

Terminal Report

Consultation on Integrating Disaster Risk Management into the Local Planning System: Focus on the Comprehensive Planning Process

December 20, 2007
Rembrandt Hotel, Quezon City

conducted by the
Department of the Interior and Local Government



The Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) recognizes the importance of interventions in urban areas and accordingly identifies Urban Disaster Risk Management as one of its core thematic areas of work. The need to minimize the destructive impacts of these hydro-meteorological events on the vulnerable urban communities and economic infrastructure through enhanced preparedness and mitigation is therefore the main thrust of the present intervention in ADPC's implementation of the Program for Hydro-Meteorological Disaster Mitigation in Secondary Cities in Asia (PROMISE).

This workshop is an activity under the Advocacy component of PROMISE. Funding support for PROMISE came from the United States Agency for International Development - Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID/OFDA).

I. Consultation Preliminaries

The Department of the Interior and Local Government initiated the holding of a consultation meeting on Integrating Disaster Risk Management (DRM) in the Local Planning System on December 20, 2007 at the Rembrandt Hotel in Quezon City. This was a DILG/ADPC sponsored activity.

The inter-agency consultation meeting was formally opened at around 9:30 am by Ms. Priscella Mejillano, Chief of the Local Policy Development Planning (LPDP). She welcomed the participants and expressed the timeliness of the consultation in view of the current harmonization efforts in local planning, and instrumental to this harmonization effort is the adoption of the Rationalized Planning System (RPS) by LGUs. She noted that part of the realization of the Bureau is the inclusion of disaster risk management into the Comprehensive Development Plan. DRM is not a specific sectoral program rather it is a concern that weaves through all the sectoral and local government programs. She motioned that the inputs from the consultation will be part of the review of the CDP.

Activity Rationale

This initiative was intended to facilitate the mainstreaming of disaster risk management into the planning process since disaster risk concerns are part and parcel of the local and sectoral governance involving LGUs and NGAs. Moreover, the activity was intended to be an off-shoot to the development of a manual operationalizing the mainstreaming of DRM.

The consultation was an opportunity to generate comments and feedback from participating local government units and government agencies as regards entry points/convergence of disaster risk

management (DRM) into the comprehensive development planning process and enhance opportunities for interface and linkages between LGUs and NGAs. Currently, the manual on Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) is under review, and the inclusion of disaster risk management into the manual will enhance local governance and development planning.

It was also noted that the next steps after the workshop would be the integration of inputs, comments & suggestions for consideration in the finalization of the draft CDP manual and the conduct of follow up consultations to firm up identified DRM entry points to the CDP process. It was also announced that four (4) workshops are planned before we can finalize how DRM is integrated into the planning processes of the LGUs.

II. Participating Agencies/Offices

In attendance during the consultation were representatives from some 15 agencies from the government sector, LGUs, academe and NGOs (refer to the Annex 1 Attendance Sheet). They include:

| | |
|--|--|
| City Planning Office of Antipolo City | Pampanga Disaster Response Network |
| City Planning Office of Tagaytay City | Project PROMISE |
| Provincial Planning Office of Rizal | Office of Civil Defense |
| DILG Region 4A (CALABARZON) | National Anti-Poverty Commission |
| DILG Dagupan City | Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board |
| DILG Region 3 | De La Salle Institute of Government |
| League of Barangays of the Philippines | University of the Philippines, Department of |
| League of Cities of the Philippines | Geography |

III. Session Inputs

Session 1 : Review of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Concepts and Definition of Terms
Presentation by Ms. Lorna Victoria
Executive Director, Center for Disaster Preparedness

The session was primarily on concepts about disaster risk management (DRM) as this is currently understood and disseminated nationally and internationally. The Center for Disaster Preparedness is proactively participating in mainstreaming and integrating DRM in local development planning.

Disaster vis Hazard

The initial segments of the session presented the definition of disaster and an occurrence is considered a disaster when certain elements are present. Disaster basically brings about damage, death or loss of lives, dislocation or displacement such that the area is not livable or viable for productive use, disruption of functioning of a community and other adverse effects on lives and properties.

Hazards do not necessarily mean disaster. Hazards such as earthquake and typhoon are threatening phenomena which can cause potential damage or harm but not necessarily become disaster. For instance, fire is a hazard and when it gets out of control, it can cause damage, and thus, become a disaster. Hazards may either be natural or human induced phenomena and at some point may be a combination of phenomena. Another human induced hazard is armed conflict; however it is a complex phenomenon. Examples of combination of hazards are typhoon and poor drainage system/poor planning or deforestation and typhoon, both combination of phenomena can cause flooding and destruction of lives and properties.

There are three (3) elements that make up a disaster. The first element is "hazards" – natural hazards like typhoon, tsunami, storm, tornado; technological hazards like traffic; overloading of vessel, chemical spills; complex hazard like armed conflicts.

The second element is "vulnerability" or the presence of weaknesses or susceptibility to suffer damage or harm when hazards happen. For instance, the geophysical vulnerability of the Philippines is its location in the Pacific Ring of Fire which is earthquake prone. The country is also located in the Western Pacific Basin which is an area that typically spawns typhoons. Other conditions of vulnerability include social vulnerability like poverty and unequal relations in society; economic vulnerability refer to fragility of livelihood or no access to resources; natural vulnerability like community's dependence on few/limited natural resources; and constructed vulnerability or that which refers to structural design of buildings/edifices that collapse due to earthquakes. Vulnerability could also refer to absence of good leadership and governance.

The third element is "capacity" that refers to absence and/or lack of knowledge, ability, resources of people/community. At the local level, the need for increased capacity of people can be addressed or resolved so that less damage or no damage at all transpires despite the presence or onslaught of hazards. The current trend on "institutional capacity building" address concerns like doing risk management functions and setting up monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to find out how the local level is faring, the availability of resources, and the general readiness to respond to risks and hazards.

It was pointed out in the session that at the local level, when a hazard interacts with vulnerability and condition of little capacity, the likelihood of damage or loss results.

The concept of disaster risk (DR) was also introduced. Disaster risk was presented in a mathematical formula for a more precise appreciation:

$$\text{Disaster Risk} = \frac{\text{hazard} \times \text{vulnerability}}{\text{capacity}}$$

To elucidate, if capacity is increased and hazard is held constant, disaster risk will be lower and vulnerability decreases. The relationship of the elements could also mean that when risk becomes too high such that capacity is insufficient; vulnerability is too great and scale of hazard is too big, then emergency may not be managed locally, thus disaster occurs.

