



Philippines

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2013-2015)

Name of focal point: Mr ALEXANDER PAMA
Organization: National Disaster Risk Reduction & Management Council
Title/Position: OCD-NDRRMC
E-mail address: ndrmmc.secretariat@yahoo.com
Telephone: +632 9126675

Reporting period: 2013-2015
Report Status: Final
Last updated on: 15 March 2015
Print date: 23 April 2015
Reporting language: English

A National HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb
<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/hyogo/progress/reports/>

Strategic goals

Strategic Goal Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Policies on DRRM are further developed and refined through a comprehensive review of the existing ones, primarily the RA 10121 – specifically how the law has been implemented; how it was harmonized with other existing policies; how it links with climate change; how it was institutionalized down to the local level; and how it was able to harness the cooperation of various stakeholders, including civil society, the private sector, the academe, the Church, and the international community.

Strategic Goal Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Institutions that promote DRR are operationalized, thereby ensuring that members of the national DRR platform (i.e. the NDRRMC) consciously and proactively develop their own DRRM-specific capacity-building programs and synchronize these with those of the other agencies. Part of institutional strengthening is the full integration of DRRM into the educational curriculum, both at the formal and non-formal level, which would bring forth a culture of preparedness and readiness across the country and especially among the communities.

Strategic Goal Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Strategic Goal Statement 2013-2015

Communities are equipped with the proper knowledge, tools, resources, and most importantly, attitude to deal with impending disasters and are cognizant of the need to quickly recover and build back stronger and better. This entails strengthening

community-based DRRM, fine-tuning contingency and preparedness plans, regularly conducting drills and exercises, establishing SOPs, ensuring continuous communication flow in any eventuality, and developing pre-, during, and post-disaster databases. Integral to this goal is ensuring the safety and welfare of DRRM workers, especially the disaster responders, through the establishment of a Magna Carta for DRRM Workers.

Priority for Action 1

Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.

Core indicator 1

National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is disaster risk taken into account in public investment and planning decisions? Yes

National development plan	Yes
Sector strategies and plans	Yes
Climate change policy and strategy	Yes
Poverty reduction strategy papers	No
CCA/ UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/ UN Development Assistance Framework)	Yes
Civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning	Yes

Have legislative and/or regulatory provisions been made for managing disaster risk?
Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The implementation of the Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act 10121), as the country's foremost guiding policy and framework for DRR, is in full swing and continues at various governance levels. The Office of Civil Defense national and regional offices continue to oversee the implementation of the law through the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan (NDRRMP). The member agencies of the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC) also perform their respective roles through sector strategies, department orders and plans:

Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH): currently in the process of finalizing the "green, sustainable" Revised Building Code, which, among others, intends to update the design of structures to withstand 250kph winds.

National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA): ensured the inclusion of DRR into the Philippine Development Plan (2011-2016) and the Regional Development Plans (2011-2016) and continues to monitor its implementation in the current periods.

Department of Education (DepEd): came up with new frameworks to mainstream DRR and CCA not only in the curriculum but also in the professional field.

Department of Agriculture (DA): created a Systems-Wide Climate Change Office responsible for formulating policies, providing guidance and monitoring implementation of mainstreaming climate change adaptation and mitigation initiatives in all DA programs, projects and budgets through the Adaptation and Mitigation Initiative in Agriculture (AMIA).

Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR): the ecosystem-based approached in its National Wetlands Action Plan for the Philippines and its Solid Waste Management Compliance Programme contribute to DRR)

Department of Justice (DOJ): created the Disaster Rapid Response Task Force under the Inter-Agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT), which aims to address internal displacement and established mechanisms to address the immediate needs of those displaced by conflict and natural hazard-related disasters.

Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG): DRRM and CCA mainstreamed in various laws, policies, ordinances enacted, community development plans, and comprehensive land use plans (CLUPs). Local DRRM offices have also been established (facility, manpower and budget).

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

There are some questions on whether the RA 10121, as well as its implementation plan, is in complete harmony with the Philippines’ Local Government Code. There needs to be a study to see any possible conflicts and to address these through subsequent policy drafting or even legislation.

Another challenge is that the integration of DRR and CCA in programs and initiatives has yet to be fully realized. It is strongly recommended that DRR and CCA are fully mainstreamed in all CLUPs.

Core indicator 2

Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

What is the ratio of the budget allocation to risk reduction versus disaster relief and reconstruction?

	Risk reduction / prevention (%)	Relief and reconstruction (%)
National budget	0.5%	.25% - Relief & Reconstruction
Decentralised / sub-national budget	3.5%	1.5% - Relief & Reconstruction

USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)	
---	--

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The total Philippine budget for 2015 is PHP 2.606 T. PHP 14 B of this is for the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Fund (NDRRMF). PHP 6.7 B is for Quick Response Funds (QRF) (source: General Appropriations Act (GAA) 2015).

On local allocation, Section 21 of RA 10121 provides that the Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Fund (LDRRMF) amounting to not less than five percent (5%) of the estimated revenue from regular sources shall be set aside to support disaster risk management activities... This shall “cover the thirty percent (30%) lump-sum allocation for Quick Response Fund (QRF) and the seventy percent (70%) allocation for disaster prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, rehabilitation and recovery.”

There are other budget allocations undertaken by respective agencies (some of them may not be explicitly labelled as “for DRRM” but in fact perform this function) such as the following agencies:

DA: 21% of the 2015 DA budget is allocated for climate change adaptation/risk reduction strategies.

DENR: PHP P1B for the National Greening Program (environment, eco-system based management)that includes multi-hazard mapping

DPWH: PHP 1B for mitigation/prevention and road slope prevention

Also, the “bottom-up budgeting” process adopted for developing the national budget (started in 2013) may also impel the inclusion of DRRM concerns into the approved appropriation if these are the identified need at the local level.

Lastly, based on the Yolanda Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Plan (CRRP), PHP 167.9 Billion has been allocated for rehabilitation and reconstruction of Yolanda (Haiyan)-affected areas for the period 2014-2016.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context & Constraints

In the earlier years of this coverage period, bulk of the budget has been allocated more for response. For example, in 2013 out of the PHP 3.7 B DRRM fund released, P3.69 Billion have been for the Quick Response Fund (QRF).

There is also some difficulty in tracking the resources that fall under different names or categories but can actually be considered “for disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM).” A way to address this is shown in the initiative of the Climate Change Commission (CCC) and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) on “Tagging/Tracking Government Expenditures for Climate Change in the Budget Process,” where government offices are asked to identify and tag in their Online Submission of Budget Proposal (OSBP), the climate change-related expenditures shown in the Climate Change Typologies.

It may be useful to follow such “tagging” practice for expenditures related to DRRM.

Core indicator 3

Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do local governments have legal responsibility and regular / systematic budget allocations for DRR? Yes

Legislation (Is there a specific legislation for local governments with a mandate for DRR?)	Yes
Regular budget allocations for DRR to local government	Yes
Estimated % of local budget allocation assigned to DRR	5%

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Implementing Guidelines for the Establishment of Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices (LDRRMOs) or Barangay DRRM Committees (BDRRMCS)

in Local Government Units have been issued on April 2014 through a Joint Memorandum Circular between the NDRRMC, DILG, Department of Budget and Management, and Civil Service Commission (JMC No. 2014-1).

In terms of community involvement, the DILG and civil society groups co-managed trainings and projects under the auspices of the Local Government Academy (LGA), examples of which are the following:

CBDRRM - Center for Disaster Preparedness (CDP)

o DRRM Volunteer Management Seminar - VSO Bahaginan Foundation

o Flood/Swift Water First Responder Training - Disaster Emergency Search and Rescue (DESAR) o Sustainable Livelihoods Assessment Workshop – Ateneo School of Government (ASoG)

o Project Encore - Save the Children (NBOO).

NDRRMC document dated 20 February 2013 containing the list of Approved and Selected/Endorsed CSOs and Private Sector (PS) Representatives to the National DRRM Council was also issued, as a requirement of multi-stakeholder representation.

(N.B. The questions under this indicator are not precisely about “community participation and decentralization.”)

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

RA 10121's Declaration of Policy highlights the role of local government units (LGUs) in performing and implementing the law and its plans down to the community level.

The law also provides for the creation of regional and local equivalents of the National Risk Reduction and Management Council, including civil society representation. While the full national council, including all its representatives, has already been constituted at the national level, it remains a challenge to do it at the local level. This includes the setting-up of fully-functioning Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices (DRRMOs), let alone civil society representation.

Core indicator 4

A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such

as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are civil society organizations, national finance and planning institutions, key economic and development sector organizations represented in the national platform? Yes

civil society members (specify absolute number)	4
national finance and planning institutions (specify absolute number)	39
sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)	6
private sector (specify absolute number)	1
science and academic institutions (specify absolute number)	1
women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)	5
other (please specify)	

Where is the coordinating lead institution for disaster risk reduction located?

