

FINAL REPORT

RAPID RESPONSE

Please delete the guiding instructions marked in red font before submitting the report but maintain the headlines and questions.

The total report may not exceed **8 pages** (excluding this page).

The aim of this report is to provide the organisation(s) that partnered in implementing an intervention with the opportunity to document, reflect on and learn from achievements made and challenges experienced in seeking to assist people and communities at risk. The final report is also part of the applicant organisation's (i.e. the Grantee's) 'track record' and can be taken into account in future assessments of applications to the DERF or other CISU administered pools of funds from the Grantee with the same or other partner organisations.

Grantee / applicant organisation	DIB		
Contact person, name	Simon Langvad Græsbøll Iversen	E-mail	dib@dib.dk
Implementing Partner	Alternative Planning Initiatives (ALTERPLAN)		
DERF Reference number	22-3800-DERF-RR		

Title of Intervention	Post-Odette humanitarian actions in vulnerable coastal barangays in Ubay Municipality, Bohol Province
Name of Call	21-010-RO Typhoon Rai in the Philippines
Country of Intervention	Philippines
Location(s) of Intervention	Barangays Cagting, Cuya and Guintabonan in Ubay Municipality, Bohol Province
Period of Intervention	February 8 – November 7, 2022
Total <i>Budget</i> of Intervention	DKK 1.488.414,00

AARHUS, 12-12-2022

Place and Date

dib@dib.dk

E-mail



Person responsible (Signature)

SIMON LANGVAD GRÆSBØLL IVERSEN

Person responsible (Name in capital letters)

1. Overall performance (CHS 1, 2, 4 & 7) suggested length max. 4 pages

1.1 Write max. 10 lines about the overall purpose of the intervention, and whether the intervention achieved its expected short-term impacts.

The intervention was generally successful in its overall purpose of providing life-saving relief through the delivery of safe water, power and communication, and safer shelter. The actions were able to assist the target communities in resuming daily activities and livelihoods. In addition, the intervention was able to introduce improvements in community infrastructure and practices that are expected to help make the communities more resilient and self-reliant in the long-term, such as the use of renewable energy and rainwater harvesting, while responding to urgent needs.

a) Timeframe of the intervention

How many days after submission of a fund disbursement request was funding made available to your organisation?	14 days after the first request
How many days after the applicant organisation's receipt of funds were you able to start implementation?	Coordination and planning with affected communities started as soon as notice of project approval was received.
How many days after the applicant organisation's receipt of funds were target groups in receipt of assistance?	5 days after the first transfer was received
What internal or external factors negatively affected the speed of implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Damaged communication and transportation infrastructure - Banking challenges at the project site - Mobility restrictions (due to the pandemic) in the first months of implementation
Additional comments:	

b) Planned and actual direct target population

The following information was provided by community leaders from barangay government data during the preparation of the proposal:

PLANNED TARGET POPULATION (INDIVIDUALS) (from intervention application/proposal)										
Age Group	Male		Female		Sub-total	Age Group	Male	Female	Sub-total	Total
	Bgy. Cuya	Bgy. Guintabonan	Bgy. Cuya	Bgy. Guintabonan	# of persons		Bgy. Cagting			
< 5	38	55	29	47	169	< 5	113	107	220	
6-14	62	92	43	72	269	6-12	177	138	315	
15-24	48	92	48	90	278	13-17	131	130	261	
25-49	75	136	83	132	426	18-59	630	620	1,250	
50-64	28	53	23	67	171	>60	91	91	182	
> 65	15	29	25	23	92					
Total	266	457	251	431	1,405	Total	1,142	1,086	2,228	3,633

Actual Target Population

For Components 1 and 2, the actual population potentially served is equivalent to the planned target population, while for Component 3, the actual target population is as shown in the table below:

ACTUAL TARGET POPULATION (INDIVIDUALS)							
Age Group	Male			Female			Total
	Bgy. Cagting	Bgy. Cuya	Bgy. Guintaboan	Bgy. Cagting	Bgy. Cuya	Bgy. Guintaboan	# of persons
< 5	26	24	22	25	21	17	135
6-14	56	47	44	38	33	45	263
15-24	68	49	55	56	26	38	292
25-49	63	62	58	59	54	52	348
50-64	30	23	24	28	16	33	154
> 65	9	10	16	9	14	12	70
No age given	3	4		6	4		17
Total	255	219	219	221	168	197	1,279

1.2 Describe the intervention's effect on the direct target population and the needs of particularly vulnerable groups (e.g. women, men, boys, girls, people with disabilities, elderly, ethnic minorities).

