# Humanitarian Coalition Philippines Typhoon Appeal – PART A: *DISCUSSION PAPER*

**SvN** re Plan

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# LIST OF ACRONYMS

| | |
|---|---|
| ALNAP | Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance |
| ASDW | A Single Drop for Safe Water |
| CFW | Cash for Work |
| CRRP | Comprehensive Rehabilitation and Recovery Plan |
| DFATD | Department of Foreign Affairs Trade and Development |
| DEC | Disasters Emergency Committee |
| DFID RRF | Department for International Development Rapid Response Facility |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| DZ | Dwell Zone |
| ERC | Emergency Relief Coordinator |
| ERL | Early Recovery & Livelihoods (Cluster) |
| FSAC | Food Security & Agriculture Cluster |
| GBV | Gender-Based Violence |
| GFSC | Global Food Security Cluster |
| GPH | Government of Philippines |
| HC | Humanitarian Coalition |
| HRC | Humanitarian Response Consortium |
| HRN | Humanitarian Response Network |
| HumEx | Humanitarian Expertise |
| IASC | Inter-Agency Standing Committee |
| LGU | Local Government Unit |
| NBZ | No Build Zone |
| NDZ | Non-Dwell Zone |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| OCHA | Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OPARR | Office for the Presidential Assistant for Rehabilitation and Recovery |
| UCG | Unconditional Cash Grants |
| UN | United Nations |
| VAW | Violence Against Women |
| WASH | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene |

**PART A: DISCUSSION PAPER**

# 1.0   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Based on the literature review commissioned by the HC, this discussion paper aims to provide recommendations for Canada-based humanitarian agencies and donors looking to improve their involvement in urban-based humanitarian responses.

The Literature Review focuses on the lessons learned, best practices and common challenges for urban shelter, WASH and livelihoods interventions during the Typhoon Haiyan response. As such, the recommendations presented both reinforce learning and best practices found by similar review exercises, and include new perspectives that aim to spark discussions amongst Canadian actors for future urban humanitarian responses.

The focus of the Literature Review is on responses that occurred within existing cities or towns under the authority of a municipal government. These urban areas are typically characterized by a growing population living and working within a fairly dense and contiguous built form and local "urban" economy under a municipal government responsible for the provision of public infrastructure and services. As a general observation, within the post-disaster context, urban areas experienced higher rates of population growth resulting from induced displacement and rapid urbanization in the form of urban infill (ie., formal or informal occupancy of previously vacant or underutilized land) or peri-urban extensions (ie., formal and informal occupancy of lands on the perimeter of urban areas). Moreover municipal governments and urban populations have a much higher exposure to risk due to disaster-induced damage and displacement and the resulting administrative, financial and capacity strain on public infrastructure and services and due to lack of protections, basic needs and opportunity within the emerging post disaster context.  Considering this uneven distribution of risk, many of the main recommendations focus on municipalities (as the governance framework and service provider) as a critical focal point for improving humanitarian response outcomes including increased urban resiliency and disaster risk reduction.

The main recommendations in this paper are divided into two categories – policy recommendations and recommendations for operational agencies.

## Policy Recommendations include:

### Recommendation 1:  Set the stage for early recovery from the outset by using an integrated, incremental "relief to recovery" approach for program design.

1.1 Agencies should plan for early recovery from the outset of a response by integrating the necessary flexibility into program design through the use of incremental strategies that effectively link relief and recovery activities.
1.2 Agencies should include housing, land and property rights as a central element of any "incremental approach" to relief and recovery in urban area from the outset.
1.3 Agencies should use planning tools such as community and regional plans to assess, analyze and respond to the greater effects of post-disaster relief and recovery interventions.

## Recommendation 2: Provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable humanitarian agencies to develop integrated, incremental, "relief to recovery" programming.

2.1 Donors should provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable implementing agencies to adapt programming where necessary based on updated, urban appropriate needs assessments, situation and response analyses.

2.2 Donors should provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable implementing agencies to adapt and develop integrated, cross-sectoral programming that strengthens existing municipal services as part of first phase response. This includes capacity building of municipal departments and the use of integrated and/or area-based approaches.

2.3 Donors should provide increased funding for recovery efforts that involve participatory planning efforts and partnerships between local government, local civil society and affected communities.

## Operational Recommendations Include:

## Recommendation 3: Adopt cross-sectoral, neighbourhood, or area-based approaches when implementing responses in densely populated urban contexts

3.1 Implementing agencies should plan responses to displacement so they reflect beneficiaries' new contexts and sense of place post-disaster, integrating essential and secondary services so that sectoral activities support, reinforce and multiply one another's impacts.

3.2 Agencies should make more use of geographically focused targeting methodologies when implementing responses in dense urban environments, as part of an integrated area-based approach.

3.3 Agencies should adapt existing assessment and program design tools so they better reflect the complexities of the urban environment, needs of host and displaced populations and capacity of municipal service providers to respond.

3.4 Agencies should integrate sectoral programming with cross-cutting livelihoods strategies reflective of pre-existing regional and local urban economies and the emerging reconstruction economy.

## Recommendation 4: Establish partnerships with municipalities and local authorities to plan for, and deliver, integrated "relief to recovery" interventions from the outset of humanitarian operations – even prior to emergencies.

