



# INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION

NOVEMBER 2017

## Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP) Project, The Philippines



Funded by  
**ECHO**

By Jerome Casals

# Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE UP) Project

## Final Independent External Evaluation Report

27 November 2017

Intervention Name	Moving Urban Poor Communities Towards Resilience Project (MOVE-UP)	
Partners (if applicable)	PLAN International Philippines CARE Nederland Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD)	
Location (country/ies, region/s)	Philippines, South East Asia	
Duration	18 Months	
Starting Date	15 February 2016	
Ending Date	14 September 2017	
Intervention / Country Office Language	Filipino, English	
Donor and Contribution/s	European Union Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) under its Humanitarian Action Plan (HIP) for Southeast Asia and the Pacific programme	€ 850,000.00
	Moving Urban Poor Communities Towards Resilience (MOVE UP) Project Consortium	€ 150,000.00
Country Office administering the Intervention	Action Against Hunger - Philippines	
Responsible Action Against Hunger HQ	Action Against Hunger - UK	
Evaluation Type	Final Independent External Evaluation	
Evaluation Dates	11 September to 20 October 2017	

The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Action Against Hunger or the other members of the Project Consortium

Lead Independent Evaluator: Jerome Casals

Field Researchers: Alvin Silva, Donn David Ramos, Angelina Golamco, William Baang

## List of Acronyms

ACCORD	Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ATS	Alternative Temporary Shelter
BDRRMO	Barangay Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office
CARD	Center for Agriculture and Rural Development
CBDRRM	Community-Based Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCC	Climate Change Commission
CBO	Community-Based Organizations
CDP	City Development Plan
CDRRMO	City Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office
COA	Commission on Audit
CSG	Community Savings Group
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DEPED	Department of Education
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
DRF	Disaster Risk Financing
DRRM	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management
DRRMO	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
ECHO	European Commission - Civil Protection & Humanitarian Aid Operations
EWS	Early Warning System
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HIP	Humanitarian Implementation Plan
KII	Key Informant Interview
LDRRMF	Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Fund
LGU	Local Government Unit
MOVE-UP	Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience
MFI	Micro-Finance Institution
MMDRRMC	Metro Manila Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
NDRRMC	National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council
NDRMMP	National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
PAGASA	Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration
PESO	Public Employment Service Office
PHIVOLCS	Philippine Institute for Volcanology and Seismology
PRC	Philippine Red Cross
PWD	Persons with Disability
PWG	Project Working Group
ROSCA	Rotating Savings and Credit Associations
TWG	Technical Working Group
UAP/EA	United Architects of the Philippines/Emergency Architects
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment
WASH	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene
ZERT	Zone Emergency Response Team

## Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	1
<b>Background Information</b>	5
<b>Methodology</b>	6
Constraints and Limitations	7
<b>Findings</b>	8
<b>Conclusions</b>	27
<b>Lessons Learnt and Good Practices</b>	29
<b>Recommendations</b>	31
<b>Annexes</b>	
Annex A: Logical Framework	
Annex B: Terms of Reference	
Annex C: Project Inception Report	
Annex D: List of Documents Reviewed	
Annex E: List of Evaluation Participants	
Annex F: Evaluation Criteria Rating Table	
Annex G: Good Practice	
Annex H: Data Collection Instruments	

## Executive Summary

---

This report is based on an independent evaluation of the Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP) Project in the Philippines. Implemented from 15 February 2016 to 14 September 2017, this project was jointly managed and implemented by Action Against Hunger, CARE Nederland and CARE Philippines through its local partner Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD) and Plan International Philippines, building on the consortium's experience of resilience, of disaster risk reduction and management, and the lessons learnt from the broader engagement with cities in the Philippines.

The overall objective of the project was to contribute to institutionalizing urban resilience and disaster preparedness mechanisms for urban poor in Metro Manila, Philippines. Specifically, it intended to pilot and demonstrate systems and models for Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS) and livelihood as means to increase the resilience of Local Government Units (LGUs) and urban poor against natural disasters in Metro Manila. The following result areas were identified: (1) ATS solutions are improved for the urban poor in the targeted Cities; (2) Urban poor communities increase their resilience in ATS and livelihood; and, (3) City local government units are strengthened, and policies and mechanisms for urban poor disaster resilience are institutionalized.

The evaluation utilized different approaches for data collection. Project reports and other documents yielded secondary data which was, in turn, supported by a documentary and literature review, including critical reviews of regional and global practices and frameworks. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and Site Observations were conducted during fieldwork held last 28 September to 5 October 2017.

### Key Findings and Conclusion

The evaluation findings reveal that overall, the implementation of the MOVE-UP project in the cities of Malabon, Quezon City and Valenzuela met expectations across the evaluation areas of Project Design, Relevance/

Criteria	Score (Maximum of 5)
Project Design	3 - on average, meets expectations
Coherence	5 - exceptional
Relevance / Appropriateness	4 - meets expectations
Efficiency	4 - meets expectations
Effectiveness	4 - meets expectations
Sustainability	4 - meets expectations
Likelihood of Impact	4 - meets expectations

Appropriateness, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability, and Likelihood of Impact. Quality of work is assessed as above average with the most critical expectations and objectives attained.

#### ***Project Design (score: 3)***

Much of the project design has been driven by the logical framework and parameters pre-determined by the donor. As such, there was a difficulty in ascribing the design to an overarching urban resilience framework that normally becomes the reference for similar projects. Nonetheless, given the pilot nature of the project, this particular gap has been deemed

acceptable. The program logic has room for further improvement, as some assumptions or conditions may not have been tested or given appropriate consideration, given that the project designers were not able to extensively engage with key stakeholders at the city and barangay (village) or community levels before the preparation of the proposal.

***Coherence (score 5)***

Findings reveal significant efforts were initiated that ensured the identification and participation of a wide range of stakeholders, including private organizations and local government agencies. MOVE-UP was able to identify, mobilize and engage different stakeholder segments at the different levels.

***Relevance/Appropriateness (score 4)***

The project was consistent with priorities of the donor and institutional mandates of consortium members. At the implementation level, the project was deemed appropriate because it conducted extensive assessments on the needs of targeted vulnerable cities and communities on temporary shelter, resilient livelihoods, and risk transfers, addressing the relevant issues identified in the assessments.

***Efficiency (score 4)***

The final evaluation found the project was implemented efficiently, supported with adequate resources, and delivering results in a timely manner, achieving good implementation despite the project team and staff belonging to different consortium member organizations.

***Effectiveness (score 4)***

The project was found effective in that, by the end of the 18-month pilot implementation period, all inputs and activities were reported to have been implemented in accordance with the design and its objectives in terms of a number of beneficiaries, intervention indicators, and financial disbursement.

***Sustainability (score 4)***

The project has provided a good foundation for the continuation of project gains through different measures, including: (1) improved policy and governance structures at the city level; (2) enhanced capacities of all involved in the project; (3) increased public-private partnership, with increased local ownership of project interventions; and (4) development and availability of tools and resources to support specific project components.

***Likelihood of Impact (score 4)***

Although it is not possible to assess the medium-term and long-term impact at this point (given the pilot nature of the project), the successful completion of the project as designed and its achievement of declared project objectives and outcomes may be taken as a potential indication of a high likelihood of impact in the coming years.

**Lessons Learnt**

As a result of the project, the following key lessons have been learned:

1. The consortium management approach can be an effective and efficient strategy for project implementation.
2. It is essential to integrate urban resilience learning and mainstreaming into city decision making and policies.
3. Increasing the capacity of cities and participation of key actors in project activities are necessary for a relatively successful project implementation and the improvement of potential for impact and project sustainability.
4. Targeting project beneficiaries at the barangay or community level are necessary to achieve desired project outcomes.
5. Providing resilient livelihoods entail considering enterprise and supply chain management, market analysis, marketing and investment considerations that should be addressed as part of the package.

## **Recommendations**

Given the findings, the evaluator recommends the following actions:

- (1) The consortium should consider significantly strengthening the project design of the succeeding phase or iteration of this model development process. The next phase should better elucidate the conceptual relationships and interactions between ATS, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer, and use these in the redesign of components and activities for the next project cycle. Specifically, this will entail that the consortium to:
  - a. Review the assumptions in the logical framework guiding the project, particularly on establishing a clear operational definition of resiliency that leads to highlighting the importance of ATS, resilient livelihoods and risk transfers as critical factors;
  - b. Strengthen process documentation, including a separate mechanism for the distillation of inter-organizational lessons learned to feed back into the activities of the project;
  - c. Increase knowledge sharing mechanisms not only between consortium partners but also across partners and community beneficiaries; Part of this should be to develop compendiums, checklists and other references that will help LGUs facilitate the mainstreaming of key considerations into their respective plans.
  - d. And finally, craft well-packaged business models, by including model-building as a key result area to ensure the development of a replicable model, or specific methodologies attaining the desired results for the project
- (2) The consortium should continue to strengthen its engagement with the Local Government Units for policy development, towards influencing the crafting and approval of contingency plans and DRRM plans that align and subscribes to the lessons learned in this project. Specifically, this means:
  - a. Working with the LGU for the approval of a range of ATS solutions appropriate to their respective LGU, taking into consideration the full range

of needs and issues arising from the limitations of space constraints, population, and available financing;

- b. Mainstream the wider, more comprehensive understanding of ATS into formal LGU development and sectoral plans and operations to sustain the gains of the project;
  - c. Promoting a more favorable policy environment for increasing the diversity of resilient livelihood options for the beneficiary community, and encouraging greater financial and economic inclusion, up to the point of exploring LGU-driven incentives for activities that will promote savings, increasing access to microfinance and other mechanisms that will promote resilient livelihoods;
  - d. Working with LGU economic departments, and commercial partners to further enhance supply-side focus on risk transfer, by engaging industry-wide insurance providers to develop products and services appropriate for the urban poor.
- (3) The consortium, in the longer term, should expand and deepen their engagement with community and industry partners towards the continued provision of services such as livelihood capability-building, micro-financing, risk insurance, all the way to promoting practices such as business and service continuity processes, and widening acceptance for micro-insurance packages and services on offer. This will include:
- a. Reviewing, approving and tapping existing suppliers in the localities that can offer short-term risk transfer products such as short-term accident insurance schemes, and assisting the community and LGU establish monitoring mechanisms that will continue to observe the progress, impact and effect of these service providers and services on the beneficiary community.
  - b. Considering a wider range of livelihood interventions, including designing mitigating interventions for existing and operating livelihood value chains, as opposed to only investing in new livelihoods that will entail a learning curve and increased investments in training and adaptation.



## Background Information

---

This report presents the key findings and recommendations of an external evaluation conducted for the “Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP)” Project implemented by a consortium of international non-government organizations NGOs composed of Action Against Hunger Philippines, PLAN International, CARE working with its local partner Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD). The project was implemented within the period of February 2016 to August 2017, with a total budget of €1,000,000.0 financed through a contribution of € 850,000.00 from the European Commission - Civil Protection & Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) under its Humanitarian Action Plan (HIP) for Southeast Asia and the Pacific program and a counterpart contribution of Euro €150,000.00 from the consortium organizations.

The overall objective of the project is to contribute to institutionalizing urban resilience and disaster preparedness mechanisms for urban poor in Metro Manila- Philippines. This is to be accomplished through interventions focused the piloting and demonstration of systems and models for Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS) and livelihood to increase the resilience of LGUs and urban poor against natural disasters in Metro Manila. The project logical framework is enclosed in this report as Annex A. Under the logical framework, the following result areas were identified: Result 1: Improved ATS solutions for the urban poor in the targeted Cities; Result 2: Urban poor communities increased their resilience capacity in ATS and livelihood; and, Result 3: City local government units strengthened and institutionalized policies and mechanisms for urban poor disaster resilience

The project was implemented by a consortium of NGOs led by Action Against Hunger, which currently oversees the project and is primarily responsible for achieving Result 3: the strengthening and institutionalization of policies and mechanisms in the three (3) city local government units towards urban poor disaster resilience. CARE is responsible for achieving Result 1: Improved ATS solutions for urban poor in Malabon, Quezon and Valenzuela Cities; while Plan International Philippines is responsible for achieving Result 2: the Increased resilience capacity of urban poor communities in ATS and livelihood, covering 30,000 individuals and 20 organizations.

Implementation at the city level involved mobilizing a Technical Working Group (TWG) headed by the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO) of the cities. For the city of Malabon, a Project Working Group (PWG) was established consisting of two (2) TWGs: one for ATS, and another for Resilient Livelihood-Risk Transfer. At the *barangay* or village level, the Barangay Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (BDRRMO) and the Zone Emergency Response Team (ZERT) members were the primary partners identified. Project implementation in each of the project areas was further enhanced by the consortium members’ inclusion of other existing community-based groups present in their targeted areas.

## Methodology

---

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the intervention regarding the achievement of intended objectives in all the components of the results chain (inputs, activities, results) as well as the key contextual factors that might have enabled or hindered the delivery of the results. Action Against Hunger adopts the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating its programs and projects. The DAC criteria identified include: Relevance and Appropriateness; Coherence; Coverage; Efficiency; Effectiveness; Sustainability and; Likelihood of Impact. In addition to these criteria, Action Against Hunger also required an assessment of the project's design and the project monitoring system put in place.

For each of the evaluation criteria, Action Against Hunger identified specific evaluation questions enumerated in the project's Terms of Reference (ToR), enclosed as Annex B of this report. During the evaluation briefing conducted in Manila on 7 September 2017, the Action Against Hunger Mission focal persons emphasized that the primary focus of the evaluation should be on sustainability and impact. More specifically on providing evidence-based recommendations that can inform the direction of future interventions including specific actions that can enhance future implementation of the project components related to each of the project components namely: alternative shelter, resilient livelihoods, and risk transfer. As a result, the approach, time allocation, methodology, and data collection was modified to reflect this focus. The project evaluation inception report agreed upon at the start of the evaluation is enclosed as Annex C.

The evaluation was conducted by an independent external evaluation consultant assisted by three (3) researchers over a total period of twenty-eight (28) days. The field visits involved a purposive sampling of 9 of the 12 communities where the project was being implemented and include three barangays in Quezon City; 3 barangays in Malabon; and three barangays in Valenzuela. Action Against Hunger identified the barangays or villages visited based on the availability of key stakeholders during the time the evaluation was scheduled to be undertaken.

The three main data collection and information gathering methodologies used were: 1) a desk review of available project documents and related literature; 2) key informant interviews (KII), and; (3) Focus Group Discussions (FGD) at the community level.

The review of documents and related literature included global policies, frameworks and standards in the field of urban resilience and disaster risk reduction, relevant national and local laws and ordinances including the local city government and *barangay* disaster risk reduction and management plans. Project documents consisting of progress reports needs assessment reports and other related studies were provided by AAH and project consortium members. The list of documents reviewed is enclosed as Annex D.

Key informant interviews (KII) were conducted with key stakeholders consisting of consortium member organizations, private sector partner organization, and city government officials. Meetings were scheduled through the respective consortium members assigned in each of the cities. The interview guides designed and approved at the inception stage were used to elicit specific information as well as stakeholder perceptions on project implementation and its results. Annex E provides a list of the key informants consulted in the evaluation process. Focus group discussions (FGDs) were conducted with a broad range of stakeholders of MOVE-UP in the communities including barangay officials, households, and project beneficiaries.

## **Constraints and Limitations**

Regarding limitations of the evaluation, the following should be noted:

- There was very limited time to conduct the evaluation especially considering the scope of evaluation objectives, the geographic coverage and the numerous components of the program. The time available for field visits was only eight (8) days. This restricted the gathering of more detailed data and information. In addition, interviews and community FGDs were not scheduled prior to the evaluation field visits and had to be set as part of the evaluation activities.
- The evaluation would have benefitted from key project documents that were not available as of the time the evaluation was conducted. More specifically, the absence of the end-of-project report and an incomplete interim project report. It should be noted that this is a key constraint as the end-of-project or project terminal report is the primary document normally used as the basis for data and information triangulation.
- Convenience sampling and qualitative information gathering techniques were used. Hence, information gathered cannot be used to make general conclusions about the entire project population. They are however, sufficient for identifying key lessons learnt, good practice, project strengths and weaknesses, and issues that need further investigation.
- In terms of gender and inclusiveness dimensions, the evaluation did not deeply dig into gender and inclusiveness issues. There was insufficient time to conduct specific FGDs focusing on gender and social inclusion. However, there were attempts to undertake inclusion and gender-disaggregated analysis of available data.
- This evaluation does not include an assessment and evaluation of the fiscal management of the project and limits itself to a simple comparison of projected and budgeted versus actual expenditure and disbursement as a means of ascertaining the fiscal management efficiency of the project.