For Component 1:

- Disinfection of drinking water: The project distributed Aquatabs, a disinfectant in tablet form to be dissolved in water. Supply equivalent to 3 months' consumption by 100% of households in the three barangays was provided. Jerrycans were also distributed to all households in order for them to have proper storage and for easier use of Aquatabs in the right proportion to the water it will disinfect. Information on disinfection methods was disseminated through the community leaders. However, through the slow take-up of the tablets, local partners came to know that not all households had successfully adopted the use of the disinfectant.
- Improvement of local water sources: The project installed or improved rainwater catchment and storage, as well as open dug wells (including their recharge). Direct observation of lines at wells, and conversations with community members showed that these improvements significantly improved the quantity of clean water available to households for drinking, bathing, washing and other domestic uses. The activities repaired water systems damaged by Odette, but also enhanced their sustainability for the longer term, thus cutting down on expenses and potentially improving health for community members. The water facilities as currently installed are able to serve 314 households, the children at daycare centers in the three barangays, and the staff and students of the public school in Bgy. Guintaboan.

For Component 2:

- Solar-powered charging station and back-up gasoline-powered generator: One set of these were installed in each barangay. During the weeks when there was no electricity, the charging stations powered up mobile phones and tablets that the children used for their online classes (standard during the pandemic). Other family members also used the charging stations for their own communications devices and small appliances like battery-powered electric fans and lamps. These small devices improved conditions in dwellings, especially at night. The lamps in particular extended work and study hours at home, and improved protection for family members.
- Mobile phones: Two units of cellular phones were donated in each barangay, and one unit of satellite phone was provided in Bgy. Cuya, which is the most challenged in terms of cellular access. These communication devices gave a sense of security to residents for coping with emergency situations when they need outside help.

These power and communications equipment were received by a women's organization (Bgy. Cagting), a fisherfolk organization (Bgy. Cuya), and the barangay local government (Bgy. Guintaboan). They accepted

the responsibility of learning how to operate and maintain the equipment (including raising funds for any maintenance costs), and keeping them accessible to community members in their times of need.

For Component 3:

- Transitional housing assistance for the most vulnerable households with totally damaged houses: A total of 99 households in the three barangays were given assistance for materials and labor to build new houses in safer locations. Priority was given to households in the most high-risk locations (shorelines and sandbars), income-poor women- and elderly-headed households, households with members who have special needs, and those willing to find and transfer to safer locations. Technical assistance was provided in order for the families to complete, with the limited budget, a transitional house equipped with sanitary facilities and adequate protection from the elements, using non-conventional building materials.
- Housing materials assistance for less vulnerable households with partially damaged houses: As with the assistance for totally damaged houses, priority was given to families who were income-poor, had women or elderly household heads, and households with members who have special needs. In this modality, households were assisted to prepare a list of materials needed to repair the damage to their houses, thus helping ensure that provisions would be suitable and relevant. 200 households received assistance in this manner.
- Cash-for-work: Under the guidance of a professional builder and a skilled worker retained by the project, affected household members improved their skills by helping build transitional housing units. In some instances, though, instead of distributing the funds in this modality as cash allowances, the barangay coordinators and community members agreed instead on food-for-work schemes. In those instances, they agreed this was more effective for encouraging neighbours to help each other rather than the small cash amounts. At the time of this narrative report, the number of persons who received cash and food assistance in this modality has not yet been summarised.

The households that received housing assistance had family members with special needs as follows:

- Bgy. Cuya: 12 persons (6 male, 6 female) were listed with chronic ailments that limit activity/mobility (diabetes, hypertension, asthma, arthritis, hyperacidity, poor eyesight or blindness, stroke)
- Bgy. Cagting: 4 persons (3 male, 1 female) were listed with disabilities (missing fingers, cerebral palsy, unable to speak, unable to walk)
- Bgy. Guintabonan: 6 persons (5 male, 1 female) were listed with hypertension.

1.3 Write about the results and outcomes achieved. How much progress was made towards the targets you identified for each indicator in the original proposal and which monitoring tools did you use? If a result frame and/or indicator table formed part of the original proposal it should be referred to here.

