Mid-Term Review and Evaluation Report

Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA) in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes

Submitted to the

National and Economic Development Authority (NEDA)

18 December 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the lead Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. The project period was extended from its original June 30 2012 end date to December 31, 2013. This mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) was conducted between May and September 2012. The review was undertaken through document review, individual and group interviews (e.g., focus group discussion) as well as observation. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

A year and a half after the project's national launching in October 2009, a Regional Implementation Plan was put in place in order to assist provinces formulate DRR/CCA enhanced Provincial Development Physical Framework Plans (PDPFP). A co-financing arrangement with NEDA-Agricultural Staff through its project on Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund 1656: Strengthening the Philippines' Institutional Capacity to Adapt Climate Change (MDG-F 1656 Programme), the project has expanded its geographical coverage. It covers 50 provinces distributed in 15 regions of the country (all except Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao and National Capital Region).

In a nutshell, the project objectives, relevant as they are to Philippine government priorities and the needs of the beneficiaries, are being achieved on track despite delays and staffing challenges. In the first year, the elections created delays in the project – a risk that implementers failed to factor in. In terms of operational efficiency, management of activities so far has responded to the needs though not without periods of strains in project staffing. Institutional arrangements and management arrangements plotted by the MOUs and Regional Implementation Plan have succeeded to lead towards the completing the outputs and achieving the outcome. The deliverables are being generated through a highly consultative process.

Two outputs define Outcome 1 - Local level land use and development planning and decision-making processes to reflect DRR/CCA priorities in an integrated fashion. To enhance local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change, Output 1 activities consist of IEC/advocacy and capability building. Highly region-specific audio-visual presentations drew a positive reaction from the stakeholders. The ToT program introduced key concepts and techniques to 150 participants thus leading to the project implementation in the selected regions. This was achieved with good gender balance.

Output 2 is the incorporation of DRR/CCA concerns in the land use and development plans of the target LGUs. Despite a setback in the development of the methodology, scientific and technical support from the S&T agencies and project consultants gave rise a simplified procedure now incorporated in the form of guidelines. Pilot testing in Region 13 makes the Guidelines useful, however simplification is needed. A User's Manual to guide the provincial planners in the DRA steps has been produced. Completed and under review, the manual is intended for provincial planning offices, which can provide technical assistance to their component LGUs in land use planning. The DRA methodology for city and municipal land use planning has been developed and tested within the context of the 12-step CLUP process as HLURB implements.

In Region 2, a GIS-based information system called Climate Change and Disaster Risk Information System for Planning (CRISP) was developed. CRISP is a significant vehicle towards institutionalizing the regional information system. Project activities have further strengthened collaboration among regional offices of national agencies. The Project's has so far contributed positively towards attaining local level land use and development planning and decision-making processes that integrate CCA/DRR priorities in the Region 13 pilot area of Surigao del Norte province consisting of the municipalities of Claver, Gigaquit, and Bacuag and Surigao City (ClaGiBaS). Horizontal and vertical linkages of the provincial and municipal/city government have been strengthened among the HLURB Region Office, government departments and S&T agencies. The shepherding role of Neda Regional Office (NRO) and guidance by the province proved beneficial to the four LGUs. The procedure, which adopts HLURB's 12-step process is adequate and training of other LGUs by HLURB indicates its high degree of relevance.

To achieve Outcome 2 - Enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing climate change & disaster risk, the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2011-2028 (Output 3) was drafted through a multistakeholder process that gathered 200 people from government, civil society, academe and professional groups. Signed by the President on November 22, 2011, it took effect under the legal framework provided by Climate Change Act (Republic Act 9729) of 2009. The Law that created the Climate Change Commission was created as an independent and autonomous agency, attached to the Office of the President, and replacing the Office of the Presidential Adviser for Climate Change (OPACC). The law also required the climate change action plans at the national and local level.

On Relevance: Vertical and horizontal linkages with key stakeholders defined by working arrangements through strategic partnerships made it possible to address each others' needs and contexts. The Project focused implementation on capacity building in GIS-based hazard/risk mapping and writing skills, developing a suitable disaster risk and vulnerability assessment methodology. Risk-enhanced planning was made possible through skills development and tools for the local planner.

On Effectiveness: Advocacy using region-specific audio-visual presentations and information and education campaign at the Project's beginning paid off as these significantly contributed to raising awareness about DRR/CCA links. Training of local planners and academicians helped create a core group aligned with Project's objectives.

On Efficiency: The implementation arrangements especially with the NRO as the regional focal center succeed in addressing capacity gaps effectively drawing local planners and others as well into the mainstreaming process. Utilizing expertise of S&T institutions as 'sounding board' and doing related studies is noteworthy. Adaptive management and the co-financing arrangement with the MDG-F may have introduced additional demand on staff time, but have increased geographical coverage and impact of the project.

On Impact: A few cases of local chief executives putting priority of disaster risk reduction measures and actions supportive of the project were brought to the reviewer's notice. Much is expected out of the Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans to support mainstreaming over the 66% of the provinces covered by the project's disaster risk and vulnerability assessment (DRVA). The Project achieved gains in addressing gaps in the areas of knowledge, skills and especially attitudes.

On Sustainability: That planners look forward to the time when Project outputs would advance mainstreaming was impressed on this reviewer. Ownership among LGUs is evidenced by this planners' conviction however the risk of an LCE's outlook running counter can prove to be a constraint to sustainability.

Gender participation in capacity building activities is balanced.

The following recommendations are offered:

1. The communications plan should take into account the resources that can strategically push the mainstreaming agenda. While the essential messages are brought to different stakeholders and project outputs are disseminated, the means to do these should consider the comparative advantage of well thought-out approaches.

2. The Project Team must ensure that all deliverables such as the guide, reference manuals, risk-enhanced plans and others are communicated well to their specific target groups and local stakeholders.

3. Present the results of the project through audio-visual presentation about the country's experience in mainstreaming focusing on the progress that the project achieved in the regions.

4. The Project Team has rightful claim over the output derived or produced from the project including hazard maps especially those in digital form. Therefore, all users of the output are enjoined to refer to the source and give due credit to the Project.

5. NEDA-RDCS and NROs should encourage trained provincial planners and staff through its continued support to provincial LGUs. NEDA should advocate that provincial governments continue the work began and train staff members who have not been trained yet, seeking renewed commitment from LCEs to ensure sustainable human resource for GIS, especially.

6. NEDA must continue not only its efforts to backstop the technical needs of the sub-national planners as they refine the DRVA and plans, but also strategically act to address what LCE's and decision makers might need.

7. Design and implement writeshops for the enhancement of PDPFP, e.g. in different economic sectors (livelihood, business, commercial) /agriculture/technology that could be adopted by the province. This requires a session wherein planners work together with the consultant on the integration of the comments received.

8. Consider how transboundary (interprovincial) hazards might be dealt with in the context of contiguous LGUs and/or watershed and implications on emergency preparedness and inter-governmental arrangements.

9. Find ways and means to contribute to a DRR/CCA platform, such as the donor forum or other discussion fora to discuss and seek solutions, synchronize efforts, reinforce gains, increase efficiency and effectiveness. .

10. Provide practical advice on funding opportunities and options to fund the needs of offices of provincial and municipal core team members.

11. Package the experience of Region 2 concerning its spatial information system so that it can serve as a practice guide for data and map sourcing, and institutional arrangements.

12. As GIS being part and parcel of the approach, provide practical suggestion on the use of alternative GIS software including GIS freeware such as Quantum.

13. Explore the utility of the coordinative set ups such as the Regional Land Use Committee and the Inter-Agency Task Force on Geographic Information in promoting dialogue on the management and utilization of geographic information for future operation of information systems.

14. Strengthen existing mechanisms among government agencies so that HLURB, DILG, MGB, and provincial offices of other agencies be strengthened.

15. The Project should find ways and means to promote the project and make its concerns known to stakeholders in the academe and education.

The project, to a certain extent, brings to the fore, the need for strategic alignments so that the future demand in DRR/CCA, specifically in the knowledge base related to mainstreaming can be met. Empowerment of the subnational units is taking place. This however needs a shepherding environment or guidance which needs to be provided by national agencies and mechanisms. If DRR/CCA is to be whole-of-government, then this will require a systemic change, a holistic outlook to resource allocation and risk-enhanced investments. Therefore, education, S&T, labor, transportation, infrastructure and utilities, and other sectors move together in synch.

ABBREVIATIONS and ACRONYMS

APSEMO - Albay Provincial Safety and Emergency Management Office
AusAID - Australian Agency for International Development
AV – Audio Visual
CCA - Climate Change Adaptation
CCC - Climate Change Commission
CCO - Climate Change Office
ClaGiBaS - Claver, Gigaquit, and Bacuag and Surigao City
CLUP - comprehensive land use plan
CRISP - Climate Change and Disaster Risk Information System for Planning
DILG – Department of Interior and Local Government
DPWH – Department of Public Works and Highways
DRM – Disaster Risk Management
DRR – Disaster Risk Reduction
DRRMO - Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office
DRVA - Disaster Risk and Vulnerability Assessment
EGF - Experts' Group Forum
ENR-EMB - Department of Environment and Natural Resources- Environmental Management Bureau
EO - Executive Order
FGD - Focus Group Discussion
GIS - Geographic Information System
HC - High Consequence
HLURB - Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board UNDAF - UN Development Assistance Framework
HP - High Probability
IEC - Information and Education Campaign
IP - Implementing Partner
IRA - Internal Revenue Allotment
KII - Key informant interviews
LCEs - Local Chief Executives
LCP - League of Cities of the Philippines
LGU - Local Government Unit
LMP - League of Municipalities of the Philippines
LP - Low Probability
LPP - League of Provinces of the Philippines
MENRO - Municipal Environmental and Natural Resources Officer
MGB - Mines and Geosciences Bureau
MIS - Management Information System
MOA – Memorandum of Agreement
MPDC - Municipal Planning Development Coordinators
MTRE - Mid-term Review and Evaluation
NAMRIA - National Mapping Resources and Information Authority
NAPCC - National Action Plan for Climate Change
NCCAP - National Climate Change Action Plan
NCIP - National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
NDRRMC - National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
NEDA - National Economic and Development Authority
NEDA -RDC – National Economic and Development Authority - Regional Development Council
NGA - National Government Agencies

NRO - NEDA Regional Office
NZAP - New Zealand Aid Program
OPACC - Office of the Presidential Adviser on Climate Change
PAGASA - Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration
PCT - Provincial Core Team
PDPFP - Provincial Development Physical Framework Plans
PDRRMC - Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
PHIVOLCS - Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology
PPDO - Provincial Planning and Development Office
PR -Responsible Partner
RCT - Regional Core Team
RDC - Regional Development Council
RDRRC - Regional Disaster Risk and Reduction Council
RGIN - Regional Geographical Information Network
RLUC - Regional Land Use Committee
TA – Technical Assistance
ToT – Training of Trainers
UNDP – CPAP - United Nations Development Programme's Country Programme Action
UPLB - University of the Philippines at Los Banos
ZO - Zoning Ordinances

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Evaluation

1. NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff is the lead Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project). Started in August 2009, the project completion date has been moved from August 2012 to December 2013.

2. The mid-term review and evaluation of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) was conducted from May to September 2012. This independent evaluation is an integral part of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework. The Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) and the Climate Change Commission (CCC) are the Partner Agencies, which undertake a particular component of activity of the project. Apart from these, NEDA Regional Offices and partner universities/ research institutions assist in the implementation of specific project activities and generating the deliverables. The Project Board provides overall supervision and policy directions to the project.

3. The project as designed aims to mainstream the integrated concerns of disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) into local decision making and planning processes by: (a) enhancing local awareness and understanding of climate change and its aggravating effect on existing natural hazards, (b) developing tools to enable the formulation of physical framework/land use and development plans that address existing hazards whiles considering climate change risk; (c) demonstrating practical integrated DRR/CCA approaches at the community level; and (d) improving the national enabling environment through national and local DRR enhanced CC plans and multi-stakeholder coordinating mechanisms.

4. The project not only has significance to the Philippines in light of escalating disaster and climate-related risks, exposure and impact but because the country has been increasingly experiencing weather variability and climate extremes. The project is specifically relevant to one of the outcomes in the 2005-2009 UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Philippines, namely: "increased capacity of stakeholders to protect/enhance the quality of the environment and sustainably manage natural resource." The 2004 UN Common Country Assessment, which influenced the UNDAF and the United Nations Development Programme's Country Programme Action Plan (UNDP-CPAP) for 2005-2009, explicitly recognizes climate risks. The UNDP-CPAP period that was extended until 2011 is characterized by significant changes in the legal and institutional landscape and frameworks. Since their promulgation, the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act. 10121) and the Climate Change Act of 2009 (Republic Act No. 9729) are being implemented further underlining the need to enhance previously- established linkages while others are made or rearranged.

5. The project is relevant for local government units, which are required by the two laws to develop and adopt disaster risk reduction and management plans and local climate change action plans. There is a need to develop capacities of local government functionaries "to determine the probable extent of impacts and identify the most effective risk management measures." Due to the inability to make risk-sensitive plans, settlements, agricultural, eco-

nomic and infrastructure activities are sited in unsafe and unsuitable locations. Associated with risk assessment and DRR/CCA is the need for enhanced geo-referenced information support system viz a vis planning. Developing capacities in terms of generating, maintaining and using hazard and risk information to mainstream DRR/CCA need urgent attention.

6. The project document refers to the "dichotomy in developmental governance," that has surfaced was introduced of local autonomy in 1991. The project is therefore conceived to deal with this issue such that "discontinuity in the line of operational governance between the national government agencies and local government units" may be mitigated. Current multisectoral mechanisms that provide a link among regional offices of national government agencies and LGUs include the Regional Development Council, the Regional Disaster Risk and Reduction Council, and certain oversight functions, such as that of the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) over the comprehensive land use plans (CLUPs) of cities and municipalities.

7. Disaster risk reduction (DRR) can be "the first line of defense against impacts of climate change." Thus, shifting risks associated with climate change need to be taken into account so vulnerability in the medium to long term is consequently reduced while undertaking DRR measures. While the integration of DRR and climate change adaptation have been recognized as national policy, actions at the provincial and local levels require concerted efforts aided by tools in order to guide risk-sensitive development planning and support to bridge capacity gaps. Mainstreaming DRR and CCA concerns begins with raising awareness (Output 1: Stakeholders' awareness, understanding and competencies) and then followed up by practical demonstration. Thus, the project also targets the enhancement of subnational land use/physical framework plans through integrated DRR/CCA (Output 2: Incorporation of DRR/CCA concerns in land use and development plans) and pilot communities (Output 3: Practical DRR/CCA strategies) that demonstrate climate change adaptation. In the original project document, only ten (10) provinces were targeted. This has been increased to 50 provinces (or 62.5% of all 80 provinces), as explained in the next section. These provinces are those covered under the Hazards Mapping and Assessment for Effective Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (READY Project) – both UNDP and GOP funded. Also included are some demonstration sites of MDG-F 1656 Programme and provinces deemed to be exposed to significant natural and/or climate-related risks.

8. The preparation of the National Action Plan for Climate Change (NAPCC) (Output 4: Policy/ programme instruments) and recommendations from the NAPCC planning process shall have provided the setting for multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing climate change. Lastly, collaborative mechanisms at national and local levels (Output 5: National and local multi-stakeholder mechanisms) shall have been strengthened and supported through technical backstopping, enabling environment, and capacity development.

9. The report contains results of the mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE). It is divided into four parts. Part I provides the background, objectives, scope, limitations, and methodology. Part II discusses the baseline situation and the project as implemented. Part III presents the findings of the assessment in terms of the review criteria and lessons learned. Part IV provides conclusions and recommendations.

1UND, 2009, Project Document: Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes, p. 5.

B. Objectives

10. As part of monitoring and evaluation framework, the mid-term evaluation is an independent review to assess progress on outputs/outcomes and identify areas for strategic or programmatic adjustments, if necessary. The objectives of the MTRE are:

    (a) To find out the extent to which the Project was able to achieve its development objectives and operational targets

    (b) To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems adopted with regards to planning, coordination, and use of designated resources

    (c) To preliminarily assess the sustainability context

    (d) To provide recommendations in order to improve management and implementation arrangements to achieve targets within the given timeframe.

C. Scope and Limitations

11. This mid-term review relies on qualitative information generated through primary data gathering. Opportunities for triangulation were sought. However, not all data/information can be treated in this manner especially as certain key players have not been interviewed despite several attempts.

12. The project covers 60 provinces located in 14 regions. As the review has to be completed in five months, primary data gathering can only be done in four regions, i.e. one-fourth of the country's regions where 17 provinces are situated. For some parameters, the results obtained may, to a certain extent, be biased by the geographic scope defined by political boundaries of selected provinces. The results from the focus group discussion (FGD), should then, in part be attributed to political dynamics and regional characteristics, and be taken in their respective contexts. Such issue is considered when answers are sought to explain specific responses or opinions expressed.

13. This report does not attempt to cover areas which the two audit reports have dealt with, especially concerning financial matters.

D. Methodology

14. The evaluation was conducted through a consultative process as well as an objective review and analysis of the project's annual reports, documents, internal reports and summaries, programme archives, national development documents, and relevant documentation which provided evidence to sufficiently describe the assessment parameters concerning the project's progress. The parameters were based on criteria found in AusAID's guidelines on the design and conduct of independent progress reports.

15. Apart from desk review, the methodology employed are essentially social methods of research such as: (1) key informant interview (KII) using a questionnaire guide that focuses on particular agencies/institutions vis-a-vis outcome/output, (2) focus group discussion (FGD) using a questionnaire guide, and (3) study or field visits where observation and interview methods are utilized for more insights. Details of the data gathering process are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Details of data gathering process: methodology, objective, suggested respondents.

Output (Focus of query)	Methodology	Major objective	Respondents
1 - Stakeholders' awareness, understanding and competencies (Feedback on information materials, follow up of post-training evaluation surveys)	KII (1) <Annex B>	To find out the extent achievement has been attained (awareness level, knowledge of DRR/CCA, mapping skills and writing skills for risk assessment)	Participants of training courses and orientation seminars (local chief executives, planners, academe)
2 - Incorporation in land use & development plans (Users' feedback of vulnerability assessment report and other deliverables, field survey of pilot communities, feedback on risk-based plans)	FGD (1) <Annex G>	To find out the extent achievement has been attained; To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	Members of the Regional/ Provincial Core Team in 4 regions with selected or all provinces that participated in the project
	KII (2) <Annex C>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; To assess the sustainability context	Senior official from Regional Offices of partners such as HLURB
	Observation/ field study	To assess the sustainability context	Provincial DRM and planning offices
	KII (3) <Annex D> or FGD (2) <Annex H>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	Expert Group/ Project Board Members such as PHIVOLCS and PAGASA
	KII (5) <Annex F>	To assess the sustainability context	HLURB
3 - Practical DRR/ CCA strategies (Feedback on vulnerability assessment reports, initial plans and strategies)	FGD (1) <Annex G>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	(same as and integrated into Output 2 instrument)
4 - Policy/ programme instruments (Feedback on NA-CPCC, the planning process, and its implementation)	KII (4) <Annex E>	To assess the sustainability context	Ms. Joyce Goco, CCO

5 - National/local mechanisms (Feedback on national and local multi-stakeholder mechanisms)	FGD (2) <Annex H>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems To assess the sustainability context	Project Board Members such as League of Provinces, Leagues of Municipalities, Leagues of Cities, OCD, UNDP

16. After the opening meeting with the NEDA-RDCS (IP), the approach and methodology were adjusted to be responsive to issues/concerns reflected during the Fourth Project Board Meeting.

