

FINAL REPORT

DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

The final report is the Danish organisation and its partners reporting to CISU. It is expected that the report is developed in close collaboration between the Danish organisation and local partner(s), and use it as an opportunity to reflect on the results of the intervention together.

The final report will be a part of the Danish organisation's track record with CISU. The report is therefore significant to future assessments of applications from the Danish organisations with the same or other partners.

The report is uploaded into 'Vores CISU' through the milestone *final report* under the grant no longer than 3 months after the end date of the intervention.

Before the report is uploaded, you will also need to answer the following questions in 'Vores CISU':


- Overall, have you achieved what you wanted with the intervention? (Selection from a drop-down list)
- Number of persons who have participated in activities
- Number of persons who have been affected by the interventions' activities (besides the persons who have participated directly)

CISU strives to send a response to the report to the Danish organisation no longer than two months after receiving the report. The content of the report will also be used for CISUs own reporting and communication of results related to the Civil Society Fund.

All text in *italics* is text to help you develop the report and can be deleted before uploading the report.

The report must not exceed 9 pages (excluding this frontpage). The tables in the report take up approx. one page.

Danish grantee(s)	DIB		
Partner organisation(s)	ALTERPLAN		
Title of the intervention	Mayon, Magayon: The perfect cone of participatory governance, risk reduction and resilient settlements		
Name and email of contact person	Lykke Valentin, filippinerne@dib.dk		
Reference number	21-3367-CSP-UI		
Country(ies)	Filippinerne		
Period of the intervention	1. jul. 2021 - 31. jul. 2024		
Total budget	2.996.986,00	Actual expenditure	TBC

Date 03/01/25		Person responsible (signature)
		
		Person responsible (in capital letters)

1. Overall results

1.1 Summarise (in max. 10 lines) what changes the intervention has contributed to.

The intervention has provided rallying points for the community members' efforts to achieve personal safety and more livable environments. The first rallying point is the barangay-level disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans that encapsulate the conditions, analysis and proposals of the at-risk communities. These plans were researched and prepared through the intervention's process of participatory exercises and can serve as a guide for engaging with government and other stakeholders for several years. The second rallying point is the community associations whose focus is the advocacy of safer shelter. While there have been other community-based organizations in the area for many years, the three associations that were formed during the intervention period are uniquely positioned and mandated to pursue solutions for reducing the identified risks to households in the three barangays. Lastly Laudato Si-Eco Village was established as a visionary relocation site for up to 50 most at-risk households. 39 units are occupied at the end of the project.

1.2 Describe the results achieved for each of the intervention's outcomes (objectives or goals). Use your indicators as a basis for the description.

Specific objective 1: At-risk households have a unified voice for claim-making through strong community-based organizations

Success indicators

Functional community-based organizations with membership and leadership structures and mechanisms
Official recognition of CBOs as participants in governance

Specific Objective 1 is assessed by the External Evaluator as partially achieved largely due to the small number of CBO members (113) relative to the targeted number (1,000) at the start of the intervention. However, the evaluation report notes that other indicators of functionality of CBOs have been met. The three barangay¹-based CBOs that were formed during the intervention period all have articulated shared vision, strategic plan, operational core of officers and members, planning and advocacy skills among the leaders, organizational policies and working structures. They are also accredited with local and national government authorities, giving them the legal personality to participate in local development planning and budgeting processes. Therefore the partners assess this objective to be achieved.

The activities for bringing together the residents in CBOs, as well as the risk communication activities, were delayed by the COVID pandemic restrictions on mobility and assembly. When the restrictions were lifted, the partners rolled out an adjusted action plan for reaching the grassroots. However, the remaining project period was not enough to reach the target numbers. The local partners expect that the CBOs will be able to attract more members if they are able to sustain their activities, particularly in their major areas of concern, which are safe shelter and improvement of livelihoods. The current intervention with the same set of local partners under the Climate Change Adaptation Modality that introduces nature-based solutions for both risk reduction and livelihood purposes is an opportunity to consolidate and expand the membership base of the CBOs.

Specific objective 2: Community-based organizations are capable of advocating for safer and more resilient settlements through the processes of participatory planning and budgeting

Success indicators

¹ A barangay is the smallest political-administrative unit in the Philippines. Cities and municipalities are made up of a number of barangays.

