

EVALUATION REPORT

"Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines"

Philip Emmanuel C. Peñaflor, MNSA

External Evaluator

NEDA

October 2008



[This Project was jointly implemented by National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) - Regional Development Office and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with financing coming from the European Commission's Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO)]

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

“Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines”

Content	Page
List of Acronyms	2
Executive Summary	4-6
I. Introduction	7
II. Objectives of the Evaluation	9
III. Methodology	11
IV. Findings	12
V. Conclusion	23
VI. Summary of Lessons Learned	26
VII. Recommended Action Points.....	27
Annexes	
A. Simplified FGD Questionnaire	30
B. Consolidated FGD Results.....	35
C. Summary of Ratings	45
D. Documents Reviewed	45
E. List of Participants	46

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADPC	Asian Disaster Preparedness Center
ARMM	Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao
CBDRM	Community-Based Disaster Management
CMDRR	Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction
CSCAND	Collective Strengthening of Community Awareness for Natural Disasters
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DCCs	Disaster Coordinating Councils
DILG	Department of Interior and Local Government
DIPECHO	European Commission's Disaster Preparedness Programme
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
GIS	Geographic Information System
IIRR	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
JMC	Joint Memorandum Circular
LCE	Local Chief Executive
LGUs	Local Government Units
MTPDP	Medium Term Philippine Development Plan
NDCC	National Disaster Coordinating Council
NFPP	National Framework on Physical Planning
NRO	NEDA Regional Office
OCD	Office of Civil Defense
PFRE	Project Final Review and Evaluation
PDPFP	Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan
PLPEM	Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management
PLUC	Provincial Land Use Committee
PPA	Programs, Projects and Activities
RDCS	Regional Development Coordination Staff
READY	Hazards Mapping and Assessment for Effective Community-Based Disaster Risk Management Project

RLUC	Regional Land Use Committee
RPFP	Regional Physical Framework Plan
UNDAC	United Nations Disaster Assessment and Coordination

Executive Summary

The “*Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines Project*”, aimed to minimize the adverse impact of natural disasters to communities in the Philippines by putting DRR as an integral part of sub-national planning processes, was implemented from June 2007 to May 2008. Part of the requisites of the project is a final evaluation at the end of project implementation.

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the project's performance and achievements, and its effects on the various sub-national level stakeholders. The methods employed were both secondary data gathering through documents review, and the gathering of primary data through the conduct of semi-structured interviews (SSI) and focus group discussions (FGD) with stakeholders. The data gathered were analyzed through triangulation.

Mainstreaming, as the integration of DRR perspective in sub-national plans, was achieved by the project. However, mainstreaming in its stricter sense, involves integration of DRR into the whole development planning process (i.e. analysis of the planning environment, identification of issues/goals/objectives/targets, formulation of strategies and PPAs, project evaluation and development, budgeting, expenditure management, investment programming, revenue generation, monitoring and evaluation and re- planning). The project only intended to cover integration up to the strategies and PPAs.

As designed the project has achieved its expected outputs, namely: **a)** A final draft of the Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM in Sub-National Development and Physical Framework Planning, **b)** The summary of the policy papers on *(a) geospatial data and information needed for DRM*; and *(b) recommendations on Improving DRR Mainstreaming in Sub-national Planning* are also available; **c)** 278 planners from the national government, regional line agencies and representatives from non-government organizations trained, exceeding the target 190 trainees, within five (5) trainings, exceeding the four (4) trainings originally planned to build capacities of sub-national planners to mainstream DRM into sub-national development planning; and **d)** Sixteen (16) region/province case studies which are initial assessments of hazard impacts and risk managements, which showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans; two selected sub-national action plans (i.e. RPFPs of Regions I & XIII) and one provincial plan (i.e. PDPFP of Surigao del Norte).

The following are some key conclusions that could be derived from this study:

On Relevance. The project is very relevant. The need for the project was established by the country's recent experiences of disasters that wrought havoc to lives, social, economic and environmental assets of communities.

On Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness. Overall, the project was efficient and cost-effective, with accomplishment exceeding the target, notwithstanding the decrease in approved budget and shortened timeframe.

On Effectiveness. On the one hand, mainstreaming, i.e. integration of DRR perspective in sub-national plans as designed, was achieved by the project. On the other hand, mainstreaming into the whole development planning process was introduced and even partly achieved.

On Sustainability. In all pilot areas the stakeholders have a positive acceptance of the project and expressed willingness and commitment to continue the project and feel that using existing structures, with support from DRR “champions”, the project will be sustainable.

Project Achievements. All the expected project outputs were achieved, NEDA committed to conduct all residual activities such as approval of the Guidelines by the Project Board, and the

approval of the DRR-enhanced sub-national development and land-use/physical plans by the RDCs/PDCs.

Implementation Approach. The project has shown logical tie-ups and links with both existing and forthcoming DRR initiatives, such as the READY Project, the PLPEM and the Climate Change Mainstreaming. Implementation arrangement was enhanced by the creation of the Experts Group Meeting and the commissioning of a UNDP consultant to harmonize perspective and relationships within the Experts' Group.

On Country Ownership/Driveness. There is a very clear country ownership or driveness. The current DRR mainstreaming project is not an isolated initiative but is linked-up with, or related to, other initiatives on DRR in the country. Moreover, the 2004-2010 Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) indicates disaster preparedness, mitigation and response as a priority of the Philippine government and intends to integrate disaster preparedness and management in development planning processes at all levels of governance.

On Stakeholder/Public Participation. Members of the land use committees at the national, regional and provincial level, staff of NEDA and other partner agencies were involved in the project implementation and were eventually capacitated in the process. The limitation in stakeholder participation was related to the mandate of the implementing agency (NEDA), that is, down to the provincial level only.

On Replication and Scaling-up. The stakeholders articulated readiness to scale-up, adapt, and localize the project.

On Monitoring and Evaluation. Coordination support was ably provided by the PMT/PST to ensure timely reporting/achievement of outputs.

The following are some practical recommendations gathered from the study:

1. **READY Project enhancing the DRR Mainstreaming Project** - the Disaster Management Plans (DMPs) and Contingency Plans (CPs) of the former can be incorporated into the MDPs/CLUPs, and these too, to be integrated into the PDPFPs.
2. **Phasing of two complementary projects need closer coordination** (i.e. Ready Project and DRR Mainstreaming), especially if each output is needed by the other.
3. **As technical requisites (i.e. official maps from authorized agencies only) can hamper the development of the sub-national plans, alternative sources (i.e. BSWM) should be considered.** With careful lobbying, OCD and DENR-NAMRIA, and other government agencies could be asked to consider the available maps at BSWM as "alternate official maps", in lieu of the official one, when the latter is not available.
4. **Enhance Inter-Agency Collaboration.** Constant meetings of the ad hoc experts' group contributed to the gradual leveling-off of perspectives from different collaborating agencies and, thereby, facilitated better exchanges among said agencies. In the future similar mechanisms could be established or instituted to further enhance inter-agency collaboration, exchange of data and mutual support.
5. **Entry points are defined but planners indicated that they need more practice in the actual integration.** From the design to the project implementation phase, longer time needed to absorb technical knowledge on GIS; and adequate time for the preparation of the plan should have been considered.

6. **Need to strengthen top-down and bottom-up linkage.** The involvement of LGUs, local line agencies, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and even communities, for a bottom-up approach, should be encouraged especially in providing more accurate data and in determining disaster-prone areas and their historical trends. In the long term sustainability is ensured if there is greater ownership by those who are directly affected by the project. The challenge lies in effectively engaging local stakeholders as critical players in the DRR Mainstreaming process and in development planning as a whole.
7. **In scaling-up, replication and localization,** the following are some practical recommendations:
 - a. the 278 local planners who have been trained under the project, and, therefore, are expected to become the agents or instruments for "technology transfer", i.e. as trainers, need to be equipped with further skills training through a training of trainers or a training of facilitators.
 - b. there were recommendations on the ground to tap the academe and NGOs which have related and/or relevant expertise and capabilities, in the provision of technical assistance/service inputs.
8. **Regional-Provincial-Municipal-Barangay vertical linkages.** On mainstreaming, it is recognized that the project intended to cover only the phases up to the development of strategies and PPAs, and not to go into the full cycle of the whole development planning process. It is recommended that a modeling of a Regional-Provincial-Municipal-Barangay working link be tested in the next phase of the project, in order to look into the effectiveness of the vertical linkages of the planning process.
9. **Consistency in the use of the DRR terminology** and develop an appropriate design to internalize the paradigm shift from disaster response to preparedness.
10. **LCE's to buy-in the DRR mainstreaming effort** -- close coordination among agencies is needed. Aside from projects being implemented by International NGOs (INGOs), attention may be given to local initiatives, especially those coming from the LGUs. Pursuant to JMC1, DILG at the Regional, Provincial and City/Municipal level may be engaged in the DRR Mainstreaming Process. NEDA and DILG may put together a MOA leading to the synchronized mainstreaming process of DRR- and the soon-to-be-implemented Climate Change Initiative.

I. Introduction

1. Basic Information

The Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines Project, hereinafter referred to as **the Project**, aimed to minimize the adverse impact of natural disasters to communities in the Philippines by putting DRR as an integral part of the planning process of regions and provinces.¹

The Project came up with the Guidelines for the preparation of DRR-enhanced Regional Physical Framework Plan (RPFP) and Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan (PDPFP). Sixteen 16 region/province case studies (a.k.a. Preliminary Assessments of Hazard Impacts and Risk Managements) which showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans were developed from table-top exercises. Regional and local planners were trained on the use of the said guidelines. Two RPFPs and one PDPFP were produced by the project.

The Project was jointly implemented by National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) - Regional Development Office and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with financing coming from the European Commission's Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO) and some counterpart funds and personnel from UNDP and NEDA.

A Project Board composed of NEDA, UNDP, concerned agencies in local planning and DRR and representatives from the local government units provided the policy-level component. The Board aims to assess the progress of the Project, take decisions on recommendations, and provide directions to improve the design and implementation of the project in order to achieve the expected results. This is composed of NEDA-RDO as chair, NDCC-OCD, DENR-MGB, DOST-PAGASA, PHILVOLCS, DILG, HULRB and the League of Provinces of the Philippines. The European Commission sits as an observer.

Local consultants were hired to form the Project Study Team (PST), composed of: (a) Team Leader, (b) Urban and Regional Planner, (c) DRM Expert, (d) GIS Expert, and (e) Technical Reviewer. On the other hand, the Project Management Team (PMT) was set up with the NEDA-RDCS Director as the Project Manager, and her staff as members.

NEDA Regional Offices (NROs) formed the core teams at the regional and provincial level, to assist in the actual plan preparation and provide direct assistance to pilot regions and province.

The Project duration was 11 months (June 15, 2007 to May 15, 2008), and the target beneficiaries were the (1) land use planners at the sub-national level, (2) Regional Land Use Committees and selected Provincial Land Use Committees, and (3) Regional Economic and Development Planning Board of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao².

¹ Inception Report, "Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines", NEDA-UNDP, November 2007

² Representatives of the Regional Economic and Development Planning Board of the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao were among the participants of the training conducted by the Project.