Disaster Risk Management vis Disaster Risk Reduction

The concept of disaster risk management (DRM) puts emphasis on whom and what are at risk with the occurrence of hazards. These are the people and properties. DRM refers to being proactive to disaster responses in order to minimize if not avoid loss or damage. It entails a broad range of activities before, during and after the disaster.

Disaster risk reduction (DRR) means minimizing vulnerability thru prevention; limiting or mitigation of impact of hazards in the context of sustainability.

DRM is an organizational concept where there is application of administrative decisions and operational skills to bring about disaster risk reduction mechanisms such as procedures, policies, capacities that are both structural and non-structural in nature in order to limit hazards pre, during and post occurrence. DRM encompasses actions towards prevention, mitigation, preparedness to hazard exposures. These actions are varied – technology, awareness building, enhancing physical strength, structural building codes, strengthening community support, poverty reduction strategies, insurance, risk transfer mechanisms, and sustainable livelihood activities.

Disaster preparedness would mean structuring emergency response and/or contingency planning; setting up public warning/early warning system or people-centered warning system. Disaster recovery refers to rehabilitation and reconstruction.

A new concept under DRM is disaster resilience. Noting the characteristic of a bamboo, disaster resilience means returning to acceptable level of functioning of the community.

There are models that refer to disaster management continuum: the “Expand Contract model of South Africa”, and the “Total Disaster Risk Management” that has the facets of a project management cycle. The latter looks into risks, analyzes, evaluates and treats the risk; all stakeholders are informed; monitoring and review of actions are done. All disaster risk activities begin with risk assessment where the elements – hazard, vulnerability, capacity, are assessed, and disaster risk response are chalked up.

The current initiatives of the Philippines in relation to disaster risk management are in the context of the Hyogo Framework for Action. This is a binding road map among nations up to 2015 which was a result of the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Kobe, Japan. The Philippines is coming out with strategic national action plans to implement the YOGO Action Plan. The framework of ADPC looks into policy, legal, and institutional arrangements that necessarily brings to fore participatory action by stakeholders both at the local and national levels. Thus far, three sectors are mainstreaming actions toward disaster risk reduction and management – DILG in local governance thru the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP), DPWH in infra projects like road, bridges, etc, and DepEd in the education sector.

III. Session Inputs

Session 1 : Review of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Concepts and Definition of Terms
Presentation by Ms. Lorna Victoria
Executive Director, Center for Disaster Preparedness

The session was primarily on concepts about disaster risk management (DRM) as this is currently understood and disseminated nationally and internationally. The Center for Disaster Preparedness is proactively participating in mainstreaming and integrating DRM in local development planning.

Disaster vis Hazard

The initial segments of the session presented the definition of disaster and an occurrence is considered a disaster when certain elements are present. Disaster basically brings about damage, death or loss of lives, dislocation or displacement such that the area is not livable or viable for productive use, disruption of functioning of a community and other adverse effects on lives and properties.

Hazards do not necessarily mean disaster. Hazards such as earthquake and typhoon are threatening phenomena which can cause potential damage or harm but not necessarily become disaster. For instance, fire is a hazard and when it gets out of control, it can cause damage, and thus, become a disaster. Hazards may either be natural or human induced phenomena and at some point may be a combination of phenomena. Another human induced hazard is armed conflict; however it is a complex phenomenon. Examples of combination of hazards are typhoon and poor drainage system/poor planning or deforestation and typhoon, both combination of phenomena can cause flooding and destruction of lives and properties.

There are three (3) elements that make up a disaster. The first element is "hazards" – natural hazards like typhoon, tsunami, storm, tornado; technological hazards like traffic; overloading of vessel, chemical spills; complex hazard like armed conflicts.

The second element is "vulnerability" or the presence of weaknesses or susceptibility to suffer damage or harm when hazards happen. For instance, the geophysical vulnerability of the Philippines is its location in the Pacific Ring of Fire which is earthquake prone. The country is also located in the Western Pacific Basin which is an area that typically spawns typhoons. Other conditions of vulnerability include social vulnerability like poverty and unequal relations in society; economic vulnerability refer to fragility of livelihood or no access to resources; natural vulnerability like community's dependence on few/limited natural resources; and constructed vulnerability or that which refers to structural design of buildings/edifices that collapse due to earthquakes. Vulnerability could also refer to absence of good leadership and governance.

The third element is "capacity" that refer to absence and/or lack of knowledge, ability, resources of people/community. At the local level, the need for increased capacity of people can be addressed or resolved so that less damage or no damage at all transpires despite the presence or onslaught of hazards. The current trend on "institutional capacity building" address concerns like doing risk management functions and setting up monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to find out how the local level is faring, the availability of resources, and the general readiness to respond to risks and hazards.

It was pointed out in the session that at the local level, when a hazard interacts with vulnerability and condition of little capacity, the likelihood of damage or loss results.

The concept of disaster risk (DR) was also introduced. Disaster risk was presented in a mathematical formula for a more precise appreciation:

$$\text{Disaster Risk} = \frac{\text{hazard} \times \text{vulnerability}}{\text{capacity}}$$

To elucidate, if capacity is increased and hazard is held constant, disaster risk will be lower and vulnerability decreases. The relationship of the elements could also mean that when risk becomes too high such that capacity is insufficient; vulnerability is too great and scale of hazard is too big, then emergency may not be managed locally, thus disaster occurs.

Disaster Risk Management vis Disaster Risk Reduction

The concept of disaster risk management (DRM) puts emphasis on whom and what are at risk with the occurrence of hazards. These are the people and properties. DRM refers to being proactive to disaster responses in order to minimize if not avoid loss or damage. It entails a broad range of activities before, during and after the disaster.

Disaster risk reduction (DRR) means minimizing vulnerability thru prevention; limiting or mitigation of impact of hazards in the context of sustainability.