17. Thus, the evaluation process was undertaken as follows:

(1) Submission of Inception Report (Annex A), wherein details of the evaluation methodology are outlined.

(2) Desk review or review of annual reports, programme documents, internal reports and summaries, programme archives, national development documents, and other documents pertinent to the evaluation parameters.

(3) Data gathering through key informant interviews (KIIs) focus group discussion (FGD) focusing on each of the five outputs and field observation (Table 1). The interviewees are representatives from the RPs and/or Experts' Group, as well as participants of the training events and workshops organized for Outputs 1 and 2. Feedback about the training workshops and information materials (Output 1) are be obtained in the course of the data gathering phase. Survey instruments for KIIs and FGDs are attached. The design is guided by evaluation parameters based on criteria of AusAID's guidelines (Table 2). Observation and informal interviews during field visits to pilot sites will be utilized for Outputs 2 and 3. The questionnaire-guides are in Annexes B to H.

(4) Analysis that systematically utilize collated data and information, and probe further

(5) Synthesis that seeks to organize results of the analysis towards making a whole and coherent set of findings and recommendations

(6) Submission of Draft Report which incorporates all major findings and recommendations from the evaluation

(7) Review of Draft Report by NEDA-RDCS and relevant stakeholders

(8) Submission of Final Report which incorporates comments of NEDA-RDCS and relevant stakeholders.

18. Outputs listed in Table 2 have corresponding deliverables. These deliverables are further listed in Table 3. The same AusAID evaluation criteria are later used to assess the deliverables that have been largely advanced or accomplished at the time of the mid-term review. Each deliverable is given a rating using a five-point rating scale (High, Medium-High, Medium, Medium-Low or Low) per criteria. At this point of the project, relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency emerge to be most suitable, in view of the

Table 2. Evaluation matrix using AusAID's Guidelines.

Evaluation criteria	Output 1 Stakeholders' Awareness, understanding and competences	Output 2 Incorporation in land use & development plans	Output 3 Practical DRR/CCA strategies	Output 4 Policy/ programme instruments	Output 5 National & local mechanisms
Relevance					
Effectiveness					
Efficiency					
Impact					
Sustainability					
Gender equality					
Analysis & learning					

Note: The first five are criteria of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC). The last three are AusAID's additional evaluation criteria. (AusAID, 2011. Guideline: Manage the Independent Evaluation of an Aid Activity).

Table 3. Outcomes-Outputs-Deliverables Matrix.

UNDP CP Outcome: Key stakeholders are better able to manage environment and natural resources, develop and use sustainable energy sources, cope with the impacts of environmental emergencies and maintain sustainable development.		
Project Outputs	**Project Outputs**	**Deliverables**
Local level land use and development planning and decision-making processes to reflect CCA/DRR priorities in an integrated fashion	1. Local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change are enhanced	1. IEC/Advocacy 2. Capability building activities
	2. CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/ municipalities/ cities	3. Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA at Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning 4. Draft Framework and Process for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Local Investment Programming including Financing/Resource Mobilization, and Project Evaluation and Development (secondary entry points) 5. Handbook on Information Support System on Hazards and Risks for Local/Subnational Planning 6. Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans 7. Disaster Risk Assessment (Vulnerability Assessment of 50 provinces, co-financed with MDG-F) 8. Twenty provinces with DRR/CCA enhanced plans (10 provinces under co-financing with MDG-F; 10 provinces under NZAP) 9. Four DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPS with Surigao City, and the municipalities of Claver, Gigaguit and Bacuag 10. Support provided in the updating of National Framework for Physical Planning 11. Support to Region 10's Project on "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management and Climate Change Adaptation, and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development/Physical Planning

Project Outputs	Project Outputs	Deliverables
	3. Practical strategies for climate change adaptation/DRR are demonstrated at the sub-national level	1. Documentation of adaptation strategies in local communities
Enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing climate change & disaster risk reduction in an integrated manner	4. Policy/programme instruments for enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation to address climate change developed	2. National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP)
	5. Mechanisms for multi-stakeholder cooperation on climate change at national and local levels strengthened	3. Multi-stakeholder mechanisms

fact that the rest of the criteria may have heavier bearing on the final outcome. High is the best rating while low is the worst rating. The rest are within the equally-spaced ratings, and therefore medium (or Med) is midway between worst and best.

19. In the FGDs, respondents were members of Regional/Provinces Core Teams; field visits were made in provinces of the region where FGDs were conducted. Provinces were selected from the suggested regions, namely: Regions 2, 4A, 6 and 13, with Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao represented. To select the provinces, the following criteria were used:

    (1) Level of development (as characterized by economic activities, infrastructure, built-up areas, etc.)

    (2) High/low level of progress in project implementation and/or existence of pilot project

    (3) Proneness to both high probability/high consequence (HP/HC) and low probability/high consequence (LP/HC) hazards

20. Provinces were selected such that extremes of most criteria were represented. The selected provinces were:

    (1) Surigao del Norte, Agusan del Norte, Surigao del Sur, Agusan del Sur (Region 13 CARAGA)

    (2) Quezon, Cavite, Laguna, Rizal , Batangas (Region 4A -CALABARZON)

    (3) Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Nueva Vizcaya, Quirino (Region 2-Cagayan Valley Region)

    (4) Aklan, Antique, Iloilo (Region 6-Eastern Visayas)

Note: Provinces in **bold** appear to have no significant LP/HC hazard (specifically, earthquake).

21. The schedule of interview, FGDs and observations as implemented is shown in ANNEX I.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Baseline Situation

22. The MDG-F 1656 Capacity Assessment report (2009) noted that the capacity gaps in climate change adaptation are: (1) The enabling environment on CCA needs to be advocated; (3) Inadequate data and information ; (4) Insufficient physical and financial resources; (5) Inadequate human resources and leadership; and (6) Institutional roles are not well defined as well as coordination.

23. The same capacity gaps surfaced in the course of interviews and FGDs. These concerns are consistently recurring themes which then leads us to point out problems that are systemic or chronic rather than merely a sectoral concern. It was observed that although DRR and CCA linkages are being appreciated by various stakeholders, the level of understanding was lower at the local level.

24. The project document identified several completed and ongoing projects in the country that tackle disaster risk reduction. The dimension of climate change in hydrometeorological hazards had been a factor influencing attempts by government to attain sustainable development. During the course of the Project, two laws that would affect development planning rather profoundly were passed. The Climate Change Act and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act were passed in 2009 and 2010, respectively. These two laws provided the legal framework underpinning the creation of an enabling environment to mainstream DRR and CCA. The projects dealing with DRR and CCA, plus the laws, were expected to address the gaps mentioned above.

25. There is a need for capacity building for mainstreaming DRR/CCA in many levels, both in terms of governance levels or levels of government, and 'layers' of institutional capacities. In general, DRR seems better understood than CCA. CCA is "not yet highly appreciated at the local level," as one League official commented during an interview. Then again, both government and technical staff and local chief executives (LCEs) require support to fulfill the requirements of the two new laws in addition to those that have been in effect before.

26. LCEs are the ones deciding on what adaptation projects have to be implemented even *without the benefit of guidelines*. It has been pointed out in interviews that climate scenarios, "too technical as they are, are very difficult to understand." While climate change takes place in span of 50 years or more, the term of office of LCEs is only 3 to 6 years. The disparity between the two time scales make it challenging to induce LCEs to put priority on DRR/CCA.

27. Rational planning is part and parcel of a planner's work. However, the Philippine planner's work has been hampered by lack of planning tools that incorporate disaster and climate risks, apart from an institutional environment that has only recently become more supportive of mainstreaming. Natural hazards, in the past, have been dealt with more like aberrations in nature, whereas these are obviously part of the earth's geophysical and environmental makeup. With increasing frequency of extreme weather events and variable climate, and more people and property exposed to flash floods, rainfall-induced landslides, high wind, and supertyphoons, Philippine planners have matured to appreciate them especially when hazard events severely affect his/her planning area. This observation has been confirmed in this project.

B. Manner of Implementation

28. NEDA-RDCS, through the Project Management Unit (PMU) undertakes project management. An Expert Group is the sounding board to ensure technical soundness and consistency of methodologies, frameworks and strategies with current policies and programs on DRR and climate change. Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS), Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomic Services Agency (PAGASA), Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB), National Mapping Resources and information Authority (NAMRIA), and Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) have been mainly called for Expert Group Meetings in order to provide the technical expertise to tackle issues and recommend actions. The Project Board has met three times since its first meeting on September 29, 2009, Members of the Project Board include AusAID, DILG, DND-OCD, PAGASA, PHIVOLCS, HLURB, League of Cities of the Philippines (LCP), League of Provinces of the Philippines (LPP), League of Municipalities of the Philippines (LMP). NEDA and UNDP are the co-chairs. At the passage of RA 9729 or Climate Change Act, the Climate Change Commission (CCC) was established as the "sole policy making body to coordinate, monitor and evaluate programs and actions plans of government related to climate change." It was at the Third Board Meeting held in January 19, 2011 that the CCC was formally announced as the Responsible Partner replacing the Department of Environment and Natural Resources- Environmental Managament Bureau (DENR-EMB).

29. As the lead national agency of government in socioeconomic and physical planning, NEDA has been carrying on its mandate to prepare development plans while integrating cross-cutting concerns such as gender and sustainable development and into account both national and local needs. The NEDA-RDCS is mandated to assist provinces and thus, deliverables of the project are directed towards that end, specifically in the area of DRR/CCA. Thus, some project deliverables have been put under the Technical Assistance to Provinces on the Formulation of Disaster Risk Reduction/Climate Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA)-Enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans (PDPFPs). The outputs and implementers according to the Regional Implementation Plan of the said Technical Assistance are shown in Table 4. Within an adaptive management framework, the project has undergone revision as explained below.

Table 4. Key activities according to the Regional Implementation Plan.

	Component	Outputs	Implementer
1	Organization and capacity development of regional core teams	1.1 Regional Core Teams (RCTs) 1.2 Manual for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA for Provinces	NEDA-RDCS
2	Organizing the provinces	2.1 Preparation of advocacy materials 2.2 Advocacy briefing for the Regional Development Councils, local chief executives and other provincial functionaries, and other stakeholders 2.3 Forging of partnerships between NROs and pilot provinces through a MOA 2.4 Creation of Provincial Core Teams (PCTs)	RCTs with NRO as lead

3	Disaster Risk Assessment-Part I	3.1 Mapshop 3.2 Mentoring and coaching for provinces on the preparation of hazard characterization and vulnerability profile 3.3 Regional review of hazard characterization and vulnerability profile	NROs
4	Disaster Risk Assessment-Part II	4.1 Area briefing for RCTs on frequency analysis, consequence analysis, risk estimation, risk evaluation and prioritization 4.2 Mentoring and coaching for provinces on frequency analysis, consequence analysis, risk estimation, risk evaluation and prioritization 4.3 Regional review of outputs for DRA-Part I and DRA-Part II	NROs
5	Integrating DRA Results in the PDPFP	5.1 Mentoring and coaching for provinces on the preparation of draft DRR/CCA-enhanced PDPFPs 5.2 Area review of the draft DRR/CCA-enhanced PDPFPs	NROs
6	Integrating and legitimization	6.1 Conduct of public consultation 6.2 Revision of draft DRR/CCA -enhanced PDPFPs 6.3 Approval of DRR/CCA -enhanced PDPFPs 6.4 Finalization of DRR/CCA -enhanced PDPFPs	NROs
7	Project management and monitoring	7.1 Project management and monitoring 7.2 Forging of MOA with NROs.	NEDA-RDCS

30. The Regional Implementation Plan was prepared in consultation with the NEDA Regional Offices (NROs). A memorandum of agreement (MOA) between NEDA-RDCS and NROs was signed. In order to incorporate the disaster risk and vulnerability assessments (DRVAs) into the PDPFPs of 10 more provinces, NEDA-RDCS forged a co-financing arrangement with NEDA-Agricultural Staff through the project on Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund 1656: Strengthening the Philippines' Institutional Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change (MDG-F 1656 Programme) 6 under Joint Memorandum

[6] The MDG-F 1656 Programme is a Joint Programme between the Philippines and the Spanish Government through the NEDA Agriculture Staff and the UNDP. Implementation period is from 2009 to 2011.

Table 5. Provincial coverage of Integrating DRR/CCA and MDG-Projects on the Formulation of DRR/CCA Enhanced Plans.

Region	No. of provinces	AusAid/MDG-F	NZAP
CAR	6	Abra, Benguet, Mountain Province, Ifugao	Apayao, Kalinga
1	4	Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, La Union, Pangasinan	
2	5	Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Nueva Vizcaya, Quirino	
3	7	Aurora, Bulacan, Pampanga, Zambales	Bataan, Zambales, Nueva Ecija
4A	5	Cavite, Laguna, Quezon, Rizal, Batangas	
4B	5	Oriental Mindoro, Marinduque	Occidental Mindoro, Romblon, Palawan
5	6	Camarines Norte, Catanduanes, Sorsogon, Albay	Camarines Sur, Masbate
6	6	Aklan, Antique, Iloilo	Capiz, Guimaras, Negros Occidental
7	4	Bohol, Cebu	Negros Oriental, Siquijor
8	6	Samar, Biliran, Leyte, Southern Leyte	Eastern Samar, Northern Samar
9	3	Zamboanga del Norte	Zamboanga del Sur, Sibugay
10	5	Bukidnon, Camiguin	Misamis Occidental, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Oriental
11	4	Davao Oriental, Compostela Valley,	Davao del Sur, Davao del Norte
12	4	Sarangani, South Cotabato, Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat	
13	5	Agusan del Norte, Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Norte, Surigao del Sur	Dinagat Islands
ARMM	5		Tawi-Tawi, Basilan, Sulu, Maguindanao, Lanao del Sur
Total	81		

Note: (1) All regions except National Capital Region (NCR) are being assisted. (2) The NZAP-funded provinces are listed here (see third column) for information purposes only. This midterm review does not cover these provinces.

Circular No. 1.[3] Prior to the latest Board Meeting held this year, the Project covered 50 provinces shown in Table 5.

[2]The MDG-F 1656 Programme is a Joint Programme between the Philippines and the Spanish Government through the NEDA Agriculture Staff and the UNDP. Implementation period is from 2009 to 2011.
[3]Since the above revision, additional financing was obtained through the New Zealand Aid Program (NZAP) in 2011. NZAP is funding the technical assistance (TA) to the remaining 30 provinces for the preparation of their

31. Among the agreements in the Fourth Project Board Meeting held last 16 February 2012 were:

    - Output 5 (Multistakeholder Mechanisms) already allocated PhP2.592 million out of the project budget, will be retained, focusing on developing and strengthening local level multistakeholder mechanisms.

    - The project will be extended until December 2013 to allow for: (a) review, revision and pilot testing of integrated disaster and climate risk assessment methodology, and (b) completion of three (3) major outputs, i.e., Supplemental Guidelines on Integrating DRR/CCA in Subnational Development and Physical Framework Planning, vulnerability assessment reports, and 80 DRR/CCA-enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans.

    - Funds will be realigned in accordance with the amended 2012 Work and Financial Plan.

32. To be aware of the broad context in which mainstreaming is being pursued, a chronology of relevant events/highlights in the internal and external environment of the PMU is given in Table 6. Though beyond the control of the PMU, the external environment may actually hasten, impede, or influence certain project activities. Strategically, opportunities can be utilized, challenges met with resources and together with stakeholders with common concerns. One significant item is President Aquino's Administrative Order No. 1 of September 17, 20010. It instructs LGUs to integrate disaster risk management strategies in the development planning process. It also directs NEDA to conduct capacity building activities in the use of the Guidelines on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-national Development and Physical/Land Use Planning at the local, regional and local levels.

C. Status of Project Output

33. At the time when the review was conducted, the deliverables were at various stages of development. These are noted in Annex K.

DRR/CCA-enhanced PDPFPs. Due to the aftermath of Typhoon Sendong in Cagayan de Oro City in December 2012, the NZAP is supporting the one-year project "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development Planning Project" of NEDA Region 10 which started in May 2012. The Region 10 project covers all five provinces and three cities (Cagayan de Oro, Iligan and Valencia) and outputs will be one Regional Physical and Framework Plan, five PDPFPs and three Comprehensive Land Use Plans.

III. FINDINGS

34. In a nutshell, the project objectives, relevant as they are to Philippine government priorities and the needs of the beneficiaries, are being achieved despite delays and staffing challenges. In the first year, the elections created delays in the project – a risk that implementers failed to factor in. Adaptive management and the co-financing arrangement with the MDG-F may have introduced additional demand on staff time, but have increased geographical coverage and impact of the project. The audit reports provide adequate indication in terms of financial efficiency, which is not a focus of this MTRE. In terms of operational efficiency, management of activities so far has responded to the needs though not without periods of strain in project staffing. Institutional and management arrangements plotted by the MOUs and Regional Implementation Plan have succeeded to lead towards completing the outputs and achieving the outcome. Findings and observations specific to Outputs 1 and 2 are found in Annex L.

35. Increased capacities in the local level indicate that the project has been effective towards attaining the expected outcome ("local land use and physical planning and decision making processes reflect DRR/CCA priorities in an integrated manner"). The impact is felt most directly by government personnel in the planning and other departments of provinces in terms of increased capacities in human (technical). Ownership ranges from medium to high; the degree of ownership has been found to vary according to peculiar situations in LGUs. Some local chief executives put lower priority to mainstreaming DRR/CCA than others; the changing composition of provincial core teams and poor attendance of follow-up regional workshops in some cases. Judging from requests and enquiries about the project output received by trained planners/officers, the project has started to influence local decision makers and stakeholders in terms of planning ahead with risk factors in mind. There are significant signs that incorporating disaster risk reduction now matters in socio-economic development as well as disaster preparedness.

Table 6. Selected highlights during the project period to date.

Date	External environment	Internal environment
July 22, 2009		Project document signed
August 2009		Partner meetings
September 24, 2009		First project board meeting
October 2009	Passage of R.A. 9729 – Climate Change Act of the Philippines of 2009	
October 22, 2009		National launching
December 2009		Regional launchings
January 8, 2010		Second project board meeting
April 30, 2010	Pres. Arroyo approves National Framework Strategy for Climate Change	

September 17, 2010	Pres. Aquino direct LGUs on disaster risk reduction planning through Administrative Order No. 1	*Note: A.O. No. 1 directs NEDA to conduct capacity building activities on the use of the Guidelines on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Subnational Development and Physical/Land Use Planning at the local, national and regional levels.*
January 18, 2011		Third project board meeting
April 16, 2011		Regional Implementation Plan on the Technical Assistance to Provinces released
May 13, 2011		Auditor's 2010 report submitted
February 16, 2012		Fourth project board meeting
May 24, 2012		COA 2011 audit report submitted
May 2012		MTRE consultant hired
June 2012	HLURB announces a zero backlog in CLUPs by 2013 by adopting the cluster approach to fast-track the preparation of CLUPs and Zoning Ordinances of LGUs.	MTRE Inception Report submitted
July 2012	HLURB announces commencement of GIZ assistance in the integration of DRR/CCA into CLUPs of LGUs.	

36. There were significant gains to promoting linkages among LGUs, the science and technology agencies, and the NROs. The Region 13 office of HLURB demonstrated good horizontal integration; the coordination mechanism that has evolved augurs well in term of replicating a capacity development scheme for risk-enhanced land use planning among cities and municipalities. It goes without saying that it is but appropriate for NEDA, in the remaining period of the project, to resolutely implement a communication plan that answers the questions of its stakeholders.

