the Caribbean, collaborates with key organizations like UNDRR and UNICEF to strengthen economies and societies in the region through trade facilitation, advocacy, integration of private sector in humanitarian responses, preparedness, and knowledge sharing.

Initiatives like ARISE and the CARICHAM Center of Excellence, supported by UNDRR and also promoted by other partners such as UNICEF, focus on enhancing private-sector engagement in disaster resilience efforts, including integrating risk into investment decisions and promoting resilient infrastructure. These efforts underscore the importance of private-sector involvement in disaster prevention and resilience-building, highlighting the benefits of such investments in creating a more resilient future for businesses and communities in the Caribbean. Despite challenges like the informal nature of MSMEs, ongoing collaboration between UNDRR, CARICHAM, and ARISE networks showcases the potential for private-sector contributions to disaster risk reduction and underscores the value of investing in DRR as a strategic long-term approach. Strong legal and institutional frameworks will set the right incentives for physical and financial risk reduction in the public and private sector, support clear and effective governance for integrated multi hazard early warning, preparedness, inclusive recovery and emergency response processes, and create accountability for existing and newly generated risk.

Regarding recovery preparedness, the disaster risk management systems will be enhanced, particularly involving the DRM governing entity as well as the planning and finance institutions, and line ministries. At subnational level, selected local governments, civil society organizations and private sector will be involved, to strengthen community base recovery preparedness

The ultimate beneficiaries of the action are the people in the Caribbean region. As the impacts of climate change and disasters are more pronounced for most at risk population such as children, older persons, girls and women, persons with disabilities, displaced population and minorities, a significant programme objective will be to tailor the interventions to the needs of these groups. Specific attention will be paid to the rights, needs and inclusion of persons with disabilities.

The beneficiary country per implementing partner, are as follows:

UNDP - Belize, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines

UNDRR - Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis and Suriname

WFP and UNICEF - Barbados, Belize, Grenada, Dominica, Antigua and Barbuda, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, Jamaica

1.4 Solution Pathway

Disasters undermine hard won development gains and create greater pressures than are found in 'normal' development settings: heightened urgency; the need for rapid reaction and speedy results; media scrutiny; lack of experience, capacity and expertise; a multiplicity of national, local and

international actors whose efforts all require coordination; and resource scarcity and few dedicated funding sources to meet recovery needs. Responding to these demands requires a clear road map, an efficient, well-organized process, knowledge gained from past failures and successes, rapid decision-making and implementation capabilities and skilled coordination.

National and local systems will be more resilient to crises and shocks if national capacities are strengthened through risk-informed preparedness, shock-responsive social protection systems, strengthened national capacities for conflict prevention, use of appropriate assessment tools, conduct of comprehensive recovery planning, and the promotion of resilient recovery to crises, including those of disasters and conflict. Interventions should look at both the reconstruction of infrastructure to better standards, but more importantly, the restoration of people's lives, livelihoods, social networks/cohesion and support to social protection systems to re-engage in the path of development. Lessons learned, research and exchanges on good practices are essential for evidence-based approaches. This becomes imperative when situations such as a Hurricane impacts the wellbeing of vulnerable households, as well as within their communities.

The importance of systematically incorporating risk reduction/prevention approaches into the implementation of recovery programmes should be promoted to avoid repeating the disaster and mitigating against relapse/escalation of conflict. It is however worth noting that critical awareness and practices to enable that to be accomplished are more effective when capacities are developed before the disaster strikes or conflicts become violent. Prevention and preparedness mechanisms/systems/processes should be put in place as a mitigation strategy.

The proposed Action will build on past successes while incorporating some important lessons learned to amplify and sustain the results achieved in terms of better physical resilience, improved Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus, and shock-responsive social protection. In particular, the proposed action will be designed to ensure:

- A continuous prominent role for the EU in policy dialogue with the countries/region;
- A structural collaboration with countries and regional actors such as CDEMA, OECS Commission and CDB;
- A stronger focus on resilience through investments on physical infrastructure, support to social protection systems, and disaster risk financing strategies for longer-term impact of our action;
- Mobilization of investments from other international financial institutions active in the region, in particular under the European Investment Bank (EIB) window;
- Private sector involvement at all stages.

2 The intervention logic (impact/outcomes/outputs)

The underlying intervention logic for this action is to increase the resilience to external shocks in Caribbean countries. The specific objective is to make institutions and communities better prepared to prevent, minimize impacts and recover from slow and rapid onset events. This will be achieved through:

- **Empowering households and communities:** Accelerating the Comprehensive Disaster Management policy implementation at country level and increasing coverage and adequacy of inclusive shock-responsive social protection schemes for most vulnerable people together with other grants and initiatives that support humanitarian assistance and shock-response such as ECHO.
- **Increasing Government efficiency:** Accelerating Recovery Capacities, strengthening national social protection systems and reducing future physical risks in complementarity to what FPI is implementing. Indeed, FPI is coordinating the cooperation between the United Nations, the World Bank and the EU on crisis assessments. The Service for Foreign Policy Instruments is in charge of the tripartite contacts, extensively involving other EU services in this work.

Activities will be implemented in close coordination with the regional organizations and other development partners. Private Sector engagement will be fostered in order to sustain multi hazard early warning systems as well as improving recovery and enhancing resilience and build-back-better. Coherence between the overall EU interventions in the area of the Green Deal will be ensured, bringing EU MS in the picture, and linking the action to the regional Team Europe initiative on Green Transition and raising EU profile with our counterparts.

All the above will:

1. Enhance the capacities of DRR and Social Protection practitioners and government counterparts in developing disaster and climate risk informed policies and plans,
2. Improve the infrastructure and capacity of governments, local and regional institutions and communities to better adapt and respond to adverse events or sustain a disaster,
3. Enhance the capacity of the region in recovering from disasters in a sustainable manner.