DRM is an organizational concept where there is application of administrative decisions and operational skills to bring about disaster risk reduction mechanisms such as procedures, policies, capacities that are both structural and non-structural in nature in order to limit hazards pre, during and post occurrence. DRM encompasses actions towards prevention, mitigation, preparedness to hazard exposures. These actions are varied – technology, awareness building, enhancing physical strength, structural building codes, strengthening community support, poverty reduction strategies, insurance, risk transfer mechanisms, and sustainable livelihood activities.

Disaster preparedness would mean structuring emergency response and/or contingency planning; setting up public warning/early warning system or people-centered warning system. Disaster recovery refers to rehabilitation and reconstruction.

A new concept under DRM is disaster resilience. Noting the characteristic of a bamboo, disaster resilience means returning to acceptable level of functioning of the community.

There are models that refer to disaster management continuum: the “Expand Contract model of South Africa”, and the “Total Disaster Risk Management” that has the facets of a project management cycle. The latter looks into risks, analyzes, evaluates and treats the risk; all stakeholders are informed; monitoring and review of actions are done. All disaster risk activities begin with risk assessment where the elements – hazard, vulnerability, capacity, are assessed, and disaster risk response are chalked up.

The current initiatives of the Philippines in relation to disaster risk management are in the context of the Hyogo Framework for Action. This is a binding road map among nations up to 2015 which was a result of the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Kobe, Japan. The Philippines is coming out with strategic national action plans to implement the YOGO Action Plan. The framework of ADPC looks into policy, legal, and institutional arrangements that necessarily brings to fore participatory action by stakeholders both at the local and national levels. Thus far, three sectors are mainstreaming actions toward disaster risk reduction and management – DILG in local governance thru the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP), DPWH in infra projects like road, bridges, etc, and DepEd in the education sector.

Another rising concept is the twin-face phenomenon of disaster and development. Disaster sets back development, and development increases vulnerability. This is exemplified by the rising business of real estate in agricultural lands. However, it can also be said that development can also reduce vulnerability in a condition where DRM integration is applied to comprehensive development plans that builds on attaining the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

It can also be said that disaster can provide development opportunities, that is, when rehabilitation provides increased opportunities for the area to develop and prosper. However, what people aspire is development that reduces vulnerability, and not to wait for disaster to strike in order to have the development, though this is feasible.

The current buzz word is “mainstreaming” in local and national policies and action programs, and the concept, approaches and mechanisms on disaster risk management will have to ride high on this to address quality development.

Open Forum:

On the inclusion of terrorism under disaster risk management: Terrorism and armed conflict may be regarded as part of the concept on complex disaster. The Office of Civil Defense has contingency planning focused on terrorism.

Session 2: **Dagupan Experience on Disaster Risk Reduction** Presentation by Ms. Emma Molina, Focal Person, Project PROMISE in Dagupan City

The session was an experiential sharing on the learning and accomplishments in implementing a project on disaster risk reduction. Project PROMISE of ADPC is being implemented in Dagupan City. It runs from March 2006 to May 2008. Dagupan City is noted for the tremendous devastation of the earthquake that hit the country in the late 90's. The city now seats just one meter above sea level, and is perennially flooded during the rainy season from May to September. The city suffers from flooding after the quake especially since it is located at the tail end of the Agno River Basin which is the exit point of all rivers in the upland of the Agno River system.

After the disaster, the initial effort was to activate the Local Disaster Coordinating Council (LDCC) but the action was not as fast until the barangays reorganized the LDCC. The following were acted upon by the reconstituted LDCC.

Disaster maps were generated to prepare for storm surge that visit the area every week or even twice a week. Tsunami map and flood map were made using the GIS maps of the city.

There was community watching done by barangays. Preparedness started by grounding the people on community mapping. This was taught to barangays where the latter identified for themselves their vulnerabilities.

Children are partners in the consciousness effort since they are part of the vulnerable sector.

Attitude assessment was used for children in the inculcation of proper attitude among the young, and the children are the medium to reach and teach the parents rather than the other way around.

Eight (8) barangays of Dagupan City are involved in Project PROMISE. The manual of the City Disaster Coordinating Council (CDCC) incorporates the Early Response Plans of the 8 barangays.

One of the strategies in the Early Response Plan is the mainstreaming of the civil society. Bantay Dagupan was created comprising of 20 NGOs. A memorandum of agreement is signed by the city government with these NGOs. Bantay Dagupan takes charge of relief and other relevant operations since the group is predominantly composed of private sector volunteers and contractors who own vehicles and equipment, for instance there is a group of private volunteer firefighters in Dagupan City. They own more fire trucks than the city government. The private sector also assists in traffic and flood control.

Through the project, the Disaster Preparedness Campaign was institutionalized. It was lobbied to the Sangguniang Panglungsod to give legal basis on all the actions of the project. The first request was to declare July 16 as Earthquake Day that falls within the Disaster Consciousness Month in the city.

Massive support for the project was generated in 2006 & 2007. A lot of children joined the preparedness drill and started consciousness building by joining essay writing, poster making & oratorical contests.

City-wide flood and evacuation drill where the early response plans of the barangays and the city response plan were applied. These were opportunities to test the project's early warning system which is the totality of the response for the city in order to assess how effectively this was crafted, to analyze vulnerability, and to put into action the capacities of the barangays. We also tested our communication system which has been part of our preparedness effort.

The project was able to institutionalize the DRM orientation for media where messages for disaster consciousness were broadcasted. Only the City Information Officer coordinates and links with the media. The publication of the Bangus City Journal was also started on a monthly basis where all LGUs of the province are recipients.

The city government also awarded the Kalasag Award for the best performing Barangay Disaster Coordinating Council.

The project also put in place early warning tool located in every other household in high risk areas. The device is sounded that would indicate what appropriate action has to be done by the people. Flood markers were also set up to work as gauges. The gauges are color coded (using international color codes), and the color codes corresponds to particular actions to be done.

There were calendars and book markers distributed to communities & schools that contain information on what to do during disaster & hotlines to be contacted in case of emergencies/disasters.

There were also emergency gadgets that were provided by the project in addition to what the barangays have on their own.

The project geared also at strengthening the regular services/activities of the city departments in order to address perennial problems of flooding, improper solid waste disposal, and regular river clean-up as a conscious mitigation effort of the city. There is also monitoring of fish kill. Fish pens abound the

place, and there are measures in place to assure the economic viability of aqua culture. Water pollution caused by the structures(fish pens) are monitored to warn the fishpen owners if there is a pending fish kill due to poor water quality inflow.