4.1 Agencies should work in partnership with municipalities and local authorities to plan for interventions by aligning first phase response plans with essential public services and infrastructure, as well as identifying challenges this will engender for recovery assistance.

4.2 Agencies should strengthen existing municipal services and local infrastructure as part of first phase response. This may include capacity building and systems support for the municipal departments, civil society and/or private sector actors responsible for the delivery of essential services such as water, waste management, transportation, and health among others.

## Recommendation 5:  Include participatory planning approaches for community design in relief and recovery interventions in urban areas; including incremental approaches to land tenure, housing and infrastructure.

5.1 Agencies should facilitate an open, accessible, participatory community planning process that incorporates communities and the local government into shared decision-making regarding organization of the public realm (services and infrastructure).

## 2.0   TARGET AUDIENCE

The primary audience for this discussion paper is made up of the Humanitarian Coalition (HC) and HC member agencies.  To reach a wider Canadian Humanitarian audience – including Canadian donors – the HC may choose to disseminate this discussion paper and its accompanying Literature Review at events such as HRN meetings and the 2016 Canadian Humanitarian Conference. While it is hoped that the discussion paper may also be pertinent for non-Canadian based agencies, it does not directly target recommendations for any non- Canadian based actors.

## 3.0   OBJECTIVES

The discussion paper aims to provide recommendations for:[1]
- Supporting Canada-based agencies in implementing "best practice" urban WASH, Shelter and Livelihoods interventions with a view towards transition and reconstruction;
- Aiding Canadian donors to better support effective, efficient urban humanitarian WASH, Shelter and Livelihoods interventions

The discussion and recommendations contained below are based largely on the accompanying literature review commissioned by the HC and member agencies.  The Literature Review focuses on the lessons learned, best practices and common challenges for urban shelter, WASH and livelihoods interventions during the Typhoon Haiyan response.  The content of this paper both reinforces learning and best practices previously identified in other review and learning exercises and also presents new perspectives intended to spark discussions aimed at improving Canadian actors' support for future urban humanitarian responses.

## 4.0   LIMITATIONS OF THE DISCUSSION PAPER

As noted above, the recommendations are drawn from the literature review commissioned by the HC.  Given issues related to scope and access, the literature review was limited to Haiyan and urban response specific evaluation documents that were either i) available in the public domain and/or ii) provided by HC members.  Though there is likely a significant amount of relevant information outside of these categories, this information was deemed to fall outside of the scope of the review and therefore this discussion paper.

Given these limitations, the recommendations presented below do not pretend to be exhaustive or above debate.[2]  Some recommendations are drawn directly from the literature and reiterate those identified by other actors or in other emergencies.  Other recommendations may refer to activities already being implemented by some actors but not others, while some may list new types of interventions that have yet to be implemented or funded by Canada-based agencies.  A further set of recommendations in this paper respond to lessons learned during Haiyan, but are outlined using the technical knowledge drawn from the authors' own experiences as humanitarian workers, urban planners, and livelihoods and shelter experts (in urban settings).

Where the accompanying literature review did not identify any relevant information in the documents reviewed (ie addressing gender or GBV in urban Haiyan responses), the authors did not include

---

[1] These objectives were shifted from the original objectives in the TOR.  The changes were made in consultation with the HC to better reflect the lessons learned and findings from the accompanying literature review.

[2] For a discussion of the limitations of the Literature Review forming the basis of this discussion document, please see the accompanying paper.

recommendations about these topics even if the authors' experience suggest that it is important to include.[3] The intention of this paper is to both provide recommendations for future actions as well as to use the Haiyan experience to further discussion amongst Canadian humanitarian actors regarding effective ways forward for improving future urban responses. It is the authors' hope that this paper is the beginning of a discussion rather than an end, and that the recommendations presented will be debated, discussed and further refined through a continuing dialogue with the HC and its members.

# 5.0   RECOMMENDATIONS FOR URBAN RESPONSES

## 5.1   Policy Recommendations

### Recommendation 1:  Set the stage for early recovery from the outset by using an integrated, incremental "relief to recovery" approach for program design.

If done correctly, relief activities can both save lives and also set the foundation for future recovery and resilience building.   Where displacement is longer term – such as in the case of those affected by the establishment of "no build zones" in the Philippines – affected populations are de facto required to form new and/or reconstructed communities.  To be of benefit to both the communities rebuilding themselves and the municipalities serving them, community members and local institutions need to be effectively involved in the recovery or reconstruction of in situ and new communities from the outset.  Given this, it is important that, whenever and wherever possible, immediate relief activities should be designed as part of a continuous path from assistance to recovery.

This can be done by using both integrated and incremental approaches to deliver relief activities in a way that also builds towards recovery; effectively mainstreaming resilience building for future risks (such as natural hazards, land access, displacement, etc.) into the design of relief assistance.  To achieve this, it is important to align immediate responses with existing built infrastructure, levels of service delivery, governance structures, regional and local economies and planning frameworks.   This is critical for ensuring that the activities responding to short term life saving needs can also be used to build towards successful longer term recovery. Using an integrated, incremental "relief to recovery" approach such as this – where integration occurs across sectors, actors, regions and time – has the potential to make both immediate assistance and early recovery more effective as it connects delivery strategies straight across the short, medium and longer terms.

### Recommendation 1.1: Agencies should plan for early recovery from the outset of a response by integrating the necessary flexibility into program design through the use of incremental strategies that effectively link relief and recovery activities.

