

Progress report



- Reporting period: **1 January – 31 December 2012**
- Total budget (in €) for the reporting period:
- Name of the persons who compiled the report: **Guineviene De Jesus / Fernando J. Balmaceda**
- Date of the report: **15 February 2013**

Abbreviations / Glossary

- 143 Abbreviation for: "I Love You" (1 letter, 4 letters, 3 letters). 143 refers to an initiative of the PRC in which each Barangay is equipped with a Red Cross volunteer presence. It is envisaged to have 1 team leader; 9 disaster management volunteers; 9 community health volunteers and 25 blood donors in each Barangay.
- AADC Agri-Aqua Development Coalition
- ACCORD Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development
- Barangay Village (smallest political administrative unit in the Philippine government)
- BPP Biodiversity Partnership Project
- BFAR Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources
- CBDMT Community Based Disaster Management Training
- CBDRM Community Based Disaster Risk Management
- CCA Climate Change Adaptation
- CCC Climate Change Commission
- COMELEC Commission on Elections
- CDP Comprehensive Development Plan
- CLUP Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- CNDR Corporate Network for Disaster Response
- CorDisRDS Cordillera Response and Development Services
- DepEd Department of Education
- DA Department of Agriculture
- DENR Department of Environment and Natural Resources
- DILG Department of Interior and Local Government
- DRR Disaster Risk Reduction
- EMR Ecosystem Management and Restoration
- EJK Extra-Judicial Killing
- GEF Global Environment Fund
- HQ Headquarters
- HLURB Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board
- IIRR International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
- LMDA Lake Mainit Development Alliance
- MGB Mines and Geosciences Bureau
- LGU Local Government Unit
- NCIP National Commission on Indigenous People
- NDRRMC National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
- NEDA National Economic Development Authority
- NPA New People's Army
- PPCRV Parish Pastoral Council for Responsible Voting
- PfR Partners for Resilience
- PHL Philippines
- PAG-ASA Philippine Atmospheric Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration
- PRC Philippine Red Cross
- RCCC Red Cross / Red Crescent Climate Centre
- ToT Training of Trainers
- SIP School Improvement Plan
- UNDP United Nations Development Programme
- VCA Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment
- WI Wetlands International

1 Part I – intra-organisational developments

This section focuses on developments within the different organisations, to assess how this impacts the functioning of the organisations in relation to programme implementation. Issues are for example turn-over of (key) staff, adoption of new strategies, or the impact of programmes that the organisation manages in other fields. This section relates to individual organisations.

- a. Are there developments within individual organisation(s) that impact on the ability of the organisation to implement the agreed activities? These can be e.g. reduced availability of staff or financial resources, because of or as a reaction to external developments: have staffs been involved in the development of proposals or the management of other programmes? Is staff reduced or replaced? Have resources become available in less quantity and/or later than planned?

In 2012, the general outlook and challenges faced by the Partners' for Resilience alliance in the Philippines (PfR-PHL) could be captured in three (3) major points: (1) human resource/staff; (2) existing and new programmes/project that will complement PfR programme initiatives; and (3) May 2013 Philippine local elections.

On Human Resource

In 2012, NLRC continued to lead the PfR Alliance and a Programme Coordinator for both Philippines and Indonesia was still based in the Philippines. To support this role, and to provide support to Philippine Red Cross, NLRC has a Dutch project officer who left in 2012. She was replaced by a local staff who became the NLRC Program management Adviser. Since Philippines is a new country to NLRC, the two-man team of NLRC in the Philippines were involved in various activities of NLRC in-country including exploring new opportunities and funding for its partner-Philippine Red Cross. For disaster response alone, the NLRC representatives were engaged in discussions and formulating proposal/support to affected areas including ECHO support to Typhoon WASHI Operations in April, Flooding in Metro Manila Area in August and Typhoon PABLO in December. A maternal, neonate and Child health project proposal was also developed in 2012 together with PRC.

To relatively complete its staff complementation, in relation to its programme-related deliverables, the PRC will be hiring Specialists for the posts of Lobby and Advocacy/Monitoring and Evaluation. They will all be technically supported by the new Programme Management Adviser (PMA) of the NLRC.

Two Community Development Organizers of PRC left in 2012.

The IIRR, for its part, has hired a Regional Director for Communications Development who can provide strategic inputs for the programme.

Two volunteers of the WI started working for PfR in 2012. In addition to on site trips in the Philippines, they were also preoccupied providing support in the 2012 PfR-related meetings in Indonesia and India. For the CARE Partners, there were new staffs to work with the programme, as well as, a new Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, who will be complementing the tasks being expedited by the Project Director, Project Coordinator and the DRR Advisor.

For the RCCC, while the main focal person already moved to Vanuatu, PfR programme was still managed by her, internally coordinating with the Climate Centre staff assigned in working on the minimum standards and Parsons School of Design and the staff coordinating with the Asian Ministerial Conference on DRR and the Climate and Development Knowledge Network (CDKN). In 2013, the Centre will be hiring an additional resource person (RP), who will be providing technical assistance in the centre's Asia-based initiatives, to include that of the PfR programme. The RP to be procured will be replacing the current focal person who will be on leave in 2013.

Existing and New/Pipelined Projects

New partnership has been forged and is currently complementing PfR programme initiatives. This has been a positive development for CARE with the approval of a proposed project by the ECHO's Disaster Preparedness Programme. It started in June, 2012 and will end on December, 2013. On the other hand, CARE partners in Malabon City will be adopting the Noah's Ark Project forged between the Corporate Network for Disaster Response (CNDP) and LGU-Malabon City, for the main reason that the project's strategic direction is also along DRR-CCA-EMR.

A three (3)-year "proposal on sustainable consumption and production" was also drafted by CARE, which was framed along the DRR-CCA-EMR programme continuum. Another proposal along PfR-related mitigation initiatives was submitted and is awaiting approval from the CARE Netherlands HQ.

There was already an augmented PfR programme implementation by the RCCC, with partners in the Philippines and Indonesia, with the signing of the CDKN contract. Related agreements with consultants and implementers were signed, with other still being arranged, and will be consummated in early 2013. It involved the Parsons School of Design, consultants for the minimum standards and games development, IIR and NLRC.

The PRC and other PfR partners have also been positively looking forward to the resource mobilization initiated by NLRC via its National PostCode Lottery (NPL). The RCCC provided technical inputs in the NPL. If approved, it will augment existing funds for identified mitigation projects in communities along Lake Mainit (Mainit, Surigao Del Norte) which will also include the rest of the PRC PfR areas. The cited NLRC resource mobilization could also boost a relatively wider scope of programme coverage of the PfR alliance members.