If this successfully materializes, institutions and communities will be better prepared to prevent, minimize impacts and recover from slow and rapid onset events. This in turn will reduce the impact of disasters, including those related to climate change and epidemics, and to increase the resilience to external shocks in Caribbean countries.

3.1 Objectives and Expected Outputs

The **Overall Objective** of this action is to increase the resilience to external shocks in the Caribbean.

The **Specific Objective** of this action is to make institutions and communities better prepared to prevent, minimize impacts and recover from slow and rapid onset events.

The **Outputs** to be delivered by this action contributing to the corresponding Specific Objective are:

1. Social protection programmes and systems in targeted countries are strengthened and better able to respond and provide effective, integrated support to vulnerable people affected by extreme weather events and other shocks. (UNICEF & WFP)

2. Stakeholders' capacities and evidence are strengthened to make evidence-based policy and operational decisions to improve the social protection system and make it more responsive to shocks. (UNICEF & WFP)
3. Support the implementation of Multi Hazard Early Warning Systems actions prioritized in country work programmes, and engagement of the private sector. (UNDRR)
4. Strengthened policy, institutions, communities, governance and financial mechanisms to plan and implement resilient recovery processes. (UNDP)
5. Enhanced capacities in using digital tools for conducting Post Disaster Needs Assessment and developing Recovery Frameworks (UNDP)

3 The indicative activities

Output 1: Social protection programmes and systems in targeted countries are strengthened and better able to respond and provide effective, integrated support to vulnerable people affected by extreme weather events and other shocks. (UNICEF & WFP)

Strengthening social protection programmes and systems in targeted countries is crucial for reducing risk and increasing resilience against shocks in the Caribbean. By enhancing these systems and preparing them to respond to shocks, vulnerable populations will receive more timely, effective and integrated support, minimizing their immediate suffering and long-term impacts. Effective social protection enables communities to recover more quickly and sustainably, reducing the likelihood of poverty and instability. Moreover, by building more resilient social protection frameworks and financing strategies, countries are better equipped to anticipate, absorb, and adapt to future shocks, fostering a safer and more stable environment for all. The countries covered under this Output reflect years of work by UNICEF & WFP in strengthening social protection systems, both routine and in response to shocks. A range of tailored activities will be implemented in Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Kitts and Nevis, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago.

Activity 1.1: Support the enabling environment (both regional and national), institutionalization of SRSP: Supporting the enabling environment, through the creation and strengthening of policies, strategies and legal frameworks, is essential for institutionalizing shock-responsive social protection in the Caribbean. This activity ensures that the necessary legal and policy frameworks are in place, providing a solid foundation for the broader social protection system. Embedding SRSP into national and regional policies creates the institutional environment for more cohesive and reliable response that can be activated swiftly during crises. This approach not only enhances the resilience of vulnerable populations but also ensures that social protection systems are sustainable and aligned with broader development goals.

Activity 1.2: Strengthen planning, design and implementation of cash-based assistance to respond to shocks and support most vulnerable and affected households: Strengthening the planning, design, and implementation of cash-based assistance is crucial for ensuring that social protection systems effectively respond to shocks and support the most vulnerable households in the Caribbean. By enhancing key components and developing procedures for coordination mechanisms, data collection, targeting, transfer amounts, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), this activity ensures that cash-based interventions are efficient, equitable, and impactful. Well-designed cash assistance programmes can quickly provide relief to those most affected by crises, reducing their vulnerability and supporting their recovery, even more so when there is an effort to ensure disaster risk

management mechanisms use the same platforms for cash assistance post shocks. This focus on robust planning and implementation enhances the overall effectiveness and efficiency of social protection systems, making them more responsive and resilient to future shocks.

Activity 1.3: Developing and strengthening social protection delivery systems, including digital options for enhanced and more accountable programme operation: Developing and strengthening social protection delivery systems, including Information Management Systems, grievance redress mechanisms (GRM), and payment solutions, is vital for enhancing the effectiveness and accountability of social protection programmes in the Caribbean. By incorporating digital tools such as digital data collection and developing effective information management processes, these systems become more efficient, transparent, and accessible, ensuring that assistance reaches those in need more quickly and accurately. Enhanced delivery systems allow for better tracking of beneficiaries, streamlined payment processes, and improved feedback mechanisms, all of which contribute to more responsive and accountable programme operations. This focus on robust delivery systems strengthens the overall capacity of social protection programmes to support vulnerable populations during times of crisis.

Activity 1.4: Operational support to social and child protection systems for increased integrated delivery of cash, care and services support to respond to large scale shocks affecting vulnerable children and their families: Providing operational support to social and child protection systems is essential for the integrated delivery of cash, care, and services, particularly in response to large-scale shocks affecting vulnerable children and their families in the covered countries in the Caribbean. By enhancing the operational capacity of these systems, this activity ensures a more coordinated and comprehensive response during crises, enabling timely and effective support. Integrated delivery means that families receive not just financial assistance but also essential care and services, addressing their multifaceted needs and helping them recover more swiftly. Strengthening these operational aspects ensures that social and child protection systems are better equipped to protect and support those most at risk during emergencies, ultimately increasing resilience and reducing long-term vulnerabilities.