Shelter and resettlement agenda of affected communities taken up in government planning activities
Engagement and partnership of CBOs with other stakeholders
Approved proposals for shelter and resettlement projects and programs

Specific Objective 2 is assessed by the External Evaluator as satisfactorily achieved and the partners agree. The barangay-level disaster risk-sensitive shelter plans prepared primarily by representatives of CBOs with a few barangay officials have been adopted and endorsed by the barangay government to the municipal government. Presentations of the findings and proposals were made by the three newly-formed community associations first to their respective barangay councils, then to the Mayor and key municipal officials during the local government budgeting period. For Fiscal Year 2024, the municipal government included funding for solar street lights, including in the main roads leading to the Laudato Si Eco-village, the relocation site assisted by this intervention, as well as improvement of water supply systems in Mauraro, another relocation site for high-risk residents of the 3 barangays. The community associations will continue to lobby for priority projects listed in the shelter plans.

During the Learning and Planning Sessions where the data, analysis and proposals of the shelter plan were pieced together, there was a core of 15 participants from the CBOs who participated in almost all the eight two-day sessions. There were at least 60 other CBO members who joined several sessions but were not able to complete all. Numbers were higher when the sessions were split up among the 3 barangays, not centralized in one venue. The target number of CBO participants was 35.

There was also a core of 7 barangay officials who regularly joined the sessions, and at least 20 more who were able to participate in some of the sessions. From the municipal government, there were 2 officials who were consistent in their participation, while 8 others were able to join a few sessions. The target number of participants from the barangay government was 6, while the target number for the municipal government was 4.

Specific objective 3: The 15 most vulnerable and at-risk families have gained protection through access to safer and more resilient permanent relocation

Success indicators

Selected families provided with secure tenure in permanent relocation areas with strategic plan for site improvements and socio-economic growth of the relocation areas
Dwelling structures provided in at least incremental or transition mode

Specific Objective 3 is assessed by the External Evaluator to have been satisfactorily achieved, and the partners agree. The intervention provided technical and materials assistance for the development of Laudato Si Eco-village, a relocation site whose main proponent is SAC, or local partner. With significant contributions from other development agencies (e.g., AECID, MISSIO) and local donors (e.g., an alumni association and a businessmen's organization), a subdivision plan for 60 housing units was prepared, 50 units had been constructed, and 39 units were occupied at the end of the intervention period. Due to inflation, the balance of the funds raised can build only two more units. SAC will seek to raise additional funds to build the last 10 units all at once instead of just two more from available funds. Even if the relocation site is not completely done, it's quite remarkable that finding and securing appropriate land, securing funding and doing the construction of the housing units have been achieved in such a short period of time without being a national agency. This has been achieved because of our local partner SAC.

SAC continues to screen and assist vulnerable families for moving in. Income-poor families who were identified in the BDRSSP maps to be in the most high-risk areas were selected for relocation.

The subdivision plan, the site development plans, and the house designs were all prepared with assistance from the intervention. These serve as the basis for all improvements that SAC and the residents will undertake. The municipal government is contributing to the site development through allocations in their annual budget.

The residents are organized in a homeowners association, and they are also participating in capacity-building for the adoption of nature-based solutions to address climate risks affecting their food security and safety. This is under the current CCAM intervention (24-5244-CSP-KT) being implemented in the same area. In the Mayon Magayon intervention, members of the community had brief introductions on the maintenance of the installed systems for solar power, rainwater collection and constructed wetlands. They also undertook collective clearing and clean-up activities.

1.3 Achievement of objectives

Overall, have you achieved what you wanted with the intervention? (Select one of the answers below)

Did not achieve at all	To a lesser degree than expected	Close to expected	Exactly as expected	Better than expected
		✓		

For each of your outcomes (objectives or goals), note in the table below how close you are to fulfilling the objectives (in percent).

	Achievement in %
Achievement of outcome 1 <i>At-risk households have a unified voice for claim-making through strong community-based organizations</i>	75%
Achievement of outcome 2 <i>Community-based organizations are capable of advocating for safer and more resilient settlements through the processes of participatory planning and budgeting</i>	80%
Achievement of outcome 3 <i>The 15 most vulnerable and at-risk families have gained protection through access to safer and more resilient permanent relocation</i>	100%

0-19 %: very low achievement
20-39 %: low achievement
40-59%: medium achievement
60-79%: high achievement
80-100%: very high achievement

1.4 Number of people reached

	Number
Number of persons who have participated in activities	327
Number of persons who have been affected by the interventions' activities (besides the persons who have participated directly)	3700 reached by risk communication 476 HHs (app. 2,380 person) benefiting or will benefit from approved BDRSSP projects. Might be overlaps with the above number

1.5 What lasting, sustainable improvements for the target groups have the intervention contributed to?

The community associations that have been formed during the intervention are fully expected to carry on their mandate long after the intervention has ended. Aside from the advocacy for safe shelter, the partners took note of the members' economic needs and have included activities directed to improvement of household incomes. The partners organized seminars where resource persons from government and SAC-affiliated trade agencies helped the CBOs decide on small businesses that they could continue to develop. Financial literacy seminars were also conducted. The CBOs are now generating small revenues from sales of various foodstuffs and craft items.