Complementation-cum-convergence of strategies and resources, with other like-minded institutions in 2012, must therefore be continued in 2013, since this will definitely bode well in the attainment and institutionalization of PfR programme's outputs and outcomes.

May and October 2013 Elections

Election-related positioning of upcoming and traditional politicians were already observed by PfR and relayed by its community partners. The posts for the municipal, provincial, congressional and senate levels will be contested on May 13, 2013. On the other hand, the barangay/village level elections are to be held on October, 2013. This year's election is quite significant and full of anxieties, since most political analysts declared that this is, in a way, a prelude to the much anticipated election "battle royal" for the Presidential and Vice-Presidential plums in 2016, a year after the PfR programme shall have ended.

The heightened anxiety over these elections were mainly due to the possibility of those incumbent local officials, who have already been supportive and acquainted to the PfR-oriented advocacy, of not being re-elected. Consequence of which will be a relative slow-down of the pacing of programme implementation in order for the PfR teams to relegate significant quality time in conducting another round of orientation to the newly-elected LGU officials.

To mitigate the foregoing's negative impact, CARE and PRC have already been discussing, with their respective teams and local community leaders, strategies before, during and after the onset of such political affair in the country. In addition to the usual courtesy calls and protocols to be accorded to new officials, PfR teams of CARE and PRC will initiate significant time in the provision of another round of PfR orientation. Prior and during the conduct of elections, PRC has advised its local PfR teams and partners to engage with non-partisan organizations, i.e. the Parish Pastoral Council for Responsible Voting (PPCRV) in order to complement positive information dissemination of general advocacy along sustainable environment and good governance. And as has been the *raison d'être* of PfR, active electoral participation of each PfR organization, will always be on basic and low-key environmental campaign level, and not on the electoral party's and individual candidate's endorsement.

Strategies re the programme's movement and pacing during the election period may still be discussed by the PfR Alliance during its Annual Meeting this February, 2013.

A PfR advocacy angle was forwarded by CARE to be discussed among the alliance, in connection with the alleged environmentally-induced death of a Dutch national working in a central Luzon-based NGO. Extra-judicial killings (EJK), of environmental underpinning, have been increasingly recorded in the country, in addition to the other politically-motivated EJKs. Though not of a logarithmic proportion in 2012, environmentally-related threats/deaths inflicted on environmental advocates need careful reading; and strategies need to be in place to avoid, if not mitigate, such to linger.

- b. Are there changes in the external environment of individual organisations that impact on its ability to implement the programme activities, eg. security issues or legislative changes.

As congregated from the reports submitted, the variations in the external environment that the PfR organizations documented to have either directly affected or may indirectly affect programme activities and its implementation in 2012 (and years to come) can be grouped in five (5) categories. These were: (1) Weather Events/Natural Hazards; (2) Macro and Micro Policy Environment; (3); (4) 2013 Elections; and (5) Security;

Noticeably, concrete examples to substantiate the cited categories have been already highlighted in item I.a. Just the same, for emphasis, they will still be narrated in this sub-section, in order to answer the process-question posted.

Weather Events/Natural Hazards

While 2011 was bannered by the ideologically-littered burning of the mining companies' properties in the PfR area of Claver, Surigao Del Norte, triggering a national debate on the government's policy re foreign-owned large-

scale mining as a major development-facilitator, **in 2012**, the same Mindanao still touched the headlines and lives of the Filipinos and the world. But this time, via the seemingly insurmountable havoc wrought by “Super Typhoon” Bopha (local name Pablo), as Filipinos were then, ironically, in the midst of a festive yuletide mood of Christmas in December, 2012.

Bopha was, by far, the strongest typhoon that hit the Mindanao regions, packing a maximum wind of 185 kph and wind gustiness of 220 kph. Its strength was significantly proportional to its devastation to lives and properties: more than 1,000 deaths; more than 800 individuals still missing; 6.2 million survivors in disaster-affected areas still struggling for food and shelter, to include the 1.2 million families displaced; agricultural damage pegged at \$390 million (16 billion Philippine peso) and lost infrastructure amounted to PhP 7.7 billion.

Affecting 30 provinces in Visayas and Mindanao, Bopha surpassed the wreckage of TS “Washi” (Sendong) which hit the country in June, 2011.

While losses in lives and properties were not comparable to those in Davao Oriental and Compostela Valley, PFR communities in Surigao Del Norte and Agusan Del Sur also experienced the same hardship and losses due to flooding and landslide occurrences, during and even weeks after that fateful December 4, 2013 typhoon landfall.

However, out of this debacle, it brought to the fore the simple, but, significant application of PFR-related learning by Red Cross 143 Volunteers (in SDN and ADS), who initiated massive pre-typhoon information-dissemination drive and related early warning activities to their respective communities. This was documented not just by PRC PFR programme teams, but by an RCCC Intern, who happened to be in the Mindanao PFR areas (before and during the typhoon), validating the results of the conducted Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA). Anecdotal statements of the same volunteers pointed to their participation in PFR-facilitated trainings that gave them enhanced skills and commitment in the preparation, support and in dealing with a disaster/hazards whenever it strikes their areas.

Too, the cataclysmic December 2012 phenomenon all the more validated, if not a vindication, of the scientific finding relating to climate change, giving environmental advocates an additional latest “model” why initiatives should be genuinely pushed through along DRR-CCA-EMR.

The Philippines, leaving to its moniker as the world’s “Monument of Disasters”, has had a number of catastrophes before and even after Bopha. Seventeen typhoons visited the country, started with TS “Ambo,” and ending, in December 28, with TS Wukong (local name Quinta).

