

**Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns**  
**Partnership of the Alternative Planning Initiatives Inc. (ALTERPLAN)**  
**And the Danish International Human Settlement Service (DIB)**

**END- PROJECT EVALUATION**

**April 2018**

*Maria Lourdes G. Rebullida, DPA*  
*Arne Jensen*

## Table of Contents

List of Illustrations, Tables, and Annexes	ii	
Acronyms	iii	
Executive Summary	iv	
Introduction		1
Project Background	1	
Overview of the End-Project Evaluation Report	3	
Evaluation Framework, Methodology, Design, Methods	4	
Relevance		9
Relevance to ALTERPLAN, DIB, CISU and the Global Community	9	
Relevance to the Philippines: Policy Mandates for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management	10	
Relevance: Perspectives of Partners, LGUs and NGOs	10	
Issues and Concerns	15	
Analysis of Project Relevance	16	
Efficiencies and Effectiveness		17
Context and Criteria for the Effectiveness and Efficiencies Evaluation	17	
Effectiveness and Efficiency in Implementation of Activities	19	
Effectiveness in Deliverable of Major Outputs	19	
Efficiencies	22	
Analysis and Conclusions on Effectiveness and Efficiencies	30	
Outcomes-Impact		33
Changes at the Project Sites	34	
Issues and Concerns	38	
Analysis of Project Impact	38	
Sustainability		39
Sustainability Planning and Commitment	39	
Constraints to Sustainability	40	
Potential Resources	40	
Unfinished Business	40	
Replication	42	
Analysis of Sustainability	42	
Summary-Analysis and Conclusion		43
References		47
Annexes		51

## List of Illustrations, Tables, and Annexes

### MAPS

1	Philippine map showing the 4 project sites	1
2	General Santos City	2
3	Iligan City	2
4	Ligao City	2
5	Municipality of Ubay	2

### TABLES

1	Project sites of the Project <i>Promoting Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Cities and Towns</i>	3
2	Number of FGD participants in End-Project Evaluation per site January 17 to February 21, 2018	8
3	Partner Non-Government Organization per Project site	8
4	Partner People's Organization per Project site	8
5	Capacity building-training for DRSSP methodology and process	11
6	Participants' perceived relevance (appropriateness to needs) of the Project's capacity building	12
7	Participants' perceived relevance (appropriateness of Project) to disaster-related conditions	13
8	Summary of achieved Project outputs and accomplishment rating	20
9	Local stakeholders and Project partner NGOs' participation in ALTERPLAN's DRSSP trainings	24
10	Number of proposed BDRSSP projects and activities per DRR category per site	25
11	Technical assistance provided through the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project by type of projects	26
12	Summary of claimed volunteer contributions by PO and BLGU members per Project site	27
13	Funding sources and secure indicative financing (PhP) or prioritized BDRSSP projects	28
14	FGD participant perceived self-assessed capacities for their DRSSP January-February 2018	35
15	Identified replication sites	42

### BOXES

1	Evaluation criteria (based on the OECD/DAC 2012, 18)	4
2	Highlights of the End-Project Evaluation	46

### ANNEXES

A	Project evaluation consultant TOR	51
B	Instruments/Guides for End-Project Evaluation	54
C	Self-administered capacity assessment questionnaire	62
D	FGD Participants per site and per barangay in the End-Project Evaluation	65
E	Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans (BDRSSPs)	74
F	LGU issuances related to Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans	75
G	Projects listed in the BDRSS Plans	78
H	Priority projects and plans submitted to LGUs for funding	82

## Acronyms

AIP	Annual Investment Program
ALTERPLAN	Alternative Planning Initiatives, Inc.
A2D	A2D Project - Research Group for Alternatives to Development Inc. (Cebu City)
BDRSS Plan	Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans
BDRSSP	Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans
BLGU	Barangay Local Government Unit
BRGY	Barangay (smallest administrative division in the Philippines)
C/M LGU	City/Municipality Local Government Unit
City/mun LGU	City/Municipality Local Government Unit
CISU	Civil Society in Development/Civilsamfund i Udvikling
CMP	Community Mortgage Program
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DIB	Danish International Human Settlement Service/Dansk International Bosætningservice
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DKK	Danish Kroner
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
HUDCC	Housing and Urban and Development Coordinating Council
ICES-Dev	Center for Community Extension and Social Development Services Inc.(Iligan City)
IDRRDPP	Integrated Disaster Risk Reduction and Development Planning in the Philippines Project
ISF	Informal Settler Families
Inc.	Incorporated
KI	Key Informant Interviews
KPS	Katotohanan Pagkakaisa at Serbisyo Foundation (General Santos City)
LGU	Local Government Unit
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTPIP	Medium-term Public Investment Program
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NHA	National Housing Authority
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PHILSSA	Partnership of Philippine Support Service Agencies, Inc.
PhP	Philippine Peso
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PO	People's Organization
PPP	Prioritized Projects and Plans (Project Briefs)
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SAC	Social Action Center - Diocese of Legazpi
SHFC	Social Housing Finance Corporation

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Background**

The Alternative Planning Initiatives, Inc. (ALTERPLAN) and the Dansk International Bosaetningsservice/Danish International Human Settlement Services (DIB) collaborated in implementing the partnership Project “Promoting Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Cities and Towns”. It began in 2015 and ends in June 2018, or a timeline of for 3.5 years. The Project aimed to promote disaster risk responsive safe settlements for the marginalized urban poor in the four Project sites of General Santos City, Iligan City, Ligao City and Ubay Municipality in different regions of the Philippines. Engaging the participation of the Local Government Units (LGUs), Non-Government Organization (NGO) and People’s Organizations (PO) in the local Project areas, the Project worked at accomplishing three specific objectives:

- Objective 1: Civil society participants of the project in the four selected cities/municipalities shall have demonstrated increased capacities for preparedness through the formulation of strategies, policies and actions incorporated in Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans (DRSSPs).
- Objective 2: Target groups in the four localities shall have benefited from the implementation of actions recommended in the disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans.
- Objective 3: Disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning shall have been accepted by different stakeholders as a viable and useful methodology.

### **End-Project Evaluation Methodology**

The End-Project Evaluation examined the objectives, process, outputs and outcomes of the Project at near end in April 2018 following the criteria and guidelines of the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). The evaluation established the relevance of the Project as the intervention; measured efficiency and determined effectiveness; analyzed the outcomes and impact, and prospects for sustainability. Using qualitative methodology, the data collected consisted of documents from the Project partner LGUs and NGOs; responses from Key Informant Interviews (KI) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) among 122 representatives of the partner LGUs, POs and NGOs; photo documentation from site visits on projects implemented; and documents and responses from the ALTERPLAN and DIB.

### **Summary-Analysis and Conclusions**

Analyzing the data across the sites at near end of the Project, the Evaluation Team formulated the following conclusions with respect to the Project objectives and evaluation criteria:

#### **1. Relevance**

- The Project was relevant in the sense of being appropriate to the area’s disaster risk-related conditions and the communities’ past experiences with natural disasters.

- The Project partner POs and LGUs acknowledged the capacity building approach, the DRSSP methodology, and projects to be directly responsive to the need for solutions to disaster risks inter-linked with shelter conditions affecting communities at the pilot sites.
- The BDRSSPs addressed the need for data based planning and decision making that enabled the LGUs and were instrumental for its data-based evidence that enabled the LGUs' decision making for budget allocation and implementation of proposed and prioritized projects.
- NGO partners acknowledged the relevance of the Project to their organizational thrusts at the time of the Project's initiation and signing of Memorandum of Understanding with ALTERPLAN and DIB.

## 2. Effectiveness and Efficiencies

- The Project was steered well by the PSC although there seems to have been limited options for partner NGOs to provide suggestions to the PSC on project activities and changes in implementation budgets.
- The participatory approach contributed to the Project's accomplishment of objectives for the drafting of the DRSSP, based on systematic data collection, area mapping for disaster risks, data analysis, project development and writing of Policy Briefs, as well as advocacy to the LGUs for funding and implementation.
- The lack of legal instrument, as in a Memorandum of Understanding, where LGUs are co-signatory parties to the Project limited the full participation of LGU representatives in the training and implementation activities.
- For nine expected outputs, three were fully accomplished: (1) Barangay Disaster Risk-sensitive Shelter Plans; (2) Barangay LGU adoption of the BDRSSP; (3) budget release for projects from the Annual Investment Plans. Five outputs were partially accomplished: (1) 25 persons trained per site; (2) financing and implementation of projects; (3) resolutions replicating DRSSPs in other barangays; (4) pool of resource persons; (5) heightened profile in international fora. One expected output not accomplished was the agreement with national agencies.
- Compared to similar international collaboration, the Project achieved more than just capacitation and planning, but succeeded in leveraging local funds and implementing projects derived from the plans ((BDRSSP).
- There was an overall very positive appreciation for the Project by the Barangay Councils.
- The CISU investment has leveraged a very high amount of co-funding; by the LGUs alone more than PhP 14.2 Million or DKK 1.7 Million. Together with other indicative budgets, the Project in total may have leveraged around PhP 52.7 Million or about DKK 6.3 Million.

- Without volunteerism the Project would not have been possible. Volunteer contributions on the part of the POs and BLGUs in the Philippines and DIB in Denmark equals around PhP 3.14 Million or DKK 373,600 equivalent to 16% of the Philippine staffing budget.
- Several efficiency issues emerged:
  - Due to the attention given to the prioritized projects from the BDRSSPs, the Project missed out on pursuing 60% of the other listed BDRSSP projects and activities. It had no sustainability plan strategizing on what to do with these projects at the time of the Project-end Evaluation.
  - A substantially lower number of individuals than planned graduated from the Project's capacity building, which would be inadequate for replication, advocacy and monitoring. This brings the Project's capacity strategy and the number of graduates agreed with CISU in question.
  - Another strategic training and planning approach may have reduced the 20 month it took before BDRSSPs were approved to 14 months.
  - The strategy to have had all capacity-building, and BDRSS Plans developed and approved within the first project year was novel, but the human resource capacity to do so was too limited.
  - The thematic limitations of the Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan Manual calls for substantially more use of DRR mitigating best practices learned from other projects.
  - Technical assistance came late, such as for the vetiver projects and water supply projects. Technical assistance for relocation and housing projects was much needed but insufficiently addressed.
  - Too much time spent on the BDRSSP process left a shorter time for project advocacy, financing and implementation.
  - Monitoring by ALTERPLAN of output deliverables were generally strong. However, at the time of the Evaluation, formal monitoring agreements with POs and BLGUs on outcomes and impacts were not in place.
  - Although 92% of the barangay DRRSS Plans have been approved, the strategy of focusing on the limited number of PPPs may eventually come at the expense of the many other proposed BDRSSP activities and projects.
  - At time of the Project Evaluation, there was no strategy or agreement between the partner NGOs and the Barangay POs nor the Barangay LGUs on who shall implement the majority of proposed projects.
  - No resettlement projects have been accomplished. It raised among the target beneficiaries the question if it ever will happen? Use of

specialized resettlement experts and housing financing consultants could eventually have contributed to a more efficient deliverable.

### 3. Outcomes and Impact

- The direct and intended benefits for the communities were achieved to the extent of the number of projects and outcomes fully accomplished and partially accomplished.
- As changes attributed to the Project, POs and LGUs acquired increased capacity for DRSSP, particularly on the unique inter-relatedness of disaster risks with shelter issues that distinguished the Project from other disaster risk and management training focused on disaster preparedness and emergency response.
- The BDRSSP contributed to the barangay LGU and the city/municipal LGU by providing the data on disaster risks and correspondingly the proposed projects that enabled the LGU's decision-making on budget allocation and project implementation. The pilot barangays attributed the BDRSSP and the prioritized projects to the Project, considering that these were observed in nearby barangays that have the same or similar disaster risks and affected communities.
- The BDRSSP has potential impact on the LGUs mandates to formulate the City's Development Plan, Land Use Plan and shelter plan by adoption of the pilot barangays' BDRSSP, and the Project methodology and process for replication in other barangays.
- With respective projects related to the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project, the partner NGOs gained useful experience.

### 4. Sustainability

- No formal sustainability plans have been formulated at the respective pilot sites.
- Partially accomplished projects may be pursued, contingent on the level of formalized commitment of the POs, BLGUs, and C/MLGUs.
- ALTERPLAN and DIB have yet to work out any sustainability plan or exit strategy.





**Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns**  
**Partnership of the Alternative Planning Initiatives Inc. (ALTERPLAN)**  
**And the Danish International Human Settlement Service (DIB)**

**END- PROJECT EVALUATION**

**April 2018**

*Maria Lourdes G. Rebullida, DPA*  
*Arne Jensen*

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### ***1.1 Project Background***

The evaluation is directed at the partnership project of the Alternative Planning Initiatives, Inc. (ALTERPLAN) and the Dansk International Bosaetningservice/Danish International Human Settlement Services (DIB) entitled “*Promoting Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Cities and Towns,*” herein referred to as the Project. This partnership from 2015 to 2018 was undertaken in four sites in the Philippines, namely General Santos City, Ligao City, Iligan City, and the Municipality of Ubay (see maps).

The Project aims to promote disaster risk responsive safe settlements for the marginalized urban poor through Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) participation in the improvement of the Local Government Unit’s (LGU) shelter programs and policies.





The specific objectives include:

- Objective 1: Civil society participants of the project in the four selected cities/municipalities shall have demonstrated increased capacities for preparedness through the formulation of strategies, policies and actions incorporated in Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans (DRSSPs).
- Objective 2: Target groups in the four localities shall have benefited from the implementation of actions recommended in the disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans.

- Objective 3: Disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning shall have been accepted by different stakeholders as a viable and useful methodology.

Towards accomplishing the objectives, the Project conducted three main activities: (1) conduct of seminars and workshops for composite groups of local stakeholders who are expected to participate in the preparation of DRSSPs, (2) advocacy by People's Organizations (POs) for adoption and financing of the Barangay DRSSPs and the projects they contain, and (3) advocacy by the project partners of the DRSSP methodology to the City and Municipal LGUs, national agencies, and international fora.

The Civil Society in Development (CISU) in Denmark had previously approved applications for the partnership between DIB, a Danish-based NGO, and ALTERPLAN, also an NGO, in the Philippines for the three projects. The first project was in Legazpi City in Albay Province and entitled "*Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Development Planning in the Philippines*" followed by the second project "*Enabling Civil Society Participation in Shelter Program Preparation to Address Flooding Risk in Legazpi*". In 2013, the partners proposed the third project, "*Strengthening Partnership Structures for Disaster Risk Sensitive Shelter Planning*," to prepare for the replication of the planning process learned from the previous projects in Legazpi City in other sites in the Philippines. The Project being evaluated "*Promoting Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Cities and Towns*" began implementation in January 2015. End of the Project was set for December 2017 in all four (4) sites but was extended to April 2018 upon approval of the February 2017 Status Report, and then again." in early 2018 extended until June 2018. In each of the three cities and in one municipality, disaster-prone sections of three barangays (Brgy) were selected for the Project's implementation (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Project sites of the Project "Promoting Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Cities and Towns"

<b>Project Sites-City/Municipality</b>	<b>Barangays in Project Sites</b>
Ligao City	Brgy. Bagumbayan, Brgy Tinago, Brgy. Tuburan
Ubay Municipality	Brgy. Cagting, Brgy Cuya, Brgy. Guintabonan
Iligan City	Brgy.Hinaplanon, Brgy San Roque, Brgy. Santiago
General Santos City	Brgy. Apopong, Brgy City Heights, Brgy. Labangal

## ***1.2 Overview of the End-Project Evaluation Report***

Preparations and field work for the End-Project Evaluation was conducted from January to February 2018 with report writing in March and April 2018. Field data collection included document sources such as the Project Document, status reports to the Project's Steering Committee (PSC) and to CISU; baseline data from 2015 that provided evidence relevant to the status, accomplishments and issues of the Project in April 2018 after a three year period beginning 2015 (See References in this report.)

The Evaluation Report consists of the following main parts:

- Introduction
  - Brief Project Background

- Evaluation Framework, Methodology, Design and Methods
- Evaluation Findings and Analysis per Evaluation Criteria
  - Relevance
  - Efficiency and Effectiveness
  - Outcomes and Impacts
  - Sustainability
- Analysis, Conclusions and Recommendations
- References and Annexes

### ***1.3 Evaluation Framework, Methodology, Design, Methods***

#### ***1.3.1 Evaluation criteria, questions and objectives***

The End-Project Evaluation pursued the criteria in the guidelines provided by of the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) in 2012, which also adopted the evaluation criteria of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-Development Assistance Committee (DAC).<sup>1</sup> The five criteria constitute the evaluation framework to assess the Project at near Project end by April 2018. See Box 1.

#### **Box 1. Evaluation Criteria (based on the OECD/DAC 2012,18)**

Relevance	<p>The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities, and partners' and donors' policies</p> <p>Appropriateness as part of relevance refers to the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.</p>
Efficiency	A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results
Effectiveness	The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved taking into account their relative importance.
Cost-Effectiveness	The extent to which the program has achieved or is expected to achieve its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives*
Impact	<p>The positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.</p> <p>Reach or coverage</p>
Sustainability	The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of long-term benefits; the resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Source: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark DANIDA International Development Cooperation. 2012.

<sup>1</sup> Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark DANIDA International Development Cooperation, DANIDA Evaluation Guidelines, 2012. [www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11121/pdf/danida\\_evaluation\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11121/pdf/danida_evaluation_guidelines.pdf)

With respect to this Project, the evaluation generally aimed to determine the accomplishments and changes attributable to the Project. The specific objectives of this End-Project Evaluation were to:

1. Establish the relevance of the intervention;
2. Measure the efficiency of the intervention related what it has achieved;
3. Determine the attainment of the objectives of the intervention as indications of effectiveness;
4. Analyze the contribution of the Project to improved conditions at the project sites as outcomes and impacts at near-Project end (distinguished from impact at a much extended time after the Project ends);
5. Identify the issues for sustaining the benefits of the Project over the long term.

The End-Project Evaluation objectives addressed the objectives and approach of the Project, which are to:

1. Empower the community organizations in preparing their barangay disaster risk shelter sensitive plans;
2. Engage LGUs to support the implementation of the BDRSSP, at the barangay Local Government Unit (BLGU) level, specifically by the Barangay Council including budget allocation and logistics of implementation, and deriving benefits; as well as at the level of the City or Municipal Local Government Unit (CLGU/MLGU);
3. Elicit stakeholders' acceptance, ownership, and sustainability efforts, specifically the Project partner NGO, POs, BLGU, and CLGU/MLGU.

The main evaluation questions are based on the DANIDA evaluation framework:

#### *Relevance Criteria*

1. Does the intervention address the condition of the Project partners and the target communities concerning hazards and risks in the areas?
2. How does the Project contribute to the efforts on disaster risk reduction and management, and related housing concerns at the target sites, particularly the communities at risk and the LGUs and the POs involved?

#### *Effectiveness Criteria*

1. Did the Project achieve its objectives in terms of expected outputs and outcomes? What were not achieved and why?
2. To what extent did the Project empower/improve capacities of the PO and LGU barangay partners, and the Project NGO?
3. Were the target communities reached by the Project?

#### *Efficiency Criteria*

1. Were the resources used appropriately to achieve the expected outputs and outcomes?
2. Were the Project partners accountable for the use of resources?
3. Did the Project cover all the costs adequately?

#### *Impact Criteria*

1. What changes have occurred in the Project sites by the end of the Project compared to the conditions at the start of the Project?
2. How do conditions at the end of the Project compare in line with the objectives and expected outcomes of the intervention?
3. Are the changes positive or negative in terms of benefits/advantages and disadvantages?
4. Are the changes direct and intended effects or indirect and unintended?
5. Are the changes attributable to the project intervention or to other factors?

#### *Sustainability Criteria*

1. Can the benefits be sustained even after the end of the Project? What can be done to negative effects, if any?
2. Is there an agreed plan to sustain the benefits of the Project?
3. How will the DRSSPs be followed up with the LGU for full implementation?

### ***1.3.2 Evaluation team and field schedule***

The Evaluation Team was composed of two external, independent consultants and an external independent documentation staff, and of language translators on site. For Terms of Reference for the Evaluation, see **Annex A**. The evaluation field work took place in the mid-weeks of January 2018 in the sites of Ligao City and General Santos City, and in the mid-weeks of February 2018 in the sites of Ubay Municipality and of Iligan City.

### ***1.3.3 Qualitative methodology***

The evaluation employed a qualitative methodology since this can elicit in-depth data from Project participants and stakeholders on the process and effects of the intervention. Field research was conducted by the use of the following methods of data collection:

1. Document desk review;
2. Site inspection and photo documentation;
3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and key informant interview (KI);
4. Self-administered questionnaire among key informants that are Project implementers in the area.

Triangulation was achieved by using the four methods of data collection with respective instruments (Annex B). KI informants and FGD participants included the implementing participants of the Project partner NGOs and POs; the Barangay Councils participating members and key officials or staff of the CLGU or MLGU. They responded to the self-administered questionnaire on their perceived capacities derived from the training and mentoring sessions

(Annex C). As needed, a translator assisted in the process of the FGD and KI interviews, and in filling up the questionnaire. Main documents collected were those relevant to the End-Project Evaluation, particularly referring to the Project objectives, outputs and outcomes and on budgetary expenditures and financial standards used by the Project. At the site-level, the collected vital documents included the Barangay Council Resolutions and City/Municipality Resolutions and Ordinances for adoption of the DRSSP process and methodology, and the BDRSSPs, including prioritized projects presented in PPPs (Project Briefs) for funding. Site visits also verified prioritized projects' implementation status. Qualitative thematic content analysis was applied on the texts of the FGDs and documents and computation of mean responses was applied on the individual self-assessment responses on capacity building.