Lessons learned from the Haiyan response show that to maximize efficiency and effectiveness, it is important to avoid breaks in the continuity of support from relief to early recovery. Breaks in the cycle can lead to

1.  Losing opportunities for building sustainable options that contribute to livelihoods and resilience following first phase response; or
2.  Situations where the relative immediacy and urgency of the ongoing relief activities takes precedence, to the detriment of planning for an effective and timely transition to recovery; and
3.  Potentially increased expectations of continued, on-going assistance at higher funding levels than are either possible or optimal in the longer term; and

---

[3] Gender, GBV and Protection were key missing elements from the Literature Review and, as such, are gaps in the recommendations and discussions presented here.  The authors are hopeful that further discussions can bring information about how gender, GBV and Protection were addressed (or not) in urban specific Haiyan interventions to light and, therefore, provide a basis for the authors to use to formulate recommendations, ie with regards to land and housing rights, livelihoods, mobility or access to services, targeting, etc.

4. The risk of fomenting further dependence on external emergency support rather than on building resiliency and self-sufficiency as quickly as possible.

This can be resolved by better integrating early recovery and longer-term development planning into the early stages of a response through the use of ***incremental and integrated strategies*** that are designed to link first phase response activities with longer term recovery and development opportunities from the outset. Agencies using incremental strategies provide first phase solutions – such as emergency shelter kits, cash for work clearance activities or emergency water supplies – that are designed to link up with existing municipal services and/or recovery interventions as longer term services are re-established. For example, providing WASH connections that are pre-set to link to municipal services in the future once those services are provided to resettlement areas; providing shelter kits that function as both emergency housing as well as a shelter unit that can be built onto as materials become available, household composition and needs change and/or resettlement plans becomes clearer; working with authorities and communities to identify ways to use infill, peri-urban reconstruction and/or resettlement plans more effectively so they provide the basic infrastructures and services needed to meet immediate needs and lay the foundation for upgrading and/or connection to central networks over time (if needed, appropriate and approved by communities and local authorities). This will allow municipalities to build resettlement areas more effectively instead of potentially facing the negative effects of unchecked growth and/or settlement following population movements after a disaster.

### Recommendation 1.2: Agencies should include housing, land and property rights as a central element of any "incremental approach" to relief and recovery in urban area from the outset.

Lessons learned from the Haiyan response demonstrate the centrality of housing, land and property rights to protection and durable solutions for affected populations and the need to address these issues from the outset of a response (IASC); meaning flexible programmatic approaches, based around longer-term solutions, are required wherever and whenever possible.

An example of this is the approach to "self-recovery" and shelter taken during the Haiyan response. As reflected in the findings of multiple evaluations and learning reviews, whilst support to shelter self-recovery was considered an appropriate modality given the circumstances in the Philippines, where this targets the most vulnerable in particular, it needs to be delivered as a complete package of assistance or risks having a negligible impact. Those without the physical capacity or financial resources to either undertake the construction work themselves, or pay a qualified tradesperson to do it, may not be able to make use of the resources provided, or be left with an incomplete and/or unsafe structure that they have no means to finalize. Learning from Typhoon Haiyan underlines the advantages of focusing on self-recovery options and/or providing flexible menus of options (eg CRS) where there is a suitable and supportive context – including agreements regarding tenure and land rights. This allows more resources to be allocated to more durable shelter solutions from an early stage and is a complementary element of an integrated, multi-sectoral approach.

### Recommendation 1.3: Agencies should use planning tools such as community and regional plans to assess, analyze and respond to the greater effects of post-disaster response and recovery interventions

Urban areas are highly connected and contextualized within their surrounding areas, making it imperative to consider the impact of both disaster and recovery actions (especially when it is self-recovery led) within this larger context in order to better understand the implications of scale for urban based programs. The Haiyan response demonstrated the intricacies with which interventions at one scale can impact another, both positively and negatively. Lessons learned show that planning and resettlement policies that do not account for the interdependent nature of urban areas and their surrounding regions can have potentially negative secondary effects for populations residing outside the areas of intervention. For example, in the case of

Haiyan, the establishment of "no build zones" as a stand-alone policy response for controlling population settlement in high-risk areas led to 1) continuing vulnerability and lack of clarity for populations residing in these areas, and 2) additional pressures on host and surrounding areas receiving additional populations but that did not have the services, livelihoods opportunities or capacity to provide for them in the longer term. Though accommodating displaced communities requires significant investment of time and resources, the implications of not resettling displaced people residing in unsafe areas typically results in a negative contribution to the cycle of rapid urbanization that is informal, under-serviced and located in areas of low resiliency.

Agencies should address these issues by partnering with local service providers (including local civil society, developers and builders), municipalities and communities to support regional or community plans that consider the public framework,[4] delivery of services and options for resettlement and reconstruction sites as part of response planning. Regional or community plans that establish common organizing elements that are able to effectively integrate the essential services provided by humanitarian responses have a greater chance of success in mitigating risk and building resiliency for the populations they support across the areas they impact.   This should be done by:

- Early rapid assessment of local conditions including infrastructure, lot sizes, housing, and local economies (with a gender and dis/ability perspective included, at the minimum);
- Early identification of potential resettlement / reconstruction sites, community skills and professions (ensuring a gender and age disaggregated analysis at the minimum);
- Establishing the public framework, defined by key infrastructures (e.g., roads, water, wastewater, sanitation, etc.) and services (e.g., clinics, schools, markets, etc.) that provide choice and ability to grow incrementally (with an eye towards reducing marginalization and exclusion, e.g. with a gender, age and/or dis/ability perspective);
- Determining flexible patterns of land division and designing incremental housing types using local materials and construction techniques; and
- Establishing social and economic development plans (with an eye towards reducing marginalization and exclusion, e.g. with a gender, age and/or dis/ability perspective).