From January to December, an array of typhoon, flooding, landslide, earthquakes and volcanic activities were recorded in the country, per record of the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC). Among the notable ones, mainly due to the number of deaths and community displacements were as follows:

- January 25: Landslide, killing 25, 100 missing. Environmental groups pointed to the unregulated mining activities, causing the instability of the mountainside in Pantukan town, Compostela Valley province
- February 12: Earthquake, in Negros-Cebu regions; hitting directly the municipality of Guihulngan, Negros Oriental; 41 dead, 54 injured; total of 34,507 families affected in 135 villages, eight municipalities and two cities; Heavy flooding in Zamboanga Del Norte due to continuous rainfall brought about by an active Low Pressure Area (LPA); 13,327 families evacuated
- April: Cagayan flash flood affecting 3,768 individuals
- June: Mindanao flash floods; 6 dead, 68 missing; many villages affected in the provinces of Maguindanao, Bukidnon and Saranggani;
- July: TSs “Enteng” and “Ferdie”; “Gener” (international name Saola) – 4 killed, 28,631 people affected; Tornado in Jagna, Bohol, 85 houses destroyed, PhP 1.3 million worth of agricultural and infra damage; Flash floods in Maguindanao, 14 villages water-inundated
- September: Landslide in Cebu; landslide in Mati, Davao Oriental, with the large-scale mining by Bangil Mining Corporation, and 7,000 small-scale mining operators, it loosened mountainside that when torrential rains occurred for three (3) days, landslide happened resulting in 7 deaths.
- October: Landslide in South Cotabato, evacuating 600 residents; TS “Ofel”, evacuating 1,250 families in Zamboanga Sibugay; causing landslide in Aurora
- December : Super typhoon Bopha

The relative preponderance of climatic variability and extremes in the Philippines in 2012 all the more emphasized the same message and call forwarded in the PfR Alliance 2011 Report. To wit:

“The disasters that happened in 2011 highlighted the urgency to address the causes and solutions to disasters on a wider scale. CCA, EMR and DRR provide the broader perspective to address root causes of disaster risk and reduction of communities’ vulnerability. The disasters in Mindanao has made the public more aware of the impacts of environmental degradation and changing climate. These developments can be turned into opportunities for pushing forward PfR’s work and advocacy.”

Among other proactive initiatives, the current effort of government agencies, i.e. DENR, DILG, HLURB, NCIP (National Commission on Indigenous Peoples) in partnership with LGUs, in further mainstreaming CCA-DRR-EMR and biodiversity initiatives into their respective development plans, should therefore be actively supported by PfR, in whatever capacity and engagement applicable.

Macro and Micro Policy Environment

The PRC noted the continuing challenge of the full-implementation of the Republic Act 10121 or the DRRM Act. It made mention of the need for the LGUs’ focused commitment in the dispensation of its mandate per RA 10121. A case in point was the general, but, vague rhetorical statements in the LGUs’ Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP), version of which are, per 2012 record of the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) and the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), yet to be enhanced and finalized.

The PRC report made mention of the joint efforts between the LGUs-provinces of Agusan Del Sur, Agusan Del Norte, Surigao Del Norte and Surigao Del Sur, twith the DENR, DILG and HLURB, in the enhancement of the mentioned two major LGU plans, which will mainstream ecosystem-cum-biodiversity approaches into the said plans.

With the able technical assistance from DENR, these provinces will specifically re-institutionalize previously established environmental frameworks along the coastal, cropland and upland ecosystems of these provinces.

The National Greening Program (NGP) of the DENR was also considered by PRC for active complementation, especially so that it will initiate mangrove rehabilitation and related tree planting initiatives in 2013 as part of its DRR-CCA-EMR approach-application.

Efforts were also initiated by PRC to encourage LGUs in considering the use of the 10% DRRM fund into PfR-related initiatives. However, it will still be actualized in 2013.

Along the scheme of mainstreaming-cum-institutionalization, PRC PfR partnership with public schools was in the integration of the School-based Disaster Preparedness Plan into the School Improvement Plan (SIP).

As part of its DRR effort, the government, through the Metro Manila Development Authority (MMDA), has been steadfast in its position to ease out informal settlers along major river systems, which translates, among others, in the demolition of houses along the Tulyahan River in Malabon City, in order to mitigate accidents and deaths when flooding occurs.

The CARE PfR communities in Sitio East Riverside (in Potrero village), will inevitably be relocated in 2013. The CARE partners are yet to finally decide its next move, insofar as PfR programme implementation in the communities to be relocated are concerned. But its PfR-related engagement at the barangay level will remain, since it’s only the cited sitio/purok, with a total population of 4,000 individuals who will be affected, as matched with the whole barangay population of 40,000.

The above issue was first highlighted in the PfR Alliance report for 2011.

Government and CSO Partnership

Reports of CARE, IIRR and PRC cited varying levels of partnership/engagement which were in furtherance of the strategic directions of the PfR programme.

- CARE: On-going structured engagement with the LGUs, especially its DRRMCs at the municipal and village levels;

Engagement with the Department of Education (DepEd) along DRR mainstreaming into school plan; and with the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), for the same advocacy of DRR mainstreaming into the LGUs’ development plans. While these have been covered by CARE in its other project, such engagement, somehow, indirectly benefited PfR’s strategic direction.

- IIRR: Facilitation of a forum with the DENR, its Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB) was invited as discussing the mining industry in the country, an important information especially so that PfR areas in Mindanao have active and prospective large-scale and small-scale mining operation;

Participation in the *Aksyon Klima Pilipinas*, a loose network of CSOs working on Climate Change in the country; PFR design and related IEC materials were discussed and disseminated

Full membership of the PFR Alliance in *Aksyon* will be facilitated by the NLRC Country Representative
- PRC: Meeting with DENR National Office (Forest Management Bureau, FMB and Protected Area and Wildlife Bureau, PAWB), to identify areas for structured partnership which can be actualized via its current National Greening Programme (NGP), and related DRR-CCA-EMR approaches.

DENR will be endorsing PRC (and its PFR programme) to the Lake Mainit Development Alliance (LMDA), and programme-level complementation, to be coordinated by DENR, with the UNDP/GEF-funded Biodiversity Partnership Project (BPP). The BPP covers eight (8) municipalities (under two provinces), one of which, municipality of Mainit, is a PFR area in the province of Surigao Del Norte.

Reiterating the above sub-section, there are existing plans and programmes of the government upon which the PFR should continue to either attempt to or be actively engaged, depending on its capacity – technical and human resources-wise. What should just always be our guide is that, whatever knowledge product or output developed out of PFR interventions, they all have to be integrated and or synchronized in the established institutions' regular plans and programs, to engender a sense of ownership, consequently leading to the initiatives' mainstreaming and institutionalization.

All told, these initiatives found its way in the PFR's actualization of the programme's Strategic Direction 3 re Policy Dialogue.

2013 Elections

(refer to Item I, for the narrative of this sub-topic)

Security

No significant danger of human-induced political nature has compromised programme implementation in 2012, compared to the 2011 incidents, especially in PRC PFR areas in Claver, Surigao Del Norte.

