



ILO EVALUATION

- Evaluation Title: [Independent Final Evaluation of Community-Based Emergency Employment \(Cash-for-Work\) and Reconstruction Project](#)
- ILO TC/SYMBOL: [PHI/12/01/AUD](#)
- Type of Evaluation : [Independent Final](#)
- Country(ies) : [Philippines](#)
- Date of the evaluation: [November 2013](#)
- Name of consultant(s): [Jonathan Price](#)
- ILO Administrative Office: [CO-Manila](#)
- ILO Technical Backstopping Office: [DWT-Bangkok](#)
- Date project ends: [30 November 2013](#)
- Donor: country and budget US\$ [US\\$ 1.5 million](#)
- Evaluation Manager: [Richard Howard](#)
- Evaluation Budget: [US\\$11,171](#)
- Key Words: [livelihood, employment creation, employment intensive investment, crisis response, Philippines](#)

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Unit.

ILO EVALUATION

COMMUNITY-BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT

PHI/12/01/AUS

FINAL REPORT



TYPE OF EVALUATION: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

COUNTRY: PHILIPPINES

Date of Evaluation: November 2013

Name of Consultant: Jonathan Price

ILO Administrative Office: ILO Country Office for Philippines

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: Employment Intensive Investment Programme, ROAP,
Bangkok

Date Project ends: 30 November 2013

Donor: AusAID and ILO

Project budget: US\$ 1.5 million

Evaluation Manager: Mr Richard Howard

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Unit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES, PHOTOGRAPHS, FIGURES AND CHARTS	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
ACRONYMS	5
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1.1 BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	6
1.2 PROJECT STATUS AND FINDINGS	6
1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS	7
1.4 LESSONS LEARNT	8
2. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION	8
2.1 BACKGROUND	8
2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTPUTS	9
3. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION	10
3.1 EVALUATION AIMS	10
3.2 LIMITATIONS	11
4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	11
4.1 DETAILS ON METHODOLOGY	11
4.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS	11
5. PROJECT STATUS AND FINDINGS	11
5.1 OVERALL RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT	11
5.2 VALIDITY OF DESIGN	15
5.3 GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION	18
5.4 IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES	19
5.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE	22
5.6 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION	23
5.7 IMPACT, SHARING AND SUSTAINABILITY	27
6. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
6.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	31
6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	34
7. LESSONS LEARNT AND POTENTIAL GOOD PRACTICES	36
ANNEXES	37
8. LIST OF PERSONS AND/OR ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED	37
9. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND SUB-PROJECT VISITS	42
10. TERMS OF REFERENCE	44
11. EVALUATION QUESTIONS	53
12. PHOTOGRAPHS OF FIELD VISITS	56
13. LESSONS LEARNED	64

LIST OF TABLES, PHOTOGRAPHS, FIGURES AND CHARTS

TABLES

1. Gender equality targets
2. Progress and overall achievements
3. Comparison of achievements with targets
4. Cash injected into local economy

PHOTOGRAPHS

1. Bulao Iponan Vegetable Producers Association tree guard made from bamboo and sacks - CdO
2. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association mangrove nursery - CdO
3. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association fish cages - CdO
4. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association group photo - CdO
5. Barangay Indahag Communal Farmers Association communal garden - CdO
6. Indahag National Elementary and High School perimeter fence - CdO
7. PN Roa school drainage by Calaanan United Construction Workers Association - CdO
8. Dalipuga Farmers & Fishermen Association Inc. group photo - Iligan
9. Hindang Banana Growers Farmers Association SALT farm - Iligan
10. New Tabunan Farmers Assn. SALT farm with steep terrace steps - Iligan
11. ACMAC Fishermen Association fish cage construction - Iligan
12. Anahawon Developing Farmers Assn. SALT farm - Iligan
13. Banko Contour Farmers Association SALT farm - Iligan
14. Barangay Hindang box culvert construction - Iligan
15. Hinaplanon School perimeter wall construction - Iligan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The consultant benefited from a well organised and intensive series of field visits and interviews in Cagayan de Oro and Iligan, prepared by the Programme Officers in the field. All-important assistance in translation and facilitating meetings was given by the project support staff. Background information has been shared by ILO staff members, partner organisations and other agencies in Manila and in the field. The consultant wishes to express his thanks to all those who have contributed their time, knowledge and experience to this evaluation.

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

ACRONYMS

ACRONYM	FULL NAME
APO	Agricultural Productivity Office [Cagayan de Oro]
BICFA	Barangay Indahag Communal Farmers Association
BIVPA	Bulao Iponan Vegetable Producers Association
BUFA	Bugo United Fisherfolk Association
CAO	City Agriculturalist Office [Iligan]
CBM	Christoffel-Blindenmission or Christian Blind Mission
CdO	Cagayan de Oro
CDLO	Cooperative Development and Livelihood Office
CFW	Cash For Work
CLENRO	City Local Environment and Natural Resources Office [CdO]
CMRCF	Central Material Recovery and Composting Facility
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CUCWA	Calaanan United Construction Workers Association
DALIFFA	Dalipuga Farmers & Fishermen Association Inc.
DOLE	Department of Labour and Employment
DSWD	Department of Social Works and Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FTI	Foundation for These-Abled Persons Inc.
IAC	Interagency Committee
INGO	International Non-Government Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
LGU	Local Government Unit
MSU-IIT	Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology
OCHA	Office of Coordination for Humanitarian Affairs
PDFI	Pallig Development Foundation, Inc.
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
TESDA	Technical Education and Skills Development Authority
SALT	Slope Agriculture Land Technology
SANFIBAI	San Simon Farmer Irrigator Beneficiaries Association Inc.
TESDA	Technical Education and Skills Development Authority
WFP	World Food Programme

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

1.1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Typhoon Sendong [Washi] passed through Mindanao in mid-December 2011, killing more than 1,470 people and injuring 2,020. The cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan were the worst hit and livelihood was identified as a top priority. The ILO response built on extensive expertise and experience in responding to crises. Responding to DOLE requests ILO allocated funding of US\$ 300,000 and requested AUD 1,250,000 from AusAID. The project targeted 2,400 vulnerable workers aiming to provide them with emergency employment transitioning to livelihood recovery whilst restoring essential infrastructure. The project, executed over 18 months, collaborated with national and regional government agencies, LGUs and local communities through the livelihood cluster.

1.1.2 OBJECTIVES AND OUTPUTS

The project aimed to improve the living environment and essential infrastructure, injecting cash into the local economy. Supporting the livelihood cluster, employment impact assessments were to be carried out. A total of 2,400 workers were to be employed generating 72,000 work days. Technical manuals and guidelines were also to be developed to mainstream lessons and enhance policy formulation.

1.1.3 PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The evaluation aims to assess whether the project has delivered expected outcomes whilst providing key insights into achievements, challenges, impacts, sustainability, stakeholder involvement, capacity and possible replication.

1.1.4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation used standard quantitative and qualitative methods such as reviewing available documents and products, key informant and focus group interviews. A series of evaluation questions based on the criteria and framework were utilised.

1.2 PROJECT STATUS AND FINDINGS

1.2.1 RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

The technological approach taken and the type of sub-projects identified matched with beneficiary needs, built on existing skills and suited local conditions. The ILO decent work agenda was addressed through physical and social protection and emergency employment has become an accepted norm. The project collaborated with local agencies and organisations through the livelihood cluster, providing support through the commissioning of livelihood impact studies.

1.2.2 VALIDITY OF DESIGN

The project approach built on local resources and knowledge, partnering with established associations and collaborating with city agricultural agencies. Beneficiaries' knowledge and confidence in environmental protection was bolstered by project activities. Risks and assumptions foreseen in the project set up did not impact on implementation except where staff was temporarily reassigned to another disaster response project.

1.2.3 GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION

The project did not meet normal targets for gender equality. Although data was available during implementation the shortfall was not detected and acted upon.

1.2.4 IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The project employed 28% more workers than expected by fell short by 14% on targets for work days generated. The cash-for-work component was easily and harmoniously managed in collaboration largely with DOLE. All beneficiaries appeared to be satisfied with their wages and social and health protection measures. The remoteness of some project sties posed a challenge which was well tackled. Successful community contracting was also a challenge and required significant efforts from the project team. However DOLE is interested in further exploring this component.

1.2.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

The project was managed by a minimal number of staff in the field, though temporary reassignment of two key staff members resulted in a significant lull in project activities. The management of potential savings in PhilHealth coverage could have been better anticipated.

1.2.6 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The project faced challenges with liquidation of PPE and material purchases, which was addressed through adopting a direct purchasing approach. Implementing partners faced challenges with liquidating the first tranches and more direct assistance had to be given by the project team. Some confusion on monitoring unexpended budget resulted in sub-projects being held up and at least one being cancelled unexpectedly.

LGUs and agricultural agencies effectively collaborated with the project by providing technical assistance and materials, although resources were scarce and some differences of opinion regarding design, inconsistencies in technical design and concerns about financial influence, were flagged. The project developed effective monitoring systems and provided needed technical assistance combining efforts with the agricultural agencies. The implementing partners effectively and efficiently managed the sub-projects, although they did not discriminate between cash-for-work/emergency employment and livelihood recovery. Reporting and project documentation was lacking.

1.2.7 IMPACT, SHARING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Livelihood impact assessments carried out can be used as a baseline for future impact evaluations. Close work with agricultural agencies and the good possibility of local replication, sharing and expansion of SALT activities will enhance the sustainability of the activities. However sustainable community contracting and supporting sustainable livelihoods for IDPs in relocation sites still poses the biggest challenge. Sub-projects provided a supplementary income for beneficiaries with the more established associations having clearer future plans. The project did not meet expected targets for cash injection into the local economy. Guidelines and manuals are under development.

1.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A sub-project monitoring system could be developed as standard practice.
2. Continuing efforts are need to address the challenge of livelihood in relocation areas.
3. More advocacy on procurement laws is needed to develop community contracting.
4. Future projects should plan for the technical assistance in agriculture.

5. ILO should avoid reassigning key project staff to other emergency response projects.
6. Alternative and more flexible procurement approaches could help project efficiency.
7. Clearer finance monitoring systems are needed.
8. ILO could continue to follow-through with support to initiated sub-projects.
9. An impact assessment, after 1 or 2 years, is needed to assess project success.
10. Project replication should focus on the local resource based approach.

1.4 LESSONS LEARNT

1. SALT or contour farming was a technique that successfully made use of untapped arable land while neatly matching with the resources, environmental/organic concerns and financial capacity of local associations and local agricultural agencies.
2. Community contracting and IDP involvement in infrastructure reconstruction, while a challenge to implement, could be successfully replicated in many post disaster situations and could prove to be a significant source of new livelihood.

2. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

Typhoon Sendong [international name Washi] passed through Mindanao in mid-December 2011. More than 1,470 people were killed and 2,020 injured as a result of the floods of water and mud. Cagayan de Oro and Iligan were the two main cities affected with about 624,600 people affected and about 430,500 displaced. In the initial rapid assessment 83% of respondents indicated a problem with their source of livelihood and providing temporary livelihood assistance was identified as a top priority in all affected Barangays.

The ILO strategy built on extensive expertise in responding to crisis situations in the region. The project responded to requests from DOLE [Department of Labour and Employment] to co-finance emergency employment activities and to the need to capacitate local communities and LGUs [Local Government Units] to reduce the impact of future disasters, developing a process that can be applied by other national agencies in the future. In responding, ILO Manila office allocated crisis support funds of about US\$ 50,000, plus support from the regional office in Bangkok of US\$ 50,000 [plus work months for technical backstopping] and US\$ 200,000 from Geneva HQ, resulting in a total of US\$ 300,000. In addition to this the amount requested from AusAID for the project, was AUD 1,250,000.

The project targeted vulnerable youth, women and indigenous communities aiming to directly benefit 2,400 workers and their families. It centred on the cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan, providing immediate income with jobs through short-term emergency employment [cash-for-work]. This was to transition to medium-term employment, livelihood development and recovery, where workers would acquire practical skills needed for the repair and rehabilitation of infrastructure and where they could eventually be engaged as community-based labour contractors. Through this process essential infrastructure was to be restored and cash injected into the local economy through wages and materials/services purchase. Beneficiary selection was to be done in collaboration with local authorities. In the longer term government agencies were to benefit from a more harmonised recovery process through using the manuals and guidelines produced.

The project was to be executed by ILO Manila over a period of 18 months [starting in April 2012 and ending in November 2013], jointly with DOLE, LGUs and local communities, also collaborating with DSWD [Department of Social Works and Development], WFP [World

Food Programme] and the city government led Livelihood Clusters. AusAID were to actively participate in project meetings and monitoring missions, also using the knowledge developed to inform its own policies and programmes in the area of climate change adaptation, crisis response and social protection.

2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED OUTPUTS

The following summarises the main project objectives and expected outputs:

2.2.1 OVERALL OBJECTIVES

Development objective: Improved living environment for affected communities through essential community infrastructure and employment and livelihood development interventions ensuring a job-rich recovery process resilient to future natural disasters, with an impact evaluation carried out to assess longer term benefits and sustainable impacts.

Immediate objective: Affected households have increased access to employment and income earning opportunities. Stimulation of local economy by cash injection of AUD 742,000 - verified through impact evaluation and monitoring reports.

A technical gender audit was also to be carried out to assess gender issues and integrate gender concerns in the process and guidelines.

2.2.2 SHORT TERM RESPONSE [6 MONTHS]

Rapid employment, complementary to the DOLE emergency employment programme and DSWD cash-for-work activities, was to create jobs to clear affected areas, giving way for relief and rehabilitation and improving access, with special emphasis on clearing or renovating schools. Specific outputs were:

- **Output 1:** 2,000 vulnerable workers provided with short term work opportunities, generating 50,000 work days — verified through an impact evaluation.

