DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

PORTFOLIO PROJECT DOCUMENT

Portfolio Name: Strengthening Institutions and Empowering Localities Against Disasters and Climate Change (SHIELD) Program

Portfolio Number: PPFLIO-000104

Start Date: 15 June 2022 **End Date:** 30 September 2028 **PAC Meeting date:** 22 November 2021

Projects Included in the Portfolio:

Project Names	Project Number	Implementing Partner
1. SHIELD – UNDP	00128629	United Nations Development Programme
2. SHIELD – CBCS	00140487	Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society
3. SHIELD – NRC	00140485	Carlos P. Romulo Foundation for Peace and Development, Inc. – National Resilience Council
4. SHIELD – PBSP	00140488	Philippine Business for Social Progress

Brief Description

The Philippines is the third most disaster-prone and fifth most exposed to climate change impacts globally. Climate change is exacerbating the impacts of weather-related events in the Philippines. With 7,000+ islands and major coastal population centres, it is highly exposed to rising sea levels and extreme weather events, and associated storm surges and flooding.

The Philippines is one of the fastest growing economies in Southeast Asia and plays an important role in the stability of the region. Environmental degradation and more frequent climatic events are likely to be key political, economic, and security disrupters over the longer term. Humanitarian crises can undermine growth, reverse development gains, increase poverty, and cause instability that can last for decades.

The nexus between gender equity, disability, and social inclusion (GEDSI), disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM), and climate change adaptation (CCA) is a well-established human development issue. Climate change and inequality interlink to create a vicious vulnerability-poverty cycle. Socio-economic inequalities are a key determinant in the disproportionate adverse effects of climate hazards on marginalized people and these impacts in turn create greater inequality and marginalisation. At the same time, disasters and conflict are integrally linked to the broader national development context in which they occur and can contribute to each other by making a situation better or worse.

The Government of Australia (GOA) is investing AUD18 million in the Strengthening Institutions and Empowering Localities Against Disasters and Climate Change (SHIELD) Program to support the Government of the Philippines (GPH) in building institutional and community resilience to climate change and natural hazards, while taking into account the systemic nature of risks. The goal of the SHIELD Program is to make all people in target communities safer and more resilient to the impacts of natural hazard events and climate change. This will be realized by achieving three inter-dependent outcomes/components:

- Component 1: Government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders in targeted local government units (LGUs) are collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions
- Component 2: Relevant national government agencies (NGAs) are prioritizing action on local climate and disaster resilience

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

- Component 3: Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action

In partnership with the Government of the Philippines, the SHIELD Program will be implemented by the UNDP, together with consortium partners, including UN-Habitat, Philippine Business for Social Progress, National Resilience Council, and the Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society. The Department of Interior and Local Government serves as lead Government partner for the implementation of the SHIELD Program.

Contributing Outcome(s) (PFSD/CPD, RPD or SP): *UNDP CPD (2019-2023)* *Outcome 2: Urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, equitable, and sustainable development path for communities.* **Indicative Output(s)::** *UNDP CPD (2019-2023)* *Output 2.1 Climate-sensitivity models and hazard maps developed and applied to help NGAs and LGUs better understand and plan for the extent, scope, and distribution of medium and long-term risks.* *Output 2.2 Enabling policies, private sector engagement, monitoring, reporting and verification systems strengthened to help the country meet its commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement.* Indicative Output(s) with gender marker[1]: SHIELD – UNDP: GEN2 SHIELD – CBCS: GEN2 SHIELD – NRC: GEN2 SHIELD – PBSP: GEN2	**Total resources required:**[2]	USD 13,448,283
	Total resources allocated:	USD 13,448,283
	UNDP TRAC:	USD 300,000
	Donor - DFAT:	USD 13,148,283
	Government:	
	In-Kind:	
	Unfunded:	

Agreed by (signatures):

UNDP
DocuSigned by: 00A71179A59543C... Name: Selva Ramachandran Resident Representative
Date: 17-Jun-2022

Implementing Partner 1	Implementing Partner 2	Implementing Partner 3
DocuSigned by: D5B3BE7CE0E8485... Name: Guiamel M. Alim Chairperson	DocuSigned by: E80308A11F664CF... Name: Ma. Antonia Yulo Loyzaga President	DocuSigned by: C1273668F4D1430... Name: Elvin Ivan Uy Executive Director
Date: 17-Jun-2022	Date: 17-Jun-2022	Date: 17-Jun-2022
Institution: Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society	Institution: Carlos P. Romulo Foundation for Peace and Development, Inc. – National Resilience Council	Institution: Philippine Business for Social Progress

[1] The Gender Marker measures how much a project invests in gender equality and women's empowerment. Select one for each output: GEN3 (Gender equality as a principle objective); GEN2 (Gender equality as a significant objective); GEN1 (Limited contribution to gender equality); GEN0 (No contribution to gender quality)

[2] Based on UN currency exchange rate as of 1 November 2021 at USD1 = AUD1.369

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

I. DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

The challenge to strengthening institutions and empowering localities against disasters and climate change is underlain by four (4) inter-related conditions that characterize the Philippines: (1) exposure and susceptibility to natural hazards and climate risks, (2) high economic cost of disasters, (3) climate change exacerbation of the vulnerability-poverty cycle for marginalized groups, and (4) reinforcement of the conflict and disaster nexus in certain regions of the country.

Exposure and Susceptibility to Natural Hazards and Climate Risks

According to the 2020 World Risk Report, the Philippines has the ninth highest risk to disasters among 140 countries and with a population of over 190 million, remains to be the most densely populated and urbanised of all global disaster hotspots. An archipelagic country located in the Ring of Fire and typhoon belt, the Philippines faces risks from multiple hazards - typhoons[1], floods, landslides, tsunamis, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions,[2] as well as slow onset hazards such as droughts.[3] The country is also highly vulnerable to climate risks, with climate change exacerbating the impacts of weather-related events with associated severe wind, storm surge, coastal flooding, and sea level rise.[4] The 2021 German Climate Risk Index places the Philippines as the fourth most affected by long-term climate risks.[5] Indeed, and since 1990, the Philippines has been affected by 565 disaster events that claimed the lives of nearly 40,000 Filipinos and caused an estimated USD24 billion in damages. At least 60 per cent of the country's total land area is exposed to multiple hazards and about 75 per cent of the population is vulnerable to their impacts. Eight of the top ten cities most at risk from natural hazards are in the Philippines, including Metro Manila.

High Economic Cost of Disasters

The economic cost of disasters to the Philippines is high.[6] The Department of Finance (DOF) estimates that annual economic losses due to disasters represent 2.5% of the country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), translating to USD13 billion of the estimated nominal GDP for 2018. Major disasters have far-reaching and long-lasting impacts on livelihoods,[7] goods and services, supply chains, and businesses. Widespread and multiple disasters as experienced in the Philippines can retard and even arrest economic growth.[8] This is also readily apparent in the economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic – increased income poverty for an estimated 10.9 million workers (38% of whom are women) and a drastic 9.5% decline in the economy for 2020.

Exacerbation of the Vulnerability-Poverty Cycle

Socio-economic inequalities are a key determinant in the disproportionate adverse effects of climate change and natural hazards on marginalised people and these impacts, in turn, create greater inequality and marginalisation. The most vulnerable sectors are women,[9]10 men, and children[11] of poor[12] households and communities that depend on ecological resources for their needs,[13,14] as well as indigenous peoples, the elderly, persons with special needs and disabilities,[15] and other vulnerable groups. In urban areas,[16] most especially Metro Manila,[17] lower income households and informal settlers often reside in high-density areas more exposed to risks,[18] contributing to the estimated half a million Filipinos experiencing transient consumption poverty due to disasters each year.[19] Sadly, their lack of voice and agency in disaster risk reduction and management and climate change adaptation (DRRM/CCA) planning and implementation underpin inequitable and unsustainable outcomes.

Reinforcement of the Conflict and Disaster Nexus

The conflict and disaster nexus is pronounced in certain parts of the country, including geographically isolated and depressed areas (GIDAs),[20]Mindanao,[21] and the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM).[22] Extreme weather events and disasters exacerbate fragility challenges and can increase people's vulnerability and grievances, especially in conflict affected situations. The relationship between disasters and fragility is often mutually reinforcing.[23] Disasters, whether natural or man-made, put additional stress on stretched governance systems, decrease economic opportunities, reduce resources, and displace people.[24]

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Given all these, the positive, efficient and effective prevention, resistance, absorption, adaptation, response and recovery of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, systems and societies[25] to disasters and climate change must take into consideration the following: (1) the complex, inter-related and compounding nature of known and unknown, natural and man-made, systemic and multi-dimensional risks,[26] (2) the necessity for risk-informed investments towards planning, implementation and monitoring within interconnected systems, and (3) actions that help build capacities of multiple stakeholders, including vulnerable and marginalized groups, against risks. These are the key elements of resilience-building.[27]

The Government of the Philippines (GPH) has a clear priority on resilience, as evidenced by the Philippine Development Plan (2017-2022),[28] National Climate Change Action Plan (2011-2028)[29] and National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (2022-2030),[30] and the Philippines' Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to the Paris Agreement.[31] Strong policy reforms were also provided for by the Climate Change Act of 2009 and the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010, which marked the shift from reactive response and recovery to proactive preparedness and mitigation, and from centralised administration to devolved local and community-based action. There are several national government agencies taking the lead on intersecting and complementary resilience actions given the complexity of issues that need to be addressed, including the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG),[32] Department of Science and Technology (DOST), Office of Civil Defense (OCD),[33] National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), Department of Human Settlements and Urban Development (DHSUD) and the Climate Change Commission (CCC).[34, 35]

Sub-national entities, particularly local government units (LGUs), on the other hand, face their own unique set of challenges as DRRM/CCA frontliners,[36] including: (1) limited access to credible scientific data and analysis,[37] (2) the plethora of planning processes and products mandated by law that LGUs are required to produce, but with insufficient focus on long-term and large-scale resilience,[38] (3) fragmented implementation of gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI) initiatives,[39] and (4) limited success in unlocking financing opportunities for climate and disaster resilience actions.[40] These, in turn, are underscored by the need to support enhancements to the national monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) system – crucial for defining the country's resilience horizon. Conversely, civil society organisations (CSOs) and academic and research institutions are active in DRRM/CCA in the Philippines, and the private sector has become highly organised, demonstrating influential leadership in resilience building.[41] This creates opportunities for tapping into endogenous capacities, particularly among local stakeholders, in planning for, financing and implementing resilience initiatives – especially with the Mandanas ruling[42] providing local governments access to a larger pool of resources to fulfil their mandates.

Previous, similar interventions provide valuable insights on the successes and challenges for building resilience in the Philippines,[43] including: (1) access to good quality information empowers resilience planners, implementers and decision makers – however and despite significant improvements in information availability, challenges continue to constrain data sharing across agencies and between different levels of government, (2) strong leadership and good coordination have underpinned new, effective partnerships,[44]but these have been limited largely within the public sector, (3) DRRM/CCA integration in development planning at multiple levels shows evidence of policy progress towards longer-term outcomes and national impact, although weaknesses were noted in outcome-level monitoring and evaluation systems, as well as for local and community-based GEDSI interventions, and (4) DRRM/CCA and resilience initiatives benefit communities and have the potential for wider impact.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

II. STRATEGY

The SHIELD Program's Theory of Change (TOC) rests on a core premise that all people in the target communities will be safer and more resilient to the impacts of disasters and climate risks if stakeholders at national and subnational level are effectively collaborating and jointly planning for collective outcomes; investing and acting together for building resilience; and measuring the impact of resilience-building actions. [45]

Figure 1 presents the actors identified in the Investment Logic and the Theory of Change for the SHIELD Program.




Figure 1: SHIELD Program Investment Logic Actors and Theory of Change
as adopted from the SHIELD Investment Design Document (IDD)

A. Community and Impact

The term "community" refers to individuals, households, groups and businesses in SHIELD target sites. In order to achieve the desired impact of improving resilience given the development challenges associated with the initiative, the program will take into account the following principles and strategies:

- Efforts will be made to ensure communities are less impacted by and safer and more resilient to **climate change and natural hazards**, but also taking into account **all other types of risks** – encompassing natural and human-induced hazards and complex emergencies as exemplified by the COVID-19 pandemic – as well as the multiple dimensions of risk (i.e. threats, exposures, vulnerability, capacity and risk drivers) and their specific political, socio-economic and environmental contexts
- Interventions to help develop resilience must also be **inclusive and benefit all** people, with utmost consideration for GEDSI principles,[46] and the most vulnerable sectors[47]
- Lastly, interventions must recognize that due to the complex nature of risks, resilience building requires a **systems approach**, so that systems, institutions and people have the resources and [absorptive, adaptive, anticipate, preventive, and transformative] capacities to cope with, withstand, bounce back or even bounce forward from adverse events and shocks.

.

B. Change Agents and Outcomes

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

SHIELD takes cognizance of the results of an Office of Development Effectiveness (DFAT-ODE) evaluation in 2018 that identifies the following characteristics of stronger performing climate change investments:[48]

- *Longer investment timeframes (five years or longer)*
- *Climate change risks framed within the broader development goals of partner countries*
- *Scientific and technical partners with strong on-the-ground service delivery experience, and*
- *An appropriate level of technical input in design and implementation*

In order to ensure that this six-year investment supports the testing and refinement of approaches that GPH can scale nationally to accelerate resilience planning, financing and implementation, SHIELD has three (3) identified interdependent program outcomes, which are presented in Table 1 with their corresponding key assumptions.[49]

Table 1: SHIELD Outcomes and Key Assumptions

Outcome	Key Assumptions to Achieve Outcome
Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action	• Information products integrate scientific and social science inputs and directly support sub-national DRRM/CCA and resilience planning and implementation • Information exchange is facilitated by science and technology (S&T) agency capabilities and strengthened GPH data governance systems • Enhancements to risk communication and information accessibility are focused on people's needs
Government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders in targeted local government units (LGUs) are collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions	• Significant sources of funding are available[50] • Sub-national entities have access to relevant interdisciplinary information and identify, through multi-stakeholder partnerships and community engagement in decision-making, evidence-based solutions to address the physical, socio-economic and behavioural dimensions of risk and vulnerability in their locales
Relevant national government agencies (NGAs) are prioritising action on local climate and disaster resilience	• NGA collaborative efforts to strengthen the enabling environment for resilience include: (1) streamlining requirements for local resilience planning, investment programming, budgeting, and accessing funds; (2) improving GEDSI mainstreaming actions and (3) enhancing monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL), as well as oversight and accountability of, resilience actions and results

The above underscores that effective resilience building requires a multi-disciplinary approach – people working together to leverage their unique and complementary expertise and representation, add value that will be more than the sum of its parts,[51] build comprehensive solutions[52] and give a voice to those who are traditionally excluded.

For the **Change Agents - (1) GPH S&T Organizations, (2) Local Government Units (LGUs), (3) Relevant NGAs, and (4) the Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs)** to be nurtured by the SHIELD Program – a key strategy will be to cultivate a culture of trust and mutual appreciation for complementary and differentiated contributions, open communication, and transparency to help acknowledge and address issues of perceived and real power imbalances and hidden agendas[53] and work towards the common goal of resilience.

Supporting key strategies to foster partnerships between change agents include:

1. **Engagement of mandated and relevant GPH S&T organizations and NGAs at the strategic and operational levels** – SHIELD will ensure that the program is supporting the implementation of and enhancing relevant policies, systems and processes without introducing parallel mechanisms, and that GPH tools and data will be utilized.
2. **Concentration of resources and effort in target sites** – this refers to areas jointly identified by GPH and the Government of Australia – more particularly, specific provinces, cities, municipalities and communities within the ten SHIELD Provinces,[54] BARMM[55] and Metro Manila.[56]

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

3. **Establishment of MSPs at all levels of implementation –** MSPs is a key organizing strategy for SHIELD, with stakeholders from national and local government, civil society, the private sector, community members and GEDSI representatives collaborating to ensure broad representation and participation in planning for, implementing and learning from resilience initiatives in SHIELD program areas. Strategies for MSP engagement will include (a) joint capacity and capability building and learning,[57] (b) a high-quality approach to partnership building,[58] and (c) provision of support to MSP teams and activities. National-level MSPs will focus on science to action and policy reform initiatives, while local-level MSPs[59] will be led by sub-national (i.e., LGU, BARMM and Metro Manila) SHIELD partners.
4. **Programming that is flexible, adaptive and fit for purpose** – this allows SHIELD to appropriately and adequately meet the requirements of program partners and adjust and respond to new and emerging priorities and policies, such as those relating to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Mandanas ruling and the upcoming 2022 elections. Adaptive management strategies will also be informed by assessments related to the political economy and partner capacities in program areas, which will then be further detailed into program evaluation and learning, stakeholder engagement and risk management strategies.[60]

The fifth change agent, which will also be primarily responsible for overall program implementation is the **SHIELD Program Consortium**. The consortium, led by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),[61] is composed of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat),[62] Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP),[63] National Resilience Council (NRC),[64] and the Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society (CBCS).[65] Collectively, they demonstrate: (1) extensive experience in managing climate and disaster resilience programs, (2) proven capacity to manage programs in complex and multi-stakeholder contexts to deliver successful development results,[66] (3) delivery of support to LGUs and GPH national [technical and scientific, policy and planning, and oversight] agencies,[67] and (4) solid experience and expertise in engaging civil society, the private sector, the academe and other resilience stakeholders.[68]

The consortium approach to implementation, as preferred in the program investment design, is unprecedented particularly within UNDP and provides an avenue for new ways of working. This is necessitated by the premise that resilience building cuts across multiple risks, sectors and systems. The consortium, with their complementary technical expertise, perspectives and networks, will epitomize the multi-stakeholder, inclusive and people-centered approach of SHIELD which, in turn will be scaled-up and exemplified by the MSPs.

C. Delivery Team and Deliverables

Given the above, the **Consortium and MSPs** define the composition of the **core delivery team** for SHIELD Program. The SHIELD Program Consortium, under the leadership of UNDP, takes overall responsibility and accountability for the effective use of resources and the delivery of outputs under the SHIELD Program. The **SHIELD Support Unit (SSU)** will be responsible and accountable for day-to-day management of project interventions, achieving project outputs, and for the effective use of resources.

Other members of the program delivery team are: (1) Australian S&T agencies, (2) specialist advisers/brokers, (3) policy advisers, (4) M&E and systems advisers and (5) other contractors and partners who may be engaged by SHIELD throughout its implementation.

Of particular note are the (sub-national) Resilience Brokers[69] and Provincial Coordinators[70] who will be tasked to establish, nurture and support local MSPs such that they become effective working teams creating lasting and meaningful impact.

D. GEDSI Guiding Principles

Promoting gender equality and social inclusion (GEDSI) is a significant objective of the SHIELD Program given the scale of economic and social impacts of disasters and climate change on poverty and inequality. The SHIELD Program will tackle GEDSI through a combination of targeted interventions and mainstreaming into all aspects of SHIELD's work. The development of a GEDSI

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

strategy for SHIELD, together with earmarked resources, will specifically integrate GEDSI across all components of the Program.

The following guiding principles will be utilized to ensure GEDSI considerations are applied to all aspects of program activities. This will ensure equal participation of and access to resources for all individuals regardless of gender, age, and disability status, among others.

- All activities should be gender balance and socially inclusive;
- There is equal representation of diverse voices in implementation;
- There is effort to reach out to diverse partner agencies and organizations; and
- There are tailored interventions to specific vulnerable groups.

III. RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

The SHIELD Program has four (4) broad deliverables under its three (3) program components that are expected to lead to the realization of three (3) major, end-of-investment outcomes, as presented in Figure 2. This solution pathway will contribute to GPH goals and targets for building resilience and reducing risks from climate, natural and man-made hazards.




Figure 2: SHIELD Investment Logic
as adopted from the SHIELD Investment Design Document (IDD)

A. SHIELD Program Outcomes and Outputs

Table 2 summarizes the outputs for three (3) SHIELD outcomes and corresponding lead Consortium and GPH partners, while the succeeding narrative details the considerations and parallel initiatives for each output. The Consortium and GPH partners will work closely with other stakeholders, including civil society, academe and science institutions and the private sector in the delivery of each output.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Table 2: SHIELD Program Outcomes and Outputs

Outcome	Output	Consortium Lead	GPH Lead	Supporting NGAs
1. Government, private sector and civil society stakeholders in target areas collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions **Overall Lead:** UNDP, DILG	1.1 Engagement with LGUs established	UNDP	DILG, MILG (BARMM)	MMDA
	1.2 MSPs established and engaged in resilience planning, financing and implementation of resilience actions	NRC, CBCS	DILG, LGUs	
	1.3 Capacity development program for target LGUs developed and implemented	UNDP	DILG, MILG (BARMM)	OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, PCW, NCDA, sectoral agencies
	1.4 A robust data ecosystem that guides inclusive risk-informed planning, prioritization and resource allocation at the LGU level established	UNDP	DILG, MILG (BARMM), DOST, LGUs,	OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, PSA, sectoral agencies
	1.5 Risk and resilience-informed plans, investment programs and budgets prepared	UN-HABITAT	LGUs, DILG, MILG (BARMM)	OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, sectoral agencies
	1.6 Bankable proposals developed and funded	UNDP	LGUs	DILG, OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, sectoral agencies, BARMM
	1.7 Local Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) system established	UNDP	DILG, MILG (BARM)	OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, DICT, PSA, sectoral agencies
	1.8 Resilience of value chains improved	PBSP	DTI	DILG, OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, PCW, NCDA, sectoral agencies, BARMM
	1.9 LGU surge capacity during significant natural hazard and conflict events supported	UNDP	LGUs, DILG, MILG (BARMM)	OCD

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Outcome	Output	Consortium Lead	GPH Lead	Supporting NGAs
2. Relevant NGAs are prioritising action on local climate and disaster resilience **Overall Lead:** UNDP, OCD	2.1 Framework to organize and guide policy reform support developed	UNDP	OCD, NEDA	DILG, OCD, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, sectoral agencies
	2.2 MSPs established and engaged in policy advocacy towards resilient development	UNDP, CBCS	OCD	
	2.3 Rationalized/harmonized procedures and requirements for local resilience planning, investment programming, budgeting and accessing funds at national and local levels adopted	UN-HABITAT	DILG, OCD	OCD, NEDA, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC
	2.4 New or enhanced resilience framework, plans, policies and strategies adopted	UNDP	OCD, NEDA	DILG, OCD, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, sectoral agencies
	2.5 Resilience financing platform established and resilient investments supported	UNDP	DOF	DILG, OCD, NEDA, CCC, DENR, DHSUD, DTI, DBM
	2.6 BARMM Government resilience actions supported	UNDP, CBCS	MILG-BARMM	Other BARMM ministries, LGUs
	2.7 Enhanced national MEL for resilience established	UNDP	OCD, NEDA	DILG, OCD, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, DICT, PSA, sectoral agencies, BARMM
	2.8 National resilience index piloted and institutionalized	UNDP	NEDA	DILG, OCD, CCC, DOST, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, DICT, PSA, sectoral agencies, BARMM
	2.9 National data ecosystem for resilient development improved	UNDP	DOST, OCD	DILG, OCD, NEDA, CCC, DENR, DHSUD, DOF, DTI, DBM, PCW, NCDA, NAPC, DICT, PSA, sectoral

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Outcome	Output	Consortium Lead	GPH Lead	Supporting NGAs
				agencies, BARMM
3. Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action **Overall Lead:** UNDP, DOST	3.1 Collaboration between Philippine and Australian science agencies established	UNDP	DOST	-
	3.2 Credible and accessible technical and scientific information for LGU planning and proposal development made available	UNDP	DOST	DILG, OCD. NEDA, CCC, DENR, DTI, PSA, DSWD, sectoral agencies, BARMM

Outcome 1: Government, private sector and civil society stakeholders in target areas collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions

The first outcome respects the difficulties that LGUs hve encountered in preparing bankable proposals for climate- and disaster-relevant activities and in complying with legislated planning requirements. The phrase 'unlocking funding' recognizes that there are significant sources of funding available through GPH, international organisations, and the private sector, but that LGUs have been relatively constrained in accessing this finance and implementing their plans. The phrase 'informed resilience actions' appreciates that LGUs have faced challenges in accessing relevant socio-economic, technical, and scientific information to inform local planning and implementation — and further, that resources have tended to be concentrated on disaster response and preparedness rather than resilience to disasters and climate change. The reference to 'inclusive actions' acknowledges the gap between GPH policies that promote gender equality and social inclusion and practical measures on the ground to ensure community engagement in decision making for climate and disaster resilience.