There is periodic mangrove planting every 6 months in coordination with students in order to maintain the riverbanks.

The emergency operation center is operationalized with a 24/7 (24 hours/7days a week) preparedness. The Center was created through a city ordinance and appropriated with funds. Over and above the 5% calamity fund, the Center is allocated an annual operating budget of P2M.

With limited resources, the current and sustained preparedness activities that have been stimulated by Project PROMISE in Dagupan City can prepare communities so that they are always ready and loss of lives will be avoided.

Session 3: Review of the Rationalized Planning System and the Simplified Local Planning Process

Presentation by Ms. Priscella Mejillano,
Division Chief, Bureau of Local Government Development-DILG

The session highlighted the salient features of the Rationalized Planning System (RPS) and the synchronization and harmonization features of the Joint Memorandum Circular (JMC) No. 1 that encompass LGU operations on planning, resource administration, budgeting and expenditure management. It was emphasized that the contribution of DILG as one of the oversight agencies in the creation of the JMC is the RPS.

Current State of Local Planning

The appreciation of the need to rationalize the planning system and set up a simplified local planning process was grounded on the current state of local planning situation. The real stories and scenarios that point to

- i. inactive or non-functioning Local Development Councils;
- ii. unsupportive and indifferent Sanggunian;
- iii. unfriendly relations between the Sanggunian and the local chief executive especially since planning is a function of the the executive and budgeting is the function of the Sanggunian;
- iv. lack of or absence of vertical linkages or the bottom-up and top-bottom link as shown in the non integration of plans at the various levels – baranagy plan - municipal plan - provincial plan - regional plan. The integration is synchronized at the regional level where the Governor seats in the Regional Development Council;
- v. partisan problems;
- vi. linkage between plan and budget is weak; at time there are plans but these are not funded;
- vii. multiplicity of plans – around 27 different plans prepared by LGUs. It is a reality that every plan has requirements such as required process, created sectoral committees, timelines and schedules. It becomes a difficult job for the MPD Coordinator, especially in lower class LGUs, who take on the job of accomplishing all the required plans. Nonetheless, there are also good developments

- like in Antipolo where the MPDC has successfully set up planning guidelines and organized the sectoral committees to undertake the planning activity.
- viii. Disaster Management Plan and Solid Waste Management Plan are most useful. It is a positive indication that the topic of the current consultation is relevant to the LGUs.
 - ix. LPRAP and GAD are unnecessary though this feedback does not mean these are useless rather these are redundant since these are already in the CDP. The LGUs are not preparing anymore these plans.
 - x. some LGUs just cut & paste plans and submit to agencies. LGUs resort to these due to varying sectoral guidelines and timing which make it difficult for LGUs to prepare.

Highlights of the Rationalized Planning System (RPS)

The rationalization of local planning is based on the Local Government Code (LGC) of 1991, and this is an attempt to address the weakness of the current situation in local planning particularly the multiplicity of plans faced by LGUs. In the process, the NGAs are provided opportunities to dovetail and integrate their planning guidelines with those of the LGUs and enable multistakeholder participation and consultation in planning.

The local planning system has four components – the Local Government Code mandated plans which are the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (management of territory) and the Comprehensive Development Plan (promotion of general welfare); the local planning process which is multi-stakeholder participation; the planning structure which constitutes the Local Development Council and Sectoral/Functional Committees; and the tools for implementing the plans which comprise the Annual Investment Plan (AIP), the Local Development and Investment Plan (LDIP) and taxations.

Local Development Planning and Development Model makes use of the CLUP as the long-term framework incorporating policies and guidelines on settlement, land protection, land production, and infrastructure. The output is zoning ordinance which will be considered in the multi-year, multi-sectoral development plan or the CDP. There are five areas of planning – social, economic, infrastructure, environment management, and institutional. From this mandated plan, the term-based plan will be crafted through the Executive-Legislative Agenda (ELA). The approved plan becomes the basis for the submission of the LDIP and the yearly AIP which is provided or allocated with yearly budget.

The RPS treats monitoring and evaluation (M & E) with equal importance in the planning process. Plan M & E is promoted which will coincide with the term-based plans, as such yearly monitoring & evaluation (input/output) on the AIP, every 3 years M & E on the LDIP and ELA, and every 6 years outcome and impact M & E on the CLUP/CDP. The Local Government Operations Officers have significant roles and responsibilities as regards enabling Plan M & E to be realized and sustained.

Simplified Planning Process

The simplified planning process begins with the vision statement of the LGU as a whole, and the realization of the LGU vision is in the context of the different sectoral elements which in turn are lifted from the current realities in the communities of people generated through sectoral profiles, development indicators, mapping, and CBMS/LGPMS. One of the relevant realities that need integration and synchronization in local planning is disaster risk management (DRM). The LGUs may decide to treat DRM as a separate sectoral planning concern or they may integrate DRM in each sectoral concern.

The identified gaps between the LGU vision and the realities in the locality are basis for the sectoral goals and objectives, and the identification of targets as well as strategies/interventions. The interventions of the LGUs come in the form of legislation, programs/projects, and non-projects or services. Congress addresses national level legislation while the Sanggunian handles local level legislation. National programs/projects are initiated and planned out by NGAs. Local projects/programs are reflected in the LDIP, and private sector initiated projects are incorporated in the plans of the LDC/Sanggunian.

The current move is to harmonize the CDP with the CLUP, and not to treat these mandated plans as parallel efforts. A guide is in process to clarify the need for the CDP and eventually integrate DRM in CLUP and CDP formulation.

RPS Sourcebook and the Joint Memorandum Circular No. 1

The RPS sourcebook is categorized by respective local planning components. This document is the contribution of DILG to the Harmonization Initiatives on Local Planning, Investment Programming and Revenue Administration, Budgeting and Expenditure Management otherwise known as the Joint Memorandum Circular (JMC) No. 1. The thematic contributions of the other national oversight agencies into the JMC are as follows: the Provincial Local Planning & Expenditure Management Manual of NEDA, the Updated Budget Operations Manual for LGUs of DBM, and the Revenue Administration Sourcebook of DOF.