Work with the livelihood cluster [co-chaired by ILO and DSWD] to assess damages and losses and strengthen activities in terms of collaboration, avoiding overlaps, identifying needs and harmonising cash-for-work approaches. Specific outputs were:

- **Output 2:** Support to livelihood cluster in conducting an assessment of losses in livelihood to ensure that protection and such issues are addressed in reconstruction. The effectiveness of the cluster was expected to increase — verified through meeting reports — and a medium term livelihood strategy was to be formulated.

2.2.3 MEDIUM TERM RESPONSE

Disaster resilient livelihoods and job-rich employment recovery increasing LGU and community resilience to future natural disasters, by applying a climate change adaptation approach¹. Vulnerable communities, through employment intensive reconstruction works,

¹ Note: the project document refers to ILO guidelines on climate change adaptation. These were not reviewed by the consultant

with some on-the-job skills training, were to restore damaged infrastructure and community assets using environmentally friendly methods. Specific outputs were:

- **Output 3:** Medium term employment in reconstruction work for 400 workers, generating 32,000 work days. Indirectly the entire village population of 5 affected Barangays would benefit through improved assets — verified through community contracts and monitoring reports.

2.2.4 LONG TERM RESPONSE

Lessons learnt were to be mainstreamed by developing guidelines and technical manuals and this was to enhance policy formulation, linking activities to national mainstreaming efforts in crisis response, through the Interagency Committee [IAC], coordinating the government guidelines, monitoring & institutional framework on emergency employment and through DILG and their training programmes. Specific outputs were:

- **Output 4:** Technical manuals and guidelines strengthening capacity of national and local government, including a generic model for emergency employment [with Philippines specific guidelines and materials]; increased crisis response capacity at regional and national levels [verified through training and workshop reports]; documentation of the ILO approach increasing local capacity for replication; and Barangay and Municipal LGU prominence in medium-term recovery efforts with investment in DRR and climate change adaptation works increasing their climate change adaptation capacity.

3. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

3.1 EVALUATION AIMS

The evaluation aims to assess whether the project has delivered the expected outcomes on time and within budget and to provide key insights into project achievements, challenges, impacts, sustainability, involvement of stakeholders, capacity building and areas for replication. The evaluation is to appraise the extent to which the partners and beneficiaries gained from the projects strategy and implementation, specifically in terms of:

- Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, gender equality promotion, monitoring and evaluation and knowledge sharing and learning environment

As well as addressing the above issues the evaluation is also to assess the project achievements in the light of the changing and evolving nature of the projects operational environment assessing the following:

- Final progress made in relation to planned achievements
- Project management/coordination among stakeholders & effective implementation
- Collaboration and institutional arrangements with LGUs
- Experiences in decent work, gender, rural access & environmental sustainability
- Preliminary assessment of impact, across socio-economic & environmental variables
- Feasibility and scope for replication of activities
- Main implementation challenges encountered

In addition the evaluation will review project management, ILO support and coordination mechanisms. The evaluation includes the entire Sendong project and all components

including both ILO and AusAid resources and will have a duration of 1 month, including a field mission. The full terms of reference for the evaluation are included in the Annexes.

3.2 LIMITATIONS

Limitations to the evaluation include the lack of an independent local translator during the field mission — this was addressed through the participation of project staff in focus group discussions and interviews. However this might have had some minor influence on the neutrality of the responses given by some of the less forthright stakeholders. Limited encouragement given to and enthusiasm from institutional stakeholders, other than implementing partners, meant that participation and feedback in the stakeholder workshop was insubstantial.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

4.1 DETAILS ON METHODOLOGY

The following quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the evaluation:

- **Desk review of relevant documents:** Project document, first progress report, project monitoring documents and ILO Philippines Decent Work Country Programme².
- **Review of technical products:** Training manuals, technical guidelines and other products developed by the project.
- **Interviews with key informants:** Semi-structured interviews to provide first-hand knowledge of project operations [ILO, the donor and local/regional government].
- **On-site observation** through visits to project sites: To record information on how the project operates [activities, processes, social interactions & observable results]. Sites were chosen in consultation between project staff and the evaluator in order to reflect the range of type of sub-project implemented.
- **Focus Group Interviews:** With small groups of beneficiaries and implementing partners to explore stakeholder opinions/judgements about the project. One focus group discussion was held during each site visit – further details of who and how many participated are included in the annex.

An informal participatory approach allowed beneficiaries and stakeholders to raise concerns and issues outside of the guiding questions. The stakeholders also had an opportunity to review initial evaluation results in a stakeholder workshop.

4.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The detailed evaluation questions, which were based around the above criteria and the evaluation framework included in the terms of reference, are included in the Annexes.

5. PROJECT STATUS AND FINDINGS

5.1 OVERALL RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

² The following documents were not available for review: The Impact Evaluation and ILO guidelines developed on climate change resilience and environmentally friendly rehabilitation and reconstruction.

How the project has supported community recovery and long term response, matching beneficiary needs and supporting ILO and partner agendas as well as coordinating with complementing other donor responses.

5.1.1 OVERALL STRATEGIC FIT AND ADDRESSING RECOVERY

- The technological approach to and type of sub-projects identified matched with the needs, building on existing skills and suiting the topography and local conditions — beneficiaries and implementing partners think that the recovery of their livelihood is being addressed appropriately.

The project developed and implemented sub-projects which addressed the livelihood recovery needs of farmers and fisherfolk, through SALT or contour farms, communal gardens, riverbank protection works [protecting low lying vegetable farms] and fish cage reconstruction, etc. Both farmers and fisherfolk appear to be satisfied that the project helped to recover their livelihood because it built on their inherent skills and knowledge as farmers or fishermen. Comments were made that the ILO work was more technically sound than similar work undertaken previously, by government agencies.

The SALT farming naturally suited the topography in Iligan [only a few SALT projects were undertaken in CdO] and supports the approach of the City Agriculturalist Office [CAO]. The educational study tour made to Claveria³, made with farmers and CAO, put the technology within understandable reach and inspired the farmers to take up the idea wholeheartedly — although there are some differences in the method finally applied under the project [such as farmers choice to use cut and fill rather than contouring, which has minimal disturbance]. The support of CAO, the accessibility of such examples and the new work of the project raises the good possibility that the concept will be taken up by other farmers in the surrounding areas. The technological approach used, suits labour intensive infrastructure development and the method addresses issues of soil erosion and the shortage of affordable arable land in the area — making it fitting to the desires of the farmers. The CAO claimed that contour farms are also much more productive and easier to manage, with most untapped farming potential in Iligan being sloping land.

In support of the SALT works the project also addressed the need for improved farm to market roads in rural areas. Beneficiaries commented that poorly maintained rural roads are a common problem in all hinterland areas of Iligan — where they have to transport their produce using water buffaloor horses. The construction of some culverts and other farm-to-market road improvements works, such as reinforced concrete pipes as cross drains, addressed this problem, enhancing mobility and accessibility among upland farmers, in the communities where the project worked and also surrounding villages.

5.1.2 DECENT WORK AGENDA

- The ILO decent work agenda⁴ is addressed through the use of PPEs [Personal Protective Equipment], social and health protection and decent wages in all sub-projects.

³ Pictures of the event can be seen at:

<https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.155256851316233.1073741827.145895698919015&type=1>

⁴ The ILO Decent Work Agenda has four strategic objectives

DOLE has commented they have benefitted from ILOs introduction of the decent work principles. This includes promoting a change from paying 75% to 100% of minimum wage for cash-for-work or emergency employment — which was applied in the implemented sub-projects. Healthcare was provided by the employment of nurses under each sub-project, monitoring the workers health before and during work. Although very few serious accidents were reported the workers appreciated their presence. In fact it appears that several of the farming associations visited seemed to miss the medical support when the sub-project was completed, requesting assistance in obtaining additional medicine afterwards.

One partner raised a concern that the accident insurance affordable with the budget provided by the project and from companies suggested by the project, did not cover serious accidents and therefore did not justify the effort required to obtain such insurance for each individual worker. As an alternative it was suggested that the ILO or the project team could obtain group insurance for all workers and in so doing reduce administrative costs, negotiate better rates and ensure appropriate coverage. However none of the other implementing partners reported such difficulties.

The project addressed the needs of disadvantaged workers through one small sub-project constructing a gravel road, undertaken with the NGO CBM [Christian Blind Mission] and the members of FTI [Foundation for These-Abled Persons Inc.]. However CBM is interested in a deeper engagement with ILO to develop a country wide strategy on how to address the livelihood of disabled persons in post-disaster situations.

5.1.3 CASH-FOR-WORK AND EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT

- Emergency employment has become an accepted practice in the Philippines and DOLE and DSWD are the key links to other agencies involved. The project developed a model for a beneficiary database — combining data from DSWD and DOLE.

With ILOs involvement, DSWD issued cash-for-work guidelines in 2008. Currently with some influence from ILO, the Secretary of DSWD is in favour of a review of these guidelines, including an official increase in the rate of assistance from 75% to 100% of minimum wage. As recently as October 2013 the livelihood cluster, co-chaired by DSWD and ILO⁵, agreed on an MoU outlining the common approach to livelihood recovery and development, covering decent work principles and adoption of minimum standards for cash-for-work.

Under the short term [emergency employment] response component, project documents indicate that amongst others, the work undertaken included drainage de-clogging, tree

-
- *Promotion and standards of fundamental principles and rights at work [international labour standards, decent work] — **guaranteeing rights at work/disadvantaged poor workers***
 - *Creation of greater opportunities for women and men to decent employment and income [global promotion of job rich growth and employment agenda] — **creating jobs***
 - *Enhancing coverage and effectiveness of social protection [UN basic right promoting social consensus and fair growth] — **extending social protection/safe working conditions, adequate rest, free time, compensation, healthcare***
 - *Strengthen tripartism and social dialogue [negotiation, consultation and exchange of information between governments, employers and workers on issues of common interest] — **promoting social dialogue***

⁵ Members of the livelihood cluster include, but not limited to DOLE, TESDA, SSS, UNFPA, IOM, WFP, UNDP, TESDA, ACF and AusAID

planting & slope protection, bunkhouse construction, construction of permanent shelters and repair of community infrastructure [school perimeter walls, classroom repair, water supplies, farm to market roads and a gravel access road]. However this work only began in April or May 2012 at the earliest, which was about 5 months after Sendong hit, because of the time taken to negotiate the ILO management fee with the donor [given the lack of a partnership agreement]. During meetings DOLE repeatedly referred to CFW being a quick response approach; however this was probably in reference to the use of their own livelihood programme funding. ILO supported DOLE in this work, using internally sourced funds, only at the end of March 2012; therefore this component addressed the objective of “clearing affected areas and giving way for relief” — such as clearing of debris — only in a limited way.

Setting clear criteria for selecting priority beneficiaries was recognized as a key step in the emergency employment process. Criteria based beneficiary selection in the worst hit Barangays has been identified as a key stage in the emergency employment process. Early on the project noted that before OCHA became involved there was not much coordination between actors delivering humanitarian assistance, with a consequent rush to the most devastated areas. Therefore the project examined the regional databases of DOLE and DSWD and found inconsistencies, duplicated entries and encoding errors. In response the project commissioned the design of a searchable and criteria based model database which was tested in Davao Oriental in the response to Typhoon Pablo. Although the database was not applied under this project and is still under development it needs to be further promoted with the appropriate government agency such as DSWD. DOLE at the national level has been developing a similar combined database and there is potential for the projects work to complement and assist in this.

5.1.4 COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER DONOR RESPONSES

- The project has collaborated with other agencies through the livelihood cluster — using the cluster to establish links to line agencies, potential partners, sub-projects and LGUs. Through the cluster, the project helped prepare Barangay level base maps to indicate streets covered by cash-for-work activities, to identify gaps, overlaps or opportunities for cooperation among actors.

The project took advantage of ILOs position as co-chair of the livelihood cluster to tune into the needs and priorities of LGUs and government line agencies. Emergency employment activities were largely undertaken with DOLE, ILOs traditional partner. Through sub-projects the project also collaborated with civil society organisations such as the Rotary Club; NGOs such as CBM/FTI and Pailig [also known as PDFI — Pailig Development Foundation, Inc.]; INGOs such as IOM [International Organisation for Migration]; LGUs through Barangay Captains; and city based government agencies such as CAO and APO [Agricultural Productivity Office]. However the project did not directly engage with other international organisations such as UNDP, FAO or WFP [because of some incompatibilities in approach] except through its work with the livelihood cluster.

Identification of implementing partners was at first difficult and although the project tried to work with WFP this did not materialise. Agricultural sub-projects were implemented in collaboration with the city agricultural offices [rather than the Department of Agriculture] as agricultural extension workers are now under local government units.

5.1.5 SUPPORT TO THE LIVELIHOOD CLUSTER

- The ILO along with DSWD co-chairs the livelihood cluster which met regularly in Iligan on Fridays and in Cagayan de Oro on Mondays. Through the project the livelihood cluster was supported by the commissioning of livelihood impact studies in Iligan [by Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology] and in Cagayan de Oro [by Capitol University].

In Iligan the study looked at sources of employment and livelihood prior to Typhoon Sendong, the impact of Sendong on livelihood capacities and alternative sources of employment taken up by survivors to cope with the calamity. The report concluded that the typhoon did not adversely affect the business climate but that the most vulnerable to livelihood damage were those with few physical assets, no savings and limited access to assistance programmes prior to the disaster. The inventory of resources indicated untapped agricultural land, potential for a bamboo industry and natural resources which could become ecotourism attractions. IDPs were identified as having skills in farming, fishing and construction but lacking in community and social organisation in the relocation sites.

