COMMUNITY PRESENTATION of FRMC BASELINE STUDY

Part 1: Project Team Meeting and Preparation

A. Review of the baseline and VCA results

The team scanned through the grades and scores from the FRMC baseline study of the four barangays and cross-referenced them with the VCA results. Particular emphasis was given to D-graded sources and how this correlates with the scores and the data coming from the VCA.

The team also referred to the FRA guidance documents (From Results Analysis to Intervention Planning) and prepared the activity sheet under Stage 1 - Step 1, to better understand the baseline results. From this, it became clear what the strengths and weaknesses of the communities were and how these relates to the different lenses. Cross-referencing with the VCA results also provided a bigger picture of the community situation.

The team then discussed how to present the results to the community in the most effective and efficient way. The following steps will show how the team conducted this.

B. Preparation of materials and other requirements

Proper coordination with local authorities were ensured prior to the conduct of the activities. The community RC143 volunteers were also mobilized to invite specific people to the activity. A total of 17 community members were listed down as participants coming from different sectors such as farmers, women, youth, persons with disabilities, older persons, store owners, PTA officers, and a council member of the barangay. The team also coordinated with the local school district to use the classrooms in the community as venue for the presentation.

Different materials were also prepared such as visual aids for the discussion on the 44 Sources and the different lenses as well as the D-graded sources for each community.

Part 2: Barangay Presentation

A. The activity started with an overview of the CBDRRM-FRMC Project and a look-back on the baseline study conducted in the community to refresh the participants' memory of the data gathering activity and how it is connected with the presentation.

B. The participants were divided into four groups with one facilitator (coming from the team) in-charge of discussing the 44 Sources within an assigned lens. One facilitator will be discussing with Group 1 the 44 Sources in terms of the 5C's, another for the 4R's, another for the DRM Cycle and another one for the Themes. After 30 minutes, the facilitators switched and the process continued until all 4 groups have been presented with the 44 Sources in all 4 lenses. Each group was assigned in different rooms.

C. The groups reconvened in the main room and asked to share insights on what have been discussed to them. At this point, it was observed that most participants were confused with some of the Sources but were able to grasp a few, particularly those that have direct links to them. The Themes lens proved to be the easiest to discuss the Sources.

D. The groups were then asked to return to their assigned rooms. This time, the facilitators discussed the D-graded sources in their assigned lens. In this particular breakout session, the facilitators were instructed to refer to the baseline data and provide figures and statistics based on the household survey, FGD and KII. This way it was easier for the participants to understand why their community had a D-grade on that particular source. It was observed that in this session, participants were more interested and some were taking down notes of the discussion. Participants were also more engaging and providing their insights and previous experiences. The process was repeated until the groups have heard the discussion of their D-grades in four different lenses.

E. The groups were reconvened in the main room and had a sharing of their insights. Most of them were disappointed to hear the results while some were quite convinced and affirmed them.

F. The next step was to present all the D-graded sources and ask the participants to select their top four sources. Each participant was given four-colored chips each with a corresponding point: 4 yellow chips as their top 1 source; 3 green chips as their top 2 source; 2 red chips as their top 3 source; and 1 blue chip as their top 4 source. Before the voting started, the main facilitator removed the D-graded sources wherein the project can provide direct support (i.e., First Aid Knowledge, Community Disaster Risk Management Planning, Integrated Flood Management Planning, Community Representative Bodies, Intercommunity Flood Coordination, Evacuation and Safety Knowledge, Early Warning Systems, Water and Sanitation Awareness, and Community Participation in Flood-related Activities). The points are then tallied and presented to the participants. They then identified for each ranked source where the barangay council, the LGU or other stakeholder can potentially support them with an intervention.

Ranking of Prioritized D-Graded Sources per barangay

BOGTONG SILAG

RANK	CODE	SOURCE	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	BLUE	TOTAL
1	P09	FLOOD EMERGENCY SUPPLY	32	9	0	5	46
2	S08	LOCAL LEADERSHIP	24	15	2	0	41
3	P11	FLOOD WASTE CONTAMINATION	20	9	10	1	40
4	S03	BUSINESS CONTINUITY	12	15	0	1	28
5	S07	SOCIAL INCLUSIVENESS	4	6	4	1	15
6	P03	FLOOD EMERGENCY INFRASTRUCTURE	0	3	4	4	11
7	P06	LARGE SCALE FLOOD PROTECTION	0	6	2	1	9
8	N01	NATURAL CAPITAL CONDITION	0	0	0	0	0
9	H02	FIRST AID KNOWLEDGE	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
10	S04	COMMUNITY DRM PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
11	S09	INTER-COMMUNITY FLOOD COORDINATION	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
12	S10	INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				