Based on experience and feedback from previous similar interventions, the shelter plans are also useful for years after the intervention ends. Because of their knowledge from in-depth participation in the preparation of the plans, the community members are mindful of the opportunities for promoting their recommendations in the shelter plans.

Another long-lasting element that the intervention assisted is the development of the Laudato Si relocation site. The housing project, aside from ensuring sturdy construction and safe location, highlights features such as solar power and rainwater collection for domestic uses, constructed wetlands for wastewater management, and propagation of vetiver for slope protection. This eco-friendly approach is expanded in the current CCAM project, and the partners seek to continue to develop a model for other relocation sites that 1) typically are not able to offer even the basic amenities to new residents, and 2) are vulnerable to climate risks.

2. Changes and adjustments

2.1 Describe the most significant contextual challenges, and how these have influenced the intervention. How have you adjusted the intervention to adapt to these challenges.

COVID pandemic. The intervention started July 2021, at a time when mobility was still highly regulated. The restrictions on travel and assembly affected the conduct of community consultations for organizing local associations, as well as the conduct of the Learning and Planning Sessions for the formulation of the shelter plans. The consultations for forming the associations ended up being deferred to the last year of the intervention when travel and assembly were loosened and eventually lifted. As noted in Section 1.2, the delay affected reach of the organizing and communication efforts. The Learning and Planning Sessions were at first carried out in a hybrid manner, with ALTERPLAN staff communicating virtually with the Guinobatan participants. To make up for possible communication loss due to the technical challenges of online training, SAC staff followed up on each session with barangay-based exercises.

Disruption in the provincial government. When the site development plan for Laudato Si Eco-village had been prepared, ALTERPLAN and SAC got verbal commitments from the provincial governor and the municipal mayor for assistance with site development infrastructure (e.g., roads, drainage, slope protection). A multi-partite agreement was supposed to be signed to confirm these commitments. However, the provincial governor was ousted from office due to election violations. The multi-partite agreement was shelved. The local partners continued to follow up with the provincial government, but except for the loan of heavy equipment for earthworks, the commitments of the previous governor were not realized. The municipal government, on the other hand, managed to provide assistance, particularly in undertaking part of the road and drainage works.

Acquisition of land for the relocation site. Clearing up the legal status of the land for Laudato Si Eco-village was not straightforward because the offered land turned out to be part of a property that had been parceled out for agrarian reform, meaning its conversion to residential uses had to gain approval from the Department of Agrarian Reform and the municipal government. However, both agencies pointed to each other for the set of requirements. A few months into the intervention, SAC took the risk of shelling out payment for the land after obtaining the local government’s commitment that they would not impede SAC’s entry and development of the property, even without documented reclassification of the land use. They have honored this commitment by themselves undertaking part of the site improvements (road and drainage works). This decision facilitated the intervention’s targets for Specific Objective 3, given that the initial options for relocation were government projects that at-risk households had much apprehension.

Negative perceptions of relocation among high-risk families due to experiences with government sites that lacked basic facilities (water, electricity) and were not so accessible to livelihood sources. The partners took several approaches to address these perceptions in the case of Laudato: 1) dialogue with the municipal and provincial government to provide services, 2) installation of rainwater collection systems and solar panels to partially provide for basic needs, and 3) seminars for portable small businesses.

Risk communication through art expression. The local partners conducted focus group discussions to gain insights on effective risk communication for the barangay residents. The identified challenges for effective communication were manifold. Examples were the virtual uselessness of printed materials unless they are introduced and discussed in interactive activities, and the deep-seated distrust of government programs (which may reflect on CSO actions that have government engagement). The local partners decided to strike out with the previously unplanned approach of sponsoring an art competition employing the intervention’s key messages as themes. The messages were further driven home by requiring competition participants to join a half-day discussion on the themes, thus also improving their chances in the competition. The rules encouraged younger members of the community to participate in the slogan, poster and video competitions. The talent (e.g., singing, composing, dancing, spoken word) competition was open to all ages. The promotions and build-up to the judging and awarding involved social media among the communities.

We plan to use the material produced and the positive community response to the art competition for further risk communication activities.