Two incidents were, however, highlighted by PFR organizations. Firstly, the PRC reported an ambush-killing of a barangay/village official in Brgy. Mansayao, Mainit, Surigao Del Norte. Upon further inquiry of the NLRC adviser to a few community leaders, they alleged that the gunmen could have been operatives of the New Peoples' Army, as the fatality was active in covert counter-insurgency operations, giving the non-state armed group the basis for such EJK.

Secondly, as earlier discussed, CARE expressed concern in the EJKs of environmental advocates. High-profile of which was that of the killing of Dr. Gerry Ortega, a known environmentalist in Palawan, with no less than the government's Department of Justice (DOJ) accusing a former Palawan Governor and his Mayor-brother and who have now been declared fugitives of the law, since they are still hiding and have not yet physically presented themselves in the court, for the proper inquest proceeding for the case at bar. Dr Ortega was an actively campaigning, in his radio program and when he was then a Vice Governor of Palawan, against the massive effects of large scale mining.

Another EJK case that was cited by CARE was the death of a Dutch national (William Geertman) working with a Central Luzon-based disaster management organization, *Alay Bayan*. The tragedy was said to be related to his active environmental advocacy in Central Luzon and Aurora. As a postscript to this news, Geertman was the 3rd Dutch national killed in the country. However, there was no advocacy-related cause that was reported in the deaths of the other two Dutch nationals.

Along this context, CARE posited that a PFR advocacy should be discussed and agreed by the partners as a proactive measure in order to address the case in howsoever simple mean, as possible.

With this lingering concern, the PFR coordinated their respective activities and presence to local authorities, as has been the standard procedure. For the PRC, especially when on site visit-consultation involved representatives of foreign organizational partners, coordination with the IFRC and ICRC was promptly initiated.

2 Part II – functioning of the country team

This section focuses on the way the in-country partners operate collectively. It relates i.e. to the set-up of the country teams, frequency, efficiency and efficacy of coordination meetings, ability to manifest it as an entity vis-à-vis stakeholders, etc. Possibly also developments within individual organisations (as described in Part I) impact on this.

- a. Does the team meet frequently, are all partners able to participate? Does the team effectively reach decisions?

In addition to the regular e-mail exchanges among partners, a total of twelve (12) national-level face-to-face meetings were initiated in 2012. The monthly meetings were facilitated by the NLRC Country Representative, proposed agenda of which was transmitted to members prior to the agreed meeting-schedule. This mode of PfR Alliance coordination was, however, only applicable to Philippine-based partners, as it's not possible for WI and RCCC to be in attendance on a monthly basis due to their distant location outside of the Philippines.

Action-points and agreements, in relation to PfR-related matters (issues, concerns and updates), were documented, and subsequently shared to all members for their perusal, reference and internal organizational documentation.

In lieu of their physical presence, WI and RCCC maximized skype and email conversation-cum-correspondence for an inter-partner coordination, to include technical advice, which in some instances, had been captured in the training designs developed, as well as, the enhancement of IEC materials, and the like.

Too, on site coordination meetings with Philippine-based partners were also maximized by RCCC and WI during their representatives' official travel to the country.

Overall assessment was clearly noted by IIRR, stating in its report that, *"more visible and better coordination and partnership were demonstrated this past year. Coordination meeting has been more useful and became a venue for updating each other and deriving learning. During the regular PfR coordination meeting, partners in the Philippines were asked to share their accomplishments for the previous month/s and also shared their plans and targets for the coming month/s. This has allowed IIRR to identify areas that can be highlighted for updates / articles and also allowed everyone to ask strategic questions. This mechanism for feedbacking and updating has now been institutionalized in the coordination meetings."*

On the other hand, WI noted that while decisions were reached by the partners during meetings, WI observed that such were only on the level of *"joint meetings and trainings, and not on the level of program implementation and strategizing."*

- b. Does it operate collectively vis-à-vis stakeholders (if not, why not?).

Yes, and this could be substantiated by the activities jointly initiated/participated in. Seven (7) activities were jointly and collectively initiated by either among two or three partners. These were as follows:

- i. During the visit of WI representatives in Agusan del Sur, on May 2012, PRC and CARE visited each other's project sites. The Contingency Planning Workshop activity in Talacogon provided an opportunity for the PRC staff to observe how the activity is done.
- ii. CARE shared with partners its training modules on Community Based Disaster Risk Management, Disaster Preparedness, Contingency Planning and Community Drill.
- iii. NLRC conducted a monitoring visit in October 2012 in project areas located in the Mountain Province and Benguet. Aside from looking at the project progress, the visit also allowed for observing specific activities and learning from partners how these are conducted, and interaction with beneficiaries and LGU partners. The NLRC team's observations and recommendations were shared with the partners during the debriefing session.

- iv. Conduct of technical study re bio-rights scheme, led by WI - Indonesia in the coastal municipality of Claver, Surigao Del Norte. The activity was facilitated by PRC, with the participation of WI-Malaysia. Its conduct was an off-shoot of the Rapid Risk Assessment initiated by WI-Malaysia in the early part of 2012.

The study and assessment were the major activities initiated highlighting WI's role as an advisor, in this case, with PRC, in integrating ecosystem approach into the DRR continuum.

- v. Documentation and consolidation of the partners' "stories from the field", which populated a draft PfR coffee-table type of reading material, for publication in 2013. PfR members already submitted stories/articles, packaging/editing of which was led by the IIRR, PfR's Linking and Learning partner
- vi. PRC-facilitated DRR-CCA-EMR/Resilience Forum-Workshop, with resource persons from DENR-MGB and NLRC HQ DRR Technical Advisor. It was attended by CARE partner-organizations and IIRR.
- vii. Significant technical input provided by RCCC into the following: 1) the Dashboard concept note for its possible implementation in PfR Philippines and Indonesia; 2) training and education materials being developed by PRC; 3) creation of an information sheet on climate change and climate variability in the Philippines, for adaptation of PfR Philippine partners.

- c. Are activities of all partners aligned? Is there a shared vision on 'resilience' and 'livelihoods', and how these should be addressed? How do partners support each other's programme development and implementation in this respect? Are staff members invited to (planning) meetings or of partner organisations? Have field visits to each other's project sites already taken place?

The alignment of the partners' activities could be clearly gleaned through the consistent implementation of an array of activities categorized across the programme's three (3) strategic directions. The answers to the other process questions in this item were already captured in item b, preceding this item.