As limitations, respondents' self-assessed capacities at near end of the Project cannot be compared with baseline data because respondents at the start of the Project were a different group, many of whom were either not available or had been replaced. Furthermore, the instrument developed in the Legazpi Project and used in the baseline and mid-term assessments had to be reviewed for appropriateness and relevance to the objectives of this Project. The high scores given by the End-Project respondents must be interpreted in context of their uneven and varying experiences in the training and mentoring sessions, and implementation processes. As explained in the FGDs, the respondents referred to their increased capacities pertinent only to the activities they selectively attended.

#### ***1.3.4 Data collection***

A total of 122 participants provided inputs to the FGDs, among which were representatives of Project partner NGOs and the POs; the BLGUs, and the CLGU/MLGU. The FGDs were conducted separately for each thematic group. A range of 27 to 36 total number of participants per site, of which the majority were female. Table 2 presents the data.

Nearly half of the participants were the designated members of the POs and designated representatives of the barangay LGUs, while slightly more than half were officers or held positions of leadership in the organization. For the number of participants at the barangay level per city/municipality of the Project sites, see Annex D.

There is only one Project partner NGO in each site or a total of four Project partner NGOs (Table 3); four to six POs per Project site, or a total of 25 POs (Table 4). The Project has 3 partner city LGUs and 1 municipality LGU.

Photo documentation from ocular visit and observation served the purpose of verifying, the completed and ongoing projects at the Project sites.



**Table 2.** Number of FGD participants in End-Project Evaluation per site January 17 to February 21, 2018

Project Site	Total Number of FGD Participants	Affiliation				Position		Sex	
		PO	BLGU	NGO	City/Mun LGU	PO Member/LGU Designate/NGO Staff	PO/LGU/NGO Officer	Male	Female
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	62	33	15	12	56	66	53	69
<b>Ligao City, Albay</b>	<b>29</b>	15	9	4	1	16	13	8	21
<b>General Santos City, South Cotabato</b>	<b>36</b>	16	10	4	6	16	20	19	17
<b>Municipality of Ubay, Bohol</b>	<b>30</b>	14	10	3	3	12	18	19	11
<b>Iligan City, Lanao del Norte</b>	<b>27</b>	17	4	4	2	12	15	7	20

**Table 3.** Partner Non-Government Organization per Project site

City/ Municipality	Name of NGO Partner
General Santos City	Katotohanan Pagkakaisa at Serbisyo Foundation (KPS Foundation)
Iligan City	Iligan Medical Center College (IMCC)-Center for Community Extension and Social Development Services Inc. (ICES-Dev)
Ligao City	Social Action Center (SAC) - Legazpi
Ubay Municipality	A2D Project-Research Group for Alternatives to Development (A2D)

**Table 4.** Partner People's Organization per Project site

Cities and Municipality	No. of POs	Participating Peoples' Organizations
<b>General Santos City</b>	4	Barangay City Heights: Katotohanan, Pagkakaisa, Serbisyo (KPS) Foundation (app. 1,200 members in Barangays City Heights and Labangal);
		Barangay Labangal and Barangay City Heights: Katotohanan, Pagkakaisa, Serbisyo (KPS) Foundation
		Barangay City Heights Fortune Village HOA of Brng. City Heights
		Barangay Apopong Sama-Sama
<b>Iligan City</b>	8	Barangay Hinaplanon Women's Organization
		Barangay Citywide Women's Federation
		Barangay San Roque Women's Association
		Barangay San Roque Senior Citizen's Association
		Barangay Santiago Women's Association

		Bangon Hinaplanon Urban Poor Association
		San Roque Urban Poor Association
		Santiago Survivor Village Urban Poor Association
<b>Ligao City</b>	7	Ligao Senior Citizen's Organization
		Ligao Women's Club Federation
		Ligao City Urban Poor Federation
		Ligao Poblacion Pedicab Operators and Drivers Association Inc.
		Tinago Urban Poor Association
		Tuburan Urban Poor Association
		Bagumbayan Urban Poor Association
<b>Ubay Municipality</b>	6	Barangay Cuya Farmers and Fisherfolks Association
		Barangay Cagting Small Farmers and Fisherfolks Association
		Barangay Cagting Women's Organization
		Barangay Cagting Small Coconut Farmers Organization
		Barangay Guintaboan Fisherfolks Association
		Barangay Guintaboan Women's Association

## 2.0 RELEVANCE

The criteria of relevance was evaluated along the three main objectives of the Project: (1) capacity building for disaster preparedness indicated by the formulation of the BDRSSP; (2) beneficial implementation of the BDRSSP indicated by the adoption of the BDRSSP into the Local Development Plan of the barangay and the city/municipality, budget allocation-funding, implementation and monitoring of the BDRSSP; and (3) acceptance by stakeholders of the DRSSP methodology indicated by replication of the DRSSP methodology in other barangays, agreements with national government, pool of resource persons to give assistance, and heightened international profile.

Specifically, the End-Project Evaluation examined the relevance of the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project in terms of the appropriateness of the interventions, as usefulness of and need for the interventions considering the disaster-related conditions at the prioritizes project areas within the barangays, and as reasons for the stakeholders-partners to join and be engaged in the Project, with respect to each of the Project objectives.

### ***2.1 Relevance to ALTERPLAN, DIB and CISU (Denmark), and the Global Community***

The ALTERPLAN, a Philippine NGO based in Quezon City, Philippines, and the DIB, a Danish international NGO, had been engaged in a partnership in two related projects initiated in Legazpi City, Albay Province on civil society capacity building, shelter and disaster risk reduction and management. The experience resulted in a planning process and methodology with training materials that can be shared with other interested organizations for replication. Since 1990,

ALTERPLAN has engaged itself in projects concerning urban poor communities, on shelter/housing, environment, and recently on disaster risk reduction and management integrated with shelter planning. Since its inception in 1998, DIB has focused on promoting sustainable settlements in developing countries, and recently included disaster prevention in partnership with other NGOs in Denmark and in other developing countries. CISU - Civil Society in Development is an association of more than 280+ small and medium-sized Danish CSOs actively engaged in development work in various regions of the world. CISU's support to its members' capacity, opportunities and interventions have made the partnership with ALTERPLAN possible and thereby benefited the Philippines by way of the resources that made the Project possible in selected sites.

The initiative contributes to the global concern for disaster risk management, environment and development, urban poverty and governance. The 2015 United Nations World Community that met in Sendai, Japan crafted the 2015-2030 SENDAI Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) to take over after the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005-2015. The earlier Hyogo Framework emphasized disaster risk reduction and the dimensions of exposures, hazards, vulnerabilities to be addressed by integrated policies, plans and programs on sustainable development, poverty reduction, and good governance. The first two phases of cooperation between DIB and ALTERPLAN explicitly intended to respond to HFA Priority No. 4: Reduce underlying risk factors. The DIB-ALTERPLAN project activities seeking to mainstream disaster risk considerations in urban planning and management of disaster-prone human settlements are among the key activities listed under Priority No. 4 in the HFA. The Sendai Framework carries the initiatives forward into the next 15 years with greater emphasis on the inter-relatedness of environment, poverty reduction, governance, and disaster risk reduction and management, to be addressed by global cooperation and collaboration.

## ***2.2 Relevance to the Philippines: Policy Mandates for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management***

The national government of the Philippines joins the global community's commitment to deal with climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, disaster prevention, as well as disaster management and rehabilitation. The legislation entitled *Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act 10121)* and its Implementing Rules and Regulations mandates national and local levels of government to implement its provisions. The National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (2011-2028) sets the activities to be undertaken and budgetary requirements.

## ***2.3 Relevance: Perspectives of Partners-POs, Barangay LGUs, City/Municipal LGUs and NGOs***

The partner POs have members that reside in the communities (administrative areas called *Puroks*) within the barangay that are affected by disaster-related issues and have experienced the occurrence of disasters and its effects on lives, property, and sources of income.

The Barangay Council of the Barangay Local Government Unit (BLGU) have legal mandates for local development and disaster risk reduction and management covering the communities within its boundary.

- **Capacity Building. Objective 1. Increased capacities of civil society participants for preparedness through formulation of Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans**

ALTERPLAN had the opportunity to replicate the training process and the training materials resulting from two previously CISU-funded projects in Legazpi City, Albay Province undertaken in partnership with the DIB. Having learned from the Legazpi experience, the same training modules were used in the four sites of this 3<sup>rd</sup> ALTERPLAN-DIB Project in General Santos City, Iligan City, Ligao City and Ubay Municipality. These consisted of eight modules conducted for two days spaced out in one year. The training process included both classroom sessions and ‘hands-on’ practice training leading to the preparation of the BDRSSP per barangay. Training did not occur simultaneously across the city/municipality sites but sequentially; while in the interim, the sites acted upon certain requirements from ALTERPLAN (Table 5). The so-called training manual used, *Manual of People’s Organizations for Preparing Disaster Risk- Sensitive Shelter Plans*, was not actually a participant-oriented manual but a facilitator-oriented manual written in English but presented and discussed in Tagalog. Generally, no translation was done, since participants understand Tagalog; though as needed, translation was done and the local language was used for self-expression. From ALTERPLAN’s perspective, the training manual also evolved in the process, particularly in doing the barangay maps.

ALTERPLAN conducted follow-up mentoring and learning sessions, referred to as “hand holding” with some of its partner POs and LGUs, to address the gaps identified in the Project’s Mid-Term Assessment Report and to strengthen capacity building for the DRSSP to be advocated, funded and implemented for the remaining period of Project duration. To augment or fill in the gap in technical capacity concerning proposed and alternative projects, ALTERPLAN provided technical assistance, particularly on (1) geodetic surveys and subdivision planning for resettlements, (2) proposed vetiver grass projects as medium for remediation vis-à-vis river rip-rap (3) water assessment and water systems designs, (4) beach forest assessment, and (5) applications for housing finance.

**Table 5.** Capacity Building - Training for DRSSP methodology and process

Module No.	Activity	Description
Module 1		Seminar. Preparing the Situational Analysis
	Activity 1	Seminar. Introduction to developing a Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan
	Activity 2	Seminar. Data gathering tools
	Activity 3	Seminar. Development of skills for more effective participation in the creation of the DRSSP
	Activity 4	Field Work. Conduct of data gathering
	Activity 5	Processing collected information for use in a barangay map
	Activity 6	Presentation and validation of data gathering results
Module 2		Formulation of Strategies and Packaging of Policy Proposals in DRSSP

Module 3	Activity 1	Analysis of collected data and selection of strategies
	Activity 2	Community consultations
		Advocacy of DRSSP at the barangay and city levels
	Activity 1	Preparing an advocacy plan
	Activity 2	Participation in local special bodies

Overall, PO, BLGU and City/Municipal LGU participants narrated the Project's relevance in terms of their need to know how to deal with disasters, for which the Project provided training on how to identify the vulnerabilities, hazards and risks related to disasters. They were not aware of such terms and concepts prior to the Project, except for a few individuals that had been exposed to the disaster risk reduction and management efforts of the City/Municipal Government. Neither were they aware of disaster preparedness prior to the occurrence of major typhoons that claimed lives and property, and laid havoc in their areas.

The participants highlighted that they did not know how to do a disaster-risk sensitive shelter planning and produce the BDRSSP and PPPs (Project Briefs) prioritizing certain projects for immediate funding. The PO participants acknowledged the appropriateness of the Project's capacity building on their need for know-how in dealing with the LGUs, particularly for funding and implementing the projects on shelter and disaster related conditions.

PO and BLGU participants highlighted also the relevance, usefulness and appropriateness of the Project capacity building elements, specifically a) data gathering tools, b) conduct of the survey on barangay socio-economic demographics, c) mapping the types and location of hazards and risks to disaster, d) data analysis, and e) formulation of the BDRSSP with PPPs (Project Briefs) (See Table 6).

**Table 6.** Participants' perceived relevance (appropriateness to needs) of the Project's capacity building

<b>General Santos City</b>	<b>Iligan City</b>	<b>Ligao City</b>	<b>Ubay Municipality</b>
Brgy. Apong: know how to use disaster funds of barangay	Brgy. Hinaplan: know how on technical knowledge and skills in using GPS	Brgy. Bagumbayan: awareness of risks, hazards, and how to plan, prioritize, to do maps, how to relocate families; organize the PO for the Project	Brgy. Cagting: know how on disaster related planning, project identification and prioritizing
Brgy. City Heights: awareness of disaster risks and hazards in areas within the barangay's fire prone areas, informal settlers for relocation, how to plan projects to address hazards and risks to disasters	Brgy. San Roque: how to identify and map the hazards and risks; how to plan and prepare the Project Briefs (PPPs)	Brgy. Tinago: awareness of hazards and risks, floods, effects on informal settlements, learning planning process, risk management,; activation of Tinago Urban Poor Inc., dealing with government (ref: housing)	Brgy. Cuya: awareness of disaster risks and hazards; know how in case of typhoons

**Table 6.** Participants’ perceived relevance (appropriateness to needs) of the Project’s capacity building

<b>General Santos City</b>	<b>Iligan City</b>	<b>Ligao City</b>	<b>Ubay Municipality</b>
Brgy. Labangal; awareness of informal settler families (ISFs) in danger zones e.g. creeks, bridges, rivers, relocation - how to plan for shelter integrated with disaster risks reduction and management	Brgy. Santiago: how to identify and assess disaster risks and prepare projects, evacuation and relocation	Brgy. Tuburan: awareness of hazards and risks incl. floods, effects on informal settlements, relocation - how to plan, how to do GPS mapping, activation of the Tuburan Urban Poor Inc.	Brgy. Guintabao: awareness of risks and hazards; know how what to do, plan and prepare for occurrence of typhoons

The integrated seminar and application sessions in the capacity building training program proved useful for participants in formulating the BDRSSP, based on identified risks, hazards and vulnerabilities collected by survey and mapping of the areas. The BDRSSP and Project Briefs (PPPs) on prioritized projects supported the participants’ advocacy for BLGU and City/Municipal LGU funding by its inclusion in the Annual Investment Program (AIP) and implementation by the respective LGUs. As a general theme of responses, the participants acknowledged the usefulness of the DRSSP methodology and process that resulted in the crafting of the BDRSSP and the PPPs (Project Briefs) as outputs to address hazards and risks to disasters (Table 7).

**Table 7.** Participants’ perceived relevance (appropriateness of Project) to disaster- related conditions

<b>General Santos City</b>	<b>Iligan City</b>	<b>Ligao City</b>	<b>Ubay Municipality</b>
Brgy. Apopong: risks from 3 rivers, flash floods; relocation of families	Brgy. Hinaplanon: typhoons and affected families; disaster risks in low lying areas	Brgy. Bagumbayan: floods; relocation of communities along the rivers and railroad	Brgy. Cagting: housing relocation for families in coastlines; lack of roads to school; danger of walking to houses through slippery coastline at high tide
Brgy. City Heights: risks from 3 rivers, floods; fire-proned housing conditions; relocation of informal settler families	Brgy. San Roque: informal settlers relocation and resettlement, livelihood	Brgy. Tinago: floods due to “amihan” and “habagat”; informal settlements’ relocation and housing; canals and stagnant waters; areas affected by Typhoon Reming	Brgy. Cuya: high risk for storm surge and floods; need for evacuation centers
Brgy. Labangal: risks from three rivers, flash floods; housing conditions prone to fire; informal settlers in danger zones	Brgy. Santiago: risks from rainfall (Typhoon Sendong, Typhoon Pablo), falling trees and logs from mountains	Brgy. Tuburan: experiences with Typhoon Reming in 2006, Typhoon Nina; relocation	Brgy. Guintabao: storm surge; housing problem since Typhoon Nitang (1984) and Typhoon Caloy (2003); lack of potable water; evacuation

	downstream; relocation of affected families		centers
--	---	--	---------

Since barangay participants designated by the partner Project NGOs conducted the data collection and mapping, and participated in data analysis and report writing to some extent, they claimed ownership of the DRSSP, the planning methodology and process and the output of specific BDRSSPs. However, only the BDRSSPs for Ubay has the complete entry of stakeholders in the cover page of the plan for the three BDRSSPs. The other nine BDRSSP makes no reference to the POs as co-authors or other otherwise recognize their important contributions.

Attributing the BDRSSP to the Project, POs and BLGUs claimed that no other organization or government agency provided them with similar training and mentoring. The disaster risk reduction and management plans of the City LGUs is differentiated from the BDRSSPs produced by the DRSSP process of the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project (list and titles in Annex D).

- ***Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan. Objective 2. Adoption of Barangay DRSSP, budget allocation-funding, implementation and monitoring.***

Identifying risks, hazards and vulnerabilities proved very important in identifying and prioritizing pertinent mitigating and adaptive projects and activities that went into the formulation of the BDRSSPs. FGD narratives highlighted the prioritized projects, presented in Policy Briefs, drawn from the list of projects and activities in the BDRSSP corresponding to data and maps identifying the types of risks low, medium and high and location of affected communities. These are indicative of some feasible projects that were written into Policy Briefs to advocate to the local Barangay Council and City/Municipal Council for budget allocation and inclusion in the Annual Investment Plan, and implementation.

Indicative of relevance, all the barangay councils at the project sites passed resolutions adopting the DRSSP planning process and methodology and the BDRSSPs (barangay LGU resolutions in Annex E). Some projects had been funded by the barangay LGU when affordable within its financial capability; some by the City or Municipal LGU, and some by the national government, while others await approval and/or allocation (Annex F). The Project was deemed relevant to the LGUs' mandates for disaster risk reduction and for safety of affected communities. The Prioritized Projects and Plans (Project Briefs) served the need for evidence and justification for, at the least, for funding of some proposed important projects within the LGUs budget cycle. The Project's delay in the finalization of the DRSSPs resulted in the loss of opportunity for fund access in the 2016 C/MLGU Annual Investment Plan except in Ligao where several projects got into the 2016 AIP; and this was likely to happen again without the submission of PPPs for prioritized projects.

- ***DRSSP Methodology. Objective 3. DRSSP accepted by different stakeholders (replication, mutual agreements, resource pool, international profile)***

Although evidence was not presented to the Evaluation Mission, verbal expressions of interest to replicate the DRSSP methodology had allegedly been articulated by some neighboring barangays with similar disaster risks and hazards. The C/M LGUs noted the relevance of the Project to the remaining barangays that do not have the BDRSSPs of the pilot sites. Counterfactual sites and prospective replication (with similar problems but no similar intervention as the ALTERPLAN-DIB project) comprise nearly all of the barangays (less the three pilot barangays in each city/municipality Project site), specifically: 41 of 44 barangays in Ubay Municipality; 52 of 55 in Ligao City; 23 of 26 barangays in General Santos; 41 of 44 barangays in Iligan City. In the case of Ligao City the City Government has already started replication through the aid from the partner Project NGO SAC in three coastal barangays (see Chapter on Effectiveness and Efficiencies).

Partner Project NGOs find the Project relevant to their orientations, having signed the Memorandum of Understanding for the Project's duration until December 2017.

However, at near End-Project no documents on mutual agreements or mutual understanding with ALTERPLAN-DIB had been retrieved from the files at the level of the C/M LGUs. Neither were there formal agreements for a resource pool of technical experts or academic linkages to assist in the Project's implementation or for sustainability (aside from individual short-term contracts between the Project and individual technical experts/subcontractors for specific projects, e.g. water supplies and vetiver cultivation).

The ALTERPLAN gained international exposure in the World Urban Forum 2018, where some participants inquired about the Project's applicability and replication in their countries. Except for ICES-Dev, the NGO and LGU Project partners have not reported any international linkage relevant to the Project.

## ***2.4 Issues and Concerns***

Looking back into the Project, participants shared insights to enhance relevance, intertwined with issues of efficiency, effectiveness and outcome/impact, and provide some lessons for future replication.

***a. Site selection and coverage.*** The selection of the barangays had been limited to three per selected city/municipality; whereas, other barangays had similar situations that could have benefited from inclusion. Disaster risks in the selected barangays are inter-linked with the sources of risks located in other barangays but excluded from the Project. This points at the limitations in not using a more landscape-based approach to disaster risk reduction. The issue of coverage indicates the prospect of expansion to the other sites, but which will no longer benefit from the assistance of ALTERPLAN and DIB as the Project closes in June 2018.

***b. Capacity building and participant selection.*** Capacity building proved to be relevant; but compared to the Project's capacity building strategy as found in the Project Document, the approach could not be consistently applied because of the highly uneven attendance of participants representing the PO and the LGUs in the training and



mentoring sessions. A comment from at least in one barangay pointed out the need for more consultative processes in the selection of participants to the training and mentoring sessions.

**c. Selection of NGO.** The selection of the partner NGO could have benefited from a more in-depth consultative process with the city/municipal LGUs.

**d. Technical feasibility of relevant, identified and prioritized projects.** Although, projects were relevant based on data concerning hazards, risks, and vulnerabilities, there was a general lack of capacity, in the scale needed, in designing and implementing projects found in the DRSSP's projects and proposed activities. While technical assistance was provided for some projects, e.g. water supply and vetiver grass planting, the crucial shelter projects involving relocation, resettlement and land security, benefitted insufficiently from the Project's technical assistance and from the LGUs financing support. Proposed shelter related projects, though appropriate and relevant initiatives, face the gaps in planning, financing, logistics in the short and long terms, and sustainability beyond the lifetime of the Project.

**e. Ownership and accountability.** The signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the city/municipality LGUs was not forged. This would have been a vital strategy to emphasize the relevance of the Project to the LGUs' agenda and plans, and engage their commitment, ownership, participation and accountability.

**f. Resettlement livelihood-the gap in training and project intervention.** The Project missed out on the livelihood intervention and livelihood training component for identified relocation beneficiaries. Livelihood was expected to be relevant to their need for income generation to finance the housing costs.

