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Executive Summary

Climate change and disaster risk pose serious threats to inclusive sustainable development in the Asia-Pacific region. It is at the local level that the adverse effects of climate change and disasters are most felt through loss of lives, assets, livelihoods and well-being. Risks are likely to increase in magnitude and complexity when combined with other developmental challenges such as growing inequality, continuing environmental degradation, inadequate social services, and infrastructure deficits. Unless climate change and disaster risks are effectively managed, their impact will continue to undermine efforts to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable growth. Addressing these risks will require investments that build resilience by targeting the most vulnerable; tapping local knowledge, capacities, and resources; and focusing on a combination of structural and nonstructural measures to produce multiple benefits over different time frames. Community-based organizations (CBOs) are already leading resilience-building initiatives, which means partnerships with local communities must be the cornerstone of solutions.

It is against this backdrop that this document highlights four community-led strategies in which governments and their development partners—international finance institutions (IFIs) in the Asia-Pacific region in particular—should invest to strengthen their efforts to advance climate and disaster resilient development. While these strategies serve to build more resilient communities, embedded within these strategies is an underlying theme of empowering marginalized populations, especially women, therefore contributing to the transformative agenda set out in global policy frameworks: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030), New Urban Agenda, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, and Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

The following four recommendations emerged from community-led strategies for resilience and point to specific ways in which governments and their partners can collaborate with communities to accelerate climate and disaster resilient development. These recommendations, however, are informed by two underlying principles: disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation approaches must be aligned with the principles of good governance and communities should be perceived not merely as victims of climate change and disasters, but as drivers of resilience:
Why invest in this strategy

Community-led risk mapping can improve the design of investment projects focused on communities by identifying localized, underlying drivers of risk. Community-led risk mapping enables communities to analyze, prioritize, build consensus on their disaster and climate resilience priorities, leading to community action and advocacy.

How governments and their development partners can invest in this strategy

Institutionalize community-led risk mapping as part of project preparatory processes in investments focusing directly on community infrastructure, social services and local development.

Community Resilience Strategy 2

Communities partner with government to enhance the delivery of social protection programs

Why invest in this strategy

CBO-led beneficiary identification can reduce targeting errors in social protection programs. Real-time changes in household profiles can be fed into day-to-day program decision making and processes can be fine-tuned to consider local changes. Partnerships with government credible partners directing resources to those most in need of assistance.

How governments and their development partners can invest in this strategy

Promote government partnerships with CBOs in the delivery of social protection programs to strengthen resilience. Identify champions within government to promote and publicize partnerships with communities.

Community Resilience Strategy 3

Communities influence decentralized decision making to drive demand for climate and disaster resilient development

Why invest in this strategy

Communities learn to influence decentralized decision-making systems to realize resilience building opportunities. Community engagement in local planning promotes transparent, accountable, and responsive local governance.

How governments and their development partners can invest in this strategy

Finance local capacity building for both communities and local government, as part of decentralization reforms. Facilitate dialogue between local government and communities.

Community Resilience Strategy 4

Direct access to flexible finance enables communities to attract government support in scaling up community-driven climate and disaster resilience

Why invest in this strategy

Flexible finance to communities enables them to lead resilience practices that bundle integrated strategies that reduce multiple vulnerabilities. Communities can leverage these resources to expand their work and gain government support.

How governments and their development partners can invest in this strategy

Provide communities with access to untied finance to address underlying risks that strengthen resilience. This requires:

- incentivizing local impact
- setting aside funds targeting communities
- allocating funds for building financial management capacity
- simplifying financial management systems.
Section I

Fulfilling the Promise of the New Global Policy Frameworks

The Agenda 2030, New Urban Agenda, Paris Agreement on Climate Change and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction—major global agreements adopted by governments in 2015 to 2016—all emphasize sustainable development that is resilient to natural hazards and climate change. Governments in the Asia-Pacific region and their development partners are challenged to fulfill the promise of these new policy frameworks. Ultimately, the local implementation of these global frameworks and the national policies and programs aligned with them will be the litmus test of whether such policies can deliver on their objectives, which are: to eradicate poverty, protect development gains from the negative impacts of disasters and climate change, and ensure that the poor and most vulnerable benefit from sustainable development.

The scale and complexity of the challenges and the relatively short time frame of 15 years will require governments to collaborate with other partners for effective implementation. CBOs, their networks, and organized constituencies will be crucial, as well as local knowledge and field-tested solutions. Governments, IFIs and multilateral organizations will have to explore new ways of partnering with communities, scale up effective solutions, formulate new forms of financing, and find ways to nurture innovation and learning. It is against this backdrop that the call for investing in community-led strategies for disaster and climate resilience that advance inclusive and sustainable development must be seen.

1 CBO is a unique type of civil society organization in that it comprises potential beneficiaries of government aid, rather than intermediaries. Members of CBOs are women and men who live and work in impoverished rural and urban communities, usually with low, unstable incomes. Their inadequate housing, poor access to basic services and infrastructure and their social marginalization make them highly vulnerable to the adverse affects of natural hazards and climate change.

2 Resilience is defined in this document as the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, transform, recover from and adapt to the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management. (United Nations. 2016. Report of the Open-Ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group on Indicators and Terminology Relating to Disaster Risk Reduction. New York.)
Climate Change and Disaster Risk Pose Serious Threats to Sustainable Development

The Asia-Pacific region is the one of most disaster-prone areas of the world. Direct physical losses from natural hazards have been rising at equal pace with the region’s gross domestic product. The upward trend in disaster losses is expected to continue as demographic and economic growth continues in hazard-prone areas.

The predicted increase in the intensity and frequency of extreme weather events due to climate change is expected to compound risk. Disasters cause not only loss of life and immediate economic damage, but can also have deep, lasting impacts on long-term growth, poverty and human development. Often, already-limited development funds are diverted towards rebuilding social and economic infrastructure instead of addressing the needs for which they had been intended. Recurring disasters continue to erode development gains, preventing both communities and countries from reaching their development goals. If climate and disaster risks are left unchecked, the transformative potential of the Agenda 2030 will remain unrealized.