## Recommendation 2:  Provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable humanitarian agencies to develop integrated, incremental, "relief to recovery" programming.

The need for increased flexibility in funding is identified in a number of documents and evaluations (ALNAP, IASC…): "*while blanket, standard responses to food, water, health and shelter needs were appropriate and effective in the immediate phase of the response, it (is) apparent that there was a need for more tailored responses that go beyond enabling households to meet immediate basic needs but also to restore livelihoods quickly*" (IASC). The Philippines is representative of several humanitarian contexts in that it is a lower middle income country with experienced, capable disaster response systems and local governments.   Several evaluations point to these, among other factors, as key elements in the rapid rate of self-recovery that communities established following Haiyan.  Despite this, the literature review identified a number of examples where agencies were unable to adapt programming as quickly as required (e.g. in shelter) to respond to affected populations' rapidly evolving needs as well as pointing to instances where donor funding was not sufficiently flexible to be able to assess, support or respond to the realities of the Filipino rate of self-recovery. This led to the continuation of immediate relief activities beyond the appropriate time period.

---

[4] Ibid

Several evaluations suggested that there need to be increased flexibility in funding to better support urban appropriate interventions, including to:

- Respond to rapidly changing needs and support self-recovery;
- Support integrated "relief to recovery" and/or area based approaches;
- Support municipal services and infrastructure; and
- Facilitate wide ranging community participation processes.

**Recommendation 2.1: Donors should provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable implementing agencies to adapt programming where necessary based on updated, urban appropriate needs assessments, situation and response analyses.**

Mega disasters such as Typhoon Haiyan affect a large and diverse geographical area, encompassing urban, rural, coastal and inland environments, as well as both densely and sparsely populated areas with large and small service networks. Even the best initial rapid needs assessments implemented at the onset of an emergency will only be able to provide a snapshot of the situation and needs in the immediate aftermath of a disaster. Of necessity and as the best information available at the time, these initial assessments are used to inform response planning and funding proposals in the early days of a response. However, as the Haiyan experience demonstrated in terms of the speed with which many of those affected moved towards self-recovery activities, unanticipated changes, or more rapid change than anticipated, can mean that response planning also needs to quickly adapt to ensure it remains appropriate to best support a more sustainable recovery. Where donors were flexible to allow adaptations in planned assistance, it was beneficial in enabling support to shift to self-recovery where this had been identified as the more appropriate response. The variety of geographic, socio-economic, and service contexts affected also require flexibility to be built into response planning so that the differing needs across the various contexts can be responded to appropriately.

Recommendation 2.2**:** *Donors should provide sufficient flexibility in emergency response funding mechanisms to enable implementing agencies to adapt develop integrated, cross-sectoral programming that strengthens existing municipal services as part of first phase response. This includes capacity-building for municipal departments and the use of integrated and/or area-based approaches.*[5]

As discussed, it is important that early recovery support should be integrated with emergency response from the outset of humanitarian operations whenever possible. In densely populated urban contexts – where large populations are highly dependent on a complex web of integrated services and service providers for their needs – it is essential that relief interventions also lay the groundwork for future recovery activities by integrating programming into existing municipal plans. By doing so, integrated "relief to recovery" approaches leverage the investments made during the relief phase to contribute to resilience building for affected populations in the future as well as achieve more efficient development results in the longer term. To take advantage of these opportunities, local authorities and humanitarian actors need to be able to support holistic, cross-sectoral activities and planning strategies. Funding therefore needs to be available for area-based approaches as described in the literature as well as for sector specific responses. For example, approaches to livelihoods or shelter need to be able to be flexible and incorporate the diversity of work, tenure options and governance structures that exist in urban areas (and is usually far greater than rural areas).

---

[5] It is important to note that several donors already allow this flexibility in their emergency funding mechanisms. However, given the importance of this approach, and the fact that not all donors have this degree of flexibility in their funding mechanisms as of yet, the recommendation has been included here.

Capacity building and integration with local governance is also a critical step in recovery planning and, consequently, in effective integrated "relief to recovery" approaches. Funding directed to urban and/or municipal planning early in the relief phase will allow for strategy development and partnership creation with the municipal, civil society and private sector actors responsible for service provision in affected communities. Literature shows that long-term displacement is usually the norm for affected communities following a disaster, requiring attention at the outset in order to effectively involve people and institutions in the recovery and reconstruction of in situ and new communities.  Allowing humanitarian actors the flexibility they need to align emergency interventions with municipal levels of service delivery, governance structures and planning is critical to ensuring successful long term outcomes.