## Findings

---

This section highlights the key evaluation findings, identifies project achievements, implementation gaps. Evaluator ratings are also provided for each of the evaluation criteria using the rating scale prescribed in the evaluation ToR. The evaluator ratings are summarized in an Evaluation Criteria Rating Table, enclosed as Annex F.

### Project Design

**Rating 3:**

**On Average Meets Expectations**

In evaluating the project design, the evaluators took into consideration the design of the project as it adheres to international best practice, inclusiveness of the design, how well the design suited the institutional arrangements of local stakeholders and how the design contributed to the development of an appropriate model for resiliency projects in similar localities

In the design of project, the Action Against Hunger-led consortium faced considerable time constraints due to the very tight proposal deadline set by the donor. Hence, initial needs assessment and stakeholder engagement process undertaken was not as extensive as they had wanted it to be. Interviews with consortium representatives as well as review of project documents reveal that efforts to identify and address key urban resilience issues and concerns were made by matching donor preferences (i.e., priorities of the donor articulated in the “call for proposals”) with the experience and expertise of the consortium members.

The project is designed to pilot or test specific solutions in the pre-determined areas of; (1) Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS); (2) Resilient Livelihoods; and (3) Risk Transfer. It seeks to test appropriate methodologies and approaches in these areas and thereafter document and disseminate the successful approaches used. In addition, the project aims to translate these into local policies and institutionalize these through their integration into local DRRM and development plans. Given the piloting and modeling nature of the project, a greater degree of flexibility to frame objectives, approaches and methodologies can be expected. More so that urban resilience programming is relatively new in the country.

However, it has to be noted that the pre-identification of ATS, Resilient Livelihood and Risk Transfers as factors for resiliency also predisposed the selection of pilot areas that has these same specific conditions as factors and essentially limited the opportunity for developing a more open methodology that emphasizes local identification of critical resiliency factors, closing off the possibility of other factors (such as, for instance, migrant remittance facilitation) being explored as better and more effective means of achieving resiliency for the community.

Resiliency is a multi-faceted phenomenon, and its critical factors depend on local settings on which it is to be implemented. What may be a critical resiliency factor for one community may be different for the next adjoining community. Thus, in terms of project design,

resiliency projects should be grounded on the specificity of the localities within which it is being implemented.

Nonetheless, as a pilot project, the overall approach and strategy summarized and represented by the project logical framework is found to be sound with resources, outputs and results linked in a coherent manner. However, achieving significant outcomes within one project cycle (i.e. within the current project) is too ambitious and is not realistic. Pilot and model building projects involve undergoing a process of iteration (i.e. of learning, revising, testing and re-learning, re-testing) before the new approaches and methodologies being tested can be expected to be finalized, translated into workable models. In addition, it should also be noted that the needs assessment for each of the project components (e.g. ATS, livelihoods, risk transfer) was also expected to be conducted as part of the project implementation activities.

For projects that attempt to test and develop new or innovative approaches and methodologies, it would be advisable to include the “model development” itself as a specific key result area of the project so that resources and activities specific to defining and developing the model could be given importance. In terms of the monitoring and evaluation system required, for example, experimental models and pilots requires specific focus on process documentation, internal learning activities, knowledge sharing between project partners and well packaged written business model/s, among the key activities leading to their development.

In terms of the risks and assumptions identified in the logical framework, the assumption that there will be no occurrence of hazard events that will affect project implementation is also not realistic since one of the key criteria for selection of target areas is precisely its high exposure to natural hazards including beneficiaries who are among the most vulnerable and most likely to be affected. Consortium members should even expect that communities will likely seek assistance from them if and when natural hazards affect their communities.

One of the critical issues in project design is the setting up of monitoring and evaluation systems. The quality of monitoring of the progress of the project, as evidenced by available reports, is always indicative of the level of priority accorded to monitoring and assessment procedures. In the case of the project, monitoring reports were not submitted on time, interim reports were late, and final reports which could have been used in this evaluation has not been available at the time of the evaluation. While the use of external evaluators may provide an unbiased assessment, it is strategically sound to create an internal structure for evaluating project progress that would continually identify opportunities for increased synergies, efficiencies and effectiveness.

## Coherence

Rating 5:  
Exceptional

In terms of coherence, the evaluators looked at how the project aligned with national, regional and local plans and priorities. It also assessed the fit between the identified partners of the project and the project components they were involved in, as well as how their performance and participation contributed to the strengthening and deepening of the project component.

Information gathered reveals substantial and successful effort was exerted to identify and ensure participation of a wide array of stakeholders, consisting of local government agencies at the different levels and private sector organizations. These include:

1. Technical Working Groups (TWGs) in the 2 City Local Government Units (LGUs) of Quezon City and Valenzuela and in the case of Malabon City, a Project Working Group consisting of two TWGS.
2. The Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices of the 3 City LGUs
3. Barangay Councils of different barangays involved in the project
4. Emergency Architects group of the United Architects of the Philippines (UAP) – which is the UAP’s DRR arm supporting communities affected by disasters and calamities.
5. University of the East – Caloocan Civil Engineering Department
6. Rags to Riches – a social enterprise group
7. CARD Pioneer – an insurance company
8. Several existing organizations in each of the project areas were also identified and tapped as partners. In Malabon City, for example, these included Ladies’ Brigade and Monitoring groups, the *Alyansa ng Maralitang Mamayan ng taga Malabon* (Alliance Indigent Residents of Malabon), Homeowners Associations, and *purok* (sub-village) leaders.

Substantial effort was also exerted to align project outputs with relevant national and sub-national policies, plans and activities related to disaster risk reduction. This alignment process is a key element in the project’s sustainability strategy and also resulted in enhancing project implementation. The participation of the LGUs in two Metro Manila-wide earthquake drills, for example, highlighted the problem faced by city governments’ on the lack of available space to serve as evacuation areas and strengthened their motivation for developing appropriate ATS solutions.

City and barangay level officers and representatives were identified and aptly engaged during project implementation, with City DRRMOs identified as “project champions” responsible for taking the lead in coordinating with city hall officials and related departments. Integration of project initiatives (i.e., ATS, risk transfer and resilient livelihoods) into local DRRM plans was reported to have already been accomplished in Malabon City while the DRRMO’s in Quezon City and Valenzuela expressed their firm commitment to undertake a similar integration during the next scheduled updating and revision of their respective LDRRMPs.

Given the diversity of stakeholders, approaches and strategies involved and interacting in a city, resilience in an urban setting is fundamentally a governance challenge. Ownership and commitment from the highest levels of city government are required since developing urban resilience involves coordinated and complementary action from different departments under the city government. The establishment of TWGs and PWGs with members from the different city departments under the project provides a good foundation from which future efforts can be launched.

In terms of further enhancing the MOVE UP Project's mainstreaming effort, the project should also consider national mainstreaming guidelines laid out in official government documents. These include the *Mainstreaming DRR in Subnational Planning Development* jointly published by National Economic Development Authority (NEDA), UNDP and EC-DIPECHO and the *Supplemental Guidelines Mainstreaming Climate Change and Disaster Risks in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan* produced by the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB) with assistance from the Climate Change Commission, United Nations Development Programme, and the Australian Government. Future project enhancements and implementation could also consider the *Disaster Preparedness Minimum Standards*<sup>1</sup> prescribed by the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) that identifies disaster recovery, business, and services continuity as among the plans local governments are encouraged to develop.

Further enhancements to local government efforts on developing ATS solutions can be identified by closer review and consideration of the various components of the Metro Manila Integrated Contingency Plan for Earthquake (Oplan Metro Yakal Plus) formulated in 2015 by the Metro Manila Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (MMDRRMC) and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC). In Quezon City, for example, the contingency plan identifies areas within the Veterans Memorial Hospital and the University of the Philippines as the primary evacuation areas. Other pertinent information in the plan includes the operational protocols of national and local governments' including those related to temporary shelter and camp evacuation management, among others.

To the credit of the project that it considered the Department of Science and Technology's Project NOAH as one of its data sources. Project Noah was the Department of Science and Technology's (DOST) response to the call for a more accurate, integrated, and responsive disaster prevention and mitigation system, especially in high-risk areas throughout the Philippines. The Project harnessed technologies and management services for disaster risk reduction activities offered by the DOST through PAGASA, PHIVOLCS, and the DOST-Advanced Science and Technology Institute, in partnership with the UP National Institute of Geological Sciences and the UP College of Engineering. The use of more recent science-

---

<sup>1</sup> LGA & DILG, *Disaster Preparedness: Minimum Standards Volume 2*, 2015

based risk assessments and tools such as the Greater Metro Manila Area Risk Analysis Project (GMMA-RAP) should be explored as well, for its potential utility and contribution to the data efficiency of the project.

## Relevance/Appropriateness

**Rating 4:**

**Meets  
Expectations**

Urban resilience is relevant at regional and national levels. According to the Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2015, approximately 742 million city dwellers in the region are at 'extreme' to 'high' disaster risk – often living in multi-hazard hotspots that are vulnerable to cyclones, earthquakes, floods, and landslides. This population is projected to increase to 980 million by 2030<sup>2</sup>.

The Philippines is considered the second most disaster-prone country in Southeast Asia after Indonesia and ranks as among the most disaster-prone countries in the world. It ranks 115 out of 188 countries in the current Human Development Index<sup>3</sup> and by 2019 will remain one of Southeast Asia's vulnerable economies<sup>4</sup>. The anticipated future increase in the country's susceptibility, as well as an increase of climate change induced natural hazards, will lead to an overall increase in disaster risk.

Research from a global risk analytic company identified the Philippines, China, Japan and Bangladesh as home to over half of the 100 cities most exposed to natural hazards. Of the 100 cities with the greatest exposure to natural hazards, 21 are located in the Philippines, 16 in China, 11 in Japan and 8 in Bangladesh. The Philippines' extreme exposure to a myriad of natural hazards is reflected by the inclusion of 8 of the country's cities among the ten most at risk globally<sup>5</sup>.

At the project level, the project was consistent with the priorities of the donor and with the institutional mandates of the consortium members. An innovative move was to assign project leadership for the different project components to consortium members with the most experience and expertise. This strategy enhanced and built up on the core competence of the consortium members on the various project components.

For instance, in Result 1: *Improved Alternative Temporary Shelter solutions for urban poor in Malabon, Quezon and Valenzuela Cities*, CARE and ACCORD were the designated lead entities and initiated a partnership with the United Architect of Philippines (UAP) in the design and development of ATS prototypes, and these were disseminated at the city and barangay levels.

Plan International Philippines, the responsible entity for Result 2: *Increased resilience capacity of urban poor communities in ATS and livelihood*, mobilized the pilot cities' Technical Working Groups (TWG) and the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Offices, while at the barangay (village) level, the participation of Barangay Disaster Risk Reduction and

---

<sup>2</sup> UN ESCAP, Disasters in Asia and the Pacific: 2015 Year in Review, 10 Mar 2016

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2015). *Human Development Report 2015*. New York: UNDP

<sup>4</sup> Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU). (2015). *An Outlook of Key Emerging Asian Markets: A Special Report from the Economist Intelligence Unit*. London: The Economist.

<sup>5</sup> Verisk Maplecroft (2015). "56 per cent of 100 cities most exposed to natural hazards found in the Philippines, Japan, China and Bangladesh" 4 March. Available from <https://maplecroft.com/portfolio/new-analysis/2015/03/04/56-100-cities-most-exposed-natural-hazards-found-key-economies-philippines-japan-china-bangladesh-verisk-maplecroft/> (Accessed 6 October 2017).



Management Officer, community savings groups (CSGs), and Zone Emergency Response Teams (ZERT) were identified as key grassroots partners.

Action Against Hunger, the responsible entity for Result 3: *Strengthening and institutionalization of policies and mechanisms in the three (3) city local government units towards urban poor disaster resilience*, created linkages with microfinance organizations in the design of risk transfer mechanisms for the organized CSGs, and as part of this effort, CARD-Pioneer conducted a study to assess the viability of microfinance solutions at the barangay level.

At the city level, the project's targeted Malabon, Quezon City and Valenzuela which are among those that have experienced and will continue to be affected by natural and human-induced hazards that are likely to be further exacerbated by climate change. Current challenges experienced by local communities include but are not limited to increased migration from rural to urban areas, high incidence of extreme flooding, and potential damage to shelters and other essential community structures (e.g., health centers, barangay/village centers, etc.). Quezon City is near the Marikina fault line, making it susceptible to earthquake. One part of Malabon city is now completely submerged by water affecting at least 1,500 individuals.

Working with the respective city DRRMOs as key actors for the projects is also a key point of relevance as it created a sense of project ownership and shaped so-called "project champions" at the LGU level. The LGU can also propose, approve and fund DRR-related activities and projects through its Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Fund (LDRRMF). In the city of Malabon, a more robust project implementation structure consisting of a wide range of stakeholders was established through the formation of a Project Working Group (PWG) consisting of two Technical Working Groups, one for ATS and another for Resilient Livelihoods-Risk Transfer.

Perception of the appropriateness of project interventions varied from one city to another, with both Malabon and Valenzuela recognizing the activities and projects introduced as essential in providing positive contributions to the development of the identified barangays. Quezon City, on the other hand, did not identify the three project components introduced (i.e., ATS, Resilient Livelihoods, and Risk Transfer mechanisms) as priorities in the plans of the DRRMO and other local government departments/agencies. Rather, the project components are considered as enhancements to the city's priority DRR concerns that currently emphasizes the use of traditional evacuation centers such as schools and covered courts. Livelihood development, on the other hand, was reported as an existing priority program of the city government, but not as a strategy in building resilience against the risks of disaster.

As a response to the project, in Malabon City they included the DRRMO, Engineering Department, Local Building Office, Housing and Resettlement Office, Management and Information Systems Division, DILG, Social Welfare and Development Department, Planning and Development Department, Community and Urban Poor Affairs Office, Mayor's Office, Cooperative and Development Office, Public Employment Services Office, Environment and Natural Resources Office, and representatives for the partner-barangays in their PWG.

Policy on microinsurance also exists in the city of Malabon but the absence of guidelines from the national Commission on Audit (COA) is hindering its full implementation, and thus, was not considered a priority concern in local planning.

In the case of Malabon and Valenzuela, the introduction of ATS models and systems was appreciated and considered important by the DRRMOs although both cited the lack of sufficient areas where the ATS can be established. In addition, the DRRMO and barangay officials were not aware and wanted to know the cost of the various shelter models per design and wanted to see the actual installation of ATS designs in their identified evacuation centers.

In Valenzuela city, the TWG representative from the city's Housing and Settlements department lauded the ATS system introduced but felt that none of the shelter models introduced was suitable to the situation in the city. Similarly, the concept or idea of resilient livelihoods was welcomed, although the existing strategy of the city's Public Employment Service Office (PESO) was focused on providing employment and establishing linkages with potential employers.

While the project interventions were pre-determined, the conduct of detailed assessment studies on each of the project components helped ensure that community needs and concerns were adequately expressed assessed ensuring appropriateness of project activities to local needs. Based on the responses from the three (3) cities, the project is considered responsive to the needs of the twelve (12) selected barangays.

Most of the urban poor community members present during the FGDs were not among those consulted during the needs assessment process. Nonetheless, the barangay representatives and community residents involved in the project were aware of the MOVE-UP project and its activities. Key informants highlighted the vulnerability assessment conducted at the barangays, as well as the training as top-of-mind MOVE-UP activities.