Poor and Vulnerable Suffer Most

The Agenda 2030, including its 17 sustainable development goals (SDGs), targets poverty eradication alongside the integration of economic, social, and environmental dimensions. It also clearly states that the dignity of the individual is fundamental and that the benefits of development must specifically include vulnerable groups and individuals, leaving no one behind. Strengthening resilience to natural hazards and climate change requires cutting across many development sectors and themes, as well as assessing development and poverty reduction through the lens of resilience to achieve the SDGs. Efforts to reduce poverty and disaster- and climate change-related risk are complementary. Poverty is a key factor in determining the detrimental impacts of natural hazards and climate change because the poor are exposed to higher levels of risk.

From a wider economic perspective, they incur a smaller share of total asset loss. However, their losses are greater in terms of impact. They also arguably receive less support from governments and finance institutions after disaster strikes. Marginalized groups such as women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, and minorities are particularly vulnerable to natural hazards and to the impacts of climate change, mirroring wider socioeconomic and cultural inequalities. Unless disaster and climate change risks are effectively managed to reduce losses in assets, livelihoods, and well-being, increasing impacts will continue to undermine efforts to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development.

Marginalized groups such as women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, and minorities are particularly vulnerable to natural hazards and to the impacts of climate change, mirroring wider socioeconomic and cultural inequalities. Unless disaster and climate change risks are effectively managed to reduce losses in assets, livelihoods, and well-being, increasing impacts will continue to undermine efforts to reduce poverty and achieve sustainable development.

Despite significant progress in reducing poverty, the Asia and Pacific region remains home to a large share of world’s poor.

The number of poor in the region as of 2013 stands at 330 million under the $1.90 (2011, PPP) a day poverty line, which is around 9% of developing Asia’s population and represents 43% of the global extreme poor (ADB estimates based on World Bank’s PovcalNet Database, accessed 4 October 2016.)

Investing in Community Resilience Can Reduce Losses and Protect Development Gains

Natural hazards and climate change risks pose significant threats to national and local development. However, investments in building resilience can considerably reduce direct and indirect losses and contribute to sustained, inclusive economic growth, and the achievement of the SDGs. These investments in disaster and climate resilience will have more far-reaching effects if they are carefully integrated into the development process. There is a wide range of measures that local and national governments, the private sector, civil society, and communities can take to strengthen resilience, particularly in shifting from the prevailing perspective of “managing disaster” to “managing disaster risk”.

Strengthening resilience is a cost-effective way to address high-probability, low-impact hazards and deliver multiple benefits, including unlocking the development potential of the community, geographical area or sector. Resilience-building measures can include interventions to deal with current and future hazards through measures such as reducing the probability of landslides and flooding through forest conservation on steep slopes; reducing the exposure of people and assets to natural hazards by supporting the integration of disaster risk considerations into land use planning; and tackling vulnerability by supporting rainwater harvesting, community early warning systems, and livelihood diversification.

Local communities vulnerable to climate change and disasters can be empowered to lead action on strengthening household and community resilience. In fact, CBOs, including grassroots women’s organizations are already leading local solutions to manage climate change and disaster risks.

Government-CBO Collaborations Mutually Beneficial for Strengthening Community Resilience

There is substantial evidence demonstrating that collaboration between governments and CBOs is mutually beneficial in advancing climate and disaster resilience. When working with governments, CBOs offer practical knowledge, skills, and practices that emerge from their strategies to overcome everyday stresses. Partnerships with CBOs make government programs more efficient, effective, and responsive to the priorities of poor communities. Governments can offer policy support, technical assistance and resources—financial and/or nonfinancial – to effectively scale up and sustain community-led initiatives for strengthening resilience. Such collaborations are also key in aligning climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction efforts with the principles of good governance, particularly downward accountability, citizen participation, and transparent decision making.

IFIs could Play a Critical Role in Supporting Community-Led Strategies for Strengthening Disaster and Climate Resilience

Rising climate and disaster risks affect the overarching goals of IFIs: economic growth and poverty reduction. Acknowledging that the

---

6 Investment in this case includes both structural and nonstructural measures to build resilience.

potential impacts of climate change and disasters can threaten years of progress, IFIs are increasingly featuring disaster risk management and climate change adaptation in their development strategies, and supporting governments in incorporating resilience into their own programs across sectors. At the same time, IFIs are increasing investment in these areas through standalone investments, with the primary objective of strengthening resilience (e.g. investments in flood and drought risk management) and embedding resilience measures in sector-specific investments (e.g. flood early warning system as part of integrated urban development). Where IFIs make investments directly targeting communities or poor households, projects may include activities at the community level focusing on populations vulnerable to climate change and disasters. Such projects include investments in community infrastructure and livelihoods, community-based natural resources management, social protection, and financial inclusion.

Nonetheless, there is widespread consensus on inadequate investment in climate and disaster resilience. Underinvestment has many reasons, including the lack of understanding of the links between climate and disaster risks and development, and the inclination of policymakers to favor investments that generate immediate, tangible outcomes or short-term income streams over those in strengthening resilience where the gains may not be evident in the short term (e.g. less severe flooding, more consistency in children’s school attendance, greater crop dependability, faster disaster response times, and more prompt post-disaster recovery and reconstruction of infrastructure and livelihoods). With increasing climate and disaster risk undermining development, however, there is a real need for investments that tackle the root causes of risks, and generate multiple benefits for and focus on the most vulnerable to ensure that no one is left behind. IFIs can assist government efforts by providing financial resources through loans, grants, and technical assistance for strengthening resilience, as well as knowledge and partnerships to develop or scale up interventions.
This document highlights four community-led strategies pertinent to developing economies in the Asia-Pacific region and their IFI partners as they strengthen climate and disaster resilience. These strategies were applied by grassroots women’s organizations to advance resilience in Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam as part of pilot projects with members of the Huairou Commission (HC) with support from the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the Government of Canada. The document also draws on the experiences of HC members beyond these pilot projects. What is key is that the strategies discussed here have been tried and tested by communities to advance resilient development and, in many cases, have attracted resources and recognition from local, sub-national and national governments. Though led by grassroots women’s organizations, these strategies are not focused exclusively on women, but aim to improve the lives of their families and communities.