3. Inclusion of target groups

3.1 Fill in the table below. Add your primary target groups in the left column (primary target groups are persons who have participated directly in your activities). Add or delete columns according to how many primary target groups you have had in the intervention. Check the box according to what extent your primary target group(s) have been included in shaping the implementation of the intervention:

	Less degree of inclusion and participation	Medium degree of inclusion and participation	High degree of inclusion and participation	Very high degree of inclusion and participation
	<i>Target groups have been informed about the content of the intervention and their opportunities for participating in activities but have not</i>	<i>Target groups have been consulted in decision-making processes</i>	<i>Target groups have contributed directly to the further development of the intervention and made decisions in collaboration with the implementing partner(s).</i>	<i>Target groups have had the power and ownership to make decisions in connection with the implementation of the intervention.</i>

	<i>participated actively in decision-making processes.</i>	<i>related to the intervention.</i>		
Target group 1 <i>Residents of 3 barangays</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Target group 2 <i>Residents of 7 puroks to be relocated (subset of 1)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Target group 3 <i>CBO leaders (subset of 2)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Target group 4 <i>Women, youth, older people, persons with disability (subset of 2)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Target group 5 <i>Most vulnerable households e.g., HHs headed by single women, PWD, elderly; HHs with multiple special needs (subset of 2)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Target group 6 <i>City and barangay officials concerned with housing and DRR</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3.2 Describe/explain your answers in 3.1. How have target groups been included in the implementation of the intervention? Have you used any specific methods or approaches? Or why have target groups not been included?

Target group 1 Residents of 3 barangays. The plan for this target group was to reach them through a risk communication / information campaign. The expectation was not really high that they would be involved in decision-making. However, through focus group discussions on risk communication as mentioned in 2.1, representatives of this group provided insights that were used in the intervention’s risk communication activities.

Target group 2 Residents of 7 puroks to be relocated (subset of TG 1). The planned activities for this target group were the consultations and membership campaigns for the community associations. These were carried out in the last year of the intervention and obtained smaller numbers than the target. The residents collaborated with the local partners on the activities leading to the formation of the associations, including the formulation of their respective vision and goals.

Target group 3 CBO leaders (subset of TG 2). Participation in leadership seminars and the Barangay Distaster Risk Sensitive Shelter Plan (BDRSSP) Learning and Planning Sessions were planned for this group. These were achieved, although with slightly smaller numbers than targeted. With the built-in processes that had been prepared for the seminars, the CBO leaders were able to exercise decision-making.

Target group 4 Women, youth, older people, persons with disability (subset of TG 2). The partners intended to conduct continuing sectoral consultations with members of this target group. With the limitations on movement due to COVID19, the members of existing sectoral organizations became the core of the BDRSSP session participants. The initial expectation to delve deeper into their sectoral concerns were not purposively met, but the members of this group were instrumental in preparing the advocacy for the whole community.

Target group 5 Most vulnerable households e.g., HHs headed by single women, PWD, elderly; HHs with multiple special needs (subset of TG 2). This group was identified to receive housing materials assistance in permanent relocation sites. This expectation was met as the residents of Laudato Si Eco-village were chosen from this group of people.

Target group 6 City and barangay officials concerned with housing and DRR. This group was included in the BDRSSP sessions. This expectation was met.

4. The partnership

4.1 How would you assess that decisions have been made in relation to the implementation of the intervention? Please fill in the table below:

Decisions	Choose the description that best suits your partnership	Describe/explain your choice <i>Explain more about your relations in the partnership. How have you discussed the implementation of the intervention throughout implementation, and how have you made decisions?</i>
Decisions have primarily been made by the Danish organisation and local partner(s) have been informed about the decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The local partner(s) have been consulted before a decision has been made by the Danish organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Decisions have been made jointly in the partnership	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Decisions have primarily been made by the local partner(s)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	While providing critical input and directions, DIB has been very respectful of the knowledge and experiences of the local partners.
Decisions have been fully made by the local partner(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	

4.2 Describe how the partners (and other actors, if relevant) have been strengthened through the intervention.

The intervention added to the partners' knowledge and experience with working with CBOs and government

in participatory governance of the housing sector, especially in the challenging context of the pandemic. The partners also gained experience in construction management, use of nature-based solutions, livelihood development activities, and use of art competitions for risk communication. These are components that have not been integrated in previous BDRSSP interventions, for various reasons.

5. Lessons learned

5.1 How have you received feedback from target groups and collected experiences and results throughout the intervention? Describe the methods and tools you have used. What strengths and weaknesses have your way of monitoring had?