In the Prime Minister's/President's Office	No
In a central planning and/or coordinating unit	No
In a civil protection department	Yes
In an environmental planning ministry	No
In the Ministry of Finance	No
Other (Please specify)	

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's

ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

In addition to the multi-stakeholder platform mentioned above, majority of the members of the Philippine Council for Agriculture and Fisheries Committee on Climate Change, which serves as a consultative body and feedback mechanism for all DA policies and programs, come from business, civil society and agricultural producers' organizations.

The implementation structure under the Climate Change Act is also relevant. It provides for an Advisory Board consisting of 16 government agencies, four representatives from the various local governments (provinces, cities, municipalities and barangays), and three sectoral representatives from the academe, the business sector, and civil society. There is also a Panel of Technical Experts consisting of practitioners in disciplines that are related to climate change, including DRR. The law further requires the Climate Change Commission to coordinate with NGOs, the academe, people's organizations, the private and corporate sectors and other concerned stakeholder groups in the development and implementation of the National Climate Change Action Plan.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

While there have been previous challenges in NDRRMC's monitoring of its members' DRRM projects and activities, this continues to be addressed by developing more systematic mechanisms for reporting and exchange. The Council members are now in the process of harmonizing their respective DRRM initiatives towards functioning fully as a collective body.

Priority for Action 2

Identify, assess and monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning

Core indicator 1

National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment with a common methodology available to inform planning and development decisions? No

Multi-hazard risk assessment	No
% of schools and hospitals assessed	
schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)	
Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments	No
Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments	No
Risk assessment held by a central repository (lead institution)	No
Common format for risk assessment	No
Risk assessment format customised by user	Yes
Is future/probable risk assessed?	No
Please list the sectors that have already used disaster risk assessment as a precondition for sectoral development planning and programming.	Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector, Infrastructure

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The DRR-CCA provisions in the Philippine Development Plan (2011-2016) lists down the sectors that utilize risk assessment in planning.

The Competitive and Sustainable Agriculture and Fisheries Sector plans to continue vulnerability and adaptation assessments especially in food production areas.

Infrastructure Sector intends to institutionalize DRR and CCA in infrastructure through various areas of development, such as the following:

Energy. Assess the vulnerability of energy facilities to climate change and natural disasters (e.g., El Niño and La Niña)

Environment & Natural Resources. Conduct vulnerability assessment and mapping of different ecosystems; consider risk assessment in the EIA system; and conduct geo-hazard mapping.

The DILG shall become the central repository of risk assessment data.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

The challenges mentioned in the previous reporting period have been addressed to a considerable degree, though these are works in progress. The availability of finer geo-hazard maps, lack of technical capacity for risk assessment and gender-disaggregated data have been previously mentioned. These are being addressed, especially the parts on risk assessment, while the others are work in progress – such as fully gender-disaggregating data.

The need to enhance knowledge on certain hazard phenomena has been duly noted,

especially after Typhoon Yolanda (or Haiyan), such as the concept of “storm surge.” The dearth of knowledge and familiarity with it has been given full consideration and now being addressed in a more systematic manner.

At the national level, a database on vulnerability data and loss still needs to be put together more fully and systematically. The National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) needs to be well-informed by specific vulnerability assessments.

Core indicator 2

Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are disaster losses and hazards systematically reported, monitored and analyzed?
Yes

Disaster loss databases exist and are regularly updated	Yes
Reports generated and used in planning by finance, planning and sectoral line ministries (from the disaster databases/ information systems)	Yes
Hazards are consistently monitored across localities and territorial boundaries	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

NOTE: Level of Progress Achieved is 3.5

One of the intended outcomes in the National Disaster Risk Reduction and

Management Plan (NDRRMP) is: “Community-based and scientific DRRM and CCA assessment, mapping, analysis and monitoring,” one target output for it is to produce “readily usable and accessible knowledge product as DRRM and CCA planning tools.”

Towards this the Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology (PHIVOLCS) reports the following accomplishments in their 2014 report:

1. Active faults mapping and paleoseismic studies
2. Gas studies on Philippine active volcanoes
3. Assessment and mitigation of risks from volcanic impact on terrain and human activities
4. CSCAND: READY for GMMA, resilience and risk analysis projects
5. Establishment of cost-effective tsunami warning system for selected high-risk coastal communities
6. Enhancement of earthquake and volcano monitoring and effective utilization of disaster mitigation information
7. Ground deformation studies along active faults using GPS
8. Kinematic analysis of Central Luzon structures
9. Development of PHIVOLCS database system

The (PHIVOLCS) Strategic Plan 2012-2016 also includes the “Volcano, Earthquake, and Tsunami Disaster Risk Reduction Program,” which includes seminars, workshops, trainings, lectures and drills for various stakeholders.

The Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA), meanwhile, reports the following:

1. Flood/Flashflood Hazards Mapping (10K) and Storm Surge Hazard Mapping (10K) of 17 provinces in the Eastern Seaboard.
2. Multi-hazard maps (Flood/flashflood and Storm Surge) developed for the Greater Metro Manila Area (GMMA READY Project), including Storm Surge Hazard maps for the municipalities along the Manila Bay Area (1:50K).
3. Tropical Cyclone Severe Wind Hazard Mapping and Risk Assessment for the Greater Metro Manila Area under the AusAID Project to serve as basis for future tropical cyclone emergency planning and to mitigate the risks from severe winds in Greater Metro Manila Area.
4. Flood Risk assessment along Marikina-Pasig River Basin.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Much attention has been given to the monitoring and mapping of hazards, but not enough assessment of vulnerabilities – which are very much differentiated across sectors, socio-economic status, age, gender, and state of health.

Hazard and risk mapping should be closely matched by on-ground assessments of vulnerabilities and coping capacities.

Core indicator 3

Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events? Yes

Early warnings acted on effectively	Yes
Local level preparedness	Yes
Communication systems and protocols used and applied	Yes
Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Hazard forecasting and monitoring equipment continue to be acquired and upgraded. Currently the country has 74 seismic stations for earthquake monitoring. It also has 36 tsunami detection stations and 10 tsunami early warning systems. There are 19 NAMRIA sea level monitoring stations. PAGASA has over 1000 automated weather stations and water level sensors. Finally the country has six volcano observatories. All these agencies have their respective websites.

There is also the Nationwide Operational Assessment of Hazards (NOAH Program) of the Department of Science and Technology (DOST), a responsive program that aims to provide an ample time warning (six-hour lead time) to vulnerable communities against impending floods, improve communication of weather and related hazards to decision-makers and the general public, and use advanced technology to enhance the current geo-hazard vulnerability gaps. The NOAH Program has reported significant achievements, including the production of useful, sophisticated hazard maps and accomplishing wide Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) survey coverage (95,000 km² or 88% of target), among others.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

The key aspect under this indicator is the need for an “end-to-end early warning system” – which covers the entire process from risk mapping to the development of information and communication protocols and the conduct of simulations and drills.

The Typhoon Yolanda (Haiyan) experience brought into full view the gaps in the country's early warning system, much of it has to do with effective communication. Most of the regional DRRMOs reported the inadequacy of information and communication systems: unfamiliarity with the notion of “storm surge,” communication blackouts, lack of alternative communication systems such as radios and satellite phones, absence of early warning systems in far-flung areas, confusion on the meaning of public storm warnings, wide use of foreign and technical, unfamiliar language, lack of internet access, and so forth.

In short, while a certain technical capacity has been developed for forecasting and hazard anticipation, these have yet to be fully cascaded to the end-users of information. Some of the recommendations that surfaced from the NDRRMC's reflections in the aftermath of Yolanda are the following:

1. Use community and science-based multi-hazard maps at the local level as bases for developing their DRRM and CLUPs.
2. Hazard maps should not only be scientifically verifiable; these should also be distributed and explained to LGUs and communities so they know how to use and apply them.
3. Make scientific forecasts accessible, understandable, and usable.

More attention should also be given to peoples' “risk perception,” and how these affect their decisions and actions.

Core indicator 4

National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional actions to reduce disaster risk? Yes

Establishing and maintaining regional hazard monitoring	Yes
Regional or sub-regional risk assessment	Yes
Regional or sub-regional early warning	Yes
Establishing and implementing protocols for transboundary information sharing	Yes
Establishing and resourcing regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

There had already been mention in previous reports about the Philippines' involvement in the initiatives of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) related to emergency response and DRR, specifically through ASEAN Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre), the regional body created under the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER). Philippines is co-Chair of the Risk Assessment, Early Warning, and Monitoring Working Group of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM).

In 2013 the country participated in the ASEAN Disaster Emergency Response Simulation Exercise (ARDEX) held in Viet Nam. This and other AADMER-related

activities have been actively participated in by national and regional (i.e. subnational) agencies.

The country has also worked with the AHA Centre and the ASEAN Secretariat in responding to the recent disasters, including typhoons Yolanda and Pablo. Furthermore, the ASEAN provided support to the NDRRMC in producing the book *What It Happened: Learning from Yolanda*, which was finished with the cooperation of Oxfam GB, an international NGO.