**Recommendation 2.3: Donors should provide increased funding for recovery efforts that involve participatory planning efforts and partnerships between local government, local civil society and affected communities.**

Local civil society actors also have a key role to play in designing, managing and implementing participatory planning efforts that are appropriate to urban environments.  In the case of Haiyan, literature shows that, although national NGOs were among the first responders, overall there was limited engagement with national NGOs and civil-society.  The IASC noted that "*there was little if any evidence of the international response contributing to the strengthening of national civil society and its role in disaster management.*" The disconnection of non-Western NGOs, community groups, and the private sector from the mainstream response highlighted gaps in the response and the importance of developing relationships with local and municipal partners in order to extend impacts beyond the emergency and recovery phases (Oxfam). This is particularly important in urban areas where social services and public infrastructures are often provided by local civil society groups (ie. women's organizations) and private sector actors as well as municipal agencies. To support civil society involvement in planning processes, it is therefore important that donors consider providing direct funding to national and local civil society organisations, enabling them to 1) respond at greater scale and 2) be protagonists and facilitators for participatory community planning processes from the outset. In urban areas with complex community make-ups and potential protection issues (resulting from displacement and/or tensions over resources and services in urban areas), this can be of particular importance.

## 5.2    Operational Recommendations

**Recommendation 3:  Adopt cross-sectoral, neighbourhood, or area-based approaches when implementing responses in densely populated urban contexts**

Urban-based populations are supported by a framework of integrated, interdependent infrastructure networks and service systems. Access to that infrastructure, and supporting levels of service, are also indicators of socio-economic status, level of social protection and individual rights and freedoms in urban areas.   For example, land ownership, waste management, transportation, housing stock, and socio-economic rights such as gender inequality, all impact one another and mediate people's access to services. Given this interdependence, humanitarian responses significantly affect localized access to essential goods and services in post disaster urban areas. Lack of response in one sector therefore has the potential to significantly affect coping capacity or resilience in others. This runs the risk of undermining affected people's recovery despite the influx of humanitarian support and can be countered by using an integrated neighbourhood, or area-based approach, to response planning.

The benefits of integrated programming in urban areas, particularly with regards to shelter, livelihoods and WASH have been noted repeatedly (e.g. Shelter Cluster). The most effective way to achieve this is to use a neighbourhood, or area, based approach that can address the complex, integrated nature of people's needs in

urban environments. For example, CRS's urban shelter and settlements recovery program in Tacloban adopted an approach which placed neighbourhoods at the centre of the project, and aimed to be fully inclusive by putting decision-making power in the hands of the households themselves. Despite challenges, the approach proved successful in finding solutions to complex situations (HumEx – Urban shelter and settlement recovery). This approach is supported through the use of different urban planning tools (see recommendation 1) and is consistent with the urban development and infrastructure plans of local authorities and service providers (see recommendation 4).

**Recommendation 3.1: Implementing agencies should plan responses to displacement so they reflect beneficiaries' new contexts and sense of place post-disaster, integrating essential and secondary services so that sectoral activities support, reinforce and multiply one another's impacts.**

Actors largely agree that cross-sectoral approaches were the most beneficial for affected people's recovery following Haiyan. CARE concluded that an integrated approach "*was consistently highlighted as something which would allow affected people to recover*", and "*where this progression does not exist, there was considerably less confidence about a holistic recovery; with more concerns about debt and less confidence in completing the houses*" (CARE – HC Final Report). This is important not only in responding to essential, sector based, needs, but also when accounting for the urban and regional contexts as well as the potential push-pull factors that relief or recovery activities at one scale can engender in another. For example, in the Haiyan response, a number of the relocation sites selected were considered too far away by the majority of affected households, making it difficult to create or maintain livelihoods in proposed relocation areas (HumEx). The IASC evaluation also highlighted that the "*lack of sustainable livelihood options is a key obstacle to the relocation of families in displacement centres*". Without either having livelihoods opportunities in relocation/reconstruction areas or access to safe, appropriate channels for livelihoods opportunities in other areas (ie. through transportation networks) it is likely people will either remain in areas without opportunities and become poorer, or leave, and potentially return to areas designated as unsafe. This is a particular risk for people who are already marginalized or vulnerable such as the elderly, the very young, people living with disabilities, and/or women and girls facing restrictions on their movements.

Using an area based, or neighbourhood, approach provides humanitarian actors, communities, and local authorities with the opportunity to:

1. Take a holistic view of affected populations' needs and capacities in a given area and
2. Be strategic in developing interventions that allow sectoral activities to ladder onto each other and multiply impacts.

Using planning tools such as aerial interpretation, built form and infrastructure analysis, socio-economic assessments and growth projections, humanitarian actors and municipal partners can get a better sense of the immediate and medium term challenges facing both the populations living in the affected urban areas and the municipal services expected to support them. Having an area-based understanding of local conditions, "state of repair," "ability to pay," and "future demand" assessments for local infrastructure and services will assist humanitarian actors and municipalities in better understanding the choices available to affected populations[6] and the decisions they will make during the "relief to recovery" period. This, in turn, provides municipalities and service providers with the information they need to better plan, design and deliver new or rebuilt infrastructure and services, including social protection and/or assistance, within localized areas as well as contributing positively to urbanizing regions. The importance and implication of scale, and the interactions between scales, become a key guide to decision-making within the "relief to recovery" approach.

---

[6] Including host, displaced and resettled populations

## Recommendation 3.2: Agencies should make more use of geographically focused targeting methodologies when implementing responses in dense urban environments, as part of an integrated area-based approach.