37. An area needing improvement though is making use of or encouraging academe's participation, particularly that the need for GIS professionals has been recognized as critical while considering also a major technical aspect of mainstreaming, namely risk mapping. Likewise, the project has potentially opened avenues for partnerships with the Leagues -LCP, LMP, and LPP, which generally recognize the value of the Project for their respective constituencies.

38. In Table 7, the deliverables are described in terms of the contribution to the country's planning system or achievement as against the objectives. The project aims "to mainstream the integrated concerns of DRR and CCA into local decision making and planning processes." The remaining four are very much in their early commissioning so these are not described below. In the third column are comments in the form a brief outlook statement on opportunities or what are desired to advance Project objectives. They indicate what possibilities might be useful to further enhance the project outcomes.

Table 7. Summary table of contribution/achievement per deliverable.

Deliverables	Contribution/Achievement	Comments/Outlook
Output 1		
1. IEC/Advocacy	Awareness level of various stakeholders became significantly higher through region-specific AV presentations in regional launchings.	Effectiveness of AV materials can be once again harnessed in order to disseminate the project results/outcomes.
2. Capability building activities - Trained local planners, academicians - Local functionaries in orientation-workshops	Required regional interventions were understood through capacity assessment. Only a few academicians remain within in the project's sphere of influence. Good gender balance among the trainees was achieved.	The training experience can be built upon in many ways. Those who participated may again be invited to join forthcoming activities. A "report back" is useful in terms of providing closure and affirming achievements. Local planners trained by the project should continuously upgrade their planning skills, methods and tools.
Output 2		
3. Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning (see No. 6 below)	Pilot testing in Region 13 makes the project highly relevant to cities and municipalities. Best way to see the methodology in practice, despite data and map availability issues.	A simple, user-friendly volume to guide LGU users is desired.
4. Framework and Processes for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Local Investment Programming including Financing/Resource Mobilization, and Project Evaluation and Development *(secondary entry points)*	Just started. A consultative approach has given a boost to the interaction of experts/scientists with local planners. The project is a conduit for bringing science to different communities, a challenge to S&T institutions.	The project should continue to promote the linkage of science with local disaster and climate risk governance since the utility of scientific/technical input to the planning environment has been proven.

5. Handbook on Establishing, Managing and Maintaining DR/CR Data System	Protocols needed in information are being designed to make these acceptable for wider application. The pilot GIS-based information system called CRISP developed for Region 2 is a model that works on an interoperable system in NRO and DENR.	A user-friendly volume is desired, as guide to information system that can serve as a practice model for other regions and provinces. A priority for future is how to deal with the challenge on expanding the system to other regions and government agencies. Tapping existing networks such as the Regional Land Use Committee presents an opportunity to sustaining related discussion and action.
6. Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/ DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans (see No. 9)	The reference manual is the result of the pilot test in three municipalities and Surigao City in Surigao del Norte province. The Project has duly adopted HLURB's 12-step process for the CLUP, effectively incorporating localized DRA procedure, and utilizing GIS-generated base maps and hazard maps in decision making.	A user-friendly practical guide that communicates the scientific and evidence-based procedure to local planners is desired. While the manual offers the mainstreaming tool for LGUs, the appurtenances of sustaining the new system (including hardware maintenance and appropriate staff complement) need to be seriously anticipated and looked after.
7. 50 Vulnerability assessment reports	Despite the technical setback, introduction of disaster risk assessment as part of the planning process is a significant contribution. The reports and DRR-CCA enhanced PDPFPs, demonstrate to a large extent, the project's effectiveness.	For future, new developments such the PHIVOLCS national exposure database and updating of existing tools can even enhance risk-sensitive planning as the capability to generate risk scenarios improves. Such scenarios shall be the basis for the preparedness activities of LGUs. The skills of technical sectoral and planning personnel should continuously be upgraded. They should have access to knowledge products relevant to mainstreaming.
8. 50 DRR-CCA-enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans (PDPFPs)	The project led the planners to the resources and/ or necessitated them to look for data/maps. Linkages were established. Planners gained confidence in the process and framing strategies incorporating DRR/CCA measures Contrary to hiring external consultant, learning by doing increases sense of ownership.	These plans have high potential to re-orient development thrusts and reduce disaster risks as constraints are recognized. Thus, (1) data/map providers need to pay attention to collection/production and quality control of of useful data/maps; (2) local planners' skills to communicate well to officials/decision makers need to be enhanced.

9. Four DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs in the municipalities of Claver, Gigaquit, and Bacuag and Surigao City (ClaGiBaS)	The pilot case concretely demonstrates how risk assessment supports local development planning in an economic growth center. It showed how to operationalize the tools and link the process with the Annual Investment Plan and the PDPFP. The process brought out the needs related to data and mapping.	To date, HLURB Region 13 has been conducting training using the methodology in an easy to adopt manner. HLURB Central Office indicates this is the way to go and finds the training opportunity complementing its "clustering" approach.(Note 2). The new system requires a good supply of GIS personnel and improvement in data and mapping resources.
10. Support provided in the updating of the National Framework for Physical Planning	*Just started*	NA
11. Support to Region 10's Project on Disaster Risk and Climate Change Adaptation and Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Development/Physical Planning	*Just started*	NA
Output 3		
12. Documentation of Adaptation Strategies in Local Communities	*Just started*	NA
Output 4		
13. National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP)	The NCCAP is firmly established and on-going projects at CCO implement some parts of the plan.	There is need for local planners and politicians to understand that: (1) The LCCAP and DRRMP are complementary; (2) DRVA provides the hazard profiles in these plans.
Output 5		
14. Multistakeholder mechanisms	In progress. The Project Board's decision to shift focus from national to local mechanism is laudable.	Communicating with local stakeholders about project results is an important direction. The multistakeholder mechanisms must be supported by well thought-out communication strategies, with some emphasis on supporting the role of planners and increasing awareness among elected officials.

Note: (1) CRISP means "Climate Change and Disaster Risk Information System for Planning." (2) NA means "no applicable" because no substantial activities had been undertaken while the review was undertaken.

Note: (2) Articles appearing in the Internet and newspapers deal with "cluster" approach," HLURB's technical assistance strategy to achieve the goal of zero backlog on CLUPs and zoning ordinances. (e.g., Aznar, Mia A., HLURB offers program for LGUs to draft less costly land use plans, Oct. 22, 2012 (http://hlurb.gov.ph/

39. In Table 8, the deliverables are given a rating using a five-point rating scale (High, Medium-High, Medium, Medium-Low or Low) in terms of the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, gender equality, analysis/learning. High is the best rating while low is the worst rating. The rest are within the equally-spaced ratings, and therefore medium (or Med) is midway between worst and best. The lowest rating given in the table is Med.

40. It is observed that most Med ratings are under Efficiency; one of the factors considered is project delay. However, rated High are mainly Relevance and Analysis/Learning. Well-conceived project objectives reflect the needs and contexts of beneficiaries in the Philippines, while there are also signs that learning gained from the previous mainstreaming project has been integrated into the present project. Effectiveness, measuring the extent to which activities contributed to achieve outcomes, is High in IEC/Advocacy at the beginning of the project, the on-going production of the Handbook on Establishing, Managing and Maintaining DR/CR Data System, Reference Manual, and DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs.

41. In terms of Sustainability, it is difficult to determine how much the DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs in the next months will be carried on to municipalities and cities, other than those covered by the project (i.e., ClaGiBaS). Attempts to interview HLURB Central Office failed, however in fora where participant observation was done by the consultant, it is gathered that certain aspects of the project output (the methodology) have been adopted; thus a rating of "Med-High."

A. Relevance of the Project

42. Relevance is defined by the extent objectives address the needs and contexts of beneficiaries, as well as the priorities of both the Philippine and Australian government. Australia recognizes that the new laws and associated policies are yet to be put in practice at the local level, institutional capacity needs to be strengthened and knowledge gaps filled.[5] The project as implemented has been aligned with the Australia-Philippines Aid Program Strategy.

43. Apart from the natural disasters that befell the country in the past few years, DRR and CCA is at the center of attention among LGUs also because of the DRRM law and Climate Change Act. This is because LGUs are required by law to have DRRM and Climate Change Action Plans. The project contributes to these plans through the recognition of constraints to development. The training of trainers (ToT) program essentially introduced key concepts and techniques and eventually led to the project implementation in the selected regions. Significantly, the project capitalized on the use of a geographic information system (GIS) to produce hazard maps needed in subsequent analyses.

[5] Commonwealth of Australia, 2012, Australia-Philippines Aid Program Strategy (2012-17), Australian Agency for International Development (www.ausaid.gov.au/publications).

Table 8. Mid-term rating of deliverables against AusAID's evaluation criteria.

Deliverable	Rele-vance	Effective-ness	Efficiency	Impact	Sustainability	Gender equality	Analysis/ learning
Output 1							
1. IEC/Advocacy	High	High	Med	High	Med-High	Varied	Med
2. Capability building activities	High	Med-High	Med-High	Med-High	Med	High	High
Output 2							
3.Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/ CCA in Subnational Development and Land Use/ Physical Planning	High	Med-High	Med	Med-High	Med	Varied	Med-High
4.Framework & Processes for Main-streaming RR/CCA in Local Investment Programming including Financing/ Resource Mobilization, & Project Eval-uation and Development *(secondary entry points)*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5.Handbook on Establishing, Managing and Maintaining DR/CR data system	High	High	Med	Med	Med-High	NA	High
6.Reference manual on mainstreaming CCA/DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans	High	High	Med	Med-High	Med-High	NA	High
7.50 Vulnerability assessment reports	High	Med-High	Med	Med-High	Med-High	NA	High
8.50 DRR-CCA-enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans	High	Med-High	Med	Med-High	Med-High	NA	High
9.4 DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs	High	High	Med	High	Med-High	NA	High
10.Support provided in the updating of the National Framework for Physical Planning	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
11.Support to Region 10's Project on Disaster Risk and Climate Change Adaptation and Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Development/Physical Planning	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Output 3							
12.Documentation of Adaptation Strategies in Local Communities	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Output 4							
13.National Climate Change Action Plan	High	Med-High	Med-High	High	Med-High	NA	High
Output 5							
14.Multistakeholder mechanisms (Partial)	High	Med-High	Med	Med-High	Med-High	NA	Med-High

Note: NA means "not applicable" and Varied means "many events were the headcount was not made."

44. Mainstreaming requires both vertical and horizontal linkages with stakeholders defined by working arrangements. These are best demonstrated by partnerships. Strategic partnerships were achieved through memorandum of agreement as main instrument. Others with which NEDA has formal agreements with are its implementing partners like the Central Office and Region 13 Regional Office of HLURB and Climate Change Commission (CCC). However, between the LGUs and national agencies, there appears new channels of partnerships that can be explored to benefit the institutionalization of mainstreaming processes. In the case of mapping, no form of expressions of partnership needed to be put in place.

45. Contiguous municipalities that share common and/or similar concerns became part of "clustering" and so this was the case of ClaGiBaS spatial planning. The three municipalities and one town in the region are part of a technical assistance that produced base and thematic maps through the project by mentoring planners on how to use ArcGIS10.

46. The LGUs are breaking new ground by producing their own hazard maps, i.e. something that has not been done before. There could be new partnerships struck between the parties concerned using the newly obtained GIS capability as leverage. Similarly, data and information linkages with information bearer need to be established so that the needed data are utilized and incorporated into spatial databases and GIS-based support systems.

47. GIS-generated maps were enhanced compared with maps produced before the project. This resulted in a better appreciation of maps; enhanced technical expertise; acquisition of ability to use tools and maps; recognition of gaps in risk-sensitive planning, particularly data gaps; use of spatial data (available to the provinces) and thus becoming better equipped to plan. Planner's skills to conduct disaster risk assessment and vulnerability analysis were developed.

48. The capacity of provincial planners to deal with disaster-related matters improved in terms of individual professional skills, planning tools and maps. The project equipped them with the tools and know-how where none not practically existed before. With the technical capacity to make the risk-sensitive Provincial Development Planning Framework Plan (PDPFP), provincial planners could do it without hiring consultants for help. The prospects towards utilizing such newly-found skills in future planning activities of the province improved.

49. The planners were enabled to conduct risk assessment by using tools such as software for simulation and consequence analysis made available by the project. This was a far cry from previous practice when a planning document would merely contain a list of disasters with no analysis at all. The new technique developed analytical skills among the planners.

50. Project output particularly hazard maps found use for other purposes, revealing a demand for these and providing opportunity for the LGU to work together with some stakeholders in more appropriate ways. Availability of hazard maps proved useful when mining companies and prospective investors in the mining industry needed advice or approval of mining permits, and when nominees for the Gawad Kalasag awards by the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO). The LGU could respond to requests for maps from municipal engineers and provincial agencies, such as the Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (PDRRMC), Municipal Environmental and Natural Resources Officer (MENRO), National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and the Philippine Army at no added cost to hire GIS consultants.

51. Doing their task to coordinate the project, the provincial officers were able to establish

planners of the NRO, HLURB Regional Office and ClaGiBaS city/municipal planning offices expressed satisfaction over the working arrangements among themselves in Region 13.

52. The influence of the technical assistance to Surigao del Norte can be measured in terms of the extent in which knowledge of the hazards and risks is applied to land use decisions, and particularly to zoning ordinances, or translated into projects in the plan. The pilot case has illustrated this influence particularly when supported with studies and evidence-based analysis.

53. The different levels and number of government institutions involved can impede progress in implementation when issues are not anticipated and properly addressed. While working with ecotown LGUs, the CCO[6] cited political issues specifically concerning the relationship between provincial and municipal levels; without dealing with this relationship, serious barriers can slow down a smooth process to introduce project interventions. CCO suggests that inasmuch as the linkage and integration of DRR/CCA are the major concerns, common understanding among provincial and municipal stakeholders must be reached with respect to how the disaster risk reduction and management plans (DRRMP) and climate change action plans (CCAPs) at the national and local levels are linked.

54. When parallel efforts by government agencies like HLURB and DILG are not well coordinated, there is a risk that the introduction of mainstreaming is delayed. Simple ways to incorporate DRR/CCA into the process include a checklist and a set of basic requirements to be undertaken or produced, or inclusion of DRR/CCA concerns in the preparation of the CLUP. The Project has adopted HLURB's 12-step process for the CLUP. Consequently, this is expected to minimize confusion among LGUs. Nevertheless, the issues and concerns of respective agencies need to be recognized by all concerned; they need to work together and eventually enter into an MOU.

55. This brings to mind HLURB's cluster approach, which is described as "a strategy of providing or extending technical planning assistance to a group of LGUs in the formulation or updating of their respective CLUPs and zoning ordinances." One of the aims is "to provide an interactive environment where the LGUs can compare and share experiences and ideas on land use and development planning." One of the impacts of the project is the link with the CLUP and the application of tools developed in the project to enable local planners to produce risk-enhanced plans. It is stated below (No. 86) that HLURB Regional Office serving CARAGA (Region 13) has been training city and municipal planners on a simplified version of the tool.

[6]The Climate Change Office (CCO) assists the CCC to ensure mainstreaming of climate change, in synergy with DRR, into the national, sectoral and local development plans and programs. Apart from the budget appropriated by government, the CCO currently carries out its mandate in the areas of coordination, policy development and oversight through various projects generously funded international donors (see Annex). Ecotowns are being funded jointly by the CCO's budget and international donors such as Korea's Global Green Growth Institute and USAID for different components and locations. Through this program, the Climate Change Office is able to exercise its role as facilitator or driver in promoting sound measures dealing with future climate change scenarios.

56. Information about DRR/CCA activities can be communicated through feedback mechanisms in each region and province. Another view expressed is that information sharing and communication about the project should be designed especially for government agencies/ institutions that are relevant to climate change. Efforts to enhance and strengthen feedback mechanisms can be expected to stimulate the process for localized multistakeholder mechanisms in a particular geographic/planning area or watershed.

57. Feedback heard from a few participating LGUs is that the project's process/methodology of integrating DRR/CCA is highly technical. There is therefore a need to guide the planners and possibly, provide them with a simple material to follow. Additionally, the new cadre of planners steeped in tools for risk-enhanced land use planning and investment planning necessitate holding a forum to allow cross-learning and updating of knowhow and skills.

58. Apart from the national and local partnerships made possible by the project to date, the additional financing arrangement with New Zealand to support expanded activities in Region 10 for the remaining period of the project augurs well for future bilateral partnership between the Philippines and New Zealand.

59. The project brings out the fact that there is need for data generation at provincial level and for a scientific basis for planning. In the context of risk assessment, mapping is an essential component and the "mapman" (or the person with GIS skills) becomes an essential part of the planning team. The project addresses the low level of individual capacities. On the basis of the FGDs in four regions, it can be said that the capacity gaps have been bridged for now.

60. The planners are already experiencing the 'logic' and 'beauty' of the methods and tools used. These essentially underpin evidenced-based analysis that lead to making rational decisions. The planners have been educated on the why's and how's of DRR/CCA by interacting with knowledge bearers such as scientists and among each other. The situation is not without problems though, as discussed elsewhere in this report. The issues include as job transfers, trained persons leaving the LGU posts, and the like.

61. There were concerns raised, bringing to the fore the matter of enabling provincial planners to gain confidence in the use of the methodology as to erase their doubts or questions about methodology. For example, there remain questions about how to overlay DRR and CCA considering that different techniques are used.

62. The review of the methodology should shed light not so much on the technical detail but more so on practical use as decision support, development of rules of thumb, and calibration of results against baselines (benchmarks) established in the initial DRA, and in the future, combining with other analytical tools such as flood models, or even comparing with other methods that might be developed in the Philippines or accessed elsewhere. As it is claimed by NEDA and its consultants, this is a pioneering effort; nowhere else has a methodology to mainstream DRR/CCA combined been actually piloted.

63. The incorporation and use of data relevant to DRR/CCA are important aspects in the planning process. CRISP is a significant vehicle towards institutionalizing a regional information system for planning. To formulate the initial data model, this has meant eliciting collaboration among data bearers which now have banded together as the Regional Geographical Information Network (RGIN). The information system prior to CRISP has provided an opportunity for enhancing the already existing GIS-based planning support system. Project activities have further strengthened collaboration among data bearers, which are mostly regional offices of national agencies. The challenge lies in how to propagate and

B. Effectiveness

64. Effectiveness measures the extent to which activities contribute to achieve outcomes, on whether objectives are being achieved on track or not. Significantly, the Project has increased awareness among local actors of climate change impacts especially in the LGUS. Some LCEs have become responsive to DRR needs by allocating budget to purchase equipment, hardware and software as resources for project-related activities, as the Project proceeded.

65. The information and education campaign (IEC) was effective to draw in stakeholders to the Project's advocacy. The project started on a right footing by securing commitment from key stakeholders such as the provincial governor and regional directors of national government agencies. As designed, advocacy activities including briefings where the audio-visual presentations were shown, heightened awareness of the hazards that each region faced. These activities were appreciated very much in the regions where FGDs were conducted.

66. The audio-visual (AV) materials produced in the different regions reached a wide audience. This was evident in all regions visited based on the interviews. Judging on the content of all AV materials, the efforts done in all regions would have added contributed to the understanding of DRR and CCA and their interrelationship.