The deliverable for this outcome is: Specialist brokers are fostering collaborative and inclusive local multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) and facilitating successful LGU proposals, financing, and implementation.

Output 1.1 - LGU Engagement – will be informed by the results of the comprehensive and participatory capacity assessment and political economy analysis for LGUs targeted under the SHIELD Program, including provinces, cities and municipalities, as well as Metro Manila. In addition, a humanitarian-development-peace nexus analysis will be conducted for BARMM, which will further define the interventions, scope and target LGUs/sites. An engagement strategy will be developed for each LGU, including selection of municipalities/cities and co-financing, which will form the basis for the partnership agreement to be forged with LGUs. The selection of cities, municipalities and barangays for program implementation will be done in close coordination and collaboration with DILG for provincial SHIELD sites, with the MMDA for Metro Manila, and with the MILG for BARMM.

Output 1.2 – Local MSPs – will be supported by resilience brokers at the sub-national level. A multistakeholder mapping and capacity assessment shall be undertaken at the start of implementation to define MSP composition, roles and responsibilities and capacities. To be led by LGUs, MSPs could be comprised of technical experts from GPH agencies, the academe (such as from local institutions and state universities and colleges), social development and resilience specialists, civil society, the private sector, and GEDSI and community representatives, and supported by a panel of experts from the SHIELD consortium. In addition, SHIELD will facilitate the establishment of technically capable, engaged and inclusive multi-stakeholder platforms, building on DILG's G-HUBS and the Local Resilience Councils, as well as best practices from the Local Government Resource Center, as models. Inter-LGU MSP capacity building, learning exchanges and active reflection sessions throughout the planning, bankable proposal development, implementation and MEL process will also be facilitated through the program.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Critical to the success of SHIELD will be the Resilience Brokers that must possess exceptional political acumen, convening and mentoring skills. These brokers will help to establish a common understanding of the resilience concept and how it can be integrated to the broader development agenda. The concept of resilience will have to be unpacked and translated into operational terms and messaging understandable by different stakeholders. They, along with the MSPs, will play a key role in quality assuring the submission of bankable resilience proposals for funding. They will also provide the link between provincial and municipal governments and facilitate cross-jurisdictional approaches to resilience.

Output 1.3 – LGU Capacity Development – will be based on the results of a comprehensive and participatory capacity assessment of LGUs with the aim to strengthen capacities pursuing the resilient development agenda. In collaboration with the DILG Local Government Academy and the OCD Training Research Institute, a team of experts on climate and disaster resilience, political economy, local governance, and GEDSI will be deployed to provide a holistic perspective. Capacity building activities may anchor on and support GPH parallel initiatives, including the sub-national rollout of the updated National DRRM Plan with OCD, N/LCCAP with CCC, CC-DRR mainstreaming in project development and evaluation and disaster rehabilitation and recovery planning with NEDA. Under this output, interventions will also be identified, developed and implemented to ensure that LGUs are able to undertake additional resilience-related responsibilities in light of the Mandanas ruling. Capacity building may also look into using the LGU cluster and alliance building approaches, inter-LGU learning and expanding resilience communities of practice to include other members of the LGU-led local MSPs. Thus, it is also important to establish institutional mechanisms to ensure synergy and harmonization of capacity building efforts.

Output 1.4 – Robust Local Data Ecosystems – is imperative to inclusive, risk-informed planning, prioritization and resource allocation at the sub-national level. However, the challenges, especially relating to inter-operability and usability for short, medium and long-term planning, are complex and require enhancements to institutional capabilities at all levels. Towards this end, SHIELD may leverage on existing data platforms, such as CBMS and DEVLIVE+, among others, that encompass and connect spatial, temporal, sectoral, multi-hazards and multi-level attributes through a data warehouse which, in turn, may also be used to store georeferenced information of key resilience indicators for establishing baselines and conducting longitudinal analysis. The data platform will also be further enhanced to provide sub-national entities with improved accessibility to other essential geospatial information, such as those provided by GPH agencies or present within various LGUs at levels (e.g. GeoRisk, National Integrated Climate Change Database Information and Exchange System [NICCDIES], Rapid Earthquake Damage Assessment System [REDAS] impact simulation system, Climate and Disaster Risk Assessment [CDRA], Climate Information Risk Analysis Matrix [CLIRAM], Community-Based Monitoring System [CBMS], Learning and Development Information System [LDIS], Philippine Statistics Authority [PSA] data, climate and disaster risk and vulnerability assessments, geohazard and risk maps and other georeferenced/geotagged technical inputs, socio-economic, sectoral, GEDSI and other data, and big data). The data platform shall adopt scalable modules and conform to national standards to ensure aggregation. The MSPs and sub-national end users will also provide regular feedback on the utility of the local data ecosystem, to inform parallel national-level initiatives.

An important consideration for resilience actions is gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI). While the poor and vulnerable groups are disproportionately affected by disasters, there remains for the need to improve on policies and strategies to explicitly address how risks and vulnerabilities exacerbate inequality. For instance, post-disaster damage and losses do not report information on affected vulnerable groups in terms of displacement, damaged livelihood and assets, or loss in income. SHIELD will support the inclusion of much-needed disaggregated data in the exposure database, in the assessment of risks to the population, and in design of resilience actions to improve resilience capacities. This helps ensure that GEDSI considerations are embedded in all phases of the development process, and explicitly supports DILG Executive Order No. 100 s. 2019.

All of these considerations will also inform Output 1.7 – the establishment of a local Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system (MEL) to measure the resilience horizon at the sub-national level.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Output 1.5 – Risk-Informed Resilience Planning, Prioritization and Resource Allocation – will be undertaken by the sub-national, LGU-led MSPs established under SHIELD. The preparation of plans, investment programs and budgets will be guided by harmonized national-level frameworks, plans and policies, including the Philippine Development Plan (PDP), National Climate Risk Management Framework (NCRMF), National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Framework and Plan (NDRRMF/P), National Urban Development Housing Framework (NUDHF) and National Housing and Urban Development Sector Plan (NHUDSP), National Adaptation Plan (NAP), BARMM Food Security Framework, and other directives related to mainstreaming CCA-DRRM and resilience, among others. These will, in turn, inform the preparation of requisite sub-national plans, including the Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan (PDPFP), Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (LDRRMP), Local Climate Change Action Plan (LCCAP), Comprehensive Development Plan plus (CDP+), Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), Local and Annual Development Investment Program (LDIP/AIP), and Local Shelter Plan (LSP). Moreover, and of particular note is the anticipated assistance to be provided to LGUs given new and additional requirements associated with the implementation of the Mandanas ruling beginning in 2022, including for resilience efforts.

The term risk-informed refers to utilizing updated approaches that integrate multi-hazard, climate risk and systemic assessments in local development processes – and which may anchor on a multi-hazard, ecosystems-based, watershed-based or ridge to reef approach, as most applicable to the local context. Part of risk assessment will be the identification of risk reduction measures to address risks that have been revealed by the identification and characterization of hazards and threats affecting a locality, analysis of consequences and impacts and evaluation of risk levels. Risk information derived from the risk assessments shall guide project identification and provide guidance in the technical design, environmental considerations and social acceptability of resilience actions. This integration of risk information into project development shall consider applicability to locally financed regular programs and projects of LGUs and those requiring external funding with specific requirements by the funders. A common set of outcomes, however, is applicable regardless of source of funding or size of project. These outcomes relate to ensuring that programs and projects are designed to be resilient, that beneficiaries are properly consulted and that programs are designed based on their needs and vulnerabilities, that programs and projects when implemented will not add to vulnerabilities of the population and the environment of the impact area of the project. Given climatic uncertainties, design of resilient actions shall consider that some current design codes and standards might not be applicable in the future, and this has implications for both new and existing projects. Project design shall also ensure that the project adopts indicators of results that the project is designed to achieve and the disaggregation of data of beneficiaries to assess contribution of the project to inclusive resilience building.

Resilience measures may include engineering solutions that anchor on the Department of Public Works and Highways standards for resilient infrastructure, regulatory reforms such as for the implementation of land use and zoning ordinances or the building code, or soft measures such as early warning and contingency planning at the community level. It is also important to include post-disaster recovery in areas where evidenced-based recovery planning, applying science from risk assessments, could guide re-mapping, rezoning and updating of standards for building back better.

Engagement with communities at risk will be facilitated by the local MSPs, to ensure that bottom-up and participatory resilience building is meaningfully embedded in local systems – with the local MSP approach mirrored into and scaled to fit at the community level. Pilot initiatives will help demonstrate participatory, inclusive, people-centered, gender-sensitive and disability-inclusive resilience building.

Proposed resilience measures will be assessed to determine if they can be integrated into existing programs or designed as standalone interventions, as well as their feasibility for integration in the Local Development Investment Program (LDIP). The LDIP presents what programs and projects will lead to the achievement of local aspirations reflected in the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP), and with spatial dimensions and land use requirements emanating from the Comprehensive Land Use Plans. The annual component corresponding to the budgetary year serves as the Annual Investment Program (AIP), where investible financial resources of the LGU are directed. Resilience actions that cannot be absorbed by the annual local budget and projected local revenues are candidates for sourcing from external sources.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Output 1.6 – Bankable Proposals – is about unlocking funds for resilience actions and is also directly related to Outcome 1.5 – Resilience Planning, which can serve as an anchor for identifying specific programs, projects and activities (PPAs) for implementation. The development of bankable resilience proposals will primarily be an endeavour of the LGU-led local MSPs and will first look into existing, internal sub-national resources. Presently, the local DRRM Fund (LDRRMF) and Local Development Fund (LDF) serve as the main source of funding for resilience actions. However, there is potential to align other LGU resources for resilience building, such as those lodged in specific offices for social, environmental, and infrastructure development and agriculture, as well as the overall Local Development Fund. In addition, other special funds (e.g., for special education, early childhood development, housing, GAD, and youth) may also be utilized to explicitly align with resilience outcomes. Programs, projects and activities (PPAs) subject to proposal development may also explicitly align with the 12 criteria for climate responsiveness of the DENR, to facilitate the mainstreaming of resilience to functions devolved to LGUs. Lastly, a better understanding of LGU resource utilization for resilience may be facilitated by GPH tools and guidelines, such as for Climate Change Expenditure Tagging [CCET].

Bankable resilience proposals may also be developed to leverage external resources – including the People's Survival Fund (PSF), National DRRM Fund, Performance Challenge Fund (PCF), Local Government Support Fund (LGSF), resources from the Municipal Development Fund Office (MDFO) and the Green Climate Fund (GCF), all of which were discussed in detail in the previous section. This will build on and complement earlier gains, including the Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines (MH-IBF-EWS) which accesses the Green Climate Fund, and with the CCC as national designated authority, the Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP) as accredited entity and with DOST-PAGASA as the main executing entity in partnership with DENR-MGB, OCD and various LGUs.

Additional funding windows may also be explored, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) trust fund, the GPH Quick Response Fund, resources for public housing and disaster insurance coverage. Lastly, various modalities may also be explored for application to SHIELD program sites, including submitting proposals to donors with aligned development objectives, to the private sector for potential private-public partnership (PPP) or even to public financial institutions to obtain credit for resilience PPAs. These proposals will ensure that GEDSI considerations are well integrated as well as social and environmental safeguards.

Output 1.7 – Local MEL – will be established primarily to serve as a monitoring, evaluation and learning system to ensure that funded and implemented resilience PPAs are translating into inclusive actions and results. This will utilize the local data ecosystem to be established with progam support and facilitate generating and utilizing evidence from local MEL for accountability, policy making and decision-making. The local MEL shall enhance and integrate existing sub-national monitoring tools and procedures, given that existing systems are limited mostly to monitoring physical and financial targets. Integration and enhancement efforts may look into generating cross-sectoral learning, identifying good practices for replication, and increasing accountability, for instance, by supporting stronger stakeholder participation in Local Project Monitoring Committees (LPMCs). MEL procedures may also take into account the results of an assessment of bottlenecks and instituting the necessary measures for successful resilience implementation, including through a cost-benefit analysis of the LGU co-financing model developed through SHIELD.

The local data ecosystem platform described in Outcome 1.4 will drive the local MEL. While its initial function is to establish baseline exposure and enable analysis of vulnerabilities and risks, the platform will eventually serve as a tool for measuring the LGU Resilience Index which will be piloted in SHIELD LGUs. This is linked to the operationalization and institutionalization of the Resilience Index led by NEDA under Output 2.8.

Stronger accountability and citizen participation shall be instituted through the training of MSPs and local community groups on the use of the DEVLIVE app, a mobile-based tool which was developed by UNDP and adopted by DILG in its major programmes.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Output 1.8 – Resilient Value Chains – is one of the intended outcomes from the planning and implementation of resilience actions at the sub-national level. Towards this end will be the development of a related assessment tool and implementation of capacity building activities, primarily to engage the private sector in finding ways to strengthen local production systems and value chains and enable businesses to adjust and adapt to the impacts of disasters and climate change. This may include tapping the disaster-resilience focused Green Economic Development (GED) and Business Continuity Plan (BCP), as well as the Youth Entrepreneurship Program (YEP) and Gender Responsive Empowerment Action Towards Women (GREAT) programs of the Department of Trade and Industry – the latter two may also involve capacity building and engagement of women, persons with disabilities, youth, peacebuilders and LGBTQ+ representatives. Additional initiatives may also focus on defining the hazard sensitivity and adaptive capacity of value chains are defined, updating provincial commodity industry plants to include climate vulnerability assessment, and seeking out resilience-geared industries (e.g., alternative energy, smart agriculture and information, communication and technology or ICT, among others).

Output 1.9 – LGU Surge Capacity – SHIELD, through the Provincial Coordinators, will provide stand-by surge capacity should significant natural hazard/conflict events occur. SHIELD may work with partner LGUs (including Provincial DRRM and Peace and Order Councils) in developing or enhancing existing Public Service Continuity and Public Safety Plans (PSCPs/PSPs or business continuity plans), including standard operating procedures, should significant natural hazard or conflict events occur in SHIELD target sites for the duration of the program. Protocols for engagement with SHIELD after such events will initially involve the Provincial Coordinator, but with immediate succeeding actions endorsed to sub-national disaster response and management personnel to ensure unhindered continuity of program implementation. Surge interventions may include humanitarian assistance in affected sites support to conduct of post-disaster assessments.

Outcome 2: Relevant NGAs are prioritising action on local climate and disaster resilience

The second outcome respects that while the Investment is oriented towards progressing climate and disaster resilience at the local level, sustainable success is dependent on an enabling environment at the national level — by the NEDA, DILG, DOF, DOST, OCD, CCC, and potentially other NGAs such as Philippine Commission for Women (PCW) and National Council for Disability Affairs (NCDA). For example, there are opportunities to streamline or rationalise the number of climate and disaster- related plans required of LGUs by various line ministries and improve compliance with Philippine gender mainstreaming and social inclusion requirements; and there is a clear need to strengthen the enabling environment beyond planning and financing to also improve oversight and accountability, including by civil society, for implementation and results.

There are two deliverables for this outcome:

(1) Policy influence is fostering prioritisation of climate and disaster resilience actions, and
(2) Technical advice is enabling LGUs and NGAs to monitor and evaluate local climate and disaster resilience actions.

Output 2.1 – Policy Reform Support Framework – will be used to guide national-level actions in advocating for inclusive resilient development. The framework will support relevant GPH policies and plans, such as the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act and Plan (NDRRMA/P), the Climate Change Act (CCA) and NCCAP, the National Climate Risk Management Framework (NCRMF) and Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). The integration of these issuances into the support framework will be further enhanced by the results of political economy and cost-benefit studies, general strategies for effective national engagement, and GEDSI policy research.

Other GPH initiatives that may be integral to informing the support framework will be the examination of current and potential resilience institutions, including the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC), OCD – particularly the Policy Development and Planning Service (PDPS) and Organizational Structure and Staffing Pattern (OSSP) – and the implications of establishing the Department of Disaster Resilience (DDR).

Policy reforms will foreground issues related to rationalizing sub-national planning processes and gender equality and social inclusion by building on the lessons learned through SHIELD sub-national engagement. To address barriers to the inclusion of GEDSI sectors and as initially presented in Output

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

1.4, actions to inform national-level efforts may include: (1) building a GEDSI database to define program resilience baselines, (2) bridging institutionalization of GEDSI voices and participation in local governance processes through MSPs, and (3) enhancing public awareness and support for GEDSI sectors, including improving their access to basic services. To further the agenda of GEDSI inclusion, targeted actions leading to the strengthening of GEDSI-support networks, coalitions and advocacy groups may also be pursued under SHIELD.

Output 2.2 – MSPs for Resilient Development Policy Advocacy – while SHIELD will engage directly with GPH agencies for policy reforms/development work, it also recognizes the importance of giving a voice and facilitating active engagement of multi-stakeholder partners, particularly civil society, including GEDSI and vulnerable sector representatives private sector, and academe/science organizations, in the policy development process. SHIELD will develop partnerships and collaborative relationships with key stakeholders for policy influencing and undertake inclusive context analysis to inform the reform process and actions.

Partnerships and collaboration for policy influencing for SHIELD may include:

(1) Enabling civil society voice: Whilst there are many different kinds of civil society groups in the Philippines, SHIELD could seek to work with specific CSOs currently engaged in advocacy to influence policy change to strengthen their efforts to improve the voice and representation to marginalized groups in planning and implementation of climate and disaster resilience actions. For example, SHIELD could collaborate with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) and NGOs with strong advocacies on gender and social inclusion to map out entry points and enhance strategies for influencing the policy agenda to address current gaps related to inclusiveness, exclusion, and accessibility issues in resilience building, with specific regard to women, PWDs, and indigenous people in the first instance and other groups as identified through SHIELD's ongoing analytical work.

(2) Engaging the private sector: The Philippines has a strong philanthropic culture with many private sector-sponsored foundations and organisations seeking to contribute to development and public goods and numerous large companies having corporate social responsibility arms. Whilst they can also be tapped for funds to support the Investment's activities (for example by supporting roll-out of MSPs), they may have greater impact by leveraging their political networks for positive policy change. The SHIELD Program could engage with large companies and relevant foundations that have demonstrated an interest in resilience building, to explore policy influencing opportunities.

(3) Engaging the academia: The academic and scientific community are key stakeholders and influencers that enable a broad-based understanding of the risks and vulnerabilities associated with natural hazards and climate change. At the national level, SHIELD could play a role in helping to enhance linkages and partnerships between the GPH and SUCs and for policy solutions to be informed by scientific data. In coordination with relevant GPH agencies, key scientific institutions will be supported by the SHIELD Program to produce accurate data and accessible information, providing SHIELD with access to networks that could be leveraged for policy influence.

Aside from facilitating their involvement, where SHIELD can play a role as policy broker, the program can also provide support to equip them to effectively advocate and engage in the policy work. This may be in the form of analytical support, including development of policy briefs, case studies/business cases, cost-benefit analysis to support resilience advocacies.

Output 2.3 – Rationalization and Harmonization of Resilience Efforts – refer to national-level actions that impact on sub-national planning, investment programming, resource allocation and implementation as defined by policies, guidelines, procedures and requirements. This is directly related to Outputs 1.5 and 1.6 as previously discussed. In relation to Outcome 2, however, additional interventions that may be supported by SHIELD include (1) enhancing risk and resilience assessment methodologies through the use of a systemic, multi-hazard approach that acknowledges the interconnected nature of risks and their corresponding cascading socio-economic, sectoral, environmental and security consequences, (2) mainstreaming of the assessment methodologies into the preparation of local plans, such as the PDPFP, CDP, CLUP, LSP, LDIP, AIP, and even sectoral and/or preparedness plans (such as for homeowners' resilience at the community level), and (3) supporting GPH-initiated rationalization directives (as exemplified by the

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

DILG-NEDA-DBM-DOF Joint Memorandum Circular No. 1 s. 2016 for the *Updated Guidelines on the Harmonization of Local Planning, Investment Programming, Resource Mobilization, Budgeting, Expenditure Management and Performance Monitoring and Coordination in Fiscal Oversight*) as they impact on inclusive resilience efforts at the sub-national level.

Output 2.4 – Resilience Frameworks, Plans, Policies and Strategies – this will look into supporting operationalization of the NCRMF, updated NDRRMF and Plan, updated NCCAP/NAP and the NDC. This output will provide support to emerging needs and opportunities in the course of implementation, broadly looking into supporting formulation of national resilience framework, plans, policies and strategies, as well as possible support to the new department on disaster resilience, if enacted. This will also support Outputs 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3.

Output 2.5 – Resilience Financing Platform – together with Department of Finance, this will be established primarily to improve the access of sub-national entities to resources available for resilience actions and is directly related to Output 1.6 – Bankable Proposals. Towards this end, SHIELD will support mandated agencies and GPH priority actions that seek to reduce fragmentation and increase complementation across funding streams, beginning with mapping existing mechanisms that define the current resilience financing architecture. At this point, it is also worth underscoring that aside from improving accessibility to resources, the platform should also facilitate (1) timely recovery and the rebuilding of affected communities and infrastructure, (2) investments in measures that mitigate vulnerabilities to and the social impacts of hazardous events, and (3) support to GPH Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement.

In addition, efforts will also be pursued for private sector resilience financing. Directly related to Output 1.8, partnerships with the private sector provide opportunities for developing new tools and piloting financing innovations, such as the issuance of green bonds or micro-insurance solutions. Actions towards this end will help ensure business continuity across value chains and identify business opportunities from resilient investments.

Output 2.6 – Support to BARMM – Considering the autonomous nature of BARMM, this will focus on supporting the regional government, particularly at the policy and programming level as well as capacity building for ministries towards resilient development. This will be anchoring on and will support the operationalization of the Bangsamoro Convergence Framework for Community Resilience (CoRE) and other related policies and programmes. Specific interventions to be provided to the regional government will be informed by a Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus Analysis to be conducted under Output 1.1. Local level interventions will be supported under Component 1.