**g. Project timeframe.** The project of 3.5 years largely spent on training and planning appeared to be too long without completion of project implementation, making some participants impatient and waning in interest as their needs remain unmet and their conditions persist.

**h. Funds for implementation.** The Project funded the capacity building, planning and advocacy processes, but largely stopped short of financing the implementation of the prioritized projects. Enthusiasm for the Project was dampened to some extent by the inadequacy of LGU funds for BDRSSP projects, even as it was understood that ALTERPLAN-DIB focused on capacity building, BDRSSP formulation and advocacy to the LGUs, but not on financing the projects.

## **2.5 Analysis of Project Relevance**

Using the triangulation of data sources, the End-Project Evaluation determined the relevance and appropriateness of the Project in terms of the following patterns:

- The End-Project data confirmed the appropriateness of the Project approach and methodology that inter-linked shelter and disaster risks and planned for corresponding interventions.
  - At baseline, the conditions to be addressed by the Project were common across the sites, namely: storm surge, flooding, informal settler families in danger zones of water ways, and coastal areas; flooding, soil erosion, need for dikes or remedy for damaged or negative effects of dikes, drainage, waste disposal; fire hazards due to housing conditions; and livelihood.
  - Post-midterm, new project ideas emerged for which technical assistance was needed, such as for water supply system, rain water collection, and vetiver grass cultivation as one part of bio-engineering solutions to concrete dikes and ripraps limiting soil erosion.
- The capacity building strategy and processes, as inputs to disaster risk sensitive shelter planning, proved appropriate and useful for the POs and LGU participants, enabling them to go through the planning process and produce the BDRSSPs. Even without a formally printed participant's manual, but using the facilitator's manual, participants understood the DRSSP methodology and process.
- Capacities for disaster risk reduction and shelter planning were attributed to the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project. The Project's DRSSP capacity building is different and unique as it inter-links the shelter elements with geophysical hazards and disaster risk reduction and management, making it more appropriate to actual site conditions; and it is also 'hands on' in that the learning comes along by implementing the Project. This is not the same as the disaster risk reduction management orientation undertaken by the LGU to implement the *National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plans (2011-2018)* to comply with the *Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act 10121)*.

### 3.0 EFFICIENCIES AND EFFECTIVENESS

#### 3.1 Context and Criteria for the Effectiveness and Efficiencies Evaluation

This chapter evaluates to what extent the Project is an effective and efficient mechanism for linking a national development NGO (ALTERPLAN) through provincially-based local Project partner NGOs with barangay-based POs and LGUs. For overview of all POs' being part of the Project, see Table 4, Chapter 1.

The Project was jointly prepared by DIB and ALTERPLAN based on the learnings and documentation of the partnership intervention from the previous phases of shelter planning implementation in Legazpi City. During the partnership intervention period, insights were also obtained from dialogs with national government agencies (e.g. HUDCC) and national NGO networks, e.g. PHILSSA.

The participating NGOs, POs and BLGUs were selected by ALTERPLAN and DIB based on the following criteria: willingness and capacity to commit as partner in combination with barangays (hazard-prone *Puroks*) exposure to hazards and vulnerability. The qualitative selection indicator factors included 1) presence of concrete opportunities or available options or resources (e.g. for resettlement access to land, financing, government programs) that could positively influence outcomes and 2) evidence of needs (are there other resources/institutions/capacities that could enable prospective partners to undertake planning without the partnership's assistance?)

The Evaluation Team reviewed the efficiency and effectiveness of the CISU supported activities through the partnership between DIB and ALTERPLAN as measured by the following indicators/questions:

#### Effectiveness

- Attainment of Project objectives, expected outputs and outcomes
  - Did the Project achieve its objectives in terms of expected outputs and outcomes? What were not achieved and why?
  - To what extent did the Project empower/improve capacities of the NGO, PO, and LGU barangay partners?
- Project Reach
  - Were the target communities reached by the Project?

#### Efficiencies

- Time and effort in project development and implementation;
- Planning efficiency;
- Efficiencies in implementation of activities and deliverables of major outputs and outcomes (were resources used appropriately to achieve?);
- Man-power effort and use of consultants and of sub-contractors;
- Financial management and accountability for the use of resources;
- Cost-efficiency and cost funding internally; and
- External adequacy of funding of shelter plan projects and projects aiming at reducing disaster risks.

The Project implementation set-up were quadripartite in nature and involved a national NGO (ALTERPLAN) and four local technically capable NGOs engaged through a screening process developed during the CISU-funded bridging project *Strengthening partnership structures for disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning* in 2014. The primary stakeholders were 18 barangay POs and 12 LGU Barangay Councils representing communities residing in disaster prone areas, and four city/municipal government offices, primarily associated with housing and/or disaster risk reduction. To advise and steer the Project a Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established with representatives from ALTERPLAN, DIB and PHILSSA but without representations from the local partners. It held about 20 well-prepared and effectively steered Skype meetings aside from numerous other communications between ALTERPLAN and DIB including dialogs during DIB's bi-annual monitoring missions to the Philippines.

The composite Project strategy aimed at ensuring efficiencies and effectiveness in implementation, e.g. through revision of detailed Project Implementation Plans (PIPs) designed and proposed by ALTERPLAN in collaboration with DIB. Legal implementation arrangements through Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) were made between DIB, ALTERPLAN and the local partner Project NGOs with the Barangay LGUs and some of the POs signing as witnesses. This arrangement was different from the set-up in previous CISU-funded project for Legazpi City, e.g. *Enabling CSO Participation in Shelter Program Formulation to Address Flooding Risk in Legazpi City* where the City Government was a co-signature party to the MOUs.

### ***3.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency in Implementation of Activities***

The context in assessing efficiencies and effectiveness in activity implementation is the capability and the capacity of the human resources made available based on strategies that guides achievement towards delivery of outputs and outcomes, the PIP timelines and budgets available. Overall, the Project had relatively few personnel with high technical capabilities: ALTERPLAN, other than administrative staff, had four part time staff available and each Project NGO one full-time staff supplemented with other staff working on a part time basis. In addition nine short-term thematic consultants/ sub-contractors serviced the Project. In terms of other human resources each project barangay had as average 28 persons engaged in the Project; the bulk of these volunteers, however, in need of capacity-building prior to actual activity involvement.

Project implementation was guided by a number of thematic strategies, specifically for (1) capacity-building, (2) advocacy and (3) monitoring. Capacity building consisted of tools to equip and empower organized communities in advocating plans and policies that enable better service delivery to poor households; and approaches to tap into the official processes of LGU planning, adoption and financing of plans and projects. New skills introduced to the participants included map-making, geo-referencing, and data analysis using matrices.

Advocacy was based on the local PO/NGO partners' participation in the LGU's multi-stakeholder mechanisms including the Local Housing Board, and the City/Municipal or Barangay Development Council and dialog and collaboration with national agencies with the aim of reinforcing the foothold of DRSSP in the local shelter planning process.

As a strategy, the local partner POs and BLGUs were mentored to monitor the LGU's project implementation of their proposed projects, as well as the outcomes and impacts.

### ***3.3 Effectiveness in Deliverable of Major Outputs***

To promote DRR-responsive "safe settlements for marginalized urban poor through CSO participation in the improvement of local shelter programs and policies", the Project's overall development objective, the Project planned 38 different implementation activities. However, four activities were later deleted as Project deliverables: 1) linking with international development agencies, 2) consultations with educational institutions 3) formulation of guidelines for internship program, and 4) implementation of internship program. Regardless, four self-financing Danish interns visited the Philippines and participated in some Project activities.

Although internship guidelines were drafted, no academic institutions adapted the approach and internship plans were pushed out by ALTERPLAN due to other implementation concerns caused by limitations in staff capacities. Of other activities, only participation in budget consultations of national agencies and co-sponsorship of conferences were not accomplished.

Based on the Project's three immediate objectives and using the results of interviews with ALTERPLAN, Project partner NGOs and LGUs and the progress reports submitted to CISU from the partners DIB and ALTERPLAN, the Project's nine expected outputs were variably achieved: three outputs fully accomplished, five outputs partially accomplished, and one output unaccomplished (Table 8).

**Table 8.** Summary of achieved Project outputs and accomplishment rating

Objectives	Expected Outputs	Main Achievements
<b>Immediate Objective 1</b> Civil society participants of the project in the 4 selected cities/municipalities shall have demonstrated increased capacities for preparedness through the formulation of strategies, policies and actions incorporated in disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans	1.1 Composite group of at least 25 persons from the local partners in each selected city/ municipality	1.1 219 POs, LGUs and Project partner NGOs attended trainings. The Evaluation Mission conclude that the threshold for adequate training is attendance in 5 or more trainings. Only 14% or 31 individuals can be seen as having full or near full capacity to execute the BDRSSP approach and methodology.  <u>Rating: Partially accomplished</u>
	1.2 Disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans	1.2 Although with very substantial delays as it took 20 months from start to approval of the Plans, the Project was able to get 11 out 12 Plans approved through barangay resolutions but without City Ordinances.  <u>Rating: Accomplished</u>
<b>Immediate Objective 2</b> Target groups in the 4 localities shall have benefited from the implementation of actions recommended in the disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans	2.1 Adoption of Barangay DRSSP(s) as part of the local development plan	2.1 To the extent where the Local Development Plan equals the Barangay Development Plan, the output is successful.  <u>Rating: Accomplished</u>
	2.2 Budget for projects in MTPIP and AIP	2.2 Budget allocations are uneven across the Project sites. Indicative data suggest that >

**Table 8.** Summary of achieved Project outputs and accomplishment rating

		<p>14.2 mill PhP were spent or committed at the level of Barangay and City or Municipalities alone. Similar Philippine projects with a similar implementation period are only able to produce plans and get them approved.</p> <p><u>Rating: Accomplished</u></p>
	2.3 Financed and implemented projects	<p>2.3. Financed and committed (pipeline) Projects represents about 37% of the overall funding needs for ‘Prioritized Projects’. However, all 193 projects listed in the BDRSS Plans should be considered as important but there is no sustainability financing plan in place for 116 or 60% of the projects.</p> <p><u>Rating: Partially Accomplished</u></p>
<p><u>Immediate Objective 3</u> Disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning shall have been accepted by different stakeholders as a viable and useful methodology.</p>	3.1 City/municipal resolution to replicate DRSSP in other barangays of selected localities	<p>3.1 It is positively noted that in one case (Ligao City) the City Government and the Project partner NGO have started replication in three coastal barangays. In all other sites there are neither written commitments nor specific resolutions pointing towards replication.</p> <p><u>Rating: Partially Accomplished</u></p>
	3.2 Agreements with national agencies	<p>3.2 ALTERPLAN and some of the Project partner NGOs have been consulting with e.g. HUDDC, SHFC and NHA. Formalized agreements on how these agencies could have supported resettlement implementation more efficiently were not initiated. Considering further that a large number of risk reduction projects falls</p>

**Table 8.** Summary of achieved Project outputs and accomplishment rating

		<p>under the domain of DPWH and bio-engineering projects such as challenging riverbank tree planting under the DENR, no attempts were made to involve or consult with these departments.</p> <p><u>Rating: Not accomplished</u></p>
	3.3 Pool of resource persons	<p>3.3. The project embraced an effort to expand a pool of experts including training and facilitation specialists, who can contribute to up-scaling of BDRSSP geographically to more cities. A total of 15 individuals (Project NGO Partners in General Santos: 2, Iligan: two NGO Partners and one individual from the City LGU, and Ubay: one former A2D staff. In addition, two PHILSSA representatives and two representatives from Manila-based NGOs constitutes the resource pool.</p> <p><u>Rating: Partially Accomplished</u> with the note that there are no binding commitments to assist in project implementation or sustainability on the part of the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project nor its barangay POs and BLGUs in the four cities/municipalities.</p>
	3.4 Heightened profile in international fora	<p>3.4. The Project attended the World Urban Forum where exposure were made both through exhibits and dialogs with organizations from the Philippines and other countries. No other attempts were made in terms on establishing formal links to international or regional networks.</p> <p><u>Rating: Partially Accomplished</u></p>

**Table 8.** Summary of achieved Project outputs and accomplishment rating

--	--	--

### **3.4 Efficiencies**

#### **3.4.1 Time and Effort in Project Development and Implementation**

DIB and ALTERPLAN submitted the Project application to CISU in September 2014. The application was approved by CISU with Project start 1 January 2015. From the Project application to Project approval the timeline was very short, and only about three months. The inception phase that included final selection of the local partner Project NGOs lasted from January to April 2015; three month or a usual standard time for inception periods.

The Project was originally approved to be operational for 36 months until 31 December 2017. In May 2017, however, a no-cost extension was approved by CISU with the project now agreed to end 30 April 2018. In February 2018, however, a 2nd request was submitted to CISU for an additional no-cost extension until June 2018. A key justification for the 2<sup>nd</sup> no-cost extension was that the Project grant, largely due to more favorable exchange rates, had generated more than PhP 1 million or DKK 138,000 in surplus (by March 2018 the exchange rate effectively was PhP8.40 compared to the exchange rate used in CISU-approved budget in 2014 (exchange rate 1DKK = PhP 6.70)). The justification for the 2nd no-cost extension was to use the remaining funds to provide more time to:

- 1) Conduct an evaluation feedback session with local partners.
- 2) Hold a closing-out conference with national government and non-government stakeholders.
- 3) Provide additional technical assistance and staff-time allocation for design development, advocacy and monitoring of local projects arising from the BDRSS Plans.

#### **3.4.2 Planning efficiency**

During the Project's lifetime there has been four Project Implementation Plans (PIP) with a first request proposing timeline adjustment including deadline extension of about 20 activities in 2016. Among these and related to Objective 1, 2 and 3 of the Project were 4 activities related to *Demonstration of preparedness through DRSSP*, 7 activities under *Implementation of DRSSP recommendations* and 7 activities for *Stakeholders' acceptance of DRSSP*.

In first quarter of 2017, it was realized that Project activities such as finalization, approval and funding of all of the 12 BDRSS Plans, originally planned to have been completed in 2015, would become substantially delayed. Therefor the no-cost extension would primarily focus on detailing activity implementation for 2017 as well as implementation of key recommendation derived out of the Project's Mid-term Evaluation in August 2017. The new PIP with its revised activity plan and adjustment of a number of the budget lines was followed by



supplementary implementation agreements made for the remaining part of 2017 between ALTERPLAN and the four partner Project NGOs.

Based on the revised timelines for deliverables found in the rolling PIPs, the Project was able to deliver nearly all of the planned activities in 2017 with exception of implementation of most of the BDRSS Plan recommendations that includes 193 of thematic disaster risk mitigation activities and projects (average 48 activities per project site). For oversight of all BDRSSP proposed projects, see Annex G. However, in ensuring funding and activity implementation of selected projects within the Project timeline, the Project's management already in 2016 had decided to focus on a much smaller number of proposed activities and projects found in the Plans (Priority Projects and Plans (PPP) or Project Briefs. A total of 77 PPPs were listed in the Project Briefs, on average 19 projects per project site, and used in lobbying for inclusion in the LGUs Development Plans and Annual Investment Plans. For details, see Annex H.

A new activity was added to the no-cost extension PIP in 2017 in order to address the need to detail targeted activities such as BDRSS Plan activity implementation as well as to catch up on deficiencies in some outputs that were noted in the Project's Mid-term Assessment Report. However, at the time of the Project Evaluation, the majority of projects, 116 DRR mitigation and adaptation projects had gotten limited or no attention at all because of the necessity to ensure funding of some projects to be included in the annual AIPs and the LGUs budget cycle. The benefit of the listing is that it is potentially comprehensive of all matters that needs attention for successful disaster risk reduction. Provided a sustainability plan for the remaining interventions will be worked out, the implication can be that the BDRRSPs may yet be utilized in the next budget cycles. That will be on the initiative of the barangay LGUs and POs though.

### ***3.4.3 Capacity-Building***

ALTERPLAN mainly built capacities and relationships at the local level with the expectation that better service delivery to urban poor households and enhanced ability to tap into the official process for local development planning would help the POs and BLGUs in pushing for their plans vis-à-vis the municipal/city government processes more efficiently. Capacity-building focused mainly on the shelter planning processes for target groups most at risks from hazards and disasters (resettlement to safer areas). To a much more limited extent the Project also built capacities to plan for other aspects of disaster risk mitigation based on root cause analysis found in the BDRSS Plans.

A core-team from ALTERPLAN conducted over one year site-based trainings attended by the local Project partner NGO and targeted BLGU and POs members from the three participating barangays per site.

The training sessions were organized by the local Project partner NGO but solely implemented by technical staff from ALTERPLAN. In real numbers 219 individuals attended the trainings (NGOs 13%, BLGUs 23% and POs 64%). The attendance to the trainings varied substantially from site to site. As average per site, the trainings were attended by 55 persons and the target of 25 trained individuals per site (PO: 15, NGO: 6 and LGU: 4) were numerically accomplished in all sites (Table 9). However, only about 3% of local stakeholders attended all 8 trainings and if attendance in 5 training sessions is used as the benchmark for adequate capacity

to replicate a BDRSS Plan and to make advocacy and carry out monitoring, only 31 individuals (14%), made it.

**Table 9.** Local stakeholders and Project partner NGOs’ participation in ALTERPLAN’s DRSSP trainings

City/ Municipality	8 trainings (100%)				5-7 trainings (62-88%)				1-4 trainings (12-50%)			
	PO	LGU	NGO	TOTAL	PO	LGU	NGO	TOTAL	PO	LGU	NGO	TOTAL
General Santos	0	0	3	3	3	1	1	5	47	11	6	64
Iligan	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	10	30	8	6	44
Ligao	0	0	2	2	4	3	0	7	17	14	4	35
Ubay	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	2	32	9	4	45
<b>Total</b>	1	1	5	7	13	8	3	24	126	42	20	188
<b>Overall Total</b>												<b>219</b>

The BDRSS Plans deal with several types of mitigation themes, typically associated with flood prevention, relocation of communities at risk, waste management, and issues around fire prevention and water supplies. For details, see Table 10.

**Table 10.** Number of proposed BDRSSP projects and activities per DRR category per site

Category/ Project site	GEN. SANTOS	ILIGAN	LIGAO	UBAY	Total
Flood prevention	18	6	36	16	76
Relocation	9	13	12	12	46
Waste management	10	4	5	0	19
Fire prevention	14	2	2	0	18
Water supplies and WASH components	2	3	2	4	11
Evacuation Center	0	4	0	4	8
Others (mainly livelihoods)	0	0	1	7	8
BDRRM and associated trainings	1	6	0	0	7
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>193</b>

Since the training manual did not cover topics such as waste management, bioengineering (green technology) river bank and coastal restoration, siltation mitigation and alternatives to secure water supply, the ALTERPLAN-DIB introduced some limited technical assistance and limited information on needed technologies.

To illustrate:

- 1) The BDRSS Plans suggests use of bioengineering alternatives to the DPWH’s use of concrete in form of gabion dikes and riprapping. Specifically, the BDRSS Plans mention use of coco noir and vetiver grass in combination with tree planting. This being a technically challenging approach combining the use of specific endemic river tree species with strip grass planting and use of livelihood relevant fruit trees for the purpose of

community support and livelihood sustainability. However, the trainings provided late in the Project timeline were reduced to focus on vetiver grass planting, which is very useful to mitigate soil erosion on slopes but less so as a single tool used along riverbanks. As the training on vetiver grass technology only occurred in September 2017 and again from April 2018, it was no longer feasible to plant in the risk areas, for which reason there were no physical accomplishments at the time when the evaluation ended.

2) Waste management proposals in the BDRSS Plans were packaged as a combination of trainings on the cycle of proper waste management including issuance of ordinances, community awareness rising, establishment of and involvement in a collection system. However, the Project did not prioritize trainings on waste management.

#### ***3.4.4. Implementation of BDRSSP recommendations***

Most of the efforts and time were invested on increasing the shelter planning capacities of the Project partners and in the formulation of BDRSS Plans and LGU policy adoption of these plans in the barangays of the four participating cities and municipality. Consequently, less efforts and time were spent on the follow-up of financing for the BDRSSP recommendations and projects by inclusion into the Barangay and City Annual Investment Plans. Also, there was not much time left for the implementation of projects and for technical assistance that can enable project implementation.

In 2016, it became clear that in order to have the proposed projects and activities included in the LGUs annual budget cycle, not all of the more than 190 mitigation activities and projects proposed in the BDRSS Plans could be equally prioritized. ALTERPLAN requested the Project partner NGOs and the barangay LGUs to prioritize projects and get these included in the LGUs annual budget cycle as Priority Projects and Plans (PPPs). A total of 77 PPPs became the focus of LGU adoption advocacy for inclusion in local budgets as part of the Local Development Plans. For oversight, see Annex H.

A total of eight technical assistance projects were developed and approved for funding by the Project and mainly implemented in the second half of 2017, Table 8. In comparison there are about 115 unfunded projects and activities found in the DRRSS Plans of which the majority could have benefitted from technical assistance in form of hiring of external consultants to conduct e.g. thematic on-the-job trainings, develop site-specific mitigation assessments or provide specifications and detailed budgets for implementation where local capacity were not in place.

#### ***3.4.5 Human Resources: Project staff and consultants and volunteer contributions***

To implement the Project, ALTERPLAN and the four partner Project NGOs assigned in the Project areas, provided financing for both regular and hired project staff as well as short-time consultants. It included eight full time staff (ALTERPLAN four staff and the Project NGOs four staff), and an average of three part-time staff per Project partner NGO and one with ALTERPLAN. In addition 14 short-term subcontractors/technical consultants serviced the Project addressing specific technical issues (Table 11).