Apart from this, the country has been actively involved in global initiatives on DRR as well as CCA, such as the Asian Ministerial Conference on DRR and the series of meetings related to climate action initiated within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

One main concern is the coordination between the government and international actors especially during times of disaster. The deluge of external assistance, if not managed well, has the potential to compound the already chaotic situation especially in the areas directly affected. This was apparent in the country's recent disasters, most notably during Yolanda, when the local government and communities were overwhelmed not only by the calamity itself but also by the initially chaotic state of humanitarian responders.

Another main concern is how the country, and the rest of the ASEAN Member States, can optimize the existence of the AHA Centre, especially its systems and protocols that can facilitate not only data exchanges among each other but actual, immediate support during times of emergency. The AHA Centre has already developed a system of cross-country reporting and exchange as well as a manual of procedures and SOPs of cooperation during actual disasters – which are codified in the Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP).

The challenge is in making use of this regional mechanism, as well as in harmonizing it with the rest of the international humanitarian architecture, including the systems developed by the UN.

Priority for Action 3

Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels

Core indicator 1

Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? Yes

Information is proactively disseminated	Yes
Established mechanisms for access / dissemination (internet, public information broadcasts - radio, TV,)	Yes
Information is provided with proactive guidance to manage disaster risk	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The emergence of social media and the development of multi-media technology, as well as the improvement in mainstream media's coverage of DRR issues and actual disasters, have become favorable factors in the propagation of DRR information.

In terms of building risk-relevant bodies of knowledge, the Pre-Disaster Risk Assessment-Action Programs and Protocols or (PDRA-APP) was approved by the NDRRMC last June 11, 2014. This is an internationally accepted process of evaluating a hazard's level of risk given the degree of exposure and vulnerability in a specific area. The objectives are to have a common understanding, initially at the

national level, of how to deal with disasters way before they occur and subsequently formulate and implement coordinated national and local actions to address the impending hazards. It recognizes risk as a product of hazards whose impact on localities can be made worse by the people's vulnerability and exposure but which can be mitigated through the capacity of the affected communities. The PDRA cuts across all the thematic areas.

The PDRA, is a tool that addresses the possible risks and impacts of impending hazards in a manner that is "hazard-specific, area-focused, and time-bound" and not only based on an "across the board" warning signals.

The PDRA has been cascaded down to the regional and local levels, and has been largely responsible for the comparatively less casualties and damages caused by the subsequent typhoons after Yolanda, particularly the typhoons Glenda and Ruby. It also showed that systematic cooperation between the people and government (for example, in pre-emptive evacuation that is informed by assessments) can yield favorable results.

Other initiatives include DILG's "Operation Listo (Alert)" to boost emergency response and rehabilitation at grass-roots level, distribution of hazard maps with assessments through the "READY" Project, landslide and flood assessment and mapping (1:10,000 scale) by DENR-MGB, end-to-end Protocol on Warning and Disaster Reporting, etc.

Advisories from PAGASA-DOST and PHIVOLCS-DOST are shared through the agencies' official internet websites and at the same time through SMS to the Office of Civil Defense, Local Chief Executives of LGUs, RDRRMC/PDRRMC member agencies and local media outfits. LGUs are then expected to inform their barangay officials via SMS and/or handheld radios. Hazard maps are also available both in hard copies and electronic copies downloadable from the websites. The public service of telecom providers further facilitated information dissemination.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Some of the gaps and limitations identified are the following:

1. Lack of public utilization of available information, research products, and other academic outputs;
2. Limited understanding and usage of technical terms and concepts, including hazard maps; and
3. Technical and logistical problems, such as power outages, cellular signal troubles,

or physical damages to two-way radio antennas, which hamper the dissemination of relevant and urgent information.

Recommendations from various agencies and regional DRRMCs include:

- 1. Massive information, education, and communication (IEC) programmes on DRR;
- 2. More research fora;
- 3. Translation of technical terms into understandable language;
- 4. Collaboration with academic institutions for technical assistance on multi-risk assessment;
- 5. Partnership with international organizations, including bilateral and multilateral agencies, to facilitate technical assistance on generation of spatial data as well as information and knowledge management;
- 6. Improvement of data base and vulnerability information;
- 7. Combination and complementation of various modes of communication: mobile phone, AM/FM radio, two-way radio, internet, print media, and traditional/indigenous modes of communication. There was also a suggestion to revive the Morse Code; and
- 8. Development of a standard protocol after disasters to hasten the activation of "life lines" (road and communication facilities).

Core indicator 2

School curricula , education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes

primary school curriculum	Yes
secondary school curriculum	Yes
university curriculum	No
professional DRR education programmes	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator

(not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Unified DRRM in Basic Education Framework is consistent with the 2011-2018 NDRRM Framework with the four elements of (1) recovery and rehabilitation, (2) preparedness, (3) response, (4) prevention and mitigation. The Comprehensive School Safety Framework provides the foundation for the DRRM in Basic Education. This operates on three pillars: Pillar 1 – Safe Learning Facilities, Pillar 2 – School Disaster Management, Pillar – 3 DRR in Education. DRRM in Basic Education takes into consideration the three pillars together with the four DRRM elements.

Through the third pillar, DRR is now included in the new curriculum under the “K-12”(the new programme adopted by the DepEd that expands and extends primary education coverage), by embedding it in certain subjects. Hazard awareness, for example, is included in science subjects. DRRM was included as an elective course in senior high school.

DepEd has also institutionalized the quarterly conduct of school-based earthquake and fire drills with guidelines provided through DepEd Order No. 48, s. 2012

At the tertiary level, DRR is a component of the National Service Training Program (NSTP). There is a course on Disaster Risk Management as well.

Degree programmes on DRR are not yet existent at the national scale, though there are initiatives at the regional level such as the CCA-DRRM Training Institute in the province of Bohol. Another is the Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA) which offers Masteral programme in DRR.

Teaching DRRM – DRRM is currently being integrated in curriculum and extra-curricular activities. It is proposed to be a module in Grade 11 or 12. But the issue is – who is going to teach it?

OCD, in partnership with JICA, under the DRRM Capacity Enhancement Project (CEP), also developed standard training modules for the National DRRM Education and Training Program (NDRRMETP) with DRRM Training Courses designed for Local Chief Executives (LCEs), Local DRRM Councils Officials, and Private Sector Executives. The Civil Defense Education and Training Program (CDETP) modules for Basic, Advanced, and Executive Courses on DRRM were also developed.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Some of the gaps identified are the following:

1. The DRRM subject matter that is to be integrated into the curriculum is yet to be standardized. Also, not all schools have been compliant – many in far-flung areas as well as private schools have not yet complied with this directive;
2. Higher compliance has been observed on the regular conduct of fire and earthquake drills among primary schools, but less on state colleges and universities due to lack of specific guidelines;
3. Lack of DRRM trainings for teachers; and
4. The academe is not a member of some RDRRMCs.

Recommendations:

1. The education sector needs to formulate standardized DRRM modules that are also adaptable to specific local contexts. (One specific idea on DRR education is the building of “disaster museums” such as those in Taiwan, where the legacies and lessons of certain major disasters have been preserved for the benefit of future generations);
2. More effort should be geared towards ensuring DRR inclusion in the curriculum of schools in inaccessible areas;
3. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) should have a higher degree of participation in DRR matters, including planning and implementation. Vocational and technical institutes should also boost their curricula with specific DRR skills, including search and rescue operations on collapsed structures in urban settings among others;
4. There should be more relevant trainings and continuing education for teachers, including direct involvement in DRRM programs and activities; and
5. The RDRRMC membership should include the academe.

Core indicator 3

Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? Yes

Research programmes and projects

Yes

Research outputs, products or studies are applied / used by public and private institutions Yes

Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Many of the agency members of the NDRRMC have their respective DRR-related researches and corresponding resource allocation. The DOST however devote more specific DRR-related researches through the offices under it, namely the PAGASA and PHIVOLCS, as well as through its current project, the NOAH Programme – the mission of which is to undertake disaster science research and development; advance the use of cutting edge technologies; and recommend innovative information services in the government's disaster prevention and mitigation efforts.

Multi-risk assessment researches also continue to be conducted at the regional level. Through these studies, regional development plans, including comprehensive land use plans (CLUPS) and zoning ordinances, are more systematically informed by DRR and CCA considerations, such as the development of the Cagayan Valley Regional Development Plan 2011-2016.

Another example is the academic research undertaken by the GMMA – READY Officers, CSCAND Agencies, and OCD for the Multi-Hazard Maps Information, Education and Communication Campaign (IEC) in the barangays (villages) of Laguna, Rizal and Cavite province.