67. The key messages were unified while images and footages of recent natural hazards that occurred in the region were effectively utilized. A few highlighted disaster losses in terms of human lives and economic damage. A few also actually delved on development projects that typically characterized risk-sensitive planning. Significantly, the ideas that brought together climate change adaptation and mitigation were underlined.

68. A capacity assessment survey was conducted in pilot areas among NROs, selected LGUs and potential partners. It focused on availability of data and maps, technical capability, and institutional capability in mainstreaming DRR and CCA into plans, programs and projects. This was an effective instrument for designing the ToT.

69. Insofar as the incorporation of DRR/CCA concerns in the land use and development plans of the LGUs (Output 2) was concerned, the Project effectively created a group of planners who can form the 'critical mass' in their respective local planning units (See section on 'Impact.')

C. Efficiency

Implementation arrangements

70. Efficiency may be measured in terms of the effective use of time and resources; it includes the ability to utilize currently available local resources in order to achieve the desired output. The involvement of science and technical agencies and NROs is a good example of this. An activity is described as efficient if the management of the activity responds to needs while accomplishing with sufficient and appropriate staffing.

71. The project follows the concept that the NEDA Regional Office (NRO) is the regional focal center for project implementation. Instruments like memorandum of understanding to formalize agreements with NROs have been utilized to the best advantage of the project.

72. As technical and scientific input providers, the expert group, in many ways, is a 'sounding board' providing information and feedback. Expert group meetings and technical working groups have important roles in the project. The set-up needs follow through so that eventually it is sustained as a mechanism will lead hopefully to long-term and sustainable mechanisms.

73. Capacity gaps are being addressed rather well particularly through the capacity building activities concerning Output 2. The activities have the nature of being practically on-the-job training. This approach has effectively drawn other stakeholders as well into the mainstreaming process.

74. Regional project launchings besides introducing the project to different stakeholders increased the awareness of politicians and LGU officials especially. Placing NROs in the forefront of regional and provincial project activities helped to strengthen vertical linkages with the national level. Based on observation and interviews made during the review, the level of efficiency with respect to implementation arrangements varied from one region to another.

75. Efficiency is bound to be lower in a region where political will (in the sense of low priority given by local chief executives to DRR). An attitude of entitlement by a few provincial officers to travel privileges tends to work against achieving timely accomplishment of deliverables. NROs do face the challenge of keeping good rapport with the provincial governments as they provide technical assistance to provinces. NRO can been unduly taxed with work that could have been done by provincial staff themselves.

76. After four issues of the newsletter, none was published thereafter for lack of staff resources. This could have affected the communication link with provinces. The Communication Specialist hired in August 2012 would then ensure that the resumption of the publication

77. In addition to the server in Region 2 NRO, the project made it possible to install a server in DENR for CRISP. The Project nevertheless had enabled the system to be put in place even though only two government agencies were linked.

78. The review of the integrated method served as a necessary step towards more accurate and reliable risk estimates. The process adopted by the project permitted dealing with technical matters related to mapping with finer resolution, geographical information at the local level, alternatives for localizing risk assessment and vulnerability assessment.

79. The project is only one among many efforts by government (often with funding support from external support agencies) in DRR/CCA. In light of this reality, a key informant asks: "Are we in government aligned in terms of the things to be done?" In other words, there appears a need for a common DRR/CCA strategy shared by the member agencies and organizations comprising the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC), which is the national platform for DRR. At the NDRRMC Technical Management Group meetings, not much has been done concerning disaster-related databases including exposure data.

80. Data collection. Pertinent data to assess risk and vulnerability at the provincial level are limited. At least one province has found difficulty in acquiring data in health and environment, and even disaster data from OCD. Disaster data at OCD are not disaggregated to easily identify affected areas, for example. Some provincial governments need to generate data useful for CCA. They require assistance in primary data gathering for the enhancement of PDPFP. While preparing the plan, they find it necessary to consult with relevant experts, especially in identifying hazard-prone areas (data needs). Data availability is partly difficult because it is not clear to which agency queries may be directed. In some cases, other agencies are found to have erroneous data.

81. Demand on time. Despite the assistance given by NROs, provincial planners described the project as "time-demanding." They were doing tasks for the first time, in addition to what they have been normally undertaking. While they developed better appreciation on the use and application of knowledge and technology, this challenged patience among team members.

82. Local political scenarios. As the project was initiated one year before an election year, some provincial planners found it difficult to advance DRR/CCA mainstreaming during the transition period to a newly elected LCE. As new local officials were elected and the political administration or leadership changes, a different set of sectoral priorities could potentially put mainstreaming efforts at risk. This was partly due to the LCE's low level of awareness and appreciation of disaster and climate risks in their respective territories. To mitigate such as situation, some planners proposed that the risk-enhanced plan be endorsed before election.

D. Impacts

83. Impact includes both positive and negative impacts from external factors and unintended effects, such as finding other uses for project output through spinoffs. Thus, one spinoff of the Project is that the Project brought out resourcefulness among local government staff in terms of utilizing resources from previous projects carried out in the province as well those actually exists within the provincial government.

84. The Guidelines for Subnational Planning is meant to aid the policy environment in concerns related to DRR alone. Through this Project however, CCA concerns are brought in to enhance the DRR/CCA capacities in provinces. NEDA is not the only government agency advocating for mainstreaming. Previous projects such as the READY project have shown how DRR can be practiced. It is thus important to accept that this project and others are complementary. The projects are not necessarily in conflict but the efforts, due to their multiplicity, needs only to be directed. These are all in support of putting DRR as a priority of subnational units like provinces, municipalities and cities and developing capacities to enable them to carry out concrete measures. (See related item No. 79 above.)

85. The ultimate test of achieving mainstreaming is that when results of risk and vulnerability analysis redound to fund allocations from the Government Appropriations Act and the LGU budgets. Whereas some lessons learned for other have been shown by a few LGUs as DRA's and risk-enhanced PDPFP's are being done, there is a perception in many other LGUs that they do not have sufficient funds to do DRR. A number of reasons for this uneasiness are related to the provisions of the DRRM law. Typical comments include:

- A problem of the DRRM law is that the DRRM positions are not funded.
- For Albay, positions under Albay Provincial Safety and Emergency Management Office (APSEMO) had to be restructured.
- The law says that if the budget for DRRM fund is not fully expended, then the remaining amount will be put in a special trust fund which the LGU can not use until after five years.

86. The Project should more strongly assert what LGUs can do in terms of options to fund: (1) DRR/CCA measures through their annual investment plans, projects and day-to-day operations; and (2) what needs to be put in place in order to sustain mapping and other responsibilities related to assessment and a risk-enhanced plan.

87. On the other hand, the League of Cities of the Philippines (LCP) noted the disparity among LGUs in terms of ability to allocate funds for DRR/CCA. While some "active" cities are able to source out funds needed, others rely for support from LCP. LCP addresses this discrepancy by seeking commitment from the cities through the Sangguniang Panglungsod with a letter from the mayor endorsing the DRR project. In one sense, it is exerting peer pressure. Other examples are cited in the Learning Lessons section.

88. The League of Provinces of the Philippines (LPP) stresses that the Annual Investment Plan should be tied up with PDPFP. Each LGU has autonomy over its funds and internal revenue allotment (IRA). Presumably, some LGU officials seem "uncomfortable" with this financial autonomy because they may not be confident about how to consider risks in the planning processes and deal with them.

89. The cluster approach has been adopted by HLURB to fast-track the preparation of CLUPs and Zoning Ordinances (ZOs) of LGUs. HLURB is conducting modular workshops for 792 LGUs nationwide from May to December 2012 to guide LGUs. An apprehension expressed in one interview is the missed opportunity to enhance risk-sensitivity of CLUPs and ZOs properly caused by haste. HLURB reported in a forum where this consultant was a participant (including the EGM on the Reference Manual held on September 21, 2012 that HLURB has adopted the project's process and procedures which were piloted in CARAGA or Region 13 (specifically Surigao del Norte) in simplified modules. It pays to heed the above apprehension so the risk is dealt with accordingly.

90. Disaster risk and vulnerability assessment (DRVA) is a major undertaking of the project, which essentially covers 66% of all provinces in the country. Technical assistance is in support of what may be referred to as "on-the-job training" for provincial planners and a few regional officers of NGAs. Though NROs take the lead role in providing technical assistance to the 50 provinces, some, based on the FGDs, have a shepherding role to ensure that the provincial teams are accomplishing the project deliverables. For the piloting of the methodology to the next level (i.e., Surigao del Norte province to Surigao City and the municipalities of Claver, Guigagit, and Bacuag), the provincial government, in turn, provide guidance to the city and municipal government. In the Surigao del Norte pilot test, it was

noted that GPS training for the MPDO contributed to building confidence among its staff.

Output 1: Stakeholders' Awareness, Understanding and Competencies

91. The target beneficiaries of the Output 1 were reached effectively. The target of 200 local government executive, 50 planners and 50 community leaders and 50 academicians was attained. A good gender balance was achieved in the relevant project activities.

Knowledge

92. The training program focusing on DRR Guidelines methodology and techniques trained 155 local planners and academicians in the 15 regions which were covered in five batches. Forty-two percent of the participants were female. The post-training assessment survey concluded that there was an "average gain in knowledge" of 15%.

93. Capacity building activities were embedded in the work program of Output 2. 150 planners from regional line agencies, state universities and colleges participated in five batches of Training of Trainors on GIS Application on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Subnational Physical/Land Use Planning in 2010. Local planners underwent intensive GIS training under a standard learning program. It was noted that for training workshops, a measure of participants' capacity (knowledge) before and after training saw an improvement of 7% in the scores of a 20-item multiple-choice quiz. The trained technical planners delivered results as further described below.

94. In terms of addressing capacity gaps, the project achieved gains in the areas of knowledge; skills – analytical, technical, and others; attitudes – the usual criteria to evaluate training. Institutional capacity is recognized via the management components, among which are organization, information system, and equipment.

Skills

95. The use of GIS-generated maps for DRR/CCA enhanced plans has diffused to the different provinces. The technical and mapping skills of provincial planners using GIS to prepare GIS have been enhanced; they are not capable of vulnerable municipalities or vulnerable areas in municipalities.

96. Workshops not only produced the mappers but also technical writers who can articulate the assessed risks and communicate these with stakeholders. Some planners developed skills to prepare write-ups for the hazard characterization and profile in the context of provincial development in its social, economic and cultural aspects with the help of GIS in data analysis and processing. The direct beneficiaries who participated in the project's workshops were unanimous in acknowledging the project's contribution to the development of their skills, based on results of focus group discussions.

Attitudes

97. A major contribution of the project was related to the attitudes of provincial and local planners towards how to deal with hazards. Through the project workshop, provincial and local planners understood that integrating hazards into different sectors is an obligation. The newly found knowledge and changed attitude enabled planners to promote the value and importance of the VA and the DRR/CCA enhanced plan to LCEs. These empowered them to share knowledge and skills gained to local officials(including barangay leaders), the PDRRMC,

municipalities in completing their CLUPs. Some empowered staff armed with new technical capabilities gained confidence to explain the integration of DRR/CCA in layman's terms.

98. On the other hand, a concern that no knowledge transfer has been made within the same LGU or institution has been expressed as well. Although government could put more resources to train more among those already in government service, the educational and training functions of universities and colleges located in the province or region should not be overlooked.

Output 2: Incorporation of Land Use and Development Plans

99. The impacts of activities at the local level leading to the development of the Reference Manual are wide-ranging and profound.

100. Technical capacity. Although the project has provided the tool that could be introduced to PPDOs, NRO's technical capacity was challenged especially when changes in the methodology were introduced. NRO staff had to figure out how in most simple terms can provincial counterparts understand certain aspects of the methodology due to their technical nature.

101. New demands for local processes. The tools allowed LGUs to put together and analyze data and information, and consolidate outputs useful for many other purposes. In one of the regional FGDs, an LGU received requests for assistance in the preparation of an updated contingency plan taking into account the risks identified. As they generated hazard maps, internal and external stakeholders asked for them. Stakeholders found immediate use for these Project output. Appropriately acknowledging the source could inform the public about the Project and its achievements.

102. Role of S&T. Due to outdated and incomplete maps, assessments in some provinces were delayed. The situation necessitated linking with the expert with facilitation by NEDA, in many cases. Advice from experts in the S&T agencies was indeed valuable. The S&T agencies such as PAGASA and PHIVOLCS are service institutes that have mandates related to specific hazards, and therefore special studies related to the project are opportunities for "use-inspired research."[7]

103. Role of academia. Related to knowledge management, the Project was (and is), in a sense, "learning by doing." Multidisciplinary in nature, the Project needed input from experts. As it broke new ground, the Project team was bound to meet difficulties in both technical and practical aspects. The involvement of project consultants from academia boosted the scientific basis and level of rigor required.

E. Sustainability

104. Where there is sufficient ownership, capacity and resources, sustainability can be achieved even after the project ceases. At this point, certain areas run the risk of not being sustainable in varying degrees. It was observed that regional and local planners look forward to

[7] "Use-inspired research," according to Stokes, permits the transfer of basic to applied research This is possible through collaboration among researchers and practitioners from different fields to produce socially beneficial outcomes and forms of social outreach by consulting with local government and stakeholders so research can have a lasting impact on citizens. (Fernandez, A.L., 2005. A Comparative Study of Disaster-Related Science and Technology Policies in Five Countries," EDM Research Report No. 20, Kobe, p. 67-68).

the time when many elements and actions pursued in the project become part of day-to-day practice. This was the impression obtained through interactions with them during the MTRE. Actions need to taken in order that current tasks might be sustained.

105. On the issue of human resource capacity. A common source of apprehension is job transfer. Some planners say that they are anxious that what they learned through the Project will not be continuously applied. In some cases, different staff members have attended previous mapshops and writeshops. The contract of one casual employee trained in GIS will have ended in July 2012 with no indication that the contract will be extended. Regular employees, including those who are management information system (MIS) staff need to be trained.

106. NEDA-RDCS has recognized that a contractual position among GIS personnel is common. Personnel may be swayed to stay in government (as in NEDA) as he/she is provided opportunity to study through a service contract. Every year of study is equivalent to two years of work in the agency; the additional number of years is in exchange for the study period.

107. In Laguna, the practice is to issue an executive order (EO) that specifies the assignment of the local government personnel as a member of the technical working group or part of a core team to ensure that he/she remains in the position to fulfill the province's commitment.

108. A suggestion to mitigate the situation is to ensure that a new hiree's engagement in the job overlaps with the few weeks at work of the one leaving. Therefore, when the replacement of a trained personnel becomes inevitable, the new hiree shall have been trained by the outgoing staff member on the tasks to be performed.

109. How resources are allocated is essential for sustainability of output and expected outcome. Therefore, sustainability may depend greatly on how much is allocated for continuance of related activities. Through country strategies, donors are able to provide the development assistance needed by the Philippines. Allocation of project budget depends on priorities expressed by stakeholders. For instance, "lack of data" is often mentioned as a planning constraint that delays any project; addressing data generation may be an area needing further external support. With adequate financial support and resource allocation, such chronic situations can be addressed fully.

110. According to HLURB Region 13 Office, the procedure for mainstreaming is adequate; the problem partially lies in the acceptance and level of motivation of some LGUs. Without logistics and monetary support, the effort may not be sustainable. The suggestion for the mayor to tap the DRRM fund has been offered by provincial planners

111. There are already capacity building efforts to disseminate the methodology of integrating DRR/CCA into CLUPs to other regions. The HLURB Region 13 Office responded positively to request from provinces such as Zamboanga del Sur to hold training workshops in Regions 10 and 11. It sent one staff member as a resource person. This is a major spinoff from the project.

112. That institutionalization at the barangay level is lagging is a concern articulated by Agusan del Sur provincial planners. It may be realized that the intervention at the barangay level is beyond the scope of the project, however it is only appropriate to address this concern by documenting actual experiences while conducting the preparation of DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs in Surigao del Norte.

113. Admittedly, climate resilience is very hard to sell among LCEs as the Leagues expressed. Their perspectives have not been reflected in the Project's communication strategies done so far.

114. The completion of key project deliverables - Supplemental Guidelines and Reference Manual - marks a milestone not only in the project but in terms of the operationalization of evidence-based risk-enhanced plans in the country. Contained in the DRA methodology are enhancement with climate change impacts on hazards, sectoral climate change vulnerability assessment tools, and identification of secondary entry points for DRR/CCA mainstreaming. The secondary entry points are considerably significant in measuring the effectiveness of the deliverables. These all serve to focus on hard data, gathered and analyzed.

Output 2: Major Issues and Risks

115. Human resources. Low supply of staff with GIS skills threatens to jeopardize the significant gains achieved through the project and render the work unsustainable. In LGUs, no plantilla position with GIS skills qualification currently exists. Some persons sent by the LGU in assessment workshops are temporary (i.e., on job order) whose appointments are uncertain. Also, it may happen that a different person joins the continuing series of workshops every time; thus, the replacement has difficulty in following the process. HLURB Region 13 has brought to the reviewer's attention that in Claver and Guigate, new people had filled the vacated position of team leaders.

116. Software. While licensed GIS software was purchased through the project for NROs, this was not the case for provincial government. A number of provincial and municipal planning officers felt that they needed to be supported with licensed software. Assistance in downloading GIS to the municipalities was needed. Apart from this, some LGUs noted varying software applications in the government programs. (ArcGIS is costly therefore an open-source software (or freeware) like Manifold and Quantum GIS. Quantum GIS has been introduced by DILG to municipalities.) GIS software used in the municipalities should be the same as that used in the provincial government.

117. Hardware. Sustainability of mapping resource is threatened should hardware lags behind. GIS facilities in LGUs need to be upgraded as necessary.

118. Map information. Map inconsistencies and unavailable shape file format were noted. This gave rise to a situation wherein, for example, the province's land area is less than that of the affected area. This was observed to be more acute at the barangay level. A planner from Agusan del Norte proposed that agencies other than the planning office should "authorize" the maps. By being engaged in the Project, NEDA regional office, HLURB, and provincial staff developed a good relationship among themselves while municipalities and cities were being assisted.

119. Geo-spatial information. Regarding CRISP, sustaining and maintaining the project's mechanisms are future challenges. Beyond the project life, discussions can be sustained with the Regional Land Use Committee (RLUC), a sub-committee of the Regional Development Councils (RDCs). Bringing the matter up and other relevant issues with other mechanisms such as the Inter-Agency Task Force on Geographic Information may help. The task force has been created to promote the efficient development, management and utilization of geographic information in the country for future operation of information systems being developed. (Note: The Task Force is chaired by the Director, Information Management

Department, National Mapping and Resource Information Authority and co-chaired by Assistant Secretary General, National Statistical Coordination Board).

F. Lessons Learned

Output 1. Local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change are enhanced

120. In the course of interviews, some experiences shared may be considered good practices, i.e., departing from the usual practices that essentially did not help to advance risk-sensitive planning. The practice veers away from the many systemic causes often related to poor governance. From some project activities came spinoffs. There may also be threats and challenges that can be offset by making use of opportunities.

121. By and large, the initial advocacy activities undertaken by the NROs, provincial governments and government agencies to launch the project generated enthusiasm and spinoff events. In few instances, the academe and other sectors became involved thereafter. A momentum to raise awareness even more and possibly move people to action was established immediately after the regional launchings. The approach incorporated audio-visual methods, involved regional players in their production, utilized content with local/regional events and realities (especially those relevant to disaster and climate risks), and targeted a wide range of stakeholders –male and female, of different age groups, and social backgrounds. The role of the local chief executive was also acknowledged early in the project; this served exceedingly well in eliciting political support to project activities. Such information dissemination and communication techniques worked well to raise awareness about DRR/CCA in the regions.