Activity 1.5: Development of strategies, options and tools for shock-responsive social protection financing: Previous investments from ECHO which initially looked at advocacy and research have enabled support to governments in thinking through how their systems could better serve people. This then evolved into initial pilots in disaster risk financing which other donors took forward. In exchange for this support, governments have committed to strengthening their social protection systems in critical areas to ensure that assistance can be delivered quickly and efficiently. Past efforts have also strengthened engagements between Ministries of Social Protection with Ministries of Finance, who commit to allocating the proportion of any CCRIF SPC payout equal or greater to that of the proportion of the premium covered through the top ups towards cash transfers to impacted populations. This is a critical advancement that will ensure a more robust and longer response to the immediate needs and recovery of shock affected populations in supported countries with predictable financing. This predictability will also reduce the reliance on external international assistance in the event of shocks in the supported countries. Anticipatory action can also play a crucial role in disaster preparedness and response. This approach uses scientific forecasts and risk analysis to trigger action before hazards turn into disasters, thereby reducing or mitigating the impacts of an event on the population. Innovative anticipatory action strategies will be explored through national social protection systems, to complement disaster insurance solutions.

By creating tailored financing mechanisms and strategies, this activity ensures that social protection systems have the flexibility and capacity to scale up support during shocks, providing timely assistance to vulnerable populations. It also supports linkages of national social protection systems with existing and well known disaster risk finance mechanisms such as CCRIF SPC and other instruments. These strategies and tools enable governments

and stakeholders to plan and allocate funds more efficiently, ensuring that financial resources are accessible when needed most and put vulnerable people at the heart of financing. This proactive approach to financing strengthens the overall resilience of social protection systems, ensuring they can sustain and enhance their support during emergencies, thereby reducing the long-term impacts on affected communities. The activity also includes important aspects of the availability of fiscal space and fiscal space optimization to ensure social protection has the necessary resources to function and to expand during shocks.

This project will leverage advancements to date to assess how disaster risk financing could be leveraged for other opportunities, as these models can be expanded and built upon to support the humanitarian-development nexus, considering elements of recovery and resilience.

Output 2: Stakeholders' capacities and evidence are strengthened to make evidence-based policy and operational decisions to improve the social protection system and make it more responsive to shocks. (UNICEF & WFP)

Strengthening stakeholders' capacities and enhancing evidence-based decision-making are essential for improving the social protection system's responsiveness to shocks in the Caribbean. By building the knowledge and skills of key stakeholders and fostering cross-learning across multiple countries, this output ensures that policies and operations benefit from a diverse range of experiences and best practices, fueled by an acceleration of experiences in recent years. Effective evidence-based decision-making enables stakeholders to analyze data and trends more accurately, leading to more strategic and informed policy and operational choices. Additionally, this focus on capacity building and evidence supports advocacy efforts for securing further resources for shock-responsive social protection, ensuring that systems are better equipped to support vulnerable populations during crises.

Activity 2.1: Build, maintain, and transform capacities on shock-responsive social protection (training, change management support, tailored courses): This activity intends to strategically build, maintain, and transform the capacities of key stakeholders. By leveraging the strengthened systems, this activity will provide training, change management support, and tailored courses designed to enable a responsive and adaptive social protection framework. The enhanced systems from Output 1 will serve as a foundation, ensuring that capacity-building efforts are not only relevant but also sustainable, equipping stakeholders with the skills and knowledge necessary to operate within and further refine these improved systems. This integrated approach will ensure that social protection mechanisms are robust, flexible, and capable of addressing diverse shocks effectively.

This activity builds on achievements through training packages developed on shock-responsive social protection with wide access to the first of its kind operational handbook on shock-responsive social protection, an online self-paced course, and the provision of face-to-face training targeting existing professionals in the field. Many workshops have also accompanied the delivery of support during and outside of an emergency response, digitizing rapid assessments and visualizing the data and post-distribution monitoring of enumerators, amongst others. As countries turn their attention more strategically to formalize critical areas of investment, there have been requests for more thematic sessions and knowledge exchanges between countries in areas such as the use of digital payments establishing information management systems, amongst others. This activity will allow for the exploration of joint/ collaborative events that help to share best practices and challenges on the use of social protection in response to crises, particularly

around these more technical areas of engagement. It will also contribute to ensuring the sustainability of the use of knowledge and materials on shock-responsive social protection, and that the next generation of social protection professionals are versed in its use in a disaster.

Activity 2.2: South-South learning and exchange: Building on the results of the previous output, this activity will facilitate South-South learning and exchange to promote the dissemination of best practices and innovative approaches in shock-responsive social protection across the broader Caribbean region. Good practices and challenges in improving social protection systems, policy frameworks, and operational protocols will be shared among participating countries, extending the impact beyond the direct participants of this project. This exchange will create a dynamic platform for mutual learning and collaboration, enabling countries to adapt and implement successful strategies in their own contexts. By connecting stakeholders across the region, this activity will enrich the capacity-building efforts initiated in Activity 2.1 and foster a wider regional network of resilience, driving progress toward more resilient and adaptive social protection systems throughout the Caribbean.

Activity 2.3: Generation of evidence that enables national partners to make informed decisions to build and strengthen shock-responsive SP systems and replicate successful and cost-effective approaches: This activity will focus on generating robust evidence to support national partners in making informed decisions that further build and strengthen shock-responsive social protection systems. Drawing on support from knowledgeable partners and building on evidence generation to date, key lessons will be captured to transform them into actionable evidence. This evidence will be tailored for use by policymakers and technical practitioners, ensuring that successful and cost-effective approaches can be replicated within participant countries and across the broader Caribbean region. The involvement of expert partner(s) will also contribute to the sustainability of project activities, as the insights and evidence produced will guide ongoing national decision-making and inform future capacity-building efforts, creating a lasting impact on the resilience and responsiveness of social protection systems.

Output 3 Support the implementation of Multi Hazard Early Warning Systems actions prioritized in country work programmes, and engagement of the private sector (UNDRR).