The JMC is a good start but it is not perfect. The JMC was formulated to address the following purposes:

- i. provide guidelines on the harmonization of local planning, investment programming and revenue administration, budgeting and expenditure management
- ii. strengthen NGA-LGU interface
- iii. strengthen complementation between the province and its component cities/municipalities.
- iv. clarify and spell out responsibilities among the oversight agencies.

The basic principles behind the harmonization of core LGU operations per JMC No. 1 are as follows:

- i. synchronized calendar of activities on local planning, investment programming and revenue administration, budgeting and expenditure management
- ii. clearly defined and linked outputs on local planning, investment programming and revenue administration, budgeting and expenditure management
- iii. coordinated delivery mechanism for capacity building
- iv. integrated common course design on core LGU operations
- v. delineated responsibilities on capacity building among oversight agencies based on the mandates on core LGU operations.

As DILG's contribution to capacity building of LGUs, the Department has scheduled a training activity for local finance committee members on planning & budgeting in May 2008. The training is subsidized for the 4th –6th class municipalities while the training for upper income class LGUs will be demand driven.

Under the JMC, the oversight agencies have clarified the working definitions of terms that relate to core LGU operations, among these include AIP for planning purposes and AIP for budgeting purposes, the Comprehensive Development Plan, the Provincial Development and Physical Framework.

The synchronization procedures that are highlighted in the JMC involve:

- i. those tasks jointly done by the Local Planning and Development Coordinators (LPDC), Local Budget Officers, and Local Treasurers such as database updating following the guidelines of the province;
- ii. those tasks done by the LPDC and coordinated with the LGOOs and other LGU officials such as updating of NGOs, Business and private groups and reconstituting the LDC;
- iii. those tasks done by the Local development Council (LDC) together with the Local Finance Committee (LFC) such as matching available financing resources, formulating multi-year LDIP, culling out the AIP, and conducting of technical budget hearings
- iv. complementation of province-city/municipality
- v. interface of NGAs and LGUs on sectoral development plans.

The Synchronized Local Planning and Budgeting Calendar (SLPBC) is a potent feature that will visibly provide the avenue for synchronized implementation of plans, programs, and activities.

Open Forum

On database updating: The provinces are given a bigger role in terms of updating the database through setting up guidelines to synchronize and harmonize the data amongst the different LGUs. This is recommended to the provinces in order to enable them to aggregate the data. However, the guidelines are based on the respective provinces in consultation with their component LGUs.

DILG works in consultation with the LGUs, private sector, and non-government groups. The current objective is to synchronize updating of databases. A good example on this is the action of Bulacan Provincial Government that adopted the Community Based Monitoring System (CBMS) which facilitated not only the systematic gathering of information rather more importantly, the identification of target priorities and types of intervention.

On the importance of a fully functioning Executive-Legislative Agenda (ELA) and Local Development Council (LDC): It is the case that ELA is not fully followed and not all Local Development Councils (LDCs) are reconstituted. It is important that LDCs are activated since this mechanism is the key link to the strengthening Rationalized Planning System (RPS). In order for the LDCs to be properly constituted there is a need to have the proper selection and screening of members. DILG and the leagues can assist in enabling a properly constituted LDC.

The LDC is not a rubber stamp. It is responsible in crafting and approving resolutions to be signed by the Local Chief Executive, and in activating sectoral & functional committees to ensure that LGU plans are relevantly responsive.

The new breed of LGUs that are development oriented have functioning LDCs. A relevant point in the functioning of the LDC is the membership of NGOs. There must be an effort to have NGOs accredited. However, it doesn't mean that without the NGOs there is no functioning LDC.

The NGAs also have a role to play by exerting pressure on LGUs to act. Similar to what DILG CALABARZON did. It pressured the local officials at all levels – region and municipalities to act.

It may be that the DILG can assist in the process of constituting the LDCs, however, its focus is really on advocacy and capacity building. There exists a policy on accreditation, particularly for local special bodies that would constitute the LDC. DILG can provide incentives but it remains external to the affairs

of the LGUs since the latter are autonomous, particularly in the selection of the members of the LDC. It should be emphasized that the burden of planning rests with the Planning Coordinator and not with the LDCs.

Around a fourth of the members of the LDC is from the NGO sector, and it becomes crucial that the NGOs that become part of the LDC are in the forefront of community concerns in the locality. Since the DILG is into capacity building, particularly in enabling the functionality of LDCs, it has started consultations with NGAs on synchronization/harmonization of planning, and the Local Government Planning and Monitoring System (LGPMS) has included the indicators on the functionality of local special boards which is made up of local public and community influence groups.

On the concern to adopt the local planning system to the barangay level: There is a lot of discussion and focus on capacitating higher local government units but not the barangays. It is high time to focus on the barangays to enable the small units to effectively and efficiently be pro active in local development. There is a need to adopt a simplified manual on rationalized planning system manual that is more suited for the barangay.

It becomes a concern for barangays to serve people very well but it seems they are neglected in the discussion of governance. It is high time that barangays be given focus on capacitating their ranks. It can not be more than emphasized that the structure of local development planning starts at the barangay level. Integration of plans will be at the municipal level.

The move of the DILG in the local planning system is to push for a well functioning LDC since the barangays are represented there. In the same manner that CBMS is also being pushed because this mechanism is dependent on the information generated at the barangay level. For instance, any development effort has an address, and this is located in a barangay with specific data. A project like supplemental feeding to address malnutrition is surely implemented appropriately when basic data are generated from the target barangays.

Moreover, multi-stakeholder participation is feasible through barangay consultation. A fairly appropriate example for this concept is the project ID which emanated from the barangay itself. Barangay consultations – participatory ; projects specific and location is in the barangay

It will be beneficial advocacy for NGAs that constitute TWGs to mention the importance of the intervention of participating and raising sectoral concerns to the LDC, and one facilitating link is the Association of Barangay Captains (ABC).

On the need to popularize the RPS: Just as there are concerns on tapping the existing LDCs, the Rationalized Planning System (RPS) should also be popularized. How will these LDCs be reached on the RPS? Since a major mechanism for RPS is the CBMIS, what happens to LGUs with no CBMIS? It also becomes a concern when the Joint Memorandum Circular no. 1 (JMC) does not also mention about the LDC.