In CdO the study gathered data on the livelihood status and labour profile of affected families in 29 Barangays. As with Iligan the report concluded that the disaster had the most impact in micro and small business establishments operating in the households in the affected areas, in the manufacturing, utility, agriculture and forestry sectors. Again, repeating the findings in Iligan, the study noted that the business climate picked up only 3 months after the disaster struck, with an increase in employment opportunities in infrastructure development.

5.2 VALIDITY OF DESIGN

Whether the design met the objectives and considered local partner capacity, knowledge and [green] technology, relevant approaches to the situation on the ground and whether it identified and managed risks, assumptions and realistic indicators

5.2.1 TRAINING NEEDS AND LOCAL RESOURCE BASED APPROACH

- The local resource based approach has enabled sub-projects to be built on existing skills and knowledge, negating the need for formal training and making use of partners and beneficiaries own knowledge and experience. Building on established associations with administrative experience made the sub-projects easier to implement and manage on the part of the ILO team.

Training for the agricultural and fishery sub-projects, when needed, was provided through a combination of resources from the project and from CAO or APO. However some communal garden projects were largely a reinstatement, at a larger scale, of what the beneficiaries had been doing and what they had been trained in, before. Some associations also had members with agricultural backgrounds and generally farmers and fisherfolk did not need training unless new techniques or production methods were introduced. Likewise the mangrove reforestation works depended on the local knowledge and experience regarding mangrove species.

Thus the sub-projects which seemed to be most successful and most likely to be sustainable were those where the associations were well established, united, with strong leadership and had previous training and knowledge — and where the work undertaken reinforced previous occupations, rather than tried to establish new organisations and skills. These groups were confident of the income they would gain through their project and were able to manage finances and administration with little outside support.

This local knowledge and experience was not always a guarantee of success or trouble free implementation. The project also had to negotiate contract terms with associations, facilitate access to land and provide fishing gear and accessories – things which CAO and APO do not normally address.

For the community contracting groups it was deemed essential, to improve their chances of success, that they should be well organised and provided with proper training. Thus a key preparatory element concerned organising the potential members, identifying strong leaders and providing training in basic accounting and bookkeeping — which was done by the project or the city agricultural organisations. Establishing the community contracting groups required a long process of on-the-job training and gradual build-up of experience, beginning with the cash-for-work. Providing on-the-job training was dependent on having another technical partner like the Rotary Club.

5.2.2 LOCAL AGENCY RESOURCES AND CAPACITY BUILDING

- Collaboration with the city agricultural agencies, local NGOs and civil society organisations has been successful, however government agencies lack technical capacity and have limited human and financial resources. Project time commitments and the budget to undertake capacity building were not anticipated.

Collaboration with APO and CAO proved to be successful with the agencies providing technical assistance, training and counterpart contributions such as fingerlings and seeds [though not always for free]. The CAO in Iligan however had limited technical resources [with only 2 staff overseeing 16 sites] although they clearly had an influence on the sub-project design and will continue to do so after the ILO has gone. The lack of CAO technical assistance was countered by assistance from the ILO project team — although this did seem to create some discord. In CdO where each sub-project was assisted by a technician, the assistance provided was significantly more comprehensive.

No outputs were included in the project document on capacity building of local implementing partners and newly formed community contracting groups, although this took up a lot of the project teams time and changing mind-sets of community-based associations is vital to sustain the developed livelihood. In future projects, if there is to be an emphasis on local resourced based approach, this component could be more carefully planned [carefully considering how to achieve behavioural change] and budgeted for. Although the project attempted to commission training from TESDA, their quoted costs were found to be unaffordable.

5.2.3 GREEN, ORGANIC AND APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY

- Farmers and fisherfolk were able to speak eloquently and with confidence regarding organic farming, protecting and managing the environment and forests.

The leaders of the farmers associations undertaking SALT sub-projects were particularly aware of the causes and danger of landslides and topsoil erosion — and were confident of the positive impacts of the sub-projects on the environment. The terraces developed transformed previously idle land with the network of drainage canals channelling run off to fish ponds. ILO also provided technical inputs such as the need to set aside and later replace topsoil. Organic farming seemed to be a common direction and the farmers understood about using natural fertilisers [including compost from waste recovery facilities] and insecticides and preferred not to use GM seeds if traditional alternatives were available.

Agricultural members of some of the associations and the project team were able to introduce green and organic technology such as liquid fertiliser, vermicast⁶ composting and organic fungicide. Madre de Cacao⁷ was used to make living walls for the terracing work, the leaves of which can also be used in fertiliser.

On the whole sub-projects utilised local technologies without introducing new approaches. However the idea of using tree guards during reforestation work seemed to some groups, to be a new concept and the beneficiaries said that they had added something new to their stock of farming knowledge. Nevertheless there were some remarks made about the cost, shortage and appropriateness of using timber to make tree guards, with alternatives such as logging off-cuts being proposed and in one case bamboo and cement bags being used as a more affordable alternative – though where animals roam it is important to also ensure that the tree guard is appropriately functional. Attempts to develop Hollow Concrete Block production by community contracting groups, as a livelihood activity, were not successful, because the users of CHB in housing construction already had accredited suppliers.

5.2.4 RISKS, ASSUMPTIONS AND INDICATORS

- Risks and assumptions were foreseen in the project document and in the main did not impact on the implementation except regarding the reassignment of staff to another disaster response. Indicators were straightforward and easily verified.

Key risks identified in the project document included difficulty in identifying sub-projects and community capacity to adopt community contracting, as well as doubts about government agency commitment to adopting and using the strategies and guides developed. The latter risk can only be assessed when reviewing the impact of the project after one or more years. The risk of difficulties in taking up community contracting, being understood at the outset, were addressed by the steady commitment and hard work of the project team in developing community contracting entities.

Assumptions in the project document included similar issues as above but also identified the possibility of another natural disaster impacting on the work and the continuing activity of the livelihood cluster. Typhoon Pablo, which hit about a year after Sendong, did affect the region, as did Tropical Storm Podul [locally known as Zoraida] — however the indirect impact of Pablo was in regard to reassignment of staff as noted below under resource management. As expected the activity of the livelihood cluster did dwindle — especially after the local elections [of Mayors and Barangays] when heads of regional offices changed. However by this point cash-for-work had already been implemented and links had been established with agencies NGOs, etc.

Indicators and means of verification against objectives and outputs in the project document were largely straightforward and quantitative. Indicators on number of sub-contracts, numbers of people employed and work days created were easily monitored and reported. However an impact evaluation has not yet been carried out [to verify

⁶ Vermicast is an organic/natural fertiliser that is created by using composting earthworms — in the Philippines most commonly used are ‘African Night Crawlers’

⁷ *Gliricidia sepium*, is a medium size, nitrogen-fixing, leguminous tree [that can grow from 10 to 12 meters high] belonging to the family Fabaceae.

number of communities affected and households with increased income], the number of livelihood meetings has not yet been reported and the number of national and local officials trained has not yet been recorded.

5.3 GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION

What lessons were learnt in gender promotion and whether skills were identified & strengthened by gender, disaggregated data collected, mainstreaming tools/expertise used and if benefits accrued equally.

5.3.1 GENDER EQUALITY TARGETS

- In many of the SALT projects visited the majority of workers were men. Even though gender equality targets do not appear to have been set, normal targets for similar work were not achieved in the livelihood recovery component and shortfalls should have been detected during the project and addressed.

The following table indicates the disaggregated data collected on the sub-projects implemented:

	Number of workers				
	Women		Men		Total
Cash-for-work	736	37%	1,272	63%	2,008
Livelihood recovery	287	27%	783	73%	1,070
	Number of projects where % of women workers is 35 or higher		Number of projects where % of men workers is 35 or higher		
Number of sub-projects	10	30%	23	70%	33

No gender equality target was set in the project document. However in parallel cash-for-work projects [CERF funded project in Davao Oriental] a target of 35% was set. Thus according to the table above [which is based on the most recent information provided to the consultant by the project team — as of September 2013] gender targets for emergency employment were achieved. However in livelihood development and recovery sub-projects the overall achievement fell short by 7 percentage points. This shortfall is even more apparent when the number of projects with 35% or more women workers is examined — the result being that only 30% of the projects had 35% or more [the overall % is bolstered by three projects with more than 70% women workers]. This was verified by reports made during meetings with the majority of the SALT projects visited and at least one of the fisherfolk projects — in one project it was even reported that women doing the work was “not allowed”.

The project team reported that gender equality was encouraged but these shortfalls were not detected. The issue could have been picked up on earlier and should have been checked when the project proponent submitted lists of workers, when at least some advocacy work and discussion could have taken place. Supplementary to this shortfall during at least two visits to sub-projects, the implementing partners requested support for sub-projects that particularly target women.

The project team were confident they had met gender targets and did not seek any expertise other than having a Gender and Development checklist [not technically speaking a gender audit] completed by an assigned staff member in Manila-CO. This

checklist, completed through an interview with the Iligan based project officer, indicated that the project was gender sensitive.

5.3.2 PREGNANCY AND SAFETY

- There were several instances noted during visits of pregnant women undertaking labour and special protection seems to have been neglected.

Although the APO mentioned that the project had raised their awareness of gender issues and safety at work because of ILO policies about pregnant women undertaking heavy work, there were several instances noted of pregnant women undertaking work in SALT projects. Whilst their right to continue work should be recognised, it was not clear from either project staff or nurses whether the special protection required for pregnant women to prevent harm to themselves or their infants' health, were fully understood.

5.4 IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

What greatest and least achievements are, constraining factors, supporting institutional arrangements, cooperative interactions between components, main challenges and impact of external factors?

5.4.1 PROGRESS AND OVERALL ACHIEVEMENTS

The following table summarises the achievements in terms of number of projects, number of work days created and number of workers employed:

	No. projects	Number of workers						
		CdO		Iligan		Misamis Oriental		Total
Cash-for-work	27	1,173	58%	607	30%	228	11%	2,008
Livelihood recovery	35	255	24%	815	76%			1,070
Total	62	1,416		1,422				3,066
		Numbers of work days generated						
Cash-for-work	27	26,175	66%	11,495	29%	2,280	6%	39,950
Livelihood recovery	35	5,672	19%	24,716	81%			30,388
Total	62	31,847		36,211		2,280		70,338

Note that the number of workers employed under cash-for-work includes 824 [41%] and 14,970 work days under a DOLE contract which are not disaggregated between CdO and Iligan — so this figure was divided equally between the two in the above calculations.

The number of cash-for-work sub-projects includes two which appear to be pending in the information provided. Figures for number of workers and work days have not yet been generated. Likewise the number of livelihood sub-projects includes two pending cases for which figures have not yet been provided.

Of the cash-for-work sub-projects implemented 18 [73%] were undertaken in CdO, 1 in Misamis Oriental and 5 in Iligan [with one project under DOLE shared between CdO and Iligan]. Of the livelihood recovery projects 29 [82%] were undertaken in Iligan and just 6 in CdO. It has not been explained why the projects are spread geographically this way — although this would indicate that more clearing of debris and community infrastructure work was needed in CdO and that livelihood development and recovery sub-projects were easier to identify in Iligan.

The following table compares the above achievements with the targeted figures:

	Total achieved	Number of workers		
		Target	Difference	
Cash-for-work	2,008	2,000	+8	0.30%
Livelihood recovery	1,070	400	+670	165%
Total	3,066	2,400	+678	28%
Numbers of work days generated				
Cash-for-work	39,950	50,000	-10,050	-20%
Livelihood recovery	30,388	32,000	-1,612	-5%
Total	70,338	82,000	-11,662	-14%

- The above tables indicate that [at the time of writing] the project managed to employ about 28% more workers overall than targeted but fell short by about 14% on the overall target for number of work days generated. Thus more than the number of workers expected were employed but they worked for fewer number of days than projected. It is worthwhile to note that the above calculation of workdays generated does not reflect the workdays generated in the longer term as a result of the intervention – such as fishermen being able to fish every 3 days instead of every 14 days.

5.4.2 CASH-FOR-WORK AND DOLE

- The initial phase of cash-for-work/emergency employment with DOLE was easily managed and the relationship with ILO is harmonious and complementary. DOLE now support workers being paid 100% of the minimum wage and are considering an increase in the minimum number of CFW days. However the team faced some common problems with liquidation and therefore also sought to undertake cash-for-work with other conduit organisations.

As can be seen in the above tables 41% of the workers under cash-for-work were employed through a contract with DOLE. In meetings with DOLE it was clear that the division of roles and responsibilities between the two organisations in undertaking cash-for-work or emergency employment, is very well understood — with ILO providing technical guidance and assisting in identifying where clearing work is needed and DOLE working on beneficiary identification, administration and the payroll. However there were some difficulties faced in liquidation of expenses and the first tranche — and as a result the project team initiated more CFW with conduit organisations.

As mentioned before, DOLE have taken on board the ILO decent work principles and are supporting an increase in the standard CFW payment. In the government's own

emergency employment programme they also now provide PPEs and social insurance although they are not able to include PhilHealth coverage because of a lack of budget. DOLE is also now considering increasing the minimum standard for CFW days to 15 days full time or 30 days half time [instead of the 10 day standard set in the DSWD guidelines]. The objective here is to allow people time to attend to their other needs in times of calamity.

5.4.3 BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION

- The majority of beneficiaries that were met⁸ expressed their satisfaction with the wages, PPEs, social and health protection — though expressing doubts that they would be able to continue SSS payments. Farmer and fisherfolk associations also reported that the work strengthened their organisations.