As part of the social preparation phase of the project, community orientations and training were conducted on DRRM principles, strategies for resilient livelihood, financial literacy, risk transfer, and shelter needs. Of these, the financial literacy training was one of the most appreciated. The urban poor communities in Valenzuela, for example, stressed the importance of the Financial Literacy training that triggered the formation of Community Savings Groups (CSGs) in the different barangays. In some instances, the DRRMO training staff conducted some of these trainings to accommodate the growing demand for the training; it also provided a good opportunity for the DRRMO to learn more about resilient livelihoods.

The BDRRMOs, together with LGU representatives, were able to participate in the presentation on ATS. UAP-EA participated in roundtable discussions, monitoring/donor visits, as part of their consultation and coordination with the community. They gathered inputs from stakeholders to develop their design. ACCORD also presented needs assessment results during UAP-EA design workshop in the early stages of the designing phase. Concerns from the LGU and partner barangays were coursed through project staff

then to EA and vice versa. Although some of the models were tested before final fabrication, to ensure the structural identity of the ATS models, UAP-EA preferred to have their designs reviewed and evaluated by structural engineers to further detail the structural design of their models. As architects, structural detailing is not within their area of expertise. This was partly addressed during the presentation with ATS TWG members since the Engineering department of partner cities participated. Nonetheless, more work is expected to be done on the design and testing, and evaluation of transaction cost, among other issues.

The experience of the project reveals that partners involved on a voluntary-basis have limited effectiveness. Limited time availability and lack of accountability do not go well with tight project deadlines and timeframes. Other alternatives should be explored including tie-ups with institutions such as engineering schools, which would be able to provide the same, or better, range of needed expertise and time. The consortium should ideally consider the production of prototypes by LGUs and communities as requested by local officials, and as a measure of acceptance.

The Resilient Livelihood component is considered responsive to the target beneficiaries of the identified barangays. MOVE-UP provided the training for specific individual and micro-enterprises like rag making, piggery, cosmetology. Raw materials and technology like sewing machines were also provided.

The formation of the CSGs is considered to be significant across all the twelve (12) barangays. A total of almost 50 CSGs were established, with 23 in Malabon, 16 in Quezon City and 17 in Valenzuela City. It was observed that CSG members are often ZERT members as well. At the barangay level, CSGs were organized and made active in voluntary-revolver loans and social savings. The consortium helped in organizing and establishing a general system for CSGs; they also provided the CSG savings vault.

Some CSGs started with around Php 1,000 initial savings that have grown to as much as Php 100,000. This created excess funds which allowed these CSGs to set up a credit facility. In Malabon alone, the total amount collected was almost half a million pesos.

Building resiliency through CSGs involved three key components; namely, (i) livelihood assessment, (ii) financial literacy sessions, and (iii) training in alternative livelihoods. The livelihood assessment provided a thorough analysis of livelihood assets and strategies as well as opportunities and capacities for recovery among the urban poor. The financial literacy sessions highlighted the need to improve the household expense and income structure among the urban poor to build security through savings. Training in alternative livelihoods involved the hands-on production of items/learning of skills and forming linkages with markets. The CSG was selected as the best example of good practice initiated under the project. Annex G elaborates how CSGs build the culture of savings and can be considered as a strategy in resilient livelihood.

MOVE-UP, through CSGs, has increased awareness of the necessity of savings and the need for a credit facility for personal and livelihood needs, especially to protect households from community-based "loan sharks." In fact, in one of the barangays in Valenzuela, the barangay personnel also organized a CSG of their own using the system promoted by MOVE-UP, with a vault naturally provided by MOVE-UP.

In Malabon, the participants appreciated the MOVE-UP's Risk Transfer mechanisms, but they explicitly said that the Cebuana Lhuiller <sup>6</sup> services and products were way better than that of Pioneer Insurance. The Cebuana shops were accessible and offered a clear policy as well as short-term products that are cheaper compared to those of Pioneer's. The participants said that they would not renew their policy with Pioneer Insurance. This can be seen as an indication of the need to further explore other options for the communities.

## Efficiency

**Rating 4:**  
**Meets**  
**Expectations**

The final evaluation found the project to be efficient, and supported with adequate resources, ensuring that inputs and activities were appropriately delivered. It should be noted however that significant time was spent on the conduct of needs assessment on the various project components (i.e., ATS, Resilient Livelihoods, Risk Transfer). Had this been conducted prior to project implementation (as part of pre-project activities as is the normal practice) it could have provided more time for the implementation and could, arguably, have resulted to a better and more efficient implementation of the project.

Project documents and primary data evidenced good implementation despite project team and staff belonging to different consortium member organizations. There were also minor issues related to the sharing of data and information between consortium members that can easily be resolved within the operational meetings. In the case of partner mobilization efficiency, it has been noted that UAP-EA fully supported the project and managed to present several ATS designs, despite being unable to test their designs in the evacuation centers and their inability to identify the transaction costs like storage and logistics, among others.

No detailed examination of project expenditures was conducted as a financial review is beyond the scope of this evaluation. Based on staff interviews and progress reports, there does not appear to have been any significant variances between actual and budgeted expenses, so project overhead costs were likely kept well within the allowable levels allotted to the result areas identified by the project. In addition, no evaluation of staff capacity was possible within the scope of the evaluation.

## Effectiveness

**Rating 4:**  
**Meets**  
**Expectations**

The project objectives, as well as results areas, were achieved to a certain extent. By the end of the 18-month pilot implementation period, all inputs and activities were implemented in accordance with the design and its objectives in terms of the number of beneficiaries, intervention indicators, and financial disbursement.

---

<sup>6</sup> A local microfinance institution that provides pawn brokering, money remittance, insurance, microloans, bills payment, remit-to-account, corporate payout, collections, and e-loading services.

### *Result 1: Improved ATS solutions for the urban poor in the targeted Cities*

The project has satisfactorily met the requirements for Result 1. However, it has to be noted that to date, the final ATS prototypes have not been identified by the respective cities and barangays. Based on feedback from city officials, there are some concerns expressed on the ATS solutions that need to be addressed or refined as part of the project's next phase. These concerns revolve around the following: a) the ATS prototypes designed and presented are not applicable or suitable to existing conditions in the city; b) the absence of information regarding the costs of the shelter prototypes; b) technical information on how the prototypes should be constructed or installed; c) there is unanimous clamor for the actual testing and construction of ATS prototypes at the LGU level;

Before the identification of the ATS models, the project conducted a series of activities within the project implementation period. At the city level, Contingency Plans and Risk Assessments were initially reviewed to understand better the context that the project will be operating in. Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions of key stakeholders at the city level, especially in urban poor communities in the identified barangays were conducted to explore other forms of vulnerabilities and household practices in times of disasters. A household survey, utilizing PHILVOLCS' *How Safe is My House*, was conducted in the twelve (12) barangays; this is a 12-point questionnaire that provides an assessment of the adherence to general safety standards, structural integrity, and general earthquake readiness of houses. Hazard mapping was conducted with the DRRMO and barangay officials. The assessment also included a review of shelter capacities, an inventory of the evacuation centers in terms of space and Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), and a thorough analysis of ATS gaps in terms of displaced population vis-à-vis the available safe spaces in the cities.

The project piloted approaches and methodologies for the introduction and provision of ATS resulting in: (1) increased awareness, understanding, and recognition of the importance of temporary shelter needs of their constituents by the city government DRRMO, TWG representatives and barangays ; and (2) the reported inclusion of ATS in the participating LGUs DRRM plans including budget. The project organized a National Conference on Urban Resilience held last 29 August 2017 with some LGU and barangay representatives as participants; other cities not covered under the project were also invited to this event. The Conference showed the results of the assessment and provided a venue to discuss ATS solutions further. ACCORD shared the assessment process with the participants and UAP-EA showcased the different ATS prototypes they designed as a result of the project.

Further, the UAP-EA developed five ATS criteria namely: robustness, adaptability, affordability, scalability, and range of application. Nine architects were involved in the design process. Fifteen architects participated in different aspects of ATS work, and this does not include architecture and engineering students yet. Among the designs proposed was the use of container van design, proposed by two of the four architects interviewed by the evaluation team, but the Malabon LGU expressed its reservations on the design due to its

cost, storage and installation difficulty and the fact it can accommodate only a few individuals per area. It was also observed that the designs are limited to IDP's sleeping needs during an evacuation.

Program feedback stressed that ATS could be an appropriate substitute or supplement to traditional evacuation centers such as schools and covered courts. In fact, the Quezon City DRRMO not only committed to supporting the ATS of the four (4) MOVE-UP barangays but also expressed intent to providing funding assistance in the fabrication of suitable ATS models for every barangay-based on its vulnerability to the different forms of hazards. Currently, according to the Quezon City Housing Department, each MOVE-UP participating barangay was given priority in terms of developing its preferred ATS prototype.

The project exceeded targets by identifying and presenting a total of 14 ATS designs (from the expected ten designs) from where end users (community, LGU) would select most appropriate to their needs and capacities. Feedback or selection process would narrow down the list of "usable" models. Identification of specific shelter prototypes remains subject to further analysis and study by LGUs across all project sites. It should be noted that testing of a useable prototype was not part of the project and therefore no prototype was provided to the beneficiary-cities for actual testing.

In addition, local government officials across the three cities have the impression that they have to select a single shelter model or prototype which is not the intention of the project. A greater emphasis and dissemination on the hazard specificity of the ATS prototypes should be made to address this. There is also prevailing impression that ATS systems do not include identification of Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) related needs but ATS assessment reports state otherwise. Lastly, there are also important issues regarding the structural integrity of the ATS prototypes introduced as the UAP- EA (i.e., designers of most of the prototypes) do not vouch for structural soundness of shelter prototypes designed and have articulated the need for professional structural engineers to make that assessment.

#### *Result 2: Urban poor communities increased their resilience capacity in ATS and livelihood*

Under the second expected result, the project was effective in terms of accomplishing all the designed activities and providing the requirements for livelihood and risk transfer. However, due to the limitations mentioned in Result 1, capacity building and awareness of the ATS was high at the level of the city government, the BDRRMCs and community residents who were directly involved with the project and those who attended project-related activities. However, the community FGDs conducted as part of the evaluation indicates that the level of awareness does not appear to have reached the larger portion of the community residents.

After the initial assessments that were conducted, a series of DRRM trainings were conducted. With the MOVE-UP, the barangays became more aware of the potential risks and threats of impending disasters and were able to cascade this to the urban poor

communities, increasing preparedness and awareness of risk at the grassroots level. It should be noted that the establishment and training of Zone Emergency Response Teams (ZERT) provided invaluable support in mobilizing community participation and in the implementation of project activities.

*Financial Literacy and the Community Savings Groups (CSGs).* An important training, according to the barangay representatives and the communities, was the Financial Literacy Seminar conducted for the selected barangays. This provided the awareness on how to get out of the cycle of debt and live within household means, and also on how to have security for emergencies through savings. With this the value of savings were stressed to the urban poor communities.

To further support this, the consortium started to organise CSGs. Plan International had prior institutional experience with organizing and sustaining CSGs as an internationally tried and tested mechanism, and it has been increasingly promoted by other different organizations in other settings. Using Plan International's expertise, the consortium introduced templates and procedures and even provided the savings vault.

CSGs adopted key elements of Rotating Savings and Credit Associations (ROSCA) and added more flexibility in savings and loans, standardized the governance structure and reinforced accountability elements. CSGs agreed on amount to be saved and the timing of "depositing" of the amount in the CSG; this not only fostered consensus and accountability among members, it also permitted members to decide on the appropriate amount of membership fees that they can save individually that would not adversely affect their daily or weekly subsistence budget at the household level. A minimum level of savings is compulsory at the weekly meetings. Loans are made available to members once a month from the total savings. Loans are accessed in times of emergency or sometimes when there is a celebration (i.e. birthdays), and in a number of cases, added capitalization for micro-businesses, which is part of the stated aim of many mature CSG projects to encourage small businesses. CSGs thus created a local financial market that allocates local savings to debtors who are group members. This creates a mechanism that makes funds available during emergencies and helps community members avoid loan sharks and usurers like the "Bumbay". Once a year, all the savings and the accumulated interest are paid out, as a form of "shareout" at the end of the year in time for the Christmas season and in June at the start of school enrolment.

*Resilient Livelihood.* The project promoted livelihood programmes for the beneficiaries. Livelihood training on cosmetology, jewellery making, laundry detergent and fabric conditioner processing, candle-making, food processing, mushroom culture, livestock and hog raising, as well as sewing were conducted in the summer of 2017 across the 3 cities. Provision of raw materials, donation of pigs, ducks and red tilapia fingerlings, and equipment like sewing machines were part of the MOVE-UP project support for the livelihood. The concept of Resilient livelihood as a strategy to increase financial returns from

existing livelihoods, access to enterprise with multiple livelihood opportunities as well as venturing towards insuring the livelihood in case of disasters were emphasized.

*Risk Transfer.* For Risk Transfer, MOVE-UP has a good overall project approach and strategy of looking at both supply and demand. The project partner CARD Pioneer conducted an assessment that looked into key community concerns, micro-insurance needs and risks, risks that can be covered by the micro-insurance provider and the potential for micro-insurance provision or subsidy of the local government. The assessment found that there are community members who availed of certain micro-insurance products but were not aware about the product itself and the value of insurance. In addition, LGUs are wary of supporting micro-insurance efforts for urban poor communities.

With the aforementioned as the backdrop, it was not surprising to encounter low level of awareness and interest for micro-insurance from communities and local governments; in fact CARD-Pioneer offered an affordable product, but community members and CSGs are hesitant to avail of that service. This experience notwithstanding, the project was still successful in increasing the level of awareness and understanding (at least for those who participated in project activities) on the rationale/need for insurance, with some CSG members claiming to have availed of micro-insurance from Cebuana Lhuillier, with subsidy from MOVE-UP project.

*Result 3: City local government units strengthened and institutionalized policies and mechanisms for urban poor disaster resilience*

For Result 3, the project had successfully worked on formalizing partnerships with the cities of Malabon, Quezon City and Valenzuela, enabling the cities to understand the Resilient Livelihood and Risk Transfer, as well as assisting them in the process of policy crafting towards urban poor disaster resilience. Building on the consortium members' previous experience with the identified cities, the consortium saw it fit to formalize the MOVE-UP project engagement with the respective cities through the signing of a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). This binding agreement facilitated the formalization of the project partnership.

To further support MOVE-UP, it was not only the DRMMO that was tapped for project implementation. MOVE-UP staff engaged different representatives from Housing, Administration, CSWD, Research, Planning, Cooperatives and Livelihood, PESO and other significant departments within the city government units. As a result, a Project Working Group (the Project Working Group or PWG in the case of Malabon City) for the purpose of the project was formed, mobilized and maintained. The leadership of the TWG was dependent on the members and was not dictated by the project, helping ensure the ownership of the TWG and contributing to project accountability and governance. As for Malabon the DRRMO is the office leading the implementation. Other PWG member-offices though actively participate in identifying strategies and jointly implement with the Consortium.



For the LGUs to realize the value of the interventions, LGU representatives of the three (3) cities were tapped for project activities like the conduct of hazard mapping and vulnerability assessment in their respective barangay-beneficiaries, livelihood orientation and activities, and in certain cases training (Financial Training in the case of Valenzuela City).

In addition, exposure trips were organized by the project to look at Risk Transfer Policy at the Municipality of La Trinidad, Benguet, as well as Resilient Livelihood projects in Camarin, Caloocan City and in the Benguet State University. The PWG members also attended the National Conference on Urban Resilience together with other non-beneficiary cities last August 2017, becoming further exposed to the idea of ATS with the viewing of the prototypes designed by the UAP/EA.

The project also supported the DRRM Planning process of the cities as they were keen on integrating the MOVE-UP program components in their respective DRRM Plans. In the case of Valenzuela City, the project partially funded the planning session held in Subic, Zambales. Assistance in aligning Barangay Contingency Plans to the DRRM Plan as well as advocacy for LGU funding was also provided. In addition, the newly assigned project staff for Valenzuela was committed to help the DRRMO in the development of proposals to tap the Climate Change Commission's People Survival Fund to fund disaster initiatives.