Output 2.7 – National MEL for Resilience – SHIELD work with relevant NGAs to enhance the current national monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) system towards an integrated approach and support its implementation. An efficient MEL mechanism will ensure that funded proposals and plans translate to inclusive actions and results and deliver credible evidence of the improving resilience horizon. Increased access to available finance (under Component 1) will require effective Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) to hold LGUs accountable and ensure effective program implementation. This will also involve capacity development for national government and other MSPs on utilization of evidence from national MEL for accountability, policy making, and decision-making.

The output also includes continuous learning through the establishment of a Knowledge Management (KM) Platform, which will be developed and deployed as a core part of the MEL system to provide opportunities for dialogue, reflection and identification of opportunities and constraints for advancing the resilience agenda. Specific “learning portfolios” shall be organized where Resilience Brokers working on similar issues are grouped together so they can share learnings from individual projects through regular calls or band together to design a common solution through a Resilience Design Lab. Learnings will be curated on an on-line easily accessible knowledge management platform.

Learning will feed into the formulation of a Resilience Framework (RF) to support NEDA, DILG, and key agencies to embed resilience in the national and local development agenda to reduce current sectoral silos. Analytical work, such as studies to examine the more than 20 years of Philippines’ experience in recovery work shall be undertaken to identify key strategies that worked and did not

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

work to avoid future losses and damages and to facilitate accelerated recovery. The lessons from these studies shall be used to engage the stakeholders towards development of the RF and will be shared with relevant agencies and stakeholders.

This will integrate innovation, which will focus on understanding how resilience solutions emerge and how we learn and adapt based on what works and what does not, how we ensure that processes and solutions proposed work in local and national contexts, how we unlock finance, and enable blended sources of financing, and how we might enable effective delivery of resilience brokering services on the ground. Potential ideas and structures for innovation that will be explored including through:

- Establishment of Learning and Design Labs, which can help to rapidly translate learnings from the ground into new solutions. Through the labs, people crystallize learnings about what works and what doesn't on the ground, consider broader systemic challenges that might need to be addressed, and design new resilience prototypes based on those learnings that can be subsequently field tested and scaled up if proven effective. This lab may be structured around a quarterly process to bring MSPs together to develop resilience prototypes – for instance, a three-day lab might focus on a specific topic or geographic area, with people working together to crystallize learnings, find solutions that address broader, systemic challenges and identify actions that may be tested, scaled up and replicated if proven effective.
- Innovative Finance Lab, which will support the piloting and expansion of specific innovative financing mechanisms, especially but not limited to local governments, such as green bonds or micro-insurance solutions. The lab would profile identified resilience challenges or resilience interventions being developed, work with a selected group over several months with guidance from experts and investors to develop new financing tools, and conduct financing pilots.
- Data Lab, which will develop proof of concepts to demonstrate the value of new data sources and will use a combination of big data and ethnographic data to better understand patterns and trends so as to better inform recovery and resilience efforts. It will be designed for gathering, consolidating, processing and analysing information to help inform risk and resilience informed planning, budgeting and implementation, with a focus on inter-operability, accessibility and utility for end users.

The consortium recognises that SHIELD does not exist in isolation. There are many opportunities to build on existing initiatives of members and of other development partners. To avoid duplication and to create synergies for accelerated impact, the SHIELD will host an annual Convergence Forum chaired by the Government.

Output 2.8 – National Resilience Index – this will provide support to NEDA in establishing the National Resilience Index, which will measure the level of resilience across different lenses and sectors, potentially to be utilized at the local government unit level, but would be flexible enough to measure resilience at the ecosystem level (encompassing several LGUs), and could possibly go on to measure resilience at the national level. In helping LGUs recognize the level of resilience in their respective areas and discern the factors and indicators which could affect and influence their respective area's resilience, this study will hopefully contribute and inform policymaking in the Philippines, in targeting areas for improvement towards resilience.

SHIELD will provide technical assistance, including providing experts to support the establishment of the resilience indicators at national and subnational scale that takes into account the ex-ante, actual impacts, and ex-post elements of state and effects of natural hazards, including specific indicators and factors under socio-economic, ecological and governance systems (also taking into account multidimensional risks, to extent possible). This will then piloted in SHIELD LGUs under Output 1.7. Capacity building activities will be also conducted for national and local government to apply and use the methodology of resilience index in plan formulation, monitoring and reporting, and eventually support its institutionalization. The data ecosystem platforms that will be established at subnational and national level will provide the baseline and will feed into the local and national MEL.

Output 2.9 - National Data Ecosystem – is related to Outputs 1.4, 2.7, and 2.8. This will look into supporting improving interoperability of existing CC-DRR/resilience databases at the national level and the establishment of resilience data access and sharing protocols. This will also support to

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

establishing/strengthening data platforms, including National Loss and Damage Registry (NLDR) with OCD.

Outcome 3: Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action

The third outcome deliverable supports the three deliverables under Outcomes 1 and 2 by ensuring that credible and accessible technical and scientific information is available for LGU planning and proposal development.

This outcome appreciates the capability of Philippines scientific and technical agencies under DOST such as PAGASA, PHIVOLCS, as well NAMRIA and MGB under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). However, there are also acknowledged manpower, technical, and resource limitations that have constrained the extent to which technical and scientific knowledge has been integrated into local resilience planning and action. There is potential for improved and tailored information exchange and strengthened capabilities and systems for developing climate projections, modeling and impact forecasting, and hazard risk assessments that reflect and are informed by both scientific and social sciences inputs. There is also a critical need to focus on people's needs for information and the type of information that will suit these needs — for example, improving risk communication and the accessibility of contextual technical and scientific information products to support provincial and LGU DRRM/CCA planning and action. This tailored information is crucial for LGUs and communities to develop evidence-based practical solutions to the DRRM/CCA challenges they face. An interdisciplinary approach engaging the social sciences would be more innovative and effective in addressing not only the physical but also the socio-economic dimensions of vulnerability, risk, and resilience and have a greater potential to strengthen governance for climate and disaster resilience.

The deliverable for this outcome is: Collaboration between Philippine and Australian scientific agencies is improving the quality and accessibility of climate and hazard information products and services for LGU planners.

Output 3.1 – GPH and GOA Science Collaboration – The SHIELD program will resource and coordinate collaborations between Australian and Philippine scientific agencies, through DOST, with a view to improving data and modelling, tailoring the information for LGU accessibility, and promoting an interdisciplinary approach that is inclusive of and reflects the socio-economic dimensions of resilience strengthening. Capacity assessments will be conducted during a scoping mission at the start of the SHIELD Program implementation. This will also identify data requirements across the different levels of Philippine Government, including national and local.


Building on the earlier collaboration with Collective Strengthening of Community Awareness on Natural Disasters (CSCAND) agencies, a partnership with Philippine and Australian science agencies will be forged to help strengthen capabilities in climate modelling and projections, scenario building, and downscaling of information to develop impact forecasting for key stakeholder groups.

Output 3.2 – Accessible S&T Information – While specific activities under Component 3 will be firmed up through a scoping mission with Australian science agencies, entry points have been identified. This may include:

- Supporting the development of fine-scale climate modelling and projections, scenario building, and downscaling, including generating climate risk-based information for severe wind and storm surge
- There is recognition that information generated by the different scientific agencies needs to be collated in a user-ready database/information management system tailored to enable LGUs to access the information and contextual knowledge of the range of hazards, vulnerabilities, and risks that they need to address. The collaboration will work to find ways to minimise this risk and give the scientific community a greater sense of confidence.
- Supporting capacity building on scientific data collection and multi-hazard analysis and developing a knowledge management platform to inform climate risk assessments and multi-hazard mapping, and with such activities not being limited to science agencies but will include stakeholders and end-users (e.g. LGUs), as well

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

- Making credible and accessible technical and scientific information available for LGU planning and proposal development, and for the use of special interest sectors such as agriculture
- Sufficiently tailored and holistic information needs to be tailored to the needs of provincial and LGU planners. DOST could work with academia to test approaches for user-friendly information in the SHIELD provinces. The SHIELD Provincial Coordinators will support the science agencies to work with local academia in the development and testing of information products. SHIELD may also support network-building of DRRM/CCA knowledge centres with SUCs



Visualization of SHIELD Program Outputs and Interventions

B. SHIELD Program Sites

During the design phase of the SHIELD Program, ten provinces were identified as target sites based on the following parameters:

- degree of vulnerability in times of disaster events and overall geographic exposure to disasters
- degree and extent of economic cost of damage based on previous disasters
- current gaps in the provision of assistance from national institutions and international donors
- institutional readiness and maturity to implement necessary interventions in enhancing their capacities with rippling effects to adjacent localities.

The SHIELD Program will also cover selected cities in Metro Manila due to their high vulnerability to natural hazards, including earthquakes, and their strategic and critical importance to the functioning of the rest of the Philippine economy.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

In addition, SHIELD will cover selected areas in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) as it looks into the humanitarian-development-peace nexus to provide opportunities to contribute to the building of a prosperous and safe post-conflict environment in this priority region.

Table 3 summarizes SHIELD program sites by island group/category.

Table 3: SHIELD Program Sites

Island Group	Province/Region
Luzon	• Albay • Cagayan • Pampanga • Pangasinan • Quezon
Visayas	• Cebu • Eastern Samar • Northern Samar
Mindanao	• Agusan del Norte • Agusan del Sur • Davao Oriental
Special Regions	• Metro Manila • BARMM

Roll Out Considerations

The first year of implementation will be devoted to the following:

a. building up capacities of Metro Manila based on its previous investments and experiences
b. identification of BARMM areas and necessary interventions that will showcase the nexus of disaster and conflict and how such could be managed through the intervention, and
c. identification of specific interventions for all the 11 provinces

Succeeding years shall be devoted to the rollout of activities in all areas and provinces.

Phasing of Provinces

Depending on the amount of investment requirements, activities shall be phased based on two additional parameters: (1) provincial capacity to manage their finances and (2) impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Provincial capacity to manage finances is a crucial element for the roll out of SHIELD since it correlates with their ability to improve financing of DRR and CCA actions from their own resources or leverage these resources to access external financing, consistent with the objectives of component 1 of the SHIELD Program. The ingress to the provinces also needs to consider COVID-19 conditions in the locality. A COVID-19 hotspot will affect mobility and disrupt the timely provision of many public services. From a perspective of safety and efficiency, it is an option to engage with the provinces experiencing a high number of COVID cases at a later time, as the provincial government may be concentrating its efforts and utilizing government manpower for COVID-19 response.

Given these, the first few months of SHIELD implementation will focus on the provinces of Albay, Northern Samar and Agusan del Sur, and Cebu, along with Metro Manila and BARMM. Other provinces will follow by the middle part of Year 1.

Additional LGU sites may be considered upon recommendation and endorsement of the SHIELD Program Board.

C. Program Phasing

Given the outcomes and outputs to be achieved by the program, key activities and milestones have been identified for completion based on three (3) broad phases: (1) Start-up, (2) Roll-out and Deepening, and (3) Learning and Consolidation, and as presented in Table 4. A work plan and budget

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

for each specific work package will be developed on an annual basis, and the program for each year will be adjusted based on reflection and refocus learning events that characterize the adaptive management approach for SHIELD.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Table 4: SHIELD Key Activities and Milestones, per phase

Phase	Inclusive Years	Key Activities and Milestones

Start-up	Year 1	• establishment of Program MEL
		• completion of assessments
		  ○ political economy and peace, conflict and development
		  ○ multi stakeholder mapping and capacity assessment
		  ○ scoping for data ecosystem and MEL
		  ○ development of policy reform support framework
		• confirmation of key strategies
		• engagement with 4 PLGUs, BARMM and Metro Manila
		• organization of sub-national MSPs

Roll Out and Deepening	Years 2 to 4	• engagement with remaining PLGUs • capacity development • establishment of local and national data ecosystem • establishment of resilience financing platform • resilience planning and preparation of bankable proposals • implementation of resilience actions • establishment of local and national MEL for resilience • piloting of resilience index • policy reform advocacy
Learning and Consolidation	Years 5 to 6	• consolidation of lessons and gains • actions towards sustainability and institutionalization

D. Risks and Assumptions

SHIELD faces 14 moderate to substantial risks related to the political, operational, organizational, social and environmental, safety and security, financial and strategic context of the program.

One of these risks is associated with the capacity of the GPH to engage in and facilitate an enabling environment at the national level for climate and disaster resilience at the local level. While the GPH is committed to change and deliver on its coordination mandate, there is a risk that this will not be translated into the right kind of policy and actions for resilience outcomes. To mitigate this risk, SHIELD will work with relevant decision makers and stakeholders at the national policy level in order to encourage and support the institutionalisation of an enabling environment for local resilience building. It will support policy makers to learn from effective local level resilience actions and turn that learning into useful policy instruments at the national level. Component two of this Investment is focused on the policy environment.

A key development risk identified is a lack of sufficient will and resources required to prioritise action on resilience from relevant NGAs. This will impact efficiency and effectiveness of the Investment where scientific and technical agencies do not exchange/share tailored information and the project fails to achieve outcomes. To mitigate this risk, SHIELD will engage opportunistically with appropriate government, non-government, and private sector stakeholders to encourage positive policy reforms. Australian agencies working with their Philippine counterparts will need to focus on coordination of their efforts – ensuring they are pulling in the same direction in relation to sharing of technical information.

A risk to the program will be if (or when) a significant natural hazard/conflict event occurs in a SHIELD target province, or there are several small-medium scale events happening in a short period. This will almost certainly re-direct attention and resources to the response effort and could result in the program outcomes being de-railed in these locations (particularly if the event requires a lengthy response period). As such, Provincial Coordinators will be tasked to provide surge capacity should a significant natural hazard/conflict event occur. The SHIELD Program will further mitigate this risk by working with the Australian Embassy to establish safety/security protocols for working in disaster/conflict areas, as well as developing a response plan (including SOPs) that will be implemented by the SHIELD SSU and the Provincial Coordinator at the DFAT's request in response to a significant event.

The risk of lack of resources for NGAs to establish and implement a credible MEL system has major impacts on the program in that government accountability for results on resilience will remain low

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

with the focus remaining on planning at the expense of implementation. SHIELD will help establish a national MEL Framework and system with NGAs and recruit a MEL Technical Adviser to build effective relationships with key counterparts in DILG with a view to offering support in advancing a MEL agenda across relevant GPH agencies, and utilisation of MEL data and analysis for accountability, policy decision making, and continuous improvement in implementation.

The risk that GEDSI issues are not given proper treatment in resiliency action plans is high, impacting the program in that the needs of women, PWDs, and other marginalised groups are not met, and they face increased vulnerability and risk. This further impacts by reduced efficiency and effectiveness of the Investment. To mitigate this risk, an evaluation of GEDSI progress and achievements at key points throughout the design will enable the SHIELD Program to help implementing partners shift as needed.

Partnership agreements with GPH at the national and sub-national level, as needed, will provide opportunities for the joint identification of risks and corresponding management measures to the specific program of work agreed upon by partners. These can be reviewed and updated during annual partnership health checks. The Program will also be required to identify, manage, and report on risks in its activities and must comply with the UNDP and GOA's safeguard policies on environmental protection, health and safety, displacement/resettlement of local communities, protection of children and other vulnerable/disadvantaged groups, and indigenous peoples. Regular training on these standards should be provided by the SSU.

The SSU will initiate regular strategy testing processes which can include an assessment and updating of relevant risks. Other risks should be monitored by the MSP with the risk register updated and discussed at least twice per year during SHIELD Program Board meetings.

The consortium's work will be governed by UNDP's, Social and Environmental Standards (SES), Project-level Social and Environmental Screening Procedure and an Accountability Mechanism for stakeholder grievance and compliance. UNDP's enterprise risk management acknowledges the importance of cultivating a risk culture within the organization to enable responsible risk-taking and risk-informed decision-making. Fiduciary risk is identified as early as the design stage, during screening of potential partners through a capacity assessment process, and also through the programme and project finance and assurance processes. For engagements with a corporate foundation or state-owned enterprise, partners must undergo relevant Due Diligence processes. The consortium implements a policy of zero tolerance on proscribed practices, including fraud, corruption, collusion, unethical practices, and obstruction. UNDP is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all acts of fraud and corrupt practices against UNDP as well as third parties involved in UNDP activities. All members of the consortium will ensure compliance with DFAT's Child Protection Policy.

The list of identified risks and their corresponding management and mitigation measures are found in Annex 3 (Risk Register).

E. Stakeholder Engagement

The SHIELD consortium and NGAs are envisioned to work together in enhancing the enabling environment– including policies and guidelines, technical advice, high quality and accessible information, and monitoring, evaluation and learning – to facilitate investments for inclusive resilience actions. Thus, SHIELD may be considered as an extension of DFAT's previous resilience investments in the Philippines (such as PCTP-RAPID) and will build on previous resilience products (e.g climex.db, hazard mapping) that were developed with GPH agencies.

Multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) at all levels will remain a key priority for SHIELD throughout its implementation. As previously detailed under the discussion for Outputs 1.2 and 2.2, MSPs will be a key delivery strategy for SHIELD at the national and sub-national levels.

The SHIELD Program, through the SHIELD Support Unit (SSU), will be brokering engagement of multiple stakeholders who will form part of the national and local MSPs. These include:

- National government agencies will be engaged at strategic and operational levels. The SHIELD Program Consortium will engage and provide technical assistance to the mandated

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

and relevant GPH agencies to ensure that SHIELD is supporting the implementation of and enhancing relevant GPH policies, programs, systems, and processes.

- Work with provincial governments to improve resiliency within and across cities and municipalities, in collaboration with other MSPs.
- Civil society groups will bring representation of women and marginalised groups such as persons with disabilities and/or they will represent important parts of the local community such as churches, media, etc.
- Private sector agents bring substantial knowledge of the economic imperative for resilience building, protecting/shifting supply chains, and for business continuity. The private sector also opens opportunities for resourcing of resilience initiatives. They could be engaged through the local business chambers and the provincial/local development councils and by looking at critical infrastructure that impact on their investments, value chains, and operations.
- Academic institutions or the schools, universities and colleges (SUCs) hold or have access to the type of scientific information required to inform resilience initiatives and they have the capability to translate that information for lay persons. A bankable proposal cannot be effective unless the right people have the right information, such as public planners, industry and private sector, farmers and fishers, and others who need to understand how best to build resilience.

At the national level, the MSP will be composed of technical experts and specialists, civil society, academe and the private sector, as well as GEDSI and sectoral representatives, all working closely with and supporting GPH agencies on resilience-related reforms. This MSP will be convened at the outset of SHIELD implementation, and will be part of all SHIELD-supported activities related to Outcome 2 as collaborators with their GPH counterparts.

At the sub-national level, MSPs will be led by LGUs and composed of the academe (such as from local institutions and state universities and colleges), social development and resilience specialists, civil society, the private sector, and GEDSI and community representatives. Sub-national MSPs may also be supported by technical experts from GPH agencies and the SHIELD consortium as they work through SHIELD-supported activities related to Outcome 1. These local MSPs will ensure adequate representation of marginalized and vulnerable sectors and will be formally constituted through an appropriate issuance from the Provincial LGU.

The engagement of program beneficiaries (from the national to community level, with an emphasis on marginalized and vulnerable sectors) will not be limited to their representation in MSPs or through the interpretation of data present in sectoral agencies. Open consultation activities will also be designed to strategically facilitate their meaningful participation in planning for, prioritizing, implementing and monitoring resilience actions, especially at the community level. These activities will provide valuable insights on the effectivity of SHIELD-supported interventions, especially if these interventions deliberately seek to address the risks and vulnerabilities disproportionately affecting GEDSI sectors.

Stakeholders participated extensively throughout the program development process, as summarized in Annex 7. The proposal submitted by the consortium was endorsed by GPH agencies, BARMM ministries and other stakeholders to DFAT. The SHIELD TOC, on the other hand, was validated by various national government agencies (NGAs). Further consultations were also conducted with LGU, BARMM, Metro Manila and NGA stakeholders, while the draft portfolio document was subjected to stakeholder validation. The results refined the technical leads for each output, the details, considerations and parallel initiatives to the outputs, as well as the project management and governance arrangements as presented in this document. Parallel to these consultations was the work and financial planning conducted by consortium members to identify indicative activities and associated resources required to achieve intended outputs and outcomes.

F. South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)

SHIELD Program will allow the Philippines to be part of the regional and global conversation, including sharing of experience and learning, on resilience, especially given its vulnerabilities to natural and man-made hazards and climate change, as well as the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

SHIELD program will also open up opportunities for regional cross-learning and cooperation with countries working on or are areas with similar environmental, social and geopolitical contexts.

G. Knowledge

An online and easily accessible Knowledge Management (KM) platform will be developed as a core part of the SHIELD MEL system. The platform will be used to: (1) facilitate the exchange of ideas to identify constraints and opportunities for advancing the resilience agenda, (2) foster communities of practice that work together effectively, and (3) develop knowledge products anchored on and supportive of the program communications strategy, particularly for the use of SHIELD MSPs.

Lessons learned may be packaged to address specific disaster and climate risks or advocate for key resilience actions, including through awareness and visibility events for SHIELD. In all activities, DFAT will be acknowledged as the program donor and UNDP, as the lead organization for the consortium, will ensure that branding and marking guidelines are strictly complied with. SHIELD may also pursue the conduct of an annual Convergence Forum to bring together agencies, partners and other donors working on resilience-related initiatives. Chaired by the Philippine government, such an event may create opportunities for expanded collaboration and diminish the duplication of efforts among resilience stakeholders.

H. Sustainability and Scaling Up

The sustainability and scalability of SHIELD will be anchored on the following:

1. frameworks, plans, policies, strategies, guidelines and directives adopted and issued by the GPH for inclusive resilient development, which will redefine the enabling environment from the national to the local level beginning within and extending outside of SHIELD program sites
2. the institutionalization of MSPs in resilience building efforts at all levels, either through their transformation as independent, incorporated bodies or as a formal adjunct entity to government
3. the development and adoption of a market-based or fee-for-service approach for the engagement of resilience brokers who are able to effectively and successfully facilitate the process for unlocking resilience financing, and
4. the establishment of local knowledge centres for resilience, which may be based in SUCs and other similar institutions, and serve as a venue for convening the multiple stakeholders required for meaningful, inclusive and sustainable resilience actions

IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

The consortium approach to implementation is geared towards cost-efficiency and effectiveness, given that consortium member organizations are non-profit and that no mark-up is included in the proposed budget for implementing program activities. As the consortium lead, UNDP will undertake overall fiduciary responsibility through its existing systems that allow for open and transparent procurement, hiring and organizational partnering as well as the efficient management of multiple workstreams, performance monitoring and transparent and accountable management of funds. Work plans and budget commitments will secure the concurrence of implementation partners, and the consortium will utilize the investment for integrated workstreams, targeted technical advice, capacity development, joint analysis and planning, knowledge management, essential project management, and enhancement of program ICT systems in order to achieve intended results. This will also be supplemented by UNDP by drawing on its substantial pool of in-house expertise that can leverage the resources provided through SHIELD, including from program-complementing projects.