**Table 11.** Technical assistance provided through the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project by type of projects

Thematic technical assistance themes	Number of subcontracts/technical consultants	Location
Resettlement survey and planning	2	Ligao City
Water supply improvement	2	Ubay Municipality
Bioengineering coastal protection assessment	1	Ubay Municipality
Riverbank and slope protection (vetiver grass planting training)	3	General Santos, Iligan and Ligao City and Ubay Municipality
Baseline and Impact Assessment	2	
Mid-term and Project-end Evaluation	4	
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	

Volunteerism from the POs, BLGUs, and two of the partner NGOs added human resources to the Project. A total of 113 persons claims to have contributed varying hours of volunteer work, respectively at the sites. The activities included: coordination and organizing of activities, advocacy and lobbying for the BDRSS Plan approval, and documentation. The perceived contributions represents a total of 5,065 working days at a value of PhP 1,458, 856 or about DKK 173,670, Table 12. Additional volunteer contributions was also provided by DIB. Estimated, Danish volunteer manpower inputs equals about 107 working days valued to around PhP 1. 68 Million or DKK 200,000.

**Table 12.** Summary of claimed volunteer contributions by PO and BLGU members per Project sites

Contributions	Total	Ligao	Gensan	Ubay	Iligan
Human Resource	<b>113</b>	28	30	30	25
Hours	<b>40,518</b>	6,384	11,488	13,049	9,597
Days	<b>5,065</b>	798	1,436	1,631	1,200
Minimum Daily Wage (PhP)*		293	272	288	304
Estimated Minimum Cost (PhP)	<b>1,458,856</b>	233,814	390,592	469,764	364,686
*Minimum daily wage is based on current regional minimum daily wages as of February 2018. Source: <a href="http://www.nwpc.dole.gov.ph/pages/statistics/stat_current_regional.html">http://www.nwpc.dole.gov.ph/pages/statistics/stat_current_regional.html</a>					

In terms of the extent of payment made by the Project to the partner NGOs, there was consensus that the monthly allocation for payment of local projects staff (PhP 25,000) was a relatively modest amount and a higher allocation could have increased more timely activity deliverables. However, it was also emphasized that volunteerism formed part of the contribution of at least two Project NGOs (Iligan City and General Santos City).

### **3.4.6 Financial Management and Accountability**

The Project's budget was DKK 4,482,232 of which the CISU grant represented DKK 4,129,750. Compared to previous CISU-funded projects, DIB made relative few transfers of project funds to ALTERPLAN. Each transfer represented on average DKK475, 000. Before each transfer, ALTERPLAN submitted accounting status data and documentation for the implementation of major activities funded under the previous fund transfer. As of March 2018 six transfers were made representing DKK 2.849,241.02.

Accounting staff of the Project NGOs informed the Evaluation Team that the time from fund request to actual account deposits did not take long, as average about a week, and that the approval process for fund releases by ALTERPLAN functioned without causing delays. Preparation of expenses reports from the NGOs to ALTERPLAN and from ALTERPLAN to DIB was done monthly and transfer of funds from DIB to ALTERPLAN was tied to the regular liquidation of disbursed funds. Transfers within the Philippines were also tied to monthly activity reports as a prerequisite for receiving additional staff funding tranches. Unliquidated cash disbursement as of March 2017 was a small amount of DKK 1,785. Financial information were shared between the two partners ALTERPLAN and DIB and by ALTERPLAN and the Project NGOs in terms of relevant budget lines as referred to in the contracts between ALTERPLAN and the Project NGOs.

The utilization of an external auditor was employed by ALTERPLAN on an annual basis, and the audits covered finance utilization by both ALTERPLAN and the Project NGOs based on officially receipts and liquidations received by ALTERPLAN. The Evaluation Team checked the Project partner NGOs audit reports for 2016 and found no audit remarks in any of these reports. Similarly, the ALTERPLAN Auditor have had no remarks to the financial management and project expenditures of the Project as of the fiscal years from 2015 to 2016.

CISUs Financial Standard for grants of and above DKK 1,000,000 may generally have been followed but based on an abbreviated version of the CISU Standard made by ALTERPLAN and provided to the Project NGOs. In at least one case the Project NGO (SAC) also used its own organisation's finance management guidelines. At the level of ALTERPLAN the Evaluation did interviewed the external auditor but was unable to meet with the Project's Accountant. However, representatives of DIB informed the Evaluation Team that accounting procedures largely seems to be followed with the notes that a) double-entry book keeping using software that cannot be altered is not in place and b) project staff without a formal TOR is handling most of the daily finance management under supervision by the Project Manager.

#### ***3.4.7 Cost-efficiencies***

An indicator of the level of efficiency is the ability of a project to leverage other funds to complement project implementation. In the case of this Project, the CISU support triggered enabling implementation of the objective to see hazard and disaster mitigation projects and activities funded and implemented by other sources. Funding provided by LGUs in the four Project sites represents alone more than PhP 14.2 Million or DKK 1.7 Million. Together with indicative budgets funded by national agencies, PhP 37 Million, and contributions to technical assistance from international sources including CISU of more than PhP1.3 Million, the Project seems to have leveraged a staggering PhP 52.658 Million or about DKK 6.27 Million (Table 13).

To the Evaluation Mission's knowledge, partially based on participants FGD statements, no other NGO DRR-related project in the Philippines seems to have such high level of efficient leverage. For BDRSSP replication in other barangays, the City Government of Ligao has further allocated PhP 0.8 Million and the LGUs of Ubay and Ligao has co-funded some costs of the Projects national training sessions.

**Table 13.** Funding sources and secure indicative financing (PhP) of prioritized BDRSSP projects

<b>Project Site</b>	<b>Barangay and City LGUs</b>	<b>Social Housing Finance Corporation</b>	<b>National Housing Authority</b>	<b>DPWH</b>	<b>International funding*</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Iligan City</b>	7,870,000	0	0	4,000,000	504,050	12,374,050
<b>Ligao City</b>	1,375,000	8,000,000	0	8,000,000	205,400	> 17,580,400
<b>General Santos City</b>	>4,475,000	0	0	12,000,000	62,800	> 16,537,800
<b>Ubay Municipality</b>	516,300	0	5,000,000	0	359,600	5,875,900
<b>Total</b>	> 14,236,300	8,000,000	5,000,000	24,000,000	1,131,850	<b>52,658,150</b>
* Funding for a biosand filter project was sourced from an organization in Japan; CISU funds enabled technical assistance for a number of prioritized projects.						

In the case of the POs and the BLGUs contributions there was a relative high level of co-financing through in-kind volunteer support; for all four sites probably as high as around PhP 1.459 Million or DKK 173,700 in monetary equivalents or more than a total 20 years of volunteer inputs, Table 9. In comparison, the budget for project staffing (less consultants) is about PhP 9.059 Million or around DKK 1.08 Million. The monetary value of volunteer contributions in the Project sites represents 16% of the Project's staffing budget. In comparison the in-kind volunteer support in the CISU-funded project in Legazpi City was 18%.

Overall, the Project has maintained relatively low expenditure costs for nearly all budget activities, e.g. the unit costs used were moderate. There has though been examples where some budget activities by far overshoot the budgets, e.g. the mid-term assessments and associated activities.

Of the total budget of PhP 10.73 Million for staff salaries and consultant fees, 53% was spent by ALTERPLAN, 36% by the partner NGOs and 11% by Consultants providing technical services. This expenditure ratio does not reflect on the ratio of expenditures for full time versus part time staff paid by the Project.

### ***3.4.8 Funding of DRRSS Plan Mitigation and Adaptation Projects and Activities***

By March 2018, of 77 PPPs (Project Briefs) across the four project sites, 32 projects were implemented, 14 projects were approved pipeline projects or under negotiations for implementation by national agencies and 31 projects were still to be finalized and consequently had no funding

(Annex H). The unfunded projects includes 10 projects on green bioengineering mitigation of soil slope erosion and increased riverbank stability, 9 resettlement projects, and three projects on construction of evacuation centers. In addition, two projects are on construction of drainage canals, and one project is about drinking water supplies. Although not all projects found in the BDRSS Plans are automatically funded by the passage of the barangay and city government resolutions, they are now in principle prioritized with a higher change for funding including major flood mitigating projects that will be implemented through national funding inputs from the DPWH.

In the 12 BDRSS Plans there is a total of 193 formulated mitigation and adaptation activities and proposals of which a total of 77 projects were classified and advocated by the Project as Priority Projects and Plans (PPPs) or Project Briefs. This leave inclusion of about 116 projects for future focus and inclusion in possible barangay shelter and DRR sustainability plans. Among the unprioritized activities are proposals that falls into the following categories (number of proposed activities in bracket): Flood mitigation (63), Waste Management (17) and Fire Prevention (12).

### ***3.5 Analysis and Conclusions on Effectiveness and Efficiencies***

#### ***3.5.1 Effectiveness***

1. The Project was jointly prepared by DIB and ALTERPLAN. To advise and steer the Project a Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established with representatives from ALTERPLAN, DIB and PHILSSA, but without participation from the local partner NGOs, BLGUs and POs. Hence, the local partners had limited options for contributions to determine project activities and implementation budgets. The Project, from a management perspective, can be seen as hierarchal.
2. The participatory approach promoted at the site-level contributed to the effectiveness, especially when it comes to drafting of the DRRSS Plans and the quality of data produced which by the LGUs was seen as important data for both future planning and development.
3. The legal implementation set-up was different from the set-up in the previous project for Legazpi City where the LGU was co-signature party to the Project. The different approach prevented use of the MOU to request the City/Municipal Government to detail BLGU representatives to attend trainings and other project activities. Hence, full training attendance was lower than planned.
4. Project implementation was guided by a number of thematic strategies for a) capacity-building, b) advocacy and c) monitoring. In terms of capacitation, the training approach was learning by doing “hand-held” by ALTERPLAN while guiding the community participants towards increased understanding of risks and their causes, and to plan corresponding actions to mitigate or adapt to these.
5. Monitoring by ALTERPLAN of output deliverables were generally strong while monitoring of outcomes and impacts seems to have rested more on the partner Project NGOs. However, at

the time of the Project-end Evaluation formal monitoring agreements with POs and BLGUs were not in place.

6. The Project had relatively few personnel with high technical capabilities available for implementation. Regardless so, of the nine expected outputs, three outputs can be seen to have been fully accomplished (1.2: Disaster Risk-sensitive Shelter Plans, 2.1: Adoption of Barangay DRSSP and 2.2: Budget for projects in MTPIP and AIP), and five outputs partially accomplished (1.1: 25 persons trained per Project site, 2.3: Financed and implemented projects, 3.1: Resolutions replicating DRSSP in other barangays, 3.3: Pool of resource persons, and 3.4: Heightened profile in international for a). One output (3.2 Agreements with national agencies) was not accomplished.

The Evaluation Mission note that similar projects in the Philippines, e.g. the Nederland/Philippine Red Cross, Care Philippines and Wetlands International Project “Proud of My Purok in Agusan River Basin” with a similar implementation period, was only able to produce plans and get them approved.

7. The targeted communities where indeed reached by the Project, but the Project fell short in building sufficient capacities of all the barangay partner POs and LGUs and in the case of one Partner Project NGO (A2D). A possible reason for the limited capacitation may be a combination of a) a technical challenging methodology when it comes to providing multiple shelter plan baseline data, b) limited training on technical implementation of a series of disaster risk reduction tools needed to mitigate or adapt to identified root causes, and c) a training approach that gave limited options for the Project NGO partners to execute the training.

### **3.5.2 Efficiencies**

1. The Evaluation Mission noted an overall very positive appreciation for the Project by the Barangay Councils. This appreciation can also be measured through allocations found in the barangays Annual Investment Program.

2. To the Evaluation Mission’s knowledge, no other NGO DRR-related project in the Philippines seems to have such high level of efficient leverage. Similar projects with the same timespan at the best are only able to implement capacitation and produce plans; not to leverage funds or to implement plans.

3. Because of a decision made to prioritize a number of projects, about 60% of the BDRRSP projects and activities have gotten very limited or no attention at all. Evidently, during the FGDs carried out by the Evaluation Mission, the Barangay POs and LGUs were not able to reflect on the DRRSS Plans’ list of activities other than the PPPs.

4. Nearly all BDRSS Plans (11 out of 12 plans) had become approved at barangay levels from August to October 2017. From a planning perspective, there would have been ample time to plan implementation of more of the BDRSS Plan activities and to seek realignment of more funds to do so. The strategy to have had all capacity-building planning trainings and BDRSS Plans developed and approved (Objective 1) within the first project year was novel, but the human resource capacity to do so was too limited.



5. Trainings were conducted in national language, but the Manual used were in English despite a Tagalog manual version produced during the previous Legazpi Project. Some FGD respondents found it better if ALTERPLAN has made efforts to translate the Manual into local dialects
6. Few and substantially lower numbers than the targeted 25 individuals per project sites graduated the BDRSSP trainings, if a 5 out of 8 (60 percent) attendance benchmark is used for adequate capacity to replicate a BDRSS Plan and to make advocacy and carry out monitoring. This brings parts of the Project's capacity strategy in question.
7. Another strategic training approach could have been a 'training the trainers' approach where the partner NGOs first would have been capacitated by ALTERPLAN and then have conducted the actual trainings at barangay level. This would have reduced time input requirement for the ALTERPLAN trainers and substantially reduced travel costs. On the other hand, this approach is based on the assumption that each Project partner NGO actually had staff able to conduct trainings without substantial back-stopping from ALTERPLAN.
8. Capacitation on other aspects than shelter planning including mitigation and adaptation to disaster root causes appears to have been insufficient. The thematic limitations of the Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan Manual calls for substantially more use of best practices learned from other projects and from research, especially on bioengineering and solid waste and water management as part of the Project's capacity trainings.
9. Although the BDRSS Plans request for more use of ecologically sound bioengineering composed of three different technologies, only use of vetiver grass was introduced, and very late. Hence, the vetiver trainings had no impact on contributing to disaster risks within the Project's timeline. Vetiver technology has been tested and used since 1990 with more than 500 users participating in a national network since 1997. The Vetiver Network was not approached to advance packaging and implementation of projects.
10. The Project did not provide capacity building on waste management and the prioritized projects that were funded focused only on the financing of concrete waste management facilities; but not on setting up operationalizing the system as envisioned in the BDRSS Plans.
11. The barangay DRRSS Plans took a long time to develop and get approved because of a sometimes challenging participatory process and the actual capacity at the local level requiring substantial back-stopping from ALTERPLAN. The BDRSS Plans were consequently only approved about 20 month later than originally planned at project start.
12. Contributing to delayed deliverables of the BDRSS Plans may have been the training cycle that took about a year to fully complete, and a plan finalization process handled by just one ALTERPLAN staff. In comparison, ALTERPLAN at the end of the CISU-funded Legazpi Project was able to facilitate and finalize BDRSS Plans within a 4-month period.
13. Provided that the training of the partner NGO and Barangay POs/BLGUs would still have taken ALTERPLAN two month to conduct, it would have taken an efficiently trained Project NGO 12 months to have facilitated plan development and barangay level approval of the three

plans per project site. Or a total of 14 months compared to 20 months actually spent by the Project.

14. Although 11 out of 12 barangay DRRSS Plans have been approved by the Barangay Councils, the strategy of focusing on the limited number of PPPs may come at the expense of the many other proposed BDRSSP activities and projects. At time of the Project evaluation, there was no strategy or agreement between the partner NGOs and the Barangay POs nor the Barangay LGUs on who shall implement these projects.

15. The CISU's funding alone could not have met the totality of technical assistance needed. However, more technical assistance could have been provided when it became clear that a substantial part of the proposed activities required specific technical assistance; not easily available at the site-level.

16. To illustrate the need for technical assistance, a key concern raised by the POs across the project sites is about relocation and housing projects. The POs and targeted relocation beneficiaries are wondering when the housing projects will happen? No resettlement projects derived out of the BDRSS Plans of this Project and eventually also out of the previous project in Legazpi City have been accomplished. It raises the question whether more use of specialized resettlement experts and housing financing consultants would have been an investment that could have contributed to a more efficient deliverable?

#### ***4.5.3 Cost-effectiveness and Financial Management and Accountability***

1. The CISU investment in the Project has leveraged a very high amount of co-funding; by the LGUs alone more than PhP 14.2 Million or DKK 1.7 Million. Together with indicative budgets funded by national agencies, PhP 37 Million, and contributions to technical assistance from international agencies, including CISU, of more than PhP 1.3 Million, the Project seems to have leveraged a staggering PhP 52.658 Million or about DKK 6.27 Million.

2. The unanswered question is if the general approval of the proposed activities found in the BDRSS Plans will be prioritized by the Barangay LGUs and the City Governments? There are about 116 projects currently not prioritized for future funding focus and inclusion in possible barangay shelter and DRR sustainability plans.

3. The total minimum volunteer contributions on the part of the POs and BLGUs in the Philippines and DIB in Denmark equals a minimum of PhP 3.138 Million Pesos or DKK 373,600 equivalent to 16% of the Philippine staffing budget provided for by CISU. Without volunteerism the Project would not have been possible.

4. Overall, the Project has maintained relatively low expenditure costs; for staffing and use of consultants perhaps too low. There are indications that increased use of full time staff and of consultants (technical service providers) could have reduced the time it took to get the BDRSS Plans developed and have increased the number of projects under implementation.

5. Among the contracted partner NGOs, there was a general consensus that the monthly allocation for payment of local projects staff (Php 25,000 or DKK 2,976) was a relatively modest amount and a higher allocation could have increased more timely activity deliverables.

6. Based on a financial note issued by DIB on 18 December 2017, DIB has signalled a need for ALTERPLAN to update its financial management and accounting. It pertains mainly to use of accounting software not recommended by CISU or the Philippine Security and Exchange Commission. The issue was already noted during project monitoring in 2016 with a recommendation made only to follow CISU's requirements for double-entry book keeping using software in which data cannot be altered.

## **4.0 OUTCOMES-IMPACT**

In examining the Project's outcomes and impact, the End-Project Evaluation took into account the changes attributable to the interventions, whether these were beneficial or detrimental, direct or indirect effects, and for intended and unintended beneficiaries. Levels of capacity to resolve shelter conditions endangered by natural risks and hazards were expected to be improved by the two-pronged process of learning in-class and by direct application to formulate the BDRSSP. Projects proposed, funded and implemented intended to reduce the risks to disasters but some projects such as concreting of river banks, creation of river canals and dredging may have caused unintended environmental impacts elsewhere in the river systems. The Project did not intend to assess and could not document environmental impacts, whether positive or negative. The outcome and impact evaluation also looked into the broader and long term consequences of the interventions.

### ***4.1 Changes at the Project Sites at End-Project***

- ***Capacity Building. Objective 1. Increased capacities of civil society participants for preparedness through formulation of Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans***

Attributed to the Project's capacity building, the participants from the partner organizations explained that they learned the DRSSP methodology and process only from the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project. For a few participants in the FGDs who attended the DRRM orientation sessions for local governments, their learnings covered only disaster preparedness and disaster response, unlike the Project DRSSP that integrated disaster hazards and risks with shelter/housing conditions particularly of informal settler communities. Overall, only the Project gave them such unique training that is beneficial to them, individually and for the POs, Barangay and City LGUs.

The benefits accrue to the partner organizations - the PO, NGO, BLGU, and City/Municipal LGU. Considered to be directly intended, positive, and immediately beneficial consequences of the Project training-capacity development, useful to them even after the Project ends, are the following knowledge and skills:

- Identifying and mapping the natural and geophysical risks and hazards and endangered communities.
- Conducting the community survey for the BDRSSP.
- Drafting the BDRSSP from the scientific data and personal experiences.
- Preparing project proposals.
- Advocating the BDRSSP and project proposals, at least, to the barangay LGU, and to the city (particularly for the NGO).

The capacity building directly reached a total of 219 participants, of which only 7 attended all the 8 training sessions, while 188 attended only from 1 to 4 training sessions (see Table 6, section on Effectiveness and Efficiency). Consequently, DRSSP capacities are unevenly distributed among participants because of non-attendance in some sessions and learning activities. Majority know only some parts of the over-all DRSSP methodology and process. The Evaluation Team only consider those that attended 5 or more trainings, 13.5%, to have to full capacity potentially to replicate the DRSSP process in other barangays.

There was no replication of training for other Barangay Council members and PO officers and members, although sharing took place during meetings of the PO, the BLGU, and with the community about proposed projects. Despite partial and selective training inputs, the PO and LGU participants expressed some perceived confidence in being able to share knowledge and experiences on the BDRSSP to the extent of their attendance in the training sessions and activities after the Project ends in June 2018 (Table 14). The results of the individual self-assessment gave mean rating scores that ranged from the minimum of 2.64 to the maximum of 3.63 for the respondents per city, indicating slightly adequate (2) to adequate levels (3), but falling slightly short of the highest level 4.