2. Background

With the growing recognition of the effects of disasters on development, there is now a paradigm shift from disaster response to disaster risk reduction. The strengthening of disaster mitigation initiatives to reduce the adverse impact of future onslaught of disasters was the major concern discussed during the meeting of the National Land Use Committee (NLUC) on 15 March 2006. The NLUC saw the need for hazard maps and other technical information to be made available and become integral components of sub-national and local plans to ensure the appropriate use of land. Furthermore, it was also recognized that Local Government Units (LGUs) should be capacitated in terms of analyzing and understanding these technical maps and sets of information for them to be able to institute appropriate preventive measures.

Following said meeting, the NLUC gave instructions for the RLUC to prepare disaster risk management (DRM) components of the RPFs which will provide for the identification of the communities at risk and the immediate setting up of purposive actions for the resettlement or relocation of communities, if warranted, and the application of any appropriate mitigation technologies, as deemed necessary.

Mainstreaming DRR in sub-national plans is in line with the Hyogo Framework for Action – the global plan for DRR efforts, aimed at substantially decreasing disaster losses by 2015 – in lives, in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries. Specifically, it deals with (a) ensuring that disaster reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation; and, (b) reducing the underlying risk factors.

Through the READY Project, (a.k.a. Hazards Mapping and Assessment for Effective Community-Based Disaster Risk Management Project); UNDP provided funds for the conduct of a DRM forum for NEDA central and regional offices. This forum was held on 20 September 2006. Said forum was intended to: (1) increase the knowledge and skills of NEDA to become more effective partners for DRM and instill in them the shift from a reactive to a proactive response in dealing with natural hazards; (b) inform and familiarize NEDA on hazard areas/sites in the regions; and (c) provide an avenue for sharing experiences, ideas and technical knowledge.

Groundworking started in April 2007, with the search committee being convened to commission Project Consultants. In lieu of an international expert, five local experts were hired by the Project. After the final approval in July 2007, the Project was able to make its first disbursements. Consultations and data gathering started in August- November 2007; followed by the development of the DRR Mainstreaming framework in November-December 2007. The Inception Mission was done in September-November the same year, seeing the finalized methodology materialize in December 2007. From January-February 2008, the guidelines were disseminated and the pilot areas were oriented as to its utilization. The preparation of the RPFs and the PDPF were done in March-April 2008. The Project Finally wrapped up in May 2008.

II. Objectives of the Evaluation

The Project Final Review and Evaluation (PFRE) will generate new knowledge for and increase the capacity of stakeholders, from the donors to the project management, the partners and the beneficiaries towards aggressively pursuing similar initiatives to achieve the project's long-term goal of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction in the local development planning process.

The PFRE will provide the following outputs for the donors, the project management as well as all other project stakeholders interested in the output:

- Final Review Report
- Project Ratings Summary
- Feedback for all Stakeholders

The 11-month mainstreaming project will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. **Relevance.** The extent to which the Technical Assistance (TA) is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipients and donors.
2. **Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness.** Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs, costs and implementing time. It is an economic term which signifies that the technical assistance provided used the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.
3. **Effectiveness.** A measure of the extent to which the technical assistance attains its objectives. This includes an analysis of the attainment of outcomes and impacts, project objectives, and delivery and completion of project outputs and activities as shown by the project success indicators.
4. **Sustainability.** Sustainability measures the benefits of an activity that are likely to continue after the project has been completed and no more donor funding is available.
5. **Project Achievements.** Evaluate the achievements of the project against the expected project outcomes taking into consideration the various factors that contributed to the successful implementation of the project.
6. **Implementation Approach.** Analyze the project's approach vis-à-vis the development problems being addressed, adaptation to changing conditions, partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design and overall project management.
7. **Country Ownership/Drivenness.** This shows the relevance of the project to national development and disaster risk management agenda, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable.
8. **Stakeholders Participation/Public Involvement.** Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions or other bodies that have interest or stake in the outcome of this project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by the project.
9. **Replication and Scaling-Up Approach.** Based on the lessons and experiences in the project, this is the process of duplicating the design and implementation in adjacent communities and other sectors to create a multiplier effect that will expand the coverage of DRM principles and practices.
10. **Monitoring & Evaluation.** Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data and stakeholder participation. Any issues related to quality of backstopping and quality assurance and control of project deliverables listed in the project document should be addressed in this section.

Likewise, the FPRE aimed to generate the following:

Performance Assessment

To assess the project's performance and achievements vis-à-vis the project's overall objectives and to conduct an assessment on the effects of the project on the various sub-national level beneficiaries. Each of the detailed key questions and issues will be analyzed in a participatory, collaborative and systems-based approach using appropriate key review criteria. This assessment will also include an analysis of the capacity of the management structures of the implementing agency(ies) and target communities to implement the project activities as well as the monitoring and evaluation system.

Lessons Learned

To generate lessons learned from the implementation of the project's activities and the outcomes achieved that will be useful for similar projects in the future for the same sector. Based on the findings and conclusions from the assessment of the project's achievements, the review will identify lessons learned.

Recommendations

To develop specific recommendations for major stakeholder groups anchored on the conclusions the different stakeholder groups will develop based on their own recommendations and insights. An action plan for major stakeholder groups shall be developed to promote sustainability and long-term impact to the beneficiary communities.

III. Methodology

The following were the steps undertaken in implementing the evaluation activity:

- A. Review of Project Documents
- B. Briefing with the Project Implementers³
- C. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)
- D. Key Informant Interviews
- E. Observation

The evaluation was designed to be participatory in terms of joint reflection and analysis of the project performance through focus group discussion sessions (FGDs). Even the formulation of the FGD questions was done in a participatory manner where the evaluators presented the initial list of the FGD questions to the Project Implementers for pre-testing and fine-tuning. The members of the PMT/PST then suggested how to improve the FGD questions. In San Fernando, La Union, the members of the core team made recommendations on how to further simplify the FGD questions and also how to enhance the evaluation process.

Below were the mechanics of the FGD workshops that were disseminated to the target evaluation participants in the selected pilot evaluation sites. A simplified questionnaire was attached to the mechanics for the stakeholders reflection:

1. The External Evaluation Workshop/Focus Group Discussion (FGD) will be conducted as part of the "Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-national Development and Physical Planning in the Philippines."
2. The FGD participants will be comprised of the selected pilot areas namely, NEDA Regional Office (NRO) I, NRO XIII, Provincial Planning and Development Office of Surigao del Norte and representatives from the Regional Land Use Committees/ Provincial Land Use Committee.
3. The participants will be divided into two (2) groups where they will share the set of FGD questions (**Annex A**). The two workshop groups will discuss among themselves the sets of FGD questions which will be divided accordingly. They will select their own facilitator, reporter, and documenter.
4. This procedure aims to: 1) to engage the stakeholders in a post-reflection session of their experience with the project which is more in-depth rather than the usual question and answer approach in the FGD; and, 2) to provide an opportunity for the stakeholders to enhance their capacities in facilitating workshops for future replication of the mainstreaming project at the local level.

³ Project Implementers refer to the Project Management Team (PMT) and the Project Study Team (PST).

5. The evaluator and his colleague will assist the facilitator for each group. The NEDA-RDCS representative and project consultant will be asked to observe the process. Their observations will be included in the final report.
6. The participants will subjectively rate the evaluation indicators based on their responses to the FGD questions. This procedure will assist the evaluator in rating the project.
7. The output of each group will be shared at the plenary session to validate the answers.

In La Union (NEDA/RLUC Region I), the participants were divided into two groups to reflect on the FGD questions. However, due to the unavailability of the venue, the plenary was not conducted but the participants agreed to just submit to the evaluators the result of their FGD activity for collation.

In Butuan (NEDA/RLUC Region XIII), the participants decided not to divide the group into two due to the limited number of participants who came to the evaluation activity.

In Surigao (PPDO/PLUC), the group was divided into two for separate FGDs as in La Union, and a plenary session was held. In this case, the Evaluators assisted the group facilitators in expounding on the meaning of the FGD questions.

Some ocular visits to disaster-prone areas were conducted by the Evaluation Team together with the representatives of the PMT/PST and the core team in each of the pilot areas in La Union, Butuan and in Surigao Del Norte.

IV. Findings

The findings basically come from three sources: information from the project implementers, from the FGDs with stakeholders in the field and the review of related documents. However the information from these sources are presented in a triangulated manner, meaning already as a result of comparison and integration, except when specified from a distinct source. Distinction is also provided in the results of the FGDs by the matrices incorporated in this report (i.e. consolidated results of the FGDs with the different stakeholders found in Annex B). Findings is further refined through a debriefing with the Project Implementers, individually through KIIs, and as a group where major points were clarified. In the spirit of participatory evaluation and appreciative inquiry, the agreement was that the evaluation criteria will be viewed from two perspectives: that from achieving the target outputs/outcomes of the project, and that from the concept of mainstreaming per se.

Relevance

The extent to which the Technical Assistance (TA) is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipients and donors.

The participatory process of the project was limited to the provincial stakeholders, because the other identified local target groups, i.e. land use planners at the city/municipal level, are not within the mandate of the implementing agency.

Initially, 3 sets of target groups were identified in the original Project Document. However, only the members of one group, (i.e. the RLUC/PLUC) were fully engaged in the Project's mainstreaming effort, up to the level of the integration of the inputs of the disaster risk assessment into the analysis of the planning environment and in the plan preparation. The land use planners (LUPs) at the sub-national level, which to our understanding includes the city/municipality level, were only involved in the training. The justification put forward why the LUPs at the sub-national level were not fully engaged was that the TA mandate of NEDA extends only up to the provincial level, and the disconnect does not warrant their full engagement.

The need for the project was established with the country's recent experiences of disaster that wrought havoc to lives, social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries.

The relevance of the project is established by previous assessments and studies conducted to look into the needs of the country to strengthen its preparedness capacities to address disasters. From the FGD with the Project Study Team and the Project Management Team (PMT/PST), it was noted that this need has already been felt since the aftermath of the 1990 earthquake that devastated northern Philippines, the 1991 Pinatubo eruptions, the more recent disasters in late 2004 in Real, Infanta and Gen. Nakar, and the landslide tragedy in Gingsaugon, Southern Leyte in early 2006.

The following were the previous assessments conducted related to establishing the relevance of the project, to wit: 1) the assessment conducted by the UNDP for the Holistic Framework for Disaster and Environmental Hazards Management in June 2004, 2) the assessment conducted by the UN Disaster Assessment and Coordination (UNDAC) team from May to June 2005, and 3) the assessment conducted by the World Bank in June 2005 entitled "Natural Disaster Risk Management in the Philippines: Institutional Assessment". As explained in the project final report⁴, these assessments established the following needs:

- a. Need for more detailed guidelines on DRM
- b. Need for detailed DRM components of regional plans
- c. Low DRM capacity
- d. Need for coordination

The relevance of the project is further validated in the FGDs conducted with the stakeholders in the pilot areas. Disasters wreak great damages to lives and property, e.g. the yearly disasters in CARAGA (flooding and landslides), or the estimated 10 billion in damages due to disasters in the Surigao provinces the past 10 years. In Region I, the stakeholders felt that the project is very relevant, although they felt the need for more spatial data on more specific calamities like flooding.

Efficiency and Cost Effectiveness

Efficiency measures the outputs – qualitative and quantitative – in relation to the inputs, costs and implementing time. It is an economic term which signifies that the technical assistance provided used the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results.

Project was efficient, with accomplishment exceeding the target, notwithstanding the decrease in approved budget and shortened timeframe.