The primary goal of this project is to strengthen the Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS) in Suriname, Belize, Grenada, and St. Kitts and Nevis to enhance disaster resilience. By seamlessly integrating the planned activities, the project is dedicated to not only strengthening the MHEWS but also enhancing disaster response capabilities and promoting a culture of long-term disaster resilience in the region, including active engagement with key stakeholders such as the private sector. The project will also emphasize inclusion, gender, women's empowerment, persons with disabilities, youth and others with a view to reaching communities on the ground and empowering actors through the process. This ambitious objective will be pursued through the strategic implementation of two key activities.

Activity 3.1: Developing of MHEWS Gaps Analyses and Roadmaps: The ultimate goal of this activity is to improve multi hazard early warning systems to expand coverage and the effectiveness of such systems. In order to do so countries need to assess their capacities and needs to address the gaps with regards to existing systems.

This activity will develop and implement gap analyses and roadmaps for implementing Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS) in Suriname, Belize, Grenada, and St. Kitts and Nevis. This involves a comprehensive process to identify deficiencies in the essential components of MHEWS,

followed by the development of strategic roadmaps to address these gaps. The roadmaps will guide national and local governments in enhancing people-centred MHEWS, detailing specific activities and targeted investments. Developed in collaboration with national, regional, and international stakeholders, and coordinated by National Disaster Risk Management Organizations, these roadmaps will also contribute to efforts to secure support from international and regional financial mechanisms under the Early Warning for All Initiative (EW4All), such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF), Systematic Observations Financing Facility (SOFF), and Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS). This approach aligns with the goals of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030 and the Paris Agreement (2015).

Additionally, to ensure people centered process to leave no one behind the Inclusive Checklist and Implementation Guide for Inclusive Early Warning and Early Action will also be considered in support of governance mechanisms to ensure representativity as well as buy-in from key stakeholders. The purpose of the checklist and implementation guide is to ensure that the key elements of early warning systems (governance; disaster risk knowledge; detection, monitoring, analysis, and forecasting; dissemination and communication; and preparedness to respond) are gender-responsive and disability-inclusive. They provide support and direction for systematically integrating and monitoring gender and disability inclusivity across all actions related to warnings.

Activity 3.2: National and Regional private sector engagement on MHEWS and Recovery: This activity aims to enhance the sustainability, coverage, and usage of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS) by engaging the private sector, including EU companies, at the national and regional levels. Private sector entities, involved in critical infrastructure and essential consumer goods, can help expand MHEWS to remote areas and strengthen resilience through collaboration with the public sector. They increasingly implement MHEWS to protect operations from disasters and contribute to community resilience.

Private sector companies have specific market knowledge, which is essential for meeting immediate community needs and guiding the recovery process. During the response phase, they can quickly adapt services to ensure critical resource availability. As recovery efforts progress, businesses can leverage their market intelligence and logistical capabilities to restore supply chains, rebuild infrastructure, and support economic revitalization.

Considering the above, this activity will focus on engaging the private sector with a presence in Suriname, Belize, Grenada, St. Kitts, and Nevis with the support of the Private Sector Alliance for Disaster Resilient Societies (ARISE Network) and the Caribbean Chamber of Commerce (CARICHAM). The private sector will be actively involved in the development of the MHEWS gap analyses and roadmaps (activity 3.1) to identify private sector contributions to improve MHEWS and expand the use of such systems to increase its business resilience.

With support from the EU delegation, European businesses operating in or connected to Caribbean supply chains and the global gateway EU-driven initiative will also be identified and engaged. Focus will also be placed on the participation of companies that innovate and develop products and services directly related to early warning systems.

Additionally, at the regional level, a consultation will be facilitated with the ARISE regional Network led by CARICHAM to identify how the private sector can use its adaptability and innovation capabilities to address the gaps identified in Activity 3.1. This would involve integrating local enterprises into

service-driven business models for activities such as commissioning, maintenance, and operation of early warning systems, as well as for response and recovery actions.

Output 4: Strengthened policy, institutions, communities, governance, and financial mechanisms to plan and implement resilient recovery processes. (UNDP)

Activity 4.1: Review existing institutional arrangements, policies and practice for recovery. Institutionalization of recovery is a challenge in many countries. To be effective institutionalization requires more than recovery programmes and initiatives; it requires countries to have legal and policy frameworks and institutional arrangements in place that address the issues and requirements surrounding recovery. Institutional arrangements are fundamental because they affect the pace and quality of post-disaster recovery.

This activity will support the assessment of national institutional arrangements and policy and legal frameworks in place to examine how recovery is addressed within the wider DRM architecture in the country. The assessment report will propose institutional arrangement options, changes in policy and legal frameworks needed, checklist of key considerations for setting up recovery institutions as well as sample terms of reference for key staff involved in the recovery process. It is envisaged that the recommendations emerging from the institutional assessment will support activity 4.3 (financial mechanisms).

Activity 4.2: Application of and capacity building in participatory foresight approaches to inform preparedness for response and recovery. UNDP proposes to develop a set of future-looking and foresight decision intelligence tools following a highly participatory process with national stakeholders from various government ministries, agencies, and non-government organizations. The foresight tools can inform strategic planning, the identification of opportunities for transformation, and the anticipation and mitigation of critical risk as well as to enhance preparedness for recovery. These tools would examine the rippling impacts risks might have across the development and humanitarian perspective, presenting risk scenarios and levels of foresight to support future decision intelligence. The tools would support beneficiary governments to map and analyze the possible implications of risk scenarios on a country, municipality, or community; gain an understanding of the worst case, best case, and most likely case impact scenarios; and have an immediate insight as to what the implications for prevention and recovery could be.

The aim is to support an improved understanding of potential risk scenarios so government and development actors can adequately prepare for long-term, complex development challenges. It is about the analysis and evaluation of trade-offs among decision choices that stem from various scenarios considered that scenario planning for recovery would derive its highest value added. Additional spin-off decision intelligence tools that allow for a deep examination of a particular development sector could also be developed. These scenario-oriented tools would potentially examine everything from impacts on infrastructure to health services.