In the case of Valenzuela City, the project helped the TWG in the initial drafting of an Executive Order on Risk Transfer to be signed by the City Mayor. When this pushes through, the next step would be ordinance crafting and policy lobbying at the City Council level. In the case of Malabon city, the project interventions resulted in the integration of the financial literacy in the programming and budget of the City Cooperative Development Office, as well as the provision of technical assistance during DRRM planning sessions of the City LGU.

In terms of inclusiveness, the implementing consortium took efforts to ensure that the sectoral issues and needs of the disadvantaged groups have been incorporated in the project design. The ATS Assessment survey, for one, included the number of children, elderly and persons with disabilities in determining household vulnerability to risk. Furthermore, based on the observation of the predominantly female membership of Community Savings Groups, the livelihood project team was prodded to consider ways of improving diversity in membership. It may be good to widen and deepen further the inclusion of other disadvantaged groups such as out-of-school youths, female-headed households, among others.

## Sustainability

**Rating 4:**

**Meets  
Expectations**

The project has provided a good foundation for the continuation of project gains through different measures, including: improved policy and governance structures at the city level; enhanced capacities of LGU and Barangay officials and representatives and community members; increased

public-private partnership, increased local ownership of project interventions; and tools and resources to support specific project components. With only an 18-month project implementation period, challenges remain, however, and for project gains to be sustained and improved upon, the consortium, partner organizations, LGUs, and barangays, as well as community project beneficiaries, have to continue working together to build on project gains and develop urban resilience over the long term.

Supporting LGUs, barangays, and communities to develop increased urban resilience is a long-term process, which is not possible within the pilot timeframe of the project. Recognizing this constraint, the project has adopted several strategies to sustain the project into the longer term:

*Improved Policy and Governance Structures.* As an established and central part of Philippine society and governance structure, the LGU is critical to the continuation of project gains. The project's work with the cities enabled the project to move towards improved governance at the city level to implement the project.

The MOVE UP project spearheaded the creation of a city-based DRRM PWG across the three (3) beneficiary cities. The PWG was able to integrate all disaster-related concerns at the LGU level and cascade this to the barangays. The Valenzuela City DRRMO reported that initially, they were all working in silos, and disaster was an inclusive concern of the office; however, with its institutionalization, the TWG became an informal management committee to discuss not only DRMM and MOVE-UP concerns, but as well as other concerns related to the needs at the barangay levels. In the case of Quezon City, its DRRM Office was able to provide relevant local offices with a budget for the year 2018 for disaster-related activities. The Chairman explained that each of these offices submitted their plans that included ATS, Resilient Livelihoods and Risk Transfer which were not itemized in previous plans. As such, the city's DRRM budget can be maximized with projects that were initiated under the MOVE UP project.

Participation of the LGU and the barangays in the conduct of the vulnerability and capacity assessment of the identified barangays helped in identifying and demarcating LGU and barangay level governance in times of disasters.

At the policy level, the cities were able to review existing policies and regulations and make them responsive to DRRM. An examination of mechanisms for ATS, Resilient Livelihood and Risk Transfer were also conducted by individual LGUs. Efforts to respond to policy gaps and mechanisms were observed being done simultaneously by the TWGs. Even though ATS, Resilient Livelihood and Risk Transfer were not considered a priority then, mechanisms and partnerships are being worked on by the Quezon City TWG to support these. As a result of the initial contact with the Municipality of La Trinidad, Benguet through the MOVE-UP exposure activity, the Valenzuela TWG has helped formulate an Executive Order for the mayor to sign, with the eventual crafting and approval of a more comprehensive ordinance at the City Council level, according to the DRRMO.

*Capacity building and strengthening.* Strengthening the capacities of LGUs, barangays, and communities, and other stakeholders is a central component of the project and much time and effort have been invested in such activities.

For ATS, LGU and Barangay representatives learned about the different ATS solutions which the UAP-EA shared. A total of 14 models were presented that the architects thought may fit certain specific requirements. At the LGU and Barangay levels, internal and external capacities to set-up and manage ATS are still being reviewed, especially in cities like Malabon and Valenzuela where safe spaces are not available due to population density and congestion.

In terms of the cities' DRRM Plans, the project supported the cities in their efforts to develop a more responsive DRRM Plan and align the BDRRM Plans with it. It was reported that the cities are trying to integrate the MOVE-UP components in their plans. In fact, the Quezon City LGU committed that the rehabilitation and recovery portion of its DRRM plan will be enhanced with the three MOVE UP project components and with the concept of inclusivity. However, the Malabon City government seems hesitant to support ATS due to funding constraints, logistical considerations, and open space limitations. Despite this, Malabon City is willing to support the CSG formalization into a cooperative so it can avail of more training and additional financial support. The project also partially funded the DRRM planning of Valenzuela City conducted in Subic recently.

At the level of the community members, training and seminars on DRRM knowledge, financial literacy, resilient livelihood and risk transfer were conducted. As part of the DRRM component on urban resilience, orientation training were conducted at the respective barangays. Despite the progress made, particularly in DRRM, gaps still exist in people's knowledge and understanding of disasters, especially on how it can be addressed in a context-specific and appropriate manner. Financial literacy training were conducted, contributing to the establishment and success of CSGs. Most CSG members also participated in Resilient Livelihood based on specific type of enterprise they want to venture into. CSGs were also provided with sessions on Risk Transfer that focused on micro-insurance. There are significant capacity building and strengthening interventions that need to be carried out as being recommended<sup>7</sup> in the Resilience and Livelihood Assessment. These include building the capacity to access critical market facilities, linkages with other institutions, and knowing to invest in a new livelihood or scaling up of existing livelihood with high-income potential.

*Increased local ownership.* The use of participatory processes in the project implementation has yielded good results at all levels. The TWG and other LGU representatives, Barangay officials and CSG members view their involvement in MOVE-UP as essential.

---

<sup>7</sup> Recommendations stated in the document Resilience and Livelihood Assessment prepared by Plan International for the MOVE UP Project.

The DRRMO and TWGs of the cities have committed themselves to continue the project gains of the MOVE-UP project, even at the level of policy crafting and financial support. Mainstreaming of the project components into PPAs of local government agencies/line departments, and as part of the regular budget and government investment programming (e.g., ATS and livelihoods mainstreamed into CSWD and other departmental plans and programmes) can best ensure sustainability of project gains. Members of the TWGs are tapping other departments to help them in their efforts. With MOVE-UP, the local government of Quezon City is continuously building linkages with private organizations; for instance, with construction suppliers for possibilities created by ATS; similarly, for the Risk Transfer, it is trying to bring microinsurance providers to the local communities. The project also facilitated a potential partnership to bring the benefits of risk transfer in the most vulnerable barangays. The LGU of Valenzuela, for its part, has started running the Financial Literacy modules on their own.

Aside from this, the LGUs are thinking of ways to scale-up the livelihood into standalone micro-enterprises or organizing them into cooperatives. Cities are tapping local businesses as well as employment support, provision of training as well as creating avenues for additional funding and support. In addition, as result of the project, the city DRRM planning process is being trickled down to the barangay levels.

The BDRRMOs and the barangays are helpful to the program, with corresponding point persons to be contacted for MOVE-UP concerns. The barangays are closely coordinating with the CSGs to further help the CSG members and help other community members join or organize their own CSGs. The importance of savings has been raised by as an important contribution of the MOVE-UP program, and the barangays lauded this effort.

Most of the CSGs are already self-sustaining at project termination. In fact, some CSGs availed of microinsurance products with counterpart funding from the project. Using the consortium templates and systems, individual CSGs were able to grow on their own. An affordable saving schemes that would not affect their daily subsistence budget, the availability of loans and the promise of a big payout towards the end of the year maintains the interests of members to participate in meetings and give their “savings share” at the designated period. A governance structure based on shared accountability also ensures that the CSG members share will remain intact. According to the Plan International Philippines representative, one Valenzuela-based CSG proceeded to become formalized into a cooperative, while two CSGs in Malabon are also in the process of applying for cooperative accreditation through the assistance of the City Cooperative Development Office.

A potential hindering factor in the roll-out of CSGs may lie in its relative autonomy and their self-sustaining nature which tends to make some LGU representatives worried about them being used in political undertakings at the barangay level. In Valenzuela, for example, a barangay official supporting the CSGs is seen as a threat because they are “dilawan” (belonging to the previous presidential regime).

## Likelihood of Impact

**Rating 4:**  
**Meets**  
**Expectations**

While being able to reach the stated number of project beneficiaries and complete all project activities may appear, at first glance, to make the project objectives and outcomes realistic, given the pilot nature of the project and the corresponding 18-month implementation period, it can be argued that medium-term and long-term impact cannot be fully assessed and discussed.

Current project (model building), especially for the ATS solution, should be viewed as an investment for future returns (benefit and impact) - when sustainable and replicable models are finalized and implemented.

According to the consortium, from the targeted ten (10) ATS sample designs, the consortium in partnership with the UAP-EA and consultation with the three (3) cities' TWGs and barangays, they were able to come up with fourteen (14) ATS units that are implementable. Through the project, ATS models/systems were presented to LGU and barangay representatives, increasing their awareness of ATS is an essential aspect of DRRM. Cities perception, inclination and acceptance of specific ATS design varied depending on context-specific considerations like availability of funds, enabling policy to move towards ATS as well as access to locations of safe spaces for the ATS. The challenge of accountability, ownership, as well as subsequent management and maintenance of actual ATS - whether it is under the city government or the barangay - is being discussed by city TWGs and barangays.

MOVE-UP were able to help the LGUs and barangays understand the need to think about ATS as essential aspects of DRRM; however, this has not trickled down at the community level.

One of the most important impacts of the project is the formation of the CSGs, resulting in increased social capital, financial capital and human capital. This is primarily because of activities related to resilient livelihoods and risk transfer/micro-insurance. The three key components<sup>8</sup> of the CSG provided a strategy in increasing returns from existing assets and livelihoods by investing in alternative livelihood options. The urban poor had some amount of savings from existing employment and small livelihoods that were left idle. The CSG introduced the concept of pooling idle savings and investing in alternative forms of livelihood. In this way, community savings grew. Almost 50 CSGs were formed at the span

---

<sup>8</sup> The three key components include (i) livelihood assessment, (ii) financial literacy sessions, and (iii) training in alternative livelihoods. The livelihood assessment provided a thorough analysis of livelihood assets and strategies as well as opportunities and capacities for recovery among the urban poor. The financial literacy sessions highlighted the need to improve the household expense and income structure among the urban poor in order to build security through savings. Training in alternative livelihoods involved hands-on production of items / learning of skills and forming linkages with markets.

of the pilot implementation. It eventually improved savings practices at the household level and non-members joined or helped form CSGs themselves.

As an offshoot of the strategy, the CSG was able to provide a credit facility to members for both personal and livelihood needs. The access to credit gave households a sense of security and allowed individuals to keep their dignity in the event of financial difficulties and emergencies. It also protected those in need from being prey to loan sharks. In practice, until alternative livelihoods gained stability and sustainability, the credit facility was the main business activity of the CSG. Besides the financial benefits gained, members attested to the social cohesion that CSGs instilled in urban poor communities. CSGs have varying degrees of organizational maturity with some of them inclined to venture towards formalization in the form of joining or forming a cooperative.

The marginalized communities have formed and strengthened CSGs and built up organizational capacity to dialogue with and articulate to MOVE-UP consortium and the LGUs on their specific intents regarding livelihood programs, moving towards resilient livelihood. The project did not provide start-up capital but provided training programs on specific livelihood activities that the respective community members may need. Training on cosmetology, candle-making, food processing, livestock and hog raising, processing of fabric conditioner and detergent, sewing and other similar livelihood activities were identified and implemented. Support came in the form of livestock and hog donations, provision of raw materials, donation of electric sewing machines and other materials necessary for the livelihood.

With the introduction of the concept of resilient livelihood, through exposure activities provided by MOVE-UP, LGUs are helping the MOVE-UP livelihood beneficiaries to move towards resilient livelihood and increased absorptive capacity of CSGs members. Developing adaptive capacities possible and likely if interventions are continued and enhanced

High levels of awareness among the barangay and community, especially those involved in project activities, was observed. This awareness provides a solid foundation for future risk reduction and resilience interventions. The barangays are moving towards the formulation of their DRRM plans as they became more aware of the risks and vulnerabilities in their respective barangays. A representative of Quezon City Research Department pointed out that another significant result of the MOVE UP project was the formulation of the barangay Contingency Plans among the beneficiaries. This result could be replicated in other barangays based on the approach and manner done by MOVE UP. "The contingency plan is the mother of all DRRM plans," according to the DRRM Office Chairman. Funding cannot be provided without this plan.

## Conclusions

---

The evaluation findings reveal that overall, the pilot implementation of MOVE-UP in the cities of Malabon, Quezon City and Valenzuela has achieved an adequate level of success across the evaluation areas of Project Design, Relevance/Appropriateness, Coherence, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Likelihood of Impact.

### *Project Design*

Much of the project design has been driven by the logical framework and parameters pre-determined by the donor. As such, there was a difficulty in ascribing the design to an overarching urban resilience framework that normally becomes the reference for similar projects. Furthermore, a framework could establish conceptual parameters that may limit, if not undermine, the pilot and hence, the exploratory nature of the project. As such, in terms of project design, this particular gap is acceptable.

The program logic has room for further improvement, as some assumptions or conditions may not have been tested or given appropriate consideration, given that the project designers were not able to initially engage with key stakeholders at the city and barangay community levels before the preparation of the proposal.

### *Coherence*

Findings reveal substantial and successful efforts in ensuring participation of stakeholders, including private organizations and local government agencies. MOVE-UP was able to identify, mobilize and engage different stakeholder segments at the different levels.

### *Relevance*

At the regional and national levels, the project was deemed relevant, aligning strongly to global and regional priorities and directions on urban resilience and disaster risk reduction and management. At the project level, the project was consistent with the priorities of the donor and with the institutional mandates of the consortium members. The project's targeted cities of Malabon, Quezon City, and Valenzuela were among those vulnerable to disaster risk. At the community level, the project was deemed appropriate because it conducted extensive assessments on the needs of targeted vulnerable cities and communities on temporary shelter, resilient livelihoods, and risk transfers, addressing the relevant issues identified in the assessments.

### *Efficiency*

The final evaluation found the project to be efficient. In general, the project was supported with adequate resources. Inputs and activities were delivered and accomplished in a timely manner. Project documents and primary data pointed to good implementation despite the project team and staff belonging to different consortium member organizations.

### *Effectiveness*

The project was effective in terms of accomplishing the planned activities. All of the project objectives as well as results areas were achieved to a certain extent. By the end of the 18-month pilot implementation period, all inputs and activities were implemented in accordance with the design and its objectives in terms of number of beneficiaries, intervention indicators, and financial disbursement.

### *Sustainability*

The project has provided a good foundation for the continuation of project gains through different measures, including: (1) improved policy and governance structures at the city level; (2) enhanced capacities of LGU and Barangay officials and representatives and community members; (3) increased public-private partnership, with increased local ownership of project interventions; and (4) development and availability of tools and resources to support specific project components.

### *Likelihood of Impact*

Given the pilot nature of the project, and the shortness of the 18-month implementation time-frame, it is doubtful if medium-term and long-term impact can be fully assessed at this point. However, the successful completion of the project as designed and its achievement of declared project objectives and outcomes may be taken as a potential indication of a high likelihood of impact in the coming years.

### *On the Three Main Focus of the Project*

As a pilot project, implemented for around 18 months, the following conclusions can be raised for the three (3) main focus of the project:

*Alternative Temporary Shelter.* MOVE-UP was able to introduce and disseminate ATS solutions at the level of the city and barangays.