From the Project Interim Report, it can be gleaned that the fund that was requested from the European Community for the project was EUR 350.000 but the actual grant received was 319.000. The project implementers argued that the project implementation was efficient and cost effective because it exceeded its targets even with a diminished budget.

The first version of the original Project Document was submitted in May 2006, but was approved in July 2007. DIPECHO approved the same target, notwithstanding the fluctuation in the money market. Some adjustments have to be done, since the dollar exchange rate has plummeted from the expected rate of \$1=Php51 during project proposal submission to \$1=Php46.16 upon project's approval. Some financial adjustments had to be done in February 2008.

The project final report cited the accomplishment of 16 Regional Physical Framework Plans from the original eight (8) RFPs target, conduct of five (5) trainings of four (4) originally planned and 278 trained local planners of the 119 originally targeted. This is aside from the main outputs of

⁴ Explained in detail in the project's interim report, single form grant agreement, version 050412.

draft Guidelines for DRR mainstreaming and the two (2) RPFPs and one (1) PDPFP. The sixteen 16 region/province case studies developed from table-top exercised during the trainings/regional workshops were titled *Preliminary Assessments of Hazard Impacts and Risk Managements*.

It was also noted that the project outputs were delivered within the given timeframe despite the delay in the start of the implementation. It should be recalled that the project was supposed to be implemented for 14 months but due to delays in its approval the start-up date was late for three months, however, the same timeframe was followed and the project was completed in 11 months (i.e. from June 2007 to May 2008).

Expected project outputs for the first two quarters were considerably delivered, albeit some significant tilt in the administrative-based vs. activity-based expenditures.

The project implementers provided the External Evaluators with a copy of COA's audit report, which covered the review of revised quarterly work plan, quarterly financial reports and requests for direct payment and assessed them in terms of timeliness and their compliance with the project document or the revised work plan. Per COA's observation, the expected output (for the year) was substantially delivered in accordance with the work plan.

Based on the Annual Work Plan vs. Actual Accomplishments and Expenditure, the following burn rate vis-à-vis budget allocation for CY 2007 reflected the following figures, broken down into components:

1. Inception Phase – 67.21%
2. Component 1: Preparation of Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM – 5.82%
3. Component 2: Integration of DRM Components into sub-national plans – 0%
4. Project Monitoring – 0%
5. Project Management – 78.18%

According to a key informant, activities done during the 3rd and 4th quarter of 2007 included: commissioning of Consultants(July-Aug2007); Consultations and data gathering(Aug-Nov.2007); Inception Mission and refinements(Sept-Nov.2007); development of DRR Mainstreaming framework(Nov.-Dec.2007); and the finalization of DRR Mainstreaming methodology(Dec.2007).

For the 1st and 2nd quarter of 2008, the activities included dissemination of draft guidelines; training and preparation of the pilot areas; training on the use of the mainstreaming guidelines and table-top exercises/case studies; formulation of DRR-enhanced RPFP and PDPFP; preparation of progress and financial reports; external reports; process documentation and submission of final report.

Gauging on the accomplishments vs. burn-rate; above data revealed that there is fairly low fund utilization of activity-based budget (5.82%), as compared to the cost of managing said activities (78.18%). This is as good as having only 21% of the management budget, to cover 94% of the remaining field-based activities.

The COA report concluded that of the total budget for CY 2007, totaling Php7.27 million (USD 157,395), Php 4.74 (USD 107,297) was spent to achieve the outputs registering 65% financial delivery rate.

Effectiveness

A measure of the extent to which the technical assistance attains its objectives – this includes an analysis of the attainment of outcomes and impacts, project objectives, and delivery and completion of project outputs and activities as shown by the project success indicators.

Quantification of risk increases the chance of acceptability of mitigation proposals

According to the Inception Report, the output of the Disaster Risk Assessment or risk analysis must reflect cost that will not only reveal the magnitude of losses and damages when a disaster happen, but also should be used to assess and justify the implementation of the necessary intervention measures to mitigate and reduce the negative effects of the disaster. Ideally, the cost attendant to the mitigation is justified when such costs are far less than the estimated costs of damages and losses. The quantification of risks, therefore, will provide the basis for the social and political acceptability of mitigation proposals.

Looking at the Guidelines, the current estimated cost of damage and losses far exceeds the annual allocation for the national calamity fund. Such data will have an implication on the amount likely to be appropriated for Calamity Fund on the proposed DRM Bill.

GIS is very helpful in the visualization of DRR assessment outputs

To aid in the analysis of data, visualization tools were applied in order to derive various indicators of development and underdevelopment, problems, constraints as well as challenges and opportunities. A good feature of the Guidelines is on the use of an objective and systematic means of carrying out the risk assessment process through the use of Geographical Information System (GIS). GIS allows the integration of various data sets from different sources, and is a powerful visualization and evaluation tool able to provide concise means of presenting assessment results that will facilitate decision-making and policy formulation.

Stakeholders noted the insufficient physical inputs and time allocated for training and plan preparation as a constraint to a more effective project implementation.

The more explicit needs recognized in the project included the acquisition of facilities such as GIS server (computer unit), authentic GIS software and GPS instrument. However, stakeholders are wondering if their implicit needs were considered in the design, to name a few: (1) technology transfer to the municipal level of digital GIS mapping application; (2) acquisition of aerial images of the province; (3) longer time needed to absorb technical knowledge on GIS; and (4) longer time for the preparation of the plan.

To this comment, the Project Implementers suggested that LGUs and the other stakeholders should not only focus on the GIS software and hardware, but also on who is responsible to collect the information and how these information will be gathered and utilized, as well as on the institutional arrangements and methodologies for mainstreaming.

Mainstreaming, as the integration of DRR perspective in sub-national plans, was achieved by the project. However, mainstreaming in its stricter sense, involves integration of DRR into the whole development planning process (i.e. analysis of the planning environment, identification of issues/goals/objectives/targets, formulation of strategies and Programs, Projects and Activities (PPAs), project evaluation and development, budgeting, expenditure management, investment programming, revenue generation, monitoring and evaluation and re-planning). The project only intended to cover integration up to the strategies and PPAs.

From the perspective of the achievement of outputs/outcomes, the project was successful in the: (a) development of Guidelines for Mainstreaming DRR in Sub-national Plans; (b) conduct of five trainings; and, (c) formulation of 3 DRR-Enhanced RPFP/PDPFP. Add to this the sixteen region/province case studies (a.k.a. Preliminary Assessments of Hazard Impacts and Risk Managements) which showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans.

Cited from the Guidelines was UNDP's definition of mainstreaming, which states that "mainstreaming DRR is the process of assessing and integrating the implications of disaster risk

on any planned development action, from policy to program implementation, in all practice areas and at all levels" (UNDP, 2003). These practice areas include policies and strategies of development, geographic planning, institutional capacities, and external relations and project cycle development. (Tearfund, 2005)

Mainstreaming DRR does not end in the plan formulation process, but should be promoted towards plan implementation stages, that is, the remaining stages of the development planning cycle, as follows:

- *Investment programming

- *Financing and budgeting

- *Project evaluation and development

- *Project implementation and monitoring and evaluation

Financing through the budget and other alternative schemes must also be studied carefully to ensure that DRR PPA's are financed and implemented. Monitoring and evaluation will provide the tool for measuring reduction in risks in succeeding planning cycles. (Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR, p. 38)

Stakeholders appreciated the data complementation/supplementation, strengthening of linkages and collaboration. The project increased awareness and fostered willingness of the LGUs to mainstream DRR in CLUPs.

On the other hand, the stakeholders believed that several positive results were brought about by the project. In La Union, it was noted that there was complementation and supplementation of data that strengthened the institutional linkages and collaboration of sectors. Geological and hydro-meteorological data which previously would be coming from different sources can now be found in one consolidated document, the RPPF.

In Surigao the project contributed to raising the awareness on the need to incorporate DRR in the general planning process as well as the integration of strategies and policies on DRR in the PDPFP. In CARAGA Region, the representative from the City LGU-Butuan welcomed the strategy, and expressed that the LGU will mainstream DRR in the city planning and budgeting for the city land use plan and the comprehensive development plan.

Sustainability

Sustainability measures the benefits of an activity that are likely to continue after the project has been completed and no more donor funding is available.

The stakeholders have very positive acceptance of the project and feel that using existing structures, with support from DRR "champions", the project will be sustainable.

In all FGDs in the pilot areas the stakeholders have a very positive acceptance of the project and expressed willingness and commitment to continue the project even without donor support. According to the stakeholders, the mainstreaming effort will just become a part of their regular planning processes.

There are human resources available within existing structures (e.g. C/MLUC, PLUC, RLUC, etc.). Potential support from "champions" among local chief executives and the local legislative bodies, as in the case of the LCE of Butuan City, or the Sangguniang Panglungsod in Surigao City are expected to ensure the sustainability of financial resources. In La Union, the stakeholders pointed to the LGUs for potential support to be able to continue the project. And still in Surigao, the stakeholders included the importance of the PPDO, line agencies and the support of some NGOs.

Practical considerations that may constrain their capacity to operationalize such commitment were also expressed, particularly on the limitation in terms of skills on GIS among the LGUs. The reporting system on extent of damages is considered crucial to the development of appropriate mitigation measures, with particular emphasis on the sources of data, whose task it is and how the data should be gathered. Highlighted in Butuan was the lack of geologists to assess geological hazards and recommend structural and non-structural mitigation measures.

Project Achievements

Evaluates the achievements of the project against the expected project outcomes taking into consideration the various factors that contributed to the successful implementation of the project.

The Project Terminal Report underscored that the planned outputs were produced and even exceeded the original targets. The report enumerates the following achievements:

1. Final draft of the Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM in Sub-National Development and Physical Framework Planning, ready for adoption by the project Board;
2. Summary of the policy papers on (a) geospatial data and information needed for DRM; and (b) recommendations on Improving DRR Mainstreaming in Sub-national Planning are also available.
3. Two hundred seventy eight (278) planners from the national government, regional line agencies and representatives from non-government organizations trained, exceeding the target one hundred ninety (190) trainees,
4. Five (5) trainings, exceeding the four (4) trainings originally planned to build capacities of sub-national planners to mainstream DRM into sub-national development planning.
5. Sixteen (16) region/province case studies (a.k.a. Preliminary Assessments of Hazard Impacts and Risk Managements) which showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans.
6. Two (2) selected sub-national action plans (i.e. RPPFs of Regions I & XIII) and one (1) provincial plan (i.e. PDPFP of Surigao del Norte).

Facilitating factors identified were: the GIS training conducted, including the provision of software and hardware, and the consultations that were conducted to refine guidelines as well as the improvement of tools in the case of Butuan.

Hindering factors identified were: data gap on per capita income, no data disaggregation in terms of gender, no official barangay maps, time constraint and the lack of manpower.

Again, as mentioned earlier by the Project Implementers (see Relevance), stakeholders should not only focus on the GIS software and hardware, but also on who is responsible to collect what information and how these information will be gathered and utilized, as well as on the institutional arrangements and methodologies for mainstreaming.

Implementation Approach

The project's approach vis-à-vis the development problems being addressed, adaptation to changing conditions, partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design and overall project management.

Inter-agency coordination was enhanced by creating a relevant Ad Hoc body (i.e. Experts Group Meeting).

One prominent unexpected result that came out of the process was the creation of the Experts Group Meeting. The experts at the national level, constantly meeting together, were finally able to level-off on their understanding of technical concepts and their application. They saw the need

to meet on a more regular basis for a continued sharing of knowledge and skills that could facilitate better understanding and enhance collaboration among the different agencies involved.

