

Summary Report
National Consultative Meeting on Disaster Risk Reduction
Organised by the
European Commission –& National Disaster Coordination Council
The Philippines, 10 September 2009

Background & Overview

- The present report (including summary priority table) reflect the outputs of the National Consultative Meeting as determined by the participants. It will be used to define priorities but should not be considered as guidelines for applicants themselves. Also, the present document does not reflect the position of the European Commission of the Government of the Philippines.
- This was the fourth Meeting of the kind organised in the country (April & November 2005, 2007); for the second time jointly with the Government of the Philippines.
- The rationale behind the event is to: carry out a multi-stakeholder dialogue on current Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) issues in the country; identify priority actions for DRR advocacy; disseminate lessons learned; discuss DIPECHO's proposed orientations in the Philippines for the period 2010-2011; use participant's experience to refine priorities, gaps and actions identified.
- The Meeting contributes to a programming process in the region which outcomes will serve as the basis for the next Call for Expression of Interest for the 7th Action Plan for DIPECHO South East Asia, with the following expected timeframe:
 - Publication of a Call by January 2010 - Deadline end of February 2010
 - 15 month projects to start as of May 2010 at the earliest
- The Meeting was well attended, with over 80 participants in the opening, down to around 40 by the end of the day. Stakeholders from the Government, donors, international organisations, local and international NGOs, as well as some UN agencies participated. There was a very positive interaction and discussion level and excellent presentations, in particular a witness account from the Mayor of St Bernard.
- The Meeting coincided with a flood situation in Pampanga, reminding of the relevance and priority of the topic.
- We would like to give a particular thank to the National Disaster Coordination Council staff and the European Commission Delegation, as well as all those who have prepared or made the excellent presentations and facilitated working groups.

Opening Remarks

- In his speech, delivered on behalf of Hon. Gilberto C. Teodoro Jr., Secretary of Department of National Defense and Chairman of the NDCC, Under-Secretary Ernesto G. Carolina appraised the contribution to the DRR agenda of the European Union and in particular of the DIPECHO Programme, as well as the work of NGOs and United Nations agencies.
- The significant progresses in DRR by NDCC in understanding DRR and in engaging in partnerships with non governmental and civil society actors now have to be turned into action. The Strategic National Action Plan (SNAP) for DRR and its work plan prepared in 2008-2009 with DIPECHO support have been submitted to the President for approval. A Disaster Management Bill is also being developed, in order to provide the necessary legal framework for DRR implementation and financing.
- The Head of the European Commission Delegation to the Philippines, Alistair MacDonald, reminded of the recent adoption by the European Union of a DRR Strategy, which will ensure that disaster effects are better addressed in the EU's assistance.
- Both interlocutors emphasised the importance of linking DRR and climate change, given the high impact expected of more severe and irregular trends of disasters in the country.

Overview of DRR Achievements – Updates and Trends from Government

- Substantial and comprehensive progresses and achievements were reported under HFA Priorities 4 and in particular 5, while other Priorities need more work.
- Key accomplishments were highlighted for improved multi-stakeholder and participatory frameworks, risk and vulnerability assessments, early warning, knowledge management and preparedness to respond. However, the absence of a clear legal and financing framework, the need for capacity-development systems for DCCs and for improved quality information collection and sharing, limited public-private institutional partnerships and arrangements in DRR, the need for more programmatic and systematic approach to CBDRR pilots, are issues to address as priorities. Dealing with DRR in peace-building processes is also a necessity.
- The SNAP road map for the next decade was presented. Eighteen “projects” have been prioritised and possible sources of funding within and outside the official structures are being analysed. Further promotion and advocacy of the SNAP is planned, the endorsement by the President being made a priority measure.
- The Guidelines of Mainstreaming DRR in Sub-national Development and Land-Use Physical Planning, developed by NEDA with UNDP support and DIPECHO funding, have been approved in 2009 and made available. The NEDA Representative presented the outlines of the tool, as well as the next measures foreseen and which have started under a second phase supported by AusAid and UNDP: DRR/CCA enhanced planning,

improving mainstreaming through standardised data and map collection, management and assessment model, adding secondary entry points, mainstreaming into Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUP). NEDA will also carry out further demonstration and capacity-building measures, develop knowledge, advocacy and IEC products. Greater LGU/community involvement and partnerships with universities and research institutions will be sought.

- The tool allows for multi-hazard approaches including man-made hazards, at this stage reporting mostly on direct impact of disasters. It will be continuously reviewed so improve its user-friendliness. The tool focuses on regional and provincial levels, while including inter-municipal analysis. The main budget for implementing measures comes from provinces, while LGUs are encouraged to contribute and ODA can palliate financing gaps.
- Government officials, in particular NDCC Members, were well represented and actively participated in the discussions and facilitations of the working groups. Linkages were established or reinforced with other stakeholders.