- The ATS solutions were contextualized to the circumstances of specific barangays, based on a review of plans as well as participatory community-based vulnerability, risk and capacity assessments of the twelve barangays.
- Instead of the initially identified ten (10) ATS models or prototypes, the project disseminated fourteen (14) ATS prototypes that the cities and respective barangays can evaluate and choose from. From these, the prototype can be further developed for to suit the specific requirements of the city and barangay.
- It should be noted that during the LGUs' main concerns are the limited/lack of public open spaces and evacuation centers will not be able to accommodate most of the evacuees. Urban poor communities have very narrow and often inaccessible roads. Hence, ATS simulation and testing were requested.



*Resilient Livelihood.* The project had successfully implemented interventions to promote resilient livelihood.

- The project implemented various capacity building activities geared towards financial awareness and literacy, as well as training on enterprise and individual livelihood undertakings for the urban poor communities in the twelve (12) barangays.
- The project raised the awareness on the need for savings; thus, promoting individual household, and group savings. It was also observed that there was an increase in social cohesion among members.
- Community savings groups (CSGs) aimed at local financial intermediation were set-up at the barangay level.
- The provision of livelihood opportunities and resources needed for livelihood diversification to urban poor communities was also addressed by the project.

*Risk Transfer.* The project has developed considerably and contributed to enabling the partner city government representatives. However, at the level of the urban poor communities, uptake of micro-insurance as risk transfer mechanism seems limited.

- The project established and engaged the Project Working Groups (PWGs) – comprising of different department representatives of the city governments.
- LGU representatives were equipped and enabled to understand all the project components through consultation and engagement, as well as through capacity building activities like exposure trips, training, and conferences.
- Local government policy to include project components – especially risk transfer – was introduced through lobbying, as well as through policy crafting either through Mayor’s Executive Order or a City Ordinance.

## **Lessons Learnt and Good Practices**

---

As a result of the project, the following key lessons have been learned:

**1. The consortium approach is an effective and efficient strategy for project implementation.**

- The consortium was able to build on the relative strengths of each organization partner. Working in a consortium structure allowed for the efficient sharing of expertise and resources.

The network and social capital of each organization within the consortium were tapped in relation to the identified project results. With this, the project was able to establish and expand linkages with private organizations like UAP, Rags to

Riches and CARD Pioneer as well as LGU partners like the LGU of La Trinidad, Benguet, far beyond what may be possible to the project management alone.

**2. It is essential to integrate urban resilience mainstreaming into city decision making and policies**

- The project has shown that engagement should start with current city priorities and be tailored to local decision-making processes.
- The identification and establishment of Project Working Groups (PWGs) in the three pilot cities was an effective strategy to facilitate program integration within existing LGU practices and promote internal ownership of the program. This also helped in the defining of horizontal and vertical functional relationships across the different city departments that facilitated the work of MOVE-UP.

**3. Increasing the capacity of cities and promoting the participation of key actors in project activities are necessary for a relatively successful project implementation and the improvement of potential for impact and project sustainability.**

- Developing the capacity of PWGs and LGU representatives in the creation of the City DRMM was useful, and proved so even in cascading the creation of such similar structures at the barangay levels.
- Participation in key activities was also effective. The participation of LGU representatives in the vulnerability assessment in the barangays contributed to increased awareness of vulnerability at the barangay levels.
- Participation of LGU and barangay representatives in the presentation of the ATS contributed to understanding the value of ATS and other potential alternatives for future disasters.

**4. Targeting project beneficiaries at the barangay level may result in potential outcomes.**

- Community savings groups were formed in the targeted 12 barangays. This resulted in increased savings awareness at the community level and in the introduction of household level savings as a resiliency measure.
- Risk transfer was introduced to CSG members, and this resulted in the certain individuals availing affordable micro-insurance coverage from insuring institutions like Cebuana Lhuillier or Pioneer Insurance.
- LGUs were able to identify certain programs that they can offer to respond to specific requirements and needs at the barangay level.

**5. Providing resilient livelihoods entail considering enterprise and supply chain management, market analysis, marketing and investment considerations that should be addressed as part of the package.**

- The city government and industry partners established partnerships to provide beneficiaries of livelihood training with access to employment or markets.
- The need to diversify livelihood training to avoid competition among target beneficiary barangays in the same barangay and city must be kept in mind.
- Capacity building on livelihood must include training on supply-chain management, packaging, marketing, sales, as well as other roles and functions in managing such enterprises.

## Recommendations

---

Given the findings, the evaluator recommends the following actions:

- (1) The consortium should consider significantly strengthening the project design of the succeeding phase or iteration of this model development process. The next phase should better elucidate the conceptual relationships and interactions between ATS, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer, and use these in the redesign of components and activities for the next project cycle. Specifically, this will entail that the consortium to:
  - a. Review the assumptions in the logical framework guiding the project, particularly on establishing a clear operational definition of resiliency that lends to highlighting the importance of ATS, resilient livelihoods and risk transfers as critical factors;
  - b. Strengthen process documentation, including a separate mechanism for the distillation of inter-organizational lessons learned to feed back into the activities of the project;
  - c. Increase knowledge sharing mechanisms not only between consortium partners but also across partners and community beneficiaries; Part of this should be to develop compendiums, checklists and other references that will help LGUs facilitate the mainstreaming of key considerations into their respective plans.
  - d. And finally, craft well-packaged business models, by including model-building as a key result area to ensure the development of a replicable model, or specific methodologies attaining the desired results for the project
  
- (2) The consortium should continue to strengthen its engagement with the Local Government Units for policy development, towards influencing the crafting and approval of contingency plans and DRRM plans that align and subscribes to the lessons learned in this project. Specifically, this means:
  - e. Working with the LGU for the approval of a range of ATS solutions appropriate to their respective LGU, taking into consideration the full range of needs and issues arising from the limitations of space constraints, population, and available financing;
  - f. Mainstream the wider, more comprehensive understanding of ATS into formal LGU development and sectoral plans and operations to sustain the gains of the project;

- g. Promoting a more favorable policy environment for increasing the diversity of resilient livelihood options for the beneficiary community, and encouraging greater financial and economic inclusion, up to the point of exploring LGU-driven incentives for activities that will promote savings, increasing access to microfinance and other mechanisms that will promote resilient livelihoods;
  - h. Working with LGU economic departments, and commercial partners to further enhance supply-side focus on risk transfer, by engaging industry-wide insurance providers to develop products and services appropriate for the urban poor.
- (3) The consortium, in the longer term, should expand and deepen their engagement with community and industry partners towards the continued provision of services such as livelihood capability-building, micro-financing, risk insurance, all the way to promoting practices such as business and service continuity processes, and widening acceptance for micro-insurance packages and services on offer. This will include:
- i. Reviewing, approving and tapping existing suppliers in the localities that can offer short-term risk transfer products such as short-term accident insurance schemes, and assisting the community and LGU establish monitoring mechanisms that will continue to observe the progress, impact, and effect of these service providers and services on the beneficiary community.
  - j. Considering a wider range of livelihood interventions, including designing mitigating interventions for existing and operating livelihood value chains, as opposed to only investing in new livelihoods that will entail a learning curve and increased investments in training and adaptation.

## Annexes

### Annex A: Logical Framework

Title of the Action	<b>Moving Urban Poor Communities Towards Resilience (MOVE-UP)</b>		
Principal Objective	To contribute to institutionalizing urban resilience and disaster preparedness mechanisms for urban poor in Metro Manila-Philippines		
	<b>Intervention Logic</b>	<b>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of Verification</b>
<b>Specific Objective</b>	To pilot and demonstrate systems and models for Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS) and livelihood to increase the resilience of LGUs and urban poor against natural disasters in Metro Manila	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option of ATS systems and models piloted, documented and disseminated-<b>Target Value: 10 ATS models/systems are piloted</b></li> <li>• Number of poor urban individuals increased awareness on resilience livelihoods and/or risk transfer options/mechanisms: <b>Target Value: 30,000</b></li> <li>• Cities integrating ATS models/systems and pro-poor resilience livelihood in their plans and systems-<b>Target Value: 3 Cities and 12 BLGUs</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 document with ATS pilot results, outcomes and recommendations prepared and disseminated</li> <li>• Baseline and end line surveys on community awareness; resilience and livelihood assessment report; External evaluation report</li> <li>• City DRRM/Development Plans/AIP with resilience livelihood strategies for urban poor</li> </ul>
<b>Result 1</b>	Improved ATS solutions for the urban poor in the targeted Cities  <b>Beneficiaries:</b> 15 (3 cities and 12 barangays)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of cities developed and piloted ATS models and systems-<b>Target Value: 3 Cities</b></li> <li>▪ Number of Cities and/or BLUGs adopted ATS in their DRRM Plans with budget allocation-<b>Target Value: 15 (3 Cities and 12 Barangays)</b></li> <li>▪ Urban poor barangays with identified hazard-specific ATS needs-<b>Target Value: 12 Barangays</b></li> <li>▪ Information sharing event to increase awareness on ATS models and solutions; <b>Target Value-1 Event</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agreement reports/review on piloted models and systems; Blueprint/design and process documentation on the systems and models;</li> <li>▪ Drafted and/or approved City/BLGU plans with budget for ATS</li> <li>▪ Multi-hazard maps of barangays; reports on hazard specific ATS gaps of the barangays; minutes of BDRRMC-level meetings tackling hazard specific ATS gaps;</li> <li>▪ 1 Regional (NCR) conference proceeding; list of participants of the conference;</li> </ul>

<p><b>Result 2</b></p>	<p>Urban poor communities increased their resilience capacity in ATS and livelihood</p> <p><b>Beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>30,000 individuals</p> <p>20 Organizations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Barangays, cities, and stakeholders undertaking community activities that exhibit more resilient livelihoods-<b>Target Value: 20 organizations</b></li> <li>▪ Number of urban poor households aware of and/or adopted resilience livelihood strategies to cope with natural disasters-<b>Target Value: 30,000</b></li> <li>▪ Number of BLGUs revised DRRM plans and allocates resources for ATS and livelihood resilience initiatives for urban poor in line with DRRM/CCA Law-<b>Target Value: 12 Barangays</b></li> <li>▪ Number of Barangays with organized, trained and functional zone structures to support emergency response immediately after disasters-<b>Target Value: 12 Barangays</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Report on urban livelihood resilience; participants list in study report presentation</li> <li>▪ List of participants in orientation and workshop on resilience livelihood strategies in targeted communities; increased awareness among the urban poor on risk transfer options/mechanisms/products/services available in NCR; number of urban poor with resilience livelihood plans;</li> <li>▪ Revised and/or approved plans of BLGU with resilience livelihood for urban poor; % of budget allocated for ATS and resilience livelihood for urban poor compared to total BLGU budgets in line with national DRRM/CCA Law;</li> <li>▪ BLGU level policy and/or executive orders passed to formalize zone-level response support structures; LGU level plans, systems and procedures incorporating zone-level structures;</li> </ul>
<p><b>Result 3</b></p>	<p>City local government units strengthened and institutionalized policies and mechanisms for urban poor disaster resilience</p> <p><b>Beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>1200 Individuals</p> <p>3 Cities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Number of city DRRM plans with improved provisions for strengthening resilience of the urban poor-<b>Target Value: 3 Cities</b></li> <li>▪ Number of cities incorporated resilience livelihood strategies for urban poor in DRRM/Development Plans/AIP-<b>Target Value: 3 Cities</b></li> <li>▪ Number of Cities initiated risk transfer modalities in partnership with private sectors-<b>Target Value: 3 Cities</b></li> <li>▪ Number of urban poor individuals benefited from improved resilience livelihood planning of the cities-<b>Target Value: 1200</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Revised and approved DRRM plans and AIP</li> <li>▪ City DRRM/Development/AIP with resilience livelihood strategies for urban poor;</li> <li>▪ City plans for, and reports on practice of risk transfer systems/models for urban poor-Private sector plans, or documentation on promoting risk transfers, including documentation of private sector direct support to DRR and livelihood activities of the urban poor; Monitoring and evaluation reports;</li> <li>▪ Agreement between ACF and city/LGU on the use of incentive; list of urban poor with resilience livelihood and/or risk transfer arrangements;</li> </ul>

<p>Activities</p>	<p><b>Activities to meet the Result 1:</b></p> <p>R1.1: Hazard Specific Mapping on ATS needs  R1.2: Develop menu of ATS options - models and systems  R1.3: Piloting of models/systems at LGU level  R1.4: Support and Lobby with LGUs for ATS inclusion in the planning process and systems  R1.5: Organize national level information sharing events on the project outcomes</p> <p><b>Activities to meet the Result 2:</b></p> <p>R2.1. Conduct resilience and livelihood assessment in urban poor communities in the targeted Cities  R2.2. Conduct orientation and workshops on resilience livelihood strategies in targeted communities  R2.3. Support to and lobby with BLGUs to revise their DRM plans for urban poor anchored on the resilience livelihood assessment  R2.4. Organize and train zone-level disaster response structures in support of Barangay disaster response plans and initiatives</p> <p><b>Activities to meet the Result 3:</b></p> <p>R3.1. Assessment and review of city disaster management and response plans  R3.2. Support to and lobby with cities to incorporate resilient livelihood strategies for urban poor  R3.3. Organize convergence and workshops among cities and private sector to initiate risk transfer modalities  R3.4. Provide incentives to cities in support of implementing resilience livelihood plans for urban poor</p>
-------------------	---

## Annex B: Terms of Reference

### Terms of Reference for the External Evaluation of the Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP) project

*Final version*

Project Name	Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP)
Location	Philippines: 12 target barangays in Malabon City, Quezon City and Valenzuela City
Partners	Action Against Hunger Philippines, PLAN International, CARE Nederland and Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD)
Duration	18 months
Project Starting Date	15 February 2016
Project Ending Date	14 September 2017
Programme Language	English
Donor & Contribution/s	European Union Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) under its Humanitarian Action Plan (HIP) for Southeast Asia and the Pacific programme
Responsible Action Against Hunger HQ	Action Against Hunger - UK
Mission administering the Project	Action Against Hunger - Philippines
Evaluation Type	Final Independent External Evaluation
Evaluation Dates	01 September – 9 October 2017
Budget	18,000 Euros (inclusive all expenses)

## 1. BACKGROUND

The Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP) is an urban disaster risk reduction (DRR) project implemented by a consortium of international NGOs composed of Action Against Hunger Philippines, PLAN International, CARE Nederland and Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD).

The project, with funding support from the European Union Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) under its Humanitarian Action Plan (HIP) for Southeast Asia and the Pacific program, aims to demonstrate systems and models of Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS), resilient livelihoods and risk transfer modalities to improve the disaster risk reduction and management in major cities in Metro Manila. Within the period of February 2016 to August 2017, the project supported about 30,000 people from 12 target barangays in Malabon City, Quezon City and Valenzuela City.

Based from the needs assessment that was done in the targeted Cities in Caloocan, Malabon, Valenzuela and Quezon City, there is a need to further improve survival and bouncing back capacities of the Barangays particularly among the urban poor especially in informal settlements this is despite the strong DRR programming of the targeted cities. Community level DRR still needs critical attention since majority of the populace would still rely or depend on the support or action from the city government or Barangays. In Valenzuela City for instance, most of the Barangays still depend most of DRR related actions from the City Government. On the other hand, in Quezon City,



the DRRM Office strongly expresses to the Barangays that building resilience must start at the community level. Although the DRR governance in the 2 cities vary, what is similar is the fact that disaster preparedness and resilience building is not strong at the Purok or Zone levels of the Barangays which include individual and household level preparedness. When it comes to social protection, this is entirely lodged in a different department or unit of the City local government. Insurance is not also a priority even if there are available groups that provide life and accident insurance with a minimal premiums. At the city level, insurance related to calamities and disasters is not a priority, maybe because this is viewed as a role of the national private and other government agencies. There is no deliberate effort to allocate substantial amount from the 5% local DRRM fund related to insurance.

## 2. AIM OF THE PROJECT

### Principal Objective

To contribute to institutionalizing urban resilience and disaster preparedness mechanisms for urban poor in Metro Manila- Philippines.

### Specific Objective

To pilot and demonstrate systems and models for Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS) and livelihood to increase the resilience of LGUs and urban poor against natural disasters in Metro Manila.