This activity will undertake the development of scenario-oriented tools for the project beneficiary countries to better understand or anticipate potential future impacts of singular or cascading hazards on key sectors and populations. The findings will inform recovery planning as well as other DRR needs.

Activity 4.3: Promote Financial Mechanisms for Recovery. National level assessment to understand the public financial management of disasters with the intent of providing a Financial Preparedness Plan. The Financial Preparedness Plans will examine existing sources of financing for recovery,

existing legal and institutional frameworks for disaster risk financing (linked to findings from activity 4.1), funding gap estimates based on past disasters and projected impacts (linked to findings from activity 4.2) and provide recommendations for alternative financing instruments suited to the country context. The Financial Preparedness plans promote ex-ante disaster risk financing strategy to mitigate the financing uncertainty experienced by governments in the event of a disaster. The disaster risk financing strategy may include risk retention mechanisms such as disaster funds or contingency credit and risk transfer instruments such as sovereign insurance or catastrophic bonds which are applicable to different layers of risk.

Activity 4.4: Improve community level recovery preparedness. The impact of disasters, climate change and epidemics and their inter-linkages with development manifests itself acutely at the local level in the lives and livelihood of rural populations. To exacerbate this, most Caribbean countries face challenges in scaling-up DRR interventions at the community level due to their disconnections from the local development planning process and insufficient financial resources.

This activity will improve recovery preparedness in highly vulnerable communities through training of communities in recovery and disaster resilient construction technologies and practices, with priority given to developing the skills of youth and women. The most vulnerable communities in selected beneficiary countries may also be supported in the reconstruction of critical community infrastructures such roads, bridges, community centers, markets, and houses to be resilient and green approaches. The initiative will also explore opportunities and the possibility for jump starting local economic recovery through circular economy opportunities. Other support may also include preparation of community-based recovery plans, local PDNA training, cash for work activities and/or youth skills training.

Output 5: Enhanced capacities in using digital tools for conducting Post Disaster Needs Assessment and developing Recovery Frameworks. (UNDP)

Activity 5.1: Build national capacities to undertake and adapt PDNA and DRF methodologies to national context and selected sectors using most recent digital tools. The success of disaster recovery processes hinges on national and sub-national governments' ownership, leadership and technical capacities to undertake post-disaster assessments and manage recovery planning and implementation efficiently. An important dimension in recovery processes include data collection, analysis and reporting capabilities.

Training workshops and seminars will be organized to enhance the knowledge of government officials and other stakeholders on key PDNA and Disaster Recovery Framework (DRF) concepts and methodologies. It is expected that these trainings will be based on the updated PDNA guidelines that more holistically address Slow Onset Events (SOEs) from climate hazards and associated Non-Economic Losses (NELs). Training can also cover the Pandemic Recovery Needs Assessment (PRNA) methodology^[1], digital tools such as the use of remote sensing, kobo toolbox and other toolkits related to tracking and assessing losses related to sudden and slow onset climate events and both economic and non-economic losses.

Participants will be staff from key partner organizations, government officials, community organizations and private sector actors involved in national recovery practices. Within the scope of each training, efforts will be made to include UN Agencies and EU Delegation staff working in the region or country, to further bolster the network of technical resources available to support post disaster assessment. Context specific training will be developed; and there are already examples from other PDNA trainings conducted in the LAC region including: Colombia, Costa Rica, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Suriname and regional entities such as the University of West Indies (UWI) and CDEMA.

In addition, PDNA Standards Operating Procedures (SOPs) will also be adapted to national contexts and specific sectors following the internationally accepted methodologies developed by tripartite (UN, EU and WB) partners. This adaptation process will enable better consolidation of baseline data and standardized data collection templates for priority sectors and institutionalize these assessment processes as part of recovery preparedness efforts in the countries. It is envisaged that **each beneficiary country will develop country context PDNA guides, including at the sectoral level**. Countries where PDNA/DRF training have already taken place are eligible for the PDNA adaptation phase. Priority sectors will be determined in consultation with countries and the EU.

Activity 5.2: Guidelines for recovery that improves recovery implementation. The DRF calls for a process that involves articulating a vision for recovery, defining a strategy, prioritizing actions, fine-tuning planning and providing guidance on financing, implementing and monitoring the recovery. Drawing upon the purpose and structure of the generic DRF Guide, the sector specific DRF guide will be developed to assist national and local governments, relevant private sector partners, inter-governmental organizations and implementing partners in developing a sectorial DRF comprising sector-focused effective and efficient recovery programmes for the sector. The Guide is expected to be concise and action-oriented and provide critical direction for senior advisors/planners or decision-makers on sector recovery matters. Key steps leading to recovery and reconstruction in the priority sector(s) including cross-cutting themes such as Build Back Better and Disaster Risk Reduction will be elaborated in the guide along with possible actions for the immediate, short-term or medium-term stages of recovery and reconstruction. Notable examples already exist in the Caribbean and other SIDS, where DRF guides have been developed for Panama and Fiji. Countries where PDNA/DRF training has already taken place are eligible for the PDNA adaptation phase. At least a **national context and 2 priority sectors in each beneficiary country will develop DRFs** that provide guidance on financing, implementing and monitoring recovery for the sector. Priority sectors will be determined in consultation with countries and the EU.

Activity 5.3: Knowledge and technological innovation harnessed for recovery management (development of case studies, lessons learned and best practices) Several knowledge products will be developed in the context of this project to inform the practice of recovery in the Caribbean context. Targeted efforts will be made towards the documentation of lessons and best practices and dissemination across CDEMA countries. For instance, case studies of the experiences of beneficiary countries in undertaking PDNAs and/or recovery programmes and practices will be undertaken. This will help countries assess, adjust and adapt to their uses of the PDNA methodologies in future disasters, and other countries adopt the best practices and avoid the bottlenecks identified.