Beneficiaries particularly recognised the comparative advantage of ILO through the provision of social and health protection and the use of PPEs, which they said they hadn't experienced before. Throughout the sub-projects visits made, it was obvious that people had enjoyed the work, which helped bond their new organisation together or strengthen existing ties. Workers also very much appreciated the steady wages, which although set at minimum level were considered relatively high and exceptional — and which enabled some to pay off debts. Although the majority expressed doubts about continuing social protection payments [saying that this is too ambitious] one association said that once they generate enough income, they will pay SSS dues on behalf of their members.

5.4.4 CHALLENGES OF TERRAIN AND LOCATION

- The remoteness of some of many of the sub-project sites presented a challenge to both partners and the project team.

Many sites either had poor access roads or required several hours walk along river banks. This presented a challenge to both the workers — especially those working along the river — and to project monitoring and nursing staff. The workers overcame this through the cooperative assistance of the Barangays who in some cases provided transportation for materials and workers. The project also provided staff and technicians at the APO office with a transportation allowance.

5.4.5 CHALLENGES OF COMMUNITY CONTRACTING

- Community contracting was the most challenging type of sub-project and some of the groups formed might disband. This is because members have different backgrounds, skills and former livelihoods and have been only brought together by circumstance. Their success depends on good leadership — and efforts from the project team.

Community contracting was mostly undertaken with IDPs and residents of relocation sites. Initially potential members and leaders were identified whilst cash-for-work was being undertaken. Working through a conduit organisation such as the Rotary Club or the PDFI newly formed groups were given on-the-job training [which was considered vital in order to become skilled workers] and eventually took on contracts such as resettlement housing

⁸ Refer to Annex 8 for numbers

construction and school perimeter wall construction unassisted, either directly with ILO or with other actors such as Habitat for Humanity.

However some leaders of the community contracting groups engendered discontent amongst their workers and in CdO one group has already disbanded. The project team also had to put considerable effort into organising, developing and supporting the newly formed contracting groups, providing them with training in administration and finance and small contract management. Of the total 30,388 work days generated under the livelihood recovery component 6,720 [22%] days were generated through community contracts.

- DOLE is interested to develop the community contracting component and there is much scope for construction work in the extensive housing reconstruction required in post-disaster situations.

The focus of DOLE in community contracting would be on the unenforced law⁹ that says that 50% of skilled workers and 30% of unskilled workers should come from the locality where the project is being done. DOLE is also aware that, for example in the response to typhoon Haiyan [Yolanda], there would be a need to build up to 400,000 new housing units but that there is a shortfall of at least 120,000¹⁰ construction workers in the region — this is therefore a significant opportunity for skills training, community contracting and livelihood development.

5.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

Whether the project has managed resources efficiently, including timely delivery of funds & needs, hindering factors and counter-measures.

5.5.1 SMALL PROJECT TEAMS

- The project has been set up with a minimal number of staff — instead tapping into local resources such as government agencies and local NGOs.

The full time project team in Iligan consisted of a project officer, a driver and an administration and finance officer. In CdO only one project officer was working full time on the project. In addition monitoring, nursing and engineering staff were contracted as required. As mentioned earlier technical assistance came in the form of staff and technicians from APO, CAO as well as from 'conduit' NGOs/CSOs. Such small teams in combination with the number and spread of sub-projects indicates an efficient use of human resources.

5.5.2 TEMPORARY REASSIGNMENT OF STAFF AND PROJECT TIMING

- The two lead staff members in CdO and Iligan were both temporarily assigned to work consecutively on Pablo response projects — this resulted in a lull in project activities for

⁹ Republic Act No. 6685 requires construction companies, including the Department of Public Works and Highways and contractors for government-funded infrastructure projects, to hire thirty percent (30%) of skilled and fifty percent (50%) of unskilled labor requirements from the areas where the project is constructed/located.

¹⁰ These figures are based purely on a meeting with the Director of the DOLE Department of Local Employment and cannot be verified.

several months, delays in starting sub-projects and uncertainty about project approval. The time required for social preparation was also not anticipated.

The lull in project activities occurred in the early months of 2013 in Iligan and from May to August 2013 in CdO. During this time sub-projects that had been proposed did not move forward and implementing partners and associations were uncertain whether some sub-projects would push through. The lull in activities may have also impacted on the smoothness of the intended transition from CFW to longer term livelihood recovery.

As a consequence preparation time and momentum for some sub-projects was lost and towards the end of the overall time frame some projects were being hurried through [some projects visited were only half way through with less than two weeks remaining]. This may have impacted on the projects ability to meet targets for overall work days to be generated. One implementing partner reported that with the lull in activities it took one year for the sub-project to be approved but then they were given only a week to mobilise.

One of the biggest challenges was time — both in the time that social preparation, capacity building and ‘hand holding’ of implementing partners took, but also in the time lost because of reassignment of staff.

5.5.3 PHILHEALTH COVERAGE SAVINGS AND COSTS

- Savings in PhilHealth coverage [as a significant number of workers already have this] were not anticipated — this resulted in some partners attempting to use the savings otherwise but was addressed by withholding a third tranche in some cases.

Although it was understood early on in the project implementation that “many” workers already had PhilHealth coverage, the exact amount of savings could not be determined without a longer process of profiling, which would have delayed the initiation of sub-projects. However an approach to managing the savings generated was also not planned and thus in some cases implementing partners attempted to use the additional finance “creatively”. This was controlled by the project by withholding a third tranche of payment but may have led to some misunderstanding and dissatisfaction from implementing partners.

The project also faced some concern about the contribution required for SSS which is Php 300 if it is a voluntary contribution from the worker but Php 700 if there is an employer-employee relationship. The project managed to persuade SSS to accept the payments made by implementing partners as voluntary, but some clarification of this at a higher level might be appropriate.

An increase in PhilHealth coverage costs due in 2014 also meant that some implementing partners could only pay for half of the 6 months coverage planned. This increase was only known about after some proposals had been finalised and processed and the increases couldn’t be incorporated because the sub-projects had already gone over budget.

5.6 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Whether management arrangements, capacities, ILO and partners support were adequate, what effective approaches were used to manage implementation, LGU collaboration, data collection, tracking and stakeholder understanding of the project.

5.6.1 DIRECT PURCHASE

- In the early stages of the project, challenges regarding liquidation of purchases and reliability of quotations from implementing partners were faced — in response the project switched to direct purchasing of materials and PPEs. This was an effective compromise to achieve quick results in a post-calamity situation.

Although direct purchase by implementing partners of PPEs and materials was the preferred approach by ILO Manila CO and the approach anticipated in the project set up [and was done by DOLE for the CFW sub-projects, though not without problems], the project team found that it was not an effective use of resources to have partners [especially in livelihood recovery sub-projects] do the purchasing. This was primarily because of concerns about padded quotations. To address this, and as the project team had more experience of canvassing, suppliers and common purchasing rules, in later projects partners were only downloaded funds for social protection and wages, with the project team doing the purchase of materials and PPEs. Direct purchase also enabled some cost savings.

5.6.2 LIQUIDATION OF FIRST TRANCHE

- Many partners faced difficulties in liquidating 70% of the first tranche, so that the second tranche could be released, resulting in a delay in making workers payments. The project addressed this with more direct assistance to the associations and training on basic accounting and bookkeeping. In some cases NGO partners had to advance their own finances to cover these problems and to initiate projects on time.

The project team and virtually all implementing partners, had some difficulty in jointly preparing the first liquidation reports — in part because they had to be computerised. The APO likewise complained that they had not been given adequate and timely guidance in how to liquidate expenses, which together with the time taken to clear cheques caused some frustration and delay in paying wages — with some workers having completed the work without full pay.

To address these problems, as well as providing training in bookkeeping and basic accounting the project teams collected liquidation data much more directly when visiting the sub-project sites. Although this resulted in more prompt payments of the second tranches, it meant in a larger administration burden for the teams.

At least two of the CSO/NGO partners reported some difficulty in starting the work without the right resources and a lengthy process for liquidating purchases — both resolved this by advancing their own funds and being reimbursed later by the project. It was suggested that for short projects of 4 weeks fewer tranches may be more appropriate.

5.6.3 PROJECT BUDGETING

- Towards the end of the project there was some confusion between the project team and Manila-CO regarding the amount of unspent budget remaining, resulting in at least one sub-project being unexpectedly cancelled.

At one point during the last stages of the project the field teams were criticised for a slow delivery rate and were told they had unspent funds of more than US\$ 100,000. This figure was later revised up and down, until in the last few months the team were told that the project was running at a deficit and thus contracts were put on hold — with the figure being corrected when incorrect entries were found in the financial monitoring system. At least one sub-project was started, workers were notified, orders for PPEs were made and permits were signed by the Mayor, and then later the project had to be cancelled. Clearly

there was a problem in reconciling records between the project and Manila CO and this kind of occurrence should be avoided in future.

5.6.4 COLLABORATION WITH LGUS

- Collaboration with and involvement of LGUs varied from fairly passive to quite active depending on the relation with the association or implementing partner and on their available resources.

In some projects the Barangay helped with the purchase of fingerlings and cement or helped with providing transportation. Even though in some sub-projects the Barangay did not come through with promised contributions, all Barangays at least gave their approval for project activities. Only in one situation was it observed that the Barangay had a slightly inappropriate influence on the monitoring and disbursement of wages.

5.6.5 WORKING WITH LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

- Collaboration with agricultural agencies [through which most projects were identified] was effective — they helped develop project proposals, provided technical assistance and seeds/materials. However in Iligan resources were more scarce and there were some differences of opinion regarding technical design and some concerns regarding financial conflicts of interest.

Most of the agricultural/fisherfolk projects were identified through the APO, CAO and CDLO [Cooperative Development and Livelihood Office] offices. Cooperation with city level government appeared to be healthy, with the project team reinforcing the participatory and consultative approach taken by the agricultural offices to developing the sub-project proposals. APO was a particularly good partner as they were able to provide substantial technical assistance [with a technician on each project]; seeds and some materials — plus they had established relationships with the associations. As working with such organisations is part of their mandate sustainability of the work is ensured.

The CAO proved to be harder to work with and they had some difficulty in adjusting to working with the ILO and using ILO systems — partly because they have fewer technical resources, but still want to be the lead on the projects. They also commented that roles had not been clear in from the outset. CAO reported that they plan to expand their team by taking on 5 more staff in 2014. Although they claimed to have 5 staff supporting the sub-projects, reports in the field were that only 2 staff were assisting.

There were also some technical differences of opinion between the ILO engineer and the CAO agriculturalists on the technical design of the SALT projects, and some concern from the project team about an unhealthy interest from CAO in the associations retention money that they had put aside as savings. However all of these issues were resolved tactfully and diplomatically between the project officer and the CAO director.

5.6.6 MONITORING AND INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS

- Effective monitoring systems were developed in CdO and Iligan — though there were some differences in the way monitors were employed by ILO in each city. There were some minor comments about the quality of some construction works undertaken by community contractors.

Slightly different monitoring systems were developed by the project teams in CdO and Iligan, according to the needs of the project. The systems seemed to work well allowing

verification of actual attendance against payrolls — with the monitors having independence and some loyalty towards ILO. This was done so that collusion could be avoided because their role in signing payrolls and reporting was important for accountability and honesty. This sense of loyalty was encouraged by having the monitors either employed directly by the project in Iligan or selected by ILO and paid by the associations in CdO — both strategies seemed to have worked. The careful assignment and partnering between nurses and monitors, according to experience, in CdO was also a good support system.

The same monitoring system was also replicated in the CERF funded project in Cateel.

Infrastructure works [including perimeter walls, culverts and road improvements] were monitored by engineers taken on by the project, as well as supervising engineers from the conduit organisations — using a workplan prepared by the technician. Even so there were still some small concerns raised about the quality and accuracy of the construction works undertaken by the community contractors.

5.6.7 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND DESIGN

- Technical assistance needs, particularly in agriculture, were addressed through the combined efforts of the project team and staff from the agricultural agencies.

In CdO needed technical assistance came largely from APO and in Iligan from CAO. However, as mentioned earlier, the project team also combined efforts with these offices. In addition the overall monitor in Iligan also took on a technical role [being formerly with CAO and trained as an agriculturalist] — providing assistance at the sites and training the other monitors. It might have been more effective to take on an agriculturalist more formally, even though the need for agricultural technical assistance wasn't anticipated in the original project set up [because the work was based on the needs assessment undertaken by MSU]. This may have also helped clarify roles with CAO.

In one river bank protection project there was a concern that the plans and proposals had not been prepared very well or that at best the plans weren't followed strictly on implementation. Thus when it came to liquidation there was a mismatch, in addition to which the beneficiaries might also have had different expectations about the amount of work they would be doing and the income they would earn. This led to some minor discord between APO and the project.

- There were some inconsistencies in the technical approach taken and the result in the completed SALT projects, even though the fundamental concept is the same.

In Iligan the project officer questioned the designs prepared by CAO in the SALT projects because their approach did not follow the principle of minimal disturbance to terrain. As a result the project officer became more involved and provided some on-the-job training to the monitors.

The final design and implementation of the SALT projects seemed to depend on who provided the technical assistance, who was the "demonstrator", on the preferences and interpretation of the farmers and on the steepness of the terrain where the technology was applied. The project visited in Claveria show gently sloping terraces and small steps, however in one sub-project designed by CAO the cut of the banks was quite sharp and the terraces were wide and flat. Although looking good at the time of the visit, the stability of the soil banks will only be demonstrated to be successful following a heavy rainfall or typhoon.

CAO reported that there had already been some minor soil erosion in some of the SALT projects during Yolanda — because the hedgerows [living terrace walls] were not yet deeply rooted and the land is still unstable. Another project influenced by the ILO overall monitor [although technical assistance was also provided by CAO] was built with smaller embankments, more steps, and a grassy strip below each retaining fence — an approach which appeared to be more likely to be stable.