**Table 14.** FGD participant perceived Self-Assessed Capacities for their DRSSP January – February 2018.

<b>Questions: Compared to the start of the Project, what is your rating for the following elements at the end of the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project</b>	<b>MEAN AVERAGE</b>			
	<b>GENERAL SANTOS</b>	<b>ILIGAN</b>	<b>LIGAO</b>	<b>UBAY</b>
	<b>n = 31</b>	<b>n = 26</b>	<b>n = 25</b>	<b>n = 28</b>
1. I increased awareness of environmental hazards	3.53	3.44	3.00	3.18
2. I have increased awareness of environmental risks by the end of the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.	3.52	3.49	3.31	3.23
3. I have increased awareness of vulnerabilities by the end of the Alterplan-DIB Project.	3.47	3.35	3.20	3.21
4. I can do research on environmental hazards, risks, vulnerabilities DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.	3.02	3.10	2.97	3.11
5. This Alterplan-DIB Project has helped address the problems in our area and community.	3.61	3.63	3.15	3.43

**Table 14.** FGD participant perceived Self-Assessed Capacities for their DRSSP January – February 2018.

Questions: Compared to the start of the Project, what is your rating for the following elements at the end of the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project	MEAN AVERAGE			
	GENERAL SANTOS	ILIGAN	LIGAO	UBAY
	n = 31	n = 26	n = 25	n = 28
6. I can advocate the DRSSP to the officials in the LGU DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.	3.33	3.23	3.14	3.01
7. I can assist in the implementation of the projects in the Barangay DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.	3.40	3.32	3.13	2.99
8. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun. organization can do Barangay DRSS planning on its own even after the Project ends. (Referring to the Respondent's Org)	3.18	3.16	2.97	3.07
9. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun. can implement the projects in the Barangay DRSSP even after the Project ends. (Referring to the Respondent's Org)	3.06	3.17	2.91	2.83
10. The Alterplan gave the PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun. knowledge and skills to continue to do Barangay DRSSP DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends. (Referring to the Respondent's Org)	3.10	3.43	3.12	3.19
11. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun. accomplished the data collection system because of the Alterplan-DIB Project. (Referring to the Respondent's Org)	3.39	3.18	3.01	2.89
12. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City can assist other areas to replicate the Barangay DRSSP process after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends. (Referring to the Respondent's Org.)	3.43	3.06	3.07	2.64
13. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City can use the Barangay DRSSP planning process even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.	3.51	3.45	3.16	3.26
14. I find the Alterplan-DIB DRSSP planning manual (with the methodology/process) understandable for my use.	3.46	3.48	3.39	3.15
<b>Total</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>3.08</b>
Note: The items pertain to the respondent's organization, whether the PO, NGO, BLGU, City/Mun LGU and using a four-point scale: 1 as lowest, 2 and 3, and 4 the highest score.				

- ***Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan. Objective 2. Adoption of Barangay DRSSP, budget allocation-funding, implementation and monitoring.***

The positive and planned changes attributed to the Project occurred to the extent of completed implementation of prioritized projects from the BDRSSP by: (1) the BLGU using its budget and (2) the City/Municipality funded from its annual investment plan (AIPs). Other

BDRSSP derived projects await funding and implementation but beyond the Project end in 2018. (See Annex G and Annex H)

- **General Santos City.** Although direct impacts, whether positive or negative, cannot be verified, some 266 households in Barangay City Heights have eventually benefited from the prioritized project on the construction of a concrete gabion dike, undertaken by the national government through the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) as facilitated by the City Government, including an early warning device to assist the community in flood control and river bank erosion. Extension of the dike may also benefit Barangay Apopong particularly Purok 13, where a water system has been installed. However, the Evaluation Mission noted during the field visit that sections of the new dike already had substantial cracks indicating use of insufficient design and materials with a possible negative impact on the sustainability of the project. Further, the informal settler communities in the three pilot barangays have become aware of the fire hazards from their illegal electric connection and have been provided by the LGU with training on fire prevention.
- For relocation and resettlement, Brng City Heights referred the 223 of 446 informal settler families to the City LGU. The Olarte land area was initially identified for relocation or for a temporary staging area for families while working out their relocation; unfortunately, the area has been under litigation for several years to determine the land ownership. Land is generally difficult to find and costs are unaffordable. The City LGU has a total of 21,000 informal settler families in 26 barangays of which 5,000 located in danger zones must be relocated within a six year period.
- **Iligan City.** Solid waste management with a materials recovery facility in Brng. Santiago expects to benefit at some 1,000 households. However, only the concrete construction of the facility were prioritized for funding, not the whole strategy listed in the DRSSP which included several other important activities to make lasting impacts on better waste management ( issuance of an ordinance, increased awareness among the communities, sustained waste collection etc.). In Brng. San Roque, a funded and planned upgrade of the evacuation center has an estimated benefit for 50 households, 400 students and 73 teachers in the area; and a safe water treatment project using bio-sand filters is ongoing. In Brng. Hinaplanon, the drainage system improved by the national government intervention, benefits an estimated 430 households; while the solid waste management materials recovery facility may benefit 23 puroks.
- **Ligao City.** Two pilot barangays have common project on drainage that benefit 20 household beneficiaries in Brng. Tinago and two areas in Brng. Bagumbayan with a total of 100 households. A project widening a road in Brng. Tuburan has an estimated 113 household beneficiaries. A housing project for relocation of

communities at risk benefitting 280 households has been approved but is still under negotiation with the Socialized Housing Finance Corporation (SHFC).

- **Ubay Municipality.** An innovative water supply project were partially funded and prioritized in Brngs. Cuya, Cagting and Guintaboan. LGU funding for relocation intends to benefit 63 households in two areas in Brng. Cuya, 453 households in Brng. Cagting and 168 households in Brng. Guintaboan. The housing project, however, is still under negotiation with the National Housing Authority (NHA).

What may be considered unintended and unplanned consequences pertain to the key objective of the BDRSSP, which is to integrate shelter interventions with disaster risk reduction and management interventions. The process may extend beyond the lifetime of the Project; especially in Ligao City and in Iligan City where the partner Project NGOs has expressed their commitment to take lead in sustaining on-going processes.

- ***DRSSP Methodology. Objective 3. DRSSP accepted by different stakeholders (replication, mutual agreements, resource pool, international profile)***

The LGUs, POs, and Project NGO partners confirm the benefits they derived from engaging in the Project. The LGUs are benefited in the sense that they have evidence-based/data based list of many projects and activities found in the BDRSSP that can be taken up in the long term although no timeline or leadership for these projects have been agreed upon and contrary to about 30 projects have been accomplished within the Project's timeline. The LGUs can continue to allocate for the other projects in the next years' Annual Investment Programs. The city/municipal LGUs may integrate the BDRSSPs in the City Development Plan, the City Shelter Plan, and the City Land Use Plan. The theoretical prospects of replication are high for all the city/municipal LGUs since only three of all their barangays have BDRSS Plans at the end of the ALTERPLAN – DIB Project. But all of these are contingent on political decision making after local barangay elections in May 2018 and continued advocacy follow-up by PO leaders when the Project end in June 2018. The Evaluation Mission noted there are no official commitments on the sustainability of the Project on the part of the LGUs.

The POs affirm their efforts to use their learnings after the Project ends to continue what they have started since proposed projects and activities are vital and beneficial to them as residents of the pilot project barangays. In general, they also expressed willingness to be part of replication efforts in other barangays. However, there appears to be substantial constraints to their organizational and individual capacities.

#### ***4.3 Issues and Concerns***

There are at least three main issues that affected the outcome and impact of the Project:

- Difficulties in getting the same participants to complete the capacity building from beginning to end of the Project;

- Difficulties in access to LGU funds for the principal project on shelter relocation and resettlement; availability and affordability of land; and in the process of securing housing finance from the national government agencies;
- Difficulties in providing adequate and timely technical capacitation e.g. on composite flood bio-engineering approaches (ecological sound tree planting and use of coco noir) and a cohesive solid waste approach as listed in the DRSSPs).

#### ***4.4 Analysis of Project Impact***

On the objective for capacity building, the evaluation findings highlight the attribution to the Project of the POs' increased awareness, knowledge and skills on DRSSP. The ALTERPLAN - DIB Project's DRSSP differs from the national and local government's DRRM by its integration of shelter and disaster risk reduction and management. However, evaluation findings raise implications on capabilities due to the uneven attendance of participants in the training and learning sessions as well as late and insufficient use of Project funds needed for technical assistance to implement projects in the pilot barangays.

This matter may be traced to the lack of a policy document, such as a Memorandum of Understanding between ALTERPLAN-DIB and Project partners to designate representatives to participate consistently from training to implementation; and for other relevant commitments for project implementation.

On changes accruing from the Project interventions, the direct and intended benefits have been limited to a relative few projects out of the 193 projects and activities proposed in the BDRSSPs including those that the barangay LGUs could afford to finance within the 3.5 year period of the Project, and to bigger projects accessed through the City Government but implemented by national government agencies. The major shelter projects related to disaster risk reduction and management has, similar to the previously CISU-funded projects in Legazpi City, remained in a status of on-going progress, awaiting stronger advocacy and completion of documentation, regulatory and financing requirements from the Project partners and City/Municipal LGU response. The processes for the BDRSSP's shelter plan implementation have yet to be extended beyond the Project's timeline.

For further effects of the Project, the LGUs may potentially include the BDRSSPs in their development, shelter and land use plans; also replicate the DRSSP methodology and process in other barangays.

## **5.0 SUSTAINABILITY**

### ***5.1 Sustainability Planning and Commitment***

At the time of the End-Project Evaluation, the Project partners were yet to prepare their respective sustainability plans. However, they verbally expressed promissory and prospective action to continue the efforts of the Project even after it ends in June 2018.



- Two of the Project partner NGOs, the SAC of Ligao City and I-CESDEV of Iligan City anticipated the continuity of their work on the BDRSSPs to advocate for inclusion in the City Planning and Development Plans and the Annual Investment Plans. These NGOs affirm the relevance of the Project to their organizational thrusts and the needs of the communities they serve. ALTERPLAN- the national NGO, and DIB-the international NGO do not have and will yet have to forge a sustainability plan overall and per site.
- The POs asserted that they will continue to work on the BDRSSPs because of their personal, family and community need for the projects listed in the Plans, some completed or ongoing, but the majority still pending LGU attention.
- Barangay Council members can continue to bring forward other BDRSSP projects for budget allocation in the next cycles of the Barangay Annual Investment Plans and to advocate resolutions forwarding their requests to the city, provincial and other government sources of funds and action.
- In general, the city and municipal officials interviewed, affirm the alignment of the BDRSSPs to the LGU's priorities regarding shelter, water supply, waste management, drainage, flooding, and livelihood and may possibly include the remaining unfunded priority projects in forthcoming Annual Investment Plans. The BDRSSPs may also be considered for the purposes of the City/Municipal Land Use Plan, City/Municipal Shelter Plan, City/Municipal Development Plan, City/Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan and the Annual Investment Plan.

## ***5.2 Constraints to Sustainability***

- Election results in May 2018 pose as a major constraint for the LGU partners in the eventuality of change in political leadership in the LGUs. If re-elected, the barangay council members expressed continued support for the BDRSSPs. Otherwise newly elected political officials may not be aware and will need to be oriented about the BDRSSPs.
- With the budget limitations of the Barangay LGU, projects will have to be referred to the city/municipality LGUs, and even to the provincial LGU and national government agencies. The LGUs face varied compelling and competitive demands that cannot be accommodated by the limited funds in one budget year. This implies that remaining BDRSSP projects need to be advocated in the succeeding years of the budget cycles.
- POs are constrained by weak leadership and membership commitment to advocate the BDRSSP to the LGUs; more so by lack of funds to accomplish the projects.
- The pool of resource persons is limited to those that completed or selectively attended some training and project activities. The lack of a focal organization and focal leaders in-charge of sustainability efforts may hinder both the implementation and coordination of efforts after the Project ends.

- There is no MOU among the Project partners concerning sustainability after the Project ends in June 2018. One barangay (Apopong) in General Santos has not approved the BDRSSP and City Council; hence, cannot act without the barangay resolution to adopt the BDRSSP.

### ***5.3 Potential Resources***

The LGUs' 70% of the 5% Disaster Fund provides a potential fund source for disaster risk reduction intervention, even for training and fire drills. Technical assistance maybe requested by the Barangay Council from the city and provincial LGUs, as well as from national government.

In Ligao, the POs has been accredited and can avail of their representation in the local City Development Council to advocate the BDRSSP projects. I-CESDEV, the Iligan City NGO, and SAC in Ligao City mentioned their representation in local bodies (such as the City Development Council) where they may continue advocacy for BDRSSP projects.

### ***5.4 Unfinished Business***

When it ends, the Project leaves unfinished business that call for a sustainability agenda, specifically (1) the 40% prioritized projects still pending funding and completion; (2) the 60% unprioritized but enlisted projects in the BDRSSPs. In all the sites, the 2018 budget has been closed, such that advocacy will be needed for inclusion of the pending projects in the 2019 LGU Annual Investment Plan.

The housing relocation and resettlement projects stand out as perhaps the most crucial of the BDRSSP's projects, confronted by tedious processes in the long term. Implementation of the shelter plan will take time and resources for various processes including: identification of the suitable site for relocation and resettlement; verification and negotiation with the landowner; documentation of the ISFs and other requirements; financing for land purchase and acquisition and assistance from national agencies (Community Mortgage Program of the Socialized Housing Finance Corporation; housing programs of the National Housing Authority).

For unfinished business per site:

- **General Santos City.** The relocation and resettlement of ISFs face the problems of verification and negotiation with the landlord, documentation, and financing. The flood control of river ways cut across the pilot sites and other barangays. POs and BLGUs need the City LGU assistance. The vetiver project is ongoing but has not been coordinated with the city LGU and the DPWH; and has not been integrated into a sound bio-engineering approach that includes other tools to enhance possible impacts and sustainability.
- **Ligao City.** The housing project is ongoing but is in need of negotiations with the landlord and the city for financing land purchase and for access to the CMP program of the SHFC. Sustained monitoring is needed for the projects endorsed to the city

LGU and with national agencies (such as DILG initiative for safe water supply through the “*Sagana Ligtas Tubig* Program”). Vetiver planting is expected to continue and will need monitoring.

- **Ubay Municipality.** While the water supply project has been implemented in one barangay, it is still not operational. The inclusion in the municipality’s water supply program is expected to address the lack of barangay resources to install water supply systems. Projects still in progress include the evacuation center, relocation; alternative technologies for water supply, such as possibly by rain water harvesting; vetiver cultivation to address soil erosion, waste segregation training and sanitation, and the livelihood center. Ubay’s housing relocation project awaits assistance from the NHA; while the city LGU will try to inquire about relevant programs of the SHFC.
- **Iligan City.** The housing relocation project awaits the assistance of the city government for land purchase and other processes. Ongoing projects still raise issues on how and who will be responsible for sustainability, specifically the: bio-sand filter project, drainage rehabilitation, the materials recovery facility, livelihood, and flood control programs like dikes and green bioengineering by the DPWH and DENR, the materials recovery facility, and livelihood projects.

## 5.5 Replication

Other barangays within the city/municipality were identified for replication since these have the same or similar shelter and disaster risk-related problems, but without the Project’s BDRSSPs (in the sense of counterfactuals for the Project sites).

**Table 15.** Identified replication sites

General Santos	Iligan	Ligao*	Ubay	
Total: 26 barangays	Total: 44 barangays	Total: 55 barangays	Total: 44 barangays	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upper Labay</li> <li>• San Isidro</li> <li>• Mabuhay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bagong Silang</li> <li>• Bonbonon</li> <li>• Digkilaan</li> <li>• Mandulog</li> <li>• Pugaan</li> <li>• Tambacan</li> <li>• Tubod</li> <li>• Upper</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baligang</li> <li>• Binatagan</li> <li>• Bonga</li> <li>• Cabarian</li> <li>• Catburawan</li> <li>• Guilid</li> <li>• Layon</li> <li>• Pinit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Achila</li> <li>• Bay-ang</li> <li>• Benliw</li> <li>• Biabas</li> <li>• Camambugan</li> <li>• Fatima</li> <li>• Humayhumay</li> <li>• Juagdan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sinandigan</li> <li>• Tapal</li> <li>• Tintinan</li> <li>• Tipolo</li> <li>• Union</li> </ul>

	Hinaplanon	• Tambo	• Katarungan	
--	------------	---------	--------------	--

## ***5.6 Analysis of Sustainability***

The lack of a sustainability plan and the uneven stages of project implementation at End-Project Evaluation present issues for how Project outcomes and impact could be sustained in the long term. Across the sites, the housing relocation and resettlement projects stand as the most crucial shelter-and -disaster related intervention. Engaging multi-faceted processes, the shelter /housing project could not be fully accomplished within the 3.5 years of the Project's timeframe.

The water supply system is an unfinished business since some sites have reached near-completion but could not be operational. The vetiver project introduced late by the Project has to be worked out by the barangays in line with similar city/municipality initiatives and linked to other green initiatives such riverbank tree planting and use of coco coir. Solid waste management and materials recovery facility are other projects to be operationalized, while livelihood projects associated with resettlement need to be planned for long term sustainability.

In all the sites, the results of the forthcoming local elections pose as a challenge to sustainability changes in political leadership, unless incumbents are re-elected who will commit to sustaining the Project. POs and NGOs, while willing, may not have the necessary resources to continue advocate and press on the LGUs to support the projects.

Replication by the LGUs add relevance and impact for the Project. But this is contingent on the political leadership's decision to use the BDRSSP methodology and the limited number of human resources given capacity building by the Project, and resources the LGUs would be willing to give, considering the competing demands of other projects for funds.

## **6.0 SUMMARY – ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS**

Examining the Project across the sites at near end relative to the Project objectives and evaluation criteria, the evaluation team posits the following analysis and conclusions:

### **5. Relevance**

- The Project was relevant in the sense of being appropriate to the area's disaster risk-related conditions and the communities' past experiences with natural disasters.
- The Project partner POs and LGUs acknowledged the capacity building effort, the DRSSP methodology, and projects to be directly responsive to the need for solutions to disaster risks inter-linked with shelter conditions affecting communities at the pilot sites.
- The BDRSSPs addressed the need for data based planning and decision making that enabled the LGUs were instrumental for its data-based evidence

that enabled the LGUs' decision making for budget allocation and implementation of proposed and prioritized projects.

- NGO partners acknowledged the relevance of the Project to their organizational thrusts at the time of the Project's initiation and signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with ALTERPLAN and DIB.

#### 6. Effectiveness and Efficiencies

- The Project was steered well by the PSC although the local partners seems to have had limited options for inputs to the PSC determining project activities and implementation budgets.
- The participatory approach contributed to the Project's accomplishment of objectives for the drafting of the DRSSP, based on systematic data collection, area mapping for disaster risks, data analysis, project development and writing of Policy Briefs, as well as advocacy to the LGUs for funding and implementation.
- The lack of legal instrument, as in a Memorandum of Understanding, where LGUs are co-signatory parties to the Project limited the full participation of LGU representatives in the training and implementation activities.
- For nine expected outputs, three were fully accomplished: (1) Barangay Disaster Risk-sensitive Shelter Plans; (2) Barangay LGU adoption of the BDRSSP; (3) budget release for projects from the Annual Investment Plans. Five outputs were partially accomplished: (1) 25 persons trained per site; (2) financing and implementation of projects; (3) resolutions replicating DRSSPs in other barangays; (4) pool of resource persons; (5) heightened profile in international fora. One expected output not accomplished was the agreement with national agencies.
- Compared to similar international collaboration, the Project achieved more than just capacitation and planning, but succeeded in leveraging local funds and implementing projects derived from the plans ((BDRSSP).
- There was an overall very positive appreciation for the Project by the Barangay Councils.
- The CISU investment has leveraged a very high amount of co-funding; by the LGUs alone more than PhP 14.2 Million or DKK 1.7 Million. Together with other indicative budgets the Project in total may have leveraged around PhP 52.7 Million or about DKK 6.3 Million.
- Without volunteerism the Project would not have been possible. Volunteer contributions on the part of the POs and BLGUs in the Philippines and DIB in Denmark equals around PhP 3.14 Million or DKK 373,600 equivalent to 16% of the Philippine staffing budget.
- Several efficiency issues emerged:
  - Due to the attention given to the prioritized projects from the BDRSSPs, the Project missed out on pursuing 60% of the other listed BDRSSP projects and activities.

- A substantially lower number of individuals than planned graduated from the Project's capacity building, which would be inadequate for replication, advocacy and monitoring. This brings the Project's capacity strategy in question.
- Another strategic training and planning approach may have reduced the 20 month it took before BDRSSPs were approved to 14 months.
- The strategy to have had all capacity-building, and BDRSS Plans developed and approved within the first project year was novel, but the human resource capacity to do so was too limited.
- The thematic limitations of the Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan Manual calls for substantially more use of DRR mitigating best practices learned from other projects.
- Technical assistance came late, such as for the vetiver project, waste management, and water supply projects. Technical assistance for relocation and housing projects was much needed but insufficiently addressed.
- Too much time spent on the BDRSSP process left a shorter time for project advocacy, financing and implementation.
- Monitoring by ALTERPLAN of output deliverables were generally strong. However, at the time of the Evaluation, formal monitoring agreements with POs and BLGUs on outcomes and impacts were not in place.
- Although 92% of the barangay DRRSS Plans have been approved, the strategy of focusing on the limited number of PPPs may come at the expense of the many other proposed BDRSSP activities and projects.
- At time of the Project evaluation, there was no strategy or agreement between the partner NGOs and the Barangay POs nor the Barangay LGUs on who shall implement the majority of proposed projects.
- No resettlement projects have been accomplished. It raised among the target beneficiaries the question if it ever will happen? Use of specialized resettlement experts and housing financing consultants could eventually have contributed to a more efficient deliverable.

## 7. Outcomes and Impact

- The direct and intended benefits for the communities were achieved to the extent of the number of projects fully accomplished and partially accomplished.
- As changes attributed to the Project, POs and LGUs acquired increased capacity for DRSSP, particularly on the unique inter-relatedness of disaster risks with shelter issues that distinguished the Project from other disaster risk and management training focused on disaster preparedness and emergency response.

- The BDRSSP contributed to the barangay LGU and the city/mun LGU by providing the data on disaster risks and correspondingly the proposed projects that enabled the LGU's decision making on budget allocation and project implementation. The pilot barangays attributed the BDRSSP and the prioritized projects to the Project, considering that these were observed in nearby barangays that have the same or similar disaster risks and affected communities.
- The BDRSSP has potential impact on the LGUs mandates to formulate the City's Development Plan, Land Use Plan and shelter plan by adoption of the pilot barangays' BDRSSP, and the Project methodology and process for replication in other barangays.
- With respective programs and projects related to the ALTERPLAN-DIB Project, the partner NGOs gained useful experience.