Outcome	Results	Success indicators
Component 1: Improvement of the quality and quantity of available drinking water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protection and recharging of local water sources - Knowledge and materials for water disinfection gained by each household 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safe drinking water is accessible to 100% of the households in the three barangays

The partners believe this is 85% achieved. The new or improved water installations have significantly improved access to fresh water and are expected to improve quality (lessening salinity) and quantity of water from wells through recharging. These local improvements, rather than importing water in plastic containers during the emergency period, were designed to enhance sustainability. Less than 100% achievement is assigned to this component because of the lukewarm reception of community members to

the disinfection promoted by the project for households that lack access to enough quantities of safe water. The gap is seen to be a need for behavioural change that could not be adequately addressed by the project.

Outcome	Results	Success indicators
Component 2: Establishment of power and communication hubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to minimum power supply made available to each household - Improvement of capability for emergency communications at barangay level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One charging station in each barangay - One communication centre in each barangay

The target for this Component is largely response to survival needs during the emergency period. The indicators have been met 100% by the project. The charging stations and communication devices are located in sites known to the community members, and the guidelines for use, safekeeping and maintenance were discussed in public meetings. One adjustment made for this Component is that the partners decided not to provide hand-held radios as these were found to be available in the barangay centres. Also, only one barangay (Cuya) merited the expense of a satellite phone. Instead, each barangay received two mobile phones instead of one.

Outcome	Results	Success indicators
Component 3: Provision of housing assistance for households with totally or partially damaged houses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transitional housing in safer location provided to the most vulnerable households - Repair kit provided to less vulnerable households with partially damaged houses - Emergency livelihood provided to household members - Knowledge gained by community members in building sturdier and safer housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total of 100 households from the 3 barangays are in temporary shelters in safe locations - Total of 200 houses repaired on-site - Total of 200 community members have been provided emergency livelihood through cash-for-work

Component 3 is deemed to be 99.5% achieved. One transitional house was not built for a selected household who decided close to the end of the project to waive the assistance because they did not want to move from their unsafe location. The allocated funds instead were used to augment materials costs that kept increasing during the project period. Beyond procuring materials and labour, the project provided designs, building management and training that ensured that transitional houses were fully assembled. With the use of nonconventional building materials like *amakan* (split bamboo) and mud walls, women and even children participated in putting together some components of the houses. Documentation instruments prescribed during the project like agreements with recognized landowners gave assurance to affected households that they would have secure tenure on their dwellings at least for the next few years. This will help keep them away from fragile public land like the shorelines and sandbars.

2 Changes & amendments (CHS 7) suggested length max. 0,5 page

2.1 Briefly explain any changes to the intervention from the original plan (whether in the implementation plan, activities, measures, or outcomes), and explain why you needed to make them, for example because of a change in needs or in the overall situation.

A three-month extension was requested and approved in August. The extension was requested because the component of providing transitional housing for households with totally damaged houses proved to be more complicated than foreseen, and needed additional time to complete. Setting up the systems for using local materials to remain within the budget range, as well as the need to find safer locations delayed the actual construction of transitional housing at the required scale.

During the project period, fuel prices went on a steep upward trend, bringing up the cost of commodities including construction materials. Fortunately, Component 1 (water) and Component 2 (power and communications) budget items did not cost as much as projected, and the variance went to the increases in Component 3 (housing) items. In general, the budget remained within the limits of the main headings.

3. Environment (CHS 3) suggested length max. 0,5 page

a) Choose which of the following three descriptions best characterised your intervention (tick only one box)

MARK		DESCRIPTION		EXPLANATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	→	The intervention included environmentally harmful components without incorporating mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impact	→	The intervention duly identified and considered the environmental impact of its collective activities as harmful without being able to apply substantiated remedial action (e.g. sourcing, procurement, supply chains, logistics, transport, waste and service delivery).
<input type="checkbox"/>	→	The intervention included environmentally harmful components and incorporated some mitigation measures to reduce anticipated impact	→	The intervention duly identified and considered the environmental impact of its collective activities as harmful and applied some substantiated remedial action (e.g. sourcing, procurement, supply chains, logistics, transport, waste and service delivery).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	→	The intervention included environmentally harmful components and incorporated significant mitigation and environmental enhancement measures to reduce anticipated impact	→	The intervention duly identified and considered the environmental impact of its collective activities as harmful and included significant substantiated remedial action as well as environmental enhancement components (e.g. sourcing, procurement, supply chains, logistics, transport, waste and service delivery).