The RPS is carried through in the JMC under Section 7, DILG's contribution to the JMC. Through the Newly Elected Officials (NEO) training , there are sessions as regards the JMC as well as on RPS. NEO training constitutes the core LGU operation training which is a composite module, and one of the core inputs is the planning mandate structure, the LDC. The CBMIS is also introduced so that the officials will be have a handle on how to identify priority target projects to match the limited resources of the locality.

On the Capacity Building of Barangay Captains: The experience of the Antipolo City Planning Coordinator put emphasis on the need to capacitate the local officials on accountability and their role as members of the Local Development Council (LDC). What really happens during municipal development council or city development council meetings is that Barangay Captains send representative, and unfortunately those representatives are not technically capable/prepared. Barangay Captains may appear when the plan is for finalization, and would tend to question the plans at a critical time when the plan is due for submission. Barangay Captains should internalize their responsibilities in the CDC and LDC, and invoke non partisan stance in their participation in the LDC or CDC. Planning should be seen as emanating from the barangays and not from the municipality.

In the NEO training, LDC and planning are emphasized. In fact, in the 1st qtr, the Local Government Academy has planned to orient barangay officials, starting with barangay captains.

On the availability of the RPS sourcebook: The DILG's Rationalized Planning and Monitoring System Sourcebook, which is available at the Department's website, is an integration tool for local planning and monitoring.

Session 4: Integrating Disaster Risk Management into the Comprehensive Development Planning Process

Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant

Integrating and mainstreaming of disaster risk management can be done at the LGU level through the plans, structures, processes, operations, policies and budget.. Local realities spell out disaster risks in various forms – natural, economic, social, among others, but there seem to be no LGU action to plan, prepare and address the risks. For instance the problem of armed conflict in Mindanao would show that adjacent LGUs that usually become evacuation sites for the victims do not prepare at all for the situation – no evacuation centers, no facilities etc. On other instances, disaster risk does not affect so much the people since it has become a usual thing such that people are already prepared to hurdle the risk, an example is Batanes, a typhoon prone area, where people have adapted to their environment as shown in their type of dwellings and way of life. Despite the condition of Batanes, it has never been declared as calamity stricken area.

Building on DRM should entail anticipatory attitude and a constancy of characterizing the area/s in order to prepare for the risks and the eventual damage or destruction that the risks involve.

In order to come up with appropriate disaster risk management intervention strategies, one has to go through a process such

- i. characterizing the area and the risks,
- ii. identifying the issues and problems related to the risks present in the area,
- iii. extracting information through observations and developing explanations
- iv. develop strategies/interventions (what to do) that are connected to the observations. e.g. high malnutrition due to poverty in the area and the interventions may be a combination of supplemental feeding and parenting education.
- v. providing resources/budget to implement the interventions

Disaster Risk interventions may come in the form of projects, services & legislations. The LDIP should be able to capture the projects which will be the basis of the budget. It is understood and applied in the JMC that projects not in the LDIP can not be budgeted. The targets for DRM projects compete with the other uses of the budget so it becomes critical to ensure the presence of the project for budget

purposes. There is no standard for disaster risk management interventions and the corresponding resource allocation since risks vary across LGUs.

Monitoring is also crucial in DRM in order to assess/determine that the level of DRR aimed at is appropriate, the level of capacity to address DRR is attained and/or the level of risk reduction is significant. Monitoring enables measuring effectiveness of disaster risk preparedness and mitigation interventions. Thus, monitoring links to the planning cycle.

Issue-driven Sectoral Planning Process

DRM generally should follow an issue-driven sectoral planning process. The initial action is to characterize and analyze the LGU situation particularly the risks it faces or anticipate to face. From there, observed issues/risks are identified. The identified risk/s may cut across sectoral concerns, thus sectoral goals to address the risks are formulated, and consequently feasible interventions/strategies are crafted. These strategies enter the LDIP which are then considered for budget allocation. Monitoring and evaluation proceeds alongside implementation in order to continually study and analyze the condition of the LGU and the risks it faces.

Step 1: Characterizing and Analyzing the LGU Situation

Socio-economic physical profile (SEPP) of the LGU is compiled from various sources. These are static information about the locality. Elevating the profiling of the LGU would mean getting its ecological profile.

Ecological profile gives recognition and proper space for the biophysical or ecological dimension and incorporates the five development sectors under the CDP – social, economic, infrastructure and land use, environment, and institutional.

It is also beneficial in the process to go beyond profiling and to relate the risk conditions to the Local Development Indicators (LDIs) which is an intermediate analytical tool that will provide information on sectoral-temporal (changes in attributes of risks over time) and sectoral-geographical or spatial (changes between areas over time).

The LDIs are expressed in terms of ratios, proportions, percentages, average, and per capita share, among others, e.g. malnutrition rate- 10% of Municipality X compared to provincial figure of 8% and the regional figure of 14%. These indicators are useful for finding out what the risk situation is of the LGU and the factors that determine the risk situation, for making policies and for monitoring and evaluation

The CBMS can provide the information requirements in the ecological profile since this system is household based and the information are end-user specific. CBMS is useful in addressing the sector to be assisted. The information requirements of the ecological profile include population and social services, the local economy, the physical and spatial base, environment and natural resources, and local government's capability for disaster risk reduction and management.

DRM-focused Ecological Profiling

Ecological profiling that is focused on DRM involve the three elements that are considered to define a disaster condition. This is essentially the community risk assessment. One element is on hazard assessment, information requirements include

- i. hazards likely to hit the LGU,

- ii. disaster history (location and affected persons/properties of previous disasters),
- iii. forces that can damage the locality,
- iv. presence of indigenous early warning signs e.g. prior to the eruption of Pinatubo, a lot of cockroaches appeared; behavior of animals also change
- v. time between warning and impact of disaster - e.g. PAGASA warning but may change due to natural reasons & models used
- vi. rapidity of arrival of hazard or seasonality of hazard
- vii. frequency of occurrence of hazard
- viii. timing of occurrence of hazard

Another element to be assessed is vulnerability. The information needed are:

- i. elements/entities at risk per type of hazard
- ii. analysis of the causes of damage

The last element to be assessed is capacity. People's perception of risk vary and sometimes ideas are imposed on people. Information on how people cope, on the survival strategies done by affected people, and the strengths, knowledge and practices that can be used for disaster preparedness, mitigation and prevention.