#### 8. Sustainability

- No formal sustainability plans have been formulated at the respective pilot sites.
- Partially accomplished projects may be pursued, contingent on the level of commitment of the POs, BLGUs, C/MLGUs.
- ALTERPLAN and DIB have yet to work out any sustainability or exit plan.

## **Box 2. Highlights of the End-Project Evaluation**

- The Project was relevant in the sense of being appropriate to the area's disaster risk-related conditions and the communities' past experiences with natural disasters.
- The BDRSSPs addressed the need for data based planning and decision making that enabled the LGUs were instrumental for its data-based evidence that enabled the LGUs' decision making for budget allocation and implementation of proposed and prioritized projects
- The participatory approach contributed to the Project's accomplishment of objectives for the drafting of the DRSSP, based on systematic data collection, area mapping for disaster risks, data analysis, project development and writing of Policy Briefs (PPPs), as well as advocacy to the LGUs for funding and implementation.
- For nine expected outputs, three were fully accomplished: (1) Barangay Disaster Risk-sensitive Shelter Plans; (2) Barangay LGU adoption of the BDRSSP; (3) budget release for projects from the Annual Investment Plans. Five outputs were partially accomplished: (1) 25 persons trained per site; (2) financing and implementation of projects; (3) resolutions replicating DRSSPs in other barangays; (4) pool of resource persons; (5) heightened profile in international fora. One expected output not accomplished was the agreement with national agencies.
- As changes attributed to the Project, POs and LGUs acquired increased capacity for DRSSP, particularly on the unique inter-relatedness of disaster risks with shelter issues that distinguished the Project from other disaster risk and management training focused on disaster preparedness and emergency response
- The lack of legal instrument, as in a Memorandum of Understanding, where LGUs are co-signatory parties to the Project limited the full participation of LGU representatives in the training and implementation activities.
- Compared to similar international and national collaborations, the Project achieved more than just capacitation and planning, but succeeded in leveraging substantial local funds and implementing projects derived from the plans ((BDRSSP).
- Partially accomplished projects may be pursued, contingent on the level of commitment of the POs, BLGUs, C/MLGUs.
- ALTERPLAN and DIB, LGUs, NGOs and POs have yet to work out a sustainability plan or exit plan.



## References

- ALTERPLAN. *Financial Management Rules and Regulations*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . *Office Manual*. Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . *Operating Policies and Procedures*. ALTERPLAN and ALTERPLAN-DIB Project.
- . 2013. *People’s Organizations Participatory Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan Manual (DR-SSP Manual)*. Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2015. “Alterplan Launches Phase 3 Project with DIB: Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.” *ALTERPLAN*.  
<http://alterplan.org.ph/apii/index.php/2015/08/08/alterplan-launches-phase-3-project-with-dib-promoting-disaster-risk-sensitive-shelter-planning-in-selected-philippine-cities-and-towns/>.
- . 2015. *General Santos City Final Technical Baseline Study Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2015. *Iligan City Final Technical Baseline Study Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2015. *Ligao City Final Technical Baseline Study Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2015. *Manual for Financial Management – Reporting and Accounting System*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2015. *Ubay Municipality Final Technical Baseline Study Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2016. *General Santos City Midterm Assessment Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2016. *Iligan City Midterm Assessment Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2016. *Ligao City Midterm Assessment Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.

- . 2016. *Ubay Municipality Midterm Assessment Report*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- . 2016 and 2017. *Monthly Progress Report from Project Partner NGOs*. Alternative Planning Initiatives, Quezon City, Philippines.
- ALTERPLAN and DIB. 2014. *Application to CISU, The Civil Society Fund*. For funding of the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2015. Agreement between DIB, Dansk International Bosætningservice/Danish International Human Settlement Service and Alternative Planning Initiatives (ALTERPLAN) Concerning the Implementation of the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns” with Civil Society Fund support.
- . 2015. *Proposed Revised Project Implementation Plan*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2015. *Status Report to CISU*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2016. *Proposed Revised Project Implementation Plan*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2016. *Status Report to CISU*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2016. “Terms of Reference – Internship at DIB (DK)/Alterplan (PHI).” Draft document.
- . 2017. *Proposed Revised Project Implementation Plan (No cost extension)*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2017. *Status Report to CISU*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2018. *Project Steering Committee: Minutes of Meetings (2015-2018)*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- . 2018. *Request to CISU for a No Costs Extension from April 2018 to June 2018*. For the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns.”
- ALTERPLAN, DIB, and A2D Project. 2015. *Memorandum of Understanding (Ubay Municipality)*. For partnership in the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Municipality of Ubay, Bohol, Philippines.
- ALTERPLAN, DIB, and IMCC. 2015. *Memorandum of Understanding (Iligan City)*. For partnership in the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Cebu City, Philippines.

- ALTERPLAN, DIB, and KPS Foundation. 2015. *Memorandum of Understanding (General Santos City)*. For partnership in the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk- Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Cebu City, Philippines.
- ALTERPLAN, DIB, and SAC. 2015. *Memorandum of Understanding (Ligao City)*. For partnership in the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk- Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Ligao City, Philippines.
- . 2016. *Extension of the Supplemental Agreement to the Memorandum of Understanding*. For partnership in the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk- Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns,” Ligao City, Philippines.
- Balbarino, Edwin A. 2000. “The Vetiver Network – Philippines.” *Vetiver.org*.  
[http://www.vetiver.org/PHL\\_IVC2.htm](http://www.vetiver.org/PHL_IVC2.htm)
- CAWST. 2009. *Biosand Filter Manual: Design, Construction, Installation, Operation and Maintenance*. Alberta, Canada: CAWST.  
[https://www.sswm.info/sites/default/files/reference\\_attachments/CAWST%202009%20Biosand%20Filter%20Manual.pdf](https://www.sswm.info/sites/default/files/reference_attachments/CAWST%202009%20Biosand%20Filter%20Manual.pdf).
- CISU. 2014. *Approval of the DIB Application for Funding of the Project “Promoting Disaster Risk- Sensitive Shelter Planning in Selected Philippine Cities and Towns” (J.nr.:14-1542-SP-sep.)*. DIB. <http://dib.dk/wp-content/uploads/file/1542%20Bevillingsbrev.pdf>.
- . 2015. *Guide to the Administration of Grants from the Civil Society Fund*.
- . 2016. *Guide to Budget Preparation for the Civil Society Fund, the Eastern Neighbourhood Fund and the Fund for Climate and Environment*.
- . n.d. “Financial Standard for Grants of and Above DKK 1,000,000 Including Programmes.” *CISU - Civilsamfund i Udvikling*.  
[http://www.cisu.dk/Admin/Public/DWSDownload.aspx?File=%2FFiles%2FFiler%2FDERF%2FGuidelines+and+formats%2FFinancial+standard\\_+grants+of+and+above+1+million.docx](http://www.cisu.dk/Admin/Public/DWSDownload.aspx?File=%2FFiles%2FFiler%2FDERF%2FGuidelines+and+formats%2FFinancial+standard_+grants+of+and+above+1+million.docx).
- DIB. 2016. “List of Possible Partners for a Regional Partnership.” Draft.
- . 2016. *DIB Financial Follow-up 24 Feb 2016*. Internal Consultant Report.
- Gerrard, Chris, Dale Hill, Lauren Kelly, and Elaine Wee-Ling Ooi. 2007. “Efficiency or Cost-Effectiveness.” Chap. 11 in *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*. Washington, D.C.: IEG-World Bank.  
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/580421468332070197/Sourcebook-for-evaluating-global-and-regional-partnership-programs-indicative-principles-and-standards>.
- ICESDEV. 2017. Grant Application to Asian Community Trust: Improving Health and Sanitation, Raising Environmental Consciousness and Providing Income-generation Through the Construction of Bio-Sand Filters (BSF) as Household Water Treatment Facilities in Flood Disaster-Prone Communities in Barangay San Roque, Iligan City, Philippines.
- . 2018. “A Joint 2-Day Hands-on Training for the Rehabilitation of Landslide and Erosion-prone Areas in Barangay San Roque, Hinaplanon and Santiago Using the Vetiver (*Vetiveria zizanoides*)

- Bio-engineering Technology and its Propagation as Low Cost Solution for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction and Management.” Project Activity Proposal, February 16-17, 2018, Hinaplanon, Iligan City, Philippines.
- KPSI. 2017. Terms of Reference and Scope of Services for: Technical Assistance on BDRSSP Project – On Site Settlement Upgrading Makar Townsite Subdivision, General Santos.
- . 2017. Vetiver Grass for Bio-Engineering and Community Livelihood Phase 1: Pilot Nursery Sites in Barangay Labangal, City Heights and Apopong in General Santos City.
- Marquez, Leorey, Sarah Redoblado, Maria Cheryl Prudente, Ernesto Serote, Nicasio De Rosas, Myrna Llanes, Jenifer Belarmino, Evelyn Sierra, and Bernard Apuli. 2014. “Development of Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans from Community-Based Risk Analysis.” Conference paper for IFORS 2014, Barcelona, Spain. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275036124>.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. 2012. *DANIDA Evaluation Guidelines*. Denmark: Evaluation Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. [www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11121/pdf/danida\\_evaluation\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/11121/pdf/danida_evaluation_guidelines.pdf).
- Phil. National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council 2011. *National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan (NDRRMP) 2011-2028*. Manila: NDRRMC. <http://drrmkc.teamyap.com/2018/03/24/national-disaster-risk-reduction-and-management-plan-2011-2028/>.
- Phil. Rep. Act No. 7160 (1991). An Act Providing For a Local Government Code of 1991.
- Phil. Rep. Act No. 10121 (2010). Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010.
- Social Action Center Diocese of Legazpi. 2012. *Finance Manual*. Albay, PH: SAC.
- United Nations. 2015. *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030*. Geneva: UNISDR. [https://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291\\_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf](https://www.preventionweb.net/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf).
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction 2007. *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters*. Geneva: UNISDR. [https://www.unisdr.org/files/1037\\_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf](https://www.unisdr.org/files/1037_hyogoframeworkforactionenglish.pdf).
- Zoological Society of London – Philippines. 2017. *Rapid Assessment of the Coastal Greenbelt in the Municipality of Ubay, Bohol, Central Visayas, Philippines*.

## **Annex A. Project evaluation consultant TOR**

### **Terms of Reference & Contract**

#### **CONSULTANT FOR PROJECT EVALUATION**

*Promoting disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning in selected Philippine cities and towns*

*Planned duration 2015 – 2018*

#### **1. Background on the Project**

The project is a partnership of ALTERPLAN with the Danish International Human Settlement Service (DIB), funded by *The Civil Society Project Fund* of the Kingdom of Denmark. It is the third phase of the ALTERPLAN-DIB partnership to provide technical assistance through civil society organizations to reduce disaster risks for targeted urban poor in the 4 partner cities: Ligao, Ubay, Iligan and General Santos.

The overall objectives of the project are to promote disaster risk responsive safe settlements for the marginalized urban poor through civil society organizations participation in the improvement of the local Government City's shelter programs and policies. The Specific Objectives are to:

- Objective 1: Civil society participants of the project in the 4 selected cities/municipalities shall have demonstrated increased capacities for preparedness through the formulation of strategies, policies and actions incorporated in disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans
- Objective 2: Target groups in the 4 localities shall have benefited from the implementation of actions recommended in the disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans
- Objective 3: Disaster risk-sensitive shelter planning shall have been accepted by different stakeholders as a viable and useful methodology.

Among the main activities of the project are (i) conduct of seminars and workshops for composite groups of local stakeholders who are expected to participate in the preparation of DRSSPs, (ii) advocacy by the POs for adoption and financing of the Barangay DRSSPs and the projects they contain, (iii) advocacy by the project partners of the DRSSP methodology to the city LGUs, national agencies, and international fora.

#### **2. Objectives of the Evaluation**

An end-project evaluation will be conducted before the project closes on 30 April 2018. The aim of the evaluation is to find out what has been learned in the course of the project, if something could have been done differently, and to issue recommendations about possible future work in the same line.

The criteria for evaluation shall be:

- Relevance: The extent to which the objective of a project conforms to the target group's needs, as well as to the country's and partner organizations' strategies
- Efficiency: The extent to which optimal value for money has been obtained in the spending of project funds
- Effectiveness: The degree to which the project has succeeded in meeting its objectives
- Impact: The lasting changes – positive as well as negative, planned as well as unplanned – arising from the project
- Sustainability: The degree to which the processes started and results obtained can be expected to remain in place after project completion

### 3. Technical responsibilities

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of two Consultants: Dr. Ma. Lourdes G. Rebullida and Mr. Arne Erik Jensen. The Consultants are expected to collaborate on, and internally divide the scope of work for the evaluation, which will include:

- Methodology design and description of approaches to conduct the evaluation to be approved by the project management;
- Drafting of a timeline and activity plan proposal to implement the study; and to be approved by the project management;
- Based on the evaluation criteria set out above, formulate interview and/or focus group discussion instruments
- The Evaluation Report to be completed and submitted at the middle of April 2018 electronically and in three soft copies
- Through a) desk review of documents provided by project management and b) by focus group discussions and guided interviews with key informants and stakeholders

### 4. Contract Period

The engagement is from 15 December to 15 April 2018, including a total of at least twelve (12) days of fieldwork in the 4 partner cities: Ligao, Ubay, Iligan and General Santos in January to February 2018.

### 5. Remuneration

The Consultant shall receive a fixed fee for the services executed according to the agreed budget. Staff assistance shall be provided by ALTERPLAN and partner NGO. Additionally an independent translator Visayas/English and Tagalog/English shall be provided. The fee shall be exclusive of airfare, transport, communications and board and lodging expenses incurred in the course of fieldwork, which shall all be to the account of DIB.

The Consultant's fee shall be \_\_\_\_\_ (Php \_\_\_\_\_) to be released in three installments: 1.) 10% of the payment total shall be released upon signing of this TOR/Contract, 2.) 30% shall be released upon submission and approval of the methodology design and activity schedule, and 3.) 60% of the fee shall be released upon timely submission and approval of the final Evaluation Report.

For DIB

---

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Conforme:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Arne Erik Jensen

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Maria Lourdes Rebullida

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Annex B.** Instruments/Guides for end-project evaluation

**Annex B-1.** Relevance

**(KI and FGD Questions and Document Evidence Collection based on the Project Objectives, Expected Outputs, and Baseline Data)**

<b>Objectives</b>	<b>Expected outputs</b>	<b>Baseline Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline Measures</b>	<b>Relevance</b>
Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
Objective 1: Increased capacities of civil society participants for preparedness through formulation of DRR sensitive shelter plans	1.1 Composite group of at least 25 persons from the local partners in each selected city/ municipality	Pool of stakeholders  Capacity of the pool of stakeholders	Indicative capacity levels for NGO and PO local partners	<p><b>Why did the NGO, PO, Barangay join the Project?</b></p> <p><b>Are the Project's training programs useful/appropriate to you?</b></p> <p><b>Is the Project's capacity building useful/ appropriate to the work of the <u>NGO, PO LGU-bgy?</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Is there something else that the Project could have done?</u></b></p>
	1.2 Disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans	DRR Shelter Plans- developed, approved or implemented	With or without DRR shelter plans; status of process and qualitative content of DRR shelter planning, shelter plans	<p><b>Was the Project's DRR shelter sensitive planning appropriate to your needs?</b></p> <p><b>Did you need the DRSSP that you prepared?</b></p> <p><b>Was the planning process appropriate to you?</b></p> <p><b>Did you use the materials on how to prepare the DRSSP? Are these appropriate to your needs?</b></p> <p><b><u>Was there something else that the Project could have done?</u></b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence--</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Target beneficiaries in barangay</b></li> <li><b>2. Number actual beneficiaries in barangays</b></li> <li><b>3. Target in Mun or City</b></li> <li><b>4. DRRM laws and policies in Phil; in Mun or City)</b></li> </ol>



Objective 2: DRSSP recommendations implemented beneficial to communities	2.1 Adoption of Barangay DRSSP(s) as part of local development plan	DRSSP in local development plan	With or without approved DRSSP in local development plan; status of shelter planning process, shelter plan content	<p><b>Was the DRSSP adopted by the Bgy, Mun/City Development plan? Was this the appropriate way to be helpful to your needs?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence of BRRSSP, approval by LGU Bgy, Mun or City)</b></p>
	2.2 Budget for projects in MTPIP and AIP	Budget allocation	DRR shelter plan budget in MTPIP and AIP	<p><b>If the Project BRRSSP is useful, if appropriate, did it get budget allocation?</b></p> <p><b>Were there other ways to obtain funds without the DRSSP?</b></p>
	2.3 Financed and implemented projects, monitored	Projects funded, implemented, monitored	Status of DRR shelter projects -- funded, implemented	<p><b>What were implemented?</b></p> <p><b>Were these projects appropriate to your needs?</b></p> <p><b><u>What other projects could have been implemented?</u></b></p>
Objective 3: DRSSP accepted by different stakeholders as viable and useful methodology	3.1 City/municipal resolution to replicate DRSSP in other barangays of selected localities	DRSSP Policies	local government utilization of methodology	<p><b>Is this Project appropriate in other places?</b></p> <p><b>Where?</b></p> <p><b>Were there efforts to replicate?</b></p>
	3.2 Agreements with national agencies	DRSSP agreements	national agencies utilization of methodology	<p><b>Did you extend assistance to the other areas?</b></p> <p><b>Did you work with other groups? (agencies, NGOs, etc.)</b></p> <p><b>With or without formal agreement?</b></p>
	3.3 Pool of resource persons	DRSSP Resource persons	Expert pool of resource persons – number identified before Project start	<p><b>Did other persons see the relevance of the Project and came to help?</b></p> <p><b>Who? How many?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence for other resource persons.)</b></p>
	3.4 Heightened profile in international fora	International Visibility	International fora informed of methodology	<p><b>Do you see the relevance of this Project to other international groups?</b></p> <p><b>Did you participate and share your Project with them?</b></p>

**Annex B-2.** Instrument/Guide for effectiveness and impact

**(KI and FGD Questions and Document Evidence Collection based on the Project Objectives, Expected Outputs, and Baseline Data)**

Objectives	Expected outputs	Baseline Indicators	Baseline Measures	Effectiveness Criteria	Impact Criteria	
				What is the situation at End Project?  Are the expected outputs achieved? Was the objective achieved?	What are the observed directly -intended effects of the Project?	What are the Unintended- Indirect Effects of the Project?
Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6.1	Column 6.2
Objective 1: Increased capacities of civil society participants for preparedness through formulation of DRR sensitive shelter plans	1.1 Composite group of at least 25 persons from the local partners in each selected city/ municipality	Pool of stakeholders  Capacity of the pool of stakeholders	Indicative capacity levels for NGO and PO local partners	<p><b>Do you have at least 25 trained personnel?</b></p> <p><b>Yes/No. Why?</b></p> <p><b>Was the Project training extended to others outside of the NGO, PO and LGU partners?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence of trainees completed training and working in the project.)</b></p>	<p><b>Direct effects?</b> <b>What new capacities? What old capacities enhanced?</b></p> <p><b>Positive/Negative effects?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Can you say these effects resulted from the Project?</b></p> <p><b>Are there other factors that may have contributed to the direct intended effects? Did other entities give you capacity building</b></p>	<p><b>Indirect effects?</b></p> <p><b>Positive/Negative effects?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Did these come from the Project?</b></p> <p><b>Are there other factors that may have contributed to the indirect unintended effects?</b></p>
	1.2 Disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans	DRR Shelter Plans- developed, approved or implemented	With or without DRR shelter plans; status of process and qualitative content of DRR shelter planning,	<p><b>Is your DRR Shelter Plan approved at bgy level?</b> <b>Yes/No. Why?</b></p> <p><b>Were you involved in the disaster risk shelter sensitive</b></p>	<p><b>Direct effects?</b> <b>What were the effects of having a Disaster risk sensitive shelter plan</b> <b>Positive/Negative effects?</b></p>	<p><b>Indirect effects?</b> <b>Positive/Negative effects?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b> <b>Who did not benefit?</b></p>

			shelter plans	<p><b>planning?</b></p> <p><b>How were you involved in getting the plan approved? Implemented?</b></p> <p><b>What were your key learnings?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence of the DRSSP.)</b></p>	<p><b>Who benefited? Who did not benefit?</b></p> <p><b>Is this the direct and intended result of the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the direct intended result-planning process and the plan? Who did not benefit? Why?</b></p>	<p><b>Are there other factors that may have contributed to the indirect unintended effects?</b></p>
Objective 2: DRSSP recommendations implemented beneficial to communities	2.1 Adoption of Barangay DRSSP(s) as part of local development plan	DRSSP in local development plan	With or without approved DRSSP in local development plan; status of shelter planning process, shelter plan content	<p><b>Is your Barangay DRSSP approved at city/municipal level? Yes/No. Why?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence of barangay, city or municipal approval and implementation.)</b></p>	<p><b>Direct effects of city or mun approval of the DRSSP? Positive/Negative?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Do these direct and intended come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the implementation?</b></p>	<p><b>Indirect effects? Positive/Negative?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Do these indirect effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the getting the projects implemented?</b></p>
	2.2 Budget for projects in MTPIP and AIP	Budget allocation	DRR shelter plan budget in MTPIP and AIP	<p><b>Is there a budget for the BDRSSP in the MTPIP and AIP? Did you achieve the allocation of budget for projects?</b></p> <p><b>-barangay level? Yes/No. Why?</b></p> <p><b>(Collect document evidence on budget allocation.)</b></p> <p><b>-city/municipal level? Yes/No. Why?</b></p>	<p><b>Direct effects of the budget allocation? Positive/Negative?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Are these direct effects from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the approval of budget effects?</b></p>	<p><b>Indirect effects? Positive/Negative?</b></p> <p><b>Who benefited?</b></p> <p><b>Do these indirect effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b></p>