In the Haiyan response, the GFSC noted that targeting was one of the biggest gaps for urban programming as existing social protection systems were not sufficient to reach all vulnerable households and municipal information about household vulnerability was not always correct. Given the complexity of urban livelihoods, social protection mechanisms, service systems and service providers, using data dependent targeting mechanisms in areas where the data is incorrect or insufficient might negatively impact agencies' capacity to respond effectively.  This can be addressed by adapting targeting methodologies to make use of the most appropriate micro-geographic level for densely populated urban environments; namely the "area" or neighbourhood.  Combining this geographic approach with individual or household level vulnerability based targeting can allow humanitarian actors to respond to both individual needs as well as vulnerabilities and/or needs at the systems level. These targeting approaches:

1) Draw on a wide range of urban data and information to establish targeting criteria based on (but not limited to): population density, aerial interpretation, building assessments, land tenure, state of infrastructure repair and pre-existing levels of services and consumables[7] consistent with income levels (as a proxy for vulnerability) – defined by both the municipality and by neighbourhood groups or virtual communities; and
2) Set targeting criteria and relief/recovery interventions so they provide a range of activities that meet immediate needs for affected populations and also link to, and build on, the local, interconnected, service networks (from WASH, to livelihoods, to transportation) that will be needed to set durable solutions in place for the future; and
3) Support the strong coordination needed to bring multiple administrative units and service providers in given areas together for response and service planning.

Targeting systems should also be compatible with existing municipal and/or national social protection mechanisms so as to contribute to building social protection into the future, especially when and where they can provide support for improving gender, age and dis/ability analysis and targeting (at a minimum).

## Recommendation 3.3: Agencies should adapt existing assessment and program design tools so they better reflect the complexities of the urban environment, needs of host/displaced populations and capacity of municipal service providers to respond.

The Haiyan response highlighted the continuing gaps in humanitarian actors' understanding of how to assess needs, vulnerabilities and opportunities or capacities when responding in urban areas.  Gaps in conducting urban-specific assessments, including the timing of assessments; engagement with the private sector, local civil society and municipal actors; and analyzing how and when to link issues such as urban livelihoods with essential and secondary services were all noted in the literature.

Area based assessment tools can be used to address these gaps if they are used early in the assessment process.  These tools can be used as stand-alone tools, or as part of the MIRA or other joint-assessment initiatives, and can provide additional information about local conditions – both in the affected areas and in the

---

[7] While most humanitarian actors already access and use this information as a key step in needs assessments, doing so from an area-based approach signifies that actors are not only using this information to assess needs and plan sectoral responses **within** a given area, but to plan and develop a response to the needs **of** an area – linked to its regional context – through a shared planning framework that can be supported post-relief phase by the duty-bearers responsible for citizens' needs in that urban context (including municipal authorities, service delivery agencies, developers and private sector actors, social service and civil society organizations).

regions connected to, and impacted by, affected sites.  Tools to support additional gathering of information for urban areas, include:[8]

1.  Built form and land tenure: which allows for effective identification of pre-existing population levels and housing conditions along with formal and informal land tenure areas (indicator of level of vulnerability);
2.  Service networks and levels of service: which allows for determination of extent of municipal infrastructure networks, serviced areas and levels of servicing to those areas (including health, protection services and communications infrastructure that provide critical social services);
3.  Local economy: including formal and informal market and trade areas, areas of local, urban and regional production (for food and trade) and main livelihood activities within each, and key industrial activities;
4.  Corridors: including economic and transportation corridors that connect communities, government and areas of production and trade;
5.  Resources: including food production and distribution networks necessary for supporting local food security;
6.  Cultural: including local assets that can form locations of organising and community cohesion (particularly in areas that face tensions between host and displaced groups);
7.  Environment: including establishment of environmentally sensitive and hazard areas;
8.  Potential resettlement / relocation sites:  including typologies of rural, urban greenfield and urban infill sites;
9.  Vulnerability:  which allows for community involvement in identifying, targeting and integrating vulnerable households into immediate support systems and longer term reconstruction processes.

The integration and layering of area-based assessment information gathered using these tools allows actors to design programs that better integrate with the local skills and resources available in urban areas throughout both relief and recovery activities.  Moreover, if local communities are engaged in the assessment process, elements critical to community identity and cohesion can be identified and full incorporated in the recovery process, including the social elements such as gender, age, disability, and ethnicity among others.

**Recommendation 3.4: Agencies should integrate sectoral programming with cross cutting livelihoods strategies reflective of pre-existing regional and local urban economies and the emerging reconstruction economy.**

Urban livelihoods are complex – both in terms of livelihoods sources and in terms of the enabling environments and markets needed to access or maintain suitable livelihoods options.  Given these complexities, it is difficult to respond at scale using a standardized support package for beneficiaries e.g. as might be appropriate when supporting farmers through agricultural inputs and related support. The Typhoon Haiyan experience demonstrated both the benefits and the challenges of adjusting to these complexities through a broad based cash response.  While some of the benefits of cash included urgently needed infusions into the market and cash support that could be leveraged for self-recovery, drawbacks included the lack of linkages between cash support and longer term solutions for the local and regional economies – including the creation of longer term, sustainable livelihoods sources (e.g. steady employment with the same financial value as the cash transfers).