Accountability and transparency shall be the key guiding principles of partnership among consortium members, with UNDP providing overall progress and financial reporting responsibilities to DFAT following its own stringent internal guidelines. All reports shall be published in the UNDP Transparency Portal (open.undp.org) following International Aid Transparency initiative standards and guidelines.71

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

In addition, the engagement with GPH agencies will be undertaken in a strategic manner, explicitly supporting GPH priorities as executed by mandated agencies and utilizing existing data, tools and processes. Aside from fostering GPH buy in and support for the program, this approach helps ensure that resources for government-led resilience building are supplemented by SHIELD in a manner that expands on outcomes. Towards this end, the focus will be on building collaboration and partnerships, so that stakeholders are provided with a venue for appreciating the expertise embedded within GPH agencies and bringing to the forefront additional perspectives to inform the holistic and integrated approach to resilience building being advocated by SHIELD. Should the need arise, any manpower constraints within GPH agencies that limit implementation of SHIELD activities may be addressed by contracting additional technical experts and staff who may be detailed to the agency for the duration of the program. This shall be in addition to the direct assistance extended by the SHIELD Support Unit (SSU).

On the other hand, the engagement with sub-national entities (i.e. government offices lodged at LGU target sites, as well as BARMM and Metro Manila) will be informed by the implementation of a co-financing model that will be customized for every locale. The inclusion of financial sustainability as a parameter for the selection of priority sites was made with cost efficiency and effectiveness in mind – that every dollar invested in a program site has strong potential for positive ripple effects in adjoining areas. Another point that needs to be underscored is the focus on the development of bankable proposals for financing. SHIELD resources will not be used to directly finance resilience projects; rather, they will be utilized in fostering multi-stakeholder partnerships that are able to work together to put together proposals that successfully access resources that are actually available – within or outside of LGUs and the GPH – and in a manner that embeds and sustains capacities at the local level.

Portfolio Management

The day-to-day management of the SHIELD portfolio will be undertaken by the SHIELD Support Unit (SSU), which will be led by the SHIELD Program Manager. The SSU will be lodged within the UNDP Country Office and will be composed of technical, operations, administrative and financial staff. The SSU will directly support the SHIELD consortium, MSPs and GPH partners in the implementation of program activities, and will also be responsible and accountable for technical and financial reporting to DFAT.

Technical and strategic oversight of the SSU will be directly undertaken by the SHIELD Program Management Team (PMT), composed of DFAT PMT designates, the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative (UNDP DRR), the UNDP Climate Action Programme Team (UNDP CAPT) and Consortium PMT representatives. The SHIELD PMT will set up monthly program management level meetings to bring implementing teams together. It will also organize one Reflect and Refocus workshop every six months for partners, MSPs, and select stakeholders as part of the adaptive management approach – involving key stakeholders external to the program will help foster understanding of operational challenges, build people to people links, and assist staff to understand other stakeholder's perspectives.

Two bodies will provide strategic guidance to SHIELD: the SHIELD Program Board (PB) and the Executive Committee (ExeCom). The SHIELD-PB will provide a holistic approach to planning, implementation, and decision-making throughout the life of the program and reduce the gap between implementation and governance. The SHIELD ExeCom, on the other hand, will serve as an ad hoc decision-making body on matters where consensus cannot be reached within the SHIELD-PB. The SHIELD ExeCom and PB will meet quarterly in the first year of implementation, and twice yearly thereafter, to ensure ongoing collaboration across the components. The SHIELD PMT will also organize one Reflect and Refocus workshop every 12 months for the benefit of SHIELD ExeCom and PB members.

A more detailed discussion on the Governance and Management Arrangements for the program may be found in Section VIII of this document.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

V. MULTI-PROJECT PORTFOLIO RESULTS FRAMEWORK[3]

Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/country programme:
UNDP (2019-2023) Outcome 2: Urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, equitable, and sustainable development path for communities.

Outcome indicators as stated in the UNDAF/country programmes, including baseline and targets:
Output 2.1 Climate-sensitivity models and hazard maps developed and applied to help NGAs and LGUs better understand and plan for the extent, scope, and distribution of medium and long-term risks.
Output 2.2 Enabling policies, private sector engagement, monitoring, reporting and verification systems strengthened to help the country meet its commitments to the Paris Climate Agreement

Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan: Output 1.3.1 National capacities and evidence-based assessment and planning tools enable gender responsive and risk-informed development investments, including for response to and recovery from

Portfolio Title and Atlas Portfolio Number: Strengthening Institutions and Empowering Localities Against Disaster and Climate Change (SHIELD)

Project Titles and Atlas Project Numbers of Constituent Projects:

1. **SHIELD – UNDP 00128629**
2. **SHIELD – CBCS 00140487**
3. **SHIELD – NRC 00140485**
4. **SHIELD – PBSP 00140488**

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	OUTPUT INDICATORS	DATA SOURCE	BASELINE		TARGETS (CUMULATIVE)						DATA COLLECTION METHODS
			Value	Year	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	
Outcome 1: Government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders in targeted local government units (LGUs) are collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions.											
Deliverable 1: Specialist brokers are fostering collaborative and inclusive local multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) and facilitating successful LGU proposals, financing, and implementation.											
Output 1.1: Engagement with LGUs established Gender marker: GM 2A	1.1.1 Percent of partnership agreements signed and supported by LGU resolution.	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project mid-term and terminal evaluation	0%	2021	25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	1.1.2 Percent of partnership arrangements operationalized (based on partnership agreements signed and supported by LGU resolutions or other means)	KIIs, monitoring visits and Project documents	0%	2021	25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
	1.1.3 Percent of partnership arrangements that have incorporated institutional mechanisms to better facilitate engagement of LGUs with other stakeholders	KIIs, monitoring visits and Project documents	0%	2021	25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Output 1.2: Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) established and engaged in resilience planning, financing and implementation of resilience actions Gender marker: GM 2A	1.2.1 Percent of identified MSPs activated and instituted through local ordinance.	KIIs, monitoring visits and Project documents	0%	2021	25%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	1.2.2 Percent of partners with improved scores in the Multi-Stakeholder Partnership (MSP) capacity assessment. Note: The MSP capacity assessment measures changes in capacities of MSPs on assessment, planning, designing, and implementing resilience projects	MSP capacity assessment	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	
	1.2.3 Percent of MSP composition represented by GEDSI sectors and with GEDSI representatives participating in the development planning and decision making processes.	KIIs, monitoring visits and Project documents	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	100%	
Output 1.3. Capacity development program for target LGUs developed and implemented. Gender marker: GM 2A	1.3.1 Percent of LGUs with improved scores in capacity development	LGU capacity assessment	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	Document Analysis
Output 1.4 A robust data ecosystem that guides inclusive risk-informed planning, prioritization and resource allocation at the LGU level-established.	1.4.1 Percent of LGUs with improved data ecosystem and utilized for resilience planning, prioritization, resource allocation accessible	Data reports	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	100%	100%	100%	Analysis of data systems

3 Multiple projects/IPs can contribute to the same output and can share the same indicators. UNDP publishes its project information (indicators, baselines, targets and results) to meet the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards. Make sure that indicators are S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound), provide accurate baselines and targets underpinned by reliable evidence and data, and avoid acronyms so that external audience clearly understand the results of the project.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Gender marker: GM 2B											
Output 1.5 Risk- and resilience-informed plans, investment programs and budget prepared Gender marker: GM 2B	1.5.1 Percent of Provinces with risk and resilience informed PDPFP	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	Document analysis
	1.5.2 Percent of LGUs (cities/municipalities) with completed risk and resilience assessment and recommendations for mainstreaming into the CLUP and CDP		0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	
	1.5.3 Percent of LGUs with risk and resilience investment program and annual budget		0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	
	1.5.4 Percent of MSPs capacitated and engaged in mainstreaming risk and resilience-informed CLUP and CDP		0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	70%	80%	100%	
	1.5.5 Percent increase of LGU expenditure tagged as resilience action		0%	2021	0%	25%	30%	40%	50%	60%	
	1.5.6 Percent increase of BLGF LGU financial performance rating		0%	2021	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Output 1.6. Bankable proposals developed and funded Gender marker: GM 2B	1.6.1 Number of successfully financed project proposals/programs prepared by MSPs to access internal and external source of funds	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0	2021	0	5	10	15	20	20	Document analysis Stakeholder interviews
	1.6. 2 % of project funding requirements sourced from the private sector		0%	2021	0%	5%	15%	30%	40%	40%	
Output 1.7 Local Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system established Gender marker: GM 1	1.7.1 Percentage of LGUs with improved MEL system	M&E systems and review of project documents	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	100%	100%	100%	Analysis of M&E systems
	1.7.2 Percentage of LGUs with improved resilience index		0%	2021	0%	0%	25%	50%	80%	100%	
Output 1.8 Resilience of value chains improved Gender marker: GM 1	1.8.1 No. of critical value chains assessed	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0	2021	0	3	6	9	12	12	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	1.8.2 No of businesses with business continuity plans		0	2021	0	15	30	45	60	60	
	1.8.3 Percent of LGUs with multisectoral business continuity plans		0%	2021	0%	25%	40%	70%	90%	100%	
Output 1.9 LGU Surge Capacity during significant natural hazard/conflict events Gender marker: GM 2A	1.9. No. of significant hazards/conflict events supported	Review of project documents	0%	2021	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
Outcome 2: Relevant national government agencies (NGAs) are prioritizing action on local climate and disaster resilience.											
Deliverable 2: Specialist brokers are fostering collaborative and inclusive local multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) and facilitating successful LGU proposals, financing, and implementation.											
Output 2.1: Framework to organize and guide policy reform support developed Gender marker: GM 1	2.1.1 No. of policy reform framework developed with inputs from MSP	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0	2021	1	1	1	1	1	1	Analysis of framework systems
Output 2.2 Multistakeholder partnerships established and engaged in policy development and advocacy towards resilient development Gender marker: GM 1	2.2.1 Percent of National MSP members involved in policy reform/advocacy towards resilient development	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0%	2021	0%	25%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	2.2.2 No. of resilience policies developed and advocated for adoption through National MSPs		0	2021	0	1	1	2	3	3	
Output 2.3 Rationalized/harmonized procedures and requirements for local resilience planning, investment programming, budgeting and accessing funds at national and local levels adopted Gender marker: GM 2A	2.3.1 No. of strategies proposed to Government	Review of project documents	0	2021	1	2	3	3	3	3	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	2.3.2 No. of harmonized guidelines and procedures adopted by government	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0	2021	0	0	1	2	3	3	
Output 2.4: New/enhanced inclusive resilience framework, plans, policies and strategies adopted	2.4.1 No. of inclusive resilience frameworks, plans, policies and strategies accepted by government	KIIs, monitoring visits, Project evaluation	0	2021	0	0	1	1	2	2	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Gender marker: GM 2B											
Output 2.5: Resilience Financing Platform established and resilient investments supported Gender marker: GM 1	2.5.1 No. of resilience financing platform established and operationalized	Review of platforms; Project evaluation	0	2021	0	0	1	2	3	3	Analysis of platforms; systems
Output 2.6 Enhanced capacity for BARMM Government to pursue resilience actions Gender marker: GM 1	2.6.1 Percent of increase of BARMM government capacities	Capacity assessment	0%	2021	0%	25%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Document Analysis Stakeholder interviews
	2.6.2 No. of resiliency policy/frameworks/plans/systems adopted to assist BARMM government on enhancing its capacity to pursue resilience actions	Data reports	0	2021	0	1	1	1	1	1	Analysis of framework systems
Deliverable 3: Technical advice is enabling LGUs and NGAs to monitor and evaluate local climate and disaster resilience actions.											
Output 2.7: Enhanced national MEL for resilience established Gender marker: GM 2A	2.7.1 No. of enhanced MEL system adopted by government	M&E systems and review of project documents	0	2021	0	0	1	1	1	1	Analysis of M&E systems
	2.7.2 No. of knowledge management platforms (inc. resilience learning design lab/hub) established and operational		0	2021	0	1	1	2	4	4	
	2.7.3 No. of NGAs and MSPs utilizing evidence from national MEL		0	2021	0%	0%	20%	50%	80%	100%	
Output 2.8: National resilience index piloted and institutionalized Gender marker: GM 1	2.8.1 Percent of LGUs targeted for resilience index piloting collecting data to generate the resilience index	National resilience index systems and review of project documents	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	100%	100%	100%	Analysis of former residence index/es
Output 2.9: Improved national data ecosystem for resilient development Gender marker: GM 1	2.9.1 Percent of existing CC-DRR/resilience databases inter-operable with the national MEL platform	Data reports	0%	2021	0%	25%	50%	75%	100%	100%	Analysis of data systems
	2.9.2 No of data access and sharing protocols developed		0	2021	0	1	1	1	1	1	
Outcome 3: Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action.											
Deliverable 4: Collaboration between Philippine and Australian scientific agencies is improving the quality and accessibility of climate and hazard information products and services for LGU planners.											
Output 3.1: Collaboration between Philippine and Australian science agencies established	3.1.1 No. of collaborative agreements forged and established between Philippine and Australian agencies	Review of project documents	0	2021	0	1	1	1	1	1	Document analysis
Output 3.2: Credible and accessible scientific information available for LGU planning and proposal development	3.2.1 No. of information products that can be utilized in generating credible and accessible technical and scientific information	Data reports	0	2021	0	1	1	1	1	1	Document analysis Stakeholder interviews

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

VI. MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

A. Approach and Purpose

Project monitoring, evaluation and learning for the SHIELD Program will be conducted in line with the UNDP Programme and Operations Policies Procedures (POPP) and other relevant guidance in relation to MEL. The project implementing agency shall monitor the overall performance of the project, evaluate its socio-economic benefits in order to ensure the interventions are implemented in an effective way, and integrate learning into the project.

The project shall be continuously and comprehensively monitored through the conduct of periodic project progress records and quality assessments, which will be submitted by the project management team to both UNDP and DFAT. In addition, an Annual Project Report (APR) shall be prepared based on the Atlas standard and/or donor format to serve as periodic progress reports, with updated information as well as a summary of results achieved against intended annual targets at the output level. Based on the APR, an annual project review shall be conducted in the last quarter of the year, to assess the performance of the project and serve as basis for review of the Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the following year. This appraisal will be done in close coordination between UNDP and DFAT and involve other stakeholders as well. The program Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) Plan will outline other progress monitoring, evaluation and learning activities, which include regular field site visits, regular meetings of project management and meetings with partners and key stakeholders.

SHIELD will utilise an adaptive approach to change, looking to shape activities and strategically align with changing contexts, in response to opportunities to work most effectively towards the intended outcomes. For this reason, monitoring (assessment of progress) and evaluative (checking assumptions and overall program strategy) enquiries will be regularly undertaken throughout the life of the program. The approach will be based on an action-reflection cycle that will underpin management and improvement of program delivery.

Overall, monitoring and evaluation will serve several purposes:

- Contribute to communication and reporting about the program
- Provide accountability to program stakeholders, that resources have been utilised effectively and efficiently to achieve program outputs and end of program outcomes
- Support program learning, contributing to internal learning and to the demonstration of the value of the RID approach from one location to the next
- Report program contribution to Climate Partnership objectives

B. Baseline, Data Collection and Analysis

Data will be collected and analysed against three levels of program implementation: outcome, output and activity levels. Prior to the commencement of data collection and analysis, a Baseline study will be done prior to implementation to determine interventions and identify programming entry points. It is also proposed that the design of the pre-implementation baseline be expanded on the first year to provide a full information base against which to monitor and assess progress and effectiveness during implementation and program completion.

This expanded baseline may seek to collect data on the following:

- The extent to which risks are integrated into national level planning and financing and monitoring and evaluation, and how these influence the allocation of funding for development, including through reform of national development priorities, budget processes and financing systems and internal monitoring and evaluation processes
- The extent to which risks are integrated into community development, including sectors, to influence the way in which these actors seek funding through risk informed project and programme design and implementation

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

- The extent to which the gender sensitive and inclusive machinery inform risk informed budgeting and planning
- The extent to which country oversight and accountability systems scrutinise for concerns relating to climate change and disaster risks, including by formal audit functions, parliaments, and advocacy groups

Following baseline design, data collection and analysis will be done at the following levels:

OUTCOME level: in line with the results framework, data will be collected against program outcomes on an annual basis. Baseline assessment will be undertaken for each of the program outcomes and this assessment will be revisited on an annual basis, in line with national policy planning and financing systems. Assessing program progress will be undertaken through the application of various tools, which will be specified later. The version to be utilised by this program will include attention to (i) integration of gender and social inclusion alongside measures of technical progress; ii) political economy analysis (PEA) to better understand issues around who controls financial flows and narratives, (iii) what coalitions and partnerships exist and whether there are significant external influences and what their interests are. These will be used to define programming entry points, as well as accurately report on results and understand outcomes that may be attributed to SHIELD. Core to data collection at this level will be evaluative enquiry to test major program assumptions. It is anticipated that this ongoing evaluative enquiry will be largely undertaken through regular stakeholder interviews. UNDP may also possibly choose to commission independent research to further test the validity of its assumptions.

OUTPUT level: Program outputs will be assessed on a regular basis. This will include an annual assessment for areas where an annual cycle is the norm. For outputs related to changes in accountability, assessment will be more frequent (i.e., bi-annual) to the extent possible. Assessing progress against outputs will include use of the following tools: (i) policy and document analysis, given that several outputs relate to specific policies, regulations or documentation produced by government, ii) media analysis, making use of established media tracking tools to enable the program to identify significant announcements and changes in the narrative that may be attributed to program contributions, and iii) partner, CSO and regional reporting, to enable SHIELD to use publicly available records from major partners to identify activities that increase accountability for gender sensitive and inclusive risk informed development. In addition to tracking progress against outputs, further inquiries will also be undertaken in order to understand the value provided by outputs towards achieving program objectives.

ACTIVITY level: SHIELD will implement a wide range of activities to achieve the outputs identified in the results framework. Given the complexity of the program, activities are expected to contribute to and influence more than one output. SHIELD will maintain an activity tracking log, which will identify the nature and targets of each activity, including participants and intended immediate results. This log will be critical in providing evidence of actions undertaken by the program, and serve as basis for communicating with donors and stakeholders on the status of implementation. More significantly, this activity log will form the basis of regular program internal reviews to establish the value contributed by program activities to SHIELD outputs and outcomes. While it is expected that activities will draw significantly from previous strategies developed under similar or related projects, SHIELD will intentionally innovate and try out new approaches and ideas over time. The intention will be to continually test approaches against overall program objectives and determine initiatives that are worth pursuing. This adaptive management approach is key to efficiency and effectiveness, and is especially critical given the unique resilience context in each implementation site.

Table 6 summarizes the SHIELD Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Table 6: SHIELD Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Monitoring Activity	Purpose	Frequency	Expected Action
Track Results Progress	Progress data against the results indicators in the RF will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the portfolio in achieving the agreed outputs.	Quarterly, or in the frequency required for each indicator	Slower than expected progress will be addressed by portfolio management.
Monitor and Manage Risk	Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk register. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to manage financial risk.	Quarterly	Risks are identified by portfolio management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.
Learn	Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the portfolio.	At least annually	Relevant lessons are captured by the portfolio team and used to inform management decisions.
Review and Make Course Corrections	Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making.	At least annually	Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the portfolio board and used to make course corrections.
Portfolio Report	A progress report will be presented to the Portfolio Project Board and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk register with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period.	Annually, and at the end of the project (final report)	
Portfolio Review (Project Board)	The portfolio's governance mechanism (i.e., project board) will hold regular portfolio reviews to assess the performance of the portfolio and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the portfolio and its constituent projects. In the portfolio's final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of portfolio review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize portfolio results and lessons learned with relevant audiences.	At least annually	Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management, and actions agreed to address the issues identified.
Annual Portfolio/ Project Quality Assurance	The quality of the portfolio will be assessed against UNDP's quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the portfolio.	Every two years	Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by portfolio management and used to inform decisions to improve portfolio performance.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Evaluation Plan[4]

Evaluation Title	Partners (if joint)	Related Strategic Plan Output	UNDAF/CPD Outcome	Planned Completion Date	Key Evaluation Stakeholders	Cost and Source of Funding
Mid-Term Evaluation	UNDP, CBCS, NRC, PBSP, UN Habitat	Output 1.3.1 National capacities and evidence-based assessment and planning tools enable gender responsive and risk-informed development investments, including for response to and recovery from	Outcome 2: Urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, equitable, and sustainable development path for communities.	December 2024		USD 15,000/ DFAT
Terminal Evaluation	UNDP, CBCS, NRC, PBSP, UN Habitat	Output 1.3.1 National capacities and evidence-based assessment and planning tools enable gender responsive and risk-informed development investments, including for response to and recovery from	Outcome 2: Urbanization, economic growth, and climate change actions are converging for a resilient, equitable, and sustainable development path for communities.	September 2027		USD 15,000/ DFAT

C. Knowledge Sharing and Learning

To assess project achievements, challenges and learnings to ascertain how implementation can be further enhanced, iterative strategic collaborative activities, knowledge sharing, reflection, joint learning sessions and after-action reviews will be conducted with implementation partners and stakeholders regularly. These activities will focus on the following questions:

- What are our intended results? How will we know if we have achieved them?
- What theories and assumptions should we test to ensure achievement of our intended results?
- What do we not yet know that may affect the level of our achievement?
- What do we want to learn? What additional learning activities are needed to better understand our context and development challenges?