				<b>(Collect document evidence on budget allocation.)</b>		
	2.3 Financed and implemented projects, monitored	Projects funded, implemented, monitored	Status of DRR shelter projects -- funded, implemented	<b>What projects have been funded? Implemented?</b>  <b>Yes/No. Why?</b>  <b>(Collect list of projects with status if funded, implemented; by bgy; by city/municipality.)</b>	<b>Direct effects? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Do these effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>	<b>Indirect effects? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Do these indirect effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>
Objective 3: DRSSP accepted by different stakeholders as viable and useful methodology	3.1 City/municipal resolution to replicate DRSSP in other barangays of selected localities	DRSSP Policies	local government utilization of methodology	<b>Is there a city/municipal resolution to replicate BDRSSP in other barangays?</b>  <b>Yes/No. Why?</b>  <b>(Collect document evidence-city/municipal resolution to replicate in other areas.)</b>	<b>Direct effects of replication?</b>  <b>Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Do these effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>	<b>Indirect effects?</b>  <b>Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Do these unintended effects come from the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>
	3.2 Agreements with national agencies	DRSSP agreements	national agencies utilization of methodology	<b>Did you engage other agencies or organizations for them to use the DRSSP methodology?</b>  <b>Yes/No. Why?</b>  <b>(Collect document evidence on new partners, new areas.)</b>	<b>Direct effects? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are these the effects of the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>	<b>Indirect effects? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are these the effects of the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>
	3.3 Pool of resource persons	DRSSP Resource persons	Expert pool of resource persons – number identified before Project start	<b>Do you have a pool of resource persons? Do you have a list who and how involved? Yes/No. Why?</b>  <b>Have you trained</b>	<b>Direct effects of resource persons? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are these the effects of the Project? Are</b>	<b>Indirect effects? Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are these the effects of the Project? Are</b>

				<b>other barangays or groups?</b>  <b>(Collect document evidence – list of persons helping in the project and how, in what capacity?)</b>	<b>there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>	<b>there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>
	<b>3.4</b> <b>Heightened profile in international fora</b>	<b>International Visibility</b>	<b>International fora informed of methodology</b>	<b>Have you participated in any local DRRM? National DRRM? International DRRM-event, such as a forum, here or abroad?</b>  <b>Who participated?</b>  <b>Yes/No. Why?</b>  <b>(Collect document evidence of any international group and event and who participated, how, in what capacity?)</b>	<b>Direct effects of local, national, int'l participation?</b>  <b>Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are the effects of the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>	<b>Indirect effects?</b>  <b>Positive/Negative?</b>  <b>Who benefited?</b>  <b>Are the effects of the Project? Are there other factors that may have contributed to the effects?</b>

**Annex B-3.** Instrument/Guide for efficiency

**(KI and FGD Questions and Document Evidence Collection based on the Project Objectives, Expected Outputs, and Baseline Data)**

<b>FGD/KI</b>	<b>Documents</b>
a. How did the NGO conduct financial management? Ensure accountability? How did the PO get involved in financial management? In ensuring accountability?	Design requests to CISU  M&E framework
b. What kind of support did the local NGOs receive from Alterplan?	MOUs
c. How does the NGO do its work in terms of its approach, the issues/thematic areas of engagement, and geographic spread?	SOP documents  Project Document
d. Have the planning, monitoring and evaluation responsibilities been identified clearly? What methods have been applied?	5 NGO financial procedures  Audit reports
e. Do the project indicators provide adequate evidence regarding achievements?	Assessment of NGO administration structures
f. What are the strengths and constraints in terms of human and technical resources?	NGO Contracts Staff TORs and a Contracts  Salary levels and expenditure reports
g. What kind of support has the national NGO received in the area of organizational development from DIB?	ALTERPLAN AND CISU approved budget revisions
h. What kind of support have the 4 local NGOs received in the area of organizational development from ALTERPLAN?	
i. Are the financial resources adequate? Have they been allocated judiciously (overall and output wise)?	Finance and audit reports
j. What are the spending trends?	

**Annex B-4.** Instrument/Guide for sustainability

**(KI and FGD Questions and Document Evidence Collection based on the Project Objectives, Expected Outputs, and Baseline Data)**

FGD/KI	Documents
1. What is your plan to sustain capacity building?	Sustainability Plan PO 2018 beyond Sustainability Plan NGO 2018 beyond Sustainability Plan Bgy 2018 beyond Related plans of the City or Municipality 2018 beyond
a. Capacity building of currently participating members of the PO/NGO/Bgy?	
b. How about successors? 2 <sup>nd</sup> line of implementers?	
2. How will you continue updating the Barangay DRSSP planning?	
3. How will you continue to follow up with LGU on the budget allocation, funding of projects?	
4. How will you follow up on implementation of projects?	
5. Can you source other funds?	
6. Will you replicate in other areas?	
7. What are your future plans related to disaster risk shelter sensitive planning? Implementation?	

**Annex B-5.** Instrument/Guide for counterfactual and prospective replication sites

COUNTERFACTUAL	Are there barangays that have similar problems as the project sites on DRR and Shelter?
REPLICATION	Do they have similar interventions as this Alterplan and DIB Project?
	Have they improved their conditions related to disaster risks and shelter issues?
	Do they have similar effects as in the Project sites?
	Why were those sites not selected for the Alterplan-DIB Project

**Annex C. Self-administered capacity assessment questionnaire**

<p>End-of-Project Evaluation Alterplan and DIB Project 2015-2018</p>
<p><b>Respondent's Name</b> _____</p> <p><b>Age</b> _____</p> <p><b>Male</b> ____ <b>Female</b> _____</p> <p><b>Organization: PO</b> _____</p> <p><b>NGO</b> _____</p> <p><b>Barangay</b> _____</p> <p><b>City or Municipality</b> _____</p> <p><b>Address</b> _____</p> <p><b>Position in the Organization</b> _____</p>
<p><i>I give my consent to participate in the FGD and answer questionnaire and provide documents for the external evaluation of the Alterplan-DIB Project.</i></p>
<p><b>Signature of Respondent</b> _____</p> <p><b>Date:</b> _____</p>

<b>PART I. Compared to the start of the Project, what is your rating for the following elements at end of the Alterplan-DIB Project?</b>	<b>1 No/none  Hindi/wala</b>	<b>2 Slightly Adequate  Kaunti</b>	<b>3 Adequate  Sapat</b>	<b>4 Very adequate  Higit na sapat</b>
1. I increased awareness of environmental hazards				
2. I have increased awareness of environmental risks by the end of the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.				
3. I have increased awareness of vulnerabilities by the end of the Alterplan-DIB Project.				
4. I can do research on environmental hazards, risks, vulnerabilities DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.				
5. This Alterplan-DIB Project has helped address the problems in our area and community.				
6. I can advocate the DRSSP to the officials in the LGU DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.				



<b>PART I. Compared to the start of the Project, what is your rating for the following elements at end of the Alterplan-DIB Project?</b>	<b>1 No/none  Hindi/wala</b>	<b>2 Slightly Adequate  Kaunti</b>	<b>3 Adequate  Sapat</b>	<b>4 Very adequate  Higit na sapat</b>
7. I can assist in the implementation of the projects in the Barangay DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.				
8. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun organization can do Barangay DRSS planning on its own even after the Project ends. (Refer to Respondent Org)				
9. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun can implement the projects in the Barangay DRSSP even after the Project ends. (Refer to Respondent Org)				
10. The Alterplan gave the PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun knowledge and skills to continue to do Barangay DRSSP even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends. (Refer to Respondent Org)				
11. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City-Mun accomplished the data collection system because of the Alterplan-DIB Project. (Refer to Respondent Org)				
12. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City can assist other areas to replicate the Barangay DRSSP process after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends. (Refer to Respondent Org)				
13. My PO/NGO/Barangay/City can use the Barangay DRSSP planning process even after the Alterplan-DIB Project ends.				
14. I find the Alterplan-DIB DRSSP planning manual (with the methodology/process) understandable for my use. .				

<b>PART II. Check if you have accomplished or not. Give remarks as needed.</b>	<b>✓ YES</b>	<b>✓ NO</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
1. Barangay DRSSP approved by Barangay.			
2. Barangay DRSSP approved by City/Municipality.			
3. Barangay DRSSP funded by Barangay.			
4. Barangay DRSSP funded by City/Municipality			
5. Barangay DRSSP budget released by Barangay.			
6. Barangay DRSSP budget released by City/Municipality.			
7. Barangay DRSSP implemented by Barangay.			
8. Barangay DRSSP implemented by			

City/Municipality.			
9. Other sources of funds for projects in BDRSSP.			
10. Other areas request replication.			
11. BRSSP replicated in other areas.			
12. International linkages.			
13. Alterplan-DIB Project funds covered all expenses.			
14. Alterplan-DIB responded to all Project needs in the area of project site.			

<b>PART III. KI/FGD/Document evidence At the Project Site</b>		
What are the hazards?	What projects?	What status?
What are the risks?	What projects?	What status?
What are the vulnerabilities?	What projects?	What status?

**Annex D. FGD Participants per site and per barangay in the end-project evaluation**

**Annex D-1. Number of FGD participants at project sites**

<b>Number of Participants to the FGDs January 17 – February 21, 2018</b>									
<b>Organization/ LGU</b>	<b>Total Number of FGD Participant s</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>				<b>Position</b>		<b>Sex</b>	
		<b>PO</b>	<b>BLG U</b>	<b>NGO</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>PO Member / LGU Designat e/ NGO Staff</b>	<b>PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>122</b>	62	33	15	12	56	66	53	69
<b>Ligao City, Albay</b>	<b>29</b>	15	9	4	1	16	13	8	21
<b>General Santos, South Cotabato</b>	<b>36</b>	16	10	4	6	16	20	19	17
<b>Municipality of Ubay</b>	<b>30</b>	14	10	3	3	12	18	19	11
<b>Iligan City, Misamis</b>	<b>27</b>	17	4	4	2	12	15	7	20

**Annex D-2. Number of FGD participants: Ligao project site**

<b>City of Ligao, Province of Albay (January 17 – 19, 2018)</b>					
<b>Organization/ LGU</b>	<b>Number of FGD Participant s</b>	<b>Position</b>		<b>Sex</b>	
		<b>PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff</b>	<b>PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>1. Barangay Tinago</b>					
Local PO	5	3	2	-	5
Barangay Council	3	1	2	2	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Barangay Tuburan</b>					
Local PO	5	5	-	-	5
Barangay Council	4	1	3	3	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Barangay Bagumbayan</b>					
Local PO	5	3	2	-	5
Barangay Council	2		2	1	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4. Ligao City</b>					
Personnel	1	-	1	-	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>
<b>5. Local NGO Partner</b>					

City of Ligao, Province of Albay (January 17 – 19, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
Social Action Center (SAC)	4	3	1	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

City of Ligao, Province of Albay (January 17 – 19, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
<b>Local Peoples' Organization (PO)</b>				
1.	Salvacion Maimot	Urban Poor Association, Inc. (Tinago)	Member	F
2.	Salvacion Princaro	Urban Poor Association, Inc. (Tinago)	Member	F
3.	Myrna Cristina Poca	Urban Poor Association, Inc. (Tinago)	Member	F
4.	Soset Remogat	Urban Poor Association, Inc. (Tinago)	Secretary	F
5.	Melinda Roberto	Urban Poor Association, Inc. (Tinago)	President	F
6.	Mylene De Guia	Purok 1&2 Riverside Urban Poor (Tuburan)		F
7.	Luzviminda Pano	Purok 1&2 Riverside Urban Poor (Tuburan)		F
8.	Nena Tambobong	Purok 5 Urban Poor (Tuburan)		F
9.	Norma Pojol	Purok 5 Urban Poor (Tuburan)		F
10.	Rose-ann Placiente	Purok 1&2 Riverside Urban Poor (Tuburan)		F
11.	Criselda Maglaque	Bagumbayan Urban Poor Organization	Vice President	F
12.	Leonora Agnelito	Bagumbayan Urban Poor Organization	President	F
13.	Jocelyn Porcalla	Bagumbayan Urban Poor Organization	Treasurer	F
14.	Marissa Abordo	Bagumbayan Urban Poor Organization	Member	F
15.	Evelina Paala	Bagumbayan Urban Poor Organization	Member	F
<b>Barangay Government</b>				
1.	Salvador Lopez	Barangay Tinago	Barangay Kagawad	M
2.	Gloria Requio	Barangay Tinago	Barangay Kagawad	F
3.	Ching Lim	Barangay Tinago	Barangay Secretary	M
4.	Cesar Cora	Barangay Tuburan	Barangay Kagawad	M
5.	Gene Hilario	Barangay Tuburan	Barangay Kagawad	M
6.	Elena Nañoz	Barangay Tuburan	Barangay Secretary	F

City of Ligao, Province of Albay (January 17 – 19, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
7.	Wilfredo Prupogo	Barangay Tuburan	Punong Barangay	M
8.	Rafael Carullo	Barangay Bagumabayan	Barangay Kagawad	M
9.	Gisela Cariño	Barangay Bagumabayan	Punong Barangay	F
<b>Ligao City</b>				
1.	Maria Soledad Preña	City Environment and Natural Resources Office (CENRO)	Head of Office	F
<b>Local NGO Partner</b>				
1.	Mary Jane Ricafort	Social Action Center (SAC) - Legaspi	Staff	F
2.	Myrna Llanes	Social Action Center (SAC) - Legaspi	Staff	F
3.	Jason Sevilla	Social Action Center (SAC) - Legaspi	Staff	M
4.	Rev. Fr. Rex Paul Arjona	Social Action Center (SAC) - Legaspi		M
<b>Translators/ Volunteers</b>				
1.	Vanessa Llavanos	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
2.	Camille Paen	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
3.	Regine Avril Oliva	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
4.	Camille Ann Fuentes	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
5.	Glory Mae Asenjo	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
6.	Reena Joy Rima	Bicol University	Social Science - Student	F
<b>BDRSSP Impact Evaluators</b>				
1.	Maria Lourdes Rebullida	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F
2.	Arne Jensen	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	M
3.	Puri Philina Gamon	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F

**Annex D-3.** Number of FGD participants: General Santos City

General Santos, South Cotabato (January 31 – February 2, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
<b>Total</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>
1. Barangay Labangal					
Local PO	5	1	4	-	5
Barangay	3	2	1	3	

General Santos, South Cotabato (January 31 – February 2, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
Council					
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>
2. Barangay City Heights					
Local PO	5	2	3	-	5
Barangay Council	4	2	2	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>
3. Barangay Apopong					
Local PO	6	3	3	4	2
Barangay Council	3	1	2	3	-
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2</b>
4. General Santos City					
Personnel	6	4	2	4	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
5. Local NGO Partner					
	4	1	3	3	1
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>

General Santos, South Cotabato (January 31 – February 2, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
<b>Local Peoples' Organization (PO)</b>				
1.	Asuncion N. Polistico	Purok Magsaysay	Board member	F
2.	Arlene Bohol Panizales	Purok Magsaysay-A	President	F
3.	May P. Cadavos	Purok Magsaysay	Block leader	F
4.	Gloria C. Gomez	Purok Magsaysay		F
5.	Nilda E. Dela Cruz	Purok Magsaysay	Board member	F
6.	Editha Valencia	Johnny Ang Paradise Settlers Association	Purok kagawad	F
7.	Alma B. Ng	Soledad Estate	Purok chairperson	F
8.	Thelma C. Plaza	Botanic Landless Association Inc.	Member,	F
9.	Generose P. Lozada	Women's Group, Purok Johnny Ang	Member	F
10.	Elsa C. Laspobres	Senior Citizens, Purok Johnny Ang	Chapter president	F
11.	Vicente L. Suba-an	Barangay Men's Federation, Purok San Lorenzo Ruiz	Member	M
12.	Cameron Salamanca	Purok San Lorenzo Ruiz	Purok chairman	M
13.	Federico S. Palabrica	Purok 13 Phase I Lanton	Purok chairman	M
14.	Merly M. Lanita	Purok San Lorenzo Ruiz	Member	F
15.	Genevieve D. Hamoy		Secretary	F

General Santos, South Cotabato (January 31 – February 2, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
16.	Andre C. Solas		Barangay staff	M
<b>Barangay Government</b>				
1.	Ronald B. Nuneza	Barangay Labangal	Barangay kagawad	M
2.	Rodolfo M. Alas	Barangay Labangal	BDRRMC Action Officer	M
3.	Roy L. Sim	Barangay Labangal	Public Information Officer	M
4.	Edna Collado	Barangay City Heights	Barangay kagawad	F
5.	Belen T. Sandico	Barangay City Heights	Barangay secretary	F
6.	Roger P. Demos	Barangay City Heights	Barangay kagawad	M
7.	Richie S. Mantina	Barangay City Heights	Barangay captain	M
8.	Perfecto M. Lacea Jr.	Barangay Apopong	BDRRMC chairman	M
9.	Paolo Natividad	Barangay Apopong	Barangay kagawad	M
10.	Rogin Gorgoya	Barangay Apopong	BDRRMO staff	M
<b>General Santos City</b>				
1.	Joel T. Matanguihan	City Planning and Development Office	Project Development Officer III	M
2.	Alex Banguiran		CGADH II	M
3.	Francisco D. Diamante Jr.	Sulong Kabataan Youth Organization City Housing and Land Management Office	Vice President Staff	M
4.	Joel Cimafranca	Sulong Kabataan Youth Organization City Housing and Land Management Office	President Staff	M
5.	Marichel C. Dacillo	City DRRM Office	AO II	F
6.	Hannah C. Joaquin	City DRRM Office	SOO O	F
<b>Local NGO Partner</b>				
1.	Rudy Dewara	KPS Foundation		M
2.	Rogelio R. Funclara	KPS-SEED	Vice president	M
3.	Ricky Cabunyag	KPS Foundation	Unit head, Social Development-MIS	M
4.	Cathy	KPS Foundation	Finance staff	F
<b>Translator</b>				
1.	Josephine Agbon Sabas			F
<b>BDRSSP Impact Evaluators</b>				
1.	Maria Lourdes Rebullida	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F
2.	Arne Jensen	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	M
3.	Amaris Cabason	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F

**Annex D-4.** Number of FGD participants: Municipality of Ubay

Municipality of Ubay, Province of Bohol (February 14 – 16, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>
1. Barangay Cuya					
Local PO	4	3	1	4	-
Barangay Council	3	-	3	3	-
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>-</b>
2. Barangay Guintabaoan					
Local PO	5	4	1	4	1
Barangay Council	3	-	3	1	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
3. Barangay Cagting					
Local PO	5	1	4	1	4
Barangay Council	4	1	3	2	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>
4. Munisipyo					
Personnel	3	1	2	3	-
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>
5. Local NGO Partner					
A2D	3	2	1	1	2
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>

Municipality of Ubay, Province of Bohol (February 14 – 16, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
<b>Local Peoples' Organization (PO)</b>				
1.	Eric Redentor Olpindo	Cuya People's Organization	Board of Director (BOD)	M
2.	Antero Legitimas	Cuya People's Organization		M
3.	Senior Rodrigo	Cuya People's Organization		M
4.	Danny Cadorniga	Cuya People's Organization		M
5.	Carlito Daigan	Guintabaoan Fisherfolk Association	Board of Director (BOD)	M
6.	Freddie Sumayang	Guintabaoan Fisherfolk Association	Member	M
7.	Angelito Tojeros	Guintabaoan Fisherfolk Association	Member	M
8.	Fernando Hayo	Guintabaoan Fisherfolk Association	Member	M
9.	Rodelita Boybanting	Kusgahon Kbabaihan Alang sa Kauswagan (Guintabaoan)	Member	F
10.	Ramil Cutamora	Cagting Water Works Organization	Member	M
11.	Elizabeth Luzica	Cagting Water Works Organization	Treasurer	F
12.	Ligaya Billones	Cagting Water Works Organization	Secretary	F
13.	Elifel Cutamora	Dungog Ug Yanong Abag Ni Nanay (DUYAN)	Board of Director (BOD)	F



Municipality of Ubay, Province of Bohol (February 14 – 16, 2018) Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
14.	Rowena Acuram	Dungog Ug Yanong Abag Ni Nanay (DUYAN)	President	F
<b>Barangay Government</b>				
1.	Jovencio Dupalco	Barangay Cuya	Barangay Kapitan	M
2.	Conrado Carillo	Barangay Cuya	Barangay Kagawad	M
3.	Isidro Donghil	Barangay Cuya	Barangay Kagawad	M
4.	Apolinario Miasco	Barangay Guintaboan	Barangay Kapitan	M
5.	Wilma Suano	Barangay Guintaboan	Barangay Kagawad	F
6.	Marilou Ungagay	Barangay Guintaboan	Barangay Kagawad	F
7.	Rolando Sabeboosing	Barangay Cagting	Barangay Kapitan	M
8.	Refito Ocutrez	Barangay Cagting	Barangay Kagawad	M
9.	Liberty Daigan	Barangay Cagting	Barangay Kagawad	F
10.	Germa Golosino	Barangay Cagting	Barangay Kagawad	F
<b>Municipality of Ubay</b>				
1.	Maxwell Cutamora	Ubay	MDRRM Officer	M
2.	Larry Evangelista	Ubay	Chief of Staff – Mayor's Office	M
3.	Hon. Constantino Reyes	Ubay	Mayor	M
<b>Local NGO Partner</b>				
1.	Dr. Leodinito Cañete	A2D Project – Research Group	Executive Director	M
2.	Katherine Valmonte	A2D Project – Research Group	Projects Coordinator	F
3.	Edna Raray	A2D Project – Research Group	Field Assistant	F
<b>Translator</b>				
1.	Edeliza Macalandag	Translator	Independent Translator	F
<b>BDRSSP Impact Evaluators</b>				
1.	Maria Lourdes Rebullida	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F
2.	Arne Jensen	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	M
3.	Puri Philina Gamon	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F