There are clear benefits to designing livelihoods interventions so they reinforce the linkages between livelihoods activities and other sectoral activities such as shelter and WASH.  In urban areas, these advantages include tying the consideration of livelihoods development with relocation.  In cases where people are likely to

---

[8] Many of these tools are already being used by agencies in urban responses, including Typhoon Haiyan.  They have been repeated here because the literature demonstrates that not all agencies have been using them despite the essential information they provide when assessing, and designing, responses for dense urban areas.

be resettled, or forced to migrate, to areas further away from their original location,[9] tying the rehabilitation of livelihoods with settlement activities can ensure that self-recovery approaches are twinned with medium to longer term strategies aimed at building the enabling conditions needed for their success.

## Recommendation 4:  Establish partnerships with municipalities and local authorities to plan for, and deliver, integrated "relief to recovery" interventions from the outset of humanitarian operations – even prior to emergencies.

Lessons learned from Typhoon Haiyan show that approaches which build on existing national systems for disaster relief and recovery are of particular benefit at the local level, especially in urban areas. UNICEF's RTE reported that working with government at the central and municipal levels in the WASH sector yielded benefits for both complementary programming and influencing longer-term policies, while other evaluations pointed to similar benefits in other sectors. Humanitarian actors point to the importance of doing more to develop relationships with local and municipal partners as a key mechanism for ensuring responses extend impacts well beyond the life of the emergency and well into recovery (Oxfam).  Haiyan results also showed the effectiveness of responding to emergencies is increased where long-standing relationships existed with local government units and where investment in technical assistance was provided for project and aid management, DRR and strengthening accountability and local engagement and ownership (UNICEF RTE).

By partnering with municipal agencies in urban areas, humanitarian actors can move beyond a narrowly defined vision of "strengthening" for national and local systems that is often limited to a focus on training provision (IASC).  Partnerships with municipal authorities and service providers are a key aspect of integrated "relief to recovery" approaches and durable solutions.  Strategic and implementation based partnerships with municipal and local authorities are essential for putting in the resources needed to enable front line service providers to get back to work and re-establish services in the affected areas as quickly, effectively, and efficiently as possible.  This can help address issues regarding timing such as those faced during the Haiyan response where the international humanitarian community and the government appeared to have had different understandings of, and planning timeframes for, relief and recovery activities. These partnerships can allow humanitarian actors to not only meet beneficiaries' needs at scale, despite the complexities of targeting in densely populated areas, but also to put the necessary incremental or phased approaches for response in place from the outset.

## Recommendation 4.1:  Agencies should work in partnership with municipalities and local authorities to plan for interventions by aligning first phase response plans with essential public services and infrastructure, as well as identifying challenges this will engender for recovery assistance.

Urban settings often have a large, complex set of actors involved in delivering both essential and secondary services to affected populations – including municipal departments, local authorities and private sector players. There is a much heavier reliance on municipal infrastructure in urban areas with a much greater number of people using and depending on it. This often means that public services and infrastructure not traditionally considered "life saving" by the humanitarian community (such as transportation) are actually essential for urban populations' response and recovery post-disaster – especially in dense urban areas that require intricate service networks and/or where populations are able to "self-recover" early. The findings from Haiyan's "no build zones" and the impacts this had on populations' livelihoods, shelter and land rights, health, and local capacities to support and service citizens are an example of this. Partnerships with municipal and local

---

[9] I.e. if they were living in unsafe zones, or in areas where the density of existing settlements is high and/or availability of suitable space is low)

authorities are therefore necessary for restoring essential services as well as for building sustainability and resiliency.

Working with municipalities to align first phase response activities with existing urban plans can lead to the establishment of more effective public frameworks,[10] and more effective medium term recovery for affected populations. For example, by ensuring that emergency shelter activities and shelter units are linked with flexible patterns of land division that can accommodate the changes that happen in occupancy types from the immediate days following a disaster (such as squatting, renting, etc.) to the full tenure and ownership solutions needed in the recovery stage  (such as in the CRS example). Another example is to support local authorities in integrating emergency cash activities with medium to longer term social and economic development plans that build emergency activities directly into local economic development recovery strategies.[11]

It is important to note that the research reviewed shows that it is most effective if these partnerships are established prior to emergencies, as there is often too little time and too much strain to establish these partnerships during first phase response.  Alternately, where these relationships do not exist prior to first phase response, agencies can use emergency response activities as an entry point for engaging with municipal authorities – laying the groundwork for partnerships during early recovery. This approach provides humanitarian actors and local government decision-makers with the flexibility to develop the policies needed to help affected populations transition from temporary to permanent solutions.

**Recommendation 4.2:  Agencies should strengthen existing municipal services and local infrastructure as part of first phase response. This may include capacity building and systems support for the municipal departments, civil society and/or private sector actors responsible for the delivery of essential services such as water, waste management, transportation, and health among others.**

As in other responses, evaluation documents suggest that in the future local authorities and civil society organizations should be supported to take a more leading role in the coordination of activities at the municipal level from the outset (Oxfam – Report on Protecting Women and Girls).  This should be done by:

1.  Aligning relief and recovery activities with the needs and capacities of local partners and providing them with the support they need to meet their obligations to local citizens; and
2.  Prioritizing partnerships with local partners who can direct funds and procurement activities into supporting the local and regional, economies – whether within neighbourhoods in urban areas or across urban, peri-urban and rural geographies.