The strategies documented here demonstrate that grassroots women’s organizations are:

- using community-led risk mapping as entry points for communities to identify and address climate and disaster resilience priorities
- reducing targeting errors in government supported social protection programs
- influencing decentralized decision-making to drive demand for community priorities for climate and disaster resilience
- using flexible funds to promote climate and disaster resilience practices that address underlying risks and attract government support for resilience building

10 In many cases, grassroots women’s organizations also identify themselves as urban poor networks, farmers groups, people’s organizations, etc.
Community-led Strategies are Part of a Transformative Approach to Climate and Disaster Resilience

While presented as four distinct strategies, together they comprise a comprehensive approach to advancing grassroots women’s priorities for inclusive, sustainable, and resilient development. Success in one strategy often builds capacities and relationships that are stepping stones to success in the other three. The strategies are also part of an empowerment-based approach, which seeks to reconfigure relationships of power by transforming the roles of organized women’s groups engaged in shaping public decision-making. In addition to negotiating and influencing resource allocations for communities, the strategies highlight grassroots women’s leadership roles in claiming resources and public recognition. This empowerment-based approach shifts women’s status from passive beneficiaries to stakeholders and drivers of resilient development.

Community-Led Strategies Represent Opportunities for Governments and IFIs to Strengthen the Impact of their Investments

These community-led strategies represent opportunities that can be pursued by governments and their partner IFIs to engage communities as part of larger investment projects focused on community- or household-level outputs. Among these are community-driven development (CDD) projects that support community-level infrastructure and livelihoods; urban upgrading in informal settlements; investments in social protection that provide social assistance, social insurance and labor market interventions targeting poor and vulnerable households; and community-based natural resource management. Such investments in bottom-up strategies complement government efforts by driving the demand to promote resilient development for the most vulnerable.

Governments in the Asia-Pacific region and their partner IFIs are increasingly institutionalizing climate and disaster risk assessments as part of preparation for investment projects. Such assessments identify the potential risks to the proposed investment, but not necessarily the climate change and disaster risks faced by local communities in the project area. Project-level risk assessments, particularly those that support community-level infrastructure and services, could greatly benefit from investments in community-led risk mapping for the reasons outlined below.

» Community-risk mapping is an entry point for communities to analyze and act on their climate and disaster resilience priorities.

Community members apply a range of diverse participatory mapping tools to pool knowledge on their current situation. Mapping usually includes local topography, the location of vulnerable households, community infrastructure, livelihoods and well-being losses caused by past disasters. Those whose livelihoods and food security depend on fishing, farming, and forestry...
invariably also analyze unpredictable weather patterns, changing climate trends, and the degradation of natural resources. Communities usually discuss and debate evidence before developing priorities for action. Community-led risk maps therefore become catalysts for analyses crucial to communities by providing a collective understanding of natural hazards, vulnerabilities, and capacities; and facilitating consensus building that leads to collective action, which can be supported by specific investments (Box 1). Collective analyses of risk can contribute to project grievance mechanisms and safeguards-related assessments undertaken during project preparation.11

11 Grievance mechanisms are systems or specified procedures for methodically addressing grievances or complaints and resolving disputes. Grievance mechanisms help in identifying and responding to unintended impacts on individuals to ensure that the rights of affected parties are respected, and increase the likelihood that project implementation will proceed without undue delay or complication. Grievance mechanisms are generally understood to provide one or more of six different processes that are used to address a grievance: information, facilitation, negotiation, mediation/conciliation, investigation, and adjudication. (ADB. 2010. Grievance Mechanisms: A Critical Component of Project Management. Manila.)

Safeguards-related requirements of projects funded by ADB ensure that the project design factors in environmental soundness and sustainability of projects, addresses involuntary-settlement arising from the project, and fosters full respect for indigenous peoples’ identity, dignity, human rights, livelihood systems, and cultural uniqueness.
Integrating community risk assessments into planning can build climate and disaster resilience into local development

The Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan - Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (KALAHI-CIDSS) National Community Driven Development Program (KC-NCDDP) of the Government of Philippines based on community-driven development (CDD) approaches, has integrated community risk assessments into its planning process.

The KC-NCDDP addresses poverty by empowering communities to engage with the government in problem solving processes. The program targets communities working through community-based organizations as implementers with the support from local government and is characterized by a community focus, participatory planning and design, community control over resources, community implementation and community based monitoring and evaluation.

In the Philippines, the CDD program known as KALAHI-CIDSS functioned successfully for 10 years over the period of 2003-12. Building on the success of the KALAHI-CIDSS program, the Government of Philippines decided to scale up the CDD approach through the KC-NCDDP to 847 municipalities nationwide. This scaling up process coincided with the post-typhoon Haiyan recovery process and therefore prioritized typhoon-hit communities.

While continuing to apply participatory planning, implementation, monitoring and maintenance processes, new design features were introduced in the KC-NCDDP to support both post-disaster reconstruction as well as enhance disaster resilience through community risk assessments. A disaster risk assessment module has been included along with poverty profiles, needs and vulnerabilities assessments into the social preparation stage of KC-NCDDP projects. Training modules on disaster risk reduction and management have also been introduced so that facilitators can build capacities of the communities on disaster risk. Communities have been effectively using community risk mapping to promote grassroots women’s disaster and climate resilience priorities in the typhoon affected province of Leyte (Box 2).

Communities prioritize everyday impacts and frequent shocks

Impoverished communities in rural and urban areas are vulnerable to a range of climate- and natural hazard related impacts. They must continually make choices about which ones to deal with to fulfill their basic survival needs. Despite having experienced the devastation of large-scale disasters with devastating consequences, when setting priorities for action, communities tend to focus on smaller, more frequent shocks and stresses, which they confront everyday. Indonesia’s Gunungkidul District is characterized by karst topography which compounds water shortages caused by climate change and long dry spells; and deforestation increases the risk of landslides. Here, 10 grassroots women’s groups prioritized drought-related concerns for action over earthquakes and landslides. (Box 3). In the Philippines, communities in five barangays of Leyte—all affected by Typhoon Haiyan in 2013—prioritized action on recurrent floods over typhoons.