Commissioning a UNDP consultant to harmonize perspectives improved relationships among members of the Experts' Group.

Another bottleneck was the differing perspectives of the different agencies involved in the project. The different agencies involved had different perspectives on the utilization of the maps produced, other than the original intention they were made for, resulting to an impasse in the earlier part of the implementation of the project. In the FGD with the PST/PMT, it was mentioned that the protocol of the scientific community was different from that of the planning practitioners. The commissioning of a UNDP consultant to harmonize bottlenecks in the inter-agency complementation process was believed to be a positive move to improve the relationships among stakeholders.

Tie-up with the READY Project

Outputs of the READY Project (i.e. Disaster Management Plans and Contingency Plans) can enhance the data base of the DRR Mainstreaming Project. At the national level: DRR Mainstreaming institutionalizes and standardizes DRR/DRM measures and processes; while at the local level: READY Project empowers the most vulnerable municipalities and cities and enables them to prepare disaster management plans.

The UNDP in the Philippines plays a prominent role in Disaster Risk Management initiatives in the country and works closely with main government agencies involved in DRR such as the NEDA, NDCC-OCD, as well as with funding institutions and donors such as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Government of Australia and EU-DIPECHO, among others.

The current DRR mainstreaming project is supposed to be a component of an earlier project initiated in 2006 on a cost-sharing agreement with the Government of Australia. The project is entitled: "Strengthening the Disaster Preparedness Capacities of Communities in the Eastern Seaboard of the Philippines to Hydro-meteorological and Geologic Hazards", also dubbed as the READY project.

The READY project intends to address DRM capacities at the local level with the hope of developing a systematic approach to community-based disaster risk management. But in order to achieve this objective, both national and local initiatives are required. At the national level: institutionalize and standardize DRR/DRM measures and processes; at the local level: empower the most vulnerable municipalities and cities in the Philippines and enable them to prepare disaster management plans.

Phasing of two complementary projects need more close coordination, especially if each output is needed by the other. The DRR Mainstreaming project is expected to build upon outputs of the READY project. As only 2 Regional Maps and 1 Provincial Map is required by the DRR Project, prioritization of the needed maps of pilot areas could have facilitated the flooding hazard map for Region I, which stakeholders from the Department of Agriculture found very important.

The Project Implementers mentioned that in the project designs' Risks and Assumptions, it was stated in the pre-conditions that the identified priority provinces have completed their hazard mapping, and that the 2007 local elections will not disrupt the local planning processes.

It was assumed, then, that the DRR mainstreaming project will build on the data gathered by the READY project (i.e. hazard maps and risk assessments). During the evaluators' briefing with Project Study Team and the Project Management Team on Sept. 1, 2008, there was the admission from both teams' members that the Mainstreaming Project was supposed to take-off from the READY Project, but it has overtaken the implementation phase of the latter.

The methodology was designed to consider the use of the maps from the mandated agency (i.e. NAMRIA), but these were not available, thus adjustments have to be made. The assumption was that the data were there. However, the data provided were not sufficient for the requirements of the quantitative approach prescribed in the guidelines, thus affecting the generation of flooding hazard maps (i.e. as in the case of the RPFP of Region I).

As strict technical requisites (i.e. official maps from authorized agencies "only") can hamper the development of the sub-national plans, alternative sources (i.e. BSWM) should be considered.

During the project implementation itself, one of the observations made was that a specific need in Region I to produce a flooding hazard map was not met due to the unavailability of the spatial data. According to the stakeholders in Region I, this problem was rooted to the unavailability of "official maps" from the mandated agency. Examined closely, the highlights during the NEDA-NDCC discussion on ECLAC Methodology held last 24 August 2007 at the OCD in Camp Aguinaldo⁵ revealed that NDCC informed NEDA that to prevent the spread of any inaccurate information, especially hazard maps "NDCC will only recognize maps generated by mandated mapping agencies." (underscoring ours). A review of the Guidelines revealed that NAMRIA has already produced the base maps of the 4 pilot provinces of the DRR mainstreaming project, but from the same source, the BSWM has available flooding maps of the pilot areas, but were said to be official.

The inconsistency in the usage of DRR and DRM terminologies indicates that the DRR concept has not yet been fully internalized among the stakeholders.

It would be important to underscore the need to define the line that divides DRR and DRM. It appears to the Evaluators that DRR and DRM, because they are used interchangeably by the Project Implementers and the stakeholders themselves, were taken to mean the same thing. However, the difference was pointed out in one of the minutes of meetings of the Project Study Team and the Project Management Team⁶ where it was recommended that DRR be used, instead of DRM "since this project falls under the pre-disaster phase as reflected in the NDCC Comprehensive DRM Framework".

Hazard assessment and hazard quantification operationalize paradigm shift from disaster response to preparedness (i.e. mitigation decreases the cost of project damage and rehabilitation cost)

One significant change that was incorporated into the project design was the "paradigm shift", i.e. from DRM to DRR. The guidelines expounds on this idea by pointing out the current trend of government calamity fund allocation which amounts to around Php1B annually. This amount, according to the guidelines, can already fund the construction of 2,500 elementary level classrooms or 2,174 secondary level classrooms, 161.29 kilometers of farm-to-market roads or 20,000 core resettlement units, or 50,000 individually piped household communal water system if appropriate mitigation measures can be done through DRR.

According to the guidelines, "disasters erode development gains and also delay implementation of economic programs", because the needed resources which could have been appropriated to social development initiatives are "redirected to disaster response, reconstruction and rehabilitation." However this paradigm shift may still need more internalization or leveling-off so it could be appreciated more properly. As mentioned earlier, that DRM and DRR are used

⁵ Annex 8, the Inception Report, "Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-National Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines", NEDA-UNDP, Nov. 2007

⁶ Minutes of the Meeting, 3rd, 4th and 5th Joint PMT-PST Meeting, 10, 21 and 27 August 2007

interchangeably by the stakeholders themselves indicates a confused understanding of the two concepts.

The declaration of the International Decade for Natural Disasters Reduction (IDNDR) Yokohama introduced the paradigm shift from disaster response to DRR – that is, the realization that loss and damage from disasters – can be prevented or minimized if the people and governments are prepared, well-informed and has the capacity to bounce back after a disaster strikes. (Oxfam, 2008)

Tie-up with the Climate Change Mainstreaming

Climate change and disaster risk reduction are closely linked. More extreme weather events in the future are likely to increase the number and scale of disasters, while at the same time, the existing methods and tools of disaster reduction provide powerful capacities for adaptation to climate change. (UNISDR, 2008).

The Hyogo Framework sets out five priorities for action, to offer as a strong basis for developing concrete risk-reducing adaptation measures. Among them are: **(1) to ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.** This need is critical to both adaptation and risk reduction. Suggested actions include: encouraging a core ministry/department with a broad mandate including finance, economics or planning, to be responsible for mainstreaming climate change adaptation policies and activities; organizing a national high-level policy dialogue to prepare national adaptation strategy that links with disaster risk reduction strategies; formalizing collaboration and the coordination of climate related risk reduction activities through a multi-sector mechanism such as a national platform for risk reduction; and developing mechanisms to actively engage and empower women, communities and local governments in the assessment and vulnerability and impacts and the formulation of local adaptation activities. **(2) Reduce the underlying risk factors.** This covers many environmental and societal factors that create or exacerbate the risk from natural hazards. Measures can include incorporating climate risk related considerations in development planning processes, macro-economic projections and sector plans; requiring the use of climate related information in city planning, land-use planning, water management, and environmental and natural resource management, among others.

The Mainstreaming methodology developed under this process forms the template for the DRM, including climate change mainstreaming, into the national and local development and physical framework processes. For example, this methodology will be taken up and used in the soon to be implemented (estimated date: last quarter of 2008) climate change mainstreaming under the Spanish MDGF Climate Change Adaptation Project which is a joint UN Programme in the Philippines.

Tie-up with the Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management Project (PLPEM)

Entry points are defined but planners indicated that they need more practice in the actual integration. From the design to the project implementation phase, longer time needed to absorb technical knowledge on GIS; and adequate time for the preparation of the plan should have been considered.

The Guidelines produced by the Project supplements the 2007 NEDA-ADB Project on PLPEM Guidelines on Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management (PLPEM), specifically the volume on Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans (PDPFP). The Guidelines do not alter current plan formulation methodologies that planners are already familiar with, but merely enhances them.

The PLPEM still remains the main guide in the overall local planning process. Disaster risk reduction concepts and principles will enhance the PDPFP through the use of techniques to undertaking risk assessment and making use of resulting risk estimates to enhance planning

analyses and decision-making. Major output is the full or semi-quantification of hazards/risks/vulnerabilities using the tools specified in the guidelines.

During the discussions in Surigao, while the FGDs are on-going, the stakeholders expressed the need for more time to absorb technical knowledge on GIS and also longer time for the preparation of the plan.

Country Ownership/Drivenness

As already mentioned in other sections, the project dovetails or tie-up with other previous and current projects on DRM such as the earlier project in 2003 supported by the UNDP, i.e. the formation of a multi-agency group called the Collective Strengthening of Community Awareness for Natural Disasters (CSCAND) which has become part of the subcommittee of the NDCC Committee on Mitigation and Preparedness.

Through the CSCAND framework, several scientific agencies work together in preparing the scientific data, such as the hazard maps and other information that will provide the baseline for community based disaster risk management, including PHIVOLCS, PAG-ASA and MGB, together with the OCD as the chair of the CSCAND Steering Committee.

After the flash floods of 2004 in Quezon province, the UNDP implemented a multi-agency project called the REINA Project (Real, Infanta and General Nakar) which brought together various government agencies, the LGUs, the NGOs and the private sector through the CSCAND mechanism.

Another DRM related initiatives include the awareness-raising on the mainstreaming of DRM into the formal school system, under the UNDP-Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) project "Support to the Implementation of the Hyogo Action through the Mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Management in Development Planning and Implementation: Advocacy and pilot project implementation in Education Sector in Three (3) Southeast Asian RCC member countries."

The current DRR mainstreaming project is not an isolated initiative but is linked-up with, or related to, other initiatives on DRR in the country. Moreover, the 2004-2010 Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) indicates disaster preparedness, mitigation and response as a priority of the Philippine government and intends to integrate disaster preparedness and management in development planning processes at all levels of governance.

A more comprehensive and previous framework, the NFPP for 2001-2030 indicates strategies in identifying and implementing appropriate physical planning measures as part of comprehensive disaster mitigation plans. The Guidelines for DRR Mainstreaming supplements the 2007 NEDA-ADB Project on Guidelines on Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management (PLPEM), specifically the volume on Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans (PDPFP).

Stakeholders Participation/Public Involvement

Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions or other bodies that have interest or stake in the outcome of this project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by the project.

Members of the NLUC/RLUC/PLUC and other partner agencies were involved in the project implementation, however, the C/MLUCs, local DCCs, other local CSOs and other key players such as the Red Cross were not included in the project.

NEDA personnel involved in the project implementation were capacitated in the process, which is an advantage to facilitate the replication and up-scaling of the DRR mainstreaming.

The stakeholders affirmed that different sectors which included LGUs, NGAs/RLAs, PPDOs and other planning bodies, Provincial Development Councils and NGOs participated in the project

through consultations. On the other hand, at the RLUC level, the multi-sectoral participation was expanded to include the academe and the private sector.