**Annex D-5.** Number of FGD participants: Iligan City

Iligan City, Province of Misamis (February 21 – 24, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20</b>

Iligan City, Province of Misamis (February 21 – 24, 2018)					
Organization/ LGU	Number of FGD Participant s	Position		Sex	
		PO Member/ LGU Designate/ NGO Staff	PO/ LGU/ NGO Officer	Male	Female
1. Barangay Santiago					
Local PO	2	2	-	-	2
Barangay Council	1	-	1	1	-
Sub Total	3	2	1	1	2
2. Barangay San Roque					
Local PO	10	4	6	1	9
Barangay Council	2	-	2	1	1
Sub Total	12	4	8	2	10
3. Barangay Hinaplanon					
Local PO	5	3	2	-	5
Barangay Council	1	-	1	1	-
Sub Total	6	3	3	1	5
4. Iligan City					
Personnel	2	-	2	1	1
Sub Total	2	-	2	1	1
5. Local NGO Partner					
ICES-Dev	4	3	1	2	2
Sub Total	4	3	1	2	2

Iligan City, Province of Misamis (February 21 – 24, 2018)				
Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP				
	Name of Participant	Organization/ LGU	Position	Sex
<b>Local Peoples' Organization (PO)</b>				
1.	Anna Marie Dano	Youth Organization (Santiago)	Youth Volunteers	F
2.	Lady Dianne Lacida	Youth Organization (Santiago)	Youth Volunteers	F
3.	Leticia Estole	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Vice-President	F
4.	Cora Jabla	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Treasurer	F
5.	Cleo Keven Bulos	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Secretary	M
6.	Ma. Michaela Talento	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Auditor	F
7.	Zenaida Baloria	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Board of Director (BOD)	F
8.	Evangeline Biadnes	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Board of Director (BOD)	F

<b>Iligan City, Province of Misamis (February 21 – 24, 2018)</b> <b>Name of Attendees to the FGDs on BDRSSP</b>				
	<b>Name of Participant</b>	<b>Organization/ LGU</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Sex</b>
9.	Jessielyn Bulos	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Member	F
10.	Liliosa Balanay	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Member	F
11.	Ma. Virginie Mabano	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Member	F
12.	Marisa Juloran	San Roque Urban Poor Association (SARUPA)	Member	F
13.	Mila Galope	Women's Federation (Hinaplanon)	President	F
14.	Jerly Mabano	Women's Federation (Hinaplanon)	Member	F
15.	Rea Marie Palac			F
16.	Jocelyn Lacio	Purok Organization	Purok President	F
17.	Ma. Victoria Ferolino			F
<b>Barangay Government</b>				
1.	Karl Edward Abellana	Barangay Santiago	Barangay Kagawad	M
2.	Lucia Capangpangan	Barangay San Roque	Barangay Kagawad	F
3.	Jay Bado	Barangay San Roque	Barangay Kagawad	M
4.	Nestor Aquino	Barangay Hinaplanon	Barangay Kagawad	M
<b>Iligan City</b>				
1.	Arthur Alloro	Housing and Resettlement Office	PMA Unit Head	M
2.	Josephine Rosales	City Planning Development Office	Planning Officer IV	F
<b>Local NGO Partner</b>				
1.	Jose Dennis Mancia	ICES - Development	Director	M
2.	Arthur Homillano	ICES - Development	Staff	M
3.	Esmeralda Padagas	ICES - Development	Staff	F
4.	Marie Zuero	ICES - Development	Staff (Bookkeeper)	F
<b>Translator</b>				
1.	Karlai Tabimina	Translator	Independent Translator	F
<b>BDRSSP Impact Evaluators</b>				
1.	Maria Lourdes Rebullida	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F
2.	Arne Jensen	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	M
3.	Puri Philina Gamon	External Evaluation Team	Independent Consultant	F

**Annex E. Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans (BDRSSPs)**

<b>Project Site</b>	<b>Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans</b>
General Santos City	Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan KPS Foundation, the City of General Santos, Alterplan, and Danish International Human Settlement Service
Iligan City	The Barangay San Roque Disaster Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan in the City of Iligan, Mindanao, Philippines
	The Barangay Level Disaster-Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan Barangay Hinaplanon
	The Barangay Level Disaster-Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan Barangay Santiago
Ligao City	Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan A Participatory Planning Process with the Peoples' Organizations and Barangay Local Government Units of Bagumbayan, Tinago and Tuburan
Municipality of Ubay	The Barangay Level Disaster-Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan with technical assistance from A2D and Alternative Planning Initiatives, with support from Cuya Fisherfolks Association, Barangay LGU of Cuya
	The Barangay Level Disaster-Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan with technical assistance from A2D and Alternative Planning Initiatives with support from the Cagting Water Works Association, Duyog ug Yanong Abag ni Nanay, Barangay LGU of Cuya and Municipal LGU of Ubay
	The Barangay Level Disaster-Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan with technical assistance from A2D and Alternative Planning Initiatives with support from Guitaboan Fisherfolk Association, Barangay LGU of Cuya and Municipal LGU of Ubay

**Annex F. LGU issuances related to Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plans**

Issued by	Issued on	Resolution Number	Title of Resolution
<b>Ligao</b>			
1. Brgy. Tinago	September 8, 2017	07, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the final the BDRSSP of Barangay Tinago, Ligao City
2. Brgy. Tuburan	September 02, 2017	___, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the final the BDRSSP of Barangay Tuburan, Ligao City
	August 18, 2015		Annual Investment Plan of Ligao City for CY2016 included investment plans of Barangay Tuburan. Document was stamped received by the CPDO on August 18, 2015
3. Brgy. Bagumbayan	October 20, 2017	36, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the final documents of the BDRSSP and formally submitting the same to the Sanggunina Panglungsod (SP), City Development Council (CDC), City DRRM Council (CDRRMC) for technical support and funding and to the City Planning and Development Office (CPDO) for inclusion in the AIP
4. Ligao LGU	Janaury 04, 2016	2016-003	A resolution approving the list of anti-poverty reduction projects in the City of Ligao. Likewise authorizing the local chief executive to enter into a MOA with the All Bottoms-up Budgeting
		2015-078	A resolution approving the LDIP for CY 2016-2018 and the 2016 AIP of Ligao City
		2015-01	A resolution endorsing she approval by the SP CY 2016 AIP and the CY 2016-2018 LDIP of Ligao City
<b>General Santos</b>			
1. Brgy. Apopong	May 17, 2017	Minutes of 10 <sup>th</sup> Regular Session Sangguniang Barangay	Minutes of 10 <sup>th</sup> Regular Session of the Sangguniang Barangay Presentation of Mr. Rudy Dewara of the Survey Results and projects in consultation with BDRSSP PO Partners...The emphasis of the project is participatory process...This should be submitted to the City Planning
2. Brgy. Apopong	October 24, 2014	Resolution No. 2, series of 2014	Resolution Approving the CY 2015 Barangay Annual Investment Plans (BAIP) of Barangay Apopong, General Santos City
3. Brgy. City Heights	July 19, 2017	Resolution No. 50 series of 2017	Resolution Accepting with Sincere Gratitude and Thanks the “Barangay Disaster Risk-Sensitive Shelter Plan Project (BDRSSP) for the Barangay City Heights, General Santos Undertaken by Alternative Planning Initiatives, In (Alterplan) in Partnership with the Danish International Human Settlement Service (DIB) and KPS Foundation, Inc. (KPSFI)
4. Brgy. Labangal	July 17, 2017	Resolution No. 426 series of 2017	Resolution Adopting Barangay Disaster Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan (BDRSSP) Presented by BDRSSP-Gensan
<b>Ubay</b>			
1. Brgy. Cuya	June 16, 2017	15, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving of the BDRSSP. Resolution was stamped received by the Sanggunian Bayan on September 12, 2017
	August 5, 2016	16, series of 2016	A resolution to allocate funds (Php5,100) as counterpart of the water rapid assessment survey of the University of San Carlos Water Resource Center Foundation for the BDRSSP of Cuya
	August 24, 2015	12, series of 2015	A resolution earnestly requesting Hon. Galicano Atup to release Php36,000 fund for water assessment in Barangay Cuya
2. Brgy.	January 5,	02, series of	A resolution to allocate fund of 70% (Php1,000) from 5%

Guintabonan	2018	2018	Calamity Fund for purchase of vetiver grass seedlings for Guintabonan
	June 16, 2017	24, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the BDRSSP of Guintabonan. Resolution was stamped received by the Mayor's Office and the Sanggunian Bayan on August 10, 2017
	August 21, 2015	61, series of 2015	A resolution requesting Mayor Galicano to allocate financial assistance of Php36,000 for water rapid assessment survey of the University of San Carlos Water Resource Center Foundation in Guintabonan
	Stamped received by the Office of the Mayor on January 22, 2016	58, series of 2015	A resolution adopting the results of the series of planning session on the BDRSSP and formally submitting the same to the Sanggunian Bayan (SB), Municipal Development Council (MDC), Municipal DRRM Council (MDRRMC) for consideration for funding and to the Municipal Planning Development Office (MPDO) for inclusion in the AIP
3. Brgy. Cagting	Nov. 16, 2017	79, series of 2017	A resolution adopting the results of the water resources investigation and request for fund allocation from the Municipal Government for the implementation of the recommended water supply project for Cagting. Stamped received by the SB on November 23, 2017
	November 4, 2017	78, series of 2017	A resolution amending Resolution No. 35 issued on August 4, 2017 requesting assistance from the Municipal Government and the National Housing Authority in the implementation of the housing project. Stamped received by the SB on January 23, 2017
	July 30, 2017	44, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the BDRSSP of Cagting. Stamped received by the SB on August 10, 2017
	September 2, 2016	47, series of 2016	A resolution requesting Mayor Constatino Reyes for financial assistance of Php5,100 for counterpart funding on the water assessment project on Cagting. Stamped received by the Office of the Mayor on September 19, 2016
	November 6, 2015	78, series of 2015	A resolution requesting Mayor Galicano Atup to allocate Php36,000 for the water rapid assessment survey by the University of San Carlos Water Resource Foundation. Stamped received by the Office of the Mayor.
4. Ubay LGU	December 13, 2017	671, series of 2016	A resolution adopting the results of the water resources investigation and the use of recommended alternative technologies to conserve and protect the environment and fragile ground water resources for the people of Cagting, Cuya and Guintabonan and allocating funds to implement the engineering designs using composite technology of ram, solar pumps and rainwater harvesting for water supply system
	August 23, 2017	495, series of 2017	A resolution adopting the BDRSSP of Cagting
	August 23, 2017	494, series of 2017	A resolution adopting the BDRSSP of Guintabonan
	February 8, 2017	240 A series of 2017	A resolution adopting the LGU Ubay Shelter Plan 2016-2025R
<b>Iligan</b>			
1. Santiago	October 4, 2017	53, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the final documentation of the BDRSSP and submitting it to the SP, CDC, CDRRMC for considerations for technical support and funding, and to the CPDO for inclusion in the AIP.
	August 17, 2016	10, series of 2016	A resolution adopting and accepting the BDRSSP-Santiago and submitted to the CPDO for inclusion in the AIP for 2017 and the

			Office of the Mayor and Vice-Mayor respectively for technical and funding assistance.
		19, series of 2015	A resolution adopting and approving the results of the BDRSSP and formally submitting it to the Sanggunian Panlungsod (SP), City Development Council, (CDC) City DRRM Council (CDRRMC) for consideration for funding and to the City Planning and Development Office (CPDO) for inclusions to the Annual Investment Plan (AIP)
2. San Roque		27, series of 2017	Upon validation and approval of the BDRSSP through a community consultation held July 29, 2017, the barangay issued Resolution No. 27 adopting the final documents of the BDRSSP and formally submitting it to the SP, CDC, CDRRM for technical and funding consideration and to the CDC for inclusion in the AIP
	August 17, 2016	10, series of 2016	A resolution adopting the BDRSSP and same document is submitted to the CPDO for inclusion in the AIP for 2017 and to the Office of the Mayor (OM) and Office of the Vice Mayor (OVM) respectively for technical and funding assistance
	July 04, 2016	016, series of 2016	A resolution in re submission for review, consideration and approval with corresponding fund allocation of the proposed construction of multipurpose building/ evacuation center and perimeter fence to the OM through the Committee on Education of the SP. Proposed project cost is PhP 5,602,000.
	November 3, 2015.	14, series of 2015	A resolution adopting and approving the results of the BDRSSP and formally submitting the same to the SP, CDC, CDRRM for funding consideration and to the CPDO for inclusion in the AIP
3. Hinaplanon	October 2, 2017	14, series of 2017	A resolution adopting and approving the final documents of the BDRSSP_Hinaplanon and formally submitting the same to the SP, CDC, CDRRM for consideration for technical support and funding, and to the CPDO for inclusion in AIP
		21 series of 2015	A resolution adopting and approving the results of the BDRSSP and formally submitting the same to the SP, CDC, CDRRM for consideration for funding and to the CPDO for inclusion in the AIP
4. Iligan City	November 9, 2016	16-619	A resolution endorsing to the Local Finance Committee Resolution No. 106, series of 2016 of the Barangay Resolution of San Roque on the proposed construction of the multipurpose building/ evacuation center and perimeter fence located at the Echavez Elementary School, Purok Greenhills amounting to Php5,602,000 for review, consideration and appropriate action

**Annex G. Projects listed in the BDRSS Plans**

<b>Projects proposed/ Project areas and number of Projects</b>	<b>GEN. SANTOS</b>	<b>ILIGAN</b>	<b>LIGAO</b>	<b>UBAY</b>
<b>Flooding</b>				
Protection of the coastline through bio-engineering, using coco coir and vetiver grass				1
Mangrove and beach forest reforestation for coastal protection from storm surge				3
Construction, rehabilitation and/or declocking Barangay Drainage Systems		3	16	
Rehabilitation of rivers and slopes through river rip-rapping, bio-engineering with coco-coir and vetiver, and tree growing	6 (Rivers: 6,194 m rip-rapping, 7,445 m bio-engineering (coco-coir and vetiver), and 6,815 m of tree growing)		18 (no linear specifications)	4 (slope erosion mitigation through vetiver and tree planting) 2 (river rip-rap and riverbank rehabilitation w. vetiver grass, coco coir and tree planting)
Construction of Gabion Dikes	2 (500 m)			
Vetiver cultivations and community marketing for soil erosion control	4	3		4 (incl. tree planting)
Technical assistance on impacts from rechanneling of rivers, rechanneling; and sand bagging	5 (7,318 m rivers)			2
Dredging of riverbeds causing flooding and conversion of dredged materials into construction materials	1 (4,240m)		1	
Irrigation canal protection barrier			1	
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Relocation</b>				
Relocation packages including land acquisition for high risk households	7	8	12	12
Skills training and	2	5		



livelihood Programs for sociaized housing beneficiaries				
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Fire Prevention</b>				
Preparation of barangay fire response plans and purchase of fire-fighting accessories	4	1		
Construction/ rehabilitation of access road			1	
Organize and train fire-fighting volunteer brigades	4			
Draft and implement fire prevention zoning ordinance		1		
Purchase and installation of fire hydrants			1	
Advocacy campaign against faulty electrical connections	3			
Orientation of ISF community to avail the CITY LGUs low-cost electrification program	3			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Water supplies and WASH program components</b>				
Technical assistance to assess sources of water supplies to more households, test drinking water quality and develop water conservation management to protect the source and raise peoples awareness subj. water conservation needs	1			
Construction of Bio-Sand Filter Units among Communities with Problems on Water Contamination		2		
Feasibility study and provision/ construction of water supply system			2	3
Protection of dugwell form landslide impacts				1
WASH-Program including low-cost toilets	1			

Procurement of Additional Health Care Facility and Honorarium of Brgy. Health Workers		1		
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>BDRRM and associated trainings</b>				
Replication: Barangay and Purok DRRM Trainings in other barangays and puroks	1			
Conduct capacity building activities among PO members and affected HHs		5		
Equipment and Facilities for Emergency Response and Capacity-building of Community Emergency Volunteers		1		
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Waste Management</b>				
Construction of Barangay Central Material Recovery Facility (BCMRF)		3	2	
Purchase of additional waste disposal facilities (dump trucks, garbage bins, etc.)		1		
Solid Waste Management(SWM): Organize and plan for community-level SWM Program including garbage collection	2		1 (with livelihood and food production through organic farming) 2 (with livelihood components and campaign for proper garbage disposal)	
Waste Water Management: a) Construct drainage canals and regular clean-ups	4			
Waste Water Management: b) technical Assistance to assess options for low-cost communal wastewater treatment and barangay waste water management system	2			

Pera sa basure Program using waste recycling, reduction, re-se and upcycling	1			
Green Awards: Best in clean and green - Project Modelo	1			
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Evacuation Center</b>				
Construction/Improvement of safe evacuation center		4		2 1 ( retrofitting church; plan for future site)
Purchase of Land and Construction of Evacuation and Livelihood Center				1
Provide protection for school books and materials, from storm surge; Plan for future alternative site.				
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Others</b>				
Livelihood Program, Equipment and Skills Training				7
Construction of evacuation road network			1	
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>43</b>
Percentage per site of total number of projects (%)	<b>28%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>Grand Total, all sites</b>	<b>193</b>			

**Annex H. Status per March 2018 of Prioritized Projects submitted to LGUs and ALTERPLAN for funding (ALTERPLAN requests with red fund color). Amount in italic, largely DPWH project budgets that cannot be independently verified**

<b>Types of Projects per Project Site/ Funding Status and Number of Prioritized Projects</b>	<b>Funded and implemented</b>	<b>Amount (PhP)</b>	<b>Approved but not implemented. Or under negotiation with government agency</b>	<b>Amount (PhP)</b>	<b>Neither approved nor funded</b>	<b>Amount proposed (PhP)</b>	<b>Total # Projects</b>
<b>Iligan City (Barangay Santiago, San Roque and Hinaplanon)</b>							
Resettlement (purchase of lands and titles and plan development but excluding construction of houses, electrification or WASH facilities)					1 1	8,000,000 No budget	2
Solid waste management (mainly waste recovery facility)	2	1,945,000					2
New or safer water supplies	1	438,000			1	175,000	2
Flooding (including improved/ new drainage canals, engineered riverbank stabilization, siltation drainage)	1	<i>4,000,000</i>			1 1	300,000 2,500,000	3
Funds for equipment and facilities for emergency responses;					1	1,500,000	1

and committee emergency capacity-building							
Establishment/ improvement of evacuation center			1	5,600,000	1	No budget	2
Health care facility & honorarium to health workers					1	150,000	1
Vetiver Soil Erosion Control Training	1	66,050			1 1	30,000 30,000	3
Livelihoods : Microfinancing and sari-sari store; and other livelihoods for PO Members			1	325,000	1	700,000	2
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>5</b>	6,449,050	<b>2</b>	5,925,000	<b>11</b>	>13,385,000	<b>18</b>
<b>Ligao City (Barangay Tinago, Tuburan and Bagumbayan)</b>							
Resettlement (purchase of lands, titles and plan development but excluding construction of houses, electrification or WASH facilities)		181,000	1 2	8,000,000 No budget Tuburan and Bagumbayan	1	No budget	4
New or safer water supplies	1	200,000					1
Flooding (including improved/new drainage canals,	(drainage) 4 (river dike and slope	575,000 8,000,000 (estimate)	(drainage) 1	100,000			6

engineered riverbank stabilization , siltation drainage and new river dikes)	protection ) 1						
Vetiver Soil Erosion Control Training	1	24,400			3	150,000	4
Road widening	1	500,000					1
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9,480,400</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>&gt;8,100,000</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>&gt; 150,000</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>General Santos City (Barangay City Height, Apopong and Lanbangal)</b>							
Site-upgrading of resettlement area					1	No budget	1
Resettlement (purchase of lands, titles and plan development but excluding construction of houses, electrification or WASH facilities)	1	1,000,000	3	No data	1 2	16,000,000 No budget	7
Flooding (including improved/new drainage canals, engineered riverbank stabilization , siltation drainage)	1 1 1	75,000 No data 12,000,000			(part of City Planning Program) 1	50,000,000	4
Vetiver Soil Erosion Control Training	2	62,800			1 1	40,000 No data	2
Fire prevention	3	3,400,000					6
ISF community to avail the	3	No data					3

CITY LGUs low-cost electrification program							
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>12</b>	16,537,800	<b>3</b>	?	<b>7</b>	> 66,040,000	<b>22</b>
<b>Ubay ( Barangay Cuya, Cagting and Guintaboan)</b>							
Resettlement (purchase of lands, titles and plan development but excluding construction of houses, electrification or WASH facilities)			1	5,000,000 (partially implemented)	2	No budget (Cuia and Guintaboan)	3
New or safer water supplies	3	15,300 245,500	3	500,000			6
Mangrove and Beach forest assessment	3	109,000					3
Vetiver Soil Erosion Control (trainings)	1	5,100	1	1,000	3	No budget	5
Establishment/ improvement of evacuation center					1 1	9,500,000 No budget	2
Livelihood Projects in relocation area					1 1	520,000 680,000	2
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>7</b>	374,900	<b>5</b>	5,501,000	<b>9</b>		<b>21</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>32,842,150</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>&gt;19,526,000</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>&gt;90,275,000</b>	<b>77</b>