3.1 Briefly reflect on your Environment Marker self-assessment (planned & actual).

Describe how environmental or climate issues were addressed. Were environmental considerations attainable and measurable and how did you address challenges encountered?

In the application, the project committed to the following:

- Instead of shipping water in PET bottles that result in so much plastic waste, the proposed intervention is disinfection of locally sourced water through tablets and hyposol (a water treatment solution endorsed by the Department of Health and World Health Organisation). The component also seeks to promote rainwater collection not only for domestic uses but also for recharging groundwater.
- The intervention seeks to promote the use of renewable energy through solar panels that will power the charging stations for small devices.

These commitments were met through the installation or construction of the following:

- Rainwater harvesting consisting of roof catchment with storage jars, first flush pipes and drum filters
- Improvement of open dug wells with connection to rainwater catchment for recharge, concrete hollow block lining, and concrete slab flooring and cover for protecting the recharge pit
- Installation of solar panels and power generator in each barangay with charging stations for battery-powered devices

- Construction of sanitary facilities at each transitional house, ensuring that they are at sufficient distances from the wells in order to avoid contamination

It is noted that the improvement of open dug wells was possible during the DERF project period largely because there had been a water resource study prepared during an earlier Development Intervention implemented by DIB and ALTERPLAN in Ubay.

4. Participation & accountability (CHS 4 & 5) suggested length 0,5 page

4.1 How were people affected by the crisis (including vulnerable and marginalised groups) involved and consulted in the design and implementation of the intervention?

Even based in Manila, ALTERPLAN communicated directly with community leaders representing the affected households and persons. It was they who initiated contact with ALTERPLAN staff in the immediate aftermath of Typhoon Odette. During the preparation of the proposal, they provided information on urgent needs, what forms of assistance the government and other humanitarian actors had provided, and the state of land and sea transport.

During implementation, they ran the day-to-day operations and managed the pool of community volunteers who were working on the various project components. Aside from regular online and face-to-face meetings of ALTERPLAN with the barangay coordinators, there were meetings held at the level of each barangay where all community members were invited. The first cluster of barangay meetings was conducted in the first week of March for the Project Orientation. The second cluster of meetings was conducted in the fourth week of April during the visit of DIB staff. At these occasions, feedback from the community members was solicited and discussed on the spot.

4.2 Which feedback/complaints mechanisms were in place for affected populations to report cases of mismanagement, misconduct and/or sexual exploitation or abuse? How did you deal with complaints received?

During the barangay-level meetings, the contact information of DIB and ALTERPLAN were given to the community members. Due to this, ALTERPLAN (Sarah) received a text message while the Project Orientation was being held in one of the barangays. The text sender questioned the (non)selection of their family for housing assistance. Sarah responded with the commitment to get back to the sender after gathering additional information. After discussing the matter with the local coordinators, Sarah responded after two days to the text sender with an explanation of the selection criteria and process, and an appeal for understanding from the better off community members. There was no further communication after this. All other questions during the course of the project were handled by the local coordinators. The ALTERPLAN construction team validated and helped ensure during their site visits that questions were sufficiently addressed.

a) Complaints in numbers

No. of complaints received:	1
No. of complaints responded to:	1
No of complaints still pending:	0

4.3 What did affected persons think about the assistance provided?

The following are some of the comments that were gathered at the end of the project:

- The family cried when they first entered their new house because they now have protection from the rain, and they are able to sleep soundly at night.

- If ALTERPLAN and DIB had not provided assistance, maybe they would still be homeless. Now they can move freely. Especially now that the school year has started again, children have a place in the house for doing their homework.
- The charging station has been a big help especially during the time when power was not yet restored.
- They are happy because there is a well where they can get water. They do not have to buy bottled water and they save money.
- One negative comment concerned the delays in materials delivery.

5. Risk management (CHS 3, 8 & 9) suggested length 0,5 page

5.1 How did you identify risks for affected populations? Which actions did you take to avoid or minimize risks for people?