That being said, knowledge and learning will be one of the core activities of SHIELD as it is foundational to adaptive management. The program will give attention to the management of and resourcing for multiple knowledge and learning strategies, which pivot around using research and demonstration to advocate for behaviour change at the national and sub-national levels. Learnings

4 Optional, if needed

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

from previous similar projects show that in order to shift the regional narrative, the diffusion of success stories from the adoption of a risk informed development approach needs to be targeted and deliberate. In this regard, SHIELD will utilize a three-pronged approach, particularly:

- **Implementation and Demonstration**: SHIELD will work closely with Philippine government counterparts to identify and support targeted implementation of gender sensitive and inclusive risk-informed development; these "demonstrations" will then be showcased through the use of strategic visibility channels including information dissemination through project-supported fora and activities and the publication of success stories via traditional and social media and the program website
- **Research**: SHIELD will undertake targeted research which will serve as basis for the development and publication of analytical pieces, briefs and position papers;
- **Knowledge Exchange**: SHIELD will facilitate the creation and ways of working of multi-stakeholder (scientific, policy-based) national and sub-national learning networks with a focus on interventions relating to resilience, with the objectives of (1) identifying, analyzing and sharing lessons learned that may be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and (2) disseminating these lessons widely, including within the country, the region and even globally

D. Reporting Schedule

The program will provide an annual accomplishment report to the UNDP Philippines Office and DFAT based on the findings from the SHIELD MEL process. This report will present the following:

- Program progress against outcomes and outputs
- Program learning and recommendations for improvement and further development
- Selected case studies and other information to be utilised for wider communication
- Contribution from the program to the Climate Partnership objectives and KPI
- Contribution from the program to the objectives of DFAT
- Significance and value of program activities for the Philippines

In addition to the annual reports, two (2) evaluations will be conducted for SHIELD: a midterm evaluation planned for completion in 2024 and a terminal evaluation at the end of program implementation in 2027. All reports will be transmitted by email to DFAT, and the submission schedule is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: SHIELD MEL Reporting Schedule

Report	Frequency	Submission Schedule
Annual Accomplishment Report	Yearly	Every year
Midterm Evaluation Report	Mid-term of project implementation	Once, Project mid-term
Final (Terminal) Accomplishment and Evaluation Report	End of project	Once, Project conclusion

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

VII. MULTI-YEAR WORK PLAN

EXPECTED OUTPUTS	PLANNED ACTIVITIES	FUNDING SOURCE	BUDGET DESCRIPTION	CONSOLIDATED PLANNED BUDGET						
				Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6	Total
Outcome 1: Government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders in targeted local government units (LGUs) are collaborating to unlock funding and implementing informed and inclusive resilience actions.										
Output 1.1. Engagement with LGUs established Gender marker: GM 2A	Activity 1.1.1. Conduct of comprehensive and participatory capacity assessment and political economy analysis, HDP analysis, trust network analysis, integrating behavioural insights in all target LGUs and MSMEs during emergencies and disasters Activity 1.1.2. Develop LGU engagement strategy (based on analysis/assessemnts and discussions with LGUs), to include selection of municipalities/cities, co-financing, entry points Activity 1.1.3. Establish partnership agreement with LGUs Activity 1.1.4. Conduct of Peace Conflict Development Analysis for BARMM, including selection of LGUs and communities	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	0	0	0	0	0	2,632
			71300 - Local Consultants	7,664	0	0	0	0	0	7,664
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			71600 - Travel	41,800	52,200	28,408	8,408	8,408	8,408	147,632
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	10,000	13,200	10,000	10,000	10,000	53,200
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	3,000	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	15,000
			72500 - Supplies	472	472	472	472	472	472	2,832
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	9,912	9,912	9,912	9,912	9,912	0	49,560
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	100	100	100	100	100	100	600
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	0	4,000
				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total for Output 1.1.				**67,580**	**74,684**	**55,092**	**31,892**	**31,892**	**21,980**	**283,120**
Output 1.2. Multi-Stakeholder Partnerships (MSPs) established and engaged in resilience planning, financing and implementation of resilience actions Gender marker: GM 2A	Activity 1.2.1. Conduct multi-stakeholder mapping and assessment with the partner LGUs Activity 1.2.2. Conduct Capacity needs assessment and develop capacity development plan for each stakeholder Activity 1.2.3. Establish local multi-stakeholder partnerships in each LGU Activity 1.2.4. Implement capacity building interventions for MSPs Activity 1.2.5. Facilitate implementation of resilience actions of MSPs Activity 1.2.6. Establish cross-boundary linkages among MSPs Activity 1.2.7. Conduct knowledge series for MSPs on resilience planning, financing, and implementation of resilience actions Activity 1.2.8. Develop a polcy research on Environmental Challenges and Issues that impact on Conflict in selected areas in BARMM	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	0	0	0	0	0	2,632
			71300 - Local Consultants	33,957	26,293	26,000	22,000	22,000	22,000	152,250
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	32,125	47,156	47,156	47,156	47,156	22,105	242,853
			71600 - Travel	13,080	13,000	13,000	8,000	8,000	1,000	56,080
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	472	472	472	472	472	0	2,360
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	1,200
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	31,000	41,000	20,860	5,860	5,860	5,360	109,940
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.2.				**116,466**	**129,921**	**109,488**	**85,488**	**85,488**	**52,465**	**579,315**
Output 1.3. Capacity development program for target LGUs developed and implemented Gender marker: GM 2A	Activity 1.3.1. Conduct of capacity assessment for each LGU Activity 1.3.2. Develop capacity building program based on context-specific assessments done at various LGU levels	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	0	0	0	0	6,592
			71300 - Local Consultants	26,984	30,469	6,600	14,600	6,600	0	85,253
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	19,125	34,156	34,156	34,156	34,156	9,105	164,853
			71600 - Travel	5,500	9,000	9,000	5,500	3,500	1,500	34,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

	Activity 1.3.3. Implement capacity development interventions		72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	320	321	321	0	0	0	961
	Activity 1.3.4. Assess results of capacity development		72500 - Supplies	244	244	244	100	100	100	1,032
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Activity 1.3.5. Learning exchange among LGUs		72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	457	457	0	0	0	0	914
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	2,276	7,860	7,860	7,860	6,860	2,000	34,716
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	2,000	0	1,000	0	3,000
			64397 - DPC Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.3.				**59,538**	**88,467**	**62,180**	**64,216**	**54,216**	**14,705**	**343,322**
Output 1.4. A robust data ecosystem that guides inclusive risk-informed planning, prioritization and resource allocation at the LGU level-established *Gender marker: GM 2B (Activity 1.4.2)*	Activity 1.4.1. Conduct mapping of existing or baseline database platforms and recommend integration mechanism	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	0	0	15,133
			71300 - Local Consultants	15,664	41,455	35,679	27,208	0	0	120,006
	Activity 1.4.2. Develop framework for LGU data ecosystem for resilient development, including establishing data standards and designing data architecture, to include GEDSI requirements, maximizing DevLive+, and other datasets to lift up DRR/CCA information		71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	19,774	34,156	34,156	34,156	34,156	9,105	165,502
			71600 - Travel	3,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0	19,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	30,000	30,000	0	0	0	0	60,000
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	3,279	3,281	3,281	2,832	2,832	2,832	18,337
	Activity 1.4.3. Identify recommendations for investment per LGU		72500 - Supplies	4,902	182	183	0	0	0	5,267
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	9,523	10,000	0	0	0	0	19,523
	Activity 1.4.4. Provide technical assistance in establishing data platform/ecosystem, including training on community preparation and engagement; geotagging and enumeration surveys; analytics and visualizations; data cleaning; community validation		73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	639	640	0	0	0	0	1,279
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,500	2,500	2,366	0	1,000	0	7,366
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397 - DPC Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Activity 1.4.5. Data sharing protocols specific for each LGU, linked with national platform		64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.4.				**92,913**	**132,174**	**85,811**	**74,591**	**43,988**	**13,937**	**443,414**
Output 1.5. Risk- and resilience-informed plans, investment programs and budget prepared Gender marker: GM 2B	Activity 1.5.1. Conduct comprehensive risk assessment with MSPs	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	7,664	20,792	22,959	14,622	16,250	10,860	93,148
	Activity 1.5.2. Conduct joint visioning on resilience outcomes with MSPs		71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	24,476	39,507	34,156	34,156	34,156	9,105	175,556
			71600 - Travel	3,354	6,180	6,180	6,180	6,180	3,000	31,074
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Activity 1.5.3. Conduct of consultations and trainings on project prioritization, CBA/MCA, and trade off analytics		72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	1,028	1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026	0	5,132
			72500 - Supplies	561	561	1,151	1,092	1,151	100	4,616
	Activity 1.5.4. Conduct trainings on resilience financing, developing risk-informed LDIP; mentoring/coaching on enhanced PAPs		72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Activity 1.5.5. Conduct of mentoring on developing and finalizing risk and resilience informed Annual Investment Programme and implementation plan including multi-stakeholder investments and financing program		73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	1,463	1,463	1,463	1,463	1,463	0	7,314
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	747	747	747	747	0	2,988
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	10,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Activity 1.5.6. Conduct workshops on climate change expenditure tagging and report development Activity 1.5.7. Conduct inter-LGU planning and consultations and resilience building trainings and planning workshops Activity 1.5.8. Support policy development									
	Activity 1.5.9. Conduct process documentation and develop case studies and knowledge products		64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Sub-total for Output 1.5.				**44,178**	**78,237**	**75,828**	**67,680**	**69,631**	**31,969**	**367,524**
Output 1.6. Bankable proposals developed and funded Gender marker: GM 2B	Activity 1.6.1. Conduct mapping and assessment of funding windows (public, private, domestic, international), including requirements and analysis of bottlenecks for accessing Activity 1.6.2. Develop guide/checklist in developing bankable proposals according to requirements of varying funding windows, including standards/guidance in integrating resilience, GEDSI and SES Activity 1.6.3. Provide technical assistance, including quality assurance, in the development of proposals, in collaboration with MSPs	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	18,961	19,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	53,064
			71300 - Local Consultants	10,000	32,566	17,093	22,622	16,250	10,860	109,392
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	22,125	39,507	41,656	34,156	34,156	9,105	180,705
			71600 - Travel	2,000	6,180	5,590	3,000	4,180	1,770	22,720
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	769	1,090	2,276	4,135
			72500 - Supplies	0	0	197	559	398	1,075	2,228
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	1,097	1,097	1,554	3,245	6,993
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	3,500	3,500	1,500	1,500	0	10,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397 - DPC Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.6.				**36,125**	**102,714**	**90,278**	**70,097**	**65,787**	**36,235**	**401,237**
Output 1.7 Local Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system established Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 1.7.1. Conduct mapping of existing MEL platforms and recommend integration mechanism Activity 1.7.2. Develop local MEL framework linked with national MEL Activity 1.7.3. Provide technical assistance in establishing and operationalizing local MEL Activity 1.7.4. Pilot resilience index to target LGUs Activity 1.7.5. Capacity development on generating and utilizing evidence from local MEL for accountability, policy making, and decision-making Activity 1.7.6. Promote MEL to improve accountability and citizen participation, including through training of MSPs and local community groups on the use of DEVLIVE app, a mobile based tool adopted by DILG Activity 1.7.7. Develop and disseminate knowledge products emanating from MEL	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	17,664	28,589	15,093	22,622	16,250	10,860	111,079
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	48,125	54,156	54,156	54,156	54,156	29,105	293,853
			71600 - Travel	2,000	5,500	5,500	3,500	3,500	1,500	21,500
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	2,003	2,003	2,003	2,003	2,003	10,015
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	107	107	107	107	107	107	641
			72500 - Supplies	208	48	48	48	48	48	448
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	2,400	0	0	0	0	2,400
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	152	152	152	152	152	152	914
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	4,860	8,327	8,130	6,360	6,360	14,580	48,617
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	2,000	2,000	1,000	0	5,000
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.7.				**77,748**	**107,243**	**93,335**	**97,343**	**90,235**	**66,260**	**532,164**
Output 1.8 Resilience of value chains improved Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 1.8.1. Conduct value chain analysis, informed by risk assessment for critical/priority sectors Activity 1.8.2. Conduct of training on assessment tools Activity 1.8.3. Develop capacity-building framework for LGUs and business sector on value chain resilience Activity 1.8.4. Support implementation of priority capacity-building interventions Activity 1.8.5. Conduct multisectoral planning Activity 1.8.6. Conduct information campaigns and awareness-raising sessions with the business sector on resilience	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	27,886	39,418	36,547	29,354	31,424	10,860	175,489
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	43,134	140,385	132,672	115,027	115,151	9,105	555,475
			71600 - Travel	6,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	0	38,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	107	107	107	107	107	107	641
			72500 - Supplies	1,679	1,012	402	48	48	48	3,236
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	1,332	3,299	332	152	152	152	5,421
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	10,000	13,540	13,540	3,540	3,540	0	44,160
			74100 - Professional Services	1,395	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	201,395
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 1.8.				**96,166**	**261,721**	**247,746**	**212,623**	**215,081**	**28,177**	**1,061,514**
Output 1.9 LGU Surge Capacity during significant natural hazard/conflict events Gender marker: GM 2A	Activity 1.9.1 Support development of business continuity plan of LGU with MSPs Activity 1.9.2. Implement surge interventions as needed	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	0	0	0	4,659	5,904	10,563
			71300 - Local Consultants	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	46,250	40,860	207,111
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	0	0	0	0	6,000	6,000	12,000
			71600 - Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	420,000
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total for Output 1.9.				**100,000**	**100,000**	**100,000**	**100,000**	**126,909**	**122,764**	**649,673**
Sub-total for Outcome 1				**690,715**	**1,075,160**	**919,757**	**803,931**	**783,227**	**388,492**	**4,661,282**
Outcome 2: Relevant national government agencies (NGAs) are prioritizing action on local climate and disaster resilience.										
Output 2.1 Framework to organize and guide policy reform support developed Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.1.1. Conduct assessment of policies, including political economy analysis and cost-benefit analysis Activity 2.1.2. Co-develop policy reform framework with national MSP Activity 2.1.3. Develop national engagement strategy Activity 2.1.4. Support implementation of policy reform framework Activity 2.1.5. Conduct GEDSI policy research and strategy Activity 2.1.6 Conduct multi-stakeholder workshops on resilient and sustainable rural-urban linkages to inform Framework development	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	15,664	20,162	15,093	14,622	16,250	10,860	92,652
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	5,759	8,447	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	43,065
			71600 - Travel	0	2,685	0	0	0	0	2,685
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	80	80	80	80	0	0	320
			72500 - Supplies	36	134	36	36	0	0	242
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	114	114	114	114	0	0	457
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	2,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.1.				**28,285**	**37,583**	**29,916**	**29,694**	**31,356**	**22,284**	**179,118**
Output 2.2 Multistakeholder partnerships established and engaged in policy development and advocacy towards resilient development Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.2.1. Conduct multi-stakeholder mapping and assessment at the national level Activity 2.2.2. Conduct capacity needs assessment and develop capacity development plan for each stakeholder Activity 2.2.3. Establish national multi-stakeholder partnership and convergence platform Activity 2.2.4. Implement capacity building interventions for national MSP Activity 2.2.5. Facilitate active involvement of MSPs in policy development	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			71300 - Local Consultants	8,000	0	0	0	0	0	8,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	20,059	22,747	22,747	22,747	22,747	17,819	128,865
			71600 - Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	80	0	0	0	0	0	80
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	10,015	10,015	10,015	30,045
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	1,200	0	0	0	0	0	1,200
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	5,860	5,860	10,720	10,720	10,692	4,860	48,712
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.2.				**37,199**	**30,607**	**35,467**	**45,482**	**45,454**	**34,694**	**228,902**
Output 2.3 Rationalized/harmonized procedures and requirements for local resilience planning, investment programming, budgeting and accessing funds at national and local levels adopted Gender marker GM 2A	Activity 2.3.1. Support harmonization of risk and resilience assessment methodology and mainstreaming into CDP, CLUP and PDPFP developed and adopted by government (covering CDRA, CRMF, and CLIRAM tools, other tools plus introduction of resilience in the assessment) Activity 2.3.2. Support to rationalization of multiple planning requirements for LGUs, including updating of JMC No. 1 Series 2016 on rationalized local planning and budgeting Activity 2.3.3. Support development of guidelines for Mainstreaming Risk and Resilience in Project Development Activity 2.3.4. Support updating guidelines on utilization of Local DRRM Fund, Local Development Fund and improvements in local budgeting for resilience (DBM related which releases budget circular and joint MCs with DILG) Activity 2.3.5. Improved guidelines for access and utilization of NDRRMF, PSF and other grants Activity 2.3.6. Pursue rationalization and harmonization of other policies as they may evolve during implementation	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	7,664	20,162	23,093	22,622	16,250	10,860	100,652
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	14,759	8,447	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	52,065
			71600 - Travel	1,770	3,180	3,770	3,180	2,000	0	13,900
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	240	240	240	240	0	0	962
			72500 - Supplies	0	983	1,029	1,127	1,029	0	4,168
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	343	343	343	343	0	0	1,371
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	3,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	1,967	1,770	1,967	1,770	0	7,474
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.3.				**30,408**	**42,283**	**45,838**	**44,321**	**36,155**	**22,284**	**221,289**
Output 2.4: New/enhanced inclusive resilience framework, plans, policies and strategies adopted Gender marker: GM 2B	Activity 2.4.1. Support to operationalization of the NCRMF, updated NDRRMF and Plan, updated NCCAP/NAP and the NDCActivity 2.4.2. Support to formulation of national resilience framework, plans, policies and strategies (in support of emerging needs in the course of implementation, including possible support to new DDR)Activity 2.4.3. Policy paper/brief development, expert peer review	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	25,696
			71300 - Local Consultants	7,664	13,869	15,093	14,622	16,250	10,860	78,359
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	5,759	15,744	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	50,363
			71600 - Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	134	134	134	134	134	134	802
			72500 - Supplies	180	180	35	0	0	0	395
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	190	190	190	190	190	190	1,143
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	1,967	0	0	0	0	1,967
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	1,000	0	1,000	0	2,000
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.4.				**18,559**	**38,045**	**31,045**	**29,788**	**32,680**	**22,608**	**172,724**
Output 2.5: Resilience Financing Platform established and resilient investments supported Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.5.1. Conduct mapping and assessment of financing mechanisms to inform rationalization and advocacy towards reducing fragmentation and increasing complementation across funding streams Activity 2.5.2. Support strengthening of the Resilience Financing Framework, together with NGAs and LGUs, linked with Climate Finance Platform Activity 2.5.3. Support private sector in establishing resilience financing platform to ensure their business continuity across the value chains, and identify business opportunities from resilient investments	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	5,904	23,064
			71300 - Local Consultants	0	36,028	37,252	14,622	16,250	10,860	115,013
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	8,638	12,670	20,170	18,670	12,670	5,279	78,098
			71600 - Travel	0	2,000	2,000	0	0	0	4,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	64	64	65	65	65	65	386
			72500 - Supplies	29	29	29	29	29	29	174
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	2,000
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	91	91	91	91	91	91	549

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

	Activity 2.5.4 Pilot a virtual/online investment portal that will allow LGUs to reachout to investors and funders and a knowledge hub for resilience project sharing Activity 2.5.5 Develop knowledgde products on resilience financing and investments Activity 2.5.6 Conduct mentoring workshops and learning exchange on establishing and maintaining resilience investment portal		72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	2,967	2,770	1,000	1,000	0	7,737
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.5.				**10,823**	**61,810**	**68,523**	**40,872**	**36,764**	**24,228**	**243,021**
Output 2.6 Support to BARMM Government Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.6.1. Develop capacity development programme based on PCDA analysis under Outcome 1 Activity 2.6.2. Implement capacity development interventions across BARMM ministries Activity 2.6.3. Support operationalization of Bangsamoro Community Resilience (CoRe) framework	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	2,632	3,961	4,146	4,395	4,659	0	19,792
			71300 - Local Consultants	25,104	21,869	23,093	14,622	16,250	0	100,938
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	14,759	8,447	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	52,065
			71600 - Travel	6,210	5,620	6,210	5,620	4,440	0	28,100
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	160	160	160	160	160	0	802
			72500 - Supplies	72	72	72	72	72	0	360
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	229	229	229	229	229	0	1,143
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	12,000	12,000	11,000	11,000	10,000	0	56,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.6.				**63,166**	**54,357**	**55,357**	**46,545**	**46,257**	**5,519**	**271,200**
Output 2.7 Enhanced national MEL for resilience established Gender marker: GM 2A	Activity 2.7.1. Conduct of assessment of existing MEL systems, recommendations for enhancement, includng framework, design and strategy of enhanced MEL, linked to local MEL Activity 2.7.2. Technical assistance in the establishment of MEL infrastructure Activity 2.7.3. Capacity building for NGAs and stakeholders Activity 2.7.4. Establish knowledge and innovation platform from MEL, including Resilience Learning Design Lab Activity 2.7.5. Capacity development on utilization of evidence from national MEL for accountability, policy making, and decision-making Activity 2.7.6. Develop policy briefs based on data generated from national MEL	30000/ 11854		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			71200 - International Consultants	10,000	15,000	0	0	0	0	25,000
			71300 - Local Consultants	9,000	8,000	7,000	0	0	0	24,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	8,638	12,670	12,670	12,670	12,670	5,279	64,598
			71600 - Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72600 - Grants	0	60,000	60,000	0	0	0	120,000
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	2,000	2,000	1,000	0	0	5,000
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	500	5,500
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,000
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.7.				**30,638**	**101,670**	**85,670**	**17,670**	**16,670**	**8,779**	**261,098**
Output 2.8: National resilience index piloted and institutionalized Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.8.1. Establish resilience index (national and subnational scale) that takes into account the ex-ante, actual impacts, and ex-post elements of state and effects of natural hazards, including specific indicators and factors under socio-economic, ecological and governance systems (also taking into account multidimensional risks, to extent possible Activity 2.8.2. Conduct pilot testing and application of analytical resilience models in two scales with dual objectives: (a) regional political-administrative boundary for easier integration in the current spatial and development planning, public investment programming,	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			71300 - Local Consultants	10,000	0	8,000	0	0	0	18,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	5,759	8,447	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	43,065
			71600 - Travel	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	5,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	0	0	150,000
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

	and budgeting systems, which will be integrated into the national composite index; and (b) upland, lowland, or coastal ecosystem levels for direct application to landscape domains and approaches focusing on the management of critical ecosystems; Activity 2.8.3. Develop the technical capacity and knowledge systems of national and local government to apply and use the methodology of resilience index in plan formulation, monitoring and reporting (e.g., trainings/workshops, data infrastructure systems, and information, education and communication campaigns) Activity 2.8.4. Develop an approach/mechanism for institutionalization, replication and scaling-up.		73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	5,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.8.				**69,759**	**62,447**	**70,447**	**12,447**	**12,447**	**5,519**	**233,065**
Output 2.9 : Improved national data ecosystem for resilient development Gender marker: GM 1	Activity 2.9.1. Support improving interoperability of existing CC-DRR/resilience databases Activity 2.9.2. Support establishment of resilience data access and sharing protocols Activity 2.9.3. Support to establishing data platforms, including National Loss and Damage Registry	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			71300 - Local Consultants	10,000	7,000	8,000	0	0	0	25,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	5,759	8,447	8,447	8,447	8,447	3,519	43,065
			71600 - Travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	0	50,000	0	0	0	0	50,000
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	5,000
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	12,000
Sub-total for Output 2.9.				**18,759**	**68,447**	**19,447**	**11,447**	**11,447**	**5,519**	**135,065**
Sub-total for Outcome 2				**307,596**	**497,249**	**441,710**	**278,266**	**269,229**	**151,433**	**1,945,483**
Outcome 3: Philippine scientific agencies are producing tailored and accessible information for local resilience action.										
Output 3.1: Collaboration between Philippine and Australian science agencies established	Activity 3.1.1. Establish partnership agreement between GPH and GOA scientific technical agencies Activity 3.1.2. Develop fine-scale climate modeling and projections, scenario building and downscaling information Activity 3.1.3. Develop and test information products with local academia Activity 3.1.4. Establish network of DRRM/CCA knowledge centers with SUCs	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	20,000	40,000	20,000	0	0	0	80,000
			71300 - Local Consultants	20,000	20,000	20,000	15,000	0	0	75,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	96,239	190,195	190,195	190,195	190,195	76,485	933,503
			71600 - Travel	10,000	10,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	45,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	50,000	50,000	100,000	25,000	0	0	225,000
			72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	1,285	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	5,285
			72600 - Grants	0	0	50,000	20,000	0	0	70,000
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	40,000	40,000	100,000	0	0	0	180,000
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	6,926	13,851	13,851	13,851	13,851	0	62,330
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	10,000	7,504	5,000	5,000	0	0	27,504
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	24,000
Sub-total for Output 3.1.				**257,165**	**376,835**	**514,046**	**299,046**	**214,046**	**86,485**	**1,747,622**
Output 3.2: Credible and accessible technical and scientific information is available for LGU planning and proposal development	Activity 3.2.1. Generate climate risk-based information for severe wind and storm surge in SHIELD sites Activity 3.2.2. Conduct capacity building on scientific data collection and multi-hazard analysis	30000/ 11854	71200 - International Consultants	20,000	40,000	30,000	0	0	0	90,000
			71300 - Local Consultants	15,000	20,000	15,000	10,000	0	0	60,000
			71400 - Contractual Services - Individ	38,864	77,727	77,727	77,727	77,727	40,226	389,999
			71600 - Travel	0	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,000	8,000
			72100 - Contractual Services - Companies	50,000	100,000	45,000	0	0	0	195,000

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

	Activity 3.2.3. Develop national KM platform to inform climate-risk assessments and multi-hazard mapping		72400 - Communic & Audio Visual Equip	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72500 - Supplies	0	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	0	3,000
			72600 - Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72800 - Information Technology Equipmt	70,000	70,000	130,477	0	0	0	270,477
			73100 - Rental & Maintenance - Premises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			72300 - Materials & Goods	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	8,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	3,155	26,155
			74100 - Professional Services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			74200 - Audiovisual & Print Prod Cost	0	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	20,000
			75700 - Training, workshops, and Conf	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			64397/74586 - Quality Assurance and Oversight	6,000	6,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	4,563	31,563
Sub-total for Output 3.2.				**199,864**	**334,727**	**311,204**	**110,727**	**88,727**	**48,944**	**1,094,194**
Sub-total for Outcome 3				**457,029**	**711,562**	**825,250**	**409,773**	**302,773**	**135,429**	**2,841,816**
PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT COST				0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SHIELD Support Unit Personnel				116,591	233,182	233,182	233,182	233,182	120,679	1,169,997
SSU Learning Cost				13,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	4,500	13,000	44,500
General Operating Costs (Supplies, Rental, Utilities)				27,533	43,692	43,743	43,794	43,848	9,698	212,308
Communication and Equipment				37,905	11,091	11,181	11,274	11,370	8,075	90,896
HACT Assurance Activities (audit, spot checks, programme monitoring visits)		30000/ 11854		16,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	26,000	202,000
Monitoring and Evaluation				1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	1,574	16,574	24,442
Consortium Support Personnel				22,374	22,374	37,374	22,374	22,374	37,374	164,242
Consortium Project Management Cost: 8%				41,095	64,263	58,346	48,485	48,760	26,596	287,544
Sub-total Portfolio Management Cost				**276,571**	**420,675**	**429,898**	**405,183**	**405,607**	**257,995**	**5,790,227**
Sub-total : Outputs and Portfolio Management				**1,731,911**	**2,704,646**	**2,616,615**	**1,897,152**	**1,760,836**	**933,349**	**11,644,508**
GMS 8%										964,304
Total Programmable Budget with GMS										12,608,812
UN Coordination Levy (1%)	Programmed per signed cost-sharing agreement									130,181
SHIELD Program Initiation Budget - DFAT										409,290
SHIELD Program Initiation Budget - UNDP										300,000
TOTAL BUDGET				**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13,448,283**

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

VIII. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The SHIELD Program, as a portfolio, will be implemented by the Consortium composed of the United Nations Development Programme, Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society, National Resilience Council, Philippine Business for Social Progress, and UN-Habitat. UNDP, CBCS, NRC, and PBSP will serve as Implementing Partners responsible for managing respective project outputs and activities, in harmony with other Consortium workstreams, and manage risk in accordance with the agreed project document. While UN-Habitat will serve as a Responsible Party to provide support in the delivery of project outputs and activities.