There have also been partnerships with the academe in Mindanao, such as the Xavier University and Ateneo de Davao University, and various research initiatives such as the "Localization of earthquake studies(with PHIVOLCS), Climate studies, and other related subject matters identified in the Davao Region Development Research Agenda (DRDRA), with proposed funding from a consortium of academic institutions.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

The most tangible gap is the limited amount of attention and resources devoted to DRR research, especially in the regions. As a result of this, many CLUPs and community development plans (CDPs) are also not updated and not tuned-in to DRR-CCA concerns. There are also very few learning institutions devoted to DRR and CCA, and the research outputs of these institutions are not sufficiently used by the concerned agencies and the public in general.

Local governments and communities also do not have sufficient capability to conduct multi-sectoral assessments.

Positive ways forward include the establishment of more and stronger DRRM institutions at the national and regional levels. Partnership between government agencies and research/academic institutions should also be encouraged, so that planning and governance will be strongly informed by scientific research. This should be further complemented by partnerships with civil society and community-based organizations, which will provide it with the social component.

Lastly, different areas of research should be harmonized.

Core indicator 4

Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk? Yes

Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk.	Yes
Training of local government	Yes
Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)	Yes
Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)	Yes

Guidance for risk reduction

Yes

Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Disaster Information for Nationwide Awareness Project or Project DINA is the Philippines' proof of commitment to the realization of the HFA's priority action 3. Project DINA provides the public access to DRRM information materials such as audio-visual presentations (AVPs), providing online DRRM instructions to the public – before, during and after disasters. DINA's materials focus on hazards such as earthquakes, tsunami, tropical cyclones, landslides, floods, volcanic eruptions, and fires.

Other initiatives for public education for DRRM conducted in all regions include the Department of Science and Technology's "Iba Na Ang Panahon (The Weather has Changed)" or INAP: science for safer communities which promotes science and technology-based materials such as hazard maps, websites and apps. The National Simulated Earthquake Drill (NSED) is also conducted quarterly since 2006.

At the local level, LGUs, communities and youth leaders continue to receive IEC materials and orientations on DRRM and CCA Laws and policies, monitoring, early warning and risk assessment; trainings on GIS, Climate and Disaster Risk and Vulnerability Reduction, and Community-Based DRRM (CBDRRM); and understanding multi-hazard maps and integrating these into development planning through the initiatives of the RDRRMCs.

These are further enhanced by national initiatives such as the National Science and Technology Week (NSTW), the National Disaster Consciousness Month in July of every year, annual observance of the National Climate Change Consciousness Week in November, as well as the celebration of the UN International Day for Disaster Reduction in October every year.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Despite the constant IEC campaigns, the interest of some local chief executives (LCEs) remain low, as reflected in their attendance or participation in DRRM trainings, conferences, and other related activities – especially for LGUs that are not in high-risk areas. In other areas, participation is limited by funding availability.

There are also isolated LGUs in the rural areas that do not have access to IEC materials. In others, inculcating DRRM remains a challenge as the “culture of dependency” is observed.

Lastly, Metro Manila or the national capital region faces problems typical of highly urbanized centers: urban congestion, which poses additional challenges in emergency preparedness and training.

Hence, creativity is demanded in order to reach out further and be more effective. Using the local languages and dialects and simplifying complex concepts, among others, can facilitate understanding and appreciation.

There is also a need to come up with an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system for DRRM trainings and find ways to reduce overlapping activities by LGUs and NGAs.

Priority for Action 4

Reduce the underlying risk factors

Core indicator 1

Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

Protected areas legislation	Yes
Payment for ecosystem services (PES)	No
Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)	Yes
Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)	Yes
Climate change adaptation projects and programmes	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Philippines has a significant number of national legislation and regional and local policies to address environmental protection and conservation of natural resources. These can be accessed at <http://www.denr.gov.ph/laws-and-policies.html>.

RA 10121 and RA 9729 are explicit in their environmental protection provisions, and these are monitored by the NDRRMC and DILG as well as the DENR and the offices

under it (CCC and NAMRIA, among others).

Apart from the enforcement of environmental laws and policies, programs for the implementation of these policies include sector-specific programs on coastal resource management (including easement guidelines along bodies of water); forest development, protection and rehabilitation; the Ridge to Reef Framework of Development; and localized policies, such as the Agno River Basin Inter-Regional Watershed Management Program in Ilocos.

Reforestation is a key element of the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) as a carbon sequestration mechanism that is expected to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

At the local level, DRRM, Forest Land Use and IPAs are now mainstreamed into the Comprehensive Land Use Plans of LGUs, which determines zoning. Meanwhile, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) are a primary requirement for land use in any type of development. Implementation of land use allocation scheme in forest lands and improvement of river environment are also conducted.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Deficiencies in the implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, policies and DRR, CCA and environmentally sensitive plans are a result of weaknesses in collaboration or lack of binding agreements between implementing/enforcing agencies.

At the local level, implementation is hampered by poor political will and lack of capacities and resources – including manpower of regional offices of national agencies. For example there are not enough designated Environment and Natural Resources Officer (ENRO) to oversee, monitor and implement environment-related programs within their respective jurisdiction.

Concerning “No-build zones,” this policy has been implemented in some hazard-prone areas, but communities still choose to stay despite the risks. This is due to limitations in DRRM law enforcement, lack of community awareness of hazards and environmental vulnerabilities, unabated population growth, migration, and scarcity of land in non-hazard areas.

The rapid progress in the pacing and level of regional development contradicts certain land use policies and has focused primarily on socio-economic sectors, at times failing to recognize DRR concerns. Lastly, land ownership also occasionally

serves as a barrier to reforestation programs in upland areas.

To address these challenges, the enforcement of land administration laws is essential. Also, relocation plans of affected communities should incorporate social, economic and cultural considerations for sustainability.

The overlaps of various national laws and policies with the DRR and CCA laws should be looked into, in order to clarify, identify possible conflicts, and highlight the linkages among these policies and harmonize processes among agencies involved.

Core indicator 2

Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? Yes

Crop and property insurance	Yes
Temporary employment guarantee schemes	Yes
Conditional and unconditional cash transfers	Yes
Micro finance (savings, loans, etc.)	No
Micro insurance	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation (PCIC) under the DA offers insurance for crops, livestock and equipment for multi-risks including natural disasters including earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, typhoons as well as other incidents such as pest

infestation and disease. Related to this, the Philippine Climate Change Commission is currently drafting a framework on weather-based agri-parametrics as a risk transfer mechanism for the agriculture industry.

The DSWD is the key agency for safety nets. It provides “conditional cash transfers” (CCT) for the beneficiaries of the Pantawid sa Pamilyang Pilipino, Program (4Ps), or Alleviation for Filipino Families program – targeting the most vulnerable and disadvantaged families. It also provides livelihood assistance through the Self-Employment Assistance, education and programs to bring back families from the streets.

Also, the DSWD’s Student Grants in Aid Program for Poverty Alleviation (SGPPA) in cooperation with six universities aims to alleviate poverty by increasing higher education graduates, thus helping to get them employed in high value-added occupations.

And in the aftermath of disasters, the DSWD conducts cash for work and food for work programs. Similarly, the Emergency Shelter Assistance (ESA) and Core Shelter Program (CSP) were also applied for the reconstruction of damaged domiciles, especially after Haiyan.

National agencies such as the Government Insurance Service Systems (GSIS), the Home Development Mutual Fund (HDMF), and the Social Security System (SSS) provide calamity loans to disaster affected persons. The Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP), Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP), local cooperatives and micro-finance institutions provide assistance to farmers and other individuals.

Lastly, the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) implements integrated livelihood and emergency employment programs under the “Tulong Pangkabuhayan” (livelihood assistance) for Displaced/ Disadvantaged workers.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

There is not enough information and body of knowledge concerning insurance or risk transfer mechanisms related to DRR. There are also no known standards or protocols amongst financial / insurance coverage for disasters except those from GSIS and SSS (which cover only a small percentage of recovery or rehabilitation and limited only to those who have insurance coverage of their facilities).

Private sector participation in risk transfer also remains insufficient.

Affordability is also an issue. For example, some risk transfer mechanisms have interest rates from 10% up to 20%, which are only financially viable for middle-income individuals. Only a few farmers with credible “lending” records can avail of crop insurance; others are hampered by existing debts.

Some poor and deserving families are excluded from the 4Ps program due to requirement issues (e.g. failure to provide documentation).

Finally, local politics intervenes in the implementation of social safety nets such as in the identification and endorsements of beneficiaries.

Recommendations:

1. Promote micro-financing at the LGU level, through the GSIS and SSS. And develop a system to encourage and accredit insurance companies.
2. Provide insurance payment subsidies for the financially disadvantaged.
3. Enhance DSWD programs The cash for work, for example, should incorporate skills training.
4. Review and refine the system of qualification in the 4Ps program to ensure that everyone deserving of support should be served. Strengthen and systematize documentation and processing of information.