Further, WI noted in its 2012 report that partners didn't join planning-meetings of other partners. An observation shared by PRC. There were only two cases of cross-invitation among PRC, IIRR and CARE, in 2012. This was the PRC-facilitated forum and the cross visit in areas of PRC and CARE, during the WI assessment in Agusan Del Sur.

- d. Does the team apply a strategy or implementation plan for the remaining years under PfR?

The partners simultaneously conducted their respective mid-year and annual assessment sessions. Results were transformed as the programme's plan of action for the succeeding year. The accomplished deliverables were matched with the overall global target in order to ascertain each partner's contribution in the global PfR programme accomplishment.

On the part of the WI, it "developed and facilitated 'regional risk assessment workshops' for the Philippine partners working in Metro Manila and Agusan del Sur. WI created this workshop to help the partners look at the whole region and to jointly find out what the problems are and we can best address them together. During these workshops PRC, Care-partners and WI jointly:

1. Analyzed and compared the VCA/CRA's by PRC/CARE-partners and the WI assessment reports;
2. Identified and prioritized the hazardous events threatening lives and livelihoods;
3. Identified and prioritized the probable root causes of increased disaster risk; and
4. Developed coping strategies and did stakeholder mappings.

The said workshop also documented unsustainable land-use, over extraction of natural resources, pests and water pollution, as identified by the groups as (the) main sources of (livelihood) vulnerability to disasters, while (advocacy for and enforcement of) proper land-use planning, environmental regulations, flood control and rehabilitation of ecosystems were named as the most effective strategies to reduce disaster risk. These outcomes will now have to be incorporated in the plans for 2013 onward. It's to be expected that the implementing partners will come up with a joint vision and joint (advocacy and implementation) plans."

However, another challenge posed by WI to the whole alliance needs introspection. The WI report stated that "there isn't an explicit shared vision underlying PfR's activities in the Philippines."

- e. How is the DRR/CCA/EMR approach internalised, both contents and co-operation-wise? Is it applied in other DRR programmes as well? Is there more co-operation with organisations involved in PfR outside the PfR programme?

The “toolkit for community risk assessments” has been drafted. It was enhanced by the RCCC intern, needing quality discussion and finalization of the PfR alliance for its dissemination in 2013. The WI started formulating the criteria for ecosystem-smart DRR programs and projects.

Some of the PRC PfR activity-modules, like Contingency Planning, Community Drill and the VCA, were shared with staff of other Partner National Societies (PNSs) working with PRC.

In 2012, there were efforts to establish cooperation with organizations involved in PfR outside the PfR programme. For the PRC, it re-visited its strategy of engagement with DENR, by way of initiating a sustained series of meetings with its national and regional offices and officials. This simple approach of a continuous meeting with the DENR’s hierarchy, paved the way for the DENR’s commitment in finalizing a joint project implementation in the PfR areas in Claver and Mainit.

In 2013, the PRC will be looking forward for its (NHQ and local PRC/programme team) active collaborative programme implementation not only with DENR Region 13, but with the LGU-led Lake Mainit Development Alliance (LMDA).

- f. Are organisations (individually or collectively) engaged with other MFS-II alliances in-country? With Netherlands embassies? What can be said about the nature of these contacts?

The PfR Coordinator visited the Netherlands Embassy in 2012 to basically provide an overview of Alliance activities implemented in the country. The meeting paved way for future participation of the Dutch Embassy to major PfR events. As communicated by the Embassy official, they will be happy to take part or meet PfR beneficiaries so long as they are available.

- g. Is senior management of the organisations actively supporting the PfR alliance? Why (not)?

All partners guaranteed their management’s active involvement and knowledge about the PfR programme’s implementation. This was due to the fact the their respective management teams/officials were regularly updated, with others, even joining PfR Programme teams in distributing the goods procured out of the PfR fund.

Provision of just-in-time advices were also initiated which significantly informed strategic plans for PfR, as well as, guiding the PfR programme teams in the resolution of PfR-related challenges. Further, the organizations’ top officials were involved in the development of concept note for resource mobilization in favour of the PfR programme.

3 Part III – progress on programme implementation

3.1 Activities under the three strategic directions

Activities under the three strategic directions are described at output level. This can be quantitative (number of people, number of activities, frequency of meetings, etc – all in relation to the log frame’s baseline, targets, and last year’s scores) and/or qualitative (description of what has been done)

Strategic Direction 1: Community Resilience (direct intervention)

- **1.a. # mitigation measures have been implemented per community (2015 = 3 per community, with a total of 126 mitigation measures)**

In 2012, no mitigation measures were implemented. These are expected to start in 2013, since preparatory activities and processes were already initiated in 2012, which include, among others, identification of mitigation

measures by the partner communities, conduct of feasibility/technical study, and validation of the identified projects with established government agencies.

- **1.b. environmental sustainability of 100% of community mitigation measures is validated by PfR staff on basis of preset criteria (2015 = 100%)**

None yet. What used to be advised by PRC NHQ to its local chapters was that should a mitigation measure be identified, they should also consider the technical advice of the measures' appropriateness and sustainability with established agencies, i.e. DENR and Department of Agriculture.

And as stated in item 1.a, preparatory activities were conducted in 2012, an example of which was the conduct of a technical study for the possible implementation of a bio-rights scheme in partner communities in the municipality of Claver, Surigao Del Norte. It was initiated by two (2) WI-Indonesia representatives. Generally, the SDN PRC Chapter and partner communities (especially in the villages of Urbiztondo, Magpaya and Magallanes) were in agreement of the WI-recommended scheme.

Informed from WI-Indonesia discussion, the bio-rights scheme will generally initiate mangrove rehabilitation and complemented with enterprise development, all captured in an agreement between PRC and the partner community. The agreement will partly be mobilized by a stand-by fund for the cited initiative, treatment of which (either a loan or a grant) is dependent on the mutually agreed approach between the PRC and partner communities.

Upon NLRC-Philippine's discussion of the scheme with the DENR officials (national and regional levels), they posted concern as to the initial loan provision of the scheme, as this may significantly ward off community participation, given the fact that the prospective partner communities are economically poor. In DENR's decades of experience re coastal ecosystem initiatives, it perfects, together with their partner community an agreement stipulating the responsibilities and accountabilities of both parties – communities and DENR. While DENR humbly accepts failures in its previous initiatives, it can still showcase "pockets of success" on sustained mangrove rehabilitation and maintenance by communities, who are also still currently engaged in the identified enterprises out of the DENR'-facilitated programs and projects.