However, it is the case that chronic problems such as meager incomes, insecure livelihoods, food or water scarcity, lack of housing tenure, lack of infrastructure, or environmental degradation exacerbate the vulnerabilities of communities in the face of natural hazards and climate change.

12 ADB 2016. Enhancing Community Driven Development through Convergence: A Case study of household and community based initiatives in Philippine Villages Manila


14 These findings are drawn from the Huairou Commission-facilitated project Closing the Gap: Empowering Women to Link Community Resilience Priorities Decentralized Development funded by ADB.
Grassroots women tend to prioritize issues related to their social roles

Women in poor communities are disproportionately affected by climate change and natural hazards. Their views are seldom heard in public decision-making processes. It is for these reasons that grassroots women’s groups tend to prioritize issues linked to their social roles when given opportunities to influence agenda. For example, it is women who line up for hours and travel long distances to bring water to their homes, making water access a key concern for them. They are also chiefly responsible for feeding their families, and, therefore, place emphasis on food security. Health risks matter to them because illness prolongs the time they spend on caregiving. A deeper understanding of women’s roles—social, reproductive and productive—in the context of disaster and climate risk can contribute to IFIs’ project-specific Gender Action Plans (GAP).\(^{15}\)

Community risk mapping is a tool for dialogue and negotiation with local government

Communities strategically use the risk mapping process as a tool for engaging local government in three ways. First, they invite local officials to join the mapping process so that community information on vulnerabilities is complemented by public officials’ perspectives. Second, communities invite local government to join the implementation process of the community-led risk mapping, as local government has the capacity to undertake large-scale infrastructure projects. Third, when communities are planning their development goals, it is common to advocate for more robust public infrastructure—e.g., drainage systems, flood control, and clean drinking water—given that disaster management is often perceived as a crucial component of sustainable development.

\(^{15}\) GAP is a tool used by ADB to ensure that “gender mainstreaming” is visible in the project design and implementation. GAPs can improve the quality of project implementation by identifying constraints to women and men living in poverty, resulting in strategies that embed a balanced approach between hardware and software components.
by official data and validated. Second, interactions between communities and local officials give both sides a chance to learn about one another, laying the ground for future dialogue and collaboration. Third, community-led risk maps become the basis for negotiating and communicating their priorities to government officials. In the Philippines, 40 barangay officials joined the community risk-mapping workshop organized by DAMPA in Metro Manila in November 2015. Barangay council members helped validate community data on the number of families in high-risk areas near the creek of Sitio Kislap. They also shared data on the number of children, pregnant women, elderly, and persons with disabilities in the area. In Barangay Payatas, the barangay chairperson helped the community identify areas at high, medium and low risk of landslides. She also provided the exact number of families living in hazard-prone areas. In Barangay Bagong Silangan, council members helped identify the safest evacuation routes and sites.

YAKKUM Emergency Unit (YEU), a nongovernmental organization (NGO) organized grassroots women from 10 villages in Gunungkidul to map disaster risks and vulnerabilities and invited 96 local officials - village heads, secretaries, and social affairs officers to join this exercise. In addition, YEU also organized a workshop with district local government units to educate officials on the livelihood and food security initiatives led by grassroots women, and advocate for district agencies to support women's projects.

As women's caregiving roles include managing food and water and caring for the sick, issues related to food, nutrition, water, and health were prioritized. Falling farm productivity, increasing costs of goods and degradation of natural resources however, were equally important to women. They therefore initiated a range of strategies focused on preventing food and water shortages and protecting natural resources while increasing women's incomes.

Women living on slopes susceptible to landslides successfully advocated for reforestation and planted trees such as acacia to reduce soil erosion. The trees along the slopes make rice farming untenable so women are planting ginger and other herbs, which command a good price in local markets. Other groups are testing adaptive farming techniques, initiating waste banks, organizing grocery businesses or developing alternative livestock feed to reduce the impacts of disasters on their livelihoods.

In addition to initiating such practices, grassroots women also participate in dialogues with village governments (through the formal village consultative process) and with district government to gain access to programs and budgets focused on local community initiatives. Women's advocacy in the ten villages led to infrastructure improvements including: digging of wells and construction of reservoirs in Kedungpoh; the construction of irrigation, embankments, and drainage in Natah through the public works and agriculture agencies; and financial and nonfinancial support for women's rice banks from the village government in Ngalang.

Source:  Yakkum Emergency Unit (YEU)
Poverty exacerbates vulnerability to natural hazards. At the same time, an increasing number of climate-related disasters are undermining poverty reduction efforts. Social protection programs support households to manage a range of idiosyncratic and covariate shocks; and to avoid disruptions in the flow of household income. With increasing levels of disaster and climate risk, and associated uncertainties such as extreme weather events, urgent actions are needed to ensure that the design of social protection programs include ex-ante and ex-post measures to reduce risk and manage residual risk for beneficiary households. Such approaches, however, require flexibility in the targeting and implementation of social protection programs, and increased coordination with communities. IFI support for social protection programs in the region can promote such coordination.

CBOs have demonstrated that they are valuable partners to governments in enhancing the delivery of social protection programs

Errors of inclusion or exclusion in targeting beneficiaries are perennial concerns in most social protection programs. Government-drafted beneficiary registries are usually updated on a 3- to 5-year cycle and lack the flexibility to rapidly adapt to new realities. This means that beneficiary household information recorded can lose relevance over time as vulnerabilities change with the changing climate. Also, real-time information on the status of households becomes even more critical in a post-disaster context. CBOs with members residing in low-income neighborhoods have a deep contextual understanding of social and economic vulnerability and can help social protection programs by actively participating in community-based targeting. Engaging CBOs in program delivery means real-time changes in household profiles can be included into day-to-day program decision making. Program delivery processes can also be adjusted in response to local changes. In a post-disaster context, CBOs can be involved in effectively identifying beneficiaries.