5.6.8 EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT

- The implementing partners managed sub-projects effectively with a good division of labour and team work. This was particularly apparent in the projects working over long distances along river banks.

Sub-projects were managed largely independently by the associations themselves — with support as needed from the project team. The groups working along the Iponan River had a particularly difficult task as a team of 50 workers had to be organised and eventually undertake tree planting work along at least 4 km of riverbank. However the associations managed their teams effectively and the targeted work was completed satisfactorily.

5.6.9 STAKEHOLDER UNDERSTANDING OF PROJECT STRATEGY

- Implementing partners and beneficiaries still referred to work done under the livelihood reconstruction component as cash-for-work

Quite often the partners and beneficiaries referred to the work undertaken in the second component as cash-for-work rather than sustainable livelihood development — requesting more cash-for-work. Clearly one of the most important benefits to the participants is the relatively substantial salary, which all groups said they were very happy with. In the Philippines cash-for-work has become a buzz word and is what the ILO have become recognised for. This is despite the emphasis in livelihood recovery being on longer term skills development and sustainable livelihoods.

5.6.10 REPORTING

- Despite a requirement for 6 monthly reports to the donor, at the time of writing only one report for the first 6 months of cash-for-work/emergency employment has been produced.

AusAID reported that their own follow up on reporting and monitoring of the project has been lacking, although the ILO should have been more proactive in producing the agreed reports and monitoring documents. Regular monitoring of sub-projects and tracking of indicators for workers employed and work days generated has been undertaken but this has not been shared with the donor and narrative reporting and general documentation is lacking. In addition to donor reports, a Gender in Development checklist was completed by ILO staff in Manila-CO. It was also intended that an impact evaluation would be carried out to assess the immediate benefits and sustainable impacts of assets created. However it appears that this has not yet been undertaken.

Reports on content and numbers of livelihood cluster meetings, training and workshop reports and general project documentation also seem to be somewhat lacking or at least have also not been available for the consultant to review.

5.7 IMPACT, SHARING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Main project impacts, impact measurement, exit strategy and strengthening of laws, policies and capacities to enable replication — plus lessons learnt.

5.7.1 OVERALL IMPACT OF THE INTERVENTION

- Completed assessments of livelihood damage have been carried out and can be used as a baseline for a future impact evaluation.

The damage assessments on the impact of the disaster on sources of livelihood and employment carried out by Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology [MSU-IIT] in Iligan and by CUREXO-IDS, Capitol University in CdO could be used as a baseline to undertake the project impact evaluation. As noted above this has not yet been carried out plus it is considered that to truly assess the longer term impact of the project, this evaluation should be carried out at least 1 year after the completion of the project.

Cash-for-work although undertaken quite some time after the disaster, still undertook necessary clearing of access roads, de-clogging of drains, etc. Along with repairs to schools, drainage construction, construction of perimeter walls providing better security for school children and school premises, farm to market road improvements and culvert construction, the project had an obvious and immediate impact on improving the local infrastructure for the recipients of the work.

5.7.2 SUSTAINABILITY AND REPLICATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

- Close work with city agricultural agencies has somewhat ensured sustainability and continuity of support to the ongoing sub-projects — although resources to do this are scarce.

APO and CAO are obvious partners, because as well as providing technical assistance and materials, this kind of support work to farmers and fisherfolk associations is their mandate anyway and therefore sustainability and continuity is somewhat ensured. APOs established working relationship with the associations also aided good cooperation between the different actors. However as mentioned previously the lack of resources both financial and human in both agencies limits the amount of support they can provide.

Although collaboration with the Barangays was sometimes limited, some resolutions have been passed and plans have been made to sustain and protect the works undertaken.

- Many of the farmers plan to replicate the SALT or contour farming approach in their own small plots of land and the agricultural offices plan to build on the undertaken SALT projects. There is also great potential for sharing the approach with other farmers in the area.

The agricultural offices are at least planning to expand into SALT 2 & 3 level projects which include agricultural livestock, poultry, cattle and planting fruit trees [agricultural forestry] — to increase productivity. Many of the farmers met have small holdings of their own and it appears that their experience on the common SALT or contour farm may inspire many of them to take up the same approach.

- Developing sustainable community contracting groups [or workers associations] and finding alternative livelihoods for IDPs in relocation sites remains one of the biggest challenges.

Generally informants and stakeholders were happy that under the ILO project, the funding went more directly to the communities, adding that they think that the government's approach to contracting and bringing external labour [with communities just receiving the works rather than participating in implementing it] is unlikely to change. However bonds

were created between the stakeholders and their interactions will make problems easier to solve in the future.

As noted under the section above, DOLE is supportive of the community contracting approach and of enforcing the law regarding the preference in using local labour. If the government's approach did change it could be a good source of work for community contractors.

The livelihood damage assessments refer to skills inventories in the relocation sites including carpentry, construction, machine operators, farming, livestock-raising, massage, cooking, food processing, laundry, vending, tailoring and upholstery. However the local resource based approach is not a totally encompassing livelihood system and although the project did make some attempts in starting projects in communal or backyard gardening, Eco-bag production, etc., external factors and other priorities for local government impeded the projects. The approach of the project also aimed to complement but not duplicate the livelihood activities of other actors. Nevertheless it is acknowledged that further understanding is needed of how the local resource based approach could offer livelihood possibilities in relocation areas.

5.7.3 IMPACT ON INCOME AND INVESTMENT IN LOCAL ECONOMY

- Most sub-projects will provide a supplementary income to the beneficiaries. Continuing work on the sub-projects will amount to full time employment but will be rotated amongst the members.

Most of the beneficiaries when asked said that the income from their SALT farming, community contracting, communal garden, fish cage, etc., would provide them with supplementary income only, having a small impact on their economic situation. They would have to continue to find other sources of income, such as their own farms or private construction work. Very few said that the sub-project would provide them with full time employment after the completion of the ILO cash-for-work part. However workers said that they would now have two potential sources of income plus new skills and experience.

Community contracting groups saw the advantage of keeping the group together because an organised group has a better chance of getting slightly more formally contracted work [although without being registered contractors they would not legally be able to sign formal contracts]. At least one community contracting group had an increase in membership, demonstrating a belief in the advantage of forming a group, and all farming and fisherfolk associations reported an improvement in solidarity and bonding in their organisation.

The following table summarises the project monitoring report on the cash injected into the local economy through the contracts and purchase of PPEs and materials:

	Achievement	Conversion	Target
Cash-for-work contracts	\$317,151.98		
Livelihood recovery contracts	\$229,657.76		

	Achievement	Conversion	Target
PPEs	\$46,346.51		
Tools	\$24,955.81		
Total investment in local economy	\$618,112.07	AU\$679,617.00	AU\$742,000.00
Accident insurance	\$7,130.23		
SSS	\$22,246.33		
PhilHealth	\$64,172.09		
Overall total	\$711,660.72	AU\$782,473.00	

- The above table indicates that the project only met the target in local economy investment if it is considered that accident insurance, SSS and PhilHealth investments are injected into the local economy.

5.7.4 SUSTAINABILITY AND ADDRESSING THE NEED

- The more established associations have clear business-like plans for the future and income sharing and savings systems set up.

All associations practiced the idea of contributing 10% of each members wage into a pool of savings, which would be used for common needs like buying seeds, replacing tools, support in medical emergencies, etc. This trust in the associations' ability to manage savings implies that the members have some certainty that the associations will endure.

Sub-projects seem to be more likely to be sustainable if the associations have been established for some time and if the work being done reinforces previous occupations, local skills and knowledge. For example the fisherfolk and the SALT farmer associations exhibited strong leadership, were more independent and more confident of their needs and future direction. Forming new organisations is harder to do; it requires more effort on the part of the ILO team, depended on having another technical partner like the Rotary Club and on a longer process of on-the-job training and gradual build-up of experience.

Thus the community contracting groups have had varied success [in finding more work after the ILO contracts] and have been harder to manage. However for urban informal communities that are affected by disasters the approach of setting up a community contracting group is one of the few options tried for rebuilding their livelihood. Unlike the community contractors, farmers and fisherfolk have a common asset [their land or access to the sea] which brings them together. This makes sustaining the community contracting

groups a challenge. However some of the groups are finding other construction work and are investing in equipment.

The majority of the SALT farming associations have agreed to give 25% of their annual net income to the landowners as rent — with a written agreement that they can use the land for 10 years. The agreements with landowners are open, in that after 10 years the SALT farming could continue. However there are no written clauses detailing under what conditions an extension could be granted — the only assurance for an extension is that the project tried to ensure that the landowners are members of the association. Most of the farmers participating in the project are either small holders or tenant farmers and the project did not attempt to address the complex issue of rural land ownership.

5.7.5 MANUALS AND GUIDES

- A post-calamity response guideline is under development and a road maintenance manual is being published. Three videos have also been produced.

The above mentioned guides and manuals have yet to be published so their influence on national and regional government policy cannot yet be ascertained — and will depend very much on national response and the pace of the government. However DOLE recommended that any manuals, guides and videos should be made available in local dialects [and presumably at least in Tagalog] if they are to have an impact at the local level. DOLE also suggested developing partnerships with multi-media and broadcast media outlets to promulgate the video material.

6. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

6.1.1 OVERALL RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

The technological approach to and type of sub-projects identified matched with the needs, building on existing skills and suiting the topography and local conditions — beneficiaries and implementing partners think that the recovery of their livelihood is being addressed appropriately.

The ILO decent work agenda is addressed through the use of PPEs [Personal Protective Equipment], social and health protection and decent wages in all sub-projects.

Emergency employment has become an accepted practice in the Philippines and DOLE and DSWD are the key links to other agencies involved. The project developed a model for a beneficiary database — combining data from DSWD and DOLE.

The project has collaborated with other agencies through the livelihood cluster — using the cluster to establish links to line agencies, potential partners, sub-projects and LGUs. Through the cluster the project helped prepare Barangay level base maps to indicate streets covered by cash-for-work activities, to identify gaps, overlaps or opportunities for cooperation among actors.

The ILO along with DSWD co-chairs why livelihood cluster which met regularly in Iligan on Fridays and in Cagayan de Oro on Mondays. Through the project the livelihood cluster was supported by the commissioning of livelihood impact studies in Iligan [by Mindanao State University-Iligan Institute of Technology] and in Cagayan de Oro [by Capitol University].

6.1.2 VALIDITY OF DESIGN

The local resource based approach has enabled sub-projects to be built on existing skills and knowledge, negating the need for formal training and making use of partners and beneficiaries own knowledge and experience. Building on established associations with administrative experience made the sub-projects easier to implement and manage on the part of the ILO team.

Collaboration with the city agricultural agencies, local NGOs and civil society organisations has been successful, however government agencies lack technical capacity and have limited human and financial resources. Project team time commitments and budget to undertake capacity building were not anticipated.

Farmers and fisherfolk were able to speak eloquently and with confidence regarding organic farming, protecting and managing the environment and forests.

Risks and assumptions were foreseen in the project document and in the main did not impact on the implementation except regarding the reassignment of staff to another disaster response. Indicators were straightforward and easily verified.

6.1.3 GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION

In many of the SALT projects visited the majority of workers were men. Even though gender equality targets do not appear to have been set, normal targets for similar work were not achieved in the livelihood recovery component and shortfalls should have been detected during the project and addressed.

6.1.4 IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

An analysis of the figures provided by the project team indicate that the project managed to employ about 28% more workers overall than targeted but fell short by about 14% on the overall target for number of work days generated. Thus more than the number of workers expected were employed but they worked for fewer number of days than projected.

The initial phase of cash-for-work/emergency employment with DOLE was easily managed and the relationship with ILO is harmonious and complementary. DOLE now support workers being paid 100% of the minimum wage and are considering an increase in the minimum number of CFW days. However the team faced some common problems with liquidation and therefore also sought to undertake cash-for-work with other conduit organisations.

Beneficiaries all expressed their satisfaction with the wages, PPEs, social and health protection — though expressing doubts that they would be able to continue SSS payments. Farmer and fisherfolk associations also reported that the work strengthened their organisations.

The remoteness of some of many of the sub-project sites presented a challenge to both partners and the project team.

Community contracting was the most challenging type of sub-project and some of the groups formed might disband. This is because members have different backgrounds, skills and former livelihoods and have been only brought together by circumstance. Their success depends on good leadership — and efforts from the project team.

DOLE is interested to develop the community contracting component and there is much scope for construction work in the extensive housing reconstruction required in post-disaster situations.

6.1.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

The project has been set up with a minimal number of staff — instead tapping into local resources such as government agencies and local NGOs.

The two lead staff members in CdO and Iligan were both temporarily assigned to work consecutively on Pablo response projects — this resulted in a lull in project activities for several months, delays in starting sub-projects and uncertainty about project approval. The time required for social preparation was also not anticipated.

Savings in PhilHealth coverage [as a significant number of workers already have this] were not anticipated — this resulted in some partners attempting to use the savings otherwise but was addressed by withholding a third tranche in some cases.

6.1.6 MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In the early stages of the project, challenges regarding liquidation of purchases and reliability of quotations from implementing partners were faced — in response the project switched to direct purchasing of materials and PPEs. This was an effective compromise to achieve quick results in a post-calamity situation.

Many partners faced difficulties in liquidating 70% of the first tranche, so that the second tranche could be released, resulting in a delay in making workers payments. The project addressed this with more direct assistance to the associations and training on basic accounting and bookkeeping. In some cases NGO partners had to advance their own finances to cover these problems and to initiate projects on time.

Towards the end of the project there was some confusion between the project team and Manila-CO regarding the amount of unspent budget remaining, resulting in at least one sub-project being unexpectedly cancelled.