Still considering the proposed bio-rights scheme design forwarded by WI-Indonesia, PRC received commitment from DENR that they will draft a relatively similar design, for early 2013 discussion, agreement of which by the PRC, partner communities and DENR will usher in the stakeholders' structured engagement.

The cited scheme is planned to be implemented in 2013.

- **1.c. # community members reached with DRR/CCA/EMR activities (2015 = 65,000 of which 32,500 men and 32,500 women)**

From an aggregate number of 1,928 community members reached in 2011, there was a significant increase of 92 percent in 2012, owing to the 22,921 community members reached by PfR programme's IEC and advocacy campaign. These individuals were those who attended meetings, trainings initiated by PfR Alliance members. Table 1 below details the disaggregation of informed community members.

The PRC PfR Programme team is yet to ascertain the percentage of female coverage. It is yet to finalize re-plotting its data, using the matrix shared by CARE. The basic disaggregation of partner-communities highlights the lingering challenge of PRC in a conscientious conduct of progress monitoring and evaluation across the programme component. This is expected to be systematically resolved when a new PRC staff, shall have been hired in 2013, focusing on lobby, advocacy and monitoring and evaluation (LAME).

Table 1. Breakdown of community members reached by the PfR programme in the Philippines.

Community members	Men	Percent Men	Women	Per cent Women	Total
CARE	8,587	40	12,880	60	21,467
PRC	?	?	?	?	3,382
Total					24,849

- **1.1.a. # Communities conducted climate trend risk mapping(2015 = 42)**

For the period covered, at least 31 communities conducted climate trend risk mapping, an increase of six (6) communities coming from its 2011 accomplishment.

- **1.1b. # of communities that developed collective risk reduction plans based on climate trend risk mapping.**

Of the 31 communities that completed the community risk assessments, all 31 communities also completed risk reduction plans which include amongst others, contingency plans, Barangay Disaster Action Plans and Evacuation Plans.

- **1.1c. # of community members covered by risk plans**

A total of 92,401 community members were covered by the developed risk plans coming from 28 villages. These are the 11 areas of CARE partners and 17 community-partners of PRC.

The community members were reached via their participation in an array of the alliance members' series of stakeholders' meetings, training/workshops and public awareness activities. In CARE partners' activities, they were always mindful of the balanced participation of community folks from the vulnerable and even those less vulnerable groups, to gather as many ideas as possible and encourage the involvement of as many community folks as possible.

- **1.2a # community members are trained in ecosystem-based livelihood approaches**

This indicator has not yet been accomplished in 2012. The CARE partners and PRC are set to implement it in 2013.

- **1.2b # community members who have undertaken actions to adapt their livelihoods**

Ditto status as in 1.2a item.

Other Activities under SD 1:

Philippine Red Cross implemented various preparedness for response activities as a result of the successive discussions, assessments and risk reduction planning with the communities. In Agusan del Sur, 6 boats were identified by the communities as crucial to address early warning and evacuation of at risk population during flooding. In Valenzuela City, the communities also identified boats as an essential tool for the trained community members that they can utilize when flooding arises.

Strategic Direction 2: Empowering Civil Society (Capacity Building)

- **2a # communities where partner NGOs/CBOs have facilitated access to knowledge on disaster trends, climate projections, ecosystem data**

In 2012, a total of 31 communities (CARE partners = 14 communities; PRC = 17 communities) have been provided access to information on disaster trends, climate projections and ecosystem data.

These were communities which participated/engaged in the following activities: community-based disaster risk management, disaster preparedness and contingency planning. Related scientific data were obtained from the government's meteorological and environmental agencies, such as the DENR-Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB), PAG-ASA (Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Authority), and the Provincial and Municipal DRRMOs (Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices).

- **2b # network/umbrella organizations, developed and active:**

Apart from the existing PFR Alliance in the Philippines, no other network/umbrella organizations were developed and active. Individual alliance members have, however, been in contact with alliances that would be the PFR's additional platform in advocating its strategies. For IIRR, it has been attending meetings facilitated by *Aksyon Klima*, a local network working on Climate change. In its November, 2012 regular meeting, the NLRC Country Representative relayed that she will take on the initiative of arranging the administrative back staffing for the Alliance's *Aksyon Klima* membership.

- **2c % partner NGOs/CBOs engaged in structured dialogue with peers and government on DRR/CCA/EMR**

Zero engagement in 2012. However, initial coordination efforts with other Red Cross National Societies and select national government agencies had a potential of graduating into a structured dialogue-cum-partnership.

- **2.1a % partner NGOs/CBOs trained on DRR/CCA/EMR**

Eighty two (82) staff and network/chapter members and volunteers were trained. CARE partners accomplished 61, while, PRC trained 21 individuals.

The capacity building activities were in the forms of training-oriented approaches, i.e. Training of Trainers (ToT) mainly-initiated by CARE partners. Further, there was also a Training-Workshop jointly developed by PRC and IIRR. It was attended by staff of PfR alliance members. The main Resource Person of such DRR/CCA/EMR activity was the NLRC HQ Technical Advisor on DRR.

These and other capacity building initiatives should have now provided the necessary learning curve for the partners to finalize the agreed minimum standards of an operational DRR-CCA-EMR design by 2013.

- **2.1b # (Partner) NGO/CBO have established cooperation with knowledge & resource organizations (e.g meteorological institutes, universities, etc)**

Three (3) knowledge and resource organizations were actively networked and coordinated with by the alliance members. For the CARE partners and PRC, they were able to effectively maximize information and resources of PAG-ASA and DepEd. These government organizations were partners in the mainstreaming of disaster preparedness in schools and in the communities.

For IIRR, it regularly attended the activities of Aksyon Klima in 2012. IIRR shared PfR programme updates and related initiatives, i.e. risk assessment toolkit, among others.

- **2.2a # Organisations (including non-PfR) involved in DRR/CCA/EMR coalitions**

There was zero accomplishment in this indicator for 2012. The PfR Alliance is yet to formalize its membership in Aksyon Klima.