UNDP, as Consortium Lead, has entered into a cost-sharing agreement with DFAT for the implementation of the SHIELD Program. As Consortium lead, UNDP takes overall responsibility and accountability for the effective use of resources and the delivery of outputs under the SHIELD Program, as set forth in such Portfolio Document.


UNDP is accountable to the donor for the implementation of the SHIELD Program. This includes oversight of project execution to ensure that the portfolio is being carried out in accordance with agreed standards and provisions. UNDP is responsible for delivering project cycle management services comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation.

Other Consortium partners, as Implementing Partners, will enter into a Partnership Cooperation Agreement with UNDP based on the agreed deliverables under the Project Document.

The Consortium and GPH agencies, together with other national and subnational stakeholders, will serve as collaborators in designing interventions, implementing activities and delivering outputs that facilitate the attainment of program outcomes

Figure 3 shows the proposed organizational structure for the SHIELD Program.

Figure 3. SHIELD Organizational Structure



SHIELD Program Board (PB)

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

The SHIELD Program will receive strategic guidance from the **SHIELD Program Board**. The SHIELD Program Board will provide oversight and have overall responsibility for providing high level strategic directions for the project, such as ensuring that the project is focused on achieving its stated objectives throughout its life cycle, delivering quality outputs that will contribute to higher level outcomes. The Board makes management decisions for a portfolio/project when guidance is required by the SHIELD Program Manager and when portfolio/project tolerances have been exceeded.

In order to ensure UNDP's ultimate accountability for the project results, the SHIELD Program Board decisions will be made in accordance with standards that shall ensure management for development results, best value money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case consensus cannot be reached within the Board, the final decision shall rest with the **SHIELD Executive Committee**.

The SHIELD Program Board will be composed of senior representatives from multi-stakeholder partners:

- **SHIELD Consortium and Implementing Partners**, composed of UNDP, CBCS, NRC, PBSP, and UN-Habitat. UNDP, as Consortium lead, will serve as the Chair of the SHIELD Program Board.
- **Government of the Philippines**, composed of DILG, NEDA, DOST, DOF, DENR, OCD, CCC, DHSUD, DTI, PCW, NCDA, and BARMM, through MILG and BPDA. Other government agencies may be added as agreed with the Board. DILG, as lead GPH partner will serve as Vice-chair of the SHIELD Program Board.
- **Donor**, particularly Government of Australia, through the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), together with Australian science institutions. DFAT will serve as Vice-chair of the SHIELD Program Board.
- Other **multi-stakeholder partners** from civil society, private sector, and academe. Nomination of representatives will be decided by the Board.

The SHIELD Program Board, which will meet at least twice annually, shall have the following key responsibilities:

1. Provide overall guidance and direction to the SHIELD Program and agree on adjustments within provided tolerance levels;
2. Approve annual work-plans and budgets, and as needed, any essential deviations from the original plans and budgets;
3. Approve key work packages for implementation by the Implementing Partners and Responsible Parties, and establish a system to delegate approving authorities to the SHIELD Programme Management Team and SHIELD Support Unit to ensure efficient and effective portfolio/project implementation;
4. Ensure coordination between various donor and government-funded projects and programmes;
5. Ensure coordination with various government agencies and their participation in project activities;
6. Review the project progress, assess performance, and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year; Oversee and support the commitment for funding and other support for the project;
7. Assess risks to the program, and agree on management actions and resources to address them effectively; and
8. Identify and address operational issues of program implementation, including those that could lead to revisions of the portfolio/project, if required.
9. Provide guidance on post-project sustainability, institutional and financial arrangements, keeping in view the recommendations of external reviews.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

SHIELD Executive Committee (ExeCom)

The SHIELD Executive Committee composed of senior representatives from the GPH through the DILG, SHIELD Consortium through UNDP and the Government of Australia through DFAT will serve as an ad hoc decision-making body on matters where consensus cannot be reached within the SHIELD Program Board. The SHIELD Executive Committee will be convened on a per need basis.

SHIELD Program Management Team (PMT)

The **SHIELD Program Management Team** will consist of technical and operational representatives from the Consortium (UNDP, CBCS, NRC, PBSP, UN-Habitat) and Australian Embassy, with its Humanitarian and Disaster Risk Management (H&DRM) team, which will meet on a monthly basis. The SHIELD PMT will be chaired by UNDP as Consortium lead.

The SHIELD PMT will be responsible for:

- harmonization of efforts to ensure efficient and effective use of SHIELD resources
- exploration of new opportunities, ideas and approaches to allow for a multi-disciplinary approach to problem solving and collaboration to address issues and challenges, and
- integration of activities, systems and tools to ensure a coordinated approach to SHIELD

The Reflect and Refocus workshops to be facilitated by the PMT for SHIELD partners and stakeholders will focus on the following:

- evidence-based decision making through the use of MEL data for learning and continuous improvement
- strategizing to ensure that progress leads to intended outcomes
- encouraging open communication between program management, staff, and stakeholders
- networking and relationship building, and
- establishing a shared understanding of program approaches and ways of working

SHIELD Program Assurance

UNDP, through the Philippines Country Office Programme Officer under the Climate Action Programme Team, performs the quality assurance role and supports the SHIELD Program Board and SHIELD Support Unit by carrying out objective and independent portfolio oversight and monitoring functions. This role ensures appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. UNDP provides oversight services involving the UNDP Philippines Country Office. Project assurance is independent of the Project Management/SSU function.

SHIELD Support Unit


The SHIELD Support Unit (SSU) will be responsible and accountable for day-to-day management of SHIELD Program interventions across the 3 components, achieving program outputs, and for the effective use of resources through collaborative engagement with Consortium, GPH and MSPs, and GOA. While administratively reporting to UNDP, the SSU will serve as the implementation arm of the whole SHIELD Consortium.

The SHIELD Support Unit will undertake key functions to support the PB, ExeCom, and PMT, including secretariat duties, GEDSI support to programs, whole-of-program MEL and adaptive learning, and professional partnership brokering through multi-stakeholder partnerships (MSPs) at the sub-national and national levels.

Figure 4 illustrates the composition of the SHIELD Support Unit.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Figure 4. SHIELD Support Unit



The SSU will be led by the **SHIELD Program Manager** who will be responsible for the overall management of the SHIELD Program and supervision of the SHIELD Support Unit. The Program Manager will be primarily responsible in ensuring that the main objectives of the SHIELD Program in the most efficient and effective manner. S/he will play a lead role in managing, implementing, coordinating the delivery of the program, and partnership brokering with multi-stakeholder partners/stakeholders.

The MSPs working towards Outcome 1 will be led by the appropriate sub-national institution (e.g., Provincial LGUs, the BARMM regional government and MMDA). The SSU, together with the Consortium, will directly provide technical, coordination, and operational support to the MSPs, through the Resilience Broker, Provincial/Regional Coordinator and Program Assistants stationed in program sites.

Critical to the success of SHIELD will be the **Resilience Brokers** that must possess exceptional political acumen, convening and mentoring skills. The brokers, together with the Consortium, will primarily establish and nurture local MSPs such that they become effective working teams creating lasting and meaningful impact at all levels. They will also help to establish a common understanding of the resilience concept and how it can be integrated to the broader development agenda. The concept of resilience will have to be unpacked and translated into operational terms and messaging understandable by different stakeholders. They, along with the MSPs, will play a key role in quality assuring submissions for funding. They will also provide the link between provincial and municipal government and facilitate cross jurisdictional approaches to resilience.
The Resilience Brokers will facilitate annual partnership health checks and cross-learning activities to strengthen the effectiveness of the subnational MSPs. They will also ensure that programmatic guidance is adjusted to the unique context of each SHIELD program site and that the technical inputs from GPH agencies and consortium members are translated into definitive MSP actions.

The **Provincial/Regional Coordinators** will be responsible for managing, implementing and coordinating day-to-day activities under Component 1, with support from Program Assistants.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

The Coordinators will be leading the learning and adaptation of the local MSP model at the LGU level, building and nurturing a successful model that demonstrates proof of concept, and building strong linkages with key stakeholders. The Provincial Coordinators will be responsible collating evidence of what works and what doesn't for reporting to SHIELD nationally.

The National-level MSP working under Component 2 on policy engagement will mirror the composition of the sub-national MSPs, but with the work facilitated by the **National Policy Broker** and the SSU. The SSU, together with the Consortium, will work closely with technical staff from GPH agencies and other MSPs to deliver on the necessary activities and outputs.

For the third outcome, the Consortium will forge a partnership with the Australian science agencies, which may include Australia's Bureau of Meteorology, CSIRO and Geoscience Australia, and GPH through DOST. The SSU will provide implementation support towards the delivery of the outputs, in close collaboration with GPH S&T agencies.

MSPs and collaborators will not be working in silos – cross-component learning exchanges will be facilitated by the SSU, given the inter-related and inter-dependent nature of the outcomes to be achieved by SHIELD. Towards this end, the two (2) **Program Component Leads** of the SSU will have the primary responsibility for ensuring the integration of program outputs across outcomes throughout implementation. One Program Component Lead will oversee delivery under Component 1 and will coordinate closely with the Resilience Brokers, Subnational Coordinators and Consortium partners and experts. While the other Program Component Lead will oversee delivery of Components 2 and 3 and will work closely with the National Policy Broker. A Knowledge Management Officer, Program MEL Officer and Program Associate will also be hired to support the overall requirements of the SHIELD Program. Supporting the operations of the SSU will be the Finance Officer, Procurement Officer and Administrative Assistant.

Given the complexity of inclusive resilient development, the SSU will also engage **technical specialists/experts and contractors** to supplement the endogenous expertise of GPH agencies, MSPs and the consortium and inform strategic and integrative interventions to be pursued under SHIELD. Technical specialists include, but not limited to: Resilience – Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction; Resilience – Peace and Development; GEDSI; Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning; Resilience Financing; Local Governance. The specialists may be engaged on a short-term, as-needed basis or integrated as part of the SSU technical team.

Role of Government of the Philippines (GPH)

GPH as main partner for the SHIELD Program holds key roles in its implementation, including:

1. GPH as member of the SHIELD Program Board
    - Provide oversight and have overall responsibility for providing high level strategic directions for the project, such as ensuring that the project is focused on achieving its stated objectives throughout its life cycle, delivering quality outputs that will contribute to higher level outcomes;
    - Ensures that the SHIELD program is anchored on government's priorities;
    - Supports coordination, with support from the SHIELD Program, within the Government and with LGUs, development partners and stakeholders to ensure effective delivery of program objectives and maximize impact
    - Supports enabling a holistic approach to planning, implementation, and decision-making throughout the life of the Program and reduces the gap between implementation and governance

2. GPH as collaborating partners for the implementation of Components

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

- GPH, particularly mandated agencies and LGUs, in collaboration with MSPs, will be directly involved in the implementation of SHIELD Program components.
- Identified Component Lead will be mainly responsible for providing strategic and technical oversight in the delivery of the respective outcomes
- Identified GPH lead for each output will be chiefly responsible for providing technical oversight and supports coordination in the delivery of the activities, in collaboration with supporting agencies and stakeholders
- SHIELD Program will not transfer funds to the Government, but technical assistance will be provided to GPH agencies, including through contracting of experts and personnel to support the mandated agencies

Implementation arrangements with NGA leads will be further defined and stipulated in a Partnership Agreement with respective agencies.

Role of Multi-stakeholder Partners (MSPs)

As for other MSPs or representatives from civil society, academe, private sector, among others, they equally play key roles in the implementation of the SHIELD Program, including:

1. MSP as member of the SHIELD Program Board
    - Provide oversight and have overall responsibility for providing high level strategic directions for the project, such as ensuring that the project is focused on achieving its stated objectives throughout its life cycle, delivering quality outputs that will contribute to higher level outcomes;
    - Ensures that that SHIELD program is anchored on sector's needs/priorities;
    - Supports coordination, with support from the SHIELD Program, within their respective sectors to ensure effective delivery of program objectives and maximize impact

2. MSP as collaborating partners for the implementation of Components
    - In collaboration with national and local Government, Consortium and SSUs, will be directly involved in the implementation of SHIELD Program components to ensure that sector needs and priorities are considered in pursuing resilient development
    - Under Component 1, MSPs will provide the needed support to the LGUs in ensuring that resilience and inclusion are incorporated into relevant plans, programs, budgets, and policies; bankable proposals are developed and financing is accessed; inclusive resilience actions are implemented; ensuring accountability and transparency.
    - Under Component 2, MSPs will be engaged in the policy development process and system enhancement
    - Under Component 3, MSPs will provide support in translating/packaging data/information to inform local actions
    - Capacity development support will be provided to MSPs as needed

Implementation arrangements with key MSPs may be further defined and stipulated in a Partnership Agreement with respective institutions, as needed.

IX. LEGAL CONTEXT

This SHIELD Program, as a portfolio, will be implemented by the United Nations Development Programme ("Implementing Partner 1"), Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society ("Implementing Partner 2"), National Resilience Council ("Implementing Partner 3"), and Philippine Business for Social Progress ("Implementing Partner 4"), in accordance with its

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP.

Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply**.**

X. RISK MANAGEMENT

Implementing Partner 1: UNDP (DIM)

1. UNDP as the Implementing Partner will comply with the policies, procedures and practices of the United Nations Security Management System (UNSMS.)

2. UNDP as the Implementing Partner will undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the [project funds]5 [UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document]6 are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.

3. Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).

4. UNDP as the Implementing Partner will: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.

5. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.

6. UNDP as the Implementing Partner will ensure that the following obligations are binding on each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient:

    a. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions to the Project Document]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in such responsible party's, subcontractor's and sub-recipient's custody, rests with such responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient. To this end, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient shall:
        i. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
        ii. assume all risks and liabilities related to such responsible party's, subcontractor's and sub-recipient's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

5 To be used where UNDP is the Implementing Partner
6 To be used where the UN, a UN fund/programme or a specialized agency is the Implementing Partner

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

b. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the responsible party's, subcontractor's and sub-recipient's obligations under this Project Document.

c. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will take appropriate steps to prevent misuse of funds, fraud or corruption, by its officials, consultants, subcontractors and sub-recipients in implementing the project or programme or using the UNDP funds. It will ensure that its financial management, anti-corruption and anti-fraud policies are in place and enforced for all funding received from or through UNDP.

d. The requirements of the following documents, then in force at the time of signature of the Project Document, apply to each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient: (a) UNDP Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices and (b) UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations Investigation Guidelines. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient agrees to the requirements of the above documents, which are an integral part of this Project Document and are available online at www.undp.org.

e. In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP will conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP programmes and projects. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will provide its full cooperation, including making available personnel, relevant documentation, and granting access to its (and its consultants', subcontractors' and sub-recipients') premises, for such purposes at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions as may be required for the purpose of an investigation. Should there be a limitation in meeting this obligation, UNDP shall consult with it to find a solution.

f. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will promptly inform UNDP as the Implementing Partner in case of any incidence of inappropriate use of funds, or credible allegation of fraud or corruption with due confidentiality.

   Where it becomes aware that a UNDP project or activity, in whole or in part, is the focus of investigation for alleged fraud/corruption, each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient will inform the UNDP Resident Representative/Head of Office, who will promptly inform UNDP's Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). It will provide regular updates to the head of UNDP in the country and OAI of the status of, and actions relating to, such investigation.

g. *Choose one of the three following options:*

   Option 1: UNDP will be entitled to a refund from the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient of any funds provided that have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Project Document. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient under this or any other agreement. Recovery of such amount by UNDP shall not diminish or curtail any responsible party's, subcontractor's or sub-recipient's obligations under this Project Document.

   Where such funds have not been refunded to UNDP, the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient agrees that donors to UNDP (including the Government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds for the activities under this Project Document, may seek recourse to such responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient for the recovery of any funds determined by UNDP to have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Note: The term "Project Document" as used in this clause shall be deemed to include any relevant subsidiary agreement further to the Project Document, including those with responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients.

h. Each contract issued by the responsible party, subcontractor or sub-recipient in connection with this Project Document shall include a provision representing that no fees, gratuities, rebates, gifts, commissions or other payments, other than those shown in the proposal, have been given, received, or promised in connection with the selection process or in contract execution, and that the recipient of funds from it shall cooperate with any and all investigations and post-payment audits.

i. Should UNDP refer to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action any alleged wrongdoing relating to the project or programme, the Government will ensure that the relevant national authorities shall actively investigate the same and take appropriate legal action against all individuals found to have participated in the wrongdoing, recover and return any recovered funds to UNDP.

j. Each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient shall ensure that all of its obligations set forth under this section entitled "Risk Management" are passed on to its subcontractors and sub-recipients and that all the clauses under this section entitled "Risk Management Standard Clauses" are adequately reflected, *mutatis mutandis*, in all its sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into further to this Project Document.

Implementing Partners 2, 3 and 4: Consortium of Bangsamoro Civil Society, National Resilience Council, Philippine Business for Social Progress

CSO/NGO/Non-UN or other IGO with no signed SBEAA with UNDP

1. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions to the Project Document]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
   a. put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
   b. assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

2. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document and the Project Cooperation Agreement between UNDP and the Implementing Partner7.

3. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/aq_sanctions_list.shtml

4. Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (http://www.undp.org/ses) and related Accountability Mechanism (http://www.undp.org/secu-srm).

5. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism.

7 Use bracketed text only when IP is an NGO/IGO

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.

6. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.

7. The Implementing Partner will take appropriate steps to prevent misuse of funds, fraud or corruption, by its officials, consultants, responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients in implementing the project or using the UNDP funds. The Implementing Partner will ensure that its financial management, anti-corruption and anti-fraud policies are in place and enforced for all funding received from or through UNDP.

8. The requirements of the following documents, then in force at the time of signature of the Project Document, apply to the Implementing Partner: (a) UNDP Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices and (b) UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations Investigation Guidelines. The Implementing Partner agrees to the requirements of the above documents, which are an integral part of this Project Document and are available online at www.undp.org.

9. In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP has the obligation to conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP programmes and projects. The Implementing Partner shall provide its full cooperation, including making available personnel, relevant documentation, and granting access to the Implementing Partner's (and its consultants', responsible parties', subcontractors' and sub-recipients') premises, for such purposes at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions as may be required for the purpose of an investigation. Should there be a limitation in meeting this obligation, UNDP shall consult with the Implementing Partner to find a solution.

10. The Implementing Partner will promptly inform UNDP in case of any incidence of inappropriate use of funds, or credible allegation of fraud or corruption with due confidentiality.

    Where the Implementing Partner becomes aware that a UNDP project or activity, in whole or in part, is the focus of investigation for alleged fraud/corruption, the Implementing Partner will inform the UNDP Resident Representative/Head of Office, who will promptly inform UNDP's Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). The Implementing Partner shall provide regular updates to the head of UNDP in the country and OAI of the status of, and actions relating to, such investigation.

11. *Choose one of the three following options:*

    Option 1: UNDP shall be entitled to a refund from the Implementing Partner of any funds provided that have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Project Document. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the Implementing Partner under this or any other agreement. Recovery of such amount by UNDP shall not diminish or curtail the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document.

    Option 2: The Implementing Partner agrees that, where applicable, donors to UNDP (including the Government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds for the activities which are the subject of the Project Document, may seek recourse to the Implementing Partner for the recovery of any funds determined by UNDP to have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document.

    Option 3: UNDP shall be entitled to a refund from the Implementing Partner of any funds provided that have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the Implementing Partner under this or any other agreement.

    Where such funds have not been refunded to UNDP, the Implementing Partner agrees that donors to UNDP (including the Government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

for the activities under this Project Document, may seek recourse to the Implementing Partner for the recovery of any funds determined by UNDP to have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document.

Note: The term "Project Document" as used in this clause shall be deemed to include any relevant subsidiary agreement further to the Project Document, including those with the Implementing Partner, responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients.

12. Each contract issued by the Implementing Partner in connection with this Project Document shall include a provision representing that no fees, gratuities, rebates, gifts, commissions or other payments, other than those shown in the proposal, have been given, received, or promised in connection with the selection process or in contract execution, and that the recipient of funds from the Implementing Partner shall cooperate with any and all investigations and post-payment audits.

13. Should UNDP refer to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action any alleged wrongdoing relating to the project, the Government will ensure that the relevant national authorities shall actively investigate the same and take appropriate legal action against all individuals found to have participated in the wrongdoing, recover and return any recovered funds to UNDP.