#### **Result 1: Improved ATS solutions for the urban poor in the targeted Cities**

Target Beneficiaries: 15 (3 cities and 12 barangays)

#### **Result 2: Urban poor communities increased their resilience capacity in ATS and livelihood**

Target Beneficiaries: 30,000 individuals; 20 Organizations

#### **Result 3: City local government units strengthened and institutionalized policies and mechanisms for urban poor disaster resilience**

Target Beneficiaries: 1,200 Individuals, 3 Cities

Recognizing the gaps in terms of capacities related to DRR among urban poor in the identified cities in Metro Manila, this action aims to introduce and implement practical solutions to increase survival, coping and bouncing back approaches, and strategies particularly of the urban poor against the effects of various hazard events. The focus of this action is to support the LGUs in terms of strengthening disaster preparedness among the urban poor in informal settlers which include organizing and training of zone/area disaster response structures including family level survivability skills in support of Barangay disaster response plans and initiatives. The action will also focus in providing options specific to ATS in the urban setting in response to massive emergency situation in the urban cities such as flooding and impact of a 7.2 magnitude earthquake. Under the ATS initiative, the action will propose or develop practical and cost-efficient temporary shelters such as modular or butterfly shelters which can be put in targeted open spaces that the cities identified.

The value added in this action is by significantly concentrating in improving the "bouncing-back" approaches and strategies of the targeted LGUs on social protection especially among the urban poor. This will including introducing effective and appropriate models on savings, micro-insurance and livelihood improvement options. The action will also focus in introducing financial literacy activities to change the mind-set and attitude of the urban poor in relation to view social protection as their obligation. The strategies and approaches that will be implemented under this action, specifically on disaster preparedness, ATS and social protection will be in collaboration with private

sectors, civil society organizations and government agencies. As such, the results defined under this action are systematically linked with each other. Disaster preparedness activities and ATS ensures survivability of the communities, particularly of the urban poor, in the onset and/or aftermath of a disaster by allowing them to respond and manage in a timely and efficient manner. It will provide them with safe, adequate and dignified alternative temporary shelter. On the other hand, risk transfer and disaster resilient livelihoods will provide the urban poor and LGUs the capacity to "bounce-back" after a disaster event. This, alongside with improved City and LGUs DRRM plans, which includes the urban poor, is expected to reduce the vulnerability, impact and exposure to natural disasters. For the detailed project objectives, results, indicators, activities.

### 3. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

#### Rationale for the Evaluation

The final external evaluation of the project in the Philippines is being carried out as per the planning in the proposal. The evaluation results are expected to inform future the consortium's development projects and ECHO in their future funding strategies and programing.

#### Objectives of the Evaluation

This final evaluation is expected to be carried out towards the end of the action. A final external evaluation, following Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, is selected.

The aim of the evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the intervention and to determine if it has reached its intended objectives looking at all the components of the result chain (inputs, activities and results) as well as key contextual factors that might have enabled or hindered its delivery. The evaluation will mainly focus on examining evidence-based lessons learned, and draw challenges and recommendations on sustainability and on how the project could be replicated and maximize its impact.

### 4. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will cover entire project duration, from 15 February 2016 to 14 September 2017, and will cover the geographical areas of 12 target barangays in Malabon City, Quezon City and Valenzuela City. It will focus on the beneficiaries targeted by the project such as the government authorities, community savings groups, and other partners.

#### Specific issues to be covered:

- The evaluation needs to look at the project within the challenging urban risk reduction incorporating resilient livelihoods, alternative temporary shelters, and risk transfer mechanisms.
- The evaluation should set an emphasis on how projects of this nature can be improved in the future, as well as highlight limitations
- Analysis on the replicability and scaling-up the good practices and lessons learned

### 5. EVALUATION APPROACH AND QUESTIONS

As per Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and Guidelines, Action Against Hunger adheres to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria approach for evaluating its programs and projects. Specifically, Action Against Hunger uses the following DAC criteria:

- Relevance/Appropriateness;
- Coherence;
- Coverage;
- Efficiency;
- Effectiveness;
- Sustainability and;
- Likelihood of Impact.

To the latter list, Action Against Hunger adds an additional criterion, Design. Action Against Hunger also promotes a systematic analysis of the monitoring system in place within the aforementioned criteria.

Evaluation questions have been developed to help the evaluator/s assess the project against these seven criteria (refer to Annex 1). The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and the questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the Mission focal persons and ELA and Action Against Hunger – UK and the evaluator/s and reflected in the inception report.

All independent external evaluations are expected to use DAC criteria in data analysis and reporting. In particular, the evaluator/s must complete the DAC criteria rating table (refer to Annex 2) and include it as part of the final evaluation report.

## 6. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the suggested methodological approach for the evaluator/s to collect quantitative and qualitative data and the chronological steps of the evaluation process. The evaluator/s have to extend further and develop instruments and methods which allow collecting sex and age disaggregated data and analysis of inclusivity. The instruments need to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible.

### Evaluation Briefing

Prior to the evaluation taking place, the evaluator is expected to attend an evaluation technical briefing with the ELA Action Against Hunger-UK. In case face-to-face briefing is not possible due to budget or logistic constraints, briefings by telephone or online must be agreed in advance. Briefing at the mission level will be facilitated and done by Mission Focal person.

### Desk review

The evaluator/s will undertake a desk review of project materials, including the project documents and proposals, progress reports, outputs of the project (such as interim report, ATS assessments, livelihoods assessments, risk transfer study, policy review, DRRM/AIP/Development plans, executive orders, resolutions, etc.), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources.

### Action Against Hunger HQ and Mission Briefing

As part of the evaluation, the evaluator/s will attend a briefing with HQ and Mission stakeholders to get preliminary information about the project being evaluated. In case face-to-face briefing is not possible due to budget or logistic constraints, briefings by telephone or online must be agreed in advance.

## Sampling

The evaluator should clearly state the sampling approach in terms of sites and beneficiaries. Due to the short period of time in the field, access to a representative sample through a probabilistic sampling approach is highly challenged. **Convenience sampling** is suggested for both, project sites and beneficiaries. As mentioned in the evaluation scope section, the aim is for the evaluation to ideally **cover 9 barangays, with 3 barangays per municipality minimum**). The criteria for the selection of beneficiaries should involve the consortium project team leaders. The sampling approach should be adjusted and further detailed by the evaluator in the inception report.

## Inception Report

At the end of the desk review period and before the field mission, the evaluator/s will prepare a brief inception report. The report will be written in English and will include the following sections:

- Key elements of the TORs to demonstrate that the evaluator will adhere to the TORs;
- The methodological approach to the evaluation include an evaluation matrix in annex to specify how the evaluator will collect data to answer the evaluation questions, pointing out the limitations to the methodology if any and the choice of sites per field visit
- The data collection tools (focus group discussions, questionnaires);
- A detailed evaluation workplan and;
- State adherence to Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and outline the evaluation report format.

The inception report will be discussed and approved by the country office focal person who will be the primary contact in managing and coordinating the evaluation while ELA unit (ACF-UK) will support in technical advisory role,

## Field Mission

### Primary data collection techniques

As part of the evaluation, the evaluator will interview key project stakeholders (expatriate/national project staff, local/national representatives, local authorities, civil society leaders, and donor representatives). The evaluator/s will use the most suitable format for these interviews as detailed in the inception report. The evaluator/s will collect information directly from beneficiaries. Towards enriching triangulation, the evaluator is expected to conduct FGDs (beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, key informants – CSO and LGU leaders) and surveys.

### Field visits

The evaluator/s will visit the project sites and the facilities provided to the beneficiaries (if any).

### Secondary data collection techniques: Desk review

The evaluator/s will further review complementary documents and collect project monitoring data or any other relevant statistical data.

### Debriefing and stakeholders workshop

The evaluator shall facilitate a learning workshop in country to present preliminary findings of the evaluation to the project and key stakeholders; to gather feedback on the findings and build consensus on recommendations; to develop action-oriented workshop statements on lessons learned and proposed improvements for the future.

### Presentation of Findings to ECHO

The evaluator/s is expected to prepare a presentation of the evaluation report to ECHO.

## Evaluation Report

The evaluation report shall follow the following format and be written in English:

- **Cover Page** (Template to be provided by Action Against Hunger UK);
- **Summary Table** (to follow template provided);
- **Table of Contents**
- **Executive Summary** (must be a standalone summary, describing the project, main findings of the evaluation, and conclusions and recommendations. This will be no more than 2 pages in length);
- **Background Information**
- **Methodology** (describe the methodology used, provide evidence of triangulation of data and presents limitations to the methodology);
- **Findings** (includes overall assessment of the project against the evaluation criteria, responds to the evaluation questions, all findings are backed up by evidence, cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed and; unintended and unexpected outcomes are also discussed);
- **Conclusions** (conclusions are formulated by synthesizing the main findings into statements of merit and worth, judgements are fair, impartial, and consistent with the findings);
- **Lessons Learnt and Good Practices** (presents lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve project performance, outcome, or impact and; identify good practices: successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication; further develop on one specific good practice to be showcased in the template provided in Annex VII);
- **Recommendations** (Recommendations should be as realistic, operational and pragmatic as possible; that is, they should take careful account of the circumstances currently prevailing in the context of the action, and of the resources available to implement it both locally. They should follow logically from conclusions, lessons learned and good practices. The recommendations should include an analysis on enhancing the quality of the MEAL framework/tool and management process/response, The report must specify who needs to take what action and when. Recommendations need to be presented by order of priority);
- **Annexes** (These should be listed and numbered and must include the following: Good practice template, Evaluation Criteria Rating Table, list of documents for the desk review, list of persons interviewed, data collection instrument, evaluation TORs).

The whole report shall not be longer than 30 pages, 50 pages including annexes. The draft report should be submitted no later than 10 calendar days after departure from the field. The final report will be submitted no later than the end date of the consultancy contract. Annexes to the report will be accepted in the working language of the country and project subject to the evaluation.

### Debriefing with Country office Focal Person and ELA Action Against Hunger-UK

The evaluator should provide debriefing Country office focal persons and to the ELA in Action Against Hunger-UK to discuss any issues related to the evaluation report. In case face-to-face debriefing not possible with ELA Action Against Hunger-UK, debriefing will have to be done through skype. Evaluator

### Debriefing and Action Against Hunger HQ Presentation

The evaluator should provide a debriefing and a presentation with the relevant Action Against Hunger HQ on her/his draft report, and on the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. Relevant comments should be incorporated in the final report. In case face-to-face debriefing not possible with Action Against Hunger HQ, due to budget or logistic constraints, debriefing will have to be done through skype.

## 7. KEY DELIVERABLES

The following are the evaluation outputs the evaluator/s will submit to the Mission Focal person:

Outputs	Deadlines
Inception Report	6 September
Field Interview	11-16 September 2017 (including travel time)
Stakeholder Workshop: Presentation of initial evaluation findings to the stakeholders and donor	18-19 September 2017
Draft Evaluation Report	04 October 2017
Final Evaluation Report	09 October 2017

The quality of the inception report and the evaluation report will be assessed and discussed against ELA quality checklist and consultant will be requested to make necessary quality improvements. The evaluator is expected to follow the format, structure and length.

All evaluation outputs will be delivered in English. The evaluator will follow the format, structure and length defined in the ELA template. All outputs must be submitted in English and under Word Document format.

## 8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORKPLAN

The evaluation TOR was developed in a participatory manner, by the Philippine Mission and ELA in Action Against Hunger-UK based on inputs from relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation TOR will be advertised internationally (particularly in Reliefweb, AAH website and Facebook) and will be managed by Action Against Hunger, UK.

The evaluator will directly report to the Mission focal person for this evaluation while ELA in Action Against Hunger-UK will provide advisory role. The evaluator will submit all the evaluation outputs directly and only to the Mission Focal Persons while ELA in Action Against Hunger-UK will provide advisory role to ensure quality of the evaluation and decide whether the report is ready for sharing. The Mission focal persons will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications. The Mission focal persons will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator/s by date agreed between the Mission focal persons and the evaluator/s or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders. The evaluator will consider all comments to finalize report and will submit it to the Mission focal persons who will then officially forward to relevant stakeholders.

Once the evaluation is completed the Mission focal persons will prepare the management response follow-up form to track implementation of the recommendations outlined in the evaluation report. A review of the follow-up process will be undertaken six months after the publication of the evaluation report.

### Tentative Work plan – Tentative

Activities	Expected Results	Dates	Duration
------------	------------------	-------	----------

Proposal Review & Project Updating	Evaluator understands the aim of the project and gains knowledge on the progress of the project	1, 4 September 2017	2 days
Development of Inception Report, Evaluation Tool / Questionnaires & Presentation of the agreed tool to ACF	Assessment Tool developed that is useful for the conduct of FGD and KII & detailed evaluation work plan developed	5-6 September 2017	2 days
Travel - International		7 September 2017	1 day
Preliminary Meetings (Log, Admin, Program Manager, Technical Coordinator and M and E Manager)	Oriented on Consortium Philippines' Administration Protocols; discussed and agreed on External Evaluation's Process and Tools; Meeting with EU	8 September 2017	1 day
Field Visits: FGD and KII per Municipalities, partners	External Evaluation conducted	11-16 September 2017	6 days
Presentation of the evaluation results to the stakeholders and donor	Two Feedbacking session with stakeholders conducted as follows: - Feedbacking with direct beneficiaries (LGUs) - Feedbacking with Consortium and ECHO	18-19 September 2017	2 days
Travel back – International		20 September 2017	1 day
1 <sup>st</sup> Draft evaluation report submission to ACF for comments	Submitted the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft of evaluation report with comments integrated	21 September to 04 October 2017	10 days
Revising 1 <sup>st</sup> draft report with ACF comments/clarifications	Revised draft report submitted	05-06 October 2017	2 days
Submission of Final Report	Final Report submitted	09 October 2017	1 day
TOTAL CONSULTANT WORKING DAYS			28 days

### Profile of the evaluator/s

The evaluation will be carried out by an international evaluation consultant with the following profile:

- Extensive knowledge in disaster risk reduction including resilient livelihoods, temporary shelters, and risk transfer mechanisms;
- Significant field experience in the evaluation of development projects;
- Relevant degree / equivalent experience related to the evaluation to be undertaken;
- Significant practical experience in coordination, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs;
- Good communications skills and experience of workshop facilitation;
- Ability to write clear and useful reports (may be required to produce examples of previous work);

- Fluent in English and Tagalog will be an advantage
- Understanding of ECHO requirements;
- Ability to manage the available time and resources and to work to tight deadlines;
- Independence from the parties involved.

## 9. LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The ownership of the draft and final documentation belong to the agency and the funding donor exclusively. The document, or publication related to it, will not be shared with anybody except Action Against Hunger before the delivery by Action Against Hunger of the final document to the donor. Action Against Hunger is to be the main addressee of the evaluation and its results might impact on both operational and technical strategies. This being said, Action Against Hunger is likely to share the results of the evaluation with the following groups:

- Donor(s)
- Consortium partners
- Governmental partners
- Civil society partners
- Various co-ordination bodies

For independent evaluations, it is important that the consultant does not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

### Intellectual Property Rights

All documentation related to the Assignment (whether or not in the course of your duties) shall remain the sole and exclusive property of the Charity



# **EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT**

## **EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE ACTION AGAINST HUNGER MOVING URBAN POOR COMMUNITIES TOWARDS RESILIENCE (MOVE-UP) PROJECT**

Submitted by:  
**Jerome Casals**  
Evaluation Consultant

12 September 2017

---

### **1 BACKGROUND**

This document is the inception report for the final evaluation of the Moving Urban Poor Communities towards Resilience (MOVE-UP) project of the Action Against Hunger. The MOVE-UP project is an urban disaster risk reduction (DRR) project implemented by a consortium of international NGOs composed of Action Against Hunger Philippines, PLAN International, CARE Netherlands and Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD). The principal objective of the project is to contribute to the institutionalization of urban disaster preparedness and resilience among urban poor communities in Metro Manila – Philippines. Specifically, the project aims to demonstrate and pilot systems and models in (i) Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS), (ii) Resilient Livelihoods, and (iii) Risk Transfer mechanisms.