Opportunities for interaction and cross-fertilization between communities of practice in recovery will also be promoted and supported by the project. This includes peer-to-peer exchanges between beneficiary countries and, where possible, participation and exchanges in recovery related conferences such as the 2025 Global Platform, CDEMA CDM Conferences, EU Development Day etc.

4 The logical Framework

Annex 1

5 The implementation plan (joint matrix)

Annex 2

6 Governance and Management

The project will be steered by different governance and management mechanisms, at strategic, implementation, and country level.

- **Strategic governance:** Annual steering committee with UNDP, UNDRR, WFP, UNICEF, EU, CDEMA and selected countries (if needed), at the end of each implementation year. The purpose will be to review progress, address challenges and approve the next year's work plan and budget.
- **Implementation coordination:** Quarterly meetings with technical and operational teams across UNDP, UNDRR, WFP and UNICEF. There will be an open invitation for the EU to participate in these meetings. Bi-monthly online check-ins of 30 minutes will also be organized between all parts to discuss specific activities. The purpose will be to ensure synchronization and complementarity of activities by the different agencies under each output, guaranteeing efficient use of resources and effective delivery of the results.
- **Country coordination:** It will be defined during the inception phase of the project, leveraging existing mechanisms determining division of labour at country level. Country coordination meetings will also include other relevant stakeholders.

The implementing partners have divided their tasks into the following sectors:

1. Reporting Lead: WFP – the agency as the LEAD Implementing Partner in OPSYS – in charge of OPSYS consolidating reports
2. Communications Lead: UNDRR (the Steering Committee may decide to reassign it to another agency after the second year of implementation)
3. Knowledge Management coordinator: UNDP
4. Secretariat and general coordination: UNICEF

At the latest by the second quarter of the first year of implementation, the implementing partners will submit an implementation arrangement document detailing the content of each of the above tasks for review and approval by the EU.

7 Sustainability

The current project will be closely linked to ongoing Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), strengthening of social protection systems and recovery initiatives in the countries and regions, incrementally improving the overall system for disaster risk reduction and recovery. By aligning with national systems and

frameworks, the project will contribute to national commitments to deliver on Priority 4 of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, as well as SDG 1 (No Poverty) ensuring that these efforts are sustainable and embedded within existing national structures.

Emphasis will be placed on institutional capacity development and knowledge transfer, both of which are critical for building the awareness and skill sets necessary to build household resilience against shocks in an inclusive manner, advance recovery assessments and planning for resilient recovery. Linkages to policy and legal framework will further ensure the sustainability and viability of activities conducted. The project will produce documents, guidelines, and best practices that will be disseminated not only within the country but also to other CDEMA country offices, the IRP platform, and Tripartite Partners, as well as their respective websites, for broader assimilation and application. By ensuring that the PDNA and DRF guides are customized and adapted to national and regional contexts, the project will foster ownership at the national level, thereby promoting the sustainability of these initiatives and ensuring that they continue to strengthen disaster resilience well beyond the project's duration.

Results	Results chain (@): Main expected results (maximum 10)	Indicators (@): (at least one indicator per expected result)	Baselines (values and years)	Targets (values and years)	Sources of data	Assumptions
Impact	To increase the resilience to external shocks in Caribbean countries ²	1. Direct economic loss attributed to disasters concerning global gross domestic product (GDP) SDG 11.5.1. GEF 1.4 <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IPs M&E system based on data from Small Island Developing States (SIDS)	Not applicable
		2. Damage to critical infrastructure and disruptions to basic services attributed to disasters. SDG 11.5.3 <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IPs M&E system based on data from targeted SIDS	
		3. Number of deaths, missing persons and directly affected persons attributed to disasters in the target city per 100,000 population SDG 13.1.13 <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IPs M&E system based on data from targeted SIDS	
Outcome	Enhanced Caribbean inclusive Shock Responsive Social Protection schemes to adapt, prevent, minimise impacts, and recover from external shocks.	1.1 Number of countries and cities with climate change and/or disaster risk reduction strategies under implementation with EU support GERF 2.5. SDG13.1.2 <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	National and city strategy documents	Disaster risk management is considered a priority for achieving SDGs and CARICOM agendas. Key government departments line ministries, and other stakeholders are interested in strengthening disaster risk governance and integrated solutions were learnt. Multi-stakeholder regional coordination around SRSP is ensured to capitalise results. The effects of external shocks such as new pandemics, economic recession and corruption, gender-based violence, climate change impacts, and natural
		1.2 Total value (in EUR) of resilience investment projects (including <i>Disaster Risk Management (DRM)</i> or adaptation to climate change projects) in targeted countries. <i>Disaggregated by country and type of project.</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IPs M&E system based on data from targeted SIDS	
		1.3 Extent to which targeted Caribbean partner countries implement Comprehensive Disaster Management policies and strategies. <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Periodic country analysis by UN agencies.	
		1.4 % of key stakeholders' representatives who consider that the shock-responsive mechanisms supported by the intervention have improved preparedness to adapt, prevent, minimise impacts, and recover from external shocks <i>Disaggregated by country, target group, sex</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Baseline and periodic surveys by UN Agencies	
		1.5 Extent to which the EU-funded intervention contributed to extend/maintain the inclusivity of national social protection strategy and delivery mechanisms <i>Disaggregated by country, sex, gender, target group,</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Baseline and periodic surveys by UN Agencies	

² Partner countries to be determined among: Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, and Trinidad and Tobago.