DIB and ALTERPLAN used knowledge of the local context from the earlier Development Intervention in order to identify risks. The application took note of the ongoing pandemic and allocated resources for personal protective equipment and for basic life and health insurance for key volunteers in the field. Redundant communication systems were established so that staff and volunteers had access to each other and to authorities in case of emergencies. In the start-up of the project an orientation/refresher session with staff and hired volunteers was carried out, focusing on the Core Humanitarian Standard, the conduct of inclusive and sensitive humanitarian actions, including what constitutes abuse, exploitation and discrimination, and a refresher on risk management systems and procedures.

5.2 Reflect on the risk management analysis included in the initial proposal. Were the right risks identified? What new risks were there that you did not expect? What did you do to mitigate or address the risks you identified? Did this work?

On the whole, the partners believe that the identified risks were mitigated. Other risks that were not so much considered during project design were as follows:

- *Behavioural*: The introduction of improved practices was met with some resistance. Examples of these were the use of disinfectants for unsafe water (some HHs saw this as an inconvenient extra step), the use of toilet bowls connected to septic tanks (some HHs were not used to using sanitary facilities at all), and the use of alternative building materials (some HHs are used to thinking only cement-based materials are durable). The project team conducted community-based information and education activities, which - with the help of local leaders - hopefully will be effective in the long-term.
- *Financial*: The magnitude of oil price increases significantly raised the prices of construction materials, which affected the water and housing components of the project. The construction team had to be vigilant with design adjustments as well as adopting the suggestion of buying undressed logs and using a chainsaw to cut up the logs instead of purchasing higher-priced dressed lumber.

6. Sustainability & learning (CHS 3, 7 & 8) suggested length max. 1 page

6.1 Write about the strategy for closing the intervention and the expected after-effects of the intervention. Focus on the sustainability of the intervention, or whether and how results or benefits will continue after it ends.

At the conclusion of the project, the team met with the Municipal Mayor to report the accomplishments, as well as the social and technical processes employed. The mayor expressed his appreciation and receptiveness to the innovations. The team also communicated to the Mayor some activities and areas of concern that the local government was requested to help with. These included identified water sources that the local government could develop, as well as remaining numbers of families who had still not been able to rebuild their totally damaged homes. The local leaders will follow up with the Mayor on

these items, especially the smaller water facilities that the Mayor seemed ready to move forward with immediately.

6.2 What are the key lessons learned and how will these be applied in future interventions? What are suggestions for improving the design of similar interventions in the future? Based on the experiences or challenges that came up, what will the organisation do the same or differently in future similar interventions?

The intervention proved to us and other stakeholders that with a deep understanding of local conditions, it is possible to combine quick short-term relief with responses that promote long-term resilience. It would have been easier to import goods like drinking water than develop local water sources that would benefit the community for a long time. The project chose the latter, and augmented that with disinfection of available well water for immediate supply while the improvement of rainwater catchment and open dug wells were being completed. Deep understanding of conditions is important because it allows stakeholders to be flexible and creative in coming up with relevant solutions.

6.3 Briefly describe activities strengthening local partner and/or local actor capacities, as relevant.

Aside from gaining improved building skills and more knowledge about alternative materials and off-grid power and water sources, the community also gained experience in managing local volunteers and financial reporting.

7. Cost effectiveness (CHS 2 & 9) suggested length 0,5 page

7.1 In which ways did you try to improve the cost-effectiveness of the intervention? And did you spend money in a way that benefitted different groups of recipients equally and fairly?

The team tried to improve cost-effectiveness by 1) being vigilant with design adjustments, and 2) studying and using various ways of procuring goods and services to complete the project components. Local sources were used whenever possible in order to help stimulate the local economy.

8. Coordination (CHS 6) suggested length 0,5 page

8.1 Describe how you coordinated with the host government, other relevant organisations and the broader humanitarian system, including the cluster system and alignment to other relevant UN-led appeals/coordinated responses (where applicable).

At the start of the project, a meeting was conducted with local government officials in order to dialog on the objectives of the project, and how the team and government could help each other. No other humanitarian organisations were operational in the three barangays during the project period.

8.2 Describe synergies, maybe with CSP or other interventions, visibility in Denmark etc.

The earlier Development Intervention implemented by DIB and ALTERPLAN in Ubay contributed to smoother communication with local leaders and local government who were involved in the earlier project. It also contributed to the partners' knowledge of local conditions, especially the water sources that are essential to the affected households' survival needs.