Overview of DRR Achievements – Updates from Implementing Agencies

- DIPECHO partners provided a comprehensive outlook of their activities and outputs, in reference to HFA Priorities and achievements. A detailed list of lessons learned, challenges and gaps was provided, complementing the issues already raised by the Government.
- Saint Bernard Mayor Rentuza, where the devastating Guinsaigon landslide occurred in 2006, provided an “inspiring” witness account of how the Municipality implemented and is now sustaining DRR integrated measures, as well as how community-based DRR models have had positive impact on the resilience of people. The commitment, motivation and the ownership by local stakeholders were appraised by the Meeting’s participants, as a sign that DRR is realistic and feasible when political will is present.
- Some participants questioned the possibility to reach comprehensive CBDRR models without a share of external support. Coordination at local and national level was also said to be crucial – but to be improved. PHILVOCS highlighted the need for implementing actors to carefully develop risk assessment tools so they are understandable by the communities while maintaining an acceptable level of technicality. The NDCC members can assist in the methodologies for developing appropriate community-based tools.

DRR updates from Donors

- The World Bank, Asian Development Bank, AusAid and the European Commission provided updates on their DRR programmes and strategies. JICA and the United Nations

are also engaged in DRR (and CCA) initiatives. Donors, including from EU Embassies, actively engaged in the discussions during the whole day.

- The World Bank presented its comprehensive (both integrated and *ad hoc*) approach to DRR and CCA in the Philippines, including from the Global Facility for Disaster Risk and Recovery. Some components focused on gap and vulnerability assessment, including at local level and for LGUs. A methodology and ranking of LGUs most at risk of natural disasters (multi-hazard approach) were established.
- A compilation of studies highlighted some gaps, such as: high degree of decentralisation and uneven levels of poverty incidence leading to uneven abilities to prepare, respond, cope, and recover from natural disasters; weak role of sector agencies, in particular in support of local government; NDCC needs to be reformed; need for a new law promoting proactive DRR; poor enforcement of related laws and regulations pertaining to safety, mining, building codes, land management, forestry, environment etc., impacting negatively on the contributions to DRR; national policies and standards yet to be translated into local ordinances and policies.
- A DRR framework for LGU is being proposed, with elements such as the flexible model of Disaster Risk Management Offices (DRMOs), tested through various projects.
- Methodologies for scaling up models and pilots need to be developed and disseminated. Government and non government actors need to develop a “rationalised”, comprehensive framework (“work programme”), in order to step out of individual, project-based approaches.
- AusAid, another key DRR donor in the country, exposed its set of programmes addressing DRR GIS and scientific work including capacity-building, support of the Philippines National Red Cross, DRR mainstreaming into sectors, community-based DRR piloting. With its new DRR strategy enacted, AusAid’s commitment to DRR will continue, with the Philippines as one of the priority countries.
- The ADB outlined its overall support to DRR actions in the region, a large share of which benefits South East Asia. The ADB intends to make DRR more a priority when negotiating with Governments. The “National Assessment on the State of Disaster Risk Management in the Philippines¹” developed in 2008 through UNDP and OCD/NDCC with ADB support identifies 57 specific gaps and issues and 82 recommendations. These need to be prioritised and addressed.
- There is a need to mainstream DRR in the next mid term Philippines development plan.
- The European Commission will continue the DIPECHO Programme in the Philippines, with a priority for scaling up models of the experience developed at local level. With

¹ The report can be accessed through the OCD.

various DRR and development programmes ongoing, there should be accrued linkages between the CBDRR pilots and other initiatives. The potential new DRR frameworks (SNAP implementation, DM Bill) will need support for implementation or continued advocacy efforts in case these are postponed. The European Commission is preparing a CCA programme, which will take from the DIPECHO experience.