Partnerships with government empower grassroots organizations

Partnerships in which CBOs working with the government to effectively deliver social protection programs reduce the negative impacts of disasters and climate change on vulnerable households. When government agencies publicly acknowledge CBOs as knowledgeable and credible partners, they empower these local organizations. It is this shift in the relationship between these entities that strengthens the transformative potential of the social protection program.

18 ibid
BOX 4 CBOs Enhance Effective Delivery of Social Protection Programs to Communities at Risk in the Philippines and Indonesia

DAMPA supported the government to identify beneficiaries for the Modified Conditional Cash Transfer Program in Haiyan- Affected Leyte, Philippines

When Typhoon Haiyan devastated Leyte in 2013, most families lost their identity cards and documentation. The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) had to revalidate beneficiary lists of the Modified Conditional Cash Transfer (MCCT) program in disaster-affected areas. DAMPA worked closely with DSWD staff to profile and monitor recipient households.

In each barangay, beneficiaries elected parent leaders, who were trained by DSWD staff and paid a small stipend. These leaders, many of whom belonged to DAMPA, were charged with educating beneficiary households on the MCCT and monitoring beneficiary compliance with the conditions for receiving cash transfers. Each parent leader was assigned 25-30 households to monitor. Monitoring meant ensuring that: children from beneficiary households had a minimum of 85% school attendance; pregnant women and children below 5 years visited health clinics regularly; and that beneficiary households attended family development sessions. Between May and June 2014 DAMPA helped to enroll or re-enroll approximately 2000 households, who began to receive cash transfers by June 2014.

Grassroots Women’s Groups in Yogyakarta Support the Government in Identifying Vulnerable Households in Gunungkidul District, Indonesia

In Gunungkidul, officials requested YEU and women’s groups working with it to identify vulnerable households in the 86 sub-villages comprising the 10 villages they were working in as data in government records was outdated. Women’s groups went door-to-door, gathering information on the number of vulnerable individuals—women, children, the elderly, and disabled. Village authorities then endorsed the data collected by women. This resulted in:

- the community health center updating the number of beneficiaries for the supplementary feeding program for the elderly, pregnant women, and nursing mothers
- the village governments providing livelihood grants to 29 more disabled persons as part of the Program Keluarga Harapan—a conditional cash transfer program that focuses on short-term poverty alleviation and long-term development of human capital
- the village governments updating the government database to ensure poor households are included in the government beneficiary list for the conditional cash transfer program
- the village level disaster task forces and Regional Disaster Management Agency (BPBD) ensuring that vulnerable households are prioritized for evacuation and emergency assistance

Source: DAMPA and YEU
Decentralized governance can create the environment that strengthens community resilience by providing disaster and climate risk information; assigning functions to maximize the proximity, scale and capacity advantages of each level of administration; guiding the development of relevant institutions and coordination mechanisms; financing resilience-building measures; and fostering partnerships with the private sector, civil society organizations, and CBOs. Decentralization, in principle, offers opportunities for communities to get local governments to incorporate their priorities, including those on climate and disaster resilience in local development. The support of IFIs in the government roll out of decentralization reforms can play a critical role in strengthening community resilience. This can be done by investing in building communities’ capacities to engage local government and influence planning to promote more transparent, accountable, and citizen-responsive governance.

» Decentralization provides opportunities to influence local decision making, but communities must learn to navigate governance arrangements

There are two broad approaches used separately or concurrently by grassroots women to navigate decentralized decision-making processes. One approach focuses on informal dialogue outside the formal system. In Viet Nam, for example, informal multistakeholder dialogues are creating opportunities for citizen-state engagement, giving both grassroots leaders and women’s unions a greater voice in setting local agenda, including resilience-related priorities. (Box 5). The other approach involves using formal citizen engagement mechanisms such as the multi-stakeholder decision-making forum musrenbang in Indonesia, barangay assemblies in the Philippines or village assemblies in India. An example is the Village Law in Indonesia, which provides formal mechanisms for citizen engagement. These mechanisms are being effectively used by grassroots women, to press for their disaster and climate resilience priorities. (Box 6)

» Grassroots women’s groups learn to influence decentralized decision-making to realize resilience building opportunities offered by decentralization

Grassroots women’s groups either work within formal participatory decision-making mechanisms or through informal channels to hold dialogues with the local government. Both approaches require communities and the local government to build their capacity in a) understanding the relationship between development and disaster risk, b) identifying community priorities and resilience practices, and c) gaining knowledge of governance arrangements to persuade authorities to respond to the community’s short-term and long-term needs. Many of these themes are embedded in grassroots women’s organizations’ practices, but require further systematization and consolidation.

There are three ways in which grassroots women’s groups are mastering the three areas mentioned above to effectively influence local decision-making. First, they are preparing themselves for advocacy by collectively

---

19 Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 Tentang Desa roughly translates to “Republic of Indonesia Law Number 6 2014 Concerning Villages” in English.
In the city of Can Tho, Viet Nam, the Centre for Promotion of Quality of Life (LIFE Centre), an NGO with extensive experience in coordinating and working with government agencies, set up a local multistakeholder project management committee comprising representatives from local government, women’s unions, and grassroots leaders. LIFE Centre then facilitated participatory action planning focused on women’s resilience-building priorities at the commune level and then used the multi-stakeholder committee as a space of informal dialogue. Here, grassroots women and women’s union leaders presented their analyses of problems and solutions to officials and requested officials from local government and the departments of agriculture, environment and education to share their respective plans and budgets in the multi-stakeholder committee.

In the city’s Thoi Xuan Commune, strengthening of dikes that surround rice fields for flood prevention and raising rice yields was prioritized. The local district authorities found this too expensive for the commune-level budget but were willing to consider integrating this priority into the district’s larger five-year plan. The other option was to train farming households on updated and environment-friendly rice and cash crop cultivation techniques to strengthen their resilience to disasters during the entire rice crop cycle. The district agriculture office agreed to integrate the first two trainings for farmers into its annual action plan and conducted them using its own budget.