³ In line with the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030

						catastrophes are neutral for the intervention.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Output 1	Strengthened capacities of social protection programmes and systems in Caribbean countries⁴ to provide effective, integrated, digitalised support to vulnerable people affected by shocks (WFP & UNICEF)	1.1.1 Status of the Shock Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) <i>institutionalization</i> in partner countries, including the legal framework, plans, Information Management Systems, Grievance Redress Mechanisms, financing and delivery/cash-based systems. <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	Not institutionalized (Year 1)	Institutionalized (Year 4)	WFP and UNICEF periodic assessments.	Governments maintain an ongoing engagement on DRM and CCA and with the institutionalisation of Shock Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Large-scale shocks support is adapted to the needs of affected communities.
		1.1.2 Extent to which a mechanism is in place for rapid resource mobilisation/release of contingency funds to scale up provision at time of shock EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	WFP and UNICEF's Progress reports	
		1.1.3 Number of vulnerable households (vulnerable children and their families) supported by the intervention through integrated delivery of cash, care, and services in response to large-scale shocks. <i>Disaggregated by country, community.</i>	0 (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	WFP and UNICEF's Progress reports	
		1.1.4 Extent to which the EU-funded intervention proposes digital solutions for improving the interoperability of key social protection programmes, processes and information systems and the convergence with the other social sectors' digital frameworks. EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Pre- and post-training test reports	
Output 2	Strengthened Caribbean institutions and key stakeholders⁵ in making evidence-based policy and operational	2.2.1 Number of countries which have benefitted from EU support to strengthen their social protection systems. GERF 2.31. <i>Disaggregated by country</i>	0 (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IP's Progress reports	Governments have the institutional capacity to support the activities to share information and promote cooperation between national institutions.
		2.2.2 Number of people trained by the EU-funded intervention who increased their knowledge and/or skills (disaggregated by sex and age) EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by country, target group, institution/organisation, sex</i>	0 (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Pre- and post-training test reports	
		2.2.3 Number of people benefitting from EU-funded sub-grants projects (disaggregated by sex and age) EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by group, institution, country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	IP's Progress reports	

⁴ Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Kitts and Nevis, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago.

⁵ Stakeholders and target groups include 1) governmental institutions at all levels (ministries in charge of national disaster risk management, climate change, biodiversity, planning and finance, health, education, social protection and other relevant government institutions, at regional (CDEMA, OECS, and CDB), national and sub-national levels); 2) private sector (insurance companies, private sector investors, finance providers, business associations, small and medium enterprises) and 3) non-governmental organizations and institutions (academia and civil society organizations (CSOs) and communities, including women and youth).

	decisions to improve their social protection systems (WFP & UNICEF)	2.2.4 Percentage of participants in South-South exchange, and inter-governmental collaboration in lessons-learning in social protection who state satisfaction/high satisfaction with usefulness of the exchanges.	0 % (Year 1)	80%? (Year 4)	IP's Progress reports	
Output 3	Strengthened Caribbean institutions and private sector capacities for the implementation of Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems (MHEWS) in-country work programmes⁶ (UNDRR)	3.3.1 Status of available MHEWS Gap Analysis and Roadmaps that include a gender and disability perspective with the intervention's support to be eligible to gain assistance from the EW4All Initiative. <i>Disaggregated by country, institution/organisations involved.</i>	Not available (Year 1)	available (Year 2)	MHEWS Gap Analysis and Roadmaps documents	Local, national and regional stakeholders continue engaged in MHEWS activities. The private sector continues engaged and seeks return opportunities in shocks recovery.
		3.3.2 Percentage of local, national and regional stakeholders' representatives engaged in MHEWS who state satisfaction/high satisfaction with the concerted MHEWS Gap Analysis and Roadmaps . <i>Disaggregated by country, institution/organisations involved, sex</i>	0% (Year 1)	80% (Year 2)	Periodic surveys by UNDRR	
		3.3.3 Number of proposals submitted to international and regional financial mechanisms under the Early Warning for All Initiative (EW4All ⁷), <i>Disaggregated by country, sector, applicant</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 2)	UNDRR's Progress reports	
		3.3.4 Number of initiatives implemented with the support of or by the private sector in support of MHEWS and recovery with the intervention's support. <i>Disaggregated by country, community, firm.</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 2)	UNDRR's Progress reports	
Output 4	Strengthened Caribbean institutions and communities' policy, governance and finance capacities to plan and implement	4.4.1 Status of planning and/or implementation of <i>resilient recovery processes</i> supported by the intervention (capacity assessments, preparedness financial mechanisms, multi-dimensional risks plans, community recovery preparedness plans, community infrastructure constructed). <i>Disaggregated by country and type: governance arrangements, policies, SOPs/Plans, strategies</i>	Not plan or implemented (Year 1)	Planned and Implemented (Year 4)	UNDP's Progress reports	National and local governments use the intervention as a way to enhance frontline support to vulnerable communities. Communities'
		4.4.2 Number of persons trained who increased their	TBD in the	TBD in	Pre- and post-training test	

⁶ Suriname, Belize, Grenada, and St. Kitts and Nevis

⁷ Such as the Green Climate Fund (GCF), Systematic Observations Financing Facility (SOFF), and Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems (CREWS).

	resilient recovery processes (UNDP)	knowledge and/or skills on recovery planning and preparedness. <i>Disaggregated by target groups, sex, age, country, community</i>	inception phase (Year 1)	the inception phase (Year 4)	reports	continued ownership and participation in the intervention's activities.
		4.4.3 Number of affected communities participating in the identification, preparation and implementation of post-disaster/post-conflict recovery planning and action. EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by vulnerable group (women/minorities) representatives</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Participation lists	
		4.4.4 Percentage of affected communities' representatives who state satisfaction/high satisfaction with the intervention's support in resilient recovery. <i>Disaggregated by country, community, sex, ethnic/social group.</i>	0% (Year 1)	80%? (Year 4)	Periodic surveys by UNDP	