Thematic Discussions

- Rationale of the working groups: use experience from stakeholders participating in the Meeting to: build on lessons from experience and ongoing projects; build on existing coordination mechanisms; consider new developments (SNAP, draft DM Bill, potentials for linkages with new programmes etc.). The groups were to come out with a few practical recommendations for DIPECHO's next Action Plan as well as if possible for other identified stakeholders, in terms of area selection criteria, target groups, activities, priorities, transfer of knowledge and promotional tools etc.
- Each group was co-facilitated by a NDCC Member and a implementing or donor agency.
- DRR & Education: the group proposed very concrete steps and solutions to improve interaction between the national and local levels, for the implementation, design and approval of IEC and educational tools, for accrued coordination. A timeframe was also proposed for specific pending issues.
- A very large amount of participants contributed to the DRR & CCA working group, indicating the high interest and actuality of the topic. The group discussed concepts and linkages between DRR and CCA, as well as sectors, targets and actions in which the two issues could be better integrated. New CCA initiatives will hopefully learn and take from the experience of CBDRR.
- A few suggestions were made to improve dissemination and information sharing regarding advocacy and documentation – topics that had been identified as a clear gap.
- The working group on linkages between national and sub-national levels identified a few particular programmes being launched (eg through NEDA) and how these can interact better with successful DRR development planning models such as the DRMO model.
- Specific measures to address disaster risks in small and medium urban environment were proposed, such as: diagnostic/ assessment tool of city resilience to disasters; community-based flood early warning system; Rapid Earthquake Damage Assessment System rolled out into a multi-hazard and risk assessment tool; knowledge dissemination to targeted professional categories, associations and “clients”; risk sensitive Land use planning; IEC campaign/advocacy; prepare/ and improving contingency plans; improve coordination and collaboration among different level of governance and development partners.

Recommendations

- HFA Priority 1 – Governance: design and implement advocacy programme for policy review, revision and implementation at all levels; empower all levels of governance pertinent to: DRR and CC; sustainable and alternative livelihood; mainstreaming of cross cutting issues and inclusive approaches; increased participation of civil Society and of the poorest in DRR decision-making (including multi-sectoral participation; listening to the voice of the most vulnerable); mechanisms at regional, provincial and municipal levels to support the implementation of the SNAP; transparency and accountability of decision-makers to the people; reduce the degree of dependency on donors and increase incentives for pro-activity; at local levels, improve knowledge and the “trickling down” of national outputs including DRR mainstreaming into local governance processes; development training programmes for local government staff on DRR and CCA; develop measurement and benchmark systems for DRR knowledge among LGUs, in order to allow progressive intervention; improve venues for policy dialogue and exchange of information/knowledge on DRR.
- HFA Priority 2 – Risk Assessment: develop and strengthen tools, practices, guidelines and appropriate technologies: enabling tools, policy guidelines, EWS, support to communities in risk assessment and identification.
- HFA Priority 3 – Risk Management and Vulnerability Reduction: support communities in risk mitigation and reduction measures;. Improve data/information collection capacity (damage and loss) and systems at local and national level; develop system for tracking contributions, roles and financing from the various sources and stakeholders involved in preparedness and response.
- HFA Priority 4 – Knowledge and Education: develop knowledge management mechanisms: integration of DRR in school curricula (primary, secondary and tertiary); increase awareness on DRR and climate change adaptation; replication of best practices and appropriate technology; integration and promotion of indigenous and scientific knowledge.
- HFA Priority 5 – Disaster Preparedness and Response: sustain emergency preparedness measures like setting-up and maintenance of community-based EWS, contingency planning, community drills and simulation exercises; increase capacities and resources of LGUs – as first responders - to anticipate, prepare and reduce the occurrence and impact of disasters; address the absence or lack of functionality of DCCs in many LGUs; better address threats other than natural disasters and leading to complex emergencies (man-made disasters, emerging risks etc.).
- Cross-cutting issues: promote and sustain multi-sectoral DRR networking, linkages, and partnerships, in particular with regards to: coordination among DRR agencies, with the private sector, academia, civil society; popularise and ensure implementation of SNAP at all levels; quality assurance in development of technical guidelines and standards and in

DRR practice; need for an overall financing strategy for DRR, in particular for preparedness measures and for the Government structures, in combination to other resources from private, associations or households.