Core indicator 3

Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? Yes

National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.	Yes
Please provide specific examples: e.g. public infrastructure, transport and communication, economic and productive assets	Under the Philippine Development Plan (NEDA), here are some examples: Establishment of climate-resilient

agricultural
infrastructure,
Prioritize
construction of flood
management
structures in highly
vulnerable areas,
Apply DRR and
CCA strategies in
the pl

**Investments in retrofitting infrastructures
including schools and hospitals**

Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Since DRR and CCA are mainstreamed into the regional development plans, new investment in the economic and productive sectors are also better positioned against exposure to disaster/climate risks, ensuring that PPAs further socio-economic development but also disaster risk-sensitive.

Public investments in infrastructure take into consideration not only the technical and financial aspects in planning, design and implementation but also the environmental, cultural and social impacts, with particular consideration to vulnerable groups (persons with disability, women, children, older people, indigenous people, etc.).

This is especially true in the design of schools and hospitals, with foremost concerns on safety. There is higher concern now to build structures resilient against strong winds, earthquakes, floods, and other hazards while incorporating the necessary guidelines for sanitation, safety, accessibility (especially for vulnerable groups) and environmental sustainability by strictly following the National Building Code, Fire Code, and the National Structural Code of the Philippines. The Building Code in particular applies to all structures to be built, with permits to construct awarded by LGUs.

Construction of roads (including farm-to-market roads), bridges, and irrigation facilities are subjected to stricter evaluation (with consideration to flood level history), including the construction of safer redundant routes.

Relocation sites for affected communities are also subject to hazard assessments, and socialized housing schemes incorporate principles of disaster resilience.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Proliferation of substandard materials and poor construction is still observed in many parts. There is also difficulty in monitoring non-engineered infrastructure, specifically those established by informal settlers who do not seek permits before construction.

In terms of livelihood, unsafe and environmentally-destructive practices, such as kaingin (slash and burn) farming, small scale mining, and illegal logging still abound.

Political intervention in various stages of public infrastructure projects from bidding to implementation remains.

Recommendations:

1. Allocate budget for the building of resilient structures to ensure use of high quality materials and design according to DRR standards. Give emphasis to local government financing for local infrastructure projects.
2. Undertake proper assessment of construction sites.
3. Promote private sector involvement in planning and implementation (public-private partnership or PPP).
4. Institutionalize transparency to neutralize political interventions in infrastructure development.
5. Conduct infrastructure audits and intensify monitoring of infrastructure projects, back by strong political will, to ensure adherence to codes and standards.

Core indicator 4

Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes

Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas	Yes
Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas	Yes
Training of masons on safe construction technology	No
Provision of safe land and housing for low income households and communities	Yes
Risk sensitive regulation in land zoning and private real estate development	Yes
Regulated provision of land titling	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

For Regulated provision of land titling:

JMC No. 2014-01 dated November 2014 re Adoption of Hazard Zone Classification in Areas Affected by TY Yolanda and Providing Guidelines Herein

GIS, LIDAR, computer simulations, fault mapping and other technological tools have been used for the country's assessment of hydro-meteorological, geologic, and seismic hazards as well as community vulnerabilities, especially in urban areas. Some LGUs also conducted geo-tagging assessment of buildings and infrastructure. These assessments were translated into hazard and risk maps and integrated into local land use and development plans.

For example, in region IV-A, Greater Metro Manila Area (GMMA) – READY Officers, Collective Strengthening on Community Awareness on Natural Disasters (CSCAND) Agencies, and OCD conducted information, education and communication (IEC) campaign using multi-hazard maps for the local officials down to the barangay level in the provinces of Laguna, Rizal and Cavite.

Risk reduction policies include the establishment of no-build zones, relocation of vulnerable urban communities, and waterways management and development.

Hazard assessments are incorporated in infrastructure and housing development such as the Fault Certification issued by PHIVOLCS and the Engineering Geological and Geohazard Assessment (EGGA) as additional requirement for Environmental Compliance Certification (ECC).

Strict enforcement of building code and other related laws are being enforced especially in highly urbanized cities through monitoring and inspection of existing structures and ongoing construction. Newly constructed buildings are considered safer than the old low rise buildings due to the stringent requirements being imposed on safety standards. Retrofitting of older buildings using updated standards are being constructed in some areas.

A review of the building code specifically for hospitals is being undertaken, with the Department of Health providing technical support.

For families affected by disasters or are located in high-risk areas and in need of relocation, the DSWD Core Shelter Assistance Program (CSAP) has designed settlements that can withstand 220 km/hour wind velocity and strong earthquakes.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Monitoring and enforcing the National Building code and other related plans and policies remain a challenge as informal settlers continue to build settlements in identified hazard prone areas. Also, some developers only acquire the Fault Certification, EGGA and other technical reports for compliance rather than as basis for development planning.

Some land developments have started on some sites that are still subject to investigation prior to the issuance of a Geo-hazard identification report or certification.

Hazard prone areas and environmentally protected areas have been converted into residential zones, exposing communities to further risks. Also, rampant land conversion from agricultural to residential and industrial sites threatens food security.

Trans-boundary issues complicate relationships among neighbouring LGUs, and there are insufficient institutional and financial instruments to address these.

Instances of structural collapse have happened as a result of earthquake, liquefaction, and landslides – specifically those constructed in hazard-prone areas, resulting in massive deaths and destruction of properties.

Recommendations:

1. Sufficient hazard and risk assessments should be incorporated into LGUs' local land use and other development plans. These should be reviewed and updated

regularly and implemented through enabling legislation. For settlers in high-risk areas, appropriate resettlement plans should be undertaken.

2. Field visits and development plan reviews of assessors and engineers should be regular and continuous. Denial of applications in non-compliant circumstances should be strictly enforced.

3. Land classification and conversion laws should likewise be strictly enforced by the local government with the support of national government agencies.

4. Trans-boundary issues should be managed through close coordination among all stakeholders, with financial and technical support from national government institutions and donor organizations.

Core indicator 5

Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Do post-disaster programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR for resilient recovery? Yes

% of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR	
DRR capacities of local authorities for response and recovery strengthened	Yes
Risk assessment undertaken in pre- and post-disaster recovery and reconstruction planning	No
Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The Gawad Kalasag (Shield Awards) is a national initiative which aims to recognize pioneering and innovative LGUs, CSOs/NGOs, hospitals, schools, government and private volunteers/responders, individual and group heroes, and their initiatives under the four thematic areas of DRRM including (1) prevention and mitigation, (2) preparedness, (3) response, and (4) rehabilitation and recovery.

Rapid economic assessments on livelihood recovery options for a number of communities have been conducted and sustainable livelihood projects have been undertaken for some communities.

Funds for livelihood projects were also provided to 3,043 beneficiaries affected by disasters including Typhoons Pepeng, Pedring and Quiel which included projects such as vermiculture and vermicompost production cum vegetable gardening, organic fertilizer production, livestock dispersal, municipal breeding, cogon grass handicraft, tiger grass plantation and walis tambo (broom) production, plantation and marketing of upland gabi with rambutan and ginger, integrated farming on high-value commercial crop in upland areas, diversified micro enterprises (meat processing, peanut butter and instant salabat-making, salted and smoked fish processing, garment, and fishball-making).

Capacity building has been conducted for LGUs, local resource institutions and disaster recovery managers.

Post-Disaster Rehabilitation and Recovery training in Region 8 with 99 participants composed of LGU officials and technical staff was conducted.

OPARR's cluster approach to rehabilitation and recovery followed the "Build Back Better" approach, which incorporated infrastructure standards, disaster resilient livelihood opportunities, enhanced social services, and safer shelters for the affected communities, among others.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

There is no national recovery plan. Only ad hoc arrangements have been put in place, but not institutionalized (e.g. Task Force Pablo and OPARR for Typhoon Yolanda).

Coordination problems with INGOs have also been encountered.

Recommendations:

1. Improve data management, availability, and transparency; institutionalize

government processes; and set-up workable coordination mechanisms.
 2. Follow the NDRRM Framework and ensure that NEDA takes the lead in recovery and rehabilitation.

Core indicator 6

Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the impacts of disaster risk that are created by major development projects assessed? Yes

Are cost/benefits of disaster risk taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects? Yes

Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)	Yes
By national and sub-national authorities and institutions	Yes
By international development actors	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

Disaster risk is taken into account in the design and operation of major development projects. For example the Investment Coordination Committee (ICC) requires the proponent’s submission of Engineering Geological and Geo-hazard Assessment Report (EGGAR) and Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) in their review and approval of projects. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) are SOP in any development project. The DPWH also undertakes impact assessments for its infrastructure projects.

For LGUs, the DILG's Office of Project Development Services (OPDS) conducts trainings on the conduct of assessment/audit of local infrastructure assets, provides technical assistance on preparing financial statements, detailed engineering designs, and procurement, operation and maintenance. This is supported by the formulation and distribution of infrastructure audit guidelines and tools, forms and checklists. Structures are categorized as: Good Structures, Minor Repair Structures, Major Repair Structures, for Condemnation, and Demolished.