The purpose of this report is to present the overall approach and methodology to be used in the conduct of the evaluation of the MOVE-UP project including the first draft of the Interview Guides (i.e. evaluation questions). The determination of the methodology, data collection tools, area coverage and evaluation questions was based on the results of discussions held with Action Against Hunger Philippines during the evaluation briefing conducted held on 7 September 2017 between Action Against Hunger and the evaluation team. In this meeting, it was agreed that the primary focus of the evaluation will be on the generation of recommendations that can help ensure sustainability and potential impact of future actions. This was seconded by Action Against Hunger UK in a short discussion conducted (via Skype) as part of the evaluation briefing.

This report also contains the revised schedule and work plan of the evaluation that had to be modified given the slight delay in the planned conduct of the evaluation (i.e. compared to the dates set in the ToR), and more importantly based on the expected availability of local stakeholders and community residents. In view of the short schedule (the field visits are expected to take place between the 14<sup>th</sup> to the 25<sup>th</sup> of September) it was deemed necessary to immediately proceed with the formulation and submission of an inception note/report so that the evaluation mission can proceed within the Action Against Hunger preferred dates.

### **2 KEY ELEMENTS OF THE TOR**

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the overall performance of the intervention in terms of the achievement of intended objectives in all the components of the results chain

(inputs, activities, results) as well as the key contextual factors that might have enabled or hindered the delivery of the results. The evaluation will mainly focus on examining evidence-based lessons learned, and draw challenges and recommendations on sustainability and on how the project could be replicated and maximize its impact.

Action Against Hunger requires the adoption of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria for evaluating its programs and projects. The DAC criteria identified include: Relevance and Appropriateness; Coherence; Coverage; Efficiency; Effectiveness; Sustainability and; Likelihood of Impact. In addition to these criteria Action Against Hunger is also requiring an assessment of the project's design and of the project monitoring system put in place. A DAC criteria rating table summarizing the evaluators assessment of the project is to be included as part of the final evaluation report.

For each of the evaluation criteria, Action Against Hunger has identified specific evaluation questions enumerated in the project's Terms of Reference (ToR).

**Project Design.** What was the level of participation of major stakeholders in the preparation and design of the project? What was the quality and availability of baseline data and assessments at the beginning of the project? Has the strategy of sustainability of project results been clearly defined at the stage of project design and preparation?

**Relevance/Appropriateness.** Was the assistance appropriate to the customs, practices and social organization of the target beneficiaries? Did the project strategy and approach allow for replication/scaling-up of the project? Were the project objectives relevant to the expectations and capacity of major stakeholders?

**Coherence.** Were the MOVE UP actions coordinated with the existing programs of other public and private agencies so as to create synergies and avoid overlapping?

**Efficiency.** Were all the activities necessary in achieving desired results? Were goods and services delivered on time? Were the resources/inputs used reasonably proportional to the results obtained? Were relevant data gathered and used towards achievement of results?

**Effectiveness.** Were results achieved based on planned activities? Were revisions in plans necessary and what were the effects of such revisions? Was the project effective in adopting an inclusive approach? Were good practices and lessons learned from previous actions incorporated in the implementation of the project?

**Sustainability.** (i) Financial sustainability: Did the partner beneficiaries have the financial capacity to continue the benefits beyond the life of the project? Did the city government and private partner institutions commit to financial assistance beyond the project? Has private management been considered? (ii) Technical sustainability. Have arrangements been made for the availability of necessary technology beyond the project? Have competencies and sustainable practices been developed to continue the benefits beyond the project? (iii) Institutional sustainability. Has the city government made agreements and mechanisms for their continued support for the activities after the project? Has an exit plan been made by the project consortium with the city government and private partner institutions? (iv) What emerging practices, systems and models could inform future participatory governance projects,

especially those that can be incorporated into national and local policies? (v) Can the knowledge and capacity built into local structures build local ownership of the project? (vi) What incentives built a buy-in from the cities and barangays?

**Likelihood of Impact.** What were the major contributions of the MOVE UP project to the participating city governments and urban communities? What are the likely impacts of the project interventions in alternative temporary shelter, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer in building resilience? What were your learnings in the MOVE UP project?

During the evaluation briefing conducted in Manila on 7 September 2017, the Action Against Hunger Mission focal persons emphasized that the primary focus of the evaluation should be on sustainability and impact. More specifically on evidence-based recommendations that can inform the direction of future interventions including specific actions that can enhance future implementation of the project components related to alternative shelter, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer. The subsequent sections of this report on approach, methodology and data collection tools reflect this focus. In some instances, this may require reducing the questions related to the other evaluation criteria.

### **3 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The methodological approach to the conduct of the evaluation is summarized in an Evaluation Matrix attached to this report as Annex 1. The matrix summarizes the key questions to be answered and how the consultants will collect data and information.

All three cities covered by the project will be covered by the evaluation with three barangays in each city, or a total of nine barangays out of the twelve participating barangays, subject to field visits. The barangays were chosen based on the result of risk assessments; that is, those areas with the highest number of groups most vulnerable to hazards such as flood, typhoon, earthquake, and fire. This sample is deemed sufficient to attain a good understanding of the project's overall context and for the conduct of actual observations in terms of the project interventions in alternative temporary shelters, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer mechanisms. Final choice of three barangays from each city will be coordinated with Action Against Hunger from the population of participating barangays as follows:

- Quezon City – Batasan Hills / Bagong Silang / Tatalon / Roxas
- Valenzuela City – Arkong Bato / Punturin / Gen. T. De Leon / Ugong
- Malabon City – Catmon / Portrero / Hulong Duhat / Panghulo

Given the short timeframe provided for the conduct of the evaluation, convenience sampling will be used in the selection of target participants from city governments, partner private sector institutions, community groups and beneficiaries. In all cases, the final selection will take into consideration and be coordinated with Action Against Hunger and its project consortium members.

### **4 DATA COLLECTION TOOLS**

The evaluation will be primarily qualitative and will use utilize different qualitative methodologies including the following:

**1. Desk Review.** The following documents have been provided by Action Against Hunger and are currently under review by the evaluator and his team. The review is expected to be completed prior to field visits and will provide the context of the evaluation and serve as source for the validation of responses.

- Project Proposal and Logical Framework
- Monthly Activity Progress Reports (APR)
- Interim Report
- Alternative Temporary Shelter (ATS) Assessments
- Livelihood Assessments
- Risk Transfer Study
- Policy Review
- Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plans / Annual Improvement Plans / Development Plans
- Executive Orders and Resolutions
- Beneficiaries List
- Action Against Hunger Evaluation Policy and Gender Policy

**2. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs).** The following will be the target participants in the conduct of in-depth interviews using semi-structured interview guides attached to this report (Annex 2).

- Donor/s
  - ECHO Manila
- Consortium Member Organizations
  - Action Against Hunger Philippines
  - Action Against Hunger Spain
  - PLAN International,
  - CARE Netherlands / Assistance and Cooperation for Community Resilience and Development (ACCORD)
- Private Sector Partner Institutions
  - United Architects of the Philippines
  - Rags to Riches,
  - Pioneer Insurance)
- City Governments
  - Quezon City DRRM TWG headed by DRRM Officer Mr. Mike Marasigan
  - Valenzuela City DRRM TWG headed by DRRM Officer Arnold F. Antonio, M.D.
  - Malabon City DRRM TWG headed by DRRM Officer Mr. Roderick Tongol

**3. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).** The following will be the participants in the in-depth, semi-structured FGDs (Please see Annex 2 for Guide FGD Questions):

- Barangay Officials
  - Barangay Captain
  - Barangay DRRM In-Charge
- Community
  - Households (FGDs)
  - Project beneficiaries (depending the project component/s implemented in the area)

## 5 EVALUATION WORKPLAN

The Work Plan presented below represents the schedule of activities to be undertaken in the process of the assessment and evaluation process.

Desk Review	
Inception Report	12 September 2017
Stakeholder Interviews & Community Field Visits	14 – 25 September 2017
Presentation of Initial Findings and Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project Staff and Partners</li><li>• Donors</li></ul>	28 September 2017 29 September 2017
Draft Evaluation Report	13 October 2017
Final Evaluation Report	20 October 2017

## 6 ADHERENCE TO ACTION AGAINST HUNGER EVALUATION POLICY

The Consultants have read and confirm their full compliance to the spirit and provisions of the principles outlined in the “Action Against Hunger Good Business Regulations” document. These include compliance to all the measures identified and governing the professional relationship between the consultant and Action Against Hunger. The ownership of the draft and final documentation shall belong to the Action Against Hunger and the funding donor exclusively. The consultant likewise confirms that the consultant does not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation and that the document, or publication related to it, will not be shared with anybody except Action Against Hunger before the delivery by Action Against Hunger of the final document to the donor.

## 7 OUTLINE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

There are no expected changes to the format, structure and length of the evaluation report as outlined in the TOR. The whole report shall not be longer than 30 pages, 50 pages including annexes. The draft report should be submitted no later than 10 calendar days after departure from the field. The final report will be submitted no later than the end date of the consultancy contract.

- Cover Page
- Summary Table
- Table of Contents
- Executive Summary (no more than 2 pages in length)
- Background Information
- Methodology
- Findings
- Conclusions
- Lessons Learnt and Good Practices
- Recommendations
- Annexes
  - Good practice template
  - Evaluation Criteria Rating Table,
  - List of documents reviewed
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Evaluation TOR

## **Annex D: List of Documents Reviewed**

1. eSingle Form for Humanitarian Aid Actions (2016/00370/MR/01/01
2. Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) – Southeast Asia and the Pacific Call for Proposal
3. MOVE UP Project Briefer
4. Project Log frame and Work plan
5. Presentation of MOVE UP in the National Urban Resilience Conference (focusing on ATS)
6. Progress Report – April 2017
7. Malabon CSG Reports and List of Insured
8. Malabon DRRM Plans
9. Draft Catmon, Malabon DRR Contingency Plan
10. UAP/EA Information Presentation
11. MOVE UP Narrative Report April and June 2017
12. Annexes of MOVE UP Interim Report (The main project interim report is not readable)
  - 12.1 Annex 1. Sample Project MOAs with Cities
  - 12.2 Annex 2. Additional Information on Barangay Selection Justification
  - 12.3 Annex 3.ATS Preliminary Needs Assessment Report
  - 12.4 Annex 4. ATS Needs Assessment Design
  - 12.5 Annex 5.Report on Resilience and Livelihood Assessment
  - 12.6 Annex 6. ZERT Concept
  - 12.7 Annex 7. ZERT Training Module
  - 12.8 Annex 8. Data Gathering Tool for LGU Plan Review
  - 12.9 Annex 9. Result of LGU Plan and Policy Review in 3 Cities
  - 12.10 Annex 10. Convergence Strategy
  - 12.11 Annex 11. MOA with CARD-PIONEER
  - 12.12 Annex 12. Documentation on Risk Transfer Forum
  - 12.13 Annex 13. Consortium Organogram

## Annex E: List of Evaluation Participants

### I. CONSORTIUM

1. Ansherina Grace Talavera, ACCORD
2. Christina Carreon, Action Against Hunger
3. Joel Abelinde, Action Against Hunger
4. Chrisnobel Cruz, PLAN International Philippines

### II. PRIVATE PARTNER

#### A. UAP/Emergency Architect

1. AR/ENP Stephanie N. Gilles, UAP/EA Chairperson
2. Adrian Rollo Toisa, Architect
3. Geomilie Tumamao-Guittap, Architect
4. Manuel Pinulto, Architect

### III. CITY LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNITS

#### A. Quezon City

B. Name	Organization	Designation
Leonito Jumadis	LGU-TWG	Small Business Development and Promotions Office
Janet Duque	LGU-TWG	Social Services Development Department
Dionisio Navarro	LGU-TWG	Public Employment Service Office
Engr. Ma. Teresa Mamawag	LGU-TWG	Department of the Building Official
Myke Marasigan	LGU-TWG	Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office (DRRMO) Head
Ma. Bianca Perez	LGU-TWG	DRRMO Research Head
Sarina Viduya	LGU-TWG	City Planning Development Office
Rosalina Laude	LGU-TWG	City Planning Development Office
Narciso Alvarado	LGU-TWG	Housing and Community Development and Resettlement Department
Raul Bonus	LGU-TWG	Sikap Buhay
Marilyn Demata	LGU-TWG	Sikap Buhay
Robert Beltran	LGU-TWG	Engineering

#### B. Malabon City

Name	Organization	Designation
Roderick Tongol	LGU-TWG	DRRMO
Charlie Salvador	LGU-TWG	DRRM Staff
Noriel Mariano	LGU-TWG	DRRM Staff
Edgar Allan Poe	LGU-TWG	City Engineering Office
Daniel Salvador	LGU-TWG	City Engineering Office
Emma Flores	LGU-TWG	Cooperative Development Office Focal Person
Danilo Marquez	LGU-TWG	Public Employment Service Office

### C. Valenzuela City

Name	Organization	Designation
Dr. Arnaldo Antonio	LGU-TWG	City DRRM Officer
Engr. Reynaldo Sunga	LGU-TWG	City Engineering Officer
Josefina Acurantes	LGU-TWG	City Planning and Development Office Rep.
Ramon Encarnacion	LGU-TWG	Workers Affairs Office Rep.
Dorothy Evangelista	LGU-TWG	Social Welfare and Development Office Rep.
Raymond Sousa	LGU-TWG	Cooperative Development Office Focal Person
Mary Jane Macario	LGU-TWG	DILG Representative
Kimberly Galang	LGU-TWG	City Livelihood Office Representative
Elenita Reyes	LGU-TWG	Housing and Resettlement Office Representative

## IV. BARANGAY AND URBAN POOR COMMUNITIES

### A. Quezon City

Barangay	Female	Male	Total
Brgy. Bagong Silangan	6	0	6
Brgy. Batasan Hills	6	1	7
Brgy. Tatalon	4	2	6

### B. Malabon City

Barangay	Female	Male	Total
Brgy. Potero	5	3	8
Brgy. Panhulo	7	2	9
Brgy. Catmon	6	3	9

### C. Valenzuela City

Barangay	Female	Male	Total
Brgy. Arkong Bato	0	4	4
Brgy. Gen T.	5	1	6
Brgy. Punturin	4	2	6
Brgy. Ugong	1	0	1



### Annex F: Evaluation Criteria Rating Table

Criteria	Rating (1 low, 5 high)					Rationale
	1	2	3	4	5	
Design			X			- Much of the project design has been driven by the logical framework and parameters pre-determined by the donor. -The program logic has room for further improvement, as some assumptions or conditions may not have been tested or given appropriate consideration
Relevance/ Appropriateness				X		-The project aligned strongly to national government priorities, and was consistent with priorities of the donor and institutional mandates of consortium members. -The project was deemed relevant because it targeted vulnerable cities and vulnerable populations within those cities, addressing highly relevant issues central to urban poor communities such as temporary shelter, savings, resilient livelihoods as income sources, and risk transfers.
Coherence					X	Significant efforts were initiated that ensured the identification and participation of a wide range of stakeholders, including private organizations and local government agencies. MOVE-UP was able to identify, mobilize and engage different stakeholder segments at the different levels.
Efficiency						The project was implemented efficiently, supported with adequate resources, and delivering results in a timely manner, achieving good implementation despite the project team and staff belonging to different consortium member organizations.
Effectiveness				X		All inputs and activities were reported to have been implemented in accordance with the design and its objectives in terms of number of beneficiaries, intervention indicators and financial disbursement.
Sustainability				X		The project has (1) improved policy and governance structures at the city level; (2) enhanced capacities of all involved in the project; (3) increased public-private partnership, with increased local ownership of project interventions; and (4) development and availability of tools and resources to support specific project components.
Likelihood of Impact				X		The successful completion of the project as designed and its achievement of declared project objectives and outcomes may be taken as potential indication of a high likelihood of impact in the coming years.