Conclusions, including for DIPECHO / Follow-up Actions / Other Comments

- As indicated by one participant, in the Philippines DRR agenda, “there is no shortage of good advices”, lessons learned and already well identified recommendations. What is needed is prioritisation and rationalisation, as well as practical implementation and effective dissemination of the experience developed.
- To carry out a prioritisation exercise, the dissemination of reports and studies should be more systematic. For instance, the ADB DRM Framework study’s recommendations could be made available to DRR stakeholders for further discussions.
- The momentum achieved on DRR is considered very high, with potentials for critical reference frameworks such as the SNAP and a DM Bill. However, this momentum should not be lost. It is feared that, while the Climate Change agenda is moving ahead, the DRR agenda is left aside or not in-depth enough, in spite of the disasters being faced. In this context, advocacy measures for stronger and more effective DRR organisational, legal and strategic frameworks, their implementation and financing, should firmly continue. There is also a need to bring CCA more into DRR at institutional level. As indicated by one participant, “CCA begins with DRR”.
- In addition, given the challenges of sustainability of CBDRR models, there is need to further institutionalise at all relevant levels CBDRR practices. The DRR national framework should properly address local level concerns and priorities.
- The Meeting offered an excellent level of interaction between the various stakeholders, with open and frank discussions. It was generally recognised that the community and local based experience demonstrated by DIPECHO partners, other implementing agencies, and local authorities, had made a difference in the quality and effect of programmes at sub-national levels, ensuring that voices of communities are heard. This confirmed the relevance for continued DIPECHO and similar actions in the country.
- There was also positive feedback on efforts to improve coherence and harmonisation of tools, systems and standards, but also availability of project outputs (such as the READY products) or models (DRMO) even if much more work needs to be done. In this context, continued interaction between NDCC members, implementing agencies and donors is crucial. DRR coordination in general needs to be enhanced.
- Various initiatives have recently been looking at prioritisation of areas in terms of hazards and vulnerabilities. A comprehensive review (mapping) of ongoing and planned initiatives, as well as priority areas well/little addressed should be made. That would help identifying gaps but also areas for whether complementary actions or rather

dissemination. Ideally, the DRR stakeholders, including agencies working at local level, would carry out such a “homework”.

- Public-private partnerships on DRR have some large potentials in the Philippines. However, so far experience shows challenging processes and interaction. The reasons why this issue is so complex could be analysed, in order to find appropriate solutions.

Should you have any comments on this report, please send them by email to Cécile Pichon at drrc@echo-bangkok.org

Annexes

Agenda, presentations, speeches, list of participants, DIPECHO information sheet.

See also <http://www.delphi.ec.europa.eu/index.cfm>

Outcomes of Working Groups

Working Group – DRR & Education	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe School Campaign including Bangkok Agenda • Guidance Note on Safe School Construction, Global facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, ISDR, INEE, World Bank, 2009 • Mainstreaming DRR in the Education Sector in the Philippines, NDCC, DedEd, UNDP, ADPC (DIPECHO) • Recommendations from the 2007 Consultative Meeting • DRR & Education Working Group, Curricula development, IEC materials for children and schools, games and child-focused approaches, pilot projects in the Philippines <p>Facilitators: DedEd, Action Against Hunger, Save the Children</p> <p>Participants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suresh Murugesu – Accion Contra el Hambre 2. Vilches Nida – Save the Children 3. Dr. Leonida Bautista - PHIVOLCS 4. Usec. Antonio Inocentes - DepED 5. Candy F. de Juan - DepED 6. Emmanuel M. Luna - UP 7. Ruben Romero - PNRC 8. Marietta Alcid/Mia Brusola – CARE 9. Cathy Larracas – PNRC 10. Edwin B. Elegado – Plan International 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding what is happening in education Sector on DRR (Government, NGOs, UN and bilateral organisations). • Identifying DRR concerns in the educational sector in the Philippines • Discussing key agendas for common action for advocacy, capacity building, coordination, IEC materials, curricula, methodologies (intra-, extra-curricular): towards more standardisation, dissemination; are there gaps? • Promoting synergy and Integration – exploring opportunities and possibilities, in particular improved linkages between what is being done and tested at local level and the possibility to formalise the processes or materials at national level: how can we ensure that the quality materials are approved, disseminated and used; how to promote the good existing or planned materials in a coordinated way; do we need to focus more on intra- or extra-curricular activities (or both); what about disability issues. • Construction standards, evacuation: towards improvement of norms (and their implementation) • Safe School campaign, Bangkok Agenda: what type of innovative or needed action could be proposed? • Coordination mechanisms and practical working methodologies for implementing agencies and Government entities at various level: how to improve.
<p>Outputs</p>	
<p>What Needs to be done</p> <p>Suggestions:</p>	<p>How to Improve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NGOs shall coordinate with the DepED National Office on