The Community Development Workers of SAC and ALTERPLAN regularly (at least once a month during COVID, and once a week when restrictions were lifted) visited and consulted with the target groups on the conduct of activities. Multiple chat groups in social media were also used for quick and convenient dissemination and validation of information. When the community associations were formally organized, the flow of information became more focused because there were sets of officers who became responsible for cascading information and collecting feedback from the rest of the target groups. For the BDRSSP advocacy, the partners sought documentation of minutes of meetings and official resolutions regarding proposed projects and services. On the development of Laudato Si Eco-village, physical accomplishment was documented. For the risk communication that was largely conducted through the Patiribayan activities, social media reach ultimately became the metric.

We felt that our methods of monitoring did not have strengths and weaknesses per se, as these were adapted to the context and resources available to us. However, there were diverse challenges. One was the fact that there were several types and scales of target groups and intended activities for each. The differences meant that the partners also had to keep track of various methods of monitoring. It was taxing on a small staff, to say the least. And during the evaluation, gaps in documentation became apparent. Another challenge was the unevenness (or lack) of skills in documentation. The nature of our intervention is governance so we are building our results on the synthesis of plans and agreements. During the intervention period, when not all participants, even those from local government, are not so mindful or skilled in the democratic process, we have to iterate certain actions or activities to have a degree of certainty on outcomes.

5.2 What are the most important lessons learned? What advice would you give yourselves if you were to implement the intervention again?

One of the most significant considerations that we have not resolved and will likely grapple with again in the future is the synchronization of participatory planning processes with the processes of strengthening community organizations, in a time-bound intervention where we had to produce results in various components. In this intervention, several adjustments were made in response to challenges, and we realize that what we did here (where participatory planning came ahead of organizational strengthening) is probably not suitable for many other contexts.

Another aspect of this intervention that we felt was impactful was the Burunyugan asin Patiribayan (Cooperation and Competition) event that served as our risk communication channel. The factors of artistic expression, youth participation, and competition were invigorating to the target groups and the project partners, and is definitely something we want to build on.

The third feature of the intervention that we should mention here is the component of livelihood improvement that we added to the capacity-building activities for the CBOs. This is the most systematic that we have been in terms of livelihood for the communities that have participated in all our DRSSP interventions since 2009. We believe that the opportunities for sustaining community action have been much improved by the livelihood activities that the CBOs are now collectively undertaking. The livelihood activities not only respond to survival needs, they are also exercises in internal governance and decision-making.

6. Information work in Denmark

6.1 Describe the purpose – and results of – the intervention’s information activities.

The information work in Denmark was also challenged during the first two years of the intervention due to COVID. In extension for our #Risefortheworld project we tried getting one young IDP from Marawi to Denmark to participate in lectures and cultural exchange aimed at Danish students in school or Gymnasium, however this was postponed for a couple of year due to the pandemic, and later a strict filipino immigration officer in the airport, would not allow our guest out of the country. We had hoped this could be an opportunity to reach a different audience than normally, but we had to abandon the idea. However we did manage to speed up other activities in the second half of the project.

During the project period the photo exhibition from the Philippines Slum Blues has been on display at Hjørring Gymnasium & HF, Højbjerg Gymnasium, ‘Kulturhus Bunkeren’ i Aarhus and Viby Gymnasium. We are experiencing a great interest for the exhibition, however it requires quite a lot of wall space, thus we are looking into getting a more flexible format, and also how we better can combine the exhibition with information from the context (else than what we already do).

Furthermore we have done presentations at education institutions -Diakonhøjskolen, Sociologi in Aalborg, Anthropology in Aarhus and Disaster and Risk Manager at University College Copenhagen. The latter has resulted in having 4 interns on site with our partners in the Philippines, and 4 interns at DIBs office during COVID. Also fostered a collaboration with the school on internships with Globus funds. Furthermore we have been contacted by several other students or newly graduated from the above places looking for internships, volunteer experience or a job. We try to engage them in our work and organisation as much as possible.

Lastly we have created content from the project Stories for our SoMe, blog, newsletter and website which reaches our followers and members (approximately 1000 in total).

7. Follow-up

7.1 If CISU has carried out a monitoring visit to the Danish organisation and/or partner(s), describe how you have addressed the requirements and recommendations in the monitoring report. **N. A.**

7.2 How have you used the good advice given in the Assessment Committee's letter of approval? If you have chosen not to follow the advice given, please explain the reasons why. **N/A**

7.3 If mentioned at the time of application that the partner did not comply with CISU's requirements to financial management, please provide a status and describe what initiatives have been taken to live up to the standards at the end of the intervention. **N. A.**

8. Other observations or reflections