With the inclusion of DRRM in the development plans of some regions, the focus shifted from the identification of hazard-prone areas and assessment of property-damage and fatalities to the identification of hazard-free areas for socio-economic activities.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

The paradigm shift which emphasizes economic development through effective utilization of resources has jeopardized the physical and natural reserves in certain regions. Strategic resources from upland, lowland, and coastal areas have experienced negative impacts as a result of development.

Any development put threats to natural protective shields, such as mangroves, watersheds, forest covers, and topsoil. In the NCR rapid urbanization and concreting of open spaces have resulted in the loss of topsoil and destruction of the natural ecosystem. This has resulted to flooding, with the ground's capacity to absorb water compromised, and further exacerbated by clogging of sewage and drainage systems. Conversion of agricultural lands to residential areas also led to such flooding effect.

Land scarcity has led to competition in people's socio-economic activities.

Recommendations:

1. Replicate the practice of Sarangani Province (Region 12) which allocates at least 1% of the total project cost of all infrastructure projects, whether funded by the provincial government or externally, to environmental protection / rehabilitation of the project site.
2. Adhere strictly to the established land use plans, as well as infrastructure, environmental and sanitary codes and guidelines.
3. Prioritize the mainstreaming of DRR and CCA in land use plans.

Priority for Action 5

Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels

Core indicator 1

Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are there national programmes or policies for disaster preparedness, contingency planning and response? Yes

DRR incorporated in these programmes and policies	Yes
--	-----

The institutional mechanisms exist for the rapid mobilisation of resources in a disaster, utilising civil society and the private sector; in addition to public sector support.	Yes
--	-----

Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? Yes

Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety	Yes
---	-----

Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness	Yes
--	-----

Are future disaster risks anticipated through scenario development and aligned preparedness planning? Yes

Potential risk scenarios are developed taking into account climate change projections	Yes
--	-----

Preparedness plans are regularly updated based on future risk scenarios	Yes
--	-----

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The relevant policies include RA 10174 or the People's Survival Fund, National DRRRM Plan and Framework, National Disaster Response Plan (with focus on hydro-met hazards and earthquake/tsunami) and the National Disaster Preparedness Plan.

The following is a listing of agency-specific response programs:

For Health, there are policies on Health Emergency Management, Guidelines for Mass Casualty Management, Safe Hospitals programs, Nutrition in Emergencies together with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), and Mental Health and Psycho-Social Support (MHPSS). Additionally there are policies on chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosives (CBRNE), International Health Regulations, Surveillance in Post Extreme Emergencies and Disasters (SPEED), and Capacity building for delivery of life-saving interventions and services in emergencies and disasters.

DILG has its Central Office Disaster Information Coordinating Center (CODIX) and alert bulletins to LGUs to operationalize disaster preparedness and response measures. ICS training, infrastructure audits, preparedness tools are also employed. DRRM is used as an indicator in the Seal of Good Local Governance.

The Armed Forces of the Philippines has standard operating procedures (SOPs) on Humanitarian Assistance in Disaster Response (HADR) and the management of multinational forces through the Multinational Coordination Center and Civil-Military Coordination Center.

DepEd's programs include: orientation on the use of the Batingaw App, participation in the OCD's national drills, Brigada Eskwela (2014 Theme: Making Schools Safer), National Disaster Consciousness Month, disaster resilient classrooms, alternative delivery mode in disaster areas, and school improvement plan(DRR integration and safe schools program).

DSWD facilitated the creation of Disaster Risk Reduction and Operations Office, Disaster Response and Emergency Management Bureau, adopted the cluster approach, established new clusters for the Philippine context, built model evacuation centers, and prepositioned relief goods and personnel in preparation for response.

Apart from these government offices, civil society is very much involved in disaster response. National NGOs like the Center for Disaster Preparedness (CDP) has CBDRM Modules (Basic Instructors Guide), and holds joint trainings with DILG and the LGA. International NGOs like Oxfam, Save the Children, Christian Aid, World

Vision, etc. are likewise directly active in humanitarian response. Most of these groups are involved in humanitarian networks like DRRNet and the Philippine International NGO Network (PINGON).

As regards the private sector, a MOA to facilitate response cooperation has been drawn up between government and the following:

1. SMART (Batingaw, SMS Blast, etc.)
2. Air 21 (Logistics)
3. One MERALCO Foundation (Disaster Preparedness)
4. RAPPLER (Disaster Preparedness and Response)
5. National Book Store (learning kits)

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Drills and scenario-based exercises among LGUs, schools, and hospitals are still not enough compared to the need.

Risk assessments are still fragmented, not holistic and comprehensive.

The policies are in place; the challenge is in the implementation due to limitations in capacities and resources.

Information and awareness of HFA has not fully reached the local level.

No measurable indicators for HFA Implementation.

The new DRRM law is not yet in complete harmony with the implementation of the Local Government Code.

Not enough inter-agency awareness on the policies.

Logistical challenges still exist, such as the lack of aircraft for DRRM related operations.

LDRRMO institutionalization is not yet complete.

Recommendations:

1. Position health as a priority in all disaster management platforms.
2. Enhance information dissemination of the DRRM policies.

- 3. Maximize the existence of existing policies related to requests for assistance from the AFP.
- 4. Conduct more drills in schools and hospitals, including well-defined evacuation sites.
- 5. Conduct regular review and update of data, contingency plans, and protocols based on risk assessments, needs, and existing capacities, especially among LGUs.
- 6. Strictly enforce pre-emptive evacuation.
- 7. Conduct risk and vulnerability assessment and capacity needs analysis to determine key programs for LGUs.
- 8. Establish and build capabilities for emergency communications protocols and redundancies using VHF/UHF Base and Hand Held Radio, satellite phone, morse code or messenger system.
- 8. LCEs to be more proactive in DRR and have political will to implement their programs.
- 9. Allocate more funds for preparedness.

Core indicator 2

Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes

Plans and programmes are developed with gender sensitivities	Yes
Risk management/contingency plans for continued basic service delivery	Yes
Operations and communications centre	Yes
Search and rescue teams	Yes
Stockpiles of relief supplies	Yes
Shelters	Yes
Secure medical facilities	Yes

Dedicated provision for disabled and elderly in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities Yes

Businesses are a proactive partner in planning and delivery of response Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The OCD conducts Pre-Disaster Risk Assessment – Actions Programs and Protocols (PDRA-APP), Rapid Disaster Needs Assessment and Post Disaster Needs Assessments. It is also directly involved in information dissemination and contingency plan formulation. Its training courses include:

1. ICS Ladderized Courses
2. RDANA
3. PDNA
4. Search and rescue
5. Camp management
6. Simulation drills, exercises and response protocols.

A national disaster response plan was formulated and adopted for different hazards and disaster scenarios with the participation of stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector. The NDRRMC Operation Center has been established to do monitoring, evaluation, and coordination of disaster response operations.

LGUs have also formulated and practiced their own contingency plans based on worst-case scenarios with respect to key hazards in their areas. These are tested through drills and simulations. Some LGUs have also already established their own local operations center.

Local evacuation centers and temporary shelters have been identified. Stockpiles of emergency resources have been set up and pre-positioning of resources is regularly practiced. Pre-emptive evacuation procedure/process streamlined.

The DSWD provides Emergency Shelter Assistance (ESA) and Core Shelter Assistance to those families whose houses were partially and totally damaged respectively with cash for work.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities

and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Challenges:

1. Sharing and updating of information.
2. Limitations in the use of government funds and stringent government rules during disasters including differences in understanding policy on QRF use.
3. Limitations on prepositioning by LGUs.
4. Monitoring of program implementation.
5. Security of local response teams including international teams doing SAR and medical missions.
6. Lack of open spaces and evacuation areas in urban areas.
7. Not all medical facilities are assessed for safety from disasters.
8. Communications are still disrupted during disasters.
9. The use of schools as evacuation centers creates other problems.
10. Some LGUs have limited resources and capacity in updating their contingency plans and organizing and equipping rescue teams and remain dependent on the national government.
11. Not all LGUs are able to incorporate the concerns of vulnerable populations in the provision of relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities.

Recommendations:

1. Pursue capacity building for LGUs.
2. Invest in technology.
3. Establish a Magna Carta for DRRM Workers.
4. Increase investment in risk mitigation and disaster preparedness.
5. Assist LGUs in developing contingency plans as well as in networking with funding institutions or development partners.
6. Disaggregate baseline data at the local level.
7. Incentivize cooperation and compliance to DRRM standards and guidelines.
8. Conduct simulations and scenario exercises down to the community level.
9. Continuously monitor LGU preparedness measures to ensure focus is on DRR rather than on mere response.
10. Encourage LCEs' commitment to DRRM.

Core indicator 3

Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.

Level of Progress achieved? 3

Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

National contingency and calamity funds	Yes
The reduction of future risk is considered in the use of calamity funds	Yes
Insurance and reinsurance facilities	Yes
Catastrophe bonds and other capital market mechanisms	No

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

RA 10121 and NDRRM Framework articulate the shift from a reactive to proactive approach to DRRM and this is reflected in the guidelines for the National and Local DRRM Funds.