Stakeholders, however, thought that some sectors should have also been consulted such as the cities and municipalities (La Union), and some key sectors such as the civil society and the Red Cross (Butuan). In Surigao, there was a suggestion to include the local Disaster Coordinating Councils (DCCs).

The field coordination for the project included: a) NLUC for the adoption of the DRM Guidelines; b) the RLUC for the formulation of the DRM components of the plans; c) RDCs for adoption of these components; d) NDCC's Technical Working Group on the Mitigation for mapping and IEC activity.

As LGUs are beginning to recognize the need to incorporate DRM, especially disaster preparedness in local development planning, stakeholders suggest a model-building approach where communities are involved in determining disaster-prone areas and hazard historical trends, likewise in assessing their vulnerabilities and capacities.

The understanding that DRR is an essential component of sustainable development, and as such needs to be prioritized, is still being developed among LGUs. The inclusion of DRR strategies in the executive and legislative agenda (LEDAC) is a continuing challenge among local chief executives, especially when budgets are limited. However, with the growing emphasis on disaster risk management at both the national and local levels, an increasing number of LGUs are recognizing that disaster management, especially disaster preparedness, needs to be incorporated into all local development planning. (Oxfam, 2008)

Surigao even suggested a model-building approach where communities which are more knowledgeable in determining disaster-prone areas and its historical trends should be included, and data from them may be consolidated at the municipal/city level, up to the provincial level. Said bottom-up approach in the consolidation of data would have provided more accuracy in coming up with disaster risk-sensitive plans.

Replication and Scaling-Up Approach

Based on the lessons and experiences in the project, this is the process of duplicating the design and implementation in adjacent communities and other sectors to create a multiplier effect that will expand the coverage of DRM principles and practices.

The stakeholders' expressed readiness and commitment to adapt, replicate, and/or localize DRR mainstreaming, but need to be backed up by sufficient capacity support.

In all pilot areas there are plans for replication and scaling up of the project by localizing the DRR mainstreaming from the province to the cities/municipalities, putting more emphasis on the strengthening of the horizontal and vertical linkages of the planning processes.

In Surigao it was specified that the scaling up will be led by the DILG through the JMC¹⁷ framework. Pursuant to Par. K, Rule 23, Art. 182, IRR of RA 7160, DILG shall issue the Rationalized Planning System (RPS) Sourcebook for cities and municipalities while NEDA shall issue the Provincial/Local Planning and expenditure Management (PLPEM) guidelines for provinces. The DILG and NEDA shall ensure that specific guides developed within the framework of the RPS and the PLPEM will strengthen links between the province and its component cities and municipalities. This would mean a closer coordination between NEDA and DILG will be needed to upscale the mainstreaming effort.

¹⁷ Joint Memorandum Circular No. 1 series of 2007, between and among the NEDA, DILG, DOF and DBM, provides the guidelines on Harmonization of Local Planning, Investment Programming, Revenue Administration, Budgeting and Expenditure Management.

Likewise, it will be an advantage to develop the capacities of stakeholders on DRR Mainstreaming, or to develop a pool of speakers through trainers' training and facilitator's training, both for individuals and training institutions, (i.e. SUCs), on risk quantification and other knowledge and skills related to DRR mainstreaming. From the perspective of the PMT/PST, for the scaling up to be undertaken, the data required should be made available and they recommend to fast-track hazard mapping activities.

Monitoring & Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation includes activities to measure the project's achievements such as identification of performance indicators, measurement procedures and determination of baseline conditions. Projects are required to implement plans for monitoring and evaluation with adequate funding and appropriate staff and include activities such as description of data sources and methods for data collection, collection of baseline data and stakeholder participation.

It was clear among the stakeholders that project coordination of activities, including monitoring, was lodged at the NEDA particularly the Project Management Team (PMT) at the national level, and the Project Core Team at the NEDA Regional Offices (NROs) in pilot areas. Coordination was difficult in the beginning, but latter on, when the focal points at all levels have been identified and the outputs were made clear, they already felt the need to pursue the activities.

There were no issues mentioned in monitoring and evaluation as the PMT and the core team coordinated regularly within defined timelines for the delivery of outputs. The issue that was identified was not related to coordination activities but more on the delay in the submission of draft plans due to the unavailability of required data, i.e. harmonized hazard maps as outputs of the READY project. The original target for submission was May 2008 but was delayed for one month.

V. Conclusion

Mainstreaming, as the integration of DRR perspective in sub-national plans, was achieved by the project. However, mainstreaming in its stricter sense, involves integration of DRR into the whole development planning process (i.e. analysis of the planning environment, identification of issues/goals/objectives/targets, formulation of strategies and PPAs, project evaluation and development, budgeting, expenditure management, investment programming, revenue generation, monitoring and evaluation and re- planning). The project only intended to cover integration up to the strategies and PPAs.

As designed the project has achieved its expected outputs, namely: **a)** A final draft of the Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM in Sub-National Development and Physical Framework Planning, **b)** The summary of the policy papers on *(a) geospatial data and information needed for DRM*; and *(b) recommendations on Improving DRR Mainstreaming in Sub-national Planning are also available*; **c)** 278 planners from the national government, regional line agencies and representatives from non-government organizations trained, exceeding the target 190 trainees, within five (5) trainings, exceeding the four (4) trainings originally planned to build capacities of sub-national planners to mainstream DRM into sub-national development planning; and **d)** Sixteen (16) region/province case studies which are initial assessments of hazard impacts and risk managements, which showed how DRR assessments can be inputted into the sub-national plans; two selected sub-national action plans (i.e. RPPFs of Regions I & XIII) and one provincial plan (i.e. PDPFP of Surigao del Norte).

In the light of the foregoing findings of the evaluation activity, the following are some key conclusions that could be derived from this study:

1. On Relevance

The project is very relevant. The need for the project was established by the country's recent experiences of disasters that wrought havoc to lives, social, economic and environmental assets of communities.

2. On Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness

As to the rate of achievement of outputs vs. budget, administrative-based expenditures was burned faster vis-à-vis activity-based expenditures during the first two quarters of project implementation. As to the achievement of outputs vs. time, the bulk of the activities were accomplished towards the second half of the project implementation timeframe. Overall, the project was efficient and cost-effective, with accomplishment exceeding the target, notwithstanding the decrease in approved budget and shortened timeframe.

3. On Effectiveness

On the one hand, mainstreaming, i.e. integration of DRR perspective in sub-national plans as designed, was achieved by the project. On the other hand, mainstreaming into the whole development planning process was introduced and even partly achieved.

4. On Sustainability

In all pilot areas the stakeholders have a positive acceptance of the project and expressed willingness and commitment to continue the project and feel that using existing structures, with support from DRR "champions", the project will be sustainable. However, practical considerations that may constrain their capacity to operationalize such commitment include: the limitation in terms of skills on GIS among the LGUs and other stakeholders.

5. Project Achievements

All the expected project outputs were achieved, NEDA committed to conduct all residual activities such as approval of the Guidelines by the Project Board, and the approval of the DRR-enhanced sub-national development and land-use/physical plans by the RDCs/PDCs.

6. Implementation Approach

The project has shown logical tie-ups and links with both existing and forthcoming DRR initiatives, such as the READY Project, the PLPEM and the Climate Change Mainstreaming. However, collaboration between two complementary projects could still be improved, i.e. READY Project and DRR Mainstreaming, especially if one's output is needed by the other. And when official maps from authorized agencies are not available, alternative sources (i.e. BSWM) should be considered.

Implementation arrangement was enhanced by the creation of the Experts Group Meeting and the commissioning of a UNDP consultant to harmonize perspective and relationships within the Experts' Group.

7. On Country Ownership/Drivenness

There is a very clear country ownership or drivenness. The current DRR mainstreaming project is not an isolated initiative but is linked-up with, or related to, other initiatives on DRR in the country. Moreover, the 2004-2010 Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) indicates disaster preparedness, mitigation and response as a priority of the Philippine government and intends to integrate disaster preparedness and management in development planning processes at all levels of governance.

8. On Stakeholder/Public Participation

Members of the land use committees at the national, regional and provincial level, staff of NEDA and other partner agencies were involved in the project implementation and were eventually capacitated in the process. However, there is a need to reach out to other stakeholders at the city/municipality level land use committees, local DCCs, other local CSOs and other key players such as the Red Cross. The limitation in stakeholder participation was related to the mandate of the implementing agency (NEDA), that is, down to the provincial level only.

Moreover, LGUs slowly recognize the need to incorporate DRM in local development planning, and stakeholders believe that a model-building approach involving communities in the process of assessing their vulnerabilities and capacities will be met with more acceptability, ownership and support by the stakeholders.

9. On Replication and Scaling-up

Although the stakeholders' articulated readiness to scale-up, adapt, and localize, said efforts need to be backed up by sufficient capacity support.

10. On Monitoring and Evaluation

Coordination support was ably provided by the PMT/PST to ensure timely reporting/achievement of outputs.

Some continuing challenges

While the project has achieved its expected outputs, there are continuing challenges that need to be addressed towards a better implementation of the project in the future, to wit:

Paradigm shift

One significant change that was incorporated into the project design was the "paradigm shift", i.e. from DRM to DRR. The guidelines expounds on this idea by pointing out the current trend of government calamity fund allocation which amounts to around PhP1B annually. This amount, according to the guidelines, can already fund the construction of 2,500 elementary level classrooms or 2,174 secondary level classrooms, 161.29 kilometers of farm-to-market roads or 20,000 core resettlement units, or 50,000 individually piped household communal water system if appropriate mitigation measures can be done through DRR.

According to the Guidelines, "disasters erode development gains and also delay implementation of economic programs", because the needed resources which could have been appropriated to social development initiatives are "redirected to disaster response, reconstruction and rehabilitation." Related with this significant development, it would be important to understand the paradigm shift concepts from DRM to DRR.

Community Participation

The disaster Management Plan is protracted to be responsive to the emerging needs of the time and will enable LGUs to optimize the use of available resources and coordinate the services of its attached agencies as well as the national agencies. It can also serve as a venue for the support and participation of other organizations and individuals. As such, sustainability of disaster related programs and projects are assured as their acceptability becomes higher.⁸

⁸ Preliminary Assessment of Hazard Impacts and Risk Management, Province of Isabela, Region 2

Guidelines affirms that data from the barangays can enhance data accuracy

The Consequence Analysis methodology of the Guidelines prescribed that... "To identify the potentially affected population, the population map is overlayed with the hazard map. Ideally, the population map should have the actual plot(or complete inventory) of houses, buildings and structures together with data on occupancy (i.e. number of persons living or working inside the structure)... xxx... Under these Guidelines, the population density map at the barangay level is deemed as sufficient parameter to describe the elements at risk... xxx... To identify the potentially affected property, the land use map is overlayed with the hazard map. Ideally, the land use map should have actual plot of houses, buildings, roads, bridges, power lines, facilities, crops, together with data on the corresponding monetary values." (Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR, p. 30)

Insufficient funds usually prevents LCEs to buy-in the DRR mainstreaming effort

Convincing LCEs to make DRM a priority and to allocate funds for DRM initiatives is a challenge. It was recommended to involve them in the discussion and application of DRM measures, dialogue, awareness raising and capacity building. Meanwhile, calamity funds are mainly allotted to response. The lack of financing and limited local government staff emphasized the need for well-coordinated and more organized DRM initiatives to encourage resource mobilization. Provinces and municipalities can share DRM projects costs if the risk is inter-provincial or inter-municipal. The following financial options may be considered: a.) expand the use of calamity fund by including mitigation activities, b.) 20% developed fund of the LGUs, c.) ODA funds, d.) private sector participation, and e.) insurance.