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Propose a few practical actions for DIPECHO's next programme Identify how Dipecho can contribute to the DRR integration into development programmes, as well as transfer of experience and knowledge How DIPECHO can fund the training of teachers = train them on how to integrate DRR in the curriculum <p>An Overview of What happened</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different organizations did their own thing in different areas. But there was no coordination with the National DepED <p>Major Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most IEC materials are not indorsed by DepED to be used for teaching DRR in schools. How to train children to become facilitators of DRR = train them how to conduct and facilitate training, involve them in DRR activities How to involve PTCAs in DRR <p>Gaps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No data base on existing IEC materials No existing capacity mapping of the services of each organization and where they are There is no standard material for use in teaching DRR There is no clearing house to look into the quality and most appropriate materials for DRR including the Videos <p>Agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All member organizations with IEC materials shall submit the same to the Office of Usec. Inocentes for review and approval - Deadline of submission of IEC October All programs and projects on DRR which any member organization shall undertake must be coordinated with the National DepED Office for proper endorsement to the Regions, Divisions and School levels. 	<p>programs and projects they want to undertake in their areas of coverage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education in Emergencies cluster shall review all IEC materials done by NGOs and recommend materials to be replicated Coordination to be done with the National Office of DepED from the inception or designing of the project itself. Initiatives on integration in the curricula are being done through an issuance of a Memorandum on mainstreaming DRR in the curriculum. IEC materials developed on DRR have to be reviewed, finalized published and disseminated. DepED has no money to fund reproduction of IEC materials to support and help teachers teach DRR in schools. After IEC materials have been finalized, teachers should be taught and trained on how to use these in teaching DRR. Organize a Committee from DepED to look into the development of modules/IEC materials. Before any project will be approved like development of IEC materials, it has to pass through the DepED. Coordination with the National DepED Office be undertaken before any project on development of IEC materials be approved. Coordinate with the Office of Undersecretary Antonio A. Inocentes on projects related to development materials intended for teaching DRR in schools. The Committee shall come up with one standard material to be replicated /reproduced to be funded by DIPECHO. Also make a strong requirement that any new materials intended for teaching DRR shall pass through the DEPED. On Schools as Used as Evacuation Centers – make sure that schools are safe for use as evacuation centers, equipped with water and sanitation facilities. How to advocate through the children to do repair and retrofitting of school buildings. (Involving them in hazard assessment)? Building Safe Schools – recommend to DIPECHO retrofitting of
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All proposals of member organizations shall be submitted to the Office of Usec. Inocentes in October. • ACCORD, PHIVOLCS shall help DepED in looking into the feasibility, soundness, methodology, duplication of the proposals in terms of areas and topics. • The Education cluster shall become the TWG for DIPECHO programs and projects. <p>Timelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October – Deadline for submission of IEC materials and proposals • November - All proposals shall be submitted to DIPECHO 	<p>school buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document all good practices. The cluster should work on documentation of good practices – Care of Center for Disaster Preparedness. • Dr. Luna proposed General Education Subject in the University offering DRM and ask DIPECHO to fund the project. Dr. Luna shall prepare the proposal • Each school shall develop their own school safety maintenance and retrofitting so that the people in that area will cooperate and work together to make schools safer.
--	--

Working Group – Documentation & Advocacy	
<p><u>Documents of Reference & Sources</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JANI & DANI logframes and project outcomes (Joint Advocacy Network Initiative, DIPECHO Vietnam) • Samples from other countries (IEC etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy package “We cannot wait for Another Disaster to Happen: A Call for DRR Policies and Programs in the Philippines” • Safe Hospital Campaign (WHO) media and advocacy kit • DRR mainstreaming guidelines (targeted groups, sectors) • etc. • Why Advocate for DRR?, Tearfund Guidelines <p><u>Facilitators:</u> OCD, OXFAM</p> <p><u>Participants</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) Catherine Vasseur, Country Director, Handicap International 2.) Lyra Magalang, Acting Program Manager DRR, Oxfam GB 3.) Susan Cruz, OCD-NCR Director 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is certainly a strong experience on advocacy measures in the Philippines. Identify what concrete actions are still needed (eg on DRR &CCA, SNAP implementation, follow-up of the DM Bill). • There is a need for more documentation and dissemination (methodologies, materials etc.), in particular on CBDRR but also in terms of DRR integration. <p>Identify a few possible actions that could fit in the DIPECHO programming, as well as the target groups and stakeholders. Ideally this would take the form of <u>joint actions at minima among DIPECHO partners and preferably in a wider group.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advocacy: what are the gaps and (new or continued) target groups; who can do what (in particular DIPECHO partners or through DIPECHO funding); at what level (national or sub-national?). Once this has been identified, what could be a set of very concrete activities, preferably in a joint framework. ○ Documentation: how to improve on this? How to compile what exists, ensure it is of quality and usable, made available? Do we need more standardised tools? Is there an inventory of IEC

<p>4.) Red Batario, Executive Director, Center for Community Journalism and Development</p> <p>5.) Gil Francis Arevalo, Project Officer, Oxfam GB</p> <p>6.) Ms. Ruth Rodriguez, OCD</p>	<p>materials, training modules, trained staff, CBDRR models? Where can they be found? Is there a need for establishing “quality and standardised criteria” etc. At which level do we need to document more and who are the target groups? A lot of things are being produced, not only through DIPECHO, but they are not disseminated – how can resource centres such as PreventionWeb or others be better used etc.</p>
--	--