14. The Implementing Partner shall ensure that all of its obligations set forth under this section entitled "Risk Management Standard Clauses" are passed on to each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient and that all the clauses under this section entitled "Risk Management" are included, *mutatis mutandis*, in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into further to this Project Document.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Special Clauses. In case of government cost-sharing/financing through the project, the following clauses should be included:

1. The schedule of payments and UNDP bank account details.

2. The value of the payment, if made in a currency other than United States dollars, shall be determined by applying the United Nations operational rate of exchange in effect on the date of payment. Should there be a change in the United Nations operational rate of exchange prior to the full utilization by the UNDP of the payment, the value of the balance of funds still held at that time will be adjusted accordingly. If, in such a case, a loss in the value of the balance of funds is recorded, UNDP shall inform the Government with a view to determining whether any further financing could be provided by the Government. Should such further financing not be available, the assistance to be provided to the project may be reduced, suspended or terminated by UNDP.

3. The above schedule of payments takes into account the requirement that the payments shall be made in advance of the implementation of planned activities. It may be amended to be consistent with the progress of project delivery.

4. UNDP shall receive and administer the payment in accordance with the regulations, rules and directives of UNDP.

5. All financial accounts and statements shall be expressed in United States dollars.

6. If unforeseen increases in expenditures or commitments are expected or realized (whether owing to inflationary factors, fluctuation in exchange rates or unforeseen contingencies), UNDP shall submit to the government on a timely basis a supplementary estimate showing the further financing that will be necessary. The Government shall use its best endeavors to obtain the additional funds required

7. If the payments referred above are not received in accordance with the payment schedule, or if the additional financing required in accordance with paragraph [] above is not forthcoming from the Government or other sources, the assistance to be provided to the project under this Agreement may be reduced, suspended or terminated by UNDP.

8. Any interest income attributable to the contribution shall be credited to UNDP Account and shall be utilized in accordance with established UNDP procedures. In accordance with the decisions and directives of UNDP's Executive Board: The contribution shall be charged:
    a. [...%] cost recovery for the provision of general management support (GMS) by UNDP headquarters and country offices
    b. Direct cost for implementation support services (ISS) provided by UNDP and/or an executing entity/implementing partner.

9. Ownership of equipment, supplies and other properties financed from the contribution shall vest in UNDP. Matters relating to the transfer of ownership by UNDP shall be determined in accordance with the relevant policies and procedures of UNDP.

10. The contribution shall be subject exclusively to the internal and external auditing procedures provided for in the financial regulations, rules and directives of UNDP.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

ANNEXES

1. **Project Quality Assurance Report for the portfolio**
   (Forthcoming)

2. **Social and Environmental Screening Template** [English][French][Spanish], including additional Social and Environmental Assessments or Management Plans as relevant. *(NOTE: The SES Screening is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences, preparation of communication materials, strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences, partnership coordination and management of networks, or global/regional projects with no country level activities).*
   (**Refer to file Annex 2** – SES Template)

3. **Risk Analysis**. Use the standard Risk Register.
   (**Refer to file Annex 3** – Risk Register)

4. **Capacity Assessment:** Results of capacity assessments of Implementing Partner (including HACT Micro Assessment)
   (**Refer to file Annex 4** – Capacity Assessment)

5. **Portfolio Project Board Terms of Reference and TORs of key management positions**

6. **GEDSI Action Plan**

7. **Stakeholders engaged during SHIELD Program development**

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Technical Notes for Section I – Development Challenge

1 An average of 20 tropical cyclones enter the Philippine area of responsibility (PAR) – more than anywhere else in the world, and about eight or nine of them cross the Philippines. (PAGASA)

2 The Philippines has an average of 20 quakes per day, as well as 300 volcanoes, 22 of which are active.

3 The occurrence of drought and long dry spells are also big threats to the country. Records show that 11 drought events have affected the Philippines since 1968. The 2015-2016 drought, which caused damage across 16 of the Philippines' 18 regions (85% of the country), was driven by the most severe El Nino event ever recorded (World Food Program, 2016). Also, observed mean annual temperature in the Philippines is on the warming trend. An increase of 0.1°C per decade has occurred since 1951 and is projected to increase to up to 1.2°C to 2.3°C in the mid-21st century considering a high emission scenario (PAGASA, 2019). Drought, long dry spells and increasing temperatures trigger water shortages, diseases and epidemics, pose risks to agricultural production, contribute to urban heat stress or heat island effect, and lead to the decline of forest and coastal/marine ecosystems.

4 With a coastline of more than 34,000 km., the Philippines is also facing risks and disasters brought about by rising sea-levels. According to PAGASA "the sea level has risen by nearly double the global average of sea level rise over certain parts of the Philippines from 1993-2015". The agency projections note that sea level in the country is expected to increase by approximately 20 cm by the end of the 21st century which may exacerbate the impacts of storm surge, coastal erosion, salt water intrusion, and permanent land inundation.

5 The Philippines can expect (a) continuous warming at a rate of 0.1℃ per decade; (b) increasing trends in annual rainfall and seasonal rainfall in many parts of the country associated with extreme rainfall events; (c) minimal increase in the frequency of very strong tropical cyclones exceeding 170 kph; and (d) a 20cm increase in sea level rise by the end of the 21st century. With these climate projections, several vulnerabilities and sensitivities across different sectors have been identified and these include: (i) vulnerability of the Philippine coasts to sea level rise which can be further exacerbated by excessive groundwater withdrawals particularly in major urban centers; (ii) water quality and quantity, and water supply infrastructure are adversely affected by climate stresses resulting from drought, flood, landslide, and saltwater intrusion; (iii) climate-induced impacts to agriculture resulting from increased temperatures, drought-facilitated pest and disease outbreaks, and damages from extreme weather events; and (iv) changes to fishery ranges and habitats from changing currents, ocean warming, and ocean acidification.

6 The associated cost of damage to infrastructure such as roads, telecommunications, power networks, and livelihood assets; and losses from agricultural production, micro, medium and small enterprises (MSMEs) and other economic activities was USD 20 billion, with average annual losses of USD 1.2 billion.

7 The country is witnessing longer episodes of drought and El Niño, which disrupts the volume of agricultural production and hurts GDP. Unregulated urban expansion has also aggravated flood risks and is expected to continue in the future. The impacts on people, their businesses, critical assets, and livelihoods is significant, particularly in agriculture and fisheries – the economic backbone of poor families throughout the country.

8 For example, Typhoon Haiyan contributed to a national economic slowdown in 2013, dragging growth by one percentage point, and was estimated to have driven more than one million people into poverty (living on less than US$2 per day) for more than one year.

9 Women affected by disasters often face multiple hardships, including loss of livelihoods, insecure housing, lack of access to services, and increased exposure to trafficking, sexual abuse and prostitution, including exchanging sexual favours for food. In addition, Typhoon Yolanda affected 3.5 million women and girls, with 250,000 of the women being pregnant and 169,000 breastfeeding (UNFPA).

10 The impacts of climate change affect women and men differently, due to their socially constructed roles and responsibilities, which in turn shape their opportunities, capacities and power in responding (FAO 2018). The issue of gender equality is particularly acute in BARMM. It is well known that the province in the region rank lowest in the Philippines on the development index (PSA) what is less well known is that they also have the highest Gender Disparity Index. Compounding the problem are the domestic roles proscribed by cultural norms, which often constrain Muslim women's opportunities to be full participants and beneficiaries in social, political, and economic life. The reality of gender disparity in BARMM, however, is not only determined by religious or cultural differences but also result from the conflict situation in Mindanao. Concentrated in the Muslim-majority areas of central and southwestern Mindanao, the conflict is one of the world's longest-running violent conflicts. It is rooted in the clash of interests over land and natural resources, and the struggle of Muslims to preserve and protect their identity. The 26-year conflict with the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) claimed some 120,000 lives before the signing of the final peace agreement in 1996 (TAF 2012). As with most internal conflicts, women have been particularly affected. As widows and survivors, they have provided for their families in a region mired in poverty (the poorest provinces in the Philippines are in conflict-affected areas) and have faced acts of gender-based violence.

In addition to that, just this year, the Philippines had encountered significant challenges in the development landscape with the local transmissions of the global COVID-19 pandemic that followed the historic Taal Volcano eruption. The

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

pandemic and associated quarantine measures have further aggravated the pre-existing vulnerabilities and inequalities faced by women and girls in the Philippines, especially where conflict- and disaster-induced displacements are common including BARMM (UNFPA 2021). UNFPA Philippines estimates that, out of the targeted poor population in BARMM, many had already been vulnerable prior to the COVID-19 outbreak, including pregnant and lactating women, young people, persons with disabilities, the elderly, as well as women who face heightened risks to violence.

The pandemic and the succeeding lockdown shrunk the economy by 16.5% in the second quarter of 2020. The second quarter is lowest quarterly growth recorded since 1981, bringing the country to a technical recession. The main contributors to the decline were decrease in manufacturing, construction, and transportation and storage. Among the major economic sectors, only agriculture, forestry and fishing expanded with 1.6% growth. The Philippines was among Asia's fastest-growing economies before the pandemic, but now the government expects its GDP to shrink 5.5% this year - the biggest annual drop in 35 years - from a previous forecast for a 2.0-3.4% decline (PSA 2020).

In the next few years because climate change and the disruption caused by COVID19 crisis, micro and small enterprises will navigate a rapidly shifting and increasingly challenging context. The COVID19 crisis may also cause a change from global to regional value chains, thus aggravating more crises.

Prevailing social conditions and gendered labor divisions in the agriculture sector tend to provide women with less access to income, assets, resources, technology, training and decision-making power than men. These disparities can potentially limit adaptive capacity and expose women to greater risk, making them more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Adaptive capacity is further impaired when these inequalities restrict the involvement and contribution of women to climate change planning and decision-making. As climate change disproportionately affects the most vulnerable groups, pre-existing gender inequalities are expected to worsen.
11 More than 11 million school children were affected by major disasters between 2007 and 2011 (Department of Education). The series of earthquakes in Mindanao last October 2019, on the other hand, affected more than three million school-aged children (Save the Children).

12 Poverty and inequality compound the impact of hazard events. While disaster effects may be felt across the population, a dollar loss would be felt seriously by the poor. The lack of coping capacity of the poor renders them disadvantaged to slow recovery, and reversing this disproportionate impact is a development challenge. Low-income households are the most vulnerable as impacts on ecosystems affect their source of income and subsistence. Further, they lack options and have relatively fewer resources to respond to these impacts or are likely not able to invest in measures that could mitigate risks. When disaster strikes, people in poverty are "often forced to use their already limited assets to buffer disaster losses, which drives them into further poverty" (from: https://www.preventionweb.net/disaster-risk/risk-drivers/poverty/).

13 They are involved in farming, fisheries, and forestry-based activities and livelihoods.

14 Climate change and risks from natural hazards amplify the association of poverty and environmental degradation. Increased temperature and rainfall variability is reducing agricultural productivity in rural areas. Droughts reduce rural household consumption with impacts varying across regions- the most affected regions include Ilocos and Western Visayas Islands. The projected changes in maximum catch potential in a 4°C world range from a 50 percent decrease around the southern Philippines during the 2050s to a 6–16 percent increase around the northern Philippines. The deteriorated state of the country's environment and natural resources is felt mostly by the poor who depend on such resources for their livelihood and are likely vulnerable to the unfavorable consequences of resource degradation and depletion. (from: DENR. 2016. Philippine Biodiversity and Strategic Action Plan: 2016-2028. Quezon City Philippines)

15 The 2016 National Disability Prevalence Survey showed that around 12% of Filipinos aged 15 and older experienced severe disability, 47% moderate disability and 23% mild disability, with the remaining 19% experiencing no disability. This translates to about 81 million Filipinos experiencing some type of disability. Persons with disabilities are disproportionately affected by climate change impacts due to their livelihood circumstances, socio-political isolation (perpetuated by stigma, discrimination, inaccessible infrastructure/information and exclusion), and related information asymmetries. Constraints and exclusion from related decision-making processes aggravate their vulnerabilities. Amongst persons with disabilities, intersectional discrimination is common, and greatly intensifies existing vulnerabilities. Service providers can often be insensitive to the needs of persons with disabilities, especially those from marginalized groups. Persons with disabilities and their families are also vulnerable to exposure of their assets and livelihoods to climatic risks and have limited capacity to manage these risks. Furthermore, disability-inclusive responses is a big challenge as evidenced by limited information on disaster impacts to persons with disabilities.

16 A little more than 50 percent of the country's population reside in urban areas. Eight of the top ten cities most at risk from natural hazards are in the Philippines (1. Tuguegarao in Cagayan, 2. Lucena in Quezon province, 3. Manila, 4. San Fernando in Pampanga, 5. Cabanatuan in Nueva Ecija, 6. Batangas, 7. San Carlos, and 8. Naga in Bicol, from Maplecroft: Natural Hazards Risk Atlas 2015), undermining their strategic role as growth centers of the country. Ten of the largest cities of the Philippines are located along coastal areas, which make them exposed to associated risks (from Water Environment Partnership in Asia: Philippines: Environment Monitor 2003) while storm surges are projected to affect about 14% of the total population and 42% of the coastal population in the country (from: Brecht, H., Dasgupta, S., Laplante, B., Murray, S., & Wheeler, D. (2012). Sea-level rise and storm surges: High stakes for a small number of developing countries. Journal of Environment Development, 21(1), 120–138).

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

17 As the country's economic, political, educational, and cultural center, Metro Manila is home to 13 million people and contributes a third to the total GDP. Its urban ecosystem intersects the natural, built, and socioeconomic environments, and also faces complex climate and disaster risks, exposing informal settler families and urban poor communities to multiple vulnerabilities. For instance, its risks from flooding is driven by the fact that most of the metropolis is formed and now sits in the floodplain of three river systems, while its earthquake risk is predisposed with the West Valley Fault System running through six cities in the metropolis. Being highly vulnerable to flooding and earthquakes, its strategic importance can be undermined by hazards and disaster events, as already demonstrated during Typhoon Ondoy in 2009, and as evidenced by national initiatives in preparing for the "Big One".

18 Almost 36 percent of the 664 thousand informal settlement families in 2015 reside in Metro Manila. Rapid and unplanned urbanization due to migration of people from rural to urban areas contributes to urban sprawl which subsequently makes a greater portion of the population susceptible to risks of natural hazards and climate change when settlements are formed and built in disaster-prone areas. Rapid urbanization brings about concentration of people and economic activities, often outpacing development progress - threatening the sustainability of cities which are considered engines of growth. Presence of high-density informal settlements in areas prone to natural hazards, lack of basic infrastructure and services, poorly constructed buildings, disrupted natural drainage systems, poor waste management have compounded vulnerabilities especially among poor households.

Unregulated urban expansion has intensified flood risk and is expected to continue in the future with increased rainfall variability. In Manila, the demands of rapid urbanization and economic surge were met with indiscriminate construction of structures over waterways. Storm water had to find its way to the bay or sea through residential areas, sometimes flooding them (from: National Urban Development and Housing Framework 2017-2022 Full Report, DHSUD 2017).

Weak implementation of land use controls such as easements from water bodies and building codes, and poor siting of development activities in hazardous areas further aggravate risk impacts. The biggest challenge of unmanaged urbanization is the growing number of informal settlements that are located in unsafe locations. Unregulated urban expansion has intensified flood risk which is expected to continue in the future given the impacts of climate change, and outpace the delivery of basic infrastructure and services such as water, sanitation, and health services.

19 Hallegatte et al. 2016. Measuring Natural Risks in the Philippines: Socioeconomic Resilience and Wellbeing Losses

20 Human-induced disasters often affect conflict-vulnerable communities. About 10,875 barangays (27% of the total number in the country) are physically isolated, with a high incidence of poverty and with these communities currently in or recovering from situations of crisis or armed conflict.

21 Climate and hazard vulnerable provinces in Mindanao (such as Davao Oriental, Compostela Valley, Basilan, Sulu, Lanao, Surigao) remain hotspots for insurgency and conflict. The politicization of humanitarian assistance and disaster response operations can play a major role in deepening climate and hazard impacts (such as droughts) when it occurs. (from: Disaster-Conflict Interface, Comparative Experiences, Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery United Nations Development Programme, 2011, as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p.21)

22 BARMM has experienced over 40 years of social and ethnic conflict, most commonly related to land and local political disputes, as well as increasing hydro-meteorological events such as typhoons and droughts, during the last decade. The combined effects of climate change and conflict in this predominantly agriculture-dependent area include long periods of low production, loss of assets, reduced food security, and increased indebtedness which are likely to have exacerbated social and economic upheaval in Mindanao. (from: A. Chandra, K, E.McNamara, P.Dargusch, A. M Caspe and D. Dalabajan Gendered vulnerabilities of smallholder farmers to climate change in conflict-prone areas: A case study from Mindanao, Philippines Journal of Rural Studies, Vol 50, Feb 2017, pp45-59, as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 21)

23 For instance, communuist insurgents have a presence in isolated, hazard-prone and poverty-stricken pockets in the country, while violent extremist groups engaged in vertical and horizontal conflict, such as the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters (BIFF), maintain their strongholds in similarly situated areas – such as poor, isolated, natural resource-dependent communities in Shariff Aguak, Datu Saudi Ampatuan/Pagatin, Mamasapano, and Datu Salibo (collectively known as the SPMS box) within the Liguasan Marsh.

24 Rüttinger, L., Smith, D., Stang, G., Tanzler, D. and Vivkananda, J. (2015) A new climate for peace: taking action on climate and fragility risks. International Alert, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, European Union Institute for Security Studies, as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 21.

25 United Nations. 2020. UN Common Guidance on Helping Build Resilient Societies, p. 15.

26 The CoViD-19 pandemic brought to light the weaknesses and gaps of policies, systems, and structures that lack an all- hazards approach, and makes a compelling case for the consideration of a broad range of hazards—current, emerging, cascading, and complex — in risk reduction and resilience-building. The pandemic further surfaced that the nature of risks and of their interrelations is changing. The progress towards sustainable development and peaceful societies in which no one is left behind is undermined by multiple and intersecting threats that are intensified by several persistent risk drivers with cumulative effects.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Risks associated with natural and human-induced hazards, climate change, violent conflict, epidemics and pandemics, financial systems and food price fluctuations overlay risk drivers related to poverty, inequality (including gender inequality), discrimination and exclusion, extremism, demographic pressures, unplanned urbanization, ecosystem degradation, displacement, weak institutions, and declining respect for human rights. When risks accumulate and interact, they can manifest as crises and unleash cascading impacts on sectors and across systems, causing loss of life and livelihoods and dramatic socio-economic and environmental damages. The CoViD-19 pandemic is a stark example, which started as a health emergency with now huge socio-economic knock-on effects that interplay with an unfolding climate and environmental crisis. In addition, the threat of terrorism and the rise of competing powers, alongside an emerging populism and rising nationalism, are challenging the international order needed to manage complex or systemic risks and build long-term resilience.

27 Ibid. p.17.

28 The PDP 2017-2022 highlights the profile of disasters and commits to action to reduce vulnerabilities and manage risk, and build resilience to the impacts of climate change and natural hazards.

29 Current priorities are to mainstream CCA across climate-sensitive sectors and develop capacities at local levels to build resilience to changing weather conditions, for example through diversified livelihood options (as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 17).

30 The updated NDRRMP has taken on a resilience lens, with the view of harmonizing DRRM, CCA, and human security; and advancing 'building back better' approaches towards sustainable development. This resilience framing requires the consideration of the complex and changing global risk landscape and taking transformative actions to reduce the impact of disasters and emergencies to lives, livelihoods and health, among others.

31 The first Philippines' Nationally Determined Contribution submitted in April 2021 commits to a projected GHG emissions reduction and avoidance of 75%, of which 2.71% is unconditional and 72.29% is conditional, representing the country's ambition for GHG mitigation for the period 2020 to 2030 for the sectors of agriculture, wastes, industry, transport, and energy. It includes undertaking adaptation measures across but not limited to, the sectors of agriculture, forestry, coastal and marine ecosystems and biodiversity, health, and human security, to preempt, reduce and address residual loss and damage. The NDC also cited that the country will undertake equitable adaptation strategies with mitigation co-benefits and ensure their contribution to the national pandemic recovery. The Philippines' NDC conveys the country's progressive climate change mitigation commitment and adaptation challenges and requirements, including addressing residual loss and damage, in pursuit of low carbon, sustainable, and climate and disaster-resilient development.

32 The Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) provides oversight and supervision of sub-national and local governments and communities (barangays) including localising climate and disaster resilience policies; providing capacity building and technical assistance to provinces, cities/municipalities, and barangays towards ensuring they adhere to national policies (as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 16).

33 The National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC), through the Office of Civil Defense (OCD) and its regional offices, leads coordination and integration of the DRRM agenda across the whole of government. There are initiatives to further reform the DRRM governance structure to shift the role of the OCD from coordinative to leadership in planning, implementation and monitoring DRRM programs and projects.

34 The Climate Change Commission leads coordination and integration of climate change across the bureaucracy. Its mandate is limited to coordination, with direct implementation powers and resources still with mandated sectoral national government agencies (NGAs), and it does not have a presence at regional and local levels (as adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 16). The CCC is also able to work with LGUs in climate change expenditure tagging despite being an agency with no physical presence at the subnational level.

35 The government has a proposal to create a new national department on "Disaster Resilience". This department would cover all four phases of the DRM cycle, which are currently under the responsibility of separate departments, and possibly absorb certain functions of the CCC. Concerns, however, are raised on the broad scope of such a department.

36 Local DRRM Offices and Local DRRM Councils were created in each region and a Local DRRM Fund was earmarked from regular income of local government units (LGUs) for DRRM programs and projects. The climate change agenda is not similarly placed in the absence of local organizations. However, the law mandates the LGUs to prepare their Local Climate Change Action Plans (LCCAP), with guidance from the CCC and DILG.

37 The process is referred to as disaster risk assessment in the 2008 NEDA Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRR in Subnational Development and Land Use/Physical Planning which was supported by EU Humanitarian Aid and UNDP, as climate and disaster risk assessment (CDRA) under the 2014 Supplemental Guidelines for Comprehensive Land Use Planning which was supported by UNDP and DFAT under PCTP/RAPID Program. In 2019, the CCC adopted a climate risk management framework to address intensifying adverse impacts of climate change. An ongoing challenge is that different institutions (e.g., NEDA, DHSUD, CCC, NDRRMC, DILG, DOST) promote slightly different versions of climate and disaster assessments, with different definitions and methodologies. The variations in the different methods reflect the different planning processes they serve.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

Risk assessments require data and information on hazards, exposure and vulnerabilities. Probabilistic maps are needed to depict the likelihood of hazard events happening and the degree of impact on a particular geographic area. These maps have to be produced in a scale that allow application to city and municipal development and land use planning.

There has been steady progress in the Philippines in responding to climate and disaster related data and information needs. This started with the CSCAND collaboration in data sharing, skills building and production of multi-hazard maps across the 28 vulnerable eastern seaboard provinces through the READY project. Further work produced high-resolution (LiDAR derived) multi-hazard mapping of the Greater Metro Manila Area (GMMA) through the BRACE Risk Analysis Project (RAP) and GMMA-READY. Advanced flood mapping was also produced for 18 major river basins through the GPH's Nationwide Operational Assessment of Hazards (NOAH) project, managed by DOST in partnership with the University of the Philippines. CCC also partnered with Project NOAH to produce probabilistic flood maps in Tuguegarao, Cagayan de Oro, Iligan City and areas affected by Typhoon Pablo. It also prepared probabilistic flood hazard maps through modelling of major rivers of the country. DENR-MGB also improved on the resolution of flood susceptible maps and updated landslide potential information of all cities and municipalities. In January 2021, DOST-PHIVOLCS, in partnership with the University of the Philippines College of Engineering and the Department of Public Works and Highways published the latest maximum considered earthquake probabilistic ground motion hazard maps on a national and regional scale fundamentally required for the seismic design and retrofit of critical facilities.