- **2.2b # of times DRR/CCA/EMR related topics on agenda of platforms/ networks**

- **Extra activities that contributed to Strategic Direction 2 (Linking and Learning activities, and related technical assistance for enhanced capacity/technical knowledge)**

a. **South to South Citizenry-based Sub-Development Academy (SSCBDA):** All PfR alliance members participated in the 5th SSCBDA held in Indonesia It was organized by the Partners for Resilience (PfR) Alliance in Indonesia, with support from the Special Unit of South-South Cooperation in UNDP Asia Pacific Regional Center in Bangkok. The 5th SSCBDA aimed to explore how communities are strengthening their resilience in a changing world and to provide a venue for experience and learning exchange. Around 160 people coming from communities, civil society organizations, research institutes, knowledge centers as well as Indonesian government representatives have come together to participate in this meaningful event. IIRR prepared an article after the event and was posted on PfR's facebook account, as well as, in the IIRR's monthly updates. The RCCC also provided technical assistance in the development of a concept note for a school field session.

b. **VCA result validation.** An intern from King's College, recommended/placed by the RCCC with the PRC PfR program team. She conducted an *in situ* review and validation of the VCAs done by the PRC programme teams. The Intern visited all three (3) PRC PfR areas in Valenzuela, Agusan Del Sur and Surigao Del Norte. The validation report was subsequently submitted to PRC PfR, highlighting a number of major recommendations, which included, among others, the regular validation of VCA, as well as the results' triangulation with existing secondary data and meteorological and environmental agencies in the country. Value-added technical assistance was

also provided by the RCCC intern in the draft PfR PHL toolkit for risk assessments. She also made a first-hand documentation of the devastation by the super typhoon “Bopha/Pablo” which wreaked havoc in Mindanao regions, which include PfR areas in Surigao Del Norte and Agusan Del Sur.

- c. **CDKN Project.** Climate Centre, along with strong input from partners, facilitated a workshop on the creation of minimum standards for DRR and CCA. This has also prompted Wetlands to create minimum standards for integrating EMR into DRR. Minimum standards have been documented and further finalised in the second half of 2012. A policy brief on the min standards process was created for and distributed during the AMCDRR. Plans are underway to test the standards with partners in Philippines in early 2013.

Climate Centre, in conjunction with Parsons School of Design, contracted an experienced game developer to travel to Indonesia and Philippines to kick start the 3 year games development process with partners. Initial games were played in 5 workshops at provincial and national levels. Feedback will now be used to develop existing games into Indonesia and Philippines contexts as well as develop new games for partners based on their communicated challenges in 2013. These innovative approaches can assist partners in communicating difficult concepts and dealing with difficult topics such as probability, environmental degradation and linking communities with decision makers. Contract with Parsons has been finalised and signed and sent to them.

Preparations are underway to develop a writeshop with IIRR in 2013 that will document and share experiences of partners with much wider local, national, regional and global levels.

- d. **Feasibility Study of a Bio-Rights Scheme in PRC PfR areas.** This was done by WI-Indonesia representatives, with the participation of representatives from PRC, WI-Malaysia and NLRC-Philippines. It was sponsored by PRC PfR NHQ, and was conducted in the three (3) villages in the coastal municipality of Claver, province of Surigao Del Norte. The results and recommendations were presented by WI-Indonesia to local partners in Surigao Del Norte (village, municipal, provincial LGU representatives and to the members of the local PRC board of directors) and with PRC NHQ and NLRC – Philippines.
- e. **Monthly coordination meetings.** These were conducted mainly in the Philippines, during which progress against results, stakeholder meetings, linking and learning, policy and advocacy and communication were discussed, among others. For WI and RCCC partners, their coordination to the alliance were via skype meetings, email correspondence and meetings when their respective representatives visited the country in 2012.
- f. **Joint engagement with Environmental Government Agencies.** In Agusan del Sur, a joint coordination meeting with the staff of Provincial Environment and Natural Resources Office (PENRO) and Agusan Marsh Protected Area Superintendent (PASU) was held, attended by CARE, PRC and Wetlands. The PfR programme was discussed, and the partners also provided a brief background on their respective organisations. The PENRO and PASU, through a presentation, discussed the profile of the Agusan Marsh as well as the various projects and studies being done. They expressed openness in providing support to PfR for specific undertakings in the future.

Strategic Direction 3: Institutional Environment / Policy Dialogue

- **3a # of processes started to reduce identified national and local institutional obstacles to DRR/CCA/EMR activities in the communities (in terms of communication between departments, appropriateness of laws)**

Zero accomplishment for 2012. However, a simple strategy has been started by PRC in its advice to its local programme teams. It is in the aspect of integrating developed plans, i.e. Contingency Plans (CP), Barangay Development Action Plan (BDAP), School-Based Disaster Preparedness Plan (SBDPP) into the government agencies'/institutions' strategic and institutional plans. This is, in a way, the actualization of a more enhanced institutionalization of PfR-related initiatives, not just in the regular daily routine of its community members/volunteers, but more on the initiatives' mainstreaming into a government's regular plan – all in the interest of sustainability, even beyond the timeline of the PfR programme.

For the CP and BDAP, the advice was for its synchronization-cum-integration into the LGUs' Barangay Development Plan and at the municipal level, in its Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP). It integration assures its tactical and strategic implementation, especially so if the appropriate continuing budgetary allocation will be approved by the LGUs, for its Annual Investment Plan (AIP).

For the SBDPP, it has been recommended to be inter-phased with the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP is the main document-plan of the Philippines' basic education (to include pre-elementary, elementary, secondary and alternative learning system (ALS) levels) upon which all initiatives and plans should be included.

The above processes of integration will be initiated in 2013.

- **3.1a # Governments/ institutions reached with advocacy activities by Civil Society and their networks and platforms (same with previous process question in other SDs)**

From an array of different structures, the CARE partners and PRC have been able to touch base with a total of 69 government agencies, offices and institutions (local and national levels). This was the combined figure from CARE (32) and PRC (37).

At the village/barangay level:

- Barangay officials and staff, Barangay Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (BDRRMC)

At the municipal level:

- Local chief executives, municipal line agencies, i.e. Municipal Agriculture Office, Municipal Planning and Development Office, Municipal Social Welfare and Development Office, Municipal Council, Municipal DRMMC
- Schools, and their respective Schools Division Superintendent, Principals

At the provincial/regional levels:

- Governors of Provincial Governments, and provincial line agencies, i.e. Provincial DRRMC, Agriculture, Social Welfare
- Regional offices of government agencies, i.e. DepEd, DENR, MGB, PAG-ASA

- **3.1b. # of (local) government institutions actively engaged in activities(meetings/field visits/training)**

For 2012, 58 government agencies/institutions actively participated and or served as resource persons in activities initiated by the CARE partners (21 offices/institutions) and PRC (37 offices). These were mostly the same institutions mentioned in item 3.1a

- **3.1c # of countries, where the connection between DRR, CCA and EMR has explicitly been mentioned in official government documents. None**

- **Extra activities that contribute to strategic direction 3**

The Lobby and Advocacy road map discussed in 2011 did not yet take-off in 2012, as targeted. This was mainly due to the absence of a full-time staff/specialist/consultant leading its dynamics. The move of NLRC to fund a position and to be included in the PRC PFR Team, was another front seen upon which the cited work shall materialize in 2013.