Guidance for rating the evaluation criteria:

Rating	Definition
1. Unsatisfactory	Performance was <b>consistently below expectations</b> in most areas of enquiry related to the evaluation criteria. <b>Overall performance</b> in relation to the evaluation criteria <b>is not satisfactory</b> due to serious gaps in some of the areas. Significant improvement is needed. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and Action Against Hunger will monitor progress in these areas.
2. Improvement needed	Performance <b>did not consistently meet expectations in some areas of enquiry</b> – performance failed to meet expectations in one or more essential areas of enquiry. Some improvements are needed in one or more of these. Recommendations to improve performance are outlined in the evaluation report and Action Against Hunger will monitor progress in these key areas.
3. On average meets expectations	On average, performance <b>met expectations</b> in all essential areas of enquiry and the overall <b>quality of work was acceptable</b> . Eventual recommendations over potential areas for improvement are outlined in the evaluation report.
4. Meets expectations	<b>Performance consistently met expectations</b> in all essential areas of enquiry, and the overall <b>quality of work was fairly good</b> . The most critical expectations were met.
5. Exceptional	<b>Performance consistently met expectations</b> due to <b>high quality of work</b> performed in <b>all essential areas of enquiry</b> , resulting in an <b>overall quality</b> of work that was <b>remarkable</b> .

## Annex G: Good Practice

<b>Title of Good Practice</b>
Community Savings Group and Diversified Livelihoods: A Strategy Towards Resilient Livelihoods
<b>Innovative Features &amp; Key Characteristics</b>
<p><i>Good practice in building urban resilience through Community Savings Groups (CSGs) involved three key components; namely, (i) livelihood assessment, (ii) financial literacy sessions, and (iii) training in alternative livelihoods. The livelihood assessment provided a thorough analysis of livelihood assets and strategies as well as opportunities and capacities for recovery among the urban poor. The financial literacy sessions highlighted the need to improve the household expense and income structure among the urban poor in order to build security through savings. Training in alternative livelihoods involved hands-on production of items / learning of skills and forming linkages with markets.</i></p> <p><i>The three key components of the CSG provided a strategy in increasing returns from existing assets and livelihoods by investing in alternative livelihood options. The urban poor had some amount of savings from existing employment and small livelihoods that were left idle. The CSG introduced the concept of pooling idle savings and investing in alternative forms of livelihood. In this way, community savings grew.</i></p> <p><i>As an offshoot of the strategy, the CSG was able to provide a credit facility to members for both personal and livelihood needs. The access to credit gave households a sense of security and allowed individuals to keep their dignity in the event of financial difficulties and emergencies. It also protected those in need from being prey to loan sharks. In practice, until alternative livelihoods gained stability and sustainability, the credit facility was the main business activity of the CSG.</i></p> <p><i>Besides the financial benefits gained, members attested to the social cohesion that CSGs instilled in urban poor communities.</i></p>
<b>Background of Good Practice</b>
<p><i>An assessment of household finance among urban poor communities in areas most vulnerable to disasters and risks revealed that household expenses were greater than income. This family expense-income structure was aggravated by the urban poor's lack of livelihood assets; specifically, low educational attainment and capital. As such, past incidences of natural and man-made disasters have left the urban poor in a worse situation and unable to bounce back on their own. One of the most pressing needs of urban poor communities, therefore, is to build resilience against risks and hazards through savings and alternative livelihood options.</i></p> <p><i>The CSG found a good fit in this particular situation and needs of the urban poor. Community savings, or pooled individual savings, allowed for the creation of a credit facility and a venture into alternative livelihood options in order for savings to grow and provide protection from disasters and risks.</i></p> <p><i>Forming CSGs among existing livelihood groups and associations, even among family members and neighbors, was not complicated. The amount of weekly collections depended on the capacity of its members. Weekly meetings and collections provided a transparent and regular accounting of the community savings. Mechanisms such as the CSG by-laws and the "money box" with three keys and key holders were employed to protect the community savings from misdeeds.</i></p>

### **Further explanation of chosen Good Practice**

*CSGs were formed from existing livelihood groups and associations (e.g., Tricycle Operators and Drivers Association [TODA] and Homeowners' Association [HOA]) and among family members and neighbors. CSG members were required to attend financial literacy sessions with the aim of shifting the mindset of household heads from a perspective of lack to a view of untapped opportunities. The sessions showed CSG members not only how to live within their means and how to get out of a cycle of debt, but also how to have security from emergencies through savings.*

*CSG members met weekly primarily to collect individual contributions to the community savings, an amount agreed upon by all members. A set of officers, by-laws, rules and regulations, and a "money box" guided CSG activities. CSGs engaged in different business activities including: (i) credit, (ii) production of consumer items such as accessories, detergent, and processed food, and (iii) agriculture such mushroom culture and livestock raising. A DRR Caravan provided the venue to showcase livelihood products and services, and to hold a job fair.*

*At the city level, the CSGs leveled up the traditional livelihood groupings formed by the city livelihood office. CSG activities also diversified the concept of livelihood to include savings, credit, employment and cottage industries. The introduction of a diversified livelihood has enhanced city livelihood programs with a DRR lens. At the community level, CSGs have invigorated urban poor communities with practical knowledge and skills in finance and varied cottage industries. The CSGs have increased social cohesion and a sense of security among members. The CSGs have also provided the urban poor with representation as a recognized group within the city.*

### **Practical/Specific Recommendations for Roll Out**

*The CSG provides a model that can be replicated in other programmes. The livelihood assessment and financial literacy sessions may be transported in full. The concept and operations of the community savings and credit facility may also be replicated. It is, however, recommended to review the practice of distributing community savings during the holiday season. This could be contradictory to the aim of building resilience through savings.*

*The alternative livelihood training may be further developed. It may be considered to include the roles and functions of the equivalent of a business manager and operations supervisor into the livelihood team if the component of alternative livelihood training will be pursued.*

### **How could the Good Practice be developed further?**

*The alternative livelihood trainings may be leveled up by considering the following:*

- (i) sub-contracting to ensure link to markets,*
- (ii) entering into a MOA, including tax incentives, with industry partners to provide apprenticeships and/or employment for livelihood training beneficiaries,*
- (iii) asking the city for assistance in accrediting / recognizing the CSGs so that they may have access to all local grants and programmes from local agencies (in case this has not yet been fully achieved),*
- (iv) organizing the alternative livelihood training programme into phases for a more realistic timeframe*
- (v) conducting an external scanning to identify needs for products and services*
- (vi) utilizing simple financial feasibility tools such as payback period, break-even point, and projected profit and loss statement*
- (vii) intensifying training to a high level of quality,*
- (viii) exploring branding using urban poor narratives (e.g. Rags to Riches)*
- (ix) exploring institutional markets such as hotels, restaurants, etc.*

*In response to common challenges expressed by CSG members, the following may be considered:*

*(i) community organizing strategies such as setting up a community-based full-day care program to allow mothers to devote regular time to work*

*(ii) leadership training and community building for CSG leaders and members*

*(iii) training in business finance*

*(iv) training in supply chain management such as marketing, sales, et.*

## **Annex H: Data Collection Instruments**

### **INTERVIEW GUIDES**

#### **CONSORTIUM MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS INTERVIEW GUIDE**

1. How was participation ensured among stakeholders and communities (city governments, private institutions, communities) in project design and implementation?
2. Was an inclusive approach incorporated into the project design and implementation? How?
3. How did you ensure that the project objectives were relevant to the expectations and capacities of your partner beneficiaries?
4. Were baseline data relevant to emergency shelters, livelihoods and risk transfer mechanisms collected and used?
5. How effective was the conduct of needs assessments in alternative temporary shelters, resilient livelihoods and risk transfer mechanisms at the community level?
6. What were the major contributions of MOVE UP project to the city DRRM offices?
7. How did the interventions contribute to resilience in cities and urban poor communities?
8. Were goods and services delivered on time? What were the causes of delays, if any?
9. Were revisions in plans necessary to achieve results? What were the effects of these revisions?
10. What were the obstacles and challenges you encountered in implementing the project?
11. Are you satisfied with the quality of outputs and outcomes produced under the project?
12. What were the most significant results or changes attained by the project? In terms of disaster resilience?
13. What feedback have you received from other government agencies/departments and or local communities on the project? How useful are the project and its outputs are to their work?
14. What improvements can you recommend so that approaches, methods, models and other project end-products would more effective and useful?
15. How successful have capacity building/skills and/or technology transfer interventions been? What capacities have been fully transferred and what have not?
16. What improvements can you suggest to make future capacity building/skills transfer interventions more effective?

#### **SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Do you think project stakeholders will be able to continue with some or all of activities initiated under the project? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges they will face in continuing the activities initiated under the project? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What would it take for them to continue the initiatives introduced under the project?
4. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future? (in terms of design/methodology, relevance/appropriateness, coverage, strategy/sustainability)

#### **LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE**

1. What has your organization learned from the project's implementation?

2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have not been very effective? Why?

## **CITY GOVERNMENT INTERVIEW GUIDE**

1. What are the current activities and initiatives being undertaken by the City DRRM? What are your current priorities?
2. Did the project contribute to or complement with priority programs/ activities of your organization? How?
3. What is the nature of the City DRRMO's involvement with the Action Against Hunger project? What is the level of awareness of project interventions (also collaboration, meetings, workshops attended)?
4. What are the perceived (specific) benefits derived from partnership or collaboration with Action Against Hunger (e.g. knowledge, skills acquired)?
5. Were resources and inputs provided by the project sufficient for the intended objectives?
6. Were project resources and inputs (related activities and fund disbursements) provided on time?
7. Were there other resources mobilized or activities conducted that were not part of the project but directly or indirectly supported the attainment of project objectives?
8. What were the obstacles and challenges you encountered in implementing the project?
9. Are you satisfied with the quality of outputs and outcomes produced under the project? (per component)
10. What are the most significant results or changes attained by the project? Especially in terms of disaster resilience?
11. Was participation of other relevant government agencies and other stakeholders successfully secured and effective?
12. What feedback have you received from other government agencies/departments and or local communities on the project? How useful are the project and its outputs are to their work?
13. What improvements can you recommend so that approaches, methods, models and other project end-products more effective and useful?
14. How successful have capacity building/skills and/or technology transfer interventions been? What capacities have been fully transferred and what have not?
15. What improvements can you suggest to make future capacity building/skills transfer interventions more effective?

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Will your organization be able to continue with some or all of activities initiated under the project? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges you will face in continuing the activities initiated under the project? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What would it take for your organization to continue the initiatives introduced under the project?
4. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future? (in terms of design/methodology, relevance/appropriateness, coverage, strategy/sustainability)

## LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE

1. What has your organization learned from the project's implementation?
2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have not been very effective? Why?

## PRIVATE SECTOR PARTNERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. What was your organization's role in the implementation of the project?
2. What were your organization's most significant contributions to the project? Especially in terms of disaster resilience?
3. How did you ensure that your organization's contribution to the intervention was relevant to the expectations and capacities of your partner beneficiaries?
4. How effective and efficient was the consultation process with the project consortium, city governments and participating barangays?
5. Are you satisfied with the quality of outputs and outcomes produced under the project? What were the facilitating and hindering factors encountered in the project's implementation?
6. What improvements will you implement so that approaches, methods, models and other project end-products would more effective and useful?
7. How successful have capacity building/skills and/or technology transfer interventions been? What capacities have been fully transferred and what have not?
8. What improvements will you implement to make future capacity building/skills transfer interventions more effective?

## SUSTAINABILITY

1. Will your organization be able to provide continued support to project stakeholders on some or all of activities initiated under the project? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges stakeholders will face in continuing the activities initiated under the project? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future? (in terms of design/methodology, relevance/appropriateness, coverage, strategy/sustainability)

## LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE

1. What has your organization learned from the project's implementation?
2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your organization consider to have not been very effective? Why?



## **Focus Group Discussion Guide Questions**

### **COMMUNITY LEVEL ALTERNATIVE TEMPORARY SHELTER (ATS) FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE**

1. How relevant are the ATS models to the needs of the community? Is ATS a feasible intervention in your community?
2. Are you satisfied with the ATS models produced under the project? Why or why not?
3. What was your participation in identifying suitable models for ATS?
4. Were the needs of most vulnerable groups (women/girls, children, elderly, PWDs) considered in the design and implementation of the ATS?
5. What the obstacles and challenges did you encounter in the needs assessment and design phase of the ATS project?
6. What plans in terms of funding, capacity-building and manpower are in place for the fabrication of a model ATS?
7. What improvements can you recommend so that approaches, methods, and models in ATS would more effective and useful?
8. How successful have capacity building/skills and/or technology transfer interventions been? What capacities have been fully transferred and what have not?

### **SUSTAINABILITY**

1. Will your community be able to continue with the fabrication of a suitable ATS model? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges you will face in the ATS fabrication? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What would it take for your organization to pursue this activity under the project?
4. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future?

### **LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE**

1. What has your community learned from the implementation of the ATS component of the project?
2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have not been very effective? Why?

### **COMMUNITY LEVEL RESILIENT LIVELIHOODS FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE**

1. How important is financial literacy and resilient livelihoods interventions to the community?
2. Were the needs of women/girls, children, elderly, PWDs considered in personal finance and livelihood improvement options?
3. Are you satisfied with the quality of the seminar/trainings provided? Why or why not?
4. What benefit was derived from the conduct of the financial literacy seminar/training?

5. What are the most important learnings obtain from the seminars/trainings?
  6. How can this be improved in the future?
1. What resilient livelihood options did the MOVE UP project introduce in your community?
  2. Are you satisfied with the quality of the livelihood options introduced? Why or why not?
  3. What benefit was derived from the introduction of the livelihood options?
  4. What obstacles and challenges did you encounter in the implementation of the resilient livelihoods project?
  5. What are the most important learnings obtained/realized?
  6. How can this be improved in the future?

#### SUSTAINABILITY

1. Will your community be able to continue with some or all of activities initiated under the project such as the conduct of financial literacy modules, formation of CSGs, and improvements in livelihood? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges you will face in continuing the activities in resilient livelihoods? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What would it take for your community to continue the initiatives introduced under the project?
4. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future? (in terms of financial literacy sessions, formation of CSGs, and improvements in livelihoods)

#### LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE

1. What has your community learned from the project's implementation?
2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have not been very effective? Why?

#### COMMUNITY LEVEL

##### RISK TRANSFER

##### FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

1. How did the financial literacy modules change your mind set about risk transfer mechanisms?
2. How were the needs of women/girls, children, elderly, PWDs given particular consideration in risk transfer mechanisms?
3. What is the role of risk transfer in DRR?
4. How many CSGs have been formed in your barangay during the time of the MOVE UP project?
5. How efficient was the process flow in the formation of CSGs?
6. Are there barriers to entry in CSGs? How can these be overcome?
7. How do CSGs facilitate in the acquisition of risk transfer mechanisms?
8. How relevant are the risk transfer mechanisms introduced in your community to the needs of your community?
9. What bouncing back strategies did the MOVE UP project in your communities in the event of disasters?

10. How accessible are risk transfer mechanisms?
11. What obstacles and challenges did you encounter in the acquiring risk transfer mechanisms?
12. How does risk transfer improve resilience in your community?
13. What improvements can you recommend so that approaches, methods, and systems in risk transfer would more effective and useful?
14. What improvements can you suggest to make future capacity building/skills transfer in risk transfer more effective?

#### SUSTAINABILITY

1. Will your community be able to continue your interest in the acquisition of risk transfer mechanisms beyond the project? Why or why not?
2. What are the likely key obstacles and challenges you will face in acquiring risk transfer mechanisms? Do you think these can be overcome?
3. What improvements can you suggest in the design and implementation of similar projects in the future? (In terms of financial literacy sessions, formation of CSGs and acquisition of risk transfer mechanisms)

#### LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICE

1. What has your community learned from the project's implementation?
2. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have been very effective? Why?
3. What project approaches, methods and/or tools does your community consider to have not been very effective? Why?