To best meet affected populations' needs, actors should have the flexibility to use emergency funds to strengthen urban-based service providers – whether those are municipal, civil society or private sector actors – in rehabilitating municipal infrastructure and/or re-establishing services during first phase response. This may include urban infrastructure assessments, institutional capacity assessments (including governance frameworks), capacity building and/or financial support for municipal government, civil society and/or private sector actors responsible for essential services.  Examples include providing technical support and capacity building for local governments in waste management in urban areas and/or by channelling cash for work activities through the municipal agencies and providers responsible for those services. This can help avoid situations such as those during the Haiyan response where populations' rate of self-recovery in shelter

---

[10] The public framework is made up of key infrastructures (e.g., roads, water, wastewater, sanitation, etc.) and services (e.g., clinics, schools, markets, etc.)

[11] Literature found that cash for work programs and cash intervention programs had the capacity to undermine local economic development when overused and/or when not linked to larger socio-economic and market development strategies.

outstripped some agencies' and donors' capacities to provide appropriate support.[12] The value of this approach is demonstrated by agencies who recorded successes in implementing effective, efficient interventions as a result of longer-term partnerships with municipal service agencies that allowed them to scale up, and meet, demand despite issues in data collection and targeting.[13]

Literature also suggested that actors should establish pre-crisis joint response agreements with governments at national and provincial levels and invest in technical assistance to these entities to improve project and aid management, DRR, and strengthen accountability and local engagement and ownership (UNICEF RTE). This should include capacity building support to local authorities and civil society regarding how to assess and implement urban-appropriate social protection mechanisms as this will ensure greater reach of response measures if faced with future disasters.

## Recommendation 5:  Include participatory planning approaches for community design in relief and recovery interventions in urban areas; including designing incremental approaches to land tenure, housing and infrastructure.

The literature review found that those potentially subject to relocation showed they had received little or no communication or active consultation on the issue from the authorities (Oxfam) and that the cluster system in the Philippines largely failed to involve local civil society (HumEx). In this context the point was raised that resettlement processes should be inclusive and include participatory planning processes to reduce the risk of future displacement or evictions. A participatory planning approach helps alleviate risks to municipalities, host communities and affected populations through consensus driven decision-making including, but not limited to: identifying areas suitable for resettlement (in terms of safety/protection, development, and infrastructure needs); approaches to land tenure and housing designs; selecting the type and level of service for infrastructure; or delivery of social services.

Participatory planning processes that systematically reach out to, and include, all affected groups are key to ensuring that potentially marginalized groups – including, women, children, the elderly, people living with disabilities, etc. – have systematic, on-going access to community decision making. This is particularly necessary in densely populated urban areas and surrounding sites where vulnerable groups may not necessarily have the mobility needed to access authorities or participate in consultation mechanisms that happen in "central" areas (ie. the local authority office which may or may not be accessible for affected residents).  Moreover, in urban areas, new development is highly dependent on the formation of partnerships to ensure availability of land, provision of infrastructure or delivery of services to maintain public health and safety – making participatory community planning key for mainstreaming communities' input into the frameworks governing urban areas. The Literature Review identifies a very good example (see land rights and secure tenure) of participatory planning.

## Recommendation 5.1:  Agencies should facilitate an open, accessible, participatory community planning process that incorporates communities and the local government into shared decision-making regarding organization of the public realm (services and infrastructure).

While it is standard procedure for humanitarian agencies to ensure participation when planning relief activities, it is important that agencies also facilitate and/or ensure participation throughout the entire recovery process.

---

[12] The literature review highlights a few cases where agencies were required to continue providing emergency shelter after local municipal authorities and affected populations were already re-building and engaged in recovery activities.

[13] For example, Oxfam's WASH response in Leyte and its partnership with the water authorities in the area.

Humanitarian agencies therefore have a role to play in supporting local authorities and municipal actors in engaging affected populations and including the same in the planning, design, and operation of municipal infrastructure and services. In urban areas, where host and displaced communities have a high degree of interaction, often with competing interests and demands, consensus-driven planning processes can become effective mediation tools to bring communities to the same table.  These processes can enable them to share decision-making based on technically informed options for managing displacement and reconstruction in the urban context.  Where urban areas have both host populations and disaster-affected/displaced communities, this takes on particular importance, as ineffective mechanisms can lead to a variety of protection risks and/or poor services that do not meet people's needs (e.g. inadvertently enabling GBV or inter-ethnic violence).

Humanitarian actors should also play a facilitation role for local authorities and civil society organizations to help them develop open, accessible engagement processes with communities.  These processes should identify infrastructure needs and community planning – including DRR and growth – in order to foster dialogue between urban-based rights holders and duty bearers across the relief to recovery cycle.  This can be done by: providing communities with information about the resettlement/reconstruction/recovery/etc. planning process and their rights in that process; ensuring communities' representation in the planning process; and equipping communities with the skills and support they need to understand and influence the planning process (including public infrastructure, services, economic and safety issues). Agencies should also act as facilitators between local government and communities in the planning, design and delivery of approaches to tenure, housing and infrastructure. Agencies can do this by supporting local government actors in understanding how to integrate local community knowledge in the design and construction process so it builds on existing capacities, including involving private sector actors as part of local socio-economic recovery. These participation processes are especially important in urban environments where communities are often geographically diffuse and accessing – and including – marginalized groups can be particularly complex or difficult.