Discrepancies between planning and achieved results

Please fill up, as in the 2011 report, the table below.

Table 2. Discrepancies between the budget and actual expenditures in 2012.

	Budget	In-Country	Difference	Explanation (for filling up and further
--	--------	------------	------------	---

	EUR	Expenditure		enhancement of partners concerned)
CARE				<i>There has been general delay in programme implementation such that target accomplishments have not been achieved on time. Factors in the delay include delayed programme setting up, staffing, setting common time of CARE partners for staff training, and engagement of CARE partners in emergency response that takes away some time from the programme.</i>
Red Cross	Euro402,595.76	EURO226,484.09		<i>Overall, the accounts payable will be paid in early 2013. These were all related to the procurement of services (IEC collaterals, Bio-rights scheme technical study) and goods (motorboats, etc). Some activities were not being implemented because of typhoons and floods.</i>
Cordaid (IIRR)				
RCCC				
WI				
Total				

Sustainability

A “menu” of sustainability drivers identified for 2012, and beyond, were all institutional, in nature, covering capacity building strategies and organizational structures. First off, programme implementation via rights-based approaches, as highlighted by the CARE partners. This approach encourages rural folks, especially the most marginalized and disadvantaged, to effectively partake in program implementation, without fear of being manipulated and be always at the receiving end of the decision of the rural elite, as has been noted in other foreign-assisted projects in the Philippines.

The PRC, on the other hand, focused (and will still be) on the organization and strengthening of the PRC 143 volunteers across the villages where PfR programme is being and will be initiated. The community organizing effort, was complemented (as had been also done by the CARE partners) by community development, which meant the conduct of capacity building work among organized community members, to systematically increase its “voice” in project management, consequently, engendering that much-needed sense of ownership among the community members, institutionalization of which is directly proportional to having the PfR programme initiatives sustained.

Capturing the programme agreements in legal instruments and regular plans, i.e. LGU resolutions, CLUP, CDP were seen effective in spreading the programme implementation across wide population within the programme areas, due to the legal imprimatur it had with the LGUs. These resolutions and plans (integrating PfR initiatives) could also be a positive take off point with new or incoming local officials, for their respective continuation of the initiatives that have so far been started.

Another sustainability-cum-institutionalization driver was the dialect-localization of IEC materials, and the mode the trainings were conducted. The power of using the area’s mother tongue can no longer be debated, insofar as comprehension and continuous learning and adaption are concerned.

Another potent force was (and must be) the documentation and dissemination of effective (and even worst) PfR programme practices, for shared learning within and outside of the PfR alliance, to major stakeholders, i.e. community members, government agencies, and partner CSOs. A PfR programme strategy that was (and will be up until 2015) the focus of IIRR.

The PRC will also provide technical assistance to its local programme teams for the crafting of a community-driven Sustainability Plan (SusPlan). With the communities’ interest and commitment up front, the SusPlan will

take into consideration the plans of other major stakeholders that have social mandate with the communities. These stakeholders include the village/municipal and provincial LGUs, national government agencies (DENR, NCIP, among others), the CSOs and the private sector.

On the part of RCCC, it stated that the inputs it provided in the PfR training materials will enable wider implementation during and after the PfR programme.

Efficiency

Major efficiency measures initiated and suggested by the PfR Alliance partners were as follows:

CARE. *Community trainings are done within the community, as a means to ensure high level of participation and completion, and to keep costs low. When the activities are timed at harvest season, the community participants even contribute part of the food. On a case to case basis, clustering of schools across neighbouring barangays is sometimes done depending on the manageable number of participants and distance from one another. Travel of staff to project areas is also maximized by being able to participate in and monitor activities for several days at a time.*

Procurement procedures of CARE are applied, or the local partner's, whichever is stricter. This contributes to maintaining cost-efficiency of PfR.

IIRR. *Conduct of joint activities, which should be continued, to have more people to participate and resource maximization (human and financial). Conduct of linking and learning activities as joint activities will continue as this is a cost effective mechanism.*

Furthermore, the conduct of regular desk level and in situ monitoring and evaluation and meetings/consultations (with basic monitoring tools), provided the just-in time evaluation of programme implementation, without which the organization would not be able to identify major backlogs and its appropriate resolution, consequently leading to more backlogs and programme-related bottlenecks.

Quality

Among the major tools/approaches used to ascertain quality programme implementation were as follows:

- **Regular monitoring** (monthly, quarterly, mid-year and year-end). This was backed up by standard monitoring forms to capture the programme's update, providing the necessary technical assistance, coaching/mentoring for an enhanced initiation of activities. The reports were used as feedback mechanism to the programme teams, as well as, with major stakeholders, i.e. community partners, LGUs and other government agencies;
- **Formal and informal meetings.** Taking off from documented reports, meetings were regularly initiated for feedbacking – updating, issue resolution, effective practice documentation.

Ascertaining quality were regularly matched, although in varying degrees, with indicators such as sustainability, relevance and efficiency.

For WI, it provided a consolidated input re sustainability, quality and efficiency. It says:

“For the sustainability, the quality, as well as for the efficiency of the PfR Philippines program it will be necessary in the upcoming time to really integrate the ecosystem approach in the implementation part of the program and to focus on an advocacy strategy, as the partners committed to during the Regional Risk Assessment workshops. Failure to do so would have a far-reaching impact on the success of the programme, as the project areas in the Philippines are subject to large scale and grave environmental degradation, directly linked to increased disaster risk. For instance, the increased flooding problems in the Agusan marsh area likely originate from logging, mining and agriculture developments upstream and uphill (outside of the project area's province). Without addressing the root causes of these problems it will be hard to make a fundamental and lasting change in the livelihood and resilience situation in the project areas.

The large geographical scale, many stakeholders, and gravity of the problems make it difficult however to address these problems within the PfR program currently. Not addressing them would mean we are only working on preparedness and relief though. These are important too, but without addressing the root causes, we run the risk that our work on preparedness and relief might prove to be limited to mere 'Band-Aid solutions'. So it's a big and important challenge for us to redirect our work and efforts from the community level to also working on influencing and contributing to policy dialogue and other (environmental) initiatives in the regions."

ANNEX: Monitoring report PfR Philippines 2011