Collaboration with and involvement of LGUs varied from fairly passive to quite active depending on the relation with the association or implementing partner and on their available resources.

Collaboration with agricultural agencies [through which most projects were identified] was effective — they helped develop project proposals, provided technical assistance and seeds/materials. However in Iligan resources were more scarce and there were some differences of opinion regarding technical design and some concerns regarding financial conflicts of interest.

Effective monitoring systems were developed in CdO and Iligan — though there were some differences in the way monitors were employed by ILO in each city. There were some minor comments about the quality of some construction works undertaken by community contractors.

Technical assistance needs, particularly in agriculture, were addressed through the combined efforts of the project team and staff from the agricultural agencies.

There were some inconsistencies in the technical approach taken and the result in the completed SALT projects, even though the fundamental concept is the same.

The implementing partners managed sub-projects effectively with a good division of labour and team work. This was particularly apparent in the projects working over long distances along river banks.

Implementing partners and beneficiaries still referred to work done under the livelihood reconstruction component as cash-for-work

Despite a requirement for 6 monthly reports to the donor, at the time of writing only one report for the first 6 months of cash-for-work has been produced.

6.1.7 IMPACT, SHARING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Completed assessments of livelihood damage have been carried out and can be used as a baseline for a future impact evaluation.

Close work with city agricultural agencies has somewhat ensured sustainability and continuity of support to the ongoing sub-projects — although resources to do this are scarce.

Many of the farmers plan to replicate the SALT or contour farming approach in their own small plots of land and the agricultural offices plan to build on the undertaken SALT projects. There is also great potential for sharing the approach with other farmers in the area.

Developing sustainable community contracting groups [or workers associations] and finding alternative livelihoods for IDPs in relocation sites remains one of the biggest challenges.

Most sub-projects will provide a supplementary income to the beneficiaries. Continuing work on the sub-projects will amount to full time employment but will be rotated amongst the members.

An analysis of data provided by the project team indicated that the project only met the target in local economy investment if it is considered that accident insurance, SSS and PhilHealth investments are injected into the local economy.

The more established associations have clear business-like plans for the future and income sharing and savings systems set up.

A post-calamity response guideline is under development and a road maintenance manual is being published. Three videos have also been produced.

6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

All recommendations should be primarily addressed by ILO except where noted in brackets.

1. **A systematised sub-project monitoring system could be developed and built into ILO as standard practice.** This could be based on a combination of international standards and lessons learnt under recently implemented emergency response projects including those in Davao Oriental — where similar monitoring processes have been replicated. Time taken to develop systems on an as needed basis during project implementation could be saved and repeat errors avoided.
2. **Although the project has tried to address livelihood needs in relocation areas this remains a significant challenge with a lot of external factors impacting on potential sub-projects.** Project activities were based on livelihood impact assessments and there were some doubts that the objectives of EIIP and the local resource-based approach would match with these livelihood needs. Nevertheless as there is such a major need, continuing efforts to address the issue, should be made. ILO needs to work with other stakeholders and cluster member to identify new and alternative livelihoods for IDPs [ILO and other Livelihood Cluster members].

3. **More work and advocacy with DOLE on LGU procurement processes [addressing the unenforced law] is needed to develop scope for community contracting.** DOLE is interested in further perusing the community contracting approach especially in relation to forming groups of IDPs to become involved in housing and infrastructure reconstruction. [DOLE & ILO].
4. **Future projects should plan for the possibility of including technical assistance in agriculture when working in similar situations.** Although it was not anticipated in the project set up, livelihood impact assessments, some review of local capacity in line agencies and initial identification of sub-project types should guide teams and indicate likely staffing and technical assistance needs.
5. **ILO should if at all possible avoid reassigning key project staff to other emergency response projects.** Even though this was done for short staggered periods and the project still managed to meet some of the principle targets, there was an impact on the project and the work-life balance of staff. A prepositioned emergency response team or roster might help this.
6. **Although procurement standards in Manila-CO must adhere to UN common practice, some adjustment to more flexible approaches in the field would help efficiency.** This might include finding alternatives to having inexperienced implementing partners undertaking PPE and materials purchase — such as direct purchase by the project or credit lines or prepositioning with suppliers. More flexibility and looking at alternatives might help to bridge the gap between relatively complex and high level procurement procures and the more straight forward understanding of associations of fisherfolk and farmers — as well as being more appropriate in emergency response work
7. **Clearer finance monitoring systems and closer work between administration and finance staff on the project and in Manila-CO is needed.** This would avoid unnecessary confusion about unspent budget amounts and should particularly be considered when different sources of funding are flowing into the project. Assignment of distinct finance and admin staff per project in Manila-CO might also allow such staff to more comprehensively understand project mechanisms and approaches in the field.
8. **Given the lack of resources in local agricultural agencies, ILO could continue to follow-through with support to initiated sub-projects.** This could include assistance in setting up federations of SALT farmers so that they can support each other and have a stronger voice.
9. **An assessment of the longer term impact on employment, after one or two years, is needed to really see if the project was successful in rebuilding livelihoods.** It is not realistic to attempt to assess this longer term impact at the end of the project. Time should be allowed for associations to develop and perhaps expand activities. DOLE likewise is interested in developing their capacity to monitor and evaluation the longer term post implementation impacts to see if their work really meets people's needs.
10. **When considering the replicability of the project approaches the focus should be on the local resource based and green works/jobs approach, rather than on replicating the same type of sub-projects.** SALT works and agricultural projects might not be appropriate in other post calamity situations in the Philippines.

7. LESSONS LEARNT AND POTENTIAL GOOD PRACTICES

1. **SALT or contour farming of leased land was a technique that successfully make use of untapped arable land while neatly matching with the resources, experience, knowledge, environmental/ecological concerns, organic farming approaches and financial capacity of local associations and local agricultural agencies.** Although the approach should not be replicated without due consideration in other situations, it has great potential as an approach to livelihood recovery in hilly rural areas affected by natural disasters.
2. **Community contracting and IDP involvement in infrastructure reconstruction [including housing] while a challenge to implement could be successfully replicated in many post disaster situations** and prove to be a significant source of new livelihood, where a massive amount of housing reconstruction is required. However it should be recognised that community contracting requiring more time, community organisation, effort and resources from project teams.

ANNEXES

8. LIST OF PERSONS AND/OR ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED

Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
Nov 7	Ruth Honculada-Georget	ILO	Technical Cooperation Coordination and Resource Mobilisation Officer
	Ma. Concepcion Sardaña	ILO	Senior Programme Officer
	Lawrence Jeff Johnson	ILO	ILO Country Office Director
Nov 11	Chris Donnges	ILO	Senior Specialist on Employment Intensive Investments
Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
CAGAYAN DE ORO			
Nov 13	Honorio T. Palarca	ILO	Programme Manager
	Martha Mildred D. Espano	ILO	Project Officer
	Alan M. Macaraya	DOLE, CdO	Regional Director
	Rodrigo A. Deloso	DOLE Region 10	Director II
	Ricardo de Dios	DOLE Region 10	Supervising Labor Employment Officer
	Rolando M. Pacuribot	Misamis Oriental Provincial Engineering Office	Acting Provincial/Engineer
	Eduard A. Flores	Misamis Oriental Provincial Engineering Office	Chief, Administrative Division
Nov 14	June T. Ledesma	APO/River bank protection, Iponan	Technician
	Roscoe A. Masiba	APO/River bank protection, Pagatpat	Technician
	Clarita A. Adajar	APO/Communal garden and SALT Indahag	Technician
	Alfonso Bilazil	APO/Irrigation system rehab, Mambuya	Technician
	Dino B. Camaro	APO/River bank protection, Baikingon	Technician
	Monico Pioquinto	APO/Mangrove reforestation, Bugo	Technician
	Arnel M. Balibay	APO/FMR Lumbia & river bank protection	Technician
	Jose Cabaraban	APO	Senior Agriculture technician
	Joseph P. Tambiga	BUFA	President

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
	Reyna G. Pioquinto	APO	Technician
	Edwin V. Aban	Barangay Bugo	Barangay Kagawad
	Napoleon T. Patino	BUFA	Support Staff [monitor]
	Genalyn T. Alo	BUFA	Support Staff [nurse]
	Clareta A. Adajar	APO	Technician
	Leonardo N. Lumalad	BICFA	President
	Janeta B. Pulgo	BICFA	Vice-President
	Lilibeth V. Palencia	BICFA	Secretary
	Lolita B. Pamitalan	BICFA	Treasurer
	Willy Y. Ansin	BICFA	Aud.
	Cristita S. Avancena	BICFA	PJO
	Bernardito D. Cadasnian	Indahag National Elementary School	School Principle
	Candolyn L. Quilit	Indahag National High School	School Principle
	Marilla "Mar" Paano	Rotary Club CdO	Past President
Nov 15	Noemi B. Alforte	Pedro N Roa Elementary School	School Principle
	Glenda O. Mangubai	Pedro N Roa Elementary School	Support Staff [nurse]
	Jerry M. Macadim	CUCWA	President
	Romel O. Polancos	Pedro N Roa Elementary School	Support Staff [monitor]
	Eleaquim H. Mabunay	SANFIBAI	President
	May M. Yanez	SANFIBAI	Board Member
	Randy B. Abapo	SANFIBAI	Member
Nov 15	Radi A. Paclar	SANFIBAI	Member
	Nestor B. Meriles	SANFIBAI	BOD [Board of Directors]
	Ethelinda Hangayan	SANFIBAI	BOD [Board of Directors]
	Evangeline Cadalo	SANFIBAI	Secretary
	Merry Ann E. Dela Cruz	SANFIBAI	Member
	Jouita J. Tabangco	SANFIBAI	Member
	Obsioma Jason B.	SANFIBAI	Member
	Razel T. Babatido	SANFIBAI	Member/Treasurer

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
	Fernando C. Edvolin	SANFIBAI	BOD [Board of Directors]
	Rodolfo S. Nacario	SANFIBAI	BOD [Board of Directors]
	Ciriaco O. Robbles	BIVPA	Farmer/Vice-President
	Edwin T. Mapanas	BIVPA	President
	Rasol O. Rosales	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Floresita Macapanas	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Jovito Atunan	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Eden F. Enerio	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Climaco O. Ayunan	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Jessie S. Enerio	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Conchita Rosales	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Floresita Cupat	BIVPA	Secretary
	Franchita Bacas	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Joven Rivero	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
Nov 15	Alexis Jaraula	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Joy L. Lobia	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Mariel Silana	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Juneth Jaraula	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Rodolfo Silana	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	June G. Ledesma	BIVPA	Farmer/Member
	Mr. Elmer B. Villamor	FTI Gravel Road	Project Coordinator
Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
ILIGAN			
Nov 16	Honorio T. Palarca	ILO	Programme Manager
	Liezl M. Amparo	ILO	Admin and Finance
	Eddie Ernie Albano	ILO	Driver
	Leny Lozada	ILO	Support Staff [monitor]
	Ronel Gabonada	ILO	Support Staff [monitor]
	Rey Ermac	ILO	Support Staff [monitor]
	Liezl Tingcang	ILO	Support Staff [monitor]

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
	Sabino Gutierrez	ACMAC Fishermen Association	President
	Arturo Echavez Jr.	DALIFFA	President
Nov 17	Danilo Bagares	Hindang Banana Farmers Assn.	President
	Socrates Trangia	ILO	Engineer
	Geovanni Megrenio	New Tabunan Farmers Assn.	President
	Ramil Quidlat	Bangko Farmers Association	President
	Fidelita D. Butcon	Bangko Farmers Association	Treasurer
	Teresita Cortes	Small Quarry Livelihood Association	President
Nov 18	Remegio D. Cabanog	DOLE, Lanao del Norte	Provincial Head
	Octavius Molo	CAO, Iligan City	City Agriculturist
	Juliet I. Garcia	CAO, Iligan City	Farm Division Chief
	Fernando Villaber	Hinaplanon Mason & Cement Finishers Assn.	Vice President
	Elma Quinicot	Anahawon Developing Farmers Assn.	President
	Juhniel V. Torrejos	Samahan ng Magtitipay sa Upper Tominobo	President
	Sr. Ma. Liza H. Ruedas, D.C	Daughters of Charity/Deus Caritas	
	Sr. Mary Ann M. Quincena	Daughters of Charity/Deus Caritas	
Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
Nov 20	Dominique Rubia-Tutay	DOLE [National Office], Bureau of Local Employment	Director IV
	Peter Hämmerle	CBM South East Asia & Pacific Regional Office	Regional Adviser for Livelihood
EVALUATION STAKEHOLDERS MEETING			
Nov 22	Eliaquim G. Jeston		Database Programmer
	Geovanni D. Megrino	New Tabunan Farmers Association	President
	Arturo J. Chavez	DALIFFA	
	Fortun C. Palisbo	Hinaplanon Mason & Cement Finishers Assn.	