At the local level, at least 5% of income from regular sources is to be set-aside for DRRM, with a ratio of 70% for prevention and mitigation and preparedness and 30% as Quick Response Fund (QRF), i.e. for response and rehabilitation.

The 70% allocation for disaster prevention and mitigation, preparedness, can be used for infrastructure, training, planning, capacity including purchase of equipment, stockpiling of basic emergency relief supplies, IEC, building and risk transfer mechanisms among others.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Challenges:

1. Delay in release of funds. Once released, utilization is low due to limited absorptive capacities of agencies.
2. Inconsistencies in the general guidelines on QRF utilization bring about extreme caution against usage due to audit fears, resulting to low usage.
3. Insufficiency of QRF for rehabilitation and recovery needs.
4. Low capacity to pay insurance and other risk transfer mechanisms.
5. Poorer LGUs, having lower revenues, also have LDRRM Fund at their disposal despite having higher exposure and vulnerability.
6. Limited technical capacity of LGUs to generate project proposals to access NDRRMF.

Recommendations:

1. Develop clearer policies for QRF utilization and ensure thorough understanding.
2. For the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and Commission on Audit (COA) to harmonize their guidelines for the Utilization of the QRF towards improving the process of fund release.
3. Capacitate LGUs in the utilization of the LDRRMF and formulation of project proposals. And link them up with donors from national and international agencies or organizations.
4. Amend the existing law to increase the DRRMF to not less than 8% of the national and local operating annual budgets. Include the classification of LGUs as basis for the amount of funds to be provided.
5. Utilize the bottom-up budgeting process for LGUs to source funds from the DILG for preparedness projects.
6. Foster the mutual assistance among neighboring LGUs and develop the practice of cooperation especially in times of disaster.
7. Increase awareness of LGUs/ farmers/households regarding the benefit of risk transfer mechanisms.

Core indicator 4

Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews.

Level of Progress achieved? 4

Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities.

Key Questions and Means of Verification

Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? Yes

Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available	Yes
Post-disaster need assessment methodologies	Yes
Post-disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects	Yes
Identified and trained human resources	Yes

Provide description and constraints for the overall core indicator (not only the means of verification).

Please describe some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking/ assessment for the indicated level of progress.

The National Government has established guidelines for the multi-agency conduct of Rapid Disaster Needs Assessment (RDNA), conducted immediately after a disaster to serve as immediate basis for relief, response and early recovery; and the more comprehensive Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA), which serves as the more strategic basis for rehabilitation and recovery.

LGUs and other national government agencies receive trainings on conducting RDANA and PDNA.

RDANA and PDANA have been conducted in disaster stricken areas around the country with trained personnel from the various national and local governments.

Communication and information sharing at all levels is vital to RDNA and PDNA. These are all consolidated centrally by the OCD.

The NDRRMC espouses the “twinning approach” where regional offices have counterparts. In the event when a particular regional office is rendered ineffective, another one can take over its functions, including those for RDNA and PDNA.

Provide an explanation of some of the key contextual reasons for the country's ranking assessment at the indicated level. In particular, highlight key challenges encountered by the country/ national authorities and partner agencies; and recommendations on how these can/ will be overcome in the future.

Context and Constraints

Challenges:

1. Post-event reviews are not purposive; the roles within PDNA, RDNA are not clear.
2. Adoption of the SPHERE standards as basis for needs assessments is difficult in many instances.
3. Commitment of partner agencies to participate in the conduct of RDANA and PDNA is not readily secured.
4. Terms of reference (Internal and External) in the creation of National PDNA Team have yet to be finalized and approved.
5. There are no feedback mechanisms from the national to the LGUs.
6. The documentation of lessons, through RDNA and PDNA, has yet to be used to improve the DRRM system.
7. Baseline data on pre-disaster situation remains insufficient.

Recommendations:

1. Institutionalize post-event reviews.
2. Contextualize SPHERE standards into Philippine standards.
3. More RDANA and PDNA trainings should be conducted, including down to the local levels. Teams should be deployed in the earliest hours after a disaster.
4. Generate commitment of partner agencies through MOA/MOU in the 5. National Level and come up with a department order down to the regional level with approved terms of reference for the PDNA teams.
5. Feedback mechanisms must be institutionalized.
6. Documentation procedures must be enhanced.
7. Data banking of LGUs must be improved, including vulnerability information.
8. Allocate more funds for risk assessment.
9. Establish regional repositories of datasets to be used during post disaster events and accessible online.

Drivers of Progress

a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?: Yes

If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Much of the inputs regarding the country's multi-hazard risk assessments are already under Section 4 (HFA Priority 2, which focuses on risk assessment).

In addition to this, the NDRRMC also provides inputs and occasionally accesses information from the website of the ASEAN Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre).

b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?: Yes

Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

For the questions above:

Q: Is gender disaggregated data available and being applied to decision-making for risk reduction and recovery activities?

A: There are some gender disaggregated data but not consciously used in the planning process

Q: Do gender concerns inform policy and programme conceptualisation and implementation in a meaningful and appropriate way?

A: Utilization is low.

Description:

Generally there is low utilization of gender-disaggregated data in the country. It's the same in the regions, with a high level of variability. Many regions report that there are attempts to disaggregate, following from national directive, but some difficulties are encountered.

Regions that report significant degrees of success are regions 1, 6, 7, 11, and 12. For region 1, the DOH practices it. Region 7 reports that "there are conscious efforts particularly international and local CSO partners but have yet to permeate (to some) government agencies."

c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?:
Yes

Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

For the questions above:

Q: Do responsible designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations?

A: Yes. More focused on preparedness particularly on logistical requirements. DILG programs (Seal of Good Housekeeping, Seal on Disaster Preparedness – which includes standards) – not well localized

Q: Are local institutions, village committees, communities, volunteers or urban resident welfare associations properly trained for response?

A: Awareness level of community is low. There are trainings provided but not for the whole gamut of response.

Description:

Trainings and other capacity building programs (multi-hazard mapping, CBDRRM, preparedness SOPs, etc.) have been reportedly variously in previous sections.

d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Do programmes take account of socio-environmental risks to the most vulnerable and marginalised groups?: Yes

Are appropriate social protection measures / safety nets that safeguard against their specific socioeconomic and political vulnerabilities being adequately implemented?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Description

Social protection measures in the country at this point still have limited coverage. The regions also have varying progress.

For Region 1, the Regional Development Plan (2011-2016) gave emphasis on social services and social protection through increased involvement of marginalized sectors in planning for poverty reduction. However there are still significant issues on access to employment, security, social protection and safety nets, and geriatric needs.

In Region 3, the DSWD takes the lead in the Protection and Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) Clusters. They ensure the safety of vulnerable sectors such as children, women, persons with disability and older persons inside and outside the evacuation camp by (1) profiling and compiling disaggregated evacuees' data by sex, age and situation, (2) establishing women- and child-friendly spaces, (3) setting up disaster help desks for displaced persons, (4) setting up community kitchens, and (5) organizing camp management committees for sanitation, relief distribution, recreation, and peace and orders, among others.

Region 5 incorporates Gender and Development (GAD) in local agencies' plans while Region 6 initiates projects for the vulnerable such as conditional cash transfer, 4Ps and Kalahi, etc. They also put up priority lanes for the PWDs, senior citizens and pregnant women. The same level of priority to vulnerable groups is done by Regions 11 and 12.

In NCR, there are organizations formed by the government and NGOs that promote social protection like the Regional Council for Disability Affairs, Bantay Bata, etc.

e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?: Yes

If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?: Yes

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

For the questions above:

Q: Are there identified means and sources to convey local and community experience or traditional knowledge in disaster risk reduction?

A: Yes, the avenue is there but the challenge is on the response

Q: If so, are they being integrated within local, sub-national and national disaster risk reduction plans and activities in a meaningful way?

A: Yes but on a limited scale.

Description:

The breadth, diversity, and proactive involvement of civil society in the Philippines is widely recognized globally. Their presence is very much significant and their influence is multifarious. At the national level they are involved in policy advocacy and actual policy drafting. They are also very much present in the communities.

CSOs in Region 1 are recognized for their active participation. They have an awarding ceremony entitled “Bannuar ti Amianan” (Heroes of the North) where various groups including CSOs and community members are recognized.

In CARAGA, CSOs are active in the DRRM Councils. More effort is needed to encourage private sector participation.

Participation of CSOs is also significant in the CAR, though this needs to be further expanded and to go beyond DRR, i.e. to include response.

Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who)

Productive partnerships have been noted with the Church and religious sector, the academe, professional society, international NGOs, the private sector, and the media. Specific instances include their involvement in DRRM through membership in the Local DRRM Councils and by participating in the conduct of and replicating DRRM activities in their respective institutions. They are also very much visible during response.

For typhoon Sendong (Washi) for example, the Church and private sector as well as the academe were very active in the four pillars of DRR. They were active in the DRRM work specific to the Mindanao River basin as well as in the urban DRR program of Cagayan De Oro City.