VI. Summary of Lessons Learned

1. Outputs of the READY Project (i.e. Disaster Management Plans and Contingency Plans) can enhance the data base of the DRR Mainstreaming Project. At the national level: DRR Mainstreaming institutionalizes and standardizes DRR/DRM measures and processes; while at the local level: READY Project empowers the most vulnerable municipalities and cities and enables them to prepare disaster management plans.
2. Quantification of risk increases the chance of acceptability of mitigation proposals.
3. GIS is very helpful in the visualization of DRR assessment outputs.
4. Stakeholders noted the insufficient physical inputs and time allocated for training and plan preparation as a constraint to a more effective project implementation.
5. Inter-agency coordination was enhanced by creating a relevant Ad Hoc body (i.e. Experts Group Meeting).
6. Commissioning a UNDP consultant to harmonize perspectives improved relationships among members of the Experts' Group.
7. The inconsistency in the usage of DRR and DRM terminologies indicates that the DRR concept has not yet been fully internalized among the stakeholders.
8. Hazard assessment and hazard quantification operationalize paradigm shift from disaster response to preparedness (i.e. mitigation decreases the cost of project damage and rehabilitation cost)

9. Climate change and disaster risk reduction are closely linked. More extreme weather events in the future are likely to increase the number and scale of disasters, while at the same time, the existing methods and tools of disaster reduction provide powerful capacities for adaptation to climate change. (UNISDR, 2008).
10. As LGUs are beginning to recognize the need to incorporate DRM, especially disaster preparedness in local development planning, stakeholders suggest a model-building approach where communities are involved in determining disaster-prone areas and hazard historical trends, likewise in assessing their vulnerabilities and capacities. How people can work hand-in-hand with communities and institutions to develop their capabilities to prevent, prepare for, cope with and respond to disaster, leading to collaboration in the effort to help build more disaster resilient communities.

VII. Recommended action points:

1. **READY Project enhancing the DRR Mainstreaming Project** - the Disaster Management Plans (DMPs) and Contingency Plans (CPs) of the former can be incorporated into the MDPs/CLUPs, and these too, to be integrated into the PDPFPs.
2. **Phasing of two complementary projects need closer coordination**, especially if each output is needed by the other. The DRR Mainstreaming project is expected to build upon outputs of the READY project. As only 2 Regional Maps and 1 Provincial Map is required by the DRR Project, prioritization of the needed maps of pilot areas could have facilitated the flooding hazard map for Region I, which stakeholders from the Department of Agriculture found very important.
3. **As technical requisites (i.e. official maps from authorized agencies only) can hamper the development of the sub-national plans, alternative sources (i.e. BSWM) should be considered.** With careful lobbying, OCD and DENR-NAMRIA, and other government agencies could be asked to consider the available maps at BSWM as "alternate official maps", in lieu of the official one, when the latter is not available. Moreover, the lack of data should not deter local governments from doing risk assessments. It can still be done using available data and what can be generated from the province. A database from DRM can be developed to organize data and information for risk assessment and in identifying DRM projects. New ways or innovations could be introduced in the process of data collection and information gathering, e.g. engaging local communities for a participatory mapping of their localities, or providing data through rapid appraisals or participatory rural appraisals.
4. **Enhance Inter-Agency Collaboration.** The initial implementation of the DRR mainstreaming project has been hampered by differences in perspectives of the different collaborating agencies. However the constant meetings of the ad hoc experts' group contributed to the gradual leveling-off of perspectives and thereby facilitated better exchanges among said agencies. In the future similar mechanisms could be established or instituted to further enhance inter-agency collaboration, exchange of data and mutual support.
5. **Entry points are defined but planners indicated that they need more practice in the actual integration.** From the design to the project implementation phase, longer time needed to absorb technical knowledge on GIS; and adequate time for the preparation of the plan should have been considered. Related with this, provision of physical inputs as

well as the amount of time needed for the internalization and familiarization with technical knowledge, and the adequate timeframe for the preparation of the Plans should be considered in the project design.

6. **Need to strengthen top-down and bottom-up linkage.** The project intended to assist LGUs in the preparation of their PDPFPs, to quote the reviewed project documents: "Parallel to the effort of developing the National DRM Framework, the Guideline on the preparation of DRM component of the sub-national and local physical framework and land use plans will be formulated. The Guidelines are critical tools that will enable planners to mainstream DRM in the sub-national/local development and land use plans. The NEDA Regional Development Office will also assist the Local Government Units (LGUs) in the preparation of the DRM components of their Provincial Physical Framework Plans..."

The involvement of LGUs, local line agencies, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and even communities, for a bottom-up approach, should be encouraged especially in providing more accurate data and in determining disaster-prone areas and their historical trends. In the long term sustainability is ensured if there is greater ownership by those who are directly affected by the project. The challenge lies in effectively engaging local stakeholders as critical players in the DRR Mainstreaming process and in development planning as a whole.

As affirmed by the PST's GIS Expert, a bottom-up approach in the consolidation of data would have helped in determining more accurate locations of populations at risk, and could have contributed to the development of thematic maps that have higher resolutions (i.e. scale of 1:10,000). Said maps can better show locations of the element-at-risk, thus providing a visualization of the potential damage to the areas brought about by the identified hazards.

Therefore, in the preparation of the project design, identification of the target groups vis-à-vis the agency mandate should be considered.

7. **In scaling-up, replication and localization**, the following are some practical recommendations:
 - a. the 278 local planners who have been trained under the project, and, therefore, are expected to become the agents or instruments for "technology transfer", i.e. as trainers, need to be equipped with further skills training through a training of trainers or a training of facilitators.
 - b. there were recommendations on the ground to tap the academe and NGOs which have related and/or relevant expertise and capabilities, in the provision of technical assistance/service inputs.
8. **Regional-Provincial-Municipal-Barangay vertical linkages.** On mainstreaming, it is recognized that the project intended to cover only the phases up to the development of strategies and PPAs, and not to go into the full cycle of the whole development planning process. It is therefore recommended that a modeling of a Regional-Provincial-Municipal-Barangay working link be tested in the next phase of the project, in order to look into the effectiveness of the vertical linkages of the planning process. Whereas in the past, PDPs/PFPs, CDPs/CLUPs and BDPs have been good only in paper, and integration were viewed and done as mere compliance to the law, this mainstreaming

effort may well become the catalyst for a more robust development planning process, with the actual participation and involvement of relevant stakeholders.

9. **Consistency in the use of the DRR terminology** and develop an appropriate design to internalize the paradigm shift from disaster response to preparedness. In this regard a stakeholders' workshop may be done. Invite panelists who may discuss DRM vs. DRR framework, or CBDRM⁹ vs. CMDRR¹⁰ framework. Small group discussions may follow, where the participants may try to apply the different frameworks in the local context. Outputs may be compared and contrasted during the plenary. The process documentation may be shared with other agencies or disseminated in the internet for further virtual discussions.
10. **LCE's to buy-in the DRR mainstreaming effort** – close coordination among agencies is needed. Aside from projects being implemented by International NGOs (INGOs), attention may be given to local initiatives, especially those coming from the LGUs. Pursuant to JMC1, DILG at the Regional, Provincial and City/Municipal level may be engaged in the DRR Mainstreaming Process. NEDA and DILG may put together a MOA leading to the synchronized mainstreaming process of DRR- and the soon-to-be-implemented Climate Change Initiative.

⁹ Community-Based Disaster Risk Management

¹⁰ Community-Managed Disaster Risk Reduction, being advocated by the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), an international development non-government organization with headquarters in Silang, Cavite, Philippines.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A. SIMPLIFIED FGD QUESTIONNAIRE

External Evaluation of *Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Sub-national Development and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines*

Date: _____

Venue: _____

FGD Questions for Group 1

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Relevance:</p> <p><i>How did you participate in the preparation of this project, e.g. needs assessment?</i></p> <p><i>Were there explicit or implicit needs (at the regional/provincial level) not recognized in the project?</i></p> <p><i>How has the project design facilitated the achievement of the project objectives?</i></p> <p><i>What elements were most helpful?</i> <i>What were not so helpful?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Highly Satisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Marginally Satisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Unsatisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A</i></p>	

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Effectiveness</p> <p><i>What is the current status of the project outputs?</i></p> <p><i>What are its effects to concerned stakeholders or stakeholder institutions (outcomes)?</i></p>	

<p><i>What benefits have the stakeholders gained from the outputs of the project?</i></p> <p><i>Were there any unplanned activities and/or results and how did they affect the stakeholders?</i></p> <p><i>To what extent have the outputs contributed to achieving the project objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Who are responsible for managing the project to ensure that the project objectives are being achieved?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Highly Satisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Marginally Satisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Unsatisfactory</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A</i></p>	

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Sustainability</p> <p><i>How acceptable are the objectives of the project on local stakeholders (regional and provincial) and why?</i></p> <p><i>Can the stakeholders continue the implementation of the activities without donor assistance? How?</i></p> <p><i>What mechanisms or structures have been put in place in order to continue the effects of/ or the benefits derived from, the project once donor funding is withdrawn? Who are involved in these mechanisms?</i></p> <p><i>Are the capacities of the stakeholders involved in these mechanisms sufficient and/or appropriate to be able to further the objectives of the project?</i></p> <p><i>* Are there plans to further capacitate the stakeholders involved?</i></p> <p><i>* What are those capacity development plans?</i></p>	

<p><i>Who are likely to take the cudgels for continuing the project's objectives at different levels, e.g. government, civil society, local communities?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Highly Satisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Marginally Satisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Unsatisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A</i></p>	

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Project Achievements</p> <p><i>What outputs or outcomes were achieved and why?</i></p> <p><i>What were the factors that facilitated to achieve project outputs or outcomes? What were the hindering factors?</i></p> <p><i>What structure or mechanism has been established for ensuring the achievement of project objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Is this structure or mechanism clear to the project implementers and stakeholders at all levels?</i></p> <p><i>What new knowledge and skills have the stakeholders at the regional and provincial levels gathered from the training that were conducted?</i></p> <p><i>What was the effect of the training in terms of application at the regional and provincial levels?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Highly Satisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Marginally Satisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Unsatisfactory</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A</i></p>	