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Date	Name	Organisation/project	Designation
METRO MANILA			
	Jerry M. Macadim	CUCWA	President
	Sabino Gutierrez	ACMAC Fishermen Association	President
	Danilo Bagares	Hindang Banana Farmers Assn.	President
	Liezl Tingcang	ILO/Anahawon Developing Farmers Assn.	Support Staff [monitor]
	Fidelita D. Butcon	Bangko Farmers Association	Treasurer
	Hilda Tidalgo	ILO	
	Reyna G. Piequinto	LGU, CdO	
	Joseph P. Tambiga	BUFA	President
	Roberto M Quijano	Pailig Development Foundation	Acting Managing Dir
	Joey R. Molina	ECOP, South Luzon	
	Jacinto B. Taala Jr.	SICIFA MPC, Indahag CdO	
	Angie P. Laban	Barangay Women Development Assn., CdO	
	Leonardo N. Lumalad	BICFA	President
	Enriginto L. Vidal	UDISFFA, Ugiaban, CdO	
	Eleaquim H. Mabunay	SANFIBAI	President
	Noemi B. Alforte	Pedro N Roa Elementary School, DepEd	School Principle
	Edwin I. Dael	CLENRO	
METRO MANILA			
Nov 25	Anne C. Orquiza	Australian Embassy, Development Cooperation [AusAID]	Portfolio Manager

9. SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND SUB-PROJECT VISITS

Date	Task	Venue	No. Days
Mon, 28 Oct - Fri, 1 Nov 2013	• Desk review of documents and preparation of inception report	Manila	3
Fri, 1 Nov 2013	• Submission of inception report		0.5
Mon, 4 - Wed, 6 Nov 2013	• Continuing desk review of documents	Manila	3
Thu, 7 - Tue, 12 Nov 2013	Interviews with stakeholders in Metro Manila/Bangkok <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Programme Officer, ILO CO-Manila • Director, ILO CO-Manila • EIIP/Decent Work Technical [DWT] support CO-Bangkok • ILO technical unit at HQ • AusAid • National Government - DOLE 	Manila	3
	EVALUATION MISSION TO CdO AND ILIGAN		
Wed, 13 Nov 2013	• Flight from Manila to Laguindingan airport • Briefing meeting with ILO CTA and Programme Officer • Meeting with CdO project team • Meeting with DOLE • Meeting with Misamis Oriental Provincial Engineering Office	CdO	1
Thu, 14 Nov 2013	Site visits and meetings with project partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [City] Agricultural Productivity Office (APO) • Bugo Fishermen Association • Indahag Farmers Association • Indahag Communal Garden Farmers Association • Indahag National HS and ES school authorities • Rotary Club of CdO past Pres. Mar Paano 	CdO	1
Fri, 15 Nov 2013	Site visits and meetings with project partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paradise Village CARP Beneficiaries Farmers Irrigators Association (PAVICABEFIA), Mambuaya • Calaanan United Construction Workers Association (CUCWA) and PN Roa school officials • Calaanan Permanent Relocation site, visit slope protection subproject • Visit riverbank tree planting/slope protection sites along Iponan River, meet with vegetable growers associations (or other conduits like Rotary, FTI or KEDRN) 	CdO	1
Sat, 16 Nov 2013	• Final meeting with CdO project team • Travel to Iligan City • Meeting with Iligan project team Site visits and meetings with project partners	Iligan	1

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Date	Task	Venue	No. Days
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fisherfolk organisations from Santiago, Acmac and Dalipuga 		
Sun, 17 Nov 2013	Site visits and meetings with community groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hindang Banana Growers Farmers Association New Tabunan Farmers Association Bangko-Contour Farmers Association Dodiongan Farmers Association Survivors Small Quarry Farmers Association 	Iligan	1
Mon, 18 Nov 2013	Site visits and meetings with project partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DOLE Provincial Office Cooperative Development and Livelihood Office City Agriculturist Office (CAO) Hinaplanon Mason and Cement Finishers Association and school authorities Anahawon Developing Farmers Association Wrap-up meeting with ILO Iligan Team 	Iligan	1
Tue, 19 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Debriefing meeting, presentation on preliminary findings and verification with the project team Travel from Laguindingan airport to Manila 	Iligan/ CdO	1
Wed, 20 - Fri, 22 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of presentation on preliminary findings of the evaluation mission 	Manila	2
Fri, 22 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation in end of project presentation at AIM 	Manila	0.5
Fri, 22 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders meeting — for joint assessment of preliminary findings, emerging recommendations and recommended areas for further consideration 	Manila	0.5
Tue, 26 - Thu, 28 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of draft evaluation report 	Manila	3
Fri, 29 Nov 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of draft report to evaluation manager 		0.5
Thu, 5 - Fri, 6 Dec 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of final evaluation report — integrating comments from ILO, AusAid and other stakeholders Preparation of evaluation summary 	Manila	2
Total			25

10. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Community-based Emergency Employment (Cash-for-Work) and Reconstruction Project

PHI/12/01/AUD

Administrative unit: ILO Country Office for Philippines
Technical Unit: Employment Intensive Investment Programme

Terms of Reference - Final Independent Evaluation

1. Background

The Philippines is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world. Disasters such as typhoons, rains, landslides, flash floods and mudslides, flooding, earthquakes and volcanoes and armed conflict affect the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of people annually.

The ILO Country Office for the Philippines is carrying out a diverse programme of activities and projects related to crisis response. These activities build on earlier initiatives demonstrated in various localities in the country.

One of these projects is the **Community-based Emergency Employment (Cash-for-Work) and Reconstruction Project**. The project was designed to implement an employment and livelihood recovery response in the aftermath of the Typhoon Sendong that struck in December 2011 in order to ensure a job-rich recovery process resilient to future natural disasters by applying a climate change adaptation approach. The project was also designed to develop specific guidelines and technical manuals that could be used in future disaster situations in the Philippines. The project would further contribute to efforts to increase local resilience and adaptation capacity of local communities and local government units in the affected areas.

The project is being implemented by ILO, and is funded by AusAid and ILO. The project budget is just over USD 1.5 million with about USD 1.3 million coming from AusAid and about USD 250,000 coming from ILO. The project is being implemented between January 2012 and 30 November 2013. The project objective is to assist communities affected by the Sendong disaster to recover through emergency employment creation and livelihood development.

The project has the following four components:

1. Rapid Employment Impact
Target: to provide 2,000 workers with short-term work opportunities, generating 50,000 workdays
2. Livelihood Cluster Work and Assessment of Damages and Losses
Purpose: to conduct a livelihoods damage assessment
3. Disaster-resilient Livelihoods and Employment Recovery Response;
Strategy: medium term employment intensive reconstruction work for 400 workers, generating 32,000 work-days
4. Mainstreaming Lessons Learned and Development of Guidelines and Technical Manuals
Output: development of a generic model for emergency employment response and produce guidelines, technical documents and training materials – Philippines specific

The following are the main planned outputs of the project:

- Generation of 82,000 workdays and income for 2,400 women and men working in flood affected barangays;
- Stimulation of the local economies by a AUD 742,000 cash injection through wages and the purchasing of local materials and supplies;
- Improved living environment and essential community infrastructure as the foundation for economic and social development;
- Increased capacity at barangay and municipal level to adapt to the negative impacts of climate change and reduce future impacts on livelihoods and living conditions;
- Increased capacity and collaboration at regional and national level to respond in crisis situations through emergency employment creation and community contracting modalities;
- Increased effectiveness of the Livelihood Clusters; and
- Guidelines and manuals to document the emergency employment approach and increased capacity for future replication.

The small project team is led by a national project manager and backstopped by a technical expert in Bangkok.

2. Purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation

The final evaluation will assess whether the Project has delivered the expected outcomes on time and within budget and provide key insights on project achievements, challenges, impacts, sustainability, involvement of stakeholders, capacity building and areas for replication.

The independent final evaluation will seek to appraise the extent to which the project partners and beneficiaries have benefited from the project's strategy and implementation arrangements specifically in terms of:

- relevance;
- effectiveness;
- efficiency;
- sustainability;
- gender equality promotion;
- monitoring and evaluation; and
- Knowledge sharing and learning environment.

The evaluation will address all the above issues during the evaluation and appraise these in the evaluation report.

To assess the achievement of the project objectives and outputs and in light of the changing and evolving nature of the project's operational environment, this independent final evaluation will also assess the following:

- the final progress made in relation to the planned achievements of the results and the immediate objectives;
- the project management, coordination mechanisms among various stakeholders in the project area and the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation in general;
- collaboration and institutional arrangements with the local Governments during implementation of the project during the timeframe of funding;

- project's experiences that can be learned with regard to promoting decent work, gender equality, rural access, environmental sustainability in crisis response work;
- a preliminary assessment of the project's direct and indirect impact across socio-economic variables as well as environmental variables;
- an assessment of the feasibility and scope for the replication of the activities demonstrated within the broader context of crisis response in the Philippines;
- Main implementation challenges encountered during the project's time frame.

The evaluation will also review the project management, overall ILO support, coordination mechanisms among the partners and the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation in general.

The scope of the evaluation includes the entire Sendong project, in all strategic components as specified in the project document, including both ILO and AusAid resources

The evaluation process will have a total duration of 1 month. The evaluator will undertake a field mission in the second week of November, and the final report will have to be available before the end of November 2013.

The evaluation will be managed by an ILO-appointed Evaluation Manager; Mr. Richard Howard who is based in Bangkok. The Project will bear the cost of the evaluation, including the cost of the Evaluation Team Leader and a national consultant. AusAid, The Government of the Philippines as well as other stakeholders will be contacted by the evaluator for inputs and observations.

The evaluation report will be in English.

The evaluation findings and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the ILO units directly involved in the implementation and day-to-day management of the Project and AusAid as the donor.

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

3. Methodology and framework

Several methods will be used to collect information including:

- Review of documents related to the project, including the initial project document, progress reports, technical assessments and reports, project monitoring documents.
- Review of technical products (training manuals, technical guidelines, etc.) and other documents and products developed by the project.
- Review of other relevant documents such as the ILO's Philippines Decent Work Country Programme, EIIP documents, CRISIS documents, etc.
- Meetings and interviews with the project team and backstopping officials both in Manila and Bangkok.
- Meetings with AusAid.
- Field visits, interviews and group discussions in Cagayan de Oro and Iligan with key stakeholders including local government, implementing partners and beneficiaries.

At the completion of the field mission, a meeting will be organised with assistance from the ILO Country Office for Philippines to share the preliminary findings with national stakeholders in the ILO Manila Office. The draft terms of reference for the evaluation and a draft evaluation report will be shared with the donor.

Relevant data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men should be considered through-out the evaluation process. The suggested analytical framework for the final evaluation of the Project is set out below and shall guide the assessment of each strategic component of the Project.

3.1 Relevance and strategic fit

- Has the Project supported the recovery of the areas affected by typhoon Sendong?
 - o To what extent does the Project make a relevant contribution to the recovery of affected communities in the selected areas
 - o Has the Project supported the realisation of the Decent Work Country Programme outcomes and the needs and priorities of ILO partners in Philippines?
- How well was the project aligned with and has it complemented other typhoon Sendong response initiatives in the area of environmental rehabilitation, rural infrastructure improvement and investments, income generation, employment creation and skills development?
- To what extent were the project objectives consistent with beneficiaries' requirements? Are those objectives still appropriate?

3.2 Validity of design

- Was the project design adequate to meet project objectives?
 - Capacity building: To what extent was the project design adequate and effective for strengthening capacities (technical and administration) in addressing the environmental, access and sustainable livelihoods development challenges faced by communities, governments and other stakeholders in response to the Sendong disaster?
 - Were the planned Project objectives, means of action and outcomes relevant, coherent and realistic to the situation on the ground? Did it address gender needs and interests?
 - o Was the capacity of various project's partners, specifically local governments and implementing partners, taken into account in the project's strategy and means of action?
 - o Did the project design adequately plan for an effective participation of local governments in the management of the project?
 - o Did the project design take into consideration local knowledge and technologies?
 - Were risks and assumptions identified and managed? To what extent have they affected the Project?
 - Were the planned monitoring and evaluation arrangements adequate?
 - o How appropriate and useful were the project's monitoring and evaluation framework, if any, including targets and indicators, in assessing the Project's progress?
 - o Were the targeted indicator values realistic and can they be tracked?
- Assess the project design in terms of its replicability in other regions /areas.

3.3 Project progress in gender equality and promotion

- Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory? Did the benefits accrue equally to men and women?
- Has the project identified/strengthened skills by gender?

3.4 Effectiveness

- Has the Project made sufficient progress towards its planned objectives and end of project outcome? In regard to the indicators of achievement, to what extent the actual results were reached against the planned target?
 - o In which areas does the Project have the greatest achievements? Why this and what have been the supporting factors?
 - o In which areas does the Project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why?
 - o What were the arrangements made by ILO that most supported the realisation of the programme's goals and were there any constraining factors?
 - o What have been the demonstrated synergies among the 4 different strategic components?

3.5 Efficiency of resource use

- In what ways has the Project used the ILO managed programme resources efficiently (funds, human resources, etc.)? Could things have been done differently or more efficiently?
- Have Project funds and activities been delivered by ILO in a timely manner? What are the factors that have hindered timely delivery of project funds and the counter-measures that were put in place in lights of delayed delivery of project funds?

3.6 Management arrangements including monitoring and evaluation

- Were management capacities and arrangement adequate and did they facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Was there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
 - o Did the Project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its partners, especially local governments and DOLE? Did implementing partners provide for effective Project implementation?
 - o Did the project stakeholder coordination activities contribute to greater programme synchronisation between the Project and other Sendong response initiatives?
 - o Did the project stakeholders have a good grasp of the project strategy? How do the project stakeholders contribute to the success of the project?
 - o Has cooperation with project stakeholders been efficient?
- How effectively did the Project management and ILO monitor project performance and results?
 - o Was a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective has it been?
 - o Have appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values been defined?
 - o Has relevant information and data systematically been collected? Was reporting satisfactory? Was data disaggregated by sex (and by other characteristics, if relevant)?
 - o Has information being regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?
- Has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been adapted and utilised?
- Has the Project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other ILO projects and with other donor's projects in Philippines (Sendong and Pablo affected areas)?