Media partners are also involved in DRR activities through their commitment in the early warning system and emergency broadcast system of various regions as well as nationwide.

Future Outlook

Future Outlook Area 1

The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.

Overall Challenges

National Level:

The integration of DRR-CCA was at first done only with external assistance, and only for piloting. The country was only compelled to continue it in order to sustain the programs; hence the integration was only very recent.

There are plans in place but implementation remains a challenge, such as, for the integrated coastal management strategy of the DENR.

Local Level:

There is increased awareness on DRR but proper integration with CCA and other sustainable development policies is still insufficient.

RA 10121 is still not completely localized, and there is also not complete clarity on questions of LGU monitoring and supervision.

DRRM and CCA have been integrated in the various plans including the comprehensive land use and physical framework plans and the local DRRM Plan, but with so many plans being required from LGUs they may be overwhelmed. There is a need to come up with a more harmonized and at the same time comprehensive planning process with clear demonstration of linkages. Furthermore, there is some difficulty in understanding the plans and their link to sustainable development. Some LGUs submit only for compliance purposes.

Inter-LGU collaboration/cooperation in planning and ecosystem based approach also remains a challenge.

Future Outlook Statement

Review RA 10121 (Sunset Review of the law and its implementation plan).

Harmonize the whole planning process.

Mainstream all established guidelines (DRR-CCA Policy Integration and Harmonization).

Fully integrate DRR-CCA functions.

Enhance DRRM appreciation and understanding for local governments as well as communities through more vigorous IEC.

Future Outlook Area 2

The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.

Overall Challenges

The institutions that should ensure the full implementation of RA 10121 as the DRRM framework and guide to action for the Philippines are still in the process of being fully formed and operationalized, though the basic building pieces have already been put in place. The NDRRMC has been fully constituted, with all its members and representatives from civil society, the academe, and the Church already filled in. The challenge now is making every component constantly aware that DRRM is a year-round concern; that they are all aware that the Council now is collective body -- with each part expected to fully and seamlessly performing its role.

The strengthening of institutions and building of capacities for DRR still have some gaps, notwithstanding the considerable achievements that have been reached already. The lack of resources remains a concern, given the increasing enormity of hazards compounded by the unabated change in climate. Apart from resource availability, the systems in accessing and using the funds still need to be fine-tuned. While the procedures have already been put in place (through JMCs and supporting guidelines), much effort needs to be done in orienting and familiarizing the national institutions and the LGUs. With these done, problems in coordination, duplication and waste of resources will be avoided.

Finally, there is the question of culture. Some communities still tend to be more reactive rather than proactive. The culture of preparedness has yet to be really imbibed universally. Poverty and lack of access to resources contribute to this situation. Hence ensuring economic security and improving governance are also called for.

Future Outlook Statement

The integration of DRRM into the educational system needs to be more purposive and comprehensive. It should be recognized as a distinct discipline and that should be accorded a higher level of priority.

Priority should also be given to the full institutionalization of DRR offices, as prescribed under RA 10121, especially at the local level. The establishment of fully functioning and fully represented local DRRMCs should be the first order of the day.

Stakeholder involvement should be upgraded. The willingness to help and direct involvement of civil society, the private sector, and other stakeholders are already there, it is now a question of putting order and system in this so that actors can interact and cooperate with each other with synergy and greater harmony and mutuality.

The problem of resources should be addressed in the following manner: accurately identifying exactly where the needs are; finding the possible sources; and systematizing how these are utilized. The latter involves proper channeling, allocation, and prioritization – which are all functions of management, organization, leadership, and vision. What goes where, and when, and towards what? These are matters that need to be fully addressed if the country wants to be one step ahead of disasters.

Finally, there is the matter of culture. Filipinos definitely have coping capacities – hardy people built for survival. But the times call for the need to go beyond coping and making do. A culture of transcending needs to be adopted; a disposition that dictates controlling the givens instead of being controlled by what comes. Hence governance reform should be integral to DRRM.

Future Outlook Area 3

The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.

Overall Challenges

The main challenge for the country is how to keep up with the increasing frequency and severity of disasters that happen in its shores, constantly testing the limits of its institutions and preparedness mechanisms that have been put in place. The problems in fully localizing the DRRM framework result to some confusion in actual disaster response, including the accessing of earmarked funds, as well as the

conduct of recovery.

The recovery framework also needs a thorough revisiting. The RA 10121 provides that the responsibility for post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation falls under the NEDA, but the practice after Yolanda – specifically the creation of a new office call the OPARR – shows that the mechanisms, systems, and structures on recovery have yet to be clarified and institutionalized. This is an imperative in order to ensure that the country can quickly “build back better” after every disaster.

Future Outlook Statement

There are a number of positive ways forward in the area of response and recovery. Foremost of this is the development of a national recovery framework, with the notion of “building back better” or “bouncing forward” as a core guiding principle.

The laws and policies also need to be harmonized in order to ensure a clearer, more effective response system. These include the RA 10121 and the Local Government Code primarily, as well as the Climate Change Act of 2009 (RA 9729), the NDRRM Plan, the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), National Disaster Response Plan, National Disaster Preparedness Plan and other related policies and guidelines.

The integration of DRR and CCA should be fully operationalized.

Community-Based DRRM should also be strengthened and institutionalized, through the national agencies’ support to LGUs as well as that of civil society.

There should also be constant post-incident evaluation. On the whole the monitoring and evaluation framework and mechanisms should be institutionalized.

Lastly, the welfare and safety of DRRM workers, especially the disaster responders, should be ensured. One possible way is the creation of a Magna Carta for DRRM Workers.

Stakeholders

Organizations, departments, and institutions that have contributed to the report

Organization	Organization type	Focal Point
Office of Civil Defense - Department of National Defense	Governments	Secretary Voltaire T. Gazmin; Undersecretary Alexander P. Pama
Department of the Interior and Local Government	Governments	Secretary Mar Roxas; Undersecretary Austere C. Panadero
Department of Science and Technology	Governments	Secretary Mario G. Montejo; Assistant Secretary Raymund E. Liboro
Department of Social Welfare and Development	Governments	Secretary Corazon Juliano-Soliman; Assistant Secretary Vilma B. Cabrera
National Economic and Development Authority	Governments	Secretary Arsenio M. Balisacan; Deputy Director General Margarita Songco
Department of Agriculture	Governments	Secretary Proceso Alcala; Undersecretary Emerson U. Palad
Department of Health	Governments	Secretary Janette Garin; Dr. Cirilo R. Galindez
Department of Public Works and Highways	Governments	Secretary Rogelio L. Singson; Undersecretary Raul Asis
Department of Justice	Governments	Secretary Leila De Lima; Mr. Ruben F. Fondevilla
Department of Education	Governments	Secretary Armin Luistro; Assistant

		Secretary Reynaldo D. Aguda
Social Security System	Governments	Mr. Emilio S. De Quiros; VP Nestor K. Sacayan
Climate Change Commission	Governments	Sec. Mary Ann Lucille L. Sering; Commissioner Naderev M. Sano
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	Governments	Secretary Ramon JP Paje; Undersecretary Demetrio L. Ignacio, Jr.
Armed Forces of the Philippines	Governments	Chief of Staff Gen. Gregorio Pio P Catapang Jr; BGen Angelito M. De Leon
World Vision Foundation	Networks & Others	Atty. Liwayway Vinzons-Chato; Executive Director Josaias De Leon
Ateneo School of Government	Academic & Research Institutions	Dr. Antonio La Vina; Atty. Jaime G. Hofilena
Disaster Risk Reduction Network Philippines	Networks & Others	Ms. Girlie Sevilla-Alvarez; Mr. Patricio S. De Quiros
Center for Disaster Preparedness	Private Sector	Executive Director Loreine B. Dela Cruz; Ms. Malu F. Cagay
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 1	Governments	Director Melchito M. Castro
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 2	Governments	Director Norma C. Talosig
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 3	Governments	Director Josefina T. Timoteo
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 4-A	Governments	Director Vicente F. Tomazar
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 4-B	Governments	Director Eugene G. Cabrera

Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 5	Governments	Director Bernardo Rafaelito Alejandro IV
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 6	Governments	Director Rosario T. Cabrera
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 7	Governments	Director Olivia M. Luces
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 8	Governments	Director Blanche T. Gobenciong
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 9	Governments	OIC Director Emilia V. Juljahan
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 10	Governments	Director Ana C. Caneda
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 11	Governments	Director Loreto G. Rirao
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office 12	Governments	Director Minda C. Morante
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office-CAR	Governments	Director Andrew Alex Uy
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office-ARMM	Governments	OIC Director Myrna J. Angot
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office-CARAGA	Governments	Director Liza S. Mazo
Office of Civil Defense Regional Office-NCR	Governments	Director Susana M. Cruz
Department of Foreign Affairs	Governments	Secretary Albert Del Rosario; Assistant Secretary Jesus M. Domingo