<p>Outputs</p>	
<p>Gaps in Advocacy Works: (DRR and CCA, SNAP, DRRM Bill)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness/Consciousness of the General Public and the Media (Confusion about the DRR and CCA, DRR and DRM, and the mandate about the SNAP in the subnational level (regional and provincial level); • Apathy among the LGUs (not a priority, less advocacy undertaking, few local champions/advocates, not mainstreamed locally --- even if the DRRM Bill is now in the third reading in the senate and a number of interventions as regards DRR and CCA; low level link between the legislators and the community <p>Level of Advocacy; who are the new players? What can be done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of advocacy must be mainstreamed in the subnational (regional and provincial) multi-stakeholders consultation level; • To involve/engage more the Leagues of Local Governments (Provincial, Municipal, and the barangay or the local level), Media, Academe, Private Sector, Business Community, People with disabilities, youth, and of course the Survivors/victims ----from being victims to victors; and the Deputized Civil Defense Coordinators 	<p>Documentation (Gaps and Cross Cutting Issues)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory/Repository of all IEC Materials (no official agency or group) • Key messages/principles (DRR, DRM, CCA and others were not clear); • General criteria as regards documentation (especially on terminologies/jargons are not clear to all concerned implementing agencies; <p>What to do?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Prevention WEB (On line resources/courses) • D-Library

<p>Working Groups – Linking DRR & Climate Change Adaptation</p>
--

References

- Policies & strategies, environment profiles, official structure
- Numerous initiatives being implemented or planned in the Philippines (as components or full fledged projects)
- DFID staff working paper [Convergence of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation](#)

Facilitators: DOST, EC, CDP

Participants

Agnes Bolanos, Agri-Aqua Development Coalition-Mindanao
Christopher Hoffman, IOM
Patricia Escudero Renedo, Spanish Red Cross
Renald Vaw, Department of Health
Gerardo Medina, WHO
Jan Robert R. Go, WHO
Allen G. Molen, GTZ
Carlos Podolina, Citizen Disaster Response Center
Paul G. Zambrano, WHO
Sonja Bjorklund, Finnish Red Cross
Catherine Martin, Philippines National Red Cross
Michelle Mesa David, Czech Republic Embassy
Cecilia A. Montenele, PAGASA-Department of Science and Technology
Fellizar Cagay, Center for Disaster Preparedness
Terese Britanico, Citizen Disaster Response Center
Edwin B. Elegado, PLAN
Ryan Usado, Department of Science and Technology
Bess Lim, Department of Agriculture

Background - DIPECHO & CCA

Climate change adaptation cannot be the sole focus of a specific and *ad hoc* DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate components reflecting the necessity to raise awareness on evolving trends and looking at links between DRR and climate change (CC), **always in a natural disaster context**.

Non exhaustive examples (where scientific data has confirmed the impact of CC on natural disaster trends):

- Increased awareness raising on integration of CC adaptation into programming and planning (ad hoc target groups);
 - Reinforced vulnerability and risk assessments, early warning systems, land-use planning and building codes, institutional and legal capacities;
 - Development/dissemination of guidelines and tools on how to communicate CC better in a DRR context;
 - Improving and adapting practices/behaviours affecting environment and livelihoods (in a DRR context).
-
- Risk that the DRR and CCA are running in parallel and are not well coordinated or integrated (policy, strategic, planning levels). The two issues are quite high on the ISDR and regional agendas (2010 Asian Ministerial Conference on DRR).
 - Numerous pilots and actions being implemented or planned, at various levels, ie existing experience on integrated DRR/CCA approaches.
 - Funding in the pipeline for CCA – does it integrate well DRR?
 - CC will definitely have severe impacts on the Philippines, in particular on the impact of disasters. There are various studies and analyses now available (are they all reliable? Is there a need for more?)
 - Identify a few possible actions that could fit in the DIPECHO programming for the next Action Plan, as well as the target groups

<p>Nilo Pena, PC – Department of Science and Technology Caroline Maningo, EC Angel Neon, Christian Aid</p>	<p>and stakeholders (ie role of NDCC members and leading CC entities in particular, role of implementing agencies etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on local levels and on few specific activities. What could be the role of LGUs ? • How can DIPECHO ensure proper documentation and dissemination / transfer of knowledge and experience of the DRR and DRR-CCA pilots and models into upcoming CCA initiatives? • How to advocate for a better linkage between DRR and CCA?
--	--

Outputs

Better understanding CCA and DRR

General Commend: “Thoughts”