For grassroots women’s groups in Trung Thanh Commune, dengue fever was a major concern. The action plan proposed communication initiatives to encourage communities to clean up and eliminate mosquitoes’ breeding areas. LIFE Centre funded the Women’s Resilience Network’s communications programs for village women and the commune’s health department agreed to take up the distribution of larvae-eating fish to all households in the village.

Source: Centre for Promotion of Quality of Life (LIFE Centre)

analyzing community disaster and climate risks. Second, they are using financial and technical resources accessible to them to demonstrate resilience practices such as waste banks, rice banks, revolving housing tool banks, or revolving funds for livelihoods recovery through which they continually expand and refine their practical knowledge. Third, they are continually engaging local decision makers and thus learning to navigate decentralized decision-making processes to publicly voice and defend their demands. (Box 6)
BOX 6 Grassroots Women’s Groups Influence Village Development Plans and Budgets in Gunungkidul District, Indonesia

The Indonesian Village Law of 2014 enables village governments to decide how best to utilize the Village Development Fund in consultation with local actors. This fund can range from $50,000 to $200,000. In 2016, grassroots women’s groups from 10 villages in Gunungkidul identified disaster resilience priorities through the community risk mapping process. Based on this, two women from each of the 86 sub-villages attended consultative forums to present their collective priorities based on their villages’ risk and vulnerability assessments.

Previous interactions with village officials during community risk mapping sessions showed the women that many of their infrastructure priorities such as improving drainage and roads were already in the village mid-term development plans. The main role of the women then was to advance their priorities by pressing for the allocation of budgets and immediate implementation of priorities.

There are two ways in which grassroots women’s groups can influence village plans and priorities for budgeting. First, by ensuring that grassroots women’s groups bring their priorities to the consultative forums. Second, women need to ensure that they are represented in the 11-member village drafting committee, whose task is to record inputs from sub-village and village consultative forums, and rank proposals according to impact and urgency. Whereas in the past, women have focused only on issues of health and education, they are now advancing resilience-building concerns in village forums covering resilience-building issues ranging from infrastructure and natural resource management to livelihoods.

The following are examples of decisions taken by village authorities in response to grassroots women’s advocacy on their disaster resilience priorities:

In Giritirto, a village at risk of landslides, earthquakes and drought, village funds have been used to construct a 700-meter drainage system to divert water in a way that reduces pressure on unstable soil, as well as the risk of landslides. BPBD, the local agency for disaster management, has also disseminated information and provided equipment to improve evacuation routes and enhance emergency preparedness and response in the event of landslides or an earthquake.

In Kedungpoh, where addressing the effects of drought was women’s priority, the village fund has paid for a water pipe system in four sub-villages and provided a livelihood grant to the women’s group.

Village funds in Jurangjero were used for digging seven wells.

In Ngalang, village authorities allocated a small grant for women to initiate disaster resilience building activities.

Source: YEU
The impacts of disaster risk and climate change are most acutely experienced at the local level; where organized groups of farmers, fisher folk, urban poor communities, and women are testing innovative strategies to advance climate and disaster resilient development. Community access to flexible financial resources, however, continues to be a challenge. Flexibility refers to allowing local communities to determine how finances will be best utilized to advance their resilience needs. Typically, when communities gain access to financial resources, these are already earmarked for specific activities. This leaves communities without a voice in determining how to use funds. After identifying risks, vulnerabilities, and priorities for action, communities do not have the resources to address their priorities. They need access to flexible funds which they can manage to demonstrate their capacities and leadership in advancing resilient development.

The CDD modality represents a mechanism that makes flexible finances directly accessible to communities. The CDD approach in the Philippines includes community-led analysis of challenges; investment in community capacity building; an open menu of projects; and funds directly delivered to beneficiary communities, who are expected to manage them. CDD grants allow communities to identify infrastructure or services best suited to their needs, build capacities from bottom up, and increase ownership.

The Huairou Commission’s Community Resilience Fund (CRF) operating in 15 countries represents another community funding mechanism that places flexible financial resources in the hands of grassroots women’s organizations. The CRF allows women to identify and address their most pressing climate and disaster resilience concerns. In addition to being a financial mechanism that promotes grassroots-driven resilience practices and leverages these to access government support, the CRF is also a learning and capacity-building tool. Communities can use a portion of the funds for advocacy and learning, including training on resilience practices and financial management.

In contrast to the CDD approach, the CRF does not support infrastructure or hardware costs. It funds the learning, and refinement of community practices and collaborative relationship building, which equip communities to negotiate with local and national government agencies to upgrade infrastructure and improve service delivery.

Community-led resilience practices bundle strategies to reduce vulnerabilities

Access to flexible financial resources allows communities to initiate, strengthen or scale up disaster and climate resilience practices. Grassroots women’s organizations tend to address multiple vulnerabilities faced by those living in impoverished settlements. Through these practices, grassroots communities are able to learn while doing and demonstrate, to themselves and to government institutions, that they have the capacity to address underlying risks.

Resilience practices led by grassroots women’s groups tend to have the following features:

- They build or strengthen the community’s collective asset or resource base, whether these assets are revolving funds, community infrastructure, natural resources, food banks, waste banks or tool banks. These assets strengthen communities’ capacities to withstand or recover from the effects of natural hazards or climate change and improve everyday living conditions.

- They address underlying risks such as poverty, environmental degradation or poor governance, which tend to heighten vulnerabilities.

- They reinforce group solidarity by sharing, and collectively managing resources.

- They advance grassroots women’s leadership, positioning them as active agents of resilient, sustainable development.

» **Community-led disaster resilience practices attract government support**

Government agencies often have funds that can be channeled towards civil society organizations, including CBOs. There are no clear criteria, however, for identifying CBOs that are legitimate representatives of the poor and can be entrusted with government resources. When grassroots women’s organizations present their disaster and climate resilience practices, they demonstrate to government that they are active, credible, and able to transparently manage resources. This attracts government support in the form of technical assistance, training, funds, and partnerships that elevate grassroots women’s leadership roles.