DORONGAN VALERIO

RANK	CODE	SOURCE	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	BLUE	TOTAL
1	P03	FLOOD EMERGECNY INFRASTRUCTURE	28	3	2	3	36
2	F04	HOUSEHOLD INCOME CONTINUITY STRATEGY	4	21	4	1	30
3	P09	FLOOD EMERGENCY FOOD SUPPLY	16	3	6	4	29
4	H08	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AWARENESS	8	3	10	1	22
5	P11	FLOOD WASTE CONTAMINATION	0	3	6	6	15
6	P06	LARGE SCALE FLOOD PROTECTION	0	12	2	0	14
7	N03	PRIORITY MANAGED UNITS	4	0	0	0	4
8	S10	INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
9	H07	WATER AND SANITATION AWARENESS	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				

DORONGAN SAWAT

RANK	CODE	SOURCE	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	BLUE	TOTAL
1	P01	FLOOD HEALTHCARE ACCESS	44	18	4	1	66
2	F03	BUSINESS CONTINUITY	12	3	12	3	30
3	P11	FLOOD WASTE CONTAMINATION	0	3	12	11	26
4	H05	ASSET PROTECTION KNOWLEDGE	8	12	4	0	24
5	S06	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE BODIES	4	15	4	1	24
6	P03	FLOOD EMERGENCY INFRASTRUCTURE	12	9	0	1	22
7	F04	HOUSEHOLD INCOME CONTINUITY STRATEGY	8	6	6	0	20
8	P06	LARGE SCALE FLOOD PROTECTION	0	0	4	3	7
9	N03	PRIORITY MANAGED UNITS	0	0	0	2	2
10	S04	COMMUNITY DRM PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
11	S10	INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
12	H01	EVACUATION AND SAFETY KNOWLEDGE	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				

PAMPANO

RANK	CODE	SOURCE	YELLOW	GREEN	RED	BLUE	TOTAL
1	H03	EDUCATION COMMITMENT DURING FLOODS	36	6	0	4	46
2	P09	FLOOD EMERGENCY FOOD SUPPLY	20	3	10	2	35
3	F03	BUSINESS CONTINUITY	0	18	12	1	31
4	P11	FLOOD WASTE CONTAMINATION	0	9	6	8	23
5	S06	COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVE BODIES	0	9	2	0	11
6	P03	FLOOD EMERGENCY INFRASTRUCTURE	8	0	0	1	9
7	H08	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AWARENESS	4	0	2	0	6
8	P06	LARGE SCALE FLOOD PROTECTION	0	3	0	1	4
9	F04	HOUSEHOLD INCOME CONTINUITY STRATEGY	0	0	2	0	2
10	N03	PRIORITY MANAGED UNITS	0	0	0	0	0
11	S01	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN FLOOD RELATED ACTIVITIES	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
12	P02	EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
13	S09	INTERCOMMUNITY FLOOD COORDINATION	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				
14	S10	INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLANNING	*PROJECT SUPPORTED*				

G. Five participants were then elected to form part of the Barangay Flood Resilience Committee (BFRC) who will take lead in the intervention planning and proposal development to be supported by the project team in the coming weeks.

Part 3: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward

After the presentations were completed in the four partner barangays, the project team held a one-day evaluation workshop to discuss what went well and what went wrong in the activity. The following are observations from the activity:

1. In the first breakout session, it is better to prepare examples of the sources that are present or existing in the community. Facilitators can also ask the participants what they can think of as an example to gauge whether the discussion is going the right direction before moving to the next topic.
2. The first breakout session is essential. Participants' appreciation of the sources and key concepts on flood resilience is the target. Understanding is difficult to achieve at this stage. However, it can be included in the last session. The main facilitator can ask the participants about their understanding of the 44 sources of resilience or if they have further questions about the concept of flood resilience.
3. Improve the visual aids to make the font larger and images bigger. The visual aids, particularly those that are used to discuss the D-graded sources, should be posted on the wall during the last session prior to the voting. It can help the participants to remember the discussion in the previous session.
4. In the second breakout session, facilitators should give emphasis on the "why". They should have a list of data from the baseline study to deeply explain the particular D-graded source by providing statistics. On the other hand, facilitators should avoid the "how" as this may influence the participants for the next activity.
5. In the last plenary session, right after the breakout sessions on the discussion of D-graded sources, it is important to engage the whole group into a discussion on their insights and feelings about the baseline study result. This opens up the group to an exchange of opinions and the main facilitator should be keen in observing the interaction between the participants taking into consideration the specific sector the participant is representing.
6. Aside from facilitators, there should be assigned documenters for each breakout session to take down notes and record the sharing among the participants. The main facilitator can use these notes in the last session.
7. After each community presentation, it is important to do an evaluation. This way, the project team is able to adjust appropriately prior to the next community presentation. An over-all evaluation is equally important so that it can be shared with Alliance partners. More importantly, the community dynamics observed in the activity will provide better understanding of the community people which can be used in future engagements.