122. Political support is translated in terms of concrete actions by the LCE to undertake DRR and/or support project-related concerns. As MPDCs and PPDO further pursues actions to achieve project targets, it has been very helpful for local planners to coordinate and lobby with the governor who can support the core team. Giving updates to the LCE is important as this raises awareness among influential decision makers. In some cases, LCEs have been convinced to undertake strategic DRR/CCA-enhanced investments. A regular meeting with the LCE on the progress of the project has been very useful too. Based on the experiences in Region IVA, LCEs are involved through weekly updates (Batangas), regular meetings on the status of the project (Laguna), and setting targets jointly as the update is made (Laguna).

123. Another good example is exemplified by the province of Antique. By lobbying with the governor, the Antique PPDO has completed the PDFP in July 2012. The governor has authorized funding support of Php 300,000 for the purpose. Meanwhile, the LCE of Bacuag municipality is "completely sold" to the project. Among the pilot LGUs in Surigao del Norte, Bacuag can be considered "the best"; it is commonly perceived that the mayor puts the project among the LGU's priorities. These examples demonstrate that planners must interact with the LCE concerning project concerns. First, the LCE must own the project.

124. Orientation seminars for PPDCs with governors in attendance were an essential feature of the project design. Organized by the NRO, the orientation seminar opened avenues to find ways and means to deal with the demands brought about by the project. The formation of teams from the PPDO was notable for Region 6. Briefings with the RDC where conducted. During the course of the project, NRO had one-on-one visits with the governor and political leaders with the specific purpose to update them about the progress of the project and

receive feedback.

125. Some spinoffs were like a follow-through of the Project's IEC activities as shown by events organized in Region 2.

- The Weather Forum was organized by the NRO in April 2012. The NRO prepared a brief that incorporated highlights of hazard characterization as well as disaster events which happened in other areas ("shocking scenarios"). The state universities and colleges as members of the RDC also joined the forum.

- The Isabela governor initiated the Climate Change Summit, which was attended by 300 stakeholders in cooperation with the Liga ng mga Barangay. The flood mitigation plan was discussed in the summit.

126. As scientific and technical input to mainstreaming are recognized, government functionaries search for local resources to tap. For example, links are being established by the NRO in Region 4A with the Southern Luzon State University and University of the Philippines at Los Banos (UPLB) for possible future support to the process integrating DRR/CCA in day-today operations and long-term planning.

127. Visual representation of hazard and risk information has been found useful and necessary to communicate with stakeholders. Government agencies are jointly collaborating with mapping resources as shown by the following:

- Resources could be utilized to their benefit as the planners do the plans. Agusan del Norte could access the shape files from MGB Region 13; this enabled them to identify the low, medium and high susceptibility areas.

- DPWH Region 2 has been sharing information on location of critical infrastructure (like bridges), schools, and even churches while the use of Wikimapia and Google Earth continues to enhance CRISP. The project has enabled the translation of spatial data into shape files that can be manipulated.

128. The project implementation during the first year (2010) was delayed. A major cause of the delay was, the project reports say 2010 was an election year. It became clear that designing and implementing a project requires that ider such realities in the country's political life as risks.

129. As the project ends in 2013, another election year, it is important for the project team to strategically plan, draft schedules and execute in anticipation of unnecessary lulls or gaps as the project moves towards its concluding months. The time-scale of political leadership is very much shorter than that of environmental and climate change issues. Therefore, interventions while the project is on-going may "prepare" the current leadership for disaster and climate risks but not the succeeding ones.

130. The PPDO is a key player in the project. Its ability to exercise it advocacy role is essential towards creating impact and assuring continuance of project outcomes. It should be able to sell (market) the "mainstreaming" idea to such extent that eventually all players shall have developed a sense of ownership over related activities and deliverables, and make the needed risk-reducing investments.

131. Although GIS for LGUs has been in the country since the 1980s, development activities in the intervening years did not bring about the desired full utilization of the technology into spatial and physical planning. The project demonstrates that this tendency can be broken.

While GIS has practical value for land use planning, risk-enhanced land use planning and physical framework planning can viably promote GIS. This positive contribution to the planning environment may however be jeopardized if not all system components are paid attention to. The components include hardware, software and human resources.

Output 2. CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/municipalities/cities

132. Resourcefulness among the LGUs can be harnessed to bring more utility to projects.

- Synergy with other projects was possible through partnerships sought by the project beneficiaries themselves, namely the LGUs or initiated by a third party. Example: PPDP rendered technical assistance to MPPCOs in Iloilo (e.g., preparation of maps) in mainstreaming CCA enhanced annual investment program. This in part was brought about through the collaboration initiated by Ms. Jessica Dator (Ateneo School of Governance/Manila Observatory).

- A previous project can be a resource to the CCA/DRR project. Example: In Laguna, previous assistance on DRR/CCA was carried out by Oxfam and UPLB-SEARCA, results of which were used as input to the project.

133. LGUs are capable of devising ways to transfer knowledge to fellow government functionaries. The following practices were articulated:

- Knowledge has been passed on to the other members of the PDRRMC in Rizal

- Some PPDOs have been extending assistance to municipalities in completing their CLUPs.

- Knowledge/information transfer has taken place within the provincial government as provincial planners gave an echo seminar on what they learned from the training workshop which they attended in Cebu to fellow officemates at the provincial capitol. They observed that the level of interest is high among the younger provincial government staff.

134. Local planners in some LGUs recognize what can be used immediately from the project to mainstream DRR/CCA at the LGU and other levels. The PPDO in Agusan del Sur illustrates this. The province has also adopted the first two chapters of the DRA for the section on risks for its PDPFP. The PPDO declares mainstreaming is being practiced even at the purok-level.

135. In order to get started with mainstreaming at the municipal/city level, HLURB Region 13 creates a Joint Management Committee which has authority over the submissions of the engineering plan. It counts the support of the LCE as key to successful implementation. (Bacuag's mayor is cited for his notable support to the project.)

136. The Project brings to the fore the necessity to develop human resources that can meet requirements of DRR/CCA mainstreaming. The LGU has sought the involvement of state universities and colleges such as Caraga State University in Butuan City. The university, as partner, takes care of map data management. Students are tapped to contribute to the project. At the time of the FGD in Butuan City, elsewhere in the same city, a workshop on mainstreaming DRR and CCA that uses the project methodology has been in progress. Training which consists of four modules is financed by Caraga State University.

137. The Project brings to the fore the necessity to develop human resources that can meet requirements of DRR/CCA mainstreaming. The LGU has sought the involvement of state universities and colleges such as Caraga State University in Butuan City. The university, as partner, takes care of map data management. Students are tapped to contribute to the project. At the time of the FGD in Butuan City, elsewhere in the same city, a workshop on mainstreaming DRR and CCA that uses the project

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To date, the Project has produced three of the five outputs, namely: Output 1 - Local goverment and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climatechange are enhanced; Output 2 - CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/ municipalities/ cities, and Output 4 - Policy/ programme instruments for enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation to address climate change developed. The Project's deliverables under each output have been examined in terms of the evaluation criteria

2. Vertical and horizontal linkages with key stakeholders defined by working arrangements through strategic partnerships made it possible to address each others' needs and contexts. The Project focused implementation on capacity building in GIS-based hazard/risk mapping and writing skills, developing a suitable disaster risk and vulnerability assessment methodology. Risk-enhanced planning has been made possible through skills development and tools for the local planner.

3. NEDA operates in an external environment that is currently in a state of flux. There are a number of government projects and activities that related to DRR/CCA. There is a surge of interest due to recent extreme events experienced in different regions where record of similar events do not exist. It seems that there are several parameters beyond its control although the two laws appear to give the risk governance regime a semblance of stability and order in terms of vertical and horizontal linkages. Thus, the Project pursues an evidence-based analysis which can support decision makers towards what should be done.

4. NEDA through this Project has exercised its mandate judiciously to provide guidelines to the provincial level. The project goes one step further as to pilot the mainstreaming of DRR/CCA into the planning process at the municipal/city level in Surigao del Norte province. The project deliverables such as Reference Manual and the DRVAs serve as guidelines and tools for the process and plan.

5. DRVA is an important input into Step 4 of HLURB's 12 steps - analyzing the situation. Applying the DRVA results recognize that disaster-prone areas denote where certain activities should not be located, or need mitigation measures need to be undertaken. Application of the project outputs enhances the land use planning process as shown in the pilot in Surigao del Norte.

6. It is observed that government agencies (or their functionaries) behave with opportunism as they seek the possibility of earning points for bagging a project that is generously funded. Funders may see these opportunities presented to recipient countries to disburse available funds expeditiously. The Project's relevance emanates from the needs and feedback expressed by planners and decision makers from LGUs. The incorporation of such feedback ought to inform future initiatives in support of sustaining Project achievements.

7. In reality, the situation is far from stable with many local end-users – local government officials and LGU personnel – being "new" in the field of DRR/CCA, are often confounded - not knowing where to start. The HLURB GIS Cookbook even admits that LGUs are already burdened by legal frameworks that stipulate coming up with several plans, among which are the DRRMP and the climate change action plan.

8. Project experience shows that the DRRMP and CCAP, though separate documents, are-interrelated. The plans are to be linked in a holistic way, complementing each otheror even supplementing where there are insufficiently covered areas in one or the other. The DRVA results, as illustrated by at least one provincial technical working group, can be utilized for the disaster profile for the Comprehensive Development Plan. Some provincial planners are discovering how useful the maps generated and/or used in the mainstreaming process are in many aspects of local disaster risk management and governance.

9. Advocacy using region-specific audio-visual presentations and information and education campaign at the Project's beginning paid off as these significantly contributed to raising awareness about DRR/CCA links. Training of local planners and academicians helped create a core group aligned with Project's objectives.

10. There is increased awareness among decision makers. Interest in DRR/CCA and the project output manifests in terms requests for presentations on the project. LCEs who are committed need to be enlightened further; suggested actions include holding forums with LCEs wherein project findings including those of this mid-term review are conveyed.

11. The implementation arrangements especially with the NRO as the regional focal center succeeds in addressing capacity gaps effectively drawing local planners and others as well into the mainstreaming process. Utilizing expertise of S&T institutions as 'sounding board' and doing related studies is noteworthy. Adaptive management and the co-financing arrangement with the MDG-F have increased geographical coverage and impact of the project but also introduced additional demand on NEDA-RDCS staff time.

12. PPDO is a suitable facilitator in integrating DRR/CCA in the PDFP. Given access to the-appropriate resources vertically and horizontally, it can effectively support the MPDOs of municipalities within its boundaries. However, it really needs to work under political dynamics that vary from LGU to another.

13. For the rest of the project, it will be essential to consolidate the project resources that include the expert groups, implementing partners, board members and the other DRR/CCA stakeholders like the academe. For instance, the Leagues are groupings of LGUs that can potentially assist in rolling out the practical tools from the project. The Leagues can push for the DRR/CCA agenda with the support of champions such as mayors who actively advocate DRR, among whom are the LCE's of Marikina, Calapan, San Fernando City (Pampanga) and Iloilo. The organizational set-up of the Leagues lends much to peer-to-peer learning. The LCP is able to facilitate, coordinate, and pool resources. It has partnerships with agencies and, leagues of provinces and municipalities. LCP's road map need to be include activities promoting the DRR/CCA enhancement of CLUPs.

14. At the Third Philippine Cities Global Convention and Exposition held in November 2011, LCP in partnership with the UNISDR brought about the signing of many Philippine cities to participate in the Safe Cities Campaign for member cities to become DRR resilient. The Cities Alliance, LCP's partner, funded the convention. The Project Team could seek such opportunities to increase awareness, to inform/educate local stakeholders and to motivate through workable solutions and lessons learned from the project.

15. The Project could make use of the strengths of the S&T partners particularly their scientific/technical expertise. The input of PAGASA, PHIVOLCS and MGB in mainstreaming proved to be incalculable.

16. There is a need to continue addressing technical aspects. For this, a PHIVOLCS suggests a review process be undertaken. The S&T agencies may also help LGUs and other government agencies through partnership arranged by memorandum of agreement.

17. The following recommendations are offered:

(1) So that the gains from the project are sustained, the communications plan should take into account the resources that can strategically push the mainstreaming agenda. While the essential messages are brought to different stakeholders and project outputs are disseminated, the means to do these should consider the comparative advantage of well thought-out approaches. It is essential to design the communication plan to address the feedback received from the planners and NEDA's partners. It behooves the project team to carefully create and implement a communication plan that will essentially encourage disaster and climate risk-sensitive behavior within the context of the country's institutional legal frameworks, evidence-based assessments, and well-mapped territories. The communication plan could contain features based on insights from this report, particularly conveying messages intended for LCEs, their advisers, and other key local decision makers in the LGUs.

(2) Present the results of the project through audio-visual means. The positive results of thproject launch can partly be attributed to the audio-visual presentation prepared by the NROs. As much as possible, local and regional hazard events are shown side by side with global climate change phenomena. Towards the end of the project, an audio-visual presentation showing the progress that the project achieved may be prepared for viewing in the regions. This presentation is about the country's experience in mainstreaming through the project. Such a device has a place in putting a closure to a significant period of mainstreaming DRR/CCA after the publication of the Guidelines for Sub-National Development Planning.

(3) The Project Team has rightful claim over the output derived or produced from the project including hazard maps especially those in digital form. Therefore, all users of the output are enjoined to refer to the source and give due credit to the Project.

(4) As NEDA-RDCS, together with its partners, conducts the rest of the project in terms of delivering Output 2 and relevant actions, it needs to backstop the technical needs of the sub-national planners as they refine the DRVA and plans. A feedback mechanism that could function outside the project should be encouraged at this stage.

(5) Technical backstopping has proven to be important and valuable among the participating LGUs. Therefore, NEDA shall not continue, not necessarily no diminish its efforts but instead strategically act to address what LCE's and decision makers might need, getting the endorsement of DRR/CCA champions, for example.

(6) Design and implement writeshops for the enhancement of PDPFP, e.g. in different economic sectors (livelihood, business, commercial) /agriculture/technology that could be adopted by the province. The writeshop needs a session wherein planners working together with a facilitator/consultant who will integrate the comments received and consolidate results.

(7) How transboundary hazards might be dealt with is not explicitly handled by the deliverables. As pointed out by the LPP, provinces do not yet coordinate with one another, particularly investment activities which might affect their neighboring provinces and therefore plans should be interconnected. The tools and methodology may include

these inter-provincial realities – topography, hazards, emergency preparedness, inter-governmental arrangements, and river basins or watershed (water-related hazards, upstream-downstream dynamics/relationships, hydrological regime). As information is exchanged in contiguous provinces, opportunities for joint action relevant to their respective plans should be promoted.

(8) In the light of other current DRR/CCA projects, ways on how to complement efforts betterbthrough information exchanges, joint forums, workshops, and meeting should be devised. For example, a forum could be organized to allow cross-learning and updating of knowledge and skills among planners. Find ways and means to contribute to a platform to discuss and seek solutions, synchronize efforts, reinforce gains, increase efficiency and effectiveness. Currently, it is the donor forum that provides a platform of discussion especially through the cluster on DRR/CCA which is co-chaired by the CCO and OCD. There are overlaps among project funded by GIZ, World Bank, USAID, GFDRR. A mechanism may start a information exchange and developed into a platform.

(9) Provide practical advice on funding opportunities and options to fund the needs of offices of provincial and municipal core team members. These needs include equipment (laptops) and software.

(10) Package the experience of Region 2 concerning CRISP, its spatial information system so that it can serve as a practice guide for data and map sourcing, and institutional arrangements. Towards the remainder of the project, NEDA and its project partners may zero in on specific requirements related to peripheral areas like local-level database management and mapping and assist LGUs to know where and how resources may be accessed, acting like a broker of information.

(11) As GIS is part and parcel of the approach, the Project should provide practical suggestion and guidance on the use of alternative GIS software including GIS freeware such as Quantum.

(12) Explore the utility of the coordinative set up of the Inter-Agency Task Force on Geograpic Information, which was created to promote the efficient development, management and utilization of geographic information in the country for future operation of information systems being developed. (Note: The Task Force is chaired by the Director, information Management Department, National Mapping and Resource Information Authority and co-chaired by Assistant Secretary General, National Statistical Coordination Board).

(13) With only a year or so towards the completion, the project may have gained a momentum of its own. NEDA-RDCS and NROs should continue its constant support to provincial LGUs. NEDA shall advocate that provinces continue the work began and train staff members who have not been trained yet, provided the involvement is made clear. Provincial staff can be tapped as resource persons.

(14) It is suggested that the existing mechanism (if present) among government agencies such as HLURB, DILG, MGB, and provincial offices of other agencies be strengthened. It has been put forward by Surigao del Note planners that HLURB should adopt the NEDA guidelines developed through the project. This is to avoid a situation where the results using DILGs guidelines and that of the project do not end up the same. A stronger coordination among these institutions is needed. NEDA, in its pivotal role in subnational planning, may seize opportunities in providing links between the Philippine

Development Plan and the CLUPs.

(15) Still lacking, it appears are activities that involve the academe, not only partners in government. The academe as well as the Commission on Higher Education are essential to continuing the demand for human resources in many aspects of mainstreaming. Project should find ways and means to promote the project and make its concerns known to stakeholders in the academe and education.

18. The country has been making progress in many areas in DRR and the project, in no small measure, is contributing further to reaching the goals and Priorities for Action promoted by the Hyogo Framework for Action. Project shall have contributed to the advancement of Priority for Action 2 or Risk Assessment, and Priority for Action 4 or Vulnerability Reduction (through mainstreaming in land use and development planning).

19. The NEDA as vice-chair for rehabilitation in the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council also has the mission to fully inform the Council about the project deliverables, findings, and recommendations. The project has tremendous reach covering more than half of the provinces of the Philippines. It is in no small way, insignificant but may in fact, provide the best way to communicate risks effectively to politicians, LCEs, community leaders and citizens, i.e. through risk maps and assessments.

20. While there seems to be confusion among LGUs about the many plans they are supposed to develop, it is essential that the project simplifies what really is, in real terms. The Philippine DRR/CCA context now includes two plans - LCCAP and DRRMP. These plans, simply put focus on the constraints to development or limitations with respect to where and how development takes place while taking into account environmental assets and hazard profile of a given area. As the project experiences have already shown, the project outputs support the data and analytical requirements of the local plans and contingency plan that by law should incorporate DRR/CCA measures. In the end, the annual investment plan and land use plan are the main planning documents; from now and in the coming years, these should have been enhanced with DRR/CCA measures incorporated into public and private sector investments in infrastructure, agriculture, fisheries, extractive and manufacturing industries, real estate/housing and utilities. Thus, these measures are reflected in the design, planning, execution and monitoring as part of day-to-day practice.

21. The achievement of the project so far is that is has already moved the country closer to the strategic goal of “more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming” at subnational level, especially in the area of vulnerability reduction through the tools being developed and the mechanism it has been putting in place. Capacities at the provincial level have been enhanced in this area. To what extent regional and subnational institutions and mechanisms have been developed and strengthened to make communities resilient remains to be seen.

Looking Ahead

22. Sustainability issues are among the key concerns as the project is about to end. Firming up of the methodologies, framework and strategies to hasten the accomplishment of deliverables have been the major activities in the last few months. Strategic, budgetary or programmatic adjustments have been made to reflect the unanticipated events. The 2012 audit report cautions on optimally realizing the project’s expected outcome which is “local land use and physical planning and decision making processes reflect DRR/CCA priorities in an integrated manner.”