FGD Questions for Group 2

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Stakeholder participation or Public involvement</p> <p><i>What activities were implemented to raise the awareness of the public regarding the objectives of the project?</i></p> <p><i>What sectors were consulted in the planning and design of the project, and involved in this project from preparation to implementation?</i></p> <p><i>Is the mix of stakeholders involved appropriate enough to effectively carry out the project?</i></p> <p><i>Who should have participated too in the project but were not included?</i></p> <p><i>What mechanisms were put in place to generate consensus on the courses of action to take in relation to the achievement of project objectives?</i></p> <p><i>Are there any foreseen effects of the project on various sectors, and what are these?</i></p> <p><i>In implementing the project, who were the identified stakeholders from the provincial planning level and why?</i></p> <p><i>* To what extent was the project participatory? What was the nature of involvement of the identified stakeholders?</i></p> <p><i>* To what extent were the ideas of the stakeholders considered (if stakeholders included representatives from communities or sectors)?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Marginally Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Replication and Scaling-up</p> <p><i>Are plans developed to spread the activities of DRR mainstreaming not only to other regions but down to the municipalities and local communities? How will the mainstreaming activities be scaled-up?</i></p> <p><i>What are the communication strategies and methodologies to promote the objectives of the project?</i></p> <p><i>Are there sufficient capacities (among institutions and individuals) to expand the project's achievement?</i></p> <p><i>What are the capacity needs related to this that should be addressed?</i></p>	
<p><i>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Marginally Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Questions	Participants' Response
<p>Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p><i>Who were responsible for coordinating the timely implementation of project activities so that target outputs are achieved as planned?</i></p> <p><i>Were there issues related to coordination of activities? What were these issues and how were they resolved?</i></p> <p><i>Were the outputs and outcomes and their indicators clear to all implementers and stakeholders concerned?</i></p> <p><i>Have project management been timely informed of issues related to project implementation?</i></p> <p><i>Were there issues related to timely</i></p>	

reporting? What were these issues and how were they resolved?	
<p>Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Marginally Satisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>	

ANNEX B. CONSOLIDATED FGD RESULTS

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Relevance	<p><u>What was your participation in the preparation of this project e.g. needs assessment?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inputting of relevant data and information to the regional office and identification of natural hazards in the region (La Union Grp. 1) • Guidelines refinement, attendance participation to trainings, ground works preparation, plan preparation (La Union Grp. 1) • Participated in two (2) consultations conducted by the project in Butuan City and Surigao City. (Butuan) • Drafting of the DRR Enhanced PDPFP, attended trainings for the preparation of the plan. (Surigao Grp. 1) • Through interactive participation by asking questions as to the details of its application to the existing PDPFP/CLUP during consultation, forums, program orientation, etc; drafting of the plan; gathering of necessary data. (Surigao Grp. 2) <p><u>Were there explicit or implicit needs (at the regional/provincial level) recognized in the project?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for more spatial data on calamities like flooding (La Union) • Yearly disasters in CARAGA, flooding and landslides. Assessment of past 10 years estimated 10 billion in damages due to disasters (Butuan) • Yes, such as GIS server (computer unit), GIS software • Explicit needs- authentic GIS software, GPS instrument, longer time needed to absorb technical knowledge on GIS, longer time for the preparation of the plan (Surigao) • Implicit needs- technology transfer to the municipal level of digital GIS mapping application, acquisition of aerial images of the province, trainings (Surigao) <p><u>How has the project design facilitated the achievement of the project objectives?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trainings and writeshops facilitated the achievement of the objective (La Union) • Objectives partially met; coz the plan is not yet implemented; still enhancing the Plan. Guidelines still need refinement. (Butuan) • Through trainings, consultation meetings conducted, provision of IT hardware and software such as maps and methodology on risk assessment, financial and technical assistance. (Surigao) • The design helped satisfactorily in achieving the objectives of the project. However, it is suggested that the modeling process should have started in municipalities/cities and later be consolidated to the provincial data for a more comprehensive projection/estimation of the plan. (Surigao) • Furthermore, corresponding communities of the identified model LGUs which are more knowledgeable in detailing/determining disaster prone areas and its trends/historical background should be included. (Surigao) <p><u>What elements were most helpful?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology , Hazard maps and GIS (La Union) • Co-participants; project consultants; PPDO, RDCS (La Union) • Trainings, GIS maps, methodology on potential risk/damage estimation (fatalities/properties)and drafted DRM guidelines. (Butuan)

- PDPFP manual/guidebooks, trainings, consultation, financial assistance for supplies and meals, and GIS-generated maps, software application on risk analysis and estimation on potential fatalities damages, etc.(Surigao)

What were not so helpful?

- The manual is too technical that made it too difficult for non-technical participants. The timeframe was also too short to generate more realistic outputs. Inconsistencies* between the actual and map-generated/computed/estimated data. Chosen participants should be computer-literate technical persons.(Surigao)

*Inconsistencies were brought about by the differentiated political boundaries presented by neighboring municipalities, thus the planners found some difficulties in reconciling boundary lines.

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:

La Union Group 1
Highly Satisfactory

Butuan
Satisfactory

Surigao Group 1
Marginally Satisfactory

La Union Group 2
Highly Satisfactory

Surigao Group 2
Satisfactory

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Effectiveness	
<u>What is the current status of the project outputs?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRR-enhanced Regional Physical Framework Plan (RPFP) needs refinement and final editing in September. After which, will conduct advocacy for adoption of the DRR-enhanced RPFP. (Butuan) • Final draft of the PDPFP – DRR Enhanced Plan (Surigao Group 1)) • The plan is still a draft. (Surigao Group 2) 	
<u>What are its effects to concerned stakeholders or stakeholder institutions (outcomes)?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complementation and supplementation of data. (La Union) • Plan not yet implemented, so outcome cannot be determined yet. (Butuan) • Awareness on the need to incorporate DRR in the general planning process, updated the PDPFP with integration of strategies and policies on DRM. (Surigao) 	
<u>What benefits have the stakeholders gained from the outputs of the project?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness on the probability of damage whenever hazard will happen (La Union) 	
<u>LGU Butuan</u>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Welcomed the strategy, and will mainstream DRR in the city planning and budgeting for the city land use plan and the comprehensive development plan; 2) LGU capacity on GIS was enhanced; 3) Also integrate gender and DRM in the planning process. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of data for future planning purposes.(Surigao) 	

Were there any unplanned activities and/or results and how did they affect the stakeholders?

- Identification of safe and unsafe zones. (La Union)
- Stakeholders' capacity on GIS developed; For NEDA & Surigao City, both software and hardware. (Butuan)

To what extent have the outputs contributed to achieving the project objectives?

- The initial output was already incorporated in the RPFP. (La Union)
- The outputs contributed satisfactorily in attaining the objectives of the project. (Surigao)
- Partial only, because the plan is not yet implemented. (Butuan)

Who are responsible for managing the project to ensure that the project objectives are being achieved?

- DRM Team (NEDA, MGB)
- Core team from the NEDA Regional Office; with LGU representatives. There is also an integration with the RDCC
- PDCC, MDCCs, PLUC, MLUCs

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:

La Union Group 1
Highly Satisfactory

Butuan
Satisfactory

Surigao Group 1
Marginally Satisfactory

La Union Group 2
None

Surigao Group 2
Satisfactory

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Sustainability	
<u>How acceptable are the objectives of the project on local stakeholders (regional and provincial) and why?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very acceptable. For us to validate hazard prone areas for us to monitor (La Union) • Very acceptable. (Butuan) • The plan is subject to public hearing. (Surigao)
<u>Can the stakeholders continue the implementation of the activities without donor assistance? How?</u>	<p>Yes, with the technical assistance and allocation in the provincial budget.(La Union)</p> <p>Yes. There are even existing activities not covered by the project funds, like networking with other stakeholders.(Butuan)</p>
<u>What mechanisms or structures have been put in place in order to continue the effects of/ or the benefits derived from, the project once donor funding is withdrawn? Who are involved in these mechanisms?</u>	<p><u>La Union</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement of MLUC/CLUP, PLUC and PDCC in the preparation and implementation of the PPFP (La Union)

Butuan

- Existing mechanisms like RLUC, RDC, RDCC-OCD and the local disaster coordinating councils, from the provincial to the barangay levels.
- Plan to institutionalize a Regional GIS Network through the RDC.
- Active involvement of the private sector and the civil sector (CLEAN Philippines, Conservation International, REACT, RESPOND, as well as the religious sector.)

Surigao

- As of the moment, there is no existing structure, however, a Technical Working Group will be recommended for creation for this purpose.

Are the capacities of the stakeholders involved in these mechanisms sufficient and/or appropriate to be able to further the objectives of the project?

* Are there plans to further capacitate the stakeholders involved?

* What are those capacity development plans?

Still needs technical assistance in mainstreaming DRR especially in using GIS. (La Union)

Yes. Plan for GIS training to be participated by LGUs/PPDCs

Butuan

Limited capacities.

- 1) Need to strengthen reporting system (damage assessment).
- 2) Paradigm shift from response to preparedness.
- 3) Data bank establishment.
- 4) Limited technical capacity on GIS of LGUs.
- 5) High cost of GIS software.
- 6) Lack of geologists.

There are insufficient technical capacities like GIS, analyses of potential risks, fatalities and damages. (Surigao)

Yes. Technical expertise development on GIS for the Information Technology Unit (ITU).

Who are likely to take the cudgels for continuing the project's objectives at different levels, e.g. government, civil society, local communities?

LGUs (La Union)

Functional existing mechanisms; champions can come from LCEs and the Sangguniang Panlalawigan (Butuan)

LGUs and line agencies. (Surigao Grp. 1)

PPDO with support from line agencies like DILG. At the LGU level, the LCEs. For NGOs, World Vision- SNPIDA, Inc., SEDF (Surigao Grp. 2)

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:		
La Union Group 1 Marginally Satisfactory	Butuan Satisfactory	Surigao Group 1 None
La Union Group 2 None		Surigao Group 2 Satisfactory

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Project Achievements	
<u>What outputs or outcomes were achieved and why?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The guidelines in DRM mainstreaming, trainings and the DRM enhanced RPFP. Consultation, coordination and logistic support facilitated the achievement of the outputs. Some hindering factors were the unavailability of hazard maps (flood maps) and no GIS software in the provinces (La Union) DRR-Enhanced RPFP. (Butuan) Drafted the PDPFP – DRR Enhanced Plan. Generated hazard maps and risk maps. (Surigao)
<u>What were the factors that facilitated to achieve project outputs or outcomes? What were the hindering factors?</u>	<p>Facilitating factors: GIS Training; provision of software and hardware; consultations for the refinement of guidelines; improvement of tools(Butuan)</p> <p>Hindering factors: Data gaps, e.g. assessment of vulnerabilities, per capita income was only at the provincial level not the municipality, no data at the Barangay level, no data disaggregation in terms of gender; No official Barangay maps, NSO base maps are unofficial; time constraint – Sept 2007 was the orientation, actual start was Feb 2008; lack of manpower.</p>
<u>What structure or mechanism has been established for ensuring the achievement of project objectives?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation of members from the provincial governments and RLAs in the project but not all constituents aware of the project. (La Union) Core team from NEDA with support from line agencies.(Butuan)
<u>Is this structure or mechanism clear to the project implementers and stakeholders at all levels?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. (Butuan)
<u>What new knowledge and skills have the stakeholders at the regional and provincial levels gathered from the training that were conducted?</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application of GIS in DRM mainstreaming in planning. (La Union) New knowledge and skills related to the formulation of DRR-enhanced RPFP, e.g. GIS technology, risk assessment, quantification of potential damages to life and property. (Butuan)

- Inputs on risk and damage estimation through utilization of software.

What was the effect of the training in terms of application at the regional and provincial levels?