Investments in the development of such multifaceted, community-led climate and disaster resilience practices that bundle sustainable development with disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation using community managed resources are key to advancing localized, transformative, and inclusive resilience measures. (Box 7) Communities need these experiences to build the knowledge and skills that they can later leverage to gain the support of governments. It is these local initiatives that must be connected, consolidated and aggregated for large-scale impact.
The Huairou Commission’s Community Resilience Fund

The Huairou Commission has been field-testing the CRF in 15 countries, including Indonesia, the Philippines and Viet Nam. The CRF is a mechanism that channels funds (ranging from $8,000 to $40,000) to grassroots women’s groups, allowing them to identify priorities, demonstrate disaster resilience practices and collaborate with governments to scale up and strengthen solutions. The following are two examples of grassroots women’s resilience initiatives supported by the CRF:

**Grocery stores for livelihood and food security in Indonesia**

Villages that have traditionally cultivated and consumed rice are now faced with income and food insecurity due to continual climate shocks. They can no longer depend on harvesting two rice crops a year. The grassroots women’s groups used small grants from the CRF to set up 12 grocery stores. One such grocery store is in Girikarto, Gunungkidul District. Here, the local women’s group buys rice from local farmers then stores and sells it in the off-season, making rice available to local families at affordable prices while increasing women’s incomes. In order to attract more business, what were originally rice banks have expanded to become groceries that stock other everyday household items such as sugar and oil. The grocery stores also ensure food and everyday supplies are in stock during emergencies. Women’s advocacy resulted in the village government providing a space for the grocery store as well as working capital. Two of these grocery stores have generated revenues of up to $500 per month. Profits are distributed in the following way: 20% goes to group members, 35% for the management team, 20% for the social disaster preparedness fund, and 25% is reinvested in the business.

**Community-managed revolving funds for restoring livelihoods in the Philippines**

After typhoon Haiyan impacted the Philippines in 2013, DAMPA found that support for the restoration of livelihoods was desperately needed. The CRF was distributed to 15 communities in Leyte province. Each community had already established a savings and credit practice where communities pooled their savings and provided loans to members. Members used loans from the CRF revolving funds for farming, fishing, sari-sari shops and raising livestock. A few members have also taken these loans to pay for children’s school fees. The interest rate of 3% per month is equally distributed among a social welfare fund (used for emergencies), recapitalization, and interest paid out to borrowers. So far, 400 borrowers have benefited from these revolving funds. These community-managed funds were used in community-led negotiations with the municipality of Tanauan to show that communities were optimizing the use of grants. Communities were thus able to access a fund of P100,000 (equivalent to $2,000) for livestock rearing through a municipal social welfare program. In addition to Leyte, similar revolving funds for building disaster and climate resilience are operational in 35 other disaster-struck rural and urban communities organized by DAMPA.

Source: HC, DAMPA and YEU
Organized communities in Asia and the Pacific region are proactively assessing the climate and disaster risks they face, testing new solutions, and pressing local governments to embed community resilience priorities in local development processes. National government policies and programs can build upon these community-led initiatives to enhance their outreach and effectiveness, in order to attain the ambitious goals set out in the new global policy frameworks like the SDGs, New Urban Agenda, Paris Agreement on Climate Change, and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.

There are several strategies that governments and their development partners can deploy to effectively mobilize the networks, resources, skills, and knowledge of CBOs to advance disaster and climate resilient development. The following four recommendations emerging from the community-led resilience building strategies are changes that can be made within existing IFI investments or operations; where investing in community capacity and leadership could significantly enhance the resilience of development projects.

Underlying the four approaches suggested above are two broader principles that inform a transformative approach to community-led disaster and climate resilience. First, it is crucial that investments in communities that build on disaster and climate resilience be within a framework that aligns with the principles of good governance. Second, communities should be perceived not merely as victims of disasters, but drivers of resilience.
Institutionalize community-led risk mapping as part of projects targeting community level investments

IFI supported project preparatory assessments targeting communities-level projects, can be complemented by community-led risk mapping. Conducting these assessments at the early stages of project preparation will capture community perspectives on climate change and disaster risk, identifying underlying factors that contribute to localized risk. Such factors, especially those that require community infrastructure investments, can be addressed through project investments. Nonstructural challenges such as institutional weaknesses or the lack of capacity and information can be supported through technical assistance that often accompanies investment projects. However, the benefits of such community assessments go beyond informing the design of investment projects. Community-led assessments are opportunities for communities to surface their climate change and disaster risk-related concerns, build consensus on priorities and take action. While community risk assessments do not typically require large financial resources, they do need a time frame of 6 to 12 months in order to meaningfully strengthen communities’ understanding of climate change and disaster risks, facilitate consensus building and engage other stakeholders. Investment projects that are designed to channel resources directly to the community in support of community-identified investments should include community-led risk assessment as a requirement for wider community planning processes.

Promote government partnerships with CBOs in the delivery of social protection programs to strengthen resilience.

CBOs have the agility, outreach and flexibility required to target beneficiaries for social protection programs. Government registries of beneficiaries - usually updated every 3-5 years - can lose relevance as vulnerabilities keep shifting due to climate change; and real time information on households becomes all the more critical in post disaster contexts. Social protection programs should formally engage CBOs, publicly positioning them as credible partners with the ability to assist government agencies deliver social protection to disaster-prone communities in a locally appropriate, dynamic and timely manner. It is worth noting that several countries are already using participatory approaches to identify beneficiaries or validate beneficiary lists and community facilitators to mobilize broader community participation. Communities are also in a strong position to monitor beneficiaries of social assistance programs to ensure they are using resources appropriately and complying with conditions, and thereby reduce leakage and corruption. Policy champions within government agencies could play a key role in encouraging partnerships with communities and publicizing their results to ensure that government institutions have a strong institutional memory of the mutual benefits of such collaborations with communities. Equally important, the benefits of such partnerships extend beyond the effective delivery of social protection. Formal partnerships represent public recognition of community leadership and thus play a key role in empowering them.