23. The project, to a certain extent, brings to the fore, the need for strategic alignments so that the future demand in DRR/CCA, specifically in the knowledge base related to mainstreaming can be met. Knowing the current human resource constraints of the S&T institutions, such as the turnover of qualified scientists and engineers in hydrometeorological and geological fields in the science service institutions, as well as the compensation issues that surround the science community, the matter even becomes more urgent as efforts to mainstream are pursued.

24. There is a demand for certain professions in order to advance DRR/CCA. This ultimately leads to national-level strategies in the education, S&T, and labor sector. Without qualified and properly trained GIS professionals in the regions outside NCR, nothing much can be done in terms of keeping up with the requirements of a well-functioning risk-sensitive and DRR/CCA-compliant planning department.

25. The Project has given a boost to the planning profession, particularly to practice in the regions. A positive development that can support professionalization is the reported revival of the Association of Regional Planners in Iloilo. This opens new doors to opportunities to access to resources for integrating DRR/CCA into plans. Suggestions from the planners themselves revolved around the supply of human resources with appropriate capabilities and training. These were manifested in terms of calls for: additional participants; training of replacement/s especially in case retirement; granting "incentives" in terms of laptops, related hardware or software; formally recognizing the planners' efforts; making the agreement binding for the participating member to stick with the technical working group; continue training or conducting more training workshops for wider audiences; increasing the number of participants in the training workshops; low level of support by local government. Trained planners voiced out the need for the project to provide "after-care support" particularly when explaining the project output to local stakeholders and others related to hardware, software, data, and maps. In the regions, GIS mapping need to be boosted in terms of a wide range of support activities such as upgrading of GIS facilities and replicating the "capacity on GIS."

26. Empowerment of the subnational units is taking place. This however needs a shepherding environment or guidance which needs to be provided by national agencies and mechanisms. Foremost among these is the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council. If the NDRRMC does not act quickly, each national agency may device its own strategy based on the perceptions gathered from its clients. To paraphrase one key informant's thought-provoking question, "Are we looking in the same direction?"

27. The potential of the project outputs as well as those of other projects are visible. Any yet, there is something missing. What seems missing is a platform for discussion and information exchange strategically designed in order to provide the environment conducive for sustaining efforts. The environment consists of reliable human resources, and robust S&T complement.

28. If DRR/CCA is to be whole-of-government, then this will require a systemic change, a holistic outlook to resource allocation and risk-enhanced investments. Therefore, education, S&T, labor, transportation, infrastructure and utilities, and other sectors shall move together in synch.

ANNEX

ANNEX A

27 June 2012

Conduct of Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of Integrating DRR/CCA Project

A - Inception Report

Prepared by Antonio L. Fernandez, Consultant

I. Context

Since July 2009, NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project). The project completion date has been moved from August 2012 to December 2013.

With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) will be conducted. This independent evaluation is an integral part of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework. The Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) and the Climate Change Commission (CCC) are the Partner Agencies. Apart from these, NEDA Regional Offices and partner universities/ research institutions are involved in generating the deliverables.

The project not only has significance to the Philippines in light of increasing disaster risks and impact and exposure as the country faces the challenges of weather variability and climate extremes. The legal and institutional landscape and frameworks under the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act. 10121) and the Climate Change Act of 2009 (Republic Act No. 9729) need to be executed as previously established linkages are enhanced while others made or rearranged.

Disaster risk reduction (DRR) can be "the first line of defense against impacts of climate change." Thus, shifting risks associated with climate change need to be taken into account so vulnerability in the medium to long term is consequently reduced while undertaking DRR measures. While the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation has been recognized as national policy, actions at the provincial and local levels require concerted efforts aided by tools in order to guide risk-sensitive development planning and support to bridge capacity gaps.

Mainstreaming DRR and CCA concerns begins with raising awareness (Output 1: Stakeholders' awareness, understanding and competencies) and then followed up by practical demonstration. Thus, the project also targets the enhancement of subnational land use/ physical framework plans through integrated DRR/CCA (Output 2: Incorporation of DRR/ CCA concerns in land use and development plans) and pilot communities (Output 3: Practical DRR/CCA strategies) that demonstrate climate change adaptation. In the original project document, the number of target provinces was ten (10). This has been increased

to 50 provinces (or 62.5% of all 80 provinces), as explained in the next section. The selected provinces are all 43 provinces included in the READY Project and seven other provinces recommended by NEDA Regional Offices (NROs).

The preparation of the National Action Plan for Climate Change (NAPCC) (Output 4: Policy/programme instruments) and recommendations from the NAPCC planning process shall have provided the setting for multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing climate change. Lastly, collaborative mechanisms at national and local levels (Output 5: National and local multi-stakeholder mechanisms) shall have been strengthened and supported through technical backstopping, enabling environment, and capacity development.

This Inception Report is an expansion of the Concept Note submitted to NEDA-RDCS on 11 April 2012, which has discussed in an initial meeting held at the NEDA-RDCS Conference Room on 3 May 2012. Thereupon, the Consultant has made a quick review of project documentation received. The Inception Report also takes into account the results of the preliminary meeting, as well as the insights from informal interviews and observations on 7, 10 and 11 May during the Vulnerability Assessment Workshop and Workshop on Mainstreaming DRR/VA into the PDPFP held at the BSA Twin Towers Condominium-Hotel, Mandaluyong City.

2. The Project as Implemented

Within an adaptive management framework, the project has undergone revision as explained below.

The project The NEDA/RDCS is mandated to assist provinces and thus, deliverables of the project are directed towards that end. Thus, some projects deliverables were put under the Technical Assistance to Provinces on the Formulation of Disaster Risk Reduction/ Climate Change Adaptation (DRR/CCA)-Enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans (PDPFPs). There are twelve deliverables according to the Regional Implementation Plan of the said Technical Assistance (Table 1). In order to cover more provinces, NEDA/RDCS forged a co-financing arrangement with NEDA-Agricultural Staff through the project on Millennium Development Goal Achievement Fund 1656: Strengthening the Philippines' Institutional Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change (MDG-F 1656 Programme). Prior to the latest Board Meeting held this year, the project covered 50 provinces shown in Table 2.

Since the above revision, another co-financing arrangement was entered into by NEDA-RDCS with the New Zealand Aid Program (NZAP) in 2011. NZAP is funding the technical assistance (TA) to the remaining 30 provinces for the preparation of their DRR/ CCA-enhanced PDPFPs. Due to the aftermath of Typhoon Sendong in Cagayan de Oro City in December 2012, the NZAP is supporting the "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development Planning Project" of NEDA Region 10 which started in May 2012. The Region 10 project covers all five provinces and three cities (Cagayan de Oro, Iligan and Valencia) and outputs will be one Regional Physical and Framework Plan, five PDPFPs and three Comprehensive Land Use Plans.

Among the agreements in the Fourth Project Board Meeting held last 16 February 2012 were:

- Output 5 (Multistakeholder Mechanisms) with an allocation of PhP2.592 million, will beretained focusing on developing and strengthening local level multistakeholder

mechanisms.

- The project will be extended until December 2013 to allow for: (a) review, revision and pilot testing of integrated disaster and climate risk assessment methodology, and (b) completion of three (3) major outputs, i.e., Supplemental Guidelines on Integrating DRR/CCA in Subnational Development and Physical Framework Planning, vulnerability assessment reports, and 80 DRR/CCA-enhanced Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plans.

- The project will support, through the New Zealand Aid Program, NRO-X's project proposal on "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development Planning," which costs P8.865 million.

- Funds will be realigned in accordance with the amended 2012 Work and Financial Plan.

This Key Informant Interview (2) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use & development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

Objectives

The interview aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) how much has been achieved in addressing the DRR capacity gaps at the local level; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Senior officials/staff from regional offices of partners such as DILG, HLURB, and others, as suggested by Core Teams.

Methodology

The interviews shall be conducted during the field visits to the regions/provinces. The questions to be asked are contained in the following KII (2) Questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) feedback on the implementation and management of the project; (2) comments on the DRR/CCA integration processes in the region in the context of the projects outputs and desired outcomes; (3) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned; (4) lessons learned during the course of the project; and (5) suggestions.

Table 1. Outcomes-Outputs-Deliverables Matrix.

UNDP CP Outcome: Key stakeholders are better able to manage environment and natural resources, develop and use sustainable energy sources, cope with the impacts of environmental emergencies and maintain sustainable development.

Project outcomes	Project Outputs	Deliverables
Local level land use and development planning and decision-making processes to reflect CCA/DRR priorities in an integrated fashion	1. Local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change are enhanced	2. IEC/Advocacy 3. Capability building activities
	2. CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/ municipalities/ cities	1. Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/ CCA at Subnational Development and Land Use/ Physical Planning 2. Draft Framework and Process for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Local Investment Programming including Financing/Resource Mobilization, and Project Evaluation and Development (secondary entry points) 3. Handbook on Information Support System on Hazards and Risks for Local/Subnational Planning 4. Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans 5. Disaster Risk Assessment (Vulnerability Assessment of 50 provinces, co-financed with MDG-F) 6. Twenty provinces with DRR/CCA enhanced plans (10 provinces under co-financing with MDG-F; 10 provinces under NZAP) 7. Four DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPS with Surigao City, and the municipalities of Claver, Gigaguit and Bacuag 8. Support provided in the updating of National Framework for Physical Planning 9. Support to Region 10's Project on "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management and Climate Change Adaptation, and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development/Physical Planning 10. Four DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPS with Surigao City, and the municipalities of Claver, Gigaguit and Bacuag 11. Support provided in the updating of National Framework for Physical Planning 12. Support to Region 10's Project on "Enhancing Capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction and Management and Climate Change Adaptation, and Mainstreaming DRRM/CCA in Development/Physical Planning

Project outcomes	Project Outputs	Deliverables
	3. Practical strategies for climate change adaptation/DRR are demonstrated at the sub-national level	13. Documentation of adaptation strategies in local communities
Enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation in addressing climate change & disaster risk reduction in an integrated manner	4. Policy/programme instruments for enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation to address climate change developed	14.National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP)
	5. Mechanisms for multi-stakeholder cooperation on climate change at national and local levels strengthened	15. Multi-stakeholder mechanisms

Table 2. Provincial coverage of Integrating DRR/CCA and MDG-Projects on the Formulation of DRR/CCA Enhanced Plans.

Region	No. of provinces	AusAid/MDG-F	NZAP
CAR	6	Abra, Benguet, Mountain Province, Ifugao	Apayao, Kalinga
1	4	Ilocos Norte, Ilocos Sur, La Union, Pangasinan	
2	5	Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Nueva Vizcaya, Quirino	
3	7	Aurora, Bulacan, Pampanga, Zambales	Bataan, Zambales, Nueva Ecija
4A	5	Cavite, Laguna, Quezon, Rizal, Batangas	
4B	5	Oriental Mindoro, Marinduque	Occidental Mindoro, Romblon, Palawan
5	6	Camarines Norte, Catanduanes, Sorsogon, Albay	Camarines Sur, Masbate
6	6	Aklan, Antique, Iloilo	Capiz, Guimaras, Negros Occidental
7	4	Bohol, Cebu	Negros Oriental, Siquijor
8	6	Samar, Biliran, Leyte, Southern Leyte	Eastern Samar, Northern Samar
9	3	Zamboanga del Norte	Zamboanga del Sur, Sibugay
10	5	Bukidnon, Camiguin	Misamis Occidental, Lanao del Norte, Misamis Oriental
11	4	Davao Oriental, Compostela Valley,	Davao del Sur, Davao del Norte
12	4	Sarangani, South Cotabato, Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat	
13	5	Agusan del Norte, Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Norte, Surigao del Sur	Dinagat Islands
ARMM	5		Tawi-Tawi, Basilan, Sulu, Maguindanao, Lanao del Sur
TOTAL	81		

Note: All regions except National Capital Region (NCR) are being assisted.

II. Objectives

As part of monitoring and evaluation framework, the mid-term evaluation is an independent review to assess progress on outputs/outcomes and identify areas for strategic or programmatic adjustments, if necessary. The objectives of the mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) are:

(1) To find out the extent to which the Project was able to achieve its development objectives and operational targets
(2) To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems adopted with regards to planning, coordination, and use of designated resources
(3) To preliminarily assess the sustainability context
(4) To provide recommendations in order to improve management and implementation arrangements to achieve targets within the given timeframe.

III. Methodology

The evaluation shall be conducted through a consultative process as well as an objective review and analysis of the project's annual reports, documents, internal reports and summaries, programme archives, national development documents, and relevant documentation which will-provide evidence to sufficiently describe the assessment parameters concerning the project's progress. The parameters shall be based on criteria found in AusAID's guidelines on the design and conduct of independent progress reports.

Apart from desk review, the methodology to be employed are essentially social methods of research such as: (1) key informant interview (KII) using a questionnaire guide that focuses on particular agencies/institutions vis-a-vis outcome/output, (2) focus group discussion (FGD) using a questionnaire guide, and (3) study or field visits where observation and interview methods are utilized to generate short case studies. Details of the proposed data gathering process are shown in Table 3.

After the opening meeting with the NEDA-RDCS (IP), the approach and methodology were adjusted to be responsive to issues/concerns reflected during the Fourth Project Board Meeting.

Thus, the evaluation process will be undertaken as follows:

(1) Submission of Inception Report, wherein details of the evaluation methodology are outlined.

(2) Desk review or review of annual reports, programme documents, internal reports and summaries, programme archives, national development documents, and other documents pertinent to the evaluation parameters.

(3) Data gathering through key informant interviews (KIIs) focus group discussion (FGD) focusing on each of the five outputs and field observation (Table 3). The interviewees are representatives from the RPs and/or Experts' Group, as well as participants of the training events and workshops organized for Outputs 1 and 2. Feedback about the training workshops and information materials (Output 1) will also be obtained in the course of the data gathering phase. Survey instruments for KIIs and FGDs are attached. The design is guided by evaluation parameters based on criteria of AusAID's guidelines (Table 4). Observation and informal interviews during field visits to pilot sites will be utilized for Outputs 2 and 3. The questionnaire-guides are annexed.

(4) Analysis that systematically utilize collated data and information, and probe further

Table 3. Details of data gathering process: methodology, objective, suggested respondents.

Output (Focus of query)	Methodology	Major objective	Suggested respondents
1 - Stakeholders' awareness, understanding and competencies (Feedback on information materials, follow up of post-training evaluation surveys)	KII (1) <Annex A>	To find out level of achievement	Participants of training courses and orientation seminars (local chief executives, planners, academe)
2 - Incorporation in land use & development plans (Users' feedback of vulnerability assessment report and other deliverables, field survey of pilot communities, feedback on risk-based plans)	FGD (1) <Annex F>	To find out level of achievement; To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	8-10 members of the Regional/Provincial Core Team in 3-4 regions with selected or all provinces that participated in the project
	KII (2) <Annex B>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; To assess the sustainability context	Senior official from Regional Offices of partners such as DILG, HLURB
	Observation/ field study	To assess the sustainability context	Provincial DRM and planning offices
	KII (3) <Annex C> or FGD (2) <Annex G>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	Expert Group/ Project Board Members such as PHIVOLCS and PAGASA
	KII (5) <Annex E>	To assess the sustainability context	HLURB
3 - Practical DRR/CCA strategies (Feedback on vulnerability assessment reports, initial plans and strategies)	FGD (1) <Annex F>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems	(same as and integrated into Output 2 instrument)
4 - Policy/ programme instruments (Feedback on NACPCC, the planning process, and its implementation)	KII (4) <Annex D>	To assess the sustainability context	Ms. Joyce Goco, CCO
5 - National/local mechanisms (Feedback on national and local multi-stakeholder mechanisms)	FGD (2) <Annex G>	To determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems To assess the sustainability context	Project Board Members such as League of Provinces, Leagues of Municipalities, Leagues of Cities, OCD, UNDP

(5) Synthesis that seeks to organize results of the analysis towards making a whole and coherent set of findings and recommendations

(6) Submission of Draft Report which incorporates all major findings and recommendations from the evaluation

(7) Review of Draft Report by NEDA-RDCS and relevant stakeholders

(8) Submission of Final Report which incorporates comments of NEDA-RDCS and relevant stakeholders.

Table 4. Evaluation matrix using AusAID's Guidelines.

	Output 1 Stakeholders' Awareness, understanding and competences	**Output 2 Incorporation in land use & development plans**	**Output 3 Practical DRR/ CCA strategies**	**Output 4 Policy/ programme instruments**	**Output 5 National & local mechanisms**
Relevance					
Effectiveness					
Efficiency					
Impact					
Sustainability					
Gender equality					
Analysis & learning					

In the FGDs, respondents shall be members of Regional/Provinces Core Teams; field visits shall be shall be made in provinces of the region where FGDs will be conducted. Provinces shall be selected from the suggested regions, namely: Regions 2, 4A, 6 and 13. To select the provinces, the following are the suggested criteria:

(1) Level of development (as characterized by economic activities, infrastructure, built-up areas, etc.)

(2) High/low level of progress in project implementation and/or existence of pilot project

(3) Proneness to both high probability/high consequence (HP/HC) and low probability/ high consequence (LP/HC) hazards

Provinces will therefore be selected such that extremes of most criteria shall be represented. It is suggested that three to four regions; if so desired by NEDA-RDCS, field visits may be conducted in two provinces which belong to the said regions. The Consultant is submitting the following list of provinces for the consideration of NEDA-RDCS:

(1) Surigao del Norte, Agusan del Norte, Surigao del Sur, Agusan del Sur (Region 13 CARAGA)

(2) Quezon, Cavite, Laguna, Rizal , Batangas (Region 4A -CALABARZON)

(3) Batanes, Cagayan, Isabela, Nueva Vizcaya, Quirino (Region 2-Cagayan Valley Region)
(4) Aklan, Antique, Iloilo (Region 6-Eastern Visayas)

IV. Timetable

The proposed timetable for the MTRE is as follows:

Activity	Week														Responsible party
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
	4/30-5/5	5/6-12	5/13-19	5/20-26	5/27-6/2	6/3-9	6/10-16	6/17-23	6/24-30	7/1-7	7/8-14	7/15-21	7/22-28	7/29-8/4	8/5-11	
1.Preliminaries																C/IP
2. Inception report			x													C
2.Document review																C
3. KIIs																C/IP
4. FGDs																C/IP
5. Study visits																C/IP
6. Analysis/ synthesis																C
7. Preliminary draft report												x				C
8. Review of draft																IP
9. Finalize report																C
10. Submit final report															x	C

Note: C stands for Consultant; IP stands for Implementing Partner.

ANNEX B (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Key Informant Interview (1)
For Participants of Training Courses and Orientation Seminars

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (1) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 1, Stakeholders' Awareness, Understanding and Competencies. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 1 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime.

Objectives

The interview aims to find out: (1) how much has been achieved in addressing the DRR capacity gaps at the local level; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Participants of training courses and orientation-workshops (local chief executives, local planners, academe).

Methodology

The interviews shall be conducted during the field visits to the regions/provinces. The questions to be asked are contained in the following KII (1) Questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) feedback on the training attended; (2) feedback on relevance to the local government and current position; (3) follow up on the post-training evaluation; (4) comments concerning implementation of integrating DRR/CCA; (5) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned. Random sampling from among the participants in the regions/provinces is used.