A proven beneficial tool for instilling disaster risk preparedness is maps, e.g. a zoning map can provide information in the delineation of areas by the degree of risk, safe & unsafe for settlement, economic activities, and community functions, e.g. evacuation centers and safe routes.

Step 2: Identifying issues and observations

This step involves the application of the local development indicators to extract intelligence. With the observed conditions of risk in the locality, information are collated to find out the explanations for the occurrence of the disaster and to determine the implications when no intervention is introduced to the place/condition. These bits of information enable the locality to formulate policy options.

Step 3: Setting of Sectoral Goals

In setting up development goals, the universal concept of public interest is referred to, and this involves the public's health, safety, convenience, economic/livelihood, and amenities.

As far as sources of development goals are concerned, the LGC has exhaustively enumerated the General Welfare Goals (section 16 RA 7160). There is no need to formulate or craft the goals addressing people's welfare.

Step 4: Setting of Objectives and Targets

In disaster risk management, crafting of objectives specify medium range desired outcomes. These are time bound and attainable. Targets are very specific outcomes or results. Targets are described as either qualitative results or quantitative results or even a combination of both.

Target setting enable the setting up of benchmark against which performance of the program implemented can be measured. Benchmark is commonly understood as baseline. Targets are also categorized as good targets that should be enhanced and prioritized. Targets with negative effect should be mitigated if not totally eliminated.

Step 5: Determining Policy Responses

Policy responses can be categorized based on what is being responded to. Programs, projects, activities are directed to cause. Services and non-projects are directed to positive effects. Regulatory measures are directed to negative effects.

In identifying programs, projects and activities, the two useful tools are the CBMS and the LGPMS.

The fishbone analysis is very useful in determining or identifying DRM related legislations. In the process of analyzing, existing legislations are grouped according to the following – still sound, defective, and inadequate. When legislations are sound, these should be analyzed if these are implemented properly, deficiently implemented, and not implemented at all. Actions of enhancement/strengthening or replacement follow after determining if legislations are deficient or not implemented at all. Non existent legislations should be enacted.

Session 5: Integrating Disaster Risk Management into the Local Development Investment Programming and Budgeting Process

Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant

A Local development Investment Program is a list of programs and projects that the LGU wants to carry out. It also contains a program for planned financing or for using the investible portion of the local budget to finance the implementation of those programs and projects (RPS page 166). The LDIP serves as the link between the plan and the budget based on the LGC. LGUs, unlike households, are required to invest despite the absence of savings. At the minimum, investment by the LGUs refers to the 20% of IRA. Investment in the LGU is a regular outlay that has to be funded whether or not excess over operations is realized.

Local funds available for development investment refer to non-office related MOOE and capital outlay. The bigger slice of the LGU funds are office MOOE, Personal services, and capital outlay and statutory obligations. These are not available for LGU investment.

There are three streams in the preparation of the LDIP. Stream 1 is the preparation of a ranked list of programs and projects with their individual and cumulative cost estimates. Stream 2 determines available funds for investment. Stream 3 matches the fund requirements with projected funds available and deciding on financing options should the funds available are insufficient.

Stream 1: Pre-LDIP activities involve the following activities:

- a. Call for project ideas or project proposals. The proposals may be sourced from the CDP, Sectoral Committees of the LDC, and projects from other Departments, NGAs and private sector
- b. Consolidation of project ideas/proposals by sector
- c. Conduct of sifting of projects which involved differentiating projects from legislation or regulatory measures; distinguishing projects from non-projects or services; and identifying project ownership – barangay, city/municipality, province, national government or private sector (some projects from private sector include water supply, market, terminals, cemetery, ports)

To note, distinguish non-projects or “services” that are organic functions of the department. These should not be included in the AIP, rather these form parts of the office MOOE. It should be noted that AIP for purposes of planning should not include costs on organic functions but with AIP for purposes of budgeting the costs of these organic functions will have to be included.

The LDC takes up and approves the content of the AIP for purposes of planning but not the content related to AIP for budgeting purposes. The distinction of the AIP is important. The document on the AIP for budget purposes is signed by the Local Planning Officer, Local Budget Officer and Local Treasurer. CATEGORIZATION OF PROJECTS

- d. Conduct initial screening of projects require the consolidation of repetitive or redundant proposals, removal of projects that are impractical or undesirable, screen projects that are more appropriately undertaken by other agencies.
- e. Conduct screening or assess if the projects complement, are compatible or conflict (e.g. two projects proposed and titled separately but essentially refer to only one project).
- f. Rank list of proposed projects means defining the urgency for the project. There are criteria for prioritizing projects by level pf urgency. The categories are Urgent, Essential, Necessary, Desirable, Acceptable, and Deferrable.
- g. Prepare a project brief following a simplified format. (refer to format in the LDIP Stream 1 presentation).

Stream 2: Determining Funds for Investment

The LGU's investible funds is what is left after deducting all the resources necessary to run government operations. The number of projects that the LGU can finance depends on the following:

- i. revenue level of the LGU
- ii. level of recurring local government operating expenditures
- iii. current public debt level
- iv. statutory debt ceiling
- v. potential sources of additional revenue available for investment project financing

The LGU should review its historical trend in revenues and the current revenues. Following this is the collection of all operating expenditures and outstanding debts. Then, project future recurring revenue and expenditure level. Finally, compute funds for financing new investments. The Net Available Resources (NAR) and the Total Available Resources (TAR) can be determined. (Refer to the Stream 2 presentation on how to compute for NAR and TAR). However, it is normally the case that it is only the statutory obligation of 20% of IRA left for investments.

Stream 3: Matching and Iteration

After rank listing the projects, the LGU may find out that the available funds for investment are not enough. What then should the LGU do about the situation? There is a process that the LGU can take as recourse to better determine which projects to accommodate for funding and what possible funding sources can be tapped. The process is called “matching and iteration”. The LGU proceeds with the first round of matching. Using the ranked list of projects, the cumulative total of the project costs from top to downwards is taken. The projects whose cumulative equals or almost equals the estimated

available funds will constitute the projects that will be assured for implementation. The next step is to get the total amount of the remaining projects that cannot be funded. This should be transmitted to the Local Finance Committee to look for other financing options.