3.7 Impact and sustainability

- What have been the impacts of the Project? Are there any more likely impacts in the future?
 - o What is the project's impact in terms of livelihood response?
 - o What are the arrangements to measure the Project's impact during and at the end of the project? Are these arrangements adequate and will they deliver reliable findings?
 - o In how far has the Project made a contribution to the broader, longer-term Sendong response strategy or actions?
- Has there been an effective and realistic exit strategy for the Project?
 - o Are local governments and implementing partners able, willing and committed to continue with similar interventions?
 - o Has the Project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, technical capacities, local knowledge, people's attitudes, etc.)?
- How likely is it that the procedures and tools developed by the project will be replicated in future disaster situations?

4. Deliverables

The evaluator will provide:

1. A short inception report, prior to the field mission, including the work plan and details on methods, data sources, interviews, participatory methodologies, draft mission schedule and draft report format. This report should also provide a review of the available documents. It should set out the evaluation

- instruments (which include the key questions, participatory workshop and data gathering/and analysis methods) and any changes proposed to the methodology or any other issues of importance.
2. A PowerPoint presentation on the preliminary findings of the evaluation mission at a stakeholders' meeting to be held in Manila at the end of the evaluation mission, for the purpose of providing the project's stakeholders a chance to jointly assess the adequacy of the findings and emerging recommendations as well as recommend areas for further considerations by the evaluators.
 3. A draft evaluation report of no longer than 20 pages, excluding annexes. It will contain an executive summary, a section with project achievements to date, findings and recommendations for similar future initiatives. The report should be set-up in line with the ILO's 'Quality Checklists 5 and 6' for Evaluation Reports which will be provided to the evaluator.
 4. A final evaluation report, which integrates comments from ILO, AusAid and other project stakeholders. The evaluation summary according to ILO template will also be drafted by the evaluator together with the finalised evaluation report.

The evaluation report should include

- Title page (standard ILO template)
- Table of contents
- Executive summary (standard ILO template)
- Acronyms
- Background and project description
- Purpose of evaluation
- Evaluation methodology and evaluation questions
- Project status and findings by outcome and overall
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Lessons learnt and potential good practices (please provide also template annex as per ILO guidelines on Evaluation lessons learnt and good practices) and models of intervention
- Annexes (list of interviews, overview of meetings, proceedings stakeholder meetings, other relevant information)

The deliverables will be circulated to stakeholders by the evaluation manager and technical clearance for the deliverables will come from the evaluation manager.

5. Management arrangements and time frame

The evaluation will be funded from the Project budget. The ILO has appointed Mr. Richard Howard, based in ILO Bangkok, as the Project Evaluation Manager. He will be in charge of the selection of the consultants in consultation with the EIIP technical backstopping official (DWT Bangkok), the evaluation manager in ILO's Regional Office in Bangkok and ILO Manila Office management in Manila, which is in charge of ILO programmes in Philippines. These ILO offices will also handle all contractual arrangements with the evaluation team and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

The evaluation team reports to the evaluation manager, Mr. Richard Howard. The team leader (or evaluator) is an international consultant selected through a competitive process from a list of available and qualified consultants. A national consultant chosen from a list of qualified consultants will assist the team leader.

The international consultant will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods as mentioned above. The national consultant provides support to the team leader particularly during the evaluation mission as requested by the team leader.

Specific tasks of the national consultant are as follows:

- To review relevant project documents;
- To provide support to the International consultant throughout the evaluation process particularly during the evaluation mission. This includes assisting in local language translation where necessary.
- To jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop with the team leader; local beneficiaries and staff
- To contribute to the draft and finalisation of the evaluation report to be written by the International consultant.

6. Section / Qualification of evaluation

- One independent international evaluation specialist with a relevant degree. He/she should have a proven track record in the evaluation of similar projects, experience with country situations similar to that of Philippines and with crisis response programmes. Experience in the employment and environmental field will be an advantage.
- One national consultant with expertise in crisis response and environmental engineering. Familiarity with employment creation and poverty reduction schemes in rural areas will be a distinct advantage.

Stakeholders' role: All stakeholders particularly the project teams ILO CO-Manila, DWT/CO-Bangkok, ILO technical unit at HQ (EIIP) and donor will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the evaluation report.

The tasks of the Project: The Project team will provide logistic support to the evaluation team and will assist in organising a detailed evaluation mission agenda. Also the project needs to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluation team.

Time frame and responsibilities

Task	Responsible person	Time frame
Preparation of the TOR –draft	DWT/CO-Bangkok specialist Project team	Mid-September 2013
Preparation of list of stakeholders with e-mail addresses	Project team	Second half September 2013
Sharing the TOR with all concerned for comments/inputs	Evaluation Manager	Second half September 2013
Finalisation of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	Second half September 2013
Approval of the TOR	ROAP	Second half September 2013
Selection of consultant and finalisation	Evaluation Manager/ ROAP/ EVAL	First week October 2013
Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	Project team	First week October 2013
Ex-col contract based on the TOR prepared/signed	Evaluation manager /ILO Director, CO-Manila	Mid October 2013
Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy	Evaluation Manager	Second half October 2013
Inception report submitted to Evaluation	Evaluators	1 November 2013

**FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: TROPICAL STORM WASHI - COMMUNITY
BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] & RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT**

Task	Responsible person	Time frame
Manager		
Evaluation Mission	Evaluators	10-19 November 2013
Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluators	22 November 2013
Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments	Evaluation Manager	23-25 November 2013
Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	27 November 2013
Finalisation of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	29 November 2013
Review of the final report	Evaluation Manager ROAP evaluation officer	30 November 2013
Finalisation of contract	ILO Manila	30 November 2013
Submission of the final report to EVAL	evaluation manager	December 2013
Approval of the final evaluation report	EVAL	December 2013

The evaluation is estimated at the total of 20 workdays for the evaluation team leader, and at 15 days for the national evaluator as indicated below:

Time frame	Tasks
October 2013 (5 days)	Desk review of documents and preparation of the inception report.
November 2013 (10 days)	Evaluation field missions (10 days) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Field work in Manila and Cagayan de Oro and Iligan. ILO and Project staff would prepare a programme of meetings that the consultants could amend to suit their needs. Visits to the districts and villages would be arranged and facilitated by Project staff. Meetings with other stakeholders will be arranged so that the consultants could have a better understanding of the perspectives of the key stakeholders. The evaluation team will review its findings and prepare a presentation on the preliminary findings, including verification of the findings with the Project team. End-of-evaluation mission stakeholder meeting and debriefing, including the presentation of the preliminary findings and associated discussion.
November 2013 (5 days)	Produce a draft report for submission to the evaluation manager. Receive comments from evaluation manager and finalise the report. Submit evaluation summary.

6. Resources required

The following resources are required from the project:

- Cost of External International Evaluator (Fee+ travelling expenses)
- Cost of National Evaluator (Fee+ travelling expenses)
- Cost of local transportation in the field
- Stakeholders' meeting

Annex: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

- Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluator)
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL Checklist 3 Writing the inception report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL Checklist 5 Preparing the evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL Checklist 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm;
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL Guidance Note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL Guidance Note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm
- Template for evaluation title page
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm
- Template for evaluation summary: <http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

11. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1. RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

- Has the project supported the recovery of communities and areas affected by Sendong, how?
- Has the project supported the ILO decent work agenda and addressed the needs and priorities of ILO partners in the Philippines, if so, how?
- Has the project complemented other typhoon responses [environmental rehab, rural infrastructure, income generation, jobs/skills development], how?
- Are objectives [jobs/livelihood recovery, resilience through climate change adaptation, guidelines] consistent with beneficiary needs and still appropriate?

2. VALIDITY OF DESIGN

- Was the project designed in the best way to meet the objectives, including replicability in other regions/areas — has the project been replicated?
- How did the project design strengthen capacity to address environmental, access & livelihood challenges faced by stakeholders in Sendong response?
- Are the project strategies, means of action & outcomes relevant & realistic to the situation on the ground, taking into account project partners' capacity?
- Did the project design adequately plan for an effective participation of local governments in the management of the project?
- Did the project design take into consideration local knowledge and technologies, what environmentally friendly technology was used?
- Were the risks and assumptions identified and managed? To what extent have they affected the Project?
- Were the targeted indicator values useful and realistic — could they be tracked to assess progress?

3. PROJECT PROGRESS IN GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION

- What experiences have been learnt with regard to promoting gender equality in crisis response work?
- Were skills identified and strengthened by gender? Did the benefits accrue equally to men and women?
- Did the planned project objectives, means of action and outcomes address gender needs and interests, how?
- Has gender disaggregated data been collected and reported? Has gender expertise been sought and mainstreaming tools adapted and used?

4. EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION, PROGRESS IN OBJECTIVES & CHALLENGES

- In which areas does the Project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- In which areas does the Project have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why?
- What institutional arrangements were made by ILO that most supported the realisation of the programme's goals and were there any constraining factors?

- What have been the demonstrated synergies among the 4 different strategic components?
 - What were the main challenges to the implementation of the project during the time frame?
 - What external factors have had a positive or negative impact on the implementation of the project?
 - What factors [government, climate, local context, cultural, social, etc.] have impacted on the implementation of the project? How did the project adapt?
5. EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE & PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
- Has the project used ILO managed resources [funds, human resources, etc.] efficiently, how? Could things have been done differently or more efficiently?
 - Have project funds and needs been delivered by ILO in a timely manner — what factors hindered this and what measures were put in place to counter delays?
6. MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, COLLABORATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION
- Were management arrangements and capacities adequate, did they facilitate good results & efficient delivery? Were roles and responsibilities clear?
 - Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its partners, especially LGUs and DOLE?
 - Did implementing partners effectively manage the project implementation, what approaches did they use?
 - Did coordination activities contribute to synchronisation with other Sendong responses? Did the project collaborate with other ILO/donor projects?
 - What management mechanisms & institutional arrangements were made to collaborate & coordinate with stakeholders [particularly LGUs]? Was it effective?
 - Did the project stakeholders [government, donor, partners, and beneficiaries] understand the project strategy and contribute to its success?
 - What monitoring & evaluation system was used [6 monthly reports, impact evaluation, and gender audit]? was it effective & appropriate to assess progress?
 - What means of verification for tracking progress, performance & indicators of achievement have been defined? Has data been collected & assessed?
 - Has relevant information and data systematically been collected? Has it been desegregated by relevant characteristics?
 - Has reporting been satisfactory? Have results been analysed and fed into management decisions?
7. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY [KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT]
- What have been the impacts of the Project - such as livelihood response? Are there any more likely impacts in the future?
 - How is project impact measured adequately during and at the end of the project, what will ensure the findings reliable?
 - How has the project contributed towards the longer-term Sendong response strategy or actions?

- Has there been an effective and realistic exit strategy for the Project? Are LGUs and partners able, willing and committed to continue similar interventions?
- Has the project strengthened laws, policies, capacities & local knowledge — will this enable procedures & activities to be replicated in future crisis response?
- What experiences can be learned with regard to promoting decent work, rural access and environmental sustainability in crisis response work?

12. PHOTOGRAPHS OF FIELD VISITS



1. Bulao Iponan Vegetable Producers Association tree guard made from bamboo and sacks - CdO



2. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association mangrove nursery - CdO



3. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association fish cages - CdO



4. Bugo United Fisherfolk Association group photo - CdO



5. *Barangay Indahag Communal Farmers Association communal garden - CdO*



6. *Indahag National Elementary and High School perimeter fence - CdO*



7. PN Roa school drainage by Calaanan United Construction Workers Association - CdO



8. Dalipuga Farmers & Fishermen Association Inc. group photo - Iligan



9. Hindang Banana Growers Farmers Association SALT farm - Iligan



10. New Tabunan Farmers Assn. SALT farm with steep terrace steps - Iligan



11. ACMAC Fishermen Association fish cage construction - Iligan



12. Anahawon Developing Farmers Assn. SALT farm - Iligan



13. Banko Contour Farmers Association SALT farm - Iligan



14. Barangay Hindang box culvert construction - Iligan



15. Hinaplanon School perimeter wall construction – Iligan

13. LESSONS LEARNED

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: COMMUNITY-BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT	PHI/12/01/AUD
NAME OF EVALUATOR: Jonathan Price	Date: November 2013
The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report	
LL ELEMENT	TEXT
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	SALT or contour farming of leased land was a technique that successfully makes use of untapped arable land while neatly matching with the resources, experience, knowledge, environmental/ecological concerns, organic farming approaches and financial capacity of local associations and local agricultural agencies. Although the approach should not be replicated without due consideration in other situations, it has great potential as an approach to livelihood recovery in hilly rural areas affected by natural disasters.
Context and any related preconditions	Where level land is scarce or where sloping land is underutilized
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Farmers in upland or hilly rural areas
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Access to affordable land and land ownership issues
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Easily understood technology, requiring little or no resources to implement and has a positive impact on use of underutilized land, whilst impacting positively on soil erosion
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Requires agricultural engineering expertise and access to seeds or seedlings

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION: COMMUNITY-BASED EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT [CASH-FOR-WORK] AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECT	PHI/12/01/AUD
NAME OF EVALUATOR: Jonathan Price	Date: November 2013
The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report	
LL ELEMENT	TEXT
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	Community contracting and IDP involvement in infrastructure reconstruction [including housing] while a challenge to implement could be successfully replicated in many post disaster situations and prove to be a significant source of new livelihood, where a massive amount of housing reconstruction is required. However it should be recognised that community contracting requiring more time, community organisation, effort and resources from project teams.
Context and any related preconditions	Large displacement of people due to natural disaster requiring reconstruction of infrastructure and construction of new housing in safe areas
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	IDPs following natural disasters
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Community organising and working with beneficiaries from different locations and backgrounds to form a new organisation is a challenge and can be time consuming
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Organised community members can be involved in the construction of their own housing
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Requires technical supervision and training in basic bookkeeping and

	accounting
--	------------