- Long term solutions (creative solutions) in the PIP context
- Poor climate change adaptation can cause national disasters → But Not All.
- Recognition of Geographical Considerations > Vulnerable Populations → historical / Vulnerable Populations → new

Gaps / Issues	Proposed Activities	Chronology
<p>Coordination between climate change officer and National DRM body, local government unit, coordination with national body that handles DRR/CCA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced coordination at all levels • Forum to coordinate DRR and CCA (GoP, Donors, NGOs/LGovs) 	<p>1</p>
<p>Climate change → Natural Disaster</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Migration ==> Migration Policy Development (i.e. urban center growing)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vulnerable. Population Assessment • Livelihoods development <p style="text-align: center;"> </p>	<p>Long Term</p>
<p>Preparedness Changing disease trends</p>	<p>Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development (i.e. sewerage development) • C.B. in local community • Research/data archive • Surveillance 	<p>Long Term</p>

<p>Continuity of Participation Community-Local Participation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Sustainable projects/localised/replicated</p>	<p>Legazpi Model</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Replication of best practices</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>DRM Bill - support</p>	3
<p>Risk Perception</p> <p>Sensitisation of local government on CCA + funding + implementation</p>	<p>Information campaign</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Execute order, government policy</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓</p> <p>Implement</p>	2

Working Group – Urban Risks	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Risk Campaign 2010-2011 • Existing or planned pilots (EMI, Christian Aid’s partners, PROMISE, GTZ etc.) <p><u>Facilitators:</u> EMI, Christian Aid, DILG</p> <p><u>Participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Usec. Austere Panadero, DILG ▶ Dir. Renato Solidum, PHIVOLCS ▶ Dr. Tabassam Raza, EMI ▶ Marino Deocariza, EMI ▶ Jocel Pangilinan, Christian Aid 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As for the previous two Campaigns, DIPECHO is keen on supporting global DRR efforts. However, this issue is more complex for a Programme like DIPECHO, due to timing, but also since the added value of the Programme is more on remote, vulnerable areas. Addressing the poor and vulnerable urban populations has proven extremely complex and challenging so far in a DIPECHO framework. • Proposed focus of the discussions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Small and Medium Urban centers ○ Follow-up of the two previous campaigns in an urban environment (ie Safe Schools and Safe Hospitals in cities), as proposed by ISDR ○ Other potential innovative or interesting ideas for DIPECHO or

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Remy Guillena, Christian Aid ▶ Cathy Vidar, World Bank ▶ Bong Masagca, PDRN ▶ Umair Hasan, Oxfam ▶ Anita van de Haas-Conijn, Netherlands Embassy 	<p>other stakeholders to be identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Links with Climate Change Adaptation <p>Identify a few possible actions that could fit in the DIPECHO programming, as well as the target groups and stakeholders (ie role of NDCC members and DILG in particular, role of implementing agencies, media, associations, private sector etc.).</p>
--	---

Outputs	
<p>Urban Hazards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of hazard-prone areas • Earthquakes • Floods • Climate Change <p>Possible Targets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Homeowners ▶ Urban poor communities ▶ Urban planners ▶ LGUs ▶ Public and Private Critical structure Administrators 	<p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Unplanned Urbanization ▶ Limited Assessment of Resiliency of Cities ▶ Limited capacities in DRM education and awareness of LGUs and communities <p>Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Diagnostic/ assessment tool of city resiliency to disasters ▶ Community-based flood early warning system ▶ REDAS roll-out (Rapid Earthquake Damage Assessment System) - multi-hazard and risk assessment tool. ▶ Knowledge dissemination - homeowners, masons, carpenters, urban planners, engineers, consumers, parents/mass associations (“clients” and lobby groups) ▶ Risk sensitive Land use planning ▶ IEC campaign/Advocacy ▶ Prepare/ and Improving contingency plans ▶ Improve coordination and collaboration among different level of governance and development partners

Working Group - Scaling-up & Sub-National Models

References

- [Recommendations from 2007 National Consultative Meeting \(similar working group\)](#)
- [NEDA Guidelines on DRM Mainstreaming into Development](#)
- Numerous actions being implemented or planned (NEDA, UNDP, GTZ, other DIPECHO partners, AusAid, JICA etc.)
- World Bank report on vulnerability assessment

Facilitators: UNDP, NEDA

Participants: UNDP, NEDA, OXFAM, DIPECHO

Background

- Regarding DRR integration, there is a series of tools and methodologies already developed and being tested, at various levels (NEDA guidelines, LGU planning, community-based actions. READY outputs etc.), in addition to the SNAP and DM Bill.
- There are numerous CBDRR pilots and models existing, as well as experience at municipal level, watershed management level and for certain hazards. Various programmes have been building on these or intend to use them: GF DRR, upcoming JICA programme. There is an attempt to promote the experience developed, disseminate it, adapt to other levels (eg NEDA tools for lower levels) and this is very good. The NEDA Guidelines will be the take-off point for the ongoing MDG-F programme of AECI, UNDP, UNEP and other UN for mainstreaming climate-related risks; idem for the NEDA-UNDP-AusAid project on linking DRR and CCA at local level.