(2/3)

KII (1) Questionnaire

Individual Knowledge and Skills

1. What was your position when you participated in the training course? _____
   _____
2. What is your current position? _____
   _____
3. If you have been given a different position, please tell us why or how.
   _____
   _____
4. How would you rate your level of knowledge in DRR/CCA integration prior to the training course? _____
   _____
5. How would you rate your current level of knowledge in DRR/CCA integration?
   _____
   _____
6. How would you rate your level of skills in DRR/CCA integration prior to the training course?
   _____
   _____
7. How would you rate your current level of skills in DRR/CCA integration?
   _____
   _____
8. How relevant was the training course for your personal career?
   _____
   _____

Situation of Local Government

9. How would you describe the status of DRR/CCA integration in your local government prior to the training course you attended? _____
   _____
10. How would you describe the current status of DRR/CCA integration in your local government?_____
    _____
11. How relevant was the training course to the local government? _____
    _____

Application

12. How well can you apply the knowledge and skills to your current position? _____
    _____

13. What factors limit the application of knowledge and skills in your current position?

_____
_____

14. What factors promote the application of knowledge and skills in your current position?

_____
_____

(3/3)

15. Please comment on the implementation of integrating DRR/CCA in your local government as far as the new tools and future practices are concerned.

_____
_____

Sustainability

16. What are your concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in your local government and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)

_____
_____

17. What do you suggest in order to address the issues you mentioned?

_____
_____

18. In what ways can you be assisted so that you can perform the role expected of you?

_____
_____

ANNEX C (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Key Informant Interview (2)
for Senior Officials/Staff of Regional Offices of the National Agencies

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (2) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use & development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

Objectives

The interview aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) how much has been achieved in addressing the DRR capacity gaps at the local level; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Senior officials/staff from regional offices of partners such as DILG, HLURB, and others, as suggested by Core Teams.

Methodology

The interviews shall be conducted during the field visits to the regions/provinces. The questions to be asked are contained in the following KII (2) Questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) feedback on the implementation and management of the project; (2) comments on the DRR/CCA integration processes in the region in the context of the projects outputs and desired outcomes; (3) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned; (4) lessons learned during the course of the project; and (5) suggestions.

(2/3)

KII (2) Questionnaire

1. Current position: _____
   _____

2. How long have you known the project? _____
   _____

3. Please comment on the state of DRR/CCA integration processes in the region in the con text of the project outputs and outcomes.
   _____
   _____

4. Please comment on the implementation and management of the project, from the perspec tive of your agency (organization). Please explain your answer.
   _____
   _____

5. What are the strengths your office can offer in terms of integrating DRR/CCA?
   _____

6. In what areas would you need assistance or support in order to carry out the integration of DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

7. How would you describe the current status of DRR/CCA integration in your local govern- ment?
   _____
   _____

8. How would you characterize the level of awareness of the political leaders in your region? Is there disparity among the provincial/municipal leaders, among citizens, among different stakeholders?
   _____
   _____

9. Among the project outputs are new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans. What aspect of the project are you most interested in?
   _____
   _____

(3/3)

10. What are your other concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in local governments and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)

    _____

    _____

11. What do you suggest in order to address the issues you mentioned?

    _____

    _____

12. Please share lessons learned in the course of the project.

    _____

    _____

13. In what ways can you be assisted so that you can perform the role expected of you in regard to the rest of project outputs?

    _____

    _____

ANNEX D (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Key Informant Interview (3) for Expert Group/Project Board Members

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (3) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use & development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

According to the Project Document, the Experts' Group is the sounding board of the Project in matters related to methodologies, framework and strategies to ensure technical soundness and logical consistency of outputs, current policies and programmes on climate change and DRR.

Objectives

The interview aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Expert Group/Project Board Members (PHIVOLCS, PAGASA)

Methodology

The interviews shall be conducted using the attached questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) feedback on the implementation and management of the project; (2) comments on the DRR/CCA integration processes in the context of the projects outputs and desired outcomes; (3) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned; (4) lessons learned during the course of the project; and (5) suggestions.

(2/3)

KII (3) Questionnaire

1. Current position: _____
   _____

2. Please comment on the national state of DRR/CCA integration processes.
   _____
   _____

3. From the perspective of your agency, what has been (or what aspects have been) the most significant contribution of the project to the national government? To the local government units? Please explain.
   _____
   _____

4. Please comment on the implementation and management of the project, from the perspective of your agency (organization). Please explain your answer.
   _____
   _____

5. What are the strengths your office can offer in terms of integrating DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

6. In what areas are you most concerned about in terms of implementing the integration of DRR/CCA? What issues do you see? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.) Please explain.
   _____
   _____

7. How well have these areas been addressed? _____
   _____

8. What do you suggest in order to address these areas?
   _____
   _____

9. Among the project outputs are new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans. What aspect of the project are you most interested in?
   _____
   _____

(3/3)

10. What are your other concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in local governments and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)

    _____

    _____

11. In what ways can you be further enabled so that you can perform the role in contribute positively to the integration of DRR/CCA?

    _____

    _____

ANNEX E (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Key Informant Interview (4) for Climate Change Office

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (4) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 4, Policy/ programme instruments, specifically the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), and Output 5, Mechanisms for multi-stakeholder cooperation on climate change at national and local levels. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 4 is part of Outcome 2, namely enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation addressing climate and change and DRR in an integrated manner. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

Objectives

The interview aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Senior official(s)/staff from Climate Change Office.

Methodology

The interview shall be guided by the attached questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) a retrospective look at the NCCAP process; (2) feedback on the implementation and management of the project; (3) comments on mechanisms to integrate DRR/CCA integration at national and local levels in the context of the projects outputs and desired outcomes; (3) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned; (4) lessons learned during the course of the project; and (5) suggestions.

(2/3)

KII (4) Questionnaire

1. Current position: _____
   _____

2. Please comment on the NCCAP process in the context of the project outputs and outcomes.
   _____
   _____

3. Please comment on the implementation and management of the project, from the perspective of your agency (organization). Please explain your answer.
   _____
   _____

4. What are the strengths your office can offer in terms of integrating DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

5. In what areas would you need assistance or support in order to carry out the integration of DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

6. Among the project outputs are new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans. What aspect of the project are you most interested in?
   _____
   _____

7. What are your concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in local governments and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)
   _____
   _____

8. What do you suggest in order to address the issues you mentioned?
   _____
   _____

(3/3)

9. Please share lessons learned in the course of the project.
   _____
   _____

10. In what ways can you be assisted so that you can perform your role in integrating CCA/DRR?
    _____
    _____

ANNEX F (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Key Informant Interview (5) for Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) Central Office

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (5) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use & development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

Objectives

The interview aims mainly to assess the sustainability context and find out the issues/concerns that need to be addressed into order to project outcome and integration of DRR/CCA into land use and development plans.

Interviewees

Senior official (or staff) of HLURB, as Project Board member

Methodology

The interview shall be conducted using the attached questionnaire. The questions shall obtain: (1) comments on the past and on-going DRR/CCA integration processes and expected outcomes; (2) current and planned activities related to DRR/CCA integration into land use and development planning; (3) comments on sustainability issues; and (4) suggestions.

(2/3)

KII (3) Questionnaire

1. Current position: _____
   _____

2. Please comment on the national state of DRR/CCA integration processes.
   _____
   _____

3. What has been (or what aspects have been) the most significant contribution of your agency to the DRR/CCA integration process at the national level? At the local level? Please elaborate.
   _____
   _____

4. What are the strengths your office can offer in terms of integrating DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

5. In what areas are you most concerned about in terms of implementing the integration of DRR/CCA? What issues do you see? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.) Please explain.
   _____
   _____

6. How well have these areas been addressed? _____
   _____

7. What do you suggest in order to address these areas?
   _____
   _____

8. The new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans are part of the outputs. (These are briefly explained.) What aspect of the project are you most interested in?
   _____
   _____

9. In what ways can you be further enabled so that you can perform your role to contribute positively to the integration of DRR/CCA? What are your needs?
   _____
   _____

ANNEX G (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Focus Group Discussion (1) for Regional/Provincial Core Teams

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Key Informant Interview (2) is conducted as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use and development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to find out how well capacity gaps have been addressed, to determine effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems, and to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs.

Objectives

The interview aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) how much has been achieved in addressing the DRR capacity gaps at the local level; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

8-10 members of the Regional/Provincial Core Team in 3-4 regions with selected or all provinces that participated in the project.

Methodology

The focus group discussion (FGD) shall be conducted during the field visits to the regions/provinces. The method of conducting the FGD shall be through roundtable discussion revolving around progress in achieving the Output 1 and 2 and Outcome 1. The participants who are to carry out the integration of DRR/CCA at the local level are asked about level of achievement as well as concerns for the future sustainability in terms of institutionalizing the system, promoting learning, feedback and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned. Strategic actions to address their needs are elicited. The questions to be asked are contained in the following questionnaire.

(2/3)

FGD (1) Questionnaire

1. Describe how much capacity gaps have changed since the project. What have you gained?

   _____

   _____

2. How would you assess the progress of project implementation vis-à-vis the planned/target outputs?

Reference Table 1. Targets/Result/Deliverable for Outputs 1 and 2.

Deliverable	Target	Implementation status (to date)	Remarks
Output 1 – Stakeholders' awareness, understanding and competencies			
IEC/Advocacy			
Capability building activities - Trained local planners, academicians - Local functionaries in orientation-workshops			
Output 2 – DRR/CCA concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of target provinces/municipalities/cities			
Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning			
Draft Framework and Process for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Local Investment Programming including Financing/Resource Mobilization, and Project Evaluation and Development (secondary entry points)			
Handbook on Information Support System on Hazards and Risks for Local/ Subnational Planning			
Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/ DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans			
Disaster Risk Assessment (Vulnerability assessment of 50 provinces)			
Twenty province s with DRR/CCA enhanced plans (10 provinces under co-financing with MDG-F)			
Documentation of adaptation strategies in local communities			
Multi-stakeholder mechanisms			

Note: PDPFP – Provincial Development Physical Framework Plan.

(3/3)

3. In what areas would you need assistance or support in order to carry out the integration of DRR/CCA?

   _____
   _____

4. How would you describe the current status of DRR/CCA integration in your local government?

   _____
   _____

5. How would you characterize the level of awareness of the political leaders in your region? Is there disparity among the provincial/municipal leaders, among citizens, among different stakeholders?

   _____
   _____

6. Among the project outputs are new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans. What aspect of the project are you most interested in?

   _____
   _____

7. What are your concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in local governments and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)

   _____
   _____

8. What do you suggest in order to address the issues you mentioned?

   _____
   _____

9. Please share lessons learned in the course of the project.

   _____
   _____

10. In what ways can you be assisted so that you can perform the role expected of you in regard to the rest of project outputs?

    _____
    _____

ANNEX H (1/3)

Mid-Term Review and Evaluation (MTRE) of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project

Focus Group Discussion (2) for Expert Group Members

NOTE: Key informant interview may be done by the Consultant in lieu of the FGD depending on NEDA-RDCS's decision and availability of individuals concerned.)

Background:

NEDA-Regional Development Coordination Staff has been the Implementing Partner (IP) of the AusAID-assisted and UNDP-administered Project on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (or Integrating DRR/CCA Project) since 2009. With the implementation period ending in 2013, a mid-term review and evaluation (MTRE) of the project to date and the work implemented by Responsible Partners (RPs) is being conducted. The independent evaluation is an integral feature of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework.

This Focus Group Discussion (2) is prepared as part of the evaluation of Output 2, Incorporation in land use and development plans. Generally, the MTRE examines to what extent the project's development objectives and operational targets are obtained. Output 2 is part of Outcome 1, which addresses the capacity gaps at the local level (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal and city levels), especially of the planners and other functionaries of the regions and local government units and the partner academicians who are envisioned to provide continuing technical support and capacity development assistance beyond the project lifetime. In this output, it is essential to understand the sustainability context that can affect the effectiveness of the project's outputs. The Experts' Group is the sounding board of the Project in matters related to methodologies, framework and strategies to ensure technical soundness and logical consistency of outputs, current policies and programmes on climate change and DRR.

Objectives

The Focus Group Discussion (FGD) aims to determine: (1) the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation strategies or management systems; (2) what concerns need to be addressed into order to sustain the positive gains that the project has achieved; (3) how concerns can be addressed to achieve project outcome.

Interviewees

Expert Group Members (PAGASA, MGB, CCO, and League of Cities, Municipalities and Provinces can be included.)

Methodology

The questions shall obtain: (1) feedback on the implementation and management of the project; (2) comments on the DRR/CCA integration processes in the context of the projects outputs and desired outcomes; (3) comments on sustainability issues such as job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, and others that may be mentioned; (4) lessons learned during the course of the project; and (5) suggestions.

(2/3)

FGD (2) Questionnaire

1. Describe your specific role (or your agency's role) in the project. _____
   _____

2. Please comment on the national state of DRR/CCA integration processes in the context of the project outputs and outcomes.
   _____
   _____

3. From the perspective of your agency, what has been (or what aspects have been) the most significant contribution of the project to the national government? To the local government units? Please explain.
   _____
   _____

4. Please comment on the implementation and management of the project, from the perspective of your agency (organization). Please elaborate.
   _____
   _____

5. What are the strengths your office can offer in terms of integrating DRR/CCA?
   _____
   _____

6. In what areas are you most concerned about in terms of implementing the integration of DRR/CCA? What issues do you see? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.) Please explain.
   _____
   _____

7. How well have these areas been addressed? _____
   _____

8. What do you suggest in order to address these areas?
   _____
   _____

9. Among the project outputs are new tools and techniques to aid the integration of DRR/CCA into physical plans.
   _____
   _____

10. What are your other concerns regarding sustainability of integrating DRR/CCA in local governments and in the whole country. What issues do you foresee? (Issues may include job transfer, political support, budget allocation, technical support, data availability, availability of maps, coordination, and others.)
    _____
    _____

Annex I. Schedule of interviews, focus group discussions and observations.

1. Interviews

Date	Place	Interviewees	Method of interview
1. 29 June	PAGASA, Quezon City	Dr. Rosalina de Guzman and Dr. Susan Espinueva,	Group interview (FGD(2) for expert group
2. 9 July	NRO 2, Tueguegarao	Ronilo Bulseco, Leomar Israel and Ernesto Perlata, Knowledge Management Division	Informal group interview on CRISP
3. 12 July	Priscilla's, Butuan City	Mr. Rey Niog, HLURB Northern Mindanao Region	Key informant interview
4. 16 July	Climate Change Office (CCO), Manila	ASec. (Ms.) Joycelyn Goco, Deputy Executive Director,	Key informant interview
5. 17 July	LPP, Mandaluyong	Director (Mr.) Roberto Limbago	Key informant interview
6. 18 July	LCP, Quezon City	Executive Director (Mr.) Jerry Nishimori, Ms. Veron Hitosis	Group interview
7. 31 July	PHIVOLCS, Quezon City	Director (Dr.) Renato S. Solidum	Key informant interview

2. Focus group discussions conducted with team members of Regional/Provincial Core Teams.

Date	Place	Affiliation (Region/province/ municipalities/city)	No. of participants
1. 28 June	MO2 Hotel, Iloilo City	Region 6/ Aklan, Antique, Capiz, Iloilo; DENR-MGB, UPV	19
2. 3 July	NRO 4A Conference Room, Calamba City	Region 4A/ Batangas, Cavite, Laguna, Quezon, Rizal	25
3. 9 July	NRO 2 Conference Room, Tueguegarao City	Region 2/ Cagayan, Isabela, Quirino; DPWH, DENR-MGB	15
4. 12 July	Priscilla's, Butuan City	Region 13-CARAGA/ Agusan del Norte, Agusan del Sur, Surigao del Norte, Surigao del Sur	21
5. 13 July	NRO 13 Conference Room, Surigao del Norte, Provincial Capitol, Surigao City (CLUPs)	Region 13-CARAGA/ Surigao del Norte, Bacuag, Claver, Gigaquit, Surigao City	27
		Total	107

3. Observations

Date	Place	Activity	Observation
7 May, AM	BSA Twin Towers, Mandaluyong City	Workshop on disaster risk reduction and vulnerability reduction (Batch 3)	Non-Participant
7 May, PM	-do-	Workshop on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and vulnerability assessment into the PDPFPs	-do-
10 May – AM/PM	-do-	Workshop on disaster risk reduction and vulnerability reduction (Batch 3) - Presentation of initial outputs	-do-
11 May – PM	-do-	Workshop on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction and vulnerability assessment into the PDPFPs	-do-
31 Aug.	Discovery Suites	GFDRR project Integrating DRR/CCA in Local Government	Participant
21 Sep.	Richmonde Hotel	Expert Group Meeting on the Reference Manual	Participant

ANNEX J. STATUS OF PROJECT DELIVERABLES

A. Outcome 1: Local level land use and development planning and decision-making processes to reflect DRR/CCA priorities in an integrated fashion

Output 1: Local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change are enhanced (Two Deliverables: IEC/Advocacy and Capability building activities)

- Conduct of orientation and production of IEC materials which included: (a) a quarterly newsletter, video presentation, promotion and advocacy materials; and (b)conduct of orientation, briefing seminars, and similar information campaigns

Four (4) issues of the project's official newsletter called "DRR+CCA News" with a subtitle "Planning to Protect" were printed and distributed between November 2009 and October 2010. Eleven N! Online articles were posted in the website. Various news articles were published. In 2011, no newsletters were issued because the project lacked personnel. All regions covered by the project produced canned video presentations. These were utilized by the NROs in to show to decision makers in regional briefings about the project and to advocate DRR/CCA.

NEDA/RDCS presented on the mainstreaming framework into subnational and land use/physical plans at briefings made during LGU Summits organized through the MDG-F 1656 Program in 2011.

- Conduct of capability building activities; (a) capacity assessment; (b) design and conduct of Training of Trainors (ToT) for 150 participants; (c) design of survey instruments; (d) conduct of pre- and post-training assessment.

Output 2: CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/ municipalities/ cities (7 of 9 deliverables)

The deliverables in this output are interrelated in terms risk and vulnerability assessment, or more accurately disaster risk and climate change vulnerability assessment. They comprise the substance of how mainstreaming may be achieved into land use planning, provincial development planning. Assessment results are fed into the different steps of sub-national planning.

The deliverables revolve around the integrated DRR/CCA methodology that is developed in the project. They take the form of:

(1) Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA at Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning

(2) Handbook on Information Support System on Hazards and Risks for Local/Subnational Planning

(3) Reference Manual on Mainstreaming CCA/DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUP)

(4) Disaster Risk Assessment and Vulnerability Assessment of 50 provinces, co-financed with MDG-F

(5) DRR/CCA enhanced Provincial Development Physical Framework Plans (PDPFP) of 50 provinces (of which ten are co-financed by MDG-F and the other ten under NZAP)

(6) Draft Framework and Process for Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Local Investment Programming, Project Evaluation and Management.

- Supplemental Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA at Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning (Formulation of methodology for integrating DRR/CCA in investment programming, project design, budgeting and monitoring and evaluation)

Development of the Supplemental Guidelines began in 2011, and yet being completed. A vulnerability index method to measure impacts of climate change in agriculture, forestry, coastal, health and water sectors was developed and introduced to pilot provinces.