Output 5	Enhanced Caribbean Countries' capacities in conducting Post Disaster Needs Assessment and developing Recovery Frameworks (UNDP)	5.5.1 Number of national government officials trained in PDNA and DRF methodologies who increased their knowledge and/or skills. <i>Disaggregated by sex, age, country, institution.</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Pre- and post-training test reports	Governments and their officials continue engaged in the capacity-building and update and upgrade their skills and methods on PDNA and DRF. Trained officials remain in their posts.
		5.5.2 Percentage of key stakeholders' representatives who state satisfaction/high satisfaction with the adaptation of PDNA and DRF methodologies to their national and sectors contexts <i>Disaggregated by target groups, institution/organisation sex, age, country</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	Periodical surveys by UNDP	
		5.5.3 Extent to which guidelines, tools and methodologies for Post Disaster / Post Conflict Needs Assessment (PDNA/PCNA) recovery planning are available. EU Core Indicator. <i>Disaggregated by type of guidelines, sector, country.</i>	TBD in the inception phase (Year 1)	TBD in the inception phase (Year 4)	UNDP's qualitative analysis	

Activity Matrix

Output 1

Activity 1.1: Support the enabling environment for the development, strengthening and institutionalization of SRSP (policies, strategies and legal frameworks)

Activity 1.2: Strengthen planning, design and implementation of cash-based assistance to respond to shocks and support the most vulnerable and affected households.

Activity 1.3: Develop and strengthen social protection delivery systems, including digital options for enhanced and more accountable programme operation

Activity 1.4: Provide operational support to social and child protection systems for increased integrated delivery of cash, care, and services support to respond to large-scale shocks affecting vulnerable children and their families.

Activity 1.5: Develop strategies, options and tools for shock-responsive social protection financing.

Output 2

Activity 2.1: Build, maintain, and transform capacities on shock-responsive social protection (training, change management support, tailored courses).

Activity 2.2: Foster South-South learning and exchange

Activity 2.3: Generate evidence that enables national partners to make informed decisions to build and strengthen shock-responsive SP systems and replicate successful and cost-effective approaches.

Output 3

Activity 3.1: Develop MHEWS Gaps and Roadmaps that include a gender and disability perspective

Activity 3.2: Foster private sector engagement on MHEWS and Recovery

Output 4

Activity 4.1: Review existing institutional arrangements, policies and practice for recovery.

Activity 4.2: Application of and capacity building in participatory foresight approaches to inform preparedness for response and recovery

Activity 4.3: Promote Financial Mechanisms for Recovery.

Activity 4.4: Improve community-level recovery preparedness.

Output 5

Activity 5.1: Build national capacities to undertake and adapt PDNA and DRF methodologies to national context and selected sectors using most recent digital tools.

Activity 5.2: Develop guidelines/roadmaps for recovery that improves recovery implementation.

Activity 5.3: Foster knowledge and technological innovation for recovery management

Results	Main expected results	Activity	Countries	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4			
				Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1 (UNICEF & WFP)	Social protection programmes and systems in targeted countries are strengthened and better able to respond and provide effective, integrated support to vulnerable people affected by extreme weather events and other shocks	Activity 1.1: Support the enabling environment (both regional and national), institutionalization of SRSP (governance, policies)	Grenada, Dominica, Antigua and Barbuda, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Lucia, SKN, Trinidad and Tobago	Inception Phase															
		Activity 1.2: Strengthen planning, design and implementation of cash-based assistance to respond to shocks and support most vulnerable and affected households (data, targeting, transfer amounts, M&E etc.)	Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines																
		Activity 1.3: Developing and strengthening social protection delivery systems (SP Information	Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname,																

		Management Systems, GRM, payment solutions etc), including digital options for enhanced and more accountable programme operation	Trinidad and Tobago, Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba																	
		Activity 1.4: Operational support to social and child protection systems for increased integrated delivery of cash, care and services support to respond to large scale shocks affecting vulnerable children and their families	Grenada, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Lucia, St Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago																	
		Activity 1.5: Development of strategies, options and tools for shock responsive social protection financing	Belize, St Kitts and Nevis, Trinidad & Tobago, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Jamaica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines																	
		Activity 2.1: Build, maintain, and transform capacities on shock responsive social protection (training, change management	Regional																	
Output 2 (UNICEF & WFP)	Stakeholders' capacities and evidence are strengthened to make evidence-based policy and operational																			

Output 3 (UNDRR)	decisions to improve the social protection system and make it more responsive to shocks	support, tailored courses)																	
		Activity 2.2: South-South learning and exchange	Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, St Kitts and Nevis, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Cuba																
		Activity 2.3: Generation of evidence that enables national partners to make informed decisions to build and strengthen shock responsive SP systems and replicate successful and cost-effective approaches.	Regional																
	Support the implementation of Multi Hazard Early Warning Systems actions prioritized in country work programmes	Activity 3.1: Developing of MHEWS Gaps and Roadmaps	Grenada, Jamaica, SKN, Suriname																
		Activity 3.2: Private sector engagement on MHEWS and Recovery	Regional																
Output 4 (UNDP)	Strengthened policy, institutions,	Activity 4.1: Review existing institutional	Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Grenada, Belize and the Dominican Republic																

[illegible]

		Activity 5.2: Guidelines for Recovery that Improves recovery implementation.	Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Grenada, Belize and the Dominican Republic															
		Activity 5.3: Knowledge and technological innovation harnessed for recovery management (development of case studies, lessons learned and best practices)	Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Grenada, Belize, the Dominican Republic and Cuba															