- Big help in preparation of Disaster Management plan and incorporation of DRM in RPFP. (La Union)
- Appreciation of new knowledge and skills that helped in the formulation of DRR-enhanced RPFP. (Butuan)
- The inputs/knowledge of the trainings greatly helped in the formulation/updating of the plan (Surigao)

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:

La Union Group 1
Highly Satisfactory

Butuan
None

Surigao Group 1
Marginally Satisfactory

La Union Group 2
None

Surigao Group 2
Satisfactory

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Stakeholder Participation or Public Involvement	
<u>What activities were implemented to raise the awareness of the public regarding the objectives of the project?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy, presentation of plan to develop a DRR-enhanced sub-national development plan (i.e. RDC Economic Development Sector Executive Committee) (La Union) • RDCC has conducted several activities on awareness campaign in identified areas; conducted resource inventory; conducted actual risk assessment drills, e.g. drills for earthquakes and floods. (Butuan) • Consultations conducted with the PLUC and local planners. (Surigao) 	
<u>What sectors were consulted in the planning and design of the project, and involved in this project from preparation to implementation?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LGUs, RLAs (La Union) • RLUC members and the LGUs at the provincial and municipal levels.(Butuan) • Members of the PLUC, local planners • Planning Team in the preparation/drafting of the PDPFP (Surigao) 	
<u>Is the mix of stakeholders involved appropriate enough to effectively carry out the project?</u>	
<u>Who should have participated too in the project but were not included?</u>	
<u>La Union</u> Yes. Cities and municipalities were not included/involved	
<u>Butuan</u> Yes. Private sector, civil society, Red Cross	
<u>Surigao</u>	

Yes. Local Disaster Coordinating Councils

What mechanisms were put in place to generate consensus on the courses of action to take in relation to the achievement of project objectives?

- Trainings and other similar for a (La Union)
- Made use of the RLUC as an existing mechanism, with participation from the different sectoral committees. (Butuan)

Are there any foreseen effects of the project on various sectors, and what are these?

- Conscious efforts to mainstream DRR in planning, programming, budgeting and monitoring and evaluation system (PPBMES) (La Union)

Butuan

- In some areas with potentials for development, how to address high risks areas.
- Negative reactions from concerned sectors (how to convince). Challenge is how to communicate to the public regarding the high risk areas (recommendation: separate info, not part of the public document)

In implementing the project, who were the identified stakeholders from the provincial planning level and why?

- PPDOs for data validation and information (La Union)
- Community awareness on high risks areas. Possible resistance of affected existing communities/dwellers. (Surigao)

To what extent was the project participatory? What was the nature of involvement of the identified stakeholders?

To what extent were the ideas of the stakeholders considered (if stakeholders included representatives from communities or sectors)?

- Validation and consultation ; Advocacy (La Union)
- Very participatory. From the very start there were consultations already. Even members of the Legislative Body, the Provincial Council, the Provincial Disaster Coordinating Council, participated in the process. (Butuan)
- It was a multi-sectoral participation; NGAs, NGOs, Municipal Local Planners, Provincial Offices. Involved in the consultation and planning workshops. Considered their issues and concerns and recommended objectives, strategies, programs and projects. (Surigao)

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:

La Union Group 1
None

Butuan
Satisfactory

Surigao Group 1
Marginally Satisfactory

La Union Group 2
Highly Satisfactory

Surigao Group 2
None

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Replication and Scaling-up	
<u>Are plans developed to spread the activities of DRR mainstreaming not only to other regions but down to the municipalities and local communities? How will the mainstreaming activities be scaled-up?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, by advocating the benefits of the project. (La Union) • The plan is to replicate to the provinces down to the municipalities and the barangays. (Butuan) • Yes, through implementation JMC 1. (Surigao) 	
<u>What are the communication strategies and methodologies to promote the objectives of the project?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide plans and brochures and presentations to LGUs and RLAs(La Union) • JMC1(Butuan) • DILG will take lead in the replication of the project.(Surigao) 	
<u>Are there sufficient capacities (among institutions and individuals) to expand the project's achievement?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not yet sufficient; no GIS software (La Union) • To be able to localize the mainstreaming process, need more capacity - knowledge and skills. (Butuan) 	
<u>What are the capacity needs related to this that should be addressed?</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training on GIS(La Union) • Need Part II: focus on capacity-building, especially on risk assessment quantification. Guidelines need further refinement.(Butuan) 	
Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:	
La Union Group 1 None	Butuan Satisfactory
La Union Group 2 Marginally Satisfactory	Surigao Group 1 Marginally Satisfactory
	Surigao Group 2 None

Evaluation Criteria and FGD Question	Participants' Response
Monitoring and Evaluation	
<u>Who were responsible for coordinating the timely implementation of project activities so that target outputs are achieved as planned?</u>	
<u>La Union</u> Project team (consultants and NEDA-RDCS), pilot areas (NROs, LGUs and RLAs)	
<u>Butuan</u> Core team, focal person is the NEDA chief for plans, and policy formulation division.	
<u>Were there issues related to coordination of activities? What were these issues and how were</u>	

they resolved?

La Union

None

Butuan

No problem on coordination.

Were the outputs and outcomes and their indicators clear to all implementers and stakeholders concerned?

La Union

Yes

Butuan

Yes (Butuan)

Have project management been timely informed of issues related to project implementation?

La Union

Yes

Butuan

Yes. Coordination by RDCS, NEDA National is ok.

Were there issues related to timely reporting? What were these issues and how were they resolved?

La Union

Yes

Butuan

Mostly deadlines of project milestones due to harmonization of maps/data, e.g. May 15, 2008 was supposed to be the deadline of the draft plan but was produced in June.

Participants' Rating of this Evaluation Criteria:

La Union Group 1

None

Butuan

Satisfactory

Surigao Group 1

None

La Union Group 2

Highly Satisfactory

Surigao Group 1

None

Annex C. Summary of ratings¹¹

Criteria	La Union	Butuan	Surigao	Average/ or Consultants' Rating
Outcomes/ Achievements	G1 Highly Satisfactory G2 – No Answer	No Answer	G1 Marginally Satisfactory G2 Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Implementation Approach	No Answer	No Answer	No Answer	Satisfactory
Stakeholder Participation	G1 No Answer G2 Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	G1 Marginally satisfactory G2 No answer	Satisfactory
Sustainability	G1 Highly Satisfactory G2 No Answer	Satisfactory	G1 No Answer G2 Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Monitoring and Evaluation	G1 No Answer G2 Highly Satisfactory	No Answer	G1 Satisfactory G1 No Answer	Satisfactory

Annex D. Documents Reviewed

1. Project Final Report, Single Form Grant Agreement, version 050412, NEDA
2. Inception Report, Mainstreaming DRR in Sub-National Development and Physical Planning in the Philippines, NEDA-UNDP, Nov. 2007
3. Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR in Subnational Development and Physical Planning. Draft as of 19 August 2008.
4. DRM-Enhanced Regional Physical Framework Plan: 2004-2030. Region I, Regional Land Use Committee/Regional Development Council, NEDA
5. CARAGA Regional Physical Framework Plan: 2004-2030. Draft as of July 2008
6. Surigao del Norte DRR-Enhanced Provincial Physical Framework Plan. Draft as of 19 August 2008
7. Guidelines on Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management. Volume 1: Integrated Framework, NEDA-ADB. 2007
8. Guidelines on Provincial/Local Planning and Expenditure Management. Volume 2: Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan, NEDA-ADB. 2007
9. Critical Guidelines: Community-Based Disaster Risk Management, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center, 2006
10. Building Resilient Communities: Good Practices in Disaster Risk Management in the Philippines. Oxfam Great Britain. 2008
11. Briefing Note 01. Climate Change and Risk Reduction, International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), Geneva. 2008
12. Preliminary Assessment of Hazard Impact and Risk Management, Province of Isabela, Region 2

¹¹ This is required by DIPECHO but focusing only on the following criteria: Outcomes/Achievement, Implementation approach, Stakeholder Participation, Sustainability and Monitoring and Evaluation. The ratings ranges from Highly Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, and N/A. In the FGD in Butuan and Surigao, the stakeholders decided to add another rating measure: "Satisfactory" as an in-between mark between "Highly Satisfactory" and "Marginally Satisfactory".

Annex E. List of Participants

Focus Group Discussion: La Union, September 11, 2008

Name of Participant	Position	Agency/Office/Staff/Unit
Leon Dacanay Jr.	Consultant	NEA DRM Project
Brigida S. Cadile	PDO I	PPDO-Pangasinan
Avenix S. Arenas	PCDC Staff	PDCC-Pangasinan
Evelyn C. Sayson	Executive Assistant	OCDRCI, SFC, LU
Fe M. Madarcos	Sr. Agri.	DA RFU 1
Julius A. Batogan	Sr.SRS	MGB 1
Dr. Wilma Tomas	Spvg. SRS	FMS, DENR 1
Luisito S. Amada	Sr. SRS	ERDS-DENR 1
J D Lignes Jr.	Sr. Geologist	MGB-1
Gil C. Fernandez	STIDS	DTI
Josefina G. Oamar	Engineer III	DPWH-ROI
Darius Cargamento	PO III	PPDO, L.U.
Mayer Abaya	LAB I	PPDO, L.U.
Vincent S. Borja	PO I	PPDO-L.U.
Romeo V. Ramos	OR-MENT	DPWH-ROI
Menardo M. Panlilio	CEDS	NEDA 1
Jonathan Viernes	SEDS	NEDA 1
Gemma Ocon	Sr. EDS	NEDA 1
Roel Supsup	EDS I	NEDA 1
Karen Castro	SEDS	NEDA 1
Nestor G. Rillon	CEDS	NEDA 1
Aireen Fuclan	CDGI	OCD 1
Marian T. Cruz	Sr. EDS	NEDA
Salome T. Riego	PDO IV	

Focus Group Discussion: Butuan City, September 17, 2008

Name of Participant	Position	Agency/Office/Staff/Unit
Jose Salve Cabiling	Planning Officer II	DENR-MGB 13
Amado Mazo Posas	Civil Defense Officer I	OCD-Caraga
Erma R. Suyo		PPDO
Rey Niog		HLURB XIII
Lounella D. Villanueva	PO III	CPDO
Ana T. Semacio		DSWD
Grace C. Harting		NEDA
Melody M. Guimary		DA XIII
Mavic H. De Guzman		NEDA
Emmanuel Gidacan		NEDA 13
Jake Tio	Consultant	NEDA
Caryl A. Cavan	PO I	PPDO-Agusan Sur
Fides Joy A. Caduyac	Internal Consultant	NEDA 13
F. Romulus C. Villanueva		NEDA 13

Focus Group Discussion: Surigao del Norte, September 18, 2008

Name of Participant	Position	Agency/Office/Staff/Unit
Jacquez Hamabad	SUARPO-Planning	DAR
Analyn T. Boquilon	PFO-SAN Staff	BFAR
Epimaco P. Lapaz		Dep Ed Province
Dionisio A. Suapas		PAO
Gina P. Soriano	Engineer 3	DPWH-Surigao City
Billy A. General	Provincial Caretaker	DTI
Celso Bagutoy, Jr.	Staff	PPDO
Patricia Mante		PPDO
Mavic H. De Guzman		NEDA

Dr. Jake S. Tio	Risk Specialist/Consultant	
Rodulfo P. Nasi		PD/DILG
Josefina M. Edera		PPDO
Ma. Luz P. Sansa		PEO
Graciela Mante		PPDO
Al P. Gallardo		PPDO
E.T. COUSON		PPDO
Elmer Tecson		CPDO/CPOR
Antioco C. Bonono, Jr.		PHO
May B. Luison		BFAR-13
Ma. Socorro Alcantara		PPDO
Tessie A. Balomaque		PPDO
Arturo M. Orlise		PPDO
Marilyn E. Pon		PPDO
Abel M. Tejol		CPDO