- Framework for integrating DRR/CCA in land use/physical framework plans and integrated methodology for DRR/CCA mainstreaming in land use/physical framework planning

The integrated DRR/CCA framework and methodology were formulated and presented to the experts' group forum (EGF) and experts' group meeting. Specialists were engaged to provide technical input. This yielded technical papers and advice concerning specific hazards like landslides (Mines and Geosciences Bureau), and extreme rainfall and flood (PAGASA). Input from inter-agency meetings and consultations also provided context. Through a co-financing agreement with MDG-F 1656 Project, a User's Manual to guide the provincial planners in the DRA steps was produced.

- Handbook on Information Support System on Hazards and Risks for Local/Subnational Planning

A framework for DRR/CCA information support system was formulated with the support of expert group meetings. Devising the system meant identifying of data requirements, standards and other system parameters; developing GIS database and map server technologies; implementing the information system in pilot area; and producing a handbook on information support system on DRR & CCA

The GIS-based information system called Climate Change and Disaster Risk Information System for Planning (CRISP) was developed in Region 2 as pilot area. An appropriate data model was created using a proposed geospatial data infrastructure that includes DRR & CCA and working on an interoperable system.

On 8-10 July 2012, the expert group meeting (EGM) on CRISP set the stakeholders thinking about how might the information system support the planning process. Field validation took place about three months later to ascertain technical specifications and other issues related to the work plan of the pilot-demonstration.

- Reference Manual on Mainstreaming DRR/CCA in Comprehensive Land Use Plans

A concept note on DRR/CCA integration in CLUPs was prepared. A technical paper on conducting disaster risk assessment (DRA) at the local level was also written. These are all input to the reference manual intended for provincial planning offices so they can provide technical assistance to their component LGUs in land use planning. A draft reference manual was prepared by a consultant with the expert group as sounding board. It covers pilot testing in three municipalities and Surigao City, Surigao del Norte province. Accordingly, procedures for a localized DRA were described within the context of the 12-step CLUP process as HLURB implements.

Coordination meetings between NEDA and HLURB led to formulation of expectations in order to

enhance the CLUP process through the incorporation of DRR and CCA. Memoranda of understanding were signed by NEDA with HLURB Central Office, HLURB Northern Mindanao Office, and Surigao del Norte.

The draft manual has been completed and under review. Project implementation in the pilot LGUs has taken shape through a series of workshops and activation of technical working groups in the four pilot LGUs. The DRA methodology for city and municipal land use planning has been developed and tested.

In Surigao City, a flood model study was made in collaboration with PAGASA to help determine the inundation area and depth of flood.

- Four DRR/CCA enhanced CLUPs the municipalities of Claver, Gigaguit, and Bacuag and with Surigao City (ClaGiBaS)

Project implementation in the pilot LGUs took shape through a series of workshops and activation of technical working groups (TWG) in the four pilot LGUs. Six to seven people from the MPDC including health, engineering, mapper, and zoning officer. The usual number of LGU staff trained per workshop is four. According to an executive order from the mayor, a technical working group is formed by people who are the trained as part of the project. The composition of the TWG changes from time to time; thus, it is not able to achieve continuity in training appropriate personnel.

- Disaster Risk Assessment and Vulnerability Assessment of 50 provinces, co-financed with MDG-F; Technical assistance to 50 non-pilot regions/provinces

- Ten (10) provinces with DRR/CCA enhanced plans under co-financing with MDG-F

An agreement with 10 pilot areas for the conduct of disaster risk and vulnerability assessment (DRVA) was made by NEDA-RDCS with the respective LGUs. Then, a preparatory and orientation workshop for regional/provincial local planning teams was held. In order to capacitate provincial planners on DRVA, NEDA provides technical support to NROs. With 15 NROs, 43 provinces with co-financing from the MDG-F Project and 7 provinces in original proposal are involved.

Output 4: Policy/Programme instruments for enhanced multi-stakeholder cooperation to address climate change adaptation.

- National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP)

The main instrument in focus here is the national “National Climate Change Action Plan 2011-2028” (NCCAP). The NCCAP was signed by the President on November 22, 2011. However, the action plan was preceded by a frameworks strategy that initially brought together adaptation and mitigation into one document. Participatory methods were used to derive the framework strategy and plan. Initially, it was the Office of the President for Climate Change (OPACC) that handled the activities relevant to Output 4. With the passage of the Climate Change Act (Republic Act 9729) in 2009, the Climate Change Commission was created as an independent and autonomous agency, attached to the Office of the President, and replacing the OPACC. The law also required the climate change action plans at the national and local level.

NCCAP define country-driven programs of action for integrated climate change adaptation and mitigation in seven priority areas: food security, water sufficiency, environmental and ecological stability, human security, sustainable energy, climate-smart industries and services, and knowledge management.

- Multi-stakeholder mechanism (national-level)

To ensure the sustainability of the NCCAP, which is the project deliverable, a multi-stakeholder process was devised and implemented. The plan was to cover the period from 2011 to 2028, covering three (3) presidential administrations. With transparency as a guiding principle, it was a participatory process which gathered together 200 people from government, civil society, academe and professional groups participated. The product, the plan itself, is a product of multi-stakeholder consultations organized through technical working groups (TWGs) that polished the relevant sections of the plan. Each TWG covered a strategic thematic area. The thematic areas are: (1) food security, (2) water sufficiency, (3) ecosystem and environmental stability, (4) human security, (5) climate-friendly industries and services, (6) sustainable energy, (7) knowledge and capacity development, (8) cross-cutting actions, (9) means of implementation, and (10) monitoring and evaluation.

National and local mechanisms are central to the implementation of the NCCAP. Through the concept of ecologically stable and economically resilient towns or ecotowns, implementation of the action plan has been packaged, in accordance with the NCCAP. An ecotown is a "planning unit composed of municipalities or a group of municipalities...." The concept of ecotowns are currently being realized as pilots in four municipalities in Siargao Island; in San Vicente, Palawan; four towns in Samar province; and in the provinces of Batanes. These were selected by virtue of their location within and in the boundaries of critical key biodiversity areas, highly vulnerable to climate change risks due to its geography, geographic location, and poverty.

Outcome 2/Output 3: Practical strategies for climate change adaptation/DRR are demonstrated at the sub-national level

For the remainder of the Integrating DRR/CCA Project, the CCO is tasked to document exemplary adaptation strategies. The CCO is documenting each ecotown case for "do-able" good practices with the end in view of replicating them in other LGUs or developing guidelines. As technical assistance to develop local climate change action plans (LCCAP), the methodology in ecotowns uses a capacity development approach: (1) to enable the local chief executive to take leadership, (2) to enhance collaboration and seek consensus building among stakeholders, (3) to bring science to practical applications; (4) to build up the academic and research support from local colleges and universities and thus reduce dependence on Manila-based institutions. By August 2012, it is expected that the LCCAP is validated by respective communities and accepted.

ANNEX K. SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS ABOUT OUTPUTS 1 AND 2

Output 1: Local government and other stakeholders' awareness, understanding of and competencies on climate change are enhanced

IEC and Advocacy

1. After four issues of the newsletter, none was published thereafter due to lack of project personnel. The Communication Specialist hired in August 2012 would then ensure that the publication resumed. Through reports about the project status, activities, and anecdotal evidence, the newsletter make information available to a wide audience; thus can contribute to a smooth project implementation.

2. The key messages were unified while images and footages of recent natural hazards that occurred in the region were effectively utilized. A few highlighted disaster losses in terms of human lives and economic damage. A few also actually delved on development projects that typically characterized risk-sensitive planning. Significantly, the ideas that bring together climate change adaptation and mitigation were underlined.

3. Academics from major regional universities and colleges were invited to take part in the training of trainers. This move is laudable however the involvement of academics did not flourish. Instinctively, this is one way of developing knowledge networks among the potential key players. One possible explanation for this is that the academic institutions themselves did not possess the scientific knowhow essential to the city, municipality or province. The scientific and technical inputs were mainly sourced in Manila-based S&T and academic institutions. Then, as capacities of provincial planners in risk and vulnerability assessment were being developed, the academic sector in the regions was rarely, if at all, brought in either as resource-giver or recipient-beneficiary.

Capacity Development

4. Capacity development activities are embedded in Output 2. Insights are based on the synthesis of the FGDs with regional and local planners shared during the FGDs. The capacity building activities that were undertaken focused on preparing disaster risk assessments and risk-enhanced plans for provinces and regions. A major issue concerns LGU personnel who can handle GIS. Those trained in the project – some of whom were replaced by other staff members, casuals whose contracts have ceased or are expected to cease without becoming regular employees. This increases the risk of the project outcome becoming unsustainable.

Output 2: CCA/DRR concerns are incorporated in the land use and development plans of the target provinces/ municipalities/ cities

1. To a certain extent, project implementation has flexibility to incorporate knowledge building activities for NEDA-RDCS and Regional Office personnel such as the Caucus on Climate Scenarios and Flood Risk Assessment. PAGASA responded to the request by NEDA to hold the Caucus which took place on January 10, 2012.

2. As provincial planners worked on the risk and vulnerability assessments, new demands and challenges on the planner enfolded. In doing their tasks, provincial planners and the NROs encountered issues in terms low supply of resources (such as data, time), political support, technical capacity, the details of which are elsewhere in this report.

3. The League of Provinces of the Philippines identified that "local-level planning needs sup

port in database management." Developing and strengthening the database at the local level is worth investing in.

4. While there were hurdles in the technical matters involved in the earlier vulnerability and risk assessment, the big challenge presented to the new DRR/CCA converts is the continue fulfilling the knowledge bearers in their respective localities ready to support their leaders and decision makers as they lead their respective LGUs and communities to the path of reducing disaster and climate risks.

5. The project has provided the tool that could be introduced to PPDOs however, there were technical capacity challenges as well. These include: (a) adjusting to changes in the methodology; (b) PPDO staff having to devise ways and means to support the learning process of provincial counterparts; (c) responding to request for assistance in the preparation of the DRR/CCA-enhanced contingency plan; and, (d) PPDO facing a big challenge to make relevant presentations and responding to queries related to project output. In such instances, technical assistance from project resource persons are deemed to be of great help in the interest of making political decision makers and local stakeholders well informed.

6. The DRA methodology developers encountered a "technical setback." Forcing a delay in project implementation, this setback did not deter NEDA to pursue activities which were not likely to be affected by the methodology, such as the User's Manual. The "technical setback" episode may have weakened the learning process but timely actions were undertaken to save the investments that have been made.

<u>Motivating planners/GIS staff</u>

7. Professionalizing the practice of GIS in regions need to happen. (Similar comments from Region 4A and Region2 were heard.) A positive development that can support professionalization is the reported revival of the Association of Regional Planners in Iloilo. This opens new doors to opportunities to access to resources for integrating DRR/CCA into plans.

8. A number of issues and suggestions from the planners revolved around the supply of human resources with appropriate capabilities and training. These were manifested in terms of calls for: additional participants; training of replacement/s especially in case retirement; granting "incentives" in terms of laptops, related hardware or software; formally recognizing the planners' efforts; making the agreement binding for the participating member to stick with the technical working group; continue training or conducting more training workshops for wider audiences; increasing the number of participants in the training workshops; low level of support by local government. Trained planners voiced out the need for the project to provide "after-care support" particularly when explaining the project output to local stakeholders and others related to hardware, software, data, and maps.

9. In the regions, GIS mapping need to be boosted in terms of a wide range of support activities such as upgrading of GIS facilities and replicating the "capacity on GIS."

10. The project introduced the many resources planners would need to utilize in order to carry out assessment, particularly maps. It also increased their level of awareness concerning data and maps. These include:

    - Validating maps with the MGB. <Agusan del Norte>
    - Inconsistency of local from national data/ map inconsistencies <Region 4A>
    - NLUC should urge agencies about the provision of maps and data banking (NLUC).

- Access of other agencies (such as MGB) to maps the planners generate (see below)
- Data availability/access particularly CCA indicators
- Inconsistency of local data with national data
- Availability of disaggregated local data to fill in data requirements <Cavite>; <Agusan del Norte>
- Need to protect against data manipulation (such as shape files). Certain protocols must be put in place even with "freedom of information." A 'system of accreditation' may be considered to contribute to the ethics of information sharing.

11. Issues about maps and data are not insurmountable but some work by responsible agencies need to be done to determine user characteristics and needs. Among these hard-to-interpret maps and lapses in the accuracy of maps; absence of a repository of maps at the regional level <NRO6>.

12. Upon completion of risk maps, some planners react with a heightened level of urgency when confronted with high susceptibility to risks in most areas in the province. They express apprehension in the face of finding viable and optimal options from among the menu of mitigation measures, and singling out areas where some development may take place. Some articulate that DRR projects implemented by the LGU are yet to be completed in the identified hazard prone areas. Among the planners, awareness levels about the risks are much higher, but some guidance is needed in order to deal with the risks.

13. Lessons Learned:Spin-off effects or finding other uses. With the project, some LCEs of LGUs have become responsive to DRR needs by allocating budget to purchase equipment, hardware and software as resources for project-related activities. Cited during the FGDs and KIIs were the following:

    - Aklan PPDO applied GIS knowledge to mining areas to provide advise prospective investors in mining industry including small-scale mining activities (of manganese, silica, etc.) that are devolved to provincial government.
    - Iloilo realized the usefulness of produced maps, which were then used in the evaluation of nominees for the Gawad Kalasag awards in cooperation of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO).
    - LCE's may find some project outputs useful in their campaign. <Region 6>
    - Local officials have become aware/ concerned about environmental protection, particularly DRR/CCA <Batangas, Region 4A>
    - Maps generated were downloaded (made available) to municipalities especially municipal engineers <Batangas, Region 4A>
    - With the Integrating Project, READY Project-generated maps were validated <Cavite>
    - Measures like the DRRM plan and drills were among those implemented by the province. Investments on hardware for response were made. <Cavite>
    - Requests for presentations on the project were received. <Region 4A>

- Cavite's PPDO takes a proactive stance in terms of influencing and helping municipal governments to using the DRR/CCA enhanced PDPFP as input to their CLUPs.
- Laguna's PPDO also assists municipalities especially in the mapping requirements of the CLUP process; Laguna's PPDO also maintains good partnership with HLURB.

6

[2]Note: At the Caucus, PAGASA scientists made three presentations, namely: (1) F.D. Hilario, T.A. Cinco, R.G. De Guzman, and E.D. Ares, Climate Projects in the Philippines, presented by Thelma Cinco, WSC, Chief IAAS,CAD ; (2) Frequency Analysis, presented by Thelma Cinco; and (3) Flood Early Warning System, by presented by Susan Espinueva.

ANNEX L. DRR/CCA Projects of the Climate Change Office.

Project	Partners & funders	Description/Objective	Duration
1. Philippine Climate Change Adaptation Project (PhilCCAP)	P: DENR, DA, DOST-PAGASA F:World Bank thru GEF	Component 1: Strengthening the enabling environment for Climate Change - to develop and demonstrate approaches that would enable target communities to adapt to the potential impacts of climate change	June 2010 – June 2015
2. Enabling the Cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan to cope with climate change	F: AusAID, UNDP P: PAG-ASA, MGB, PHIVOLCS, NAMRIA, HLURB, OCD, LGUs of CDO and Iligan Cities, UP, Xavier University, Mindanao State University, Balay Mindanaw Foundation, Inc.	to conduct Vulnerability Assessment of the cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan and the municipalities surrounding the Cagayan de Oro and Mandulog river basins to climate change by inputting the climate scenarios ran by PAGASA and to identify priority adaptation measures to reduce vulnerabilities of communities	April 2012-June 2014
3. Project ReBUILD: Resilience Capacity Building for Cities and Municipalities to Reduce Disaster Risks from Climate Change and Natural Hazards, Phase 1	F: NZAID P: : PAG-ASA, MGB, PHIVOLCS, NAMRIA, HLURB, OCD, LGUs and concerned academic institutions	To address the institutional capacity and individual competency gaps on climate/disaster risk management of key players and municipalities surrounding the target river basins in Regions 2, 3 and 6	2012 – 2014
4. Low emissions capacity building	F: EU, Green Growth Institute, UNDP	• Outcome 1: Robust national systems for the preparation of GHG emission inventories have been established at a national level • Outcome 2: NAMAs and sectoral roadmaps have been formulated in the context of national development priorities Outcome 3: MRV systems to support implementation and evaluation of NAMAs and LEDS have been developed	2012 - 2014
5. Energy capacity for Low Emissions Development Strategy	F:USAID	• Enhanced coordination and support to the LEDS Process • Development of the National GHG Inventory System • Analytical Decision-Making Measurable Implementation Progress	2012 - 2014

6. Climate Change Public Expenditure Review	P: DBM F: World Bank	CPEIR aims to conduct a “climate review” of the budget to assess the level, distribution and funding sources of climate expenditure, examine public finance management issues related to the planning, priority setting, implementation and tracking of CC related programs and projects.	2012
7. Strengthening the implementation of NCCAP	F: GIZ	The project aims to support CCC in the implementation of the National Framework Strategy on Climate Change and the National Climate Change Action Plan. Specifically, it aims to strengthen the capacity of the Commission, increase the capacity at the local level, awareness building and knowledge management, and support DOE in designing the framework for renewable energy.	2012-2015

REFERENCES

Australian Government/AusAID, 2011. Guideline: Manage the Independent Evaluation of an Aid Activity.

Cabrido, Candido Jr., Evelyn Lorenzo, Mario de los Reyes, Connie Morga and Benjamin Carino, 2012. Training Modules and Manual on Mainstreaming Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction in the Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan/ Sectoral Vulnerability Assessment Tool: Mainstreaming Guidelines (March 15, 2012).

Commission on Audit, 2012. Audit Report on Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes (Calendar Year 2011).

Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board, 2007. CLUP GIS Guidebook: A Guide to Comprehensive Land Use Data Management.

NEDA, 2012. Reference Manual on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Comprehensive Land Use Plans (Draft, 18 September 2012).

National Economic and Development Authority, 2012. Vulnerability Assessment Workshop, May 17-11, 2012.

_____, 2012. Workshop on Mainstreaming DRR/VA into the PDPFP, May 7-11, 2012.

_____, 2012. 4th Project Board Meeting, 16 February 2012.

_____, 2011. 3rd Project Board Meeting, 18 January 2011.

_____, 2010. DRR + CCA News (October 2010).

_____, 2010. 2nd Project Board Meeting, 8 January 2010.

_____, 2009. Annual Project Report (August-December 2009).

NEDA-RDCS, 2011. Regional Implementation Plan on the Technical Assistance to Provinces on the Formulation of DRR/CCA-Enhanced PDPFPs (Draft, 15 April 2011).

NEDA/UNDP/European Commission, 2008. Guidelines: Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-national Development Planning and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines.

Penaflor, Philip Emmanuel C., 2008. Evaluation Report: Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-national Development Planning and Land Use/Physical Framework Planning in the Philippines, NEDA (October 2008).

United Nations Development Programme, 2009. Project Document: Integrating Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Local Development Planning and Decision-making Processes.

United Nations Development Programme, 2008. Project Document: MDG-F 1656: Joint

Programme on Strengthening the Philippines' Institutional Capacity to Adapt to Climate Change 2008-2010.

University of the Philippines/National Engineering Center/Training Center for Applied Geodesy & Photogrammetry, 2010. Training Report of the 1st Batch of Training of Trainers (ToT) on Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Application for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) in Land Use/Physical Framework and Local Development Plan.

University of the Philippines/School of Urban and Regional Planning, 2011. Final Training Report, Orientation-Workshop for Provinces on Climate Change: Sectoral Impact Assessment and Planning Applications, November 2011, UP/SURP, Quezon City.