- Focus the discussions on 1) socio-economic planning and 2) DRR integration into sectors, building on the previous recommendations from 2007 and the various initiatives that have taken place since.
- So far some linkages have taken place where projects were running (in particular as far as DIPECHO is concerned) – how to enhance this in a systematic way?
- Map out over the period 2010-2012 what will happen and what are the main priorities in terms of DRR/CCA implementation.
- Possible topics for discussions (to be chosen from): continued promotion/dissemination and transfer of knowledge at the sub-national & lower levels; polling efforts to ensure this is being done in a more coherent and coordinated way, possibly as part of a national plan, for instance through DILG or other entities (DOF, DBM); improving coherence between DIPECHO and other numerous initiatives and tools (how practically this can be done – advocacy measures? Further piloting or modeling?); ensuring a standardised approach to the use and dissemination of the tools (including NEDA) at various levels by relevant agencies (need of ToT to implementing agencies and “users” or “promoters”? socialisation of the tools in particular for risk and vulnerability assessment? Development of public or targeted awareness campaigns to inform on and promote the tools?); disseminating further the existing models (Flood EWS, DRMO etc.); continue complementing other programmes (JICA, READY etc.) in an enhanced and more systematic manner; How can we contribute to the implementation of the SNAP (and DM Bill is enforced) ?
- Possibly, suggest criteria for areas where DRR integrated (in overall planning or in sectors) models could be promoted.
- There are a few practical issues that we have started working up, in particular regarding mapping tools and systems – how can we ensure a standardised or compatible approach in the systems we promote and in our capacity-building efforts?
- Are there some sectors where we could be involved more ?

Outputs

Our Task

Examples of initiatives that can be upscaled: OXFAM experience

Identify tasks that DIPECHO can support

Build on what have been accomplished under earlier Action Plans and related initiatives by other partners and donors

on DRMOs

Catalyze setting up of DRMOs in 3 provinces (APSEMO model)

- Capacity development, use DRR planning tools (e.g., NEDA)
- Facilitators' Manual lodging it with DILG's GO-FAR

Replication of good practices

- Documentation
- Manualization

Examples of initiatives that can be upscaled: NEDA's Initiative in DRR/CCA integration

UNDP/AusAID

- 10 provinces/cities/municipalities assisted with preparation of DRR-enhanced plans
- NROs/regional institutions capacitated to provide TA to LGUs on DRR-enhanced planning
- With demonstration projects

MDG-F/Spanish grant

- DRR framework enhanced with CC scenarios
- Coverage: 43 provinces, 10 of which will prepare DRR/CCA-enhanced plans

What DIPECHO can cover

Contingency planning for contiguous areas sharing similar hazards

Compliment UNDP/AusAID and MDG-F initiatives in the rest of the 81 provinces

Showcase DRR/CCA-sensitive demo projects at the community level

Common early warning systems for LGUs with shared hazards

Continue documentation of good practices and develop new toolkits (manuals)

Replication of DRMO in other areas

Capacity development for LGUs on use of risk assessment tools like REDAS

READY Project

GOP Initiatives

- AGUSAN DEL NORTE
- AKLAN
- BATANGAS
- BUKIDNON
- BULACAN
- CAMARINES NORTE
- CEBU
- DAVAO ORIENTAL
- LANAO DEL SUR
- MOUNTAIN PROVINCE
- ORIENTAL MINDORO
- PANGASINAN
- QUEZON
- SAMAR
- SARANGANI
- ZAMBOANGA DEL NORTE

UNDP/AUSAID

- ABRA
- AGUSAN DEL SUR
- ANTIQUE
- AURORA
- BENGUET
- BOHOL
- CAGAYAN
- CATANDUANES
- CAVITE
- EASTERN SAMAR
- ILOCOS NORTE
- ILOCOS SUR
- ISABELA
- LAGUNA
- LEYTE
- NORTHERN SAMAR
- NUEVA VIZCAYA
- PAMPANGA
- QUIRINO
- RIZAL
- SOUTHERN LEYTE
- SURIGAO DEL NORTE
- SURIGAO DEL SUR
- ZAMBALES
- ZAMBOANGA DEL SUR
- ZAMBOANGA SIBUGAY

LA UNION