3 Finance local capacity for resilience building as part of decentralization investments

While decentralized governance arrangements provide opportunities for communities to embed resilience priorities in development agendas, it is challenging for those historically excluded from decision making to effectively utilize civic engagement opportunities to influence programs and budgets. There is a need to invest in the capacities of both grassroots and governments to ensure that decentralized decision-making is more effective and inclusive. Investments in decentralization reform, can strengthen resilience by supporting local institutions and platforms to convene relevant stakeholders and by building capacity for inclusive decision making.

In terms of capacity building, communities need to equip themselves with skills and knowledge that make them valuable partners in the eyes of local governments. For example, their ability to collect data, whether through participatory mapping processes or door-to-door surveys, is highly valued by local government.

Communities also need to understand government hierarchies, and decision-making processes to influence decision-making. Furthermore, communities need to learn to negotiate with local government in ways that convey community strengths, i.e. wide networks, the ability to identify and assist the most vulnerable, the capacity to rapidly transfer knowledge and practice, and mobilize community action.

At the same time, local governments need to understand that collaborating with community based organizations strengthens local government capacity to advance development goals and upgrade living conditions of disadvantaged citizens, thus reaffirming the leadership and credibility of local government.

In addition to conventional training activities, there is a need to convene local governments and grassroots communities in learning and dialogue fora to foster collaboration between them.

4 Provide communities with direct access to flexible finance to build resilience to underlying risks

Channeling flexible or untied financial resources directly to community groups enables communities to bundle resilience strategies to reduce multiple vulnerabilities such as food insecurity, unstable incomes, and exclusion from decision-making. This, in turn, generates wider dividends such as increased productivity, public recognition, and enhancing government accountability to the poor. The success of such community-led resilience initiatives attracts government support in the form of upgrading infrastructure, funding, and technical assistance. In order to accelerate and scale up community-led climate and disaster resilience efforts and build widespread demand for policies and programs that are locally responsive, there is a need for governments and multilateral institutions to put flexible financial resources directly in the hands of communities.

Doing so, however, requires that institutions shift their approaches to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation to incentivize local impacts, set aside funds targeting CBOs and design financial mechanisms that are governed by a set of simplified norms tailored to enhance community leadership in advancing disaster resilience. The CDD mechanism and the CRF represent two examples of such funds.
This initiative was made possible by the following:

The **Asian Development Bank** (ADB) was conceived in the 1960s as an Asian financial institution to foster economic growth and cooperation in one of the poorest regions in the world. ADB assists its members and partners by providing loans, technical assistance, grants, and equity investments to promote social and economic development. ADB has 67 members, 48 of which are from Asia and the Pacific.

The **Government of Canada**, through Global Affairs Canada, funded this initiative in cooperation with the ADB-managed Integrated Disaster Risk Management Fund. The fund contributes to Canada's regional efforts to address transboundary issues across the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), including in the disaster risk and hazards that can have a significant impact on the poor and most vulnerable, and compromise hard-won development gains. Reducing economic and human vulnerability to disasters is one way to increase resilience and stimulate sustainable economic growth in ASEAN.

The **Huairou Commission** (HC) is a global coalition of grassroots organizations, NGOs, and other development partners working together to advance grassroots women's leadership in community development. HC's Community Resilience Campaign is active in 22 countries, of which six are in Asia. The campaign positions grassroots women as leaders and active agents of resilient and sustainable community development. The coalition's empowerment-based, holistic approach to disaster and climate resilience has four interdependent elements: organizing and leadership, awareness and action, network and coalition building, and influencing policy.

The **Centre for Promotion of Quality Life** (LIFE Centre) is a nongovernmental organization (NGO) with extensive experience in coordinating and working with government agencies; international donors including the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; corporate donors; community-based organizations and research institutions. LIFE Centre's Community Health and Resilience Program has prevented the spread of HIV among 54,000 people and supported 1,000 community women to strengthen their resilience through implementing resilient livelihood development activities. LIFE Centre's Worker Support Program reached 120,000 workers in 46 apparel, footwear, electronics and furniture factories.

**Damayan ng Maralitang Pilipinong Api, Inc.** (DAMPA) is a federation of 245 community-based organizations led by women in the islands of Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao in the Philippines. It was organized around housing rights in the early 1990s in response to massive demolitions of shanties in Metro Manila. Over the years, through organizing and advocacy, DAMPA has partnered with different government institutions, including the Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of Public Works and Highways, and the Department of Interior and Local Government to access government resources and influence local planning and development processes. DAMPA's disaster resilience work focuses on building grassroots capacities to drive their own agendas through grassroots-led transfers of knowledge and practices, and enabling member groups to advocate for government resources in response to local community priorities.

**YAKKUM Emergency Unit** (YEU), a sub-unit of YAKKUM, was established in 2001 to focus on emergency response and disaster risk reduction initiatives. By 2016, YEU has provided humanitarian assistance and advanced community resilience building in Indonesia, Timor-Leste, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Nepal in partnerships with 350 community organizations throughout Indonesia. YAKKUM (including YEU) is a member of the ACT Alliance, a global network of churches consisting of 139 church-based organizations working in more than 140 countries in the spheres of humanitarian assistance, community empowerment, and impartial advocacy for the poor.
This document draws upon grassroots women’s experiences from the Huairou Commission’s membership in Southeast Asia. It highlights four community-led strategies for advancing climate and disaster resilient development. These strategies demonstrate that communities have knowledge, capacities and networks that can strengthen government-led efforts to advance resilient development. In light of increasing disaster and climate risks that threaten to erode development and poverty reduction gains in the Asia-Pacific region, governments and development partners must re-examine their investments to develop new community partnership mechanisms. Collaborations with communities will be critical to advancing the global and national commitments towards sustainable development that can withstand the impacts of natural hazards and climate change.