Matching and iteration process continues with the LDC deliberating on and deciding what financing approach to take. The LDC has 3 options.

- i. Option 1 is the Conservative Approach wherein the LDC decides that the only projects that can be implemented are those funded from regular sources.
- ii. Option 2 is the Developmental Approach wherein the LDC takes the short list of projects as final and irreducible and additional fund sourcing has to be done.
- iii. Option 3 is the Pragmatic Approach wherein the LDC opts the combination of Option 1 and Option 2.

Each option has a particular set of steps to be undertaken (refer to the presentation in Stream 2 of the steps for Options 1 to 3).

One of the funding sources in Option 2 is public borrowings. LGUs can opt to go through credit financing. The Sanggunian passes a resolution to undertake this option and such funding sources like floatation of bonds, joint venture, loans, build-operate-transfer, increase tax (though this not so politically acceptable), and implement the "idle land tax (only Marikina City and Tagaytay are currently doing this) or the "betterment tax" (tax imposed when the value of the property has increased due to the development in the area).

Session 6: Integrating Disaster Risk Management Monitoring into the Local Plan Monitoring System

Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant

Monitoring and Evaluation as envisioned in the RPS becomes a mechanism for bringing about cyclical planning. The continuous process of data collection and analysis to check that the projects are running according to plan and adjustments are made if deemed so by the project implementers. Evaluation is a systematic process of data collection and analysis about the activities and results of a project to determine its relevance and make decisions to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.

Generally, monitoring and evaluation provides the link between the Predecessor Plan and the Successor Plan, and this tandem indicates the impact of implemented programs and projects, the effects of regulatory measures that are enforced, and surfaces outcomes of unplanned development. The levels of M & E involve project outputs, project outcome, and project impact.

M & E in the sectoral planning process makes it possible to determine the changes in the current reality after a lapse of time and to update the ecological profile. Each sectoral element of the CDP rationalizes on the need for M & E.

M & E supports the quality and extent of AIP and the level of efficiency of the budget cycle. The performance evaluation on output and finance provide indicative direction to the next AIP.

The tools for M & E are varied. These are the SLGR, the end of term reports of the LCE, the CBMS, and the Local Governance Performance Management System (LGPMS)

Open Forum

On Disaster Risk Management as part of the LDIP: DRM does not have to be a separate part of LDIP. It folds within the comprehensive plan since the concern is cross-sectoral in nature. When the Development Plan has a comprehensive ecological development plan then projects with such bearing may be addressed and underscored in the investment plan. To ensure that DRM-based ecological profiling is done, the LDIP must be done comprehensively. It is always a case that LGUs do not have enough funds but to ensure DRM-based plans are in the LDIP would necessarily mean inclusion in the Annual Investment Plan of the LGU.

On the 20% Internal Revenue Allocation for project: The 20% fund from IRA that goes to projects is a misconception since it doesn't mean that only 20% goes for investment projects. The allocation for projects may not only come from the LGU allocation, the sectoral allocations from NGAs should also be considered comprehensively.

On the extent of influence of the Local Development Council on the approval of plans: The LDC has influence on both political and technical aspects of decision making on the local plans.. However, on the matter of disaster risk management projects, not all LGUs necessarily have the same projects.

On the CBMIS: The CBMIS is a comprehensive and very useful tool for planning and decision making since it is structured to provide data even on a household level, e.g. type of housing structure. It is estimated to cost P35 per household data. The CBMIS can be customized to include other indicators that the local stakeholders would prefer to include and analyze. Nonetheless, it already contains the 14 core indicators in CLPI, thus, the CBMIS is poverty focused. The system can append additional data based on the LGU preference. For instance the LGU would like to include DRM, then indicators to such can be included as rider to the system.

The system is available at the DILG, and the software is free. However, the LGU will have to carry the costs for the training, the data collection, mapping, data processing, and the integration of data into the LDIP. The duration of the data processing is dependent on the magnitude and comprehensiveness of data requirement of the LGU. Even the generation of maps can be customized based on spatial diagnosis, e.g. the LGU may be interested on the distribution map by vulnerable groups.

On the inclusion of Monitoring & Evaluation in the RPS: M & E is included in the Comprehensive Development Plan at the city/municipal level.

On the validation of the CDP: The DILG will hold a series of validation exercises on the CDP that will mainstream DRM. In the process of consultation, gaps that will impact on a harmonized/synchronized CDP may not necessarily be addressed in the soonest possible time since it is expected that sectoral interests prevail as well as donor driven interests.

A pilot run of the validation of the CDP manual will be in three LGUs in Luzon. Once the manual is finalized, training ensues for the LGUs with the League of Local Planners to be trained as coaches in financial planning. This activity is scheduled some time in May 2008.

On the RPS Orientation for NGOs and the Academe: The orientation is scheduled in the 3rd week of January 2008.

GTZ-LGU National Conference on Mainstreaming DRM in Local Governance: The focus on disaster risk management is elevated into a national conference with international attendees which is set on March 4 to 6, 2008.

IV. Conclusion

The consultation workshop was adjourned around 5:00 pm on the note that a second round of consultation will be scheduled with the same agency attendees soon after the pilot validation of the CDP manual is conducted in the initial weeks of January 2008.

ANNEXES

- A: Attendance Sheet
- PowerPoint Presentation
- B.1 Session 1: Review of Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Concepts and Definition of Terms
Presentation by Ms. Lorna Victoria, Executive Director, Center for Disaster Preparedness
- B.2 Session 2: Dagupan Experience on Disaster Risk Reduction
Presentation by Ms. Emma Molina, Focal Person, Project PROMISE in Dagupan City
- B.3 Session 3: Review of the Rationalized Planning System and the Simplified Local Planning Process
Presentation by Ms. Priscella Mejillano, Division Chief, BLGD-DILG
- B.4 Session 4: Integrating Disaster Risk Management into the Comprehensive Development Planning Process Stream 1
Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant
- B.5 Session 5: Integrating Disaster Risk Management into the Local Development Investment Programming and Budgeting Process Stream 2
Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant
- B. 6 Session 6: Integrating Disaster Risk Management Monitoring into the Local Plan Monitoring System, Stream 3
Presentation by Ms. Liza Marie Pulumbarit-Elum, DILG Consultant