DOST, through the Philippines Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA), provides early warnings and daily weather forecasts, as well as a medium to long-term weather outlook. PAGASA is currently working on moving from assessing hazards to assessing risks. This implies a shift from passive weather forecasting to a multi-hazard impact-based early-warning system and forecasting which integrates climate information. PAGASA also released a new set of climate projections for temperature, precipitation and extreme weather events in 2019 and 2021, respectively. These recent releases from PAGASA on observed and future climate, provides LGUs and other users a basis for planning climate adaptation actions. PAGASA produces a lot of weather and climate information, probabilistic weather forecasts for decision-making among farmers. It has partnered with academic institutions such as the University of the Philippines and the Philippine Institute of Development Studies, and with the Government of Australia scientific organization and universities.

The gathering of georeferenced data was adopted through ClimEx.db under PCTP/RAPID for target sites affected by Typhoons Sendong and Yolanda. Since then, it has been linked to the Community-Based Monitoring System of DILG and now through a CBMS Council headed by the Philippine Statistics Authority. CCC and UNDP partnered with government organizations, local academic institutions in the implementation of ClimEx.db and in flood modeling and natural resource assessments, and with community-based organizations in community-based risk assessments. PHIVOLCS adopted the REDAS as their exposure database for assessing geologic hazards which has now been integrated into the georisk.ph platform.

Risk assessment likewise involves specialized geographic information system (GIS) mapping skills, and technical and analytical skills to derive risk information and knowledge to undertake the assessment and make sense of the information for mainstreaming. National government agencies have been providing capacity building support to local governments as part of their mandate, for example DILG and DHSUD. Progress was achieved in LGUs that have been provided with additional resources for post-disaster recovery. Upscaling in these areas was made possible with partnerships in academic institutions and civil society organizations. Support from development partners such as UNDP, ADB, and JICA have also advanced the preparation of climate and disaster assessments, for example, in Typhoon Yolanda affected areas deliver the CDRAs through a hand holding mentoring process. The involvement of LGUs, resource persons from national government agencies, state universities and colleges, CSOs, and the private sector, have been noted in some capacity building programs demonstrating the breadth of endogenous capacity that exists among local stakeholders.

Despite this current progress in building data for risk assessment, there is a need to make this data understandable and accessible to end-users. The lack of and difficulty in accessing adequate data and information compounds existing challenges around CCA and DRM coherence and implementation. Data management systems need to be developed to facilitate data sharing and access to decision-relevant information, building around the georisk.ph.

The changes in the risk landscape of the Philippines also need updated data and information and consolidation of knowledge in order to build resilience of various systems and spatial scales. Coastal resilience, for example, needs to build hazard maps that take into account storm surge and severe wind under projected sea level rise scenarios, as well as exposure and vulnerability data of individuals and communities. This will be important in building resilience actions that are responsive to the needs of these communities.

38 Mainstreaming climate and disaster risks in development is a strategy adopted by the government to minimize the loss of lives and assets through risk-informed and resilience driven development planning, investment programming, budgeting, resource mobilization, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Mainstreaming climate and disaster risks into land use and development plans is a strategic entry point for resilience. Mainstreaming helps local governments to "systematically create an enabling environment for sustainable development that meets people's needs (from: Gabriel, A.G., Santiago, P.N.M. & Casimiro, R.R. Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in Comprehensive Development Planning of the Cities in Nueva Ecija in the Philippines. Int J Disaster Risk Sci 12, 367–380 (2021). Mainstreaming adopts a universal risk management framework which involves a process of risk identification, analysis, evaluation, and treatment. As operationalized in the Philippine context, the conduct of risk assessment, which covers identification, analysis and evaluation, will generate the risk information that will be mainstreamed into the

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

development plan, mindful of risk treatment or management options classified as risk avoidance or elimination, risk reduction or mitigation, risk sharing or transfer, and risk retention or acceptance.

However, risks are not systematically informing investment programs and budgets. There has been a strong emphasis by NGAs and LGUs on various planning processes and instruments, but there has been only limited potential for implementation of climate and disaster resilience actions. Risk management options derived from risk assessments need to be integrated into the three-year Local Development Investment Program and the Annual Investment Program, to be able to compete for inclusion in the annual budget of the LGU. The risk-informed investment program is supposed to inform the LGUs of the need for mobilization of resources from external sources if its projected income is not sufficient to meet the investment requirements.

The limited technical capacity to undertake risk assessment to inform plans and implementation is amplified further with the numerous plans that LGUs have to prepare. Apart from the Comprehensive Development Plan, the LGUs are mandated to draft 33 local plans that represent sectoral and thematic concerns. Each LGU is required to prepare them in order to ensure that the needs of these sectors are addressed. DILG has been looking at ways to mainstream, interface or integrate these plans into the Comprehensive Development Plan and the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the two plans which are mandated by the decentralization law of the Philippines, the Local Government Code of 1991.

39 Capturing gender and social inclusion in the vulnerability databases of LGUs is also challenging, failing to take opportunity for more targeted and sensitive project design and participation in decision-making. While gender and social inclusion indicators are promoted by DHSUD in the CDRA, most risk analytics and action plans developed by LGUs are still weak in highlighting and mainstreaming gender, disability and social inclusion related findings and actions.

40 GPH has set up several financing windows that LGUs may access to supplement their local budgets to finance the implementation of DRRM/CCA programs, activities, and projects; and improve their disaster preparedness and resilience to benefit poor and vulnerable communities. However, utilization of these funds has been low.

LGUs have been relatively unsuccessful in unlocking financing opportunities for climate and disaster resilience action — despite an array of LGU capacity building pilots and investments over many years. Accessing the National DRRM Fund in particular requires capacity to meet the documentary requirements as well as implementation capacities such as in procurement and engineering equipment outlays that will allow them to implement the projects by administration.

Accessing other sources of funds such as the People's Survival Fund, the Performance Challenge Fund, Municipal Development Fund, or credit from banks have been difficult for some LGUs due to lack of capacities to prepare project proposals. Financing opportunities include localized sources of finance but would need strengthening of capacities for public expenditure management and financial management systems which are weak and fractured for some LGUs, as evidenced by numerous audit findings.

The Local DRRM Fund, which represents at least 5% of the LGU combined internal revenue allotment and regular income from business taxes and other fees and charges, are poorly utilized and are not fully linked to the implementation of Local DRRM and Climate Change Action Plans. The focus at national and sub-national levels is on disaster preparedness and response.

There is also an opportunity to utilize the development fund (20% of internal revenue allotment) for climate and disaster resilience actions. This fund is plowed into financing of sectoral activities. Therefore, ensuring that risks are effectively mainstreamed into these activities increases the chance of these resources being directed to enhancing resilience.

The experience in the financial response to COVID-19 wherein the total budget including supplemental budgets to allow use of the Special Trust Fund (STF) by LGUs could provide learnings for institutionalization.

Furthermore, the current scheme of allocating at least 5% of the annual regular income of LGUs as Local DRRM Fund has posed several limitations. The creation of the fund under the Philippine DRRM Act does not recognize differentiated vulnerabilities and the wide disparity of overall budgets among LGUs. There is a significant imbalance between the risk exposure of poor, vulnerable LGUs and their available resources to prevent and cope with the impact of disasters, and LGUs with higher vulnerability to disasters often are those which have the lowest income (from: Commission on Audit. 2014. Assessment of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) at the Local Level 1. Quezon City, Philippines). COA also characterized the public spending on disaster management as "highly reactive" because of the huge balances of calamity funds before the occurrence of a disaster and the corresponding increase in expenditures.

The Philippines requires external financing to implement its climate change policies and plans. CCC figures indicate that roughly US$1.7 billion (1.7% of national budget) was allocated to climate and disaster related activities from 2004-2009 – primarily in forestry, DRRM, and environmental management. While the nation has seen unprecedented levels of resource infusion in DRRM since the passing of the National DRRM Act, the full benefits are hampered by inefficient fund utilisation, unequal resource distribution, inept directional funding, and accounting and auditing issues.

41 Adopted from the SHIELD IDD, p. 16.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

42 LGUs are expected to receive an increase of 27% of their Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA). Such a move puts local governments firmly in the driving seat; having access to a larger pool of resources to help them fulfil their mandates and deliver local public services to those who need them most.

With increase in internal revenue shares, the Local DRRM Fund will have a corresponding increase in share along with the Local Development Fund, which are both tied to the amount of IRA transfers from the national government.

The strategy of the national government is to fully devolve expenditure assignments of national government agencies which continue to perform supposedly devolved functions mandated by the 1991 Local Government Code. This would provide the opportunity for mainstreaming resilience actions into sectoral programs.

The ability of LGUs to absorb additional funds and additional responsibilities will require intense capacity building including improvements in their financial management systems. Unlocking these funds for genuine resilience building will rely on LGUs mainstreaming resilience actions into their plan to inform budget and implementation. There is also a need to address structural bottlenecks that are constraining LGU capacity to exploit greater fiscal space for resilience building. For example, budgetary rules often compartmentalize use of LGU funds for specific uses, putting budgetary caps on specific uses and provide a menu of projects for which funds should be spent. This makes it difficult for LGUs to maximize their budgets for development and resilience building. Poor financial management system and lack of transparency also hinder building of transactional relationships between the LGU and financing institutions and the private sector, missing the opportunity for the participation of these sectors in investing in resilience.

43 Lessons from Australia's past programs informing this design include the 2015 Independent Completion Review (ICR) of the Australian-funded Disaster and Climate Risks Management (DCRM) and Building the Resilience and Awareness of Metro Manila Communities to Natural Disasters and Climate Change Impacts (BRACE) programs (adopted from the SHIELD IDD, pp. 22-23)

44 These programs encouraged the growth of new partnerships, for example: between the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and CCC in integrating DRRM/CCA at sub-national levels; between government and academia in compiling data for risk and vulnerability assessment (e.g. Project Climate Twin Phoenix (PCTP)); and between the Collective Strengthening of Community Awareness on Natural Disasters (CSCAND) agencies and planning agencies at different levels of government.

Technical Notes for Section II – Strategy

45 The TOC further emphasizes the contribution (and not attribution) nature of the SHIELD Program, which highlights that outcomes are interdependent insofar as they each represent a necessary but not sufficient condition for achieving the impact. Actors must engage proactively and collaborate effectively for target communities to realize inclusive climate and disaster resilience; and for successful processes to be scaled nationally and sustainably.

46

Promoting gender equality and social inclusion is a significant objective of the SHIELD Program given the scale of economic and social impacts of disasters and climate change on poverty and inequality. The SHIELD Program will tackle gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI) through a combination of targeted interventions and mainstreaming into all aspects of SHIELD's work. The development of a GEDSI strategy for SHIELD, together with earmarked resources, will specifically integrate GEDSI across all components of the Program.

47 Individuals and groups at risk refer to children, young people, persons with disabilities, older persons, women, LGBTQ+ persons, indigenous populations, displaced people, and other marginalized groups, including poor households and informal settlers, households and individuals dependent on natural resources for livelihood and survival, and communities threatened by, within or emerging from conflict situations

48 SHIELD IDD, p. 29

49 SHIELD IDD, pp. 29 -30

50 GPH has set up several financing windows that LGUs may access to supplement their local budgets to finance the implementation of DRRM/CCA programs, activities, and projects; and improve their disaster preparedness and resilience to benefit poor and vulnerable communities. These include:

- The **People's Survival Fund (PSF)** is a grant facility with PHP1 billion (AUD28 million) annual fund intended to support LGUs and accredited community organizations to implement climate change adaptation projects to reduce vulnerabilities to the impacts of climate change. The utilisation of PSF however has so far been low; with only six climate change adaptation projects worth PHP330 million (AUD9.3 million) approved since the Fund was set-up in 2012. Access to the Fund is governed by an inter-agency PSF Board supported by the Technical Evaluation Committee and the PSF Secretariat that is led by the CCC.

- The **National DRRM Fund (NDRRMF)** was set-up under the National DRRM Act in 2010, and is meant to be used by NGAs and LGUs to fund disaster risk reduction and preparedness activities within their mandate or jurisdiction as well as for relief, recovery, reconstruction, and other work or services related to human-induced calamities. Of the

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

NDRRMF, 70 per cent should be utilised for DRRM and preparedness programs, and the remaining 30 per cent for relief and rehabilitation. In 2018, PHP89 billion was made available for NDRRMF. However, as with the PSF, take-up among NGAs and LGUs was low, with only PHP32.4 billion (AUD900 million) utilized. A 2016 study by the Coalitions for Change (CFC) reported that from 2011-2016, 98 per cent of the NDRRMF was used for relief and recovery and LGUs got only 2 per cent of the total NDRRMF releases27. The OCD manages the NDRRMF including the review and approval of project proposals. The Local DRRM Fund (LDRRMF) was also set-up under the NDRRM Act, which requires LGUs to set aside a minimum of five per cent of their estimated revenue from regular sources. The LDRRMF aims to support disaster risk management activities such as pre-disaster preparedness programs, post-disaster activities, and for the payment of premiums on calamity insurance.

Of this Fund, 70 per cent should be utilized for DRRM and preparedness activities and the remaining 30 per cent as a stand-by fund for relief and recovery programs. For low income, disaster-prone areas, however, the 5 per cent LDRRMF is inadequate, making disaster-preparedness measures challenging, if not impossible to implement.

- The **Performance Challenge Fund (PCF)** is a performance-based reform program of the DILG that seeks to rationalise the governmental transfers of the national government to LGUs and encourage the convergence of local development initiatives under the Philippine Development Plan. It is a grant or cash award provided to eligible LGUs under the Local Governance Performance Management Program as counterpart funding for high-impact capital investment projects identified by LGUs and is funded out of the 20 per cent Local Development Fund. Like the PSF and NDRRMF, the PCF supports LGU compliance with both the Climate Change Act and the National DRRM Act. In 2018, a total of PHP980 million was released to 263 LGUs qualified for the PCF. The DILG manages the PCF.

- **The Local Government Support Fund (LGSF)** is under the Assistance to Municipalities Program that seeks to equitably assist all municipalities in the delivery of basic services by providing financial subsidies to municipalities for the implementation of their priority programs and projects, including for DRRM/CCA. PHP11.7 billion (AUD325 million) was disbursed by the DILG to 207 municipalities in 2018.

- The DOF has been providing a number of financing windows to LGUs through its **Municipal Development Fund Office (MDFO)** including for DRRM/CCA initiatives. These include the Disaster Management Assistance Fund, Philippine Water Revolving Fund, Program Lending Fund, Project Technical Assistance and Contingency Fund, Public-Private Partnership Fund, and Performance-Based Grant System. In 2018, PHP269.3 million was allocated for the MDFO, however, only 6.3 percent (PHP17 million) was released.

Donor finance is also substantial. OECD figures for 2015 indicate that finance is largely accessed through the development banks as loans. The major donors – World Bank, International Finance Corporation, Asian Development Bank, Government of France, and Government of USA – primarily invest in DRRM and in the transport sector. Following its ratification of the Paris Agreement, the Philippines is also seeking to access finance from the **Green Climate Fund (GCF)**. Access to these funds will require improved institutional coordination and capacity, including at the sub-national level. Donors are predominantly focused on preparedness and response, with an emerging and increasing focus on resilience. There are numerous capacity building efforts at both national and local government levels that include awareness raising, knowledge generation through research, development of tools, and exchange of expertise. Several donors have carried out preparedness, risk reduction and resiliency pilots at local levels, with local success. However, gaining traction for national scale-up of those successes is problematic. (SHIELD IDD, pp. 19-20)

51 These intended outcomes include:

- Communities are aware of their current and future risks, take action to keep safe and be out of harm's way during disasters events, and get back on their feet after a disaster strikes
- Government and civil society have the capacities to develop climate and disaster resilient plans, identify strategic investments that have high impact to reduce risks and vulnerabilities, engage and partner with the private sector, and access funding and finance from public and private sources.
- Local government units (LGUs), with improved climate and disaster resilience capacities, are building resilience capacities in the target communities and implementing resilience actions founded on plans informed by scientific, socioeconomic and technical information, in partnership with national government agencies, civil society organizations (CSOs), academic institutions and the private sector
- National government agencies (NGAs) are enabling the policy environment by prioritizing, monitoring, and evaluating climate and disaster resilience policies, strategies and actions, in partnership with CSOs and academic institutions, which provide technical and political perspective in the passage of reforms.
- National government scientific and technical organizations and academic institutions are providing evidence-based information and products (e.g., hazard maps, risk and vulnerability assessments, climate scenarios, forecasts and warning systems) tailored and accessible to LGUs, communities and the public
- NGAs, academic institutions and CSOs are producing relevant, timely and accessible technical resources for climate and resilience actions
- NGAs, LGUs and CSOs are working inclusively with vulnerable groups - women, people with disabilities, and other marginalized groups - to improve their preparedness and wellbeing
- The private sector, in partnership with government, provide investments in risk transfer mechanisms or insurance, climate-proofing supply chains, and business continuity that ensures communities flourish despite disasters
- GPH and GOA scientific agencies are working together to build scientific and technological capacities, and
- NGAs, LGUs, CSOs are deriving learnings for sustainability from a monitoring, evaluation and learning system at the community and national levels

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

52 Efficient program management requires rationality, purpose, and synergy in the manner by which key deliverables and essential inputs are managed.

To achieve this, key program investments will be organized according to the following thematic areas:

- Local capacities for climate and disaster resilience planning, financing and implementation
- Building data and data accessibility for improved climate and disaster risk assessments
- Enabling environment for climate and disaster resilience planning, financing and implementation
- Design and implementation of MEL for evidence and knowledge management (including advancing understanding and concepts of resilience and the resilience index)
- Support to post-disaster recovery as an opportunity for climate and disaster resilience building
- Empowering women and other marginalized groups (GEDSI) for climate and disaster resilience

53 SHIELD IDD, p. 38

54 Ten provinces and two special regions were identified as SHIELD program sites:

Luzon:	Albay, Pampanga, Pangasinan, Quezon
Visayas:	Cebu, Eastern Samar, Northern Samar
Mindanao:	Agusan del Norte, Agusan del Sur, Davao Oriental
Special Regions:	Metro Manila, BARMM

The parameters for prioritization of Provincial LGUs included:

1. Degree of vulnerability in times of disaster events and overall geographic exposure to disasters
2. Degree and extent of economic cost of damage based on previous disasters
3. Current gaps in the provision of assistance from national institutions and international donors
4. Institutional readiness and maturity to implement necessary interventions in enhancing capacities with rippling effects to adjacent localities

Two additional parameters were also considered: (5) financial sustainability and (6) CoViD impact

SHIELD will be implemented in the two special regions of BARMM and Metro Manila, as well as three (3) Provinces (Albay, Northern Samar and Agusan del Sur) in the first year. Once program presence has been established in these areas, SHIELD will then commence in the remaining seven (7) provinces.

The selection of cities, municipalities and communities in SHIELD provinces will be informed by the results of a comprehensive and participatory capacity assessment and political economy analysis for LGUs. The entry points for SHIELD at the Provincial LGU level will be the Office of the Governor (to ensure buy-in and cooperation) and the Provincial Planning and Development and DRRM Offices (PPDO and PDRRMO).

55 The selection of SHIELD cities, municipalities and communities in BARMM will be informed not only by the results of a comprehensive and participatory capacity assessment and political economy analysis for the region, but will also consider the results of the peace and conflict-related development analysis to be conducted at the onset of program implementation.

The entry point for SHIELD in BARMM is the Ministry of the Interior and Local Government (MILG), which has been instrumental in providing valuable insights as early as the UNDP proposal development stage for SHIELD.

56 In Metro Manila, selection of LGUs shall be driven by political commitment and presence of strong grassroots organizations, links with academe, active private sector groups and the presence of organized civil society groups. These actors may drive intensive information campaigns to rally towards a resilience mindset, especially on earthquakes and flooding. Support may focus on greater alignment of existing budgets to support community resilience projects and supporting them to access other resources. Innovations in mobilizing internal revenues for resilience may also be tested, such as unlocking the potential of betterment levies as tools to capture increased land values and property taxes from public investments in resilience. Specialized technical advice may also be provided to Metro Manila cities as required, drawing on national and international experts.

57 Stakeholders should possess the necessary institutional capacities and the individual competencies to be effective actors in the climate and resilience sector. Enhanced institutional capacities and competencies will, in turn, facilitate the delivery of essential services, products or information that the stakeholders will produce as part of their intervention and contribution to the change initiative and that would benefit the other stakeholders involved in climate and disaster resilience.

58 Alongside the efforts to build capacities and competencies, relationships also facilitate (or hinder) the achievement of change objectives. Specifically, the manner by which the different stakeholders interact with one another in a collaborative manner add value to each other's contributions. This recognizes that interactions are never linear and more often than not, interactions between and among stakeholders are multi-directional.

59 Local MSPs will focus on designing well informed, technically sound and bankable resilience proposals(s), working together to unlock funding and collaborating to implement, monitor, evaluate and learn from resilience initiatives.

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

The aims of each local MSP will be to:

1. Nurture and strengthen an inclusive multi-stakeholder approach to local resiliency;
2. Coordinate efforts to understand and analyse social and scientific data, with broad representation of government, civil society, and private sector actors;
3. Develop bankable and technically (scientific and social data) informed proposals;
4. Oversee and implement funded inclusive resilience activities;
5. Monitor and evaluate progress of activities and their effectiveness in building resiliency and implement social accountability measures; and
6. Coordinate inclusive resiliency activities with provincial and regional planners and neighbouring LGUs (SHIELD IDD, p. 38)

60 This strategy recognizes that risk is endogenous to development and managing risks is crucial to resilience. Mainstreaming needs to be driven from within key development sectors to ensure that specific sectoral vulnerability can be assessed, and risk management institutionalized in the policymaking, planning, investment programming, project cycle and financing, implementation and monitoring and evaluation processes to implement resilience actions.

61 **UNDP** has, since 2005, supported the Philippines in resilience actions both at the national and local levels. UNDP has managed and implemented twelve resilience-promoting programs covering 100 cities and municipalities and 79 provinces totaling US$33 million. Of these, six (6) programmes were funded by the Government of Australia. Key achievements include the introduction of a risk-based approach in local development planning that utilizes future climate scenarios; development of the first climate exposure database; and contributions to the formulation of key legislation and policies. UNDP managed a US$25 million portfolio (2013-2016) for the early recovery and rehabilitation of 15-hardest hit municipalities by Typhoon Yolanda, and supported the development of the government's Yolanda Rehabilitation and Recovery Plan and produced for NEDA a detailed analysis, benchmarking the recovery effort against international trends.

62 **UN-Habitat** has been working with national and local governments in promoting sustainable, inclusive, and resilient urban development and human settlements since 2004. UN-Habitat has worked directly with more than 50 cities and local governments through advancing climate-resilient project investments, urban planning and design, planned city extensions, climate change action planning, shelter planning, and MDG/SDG localization. It is also involved in humanitarian action focused on recovery and long term rehabilitation and shelter solutions to strengthen resilience (Typhoon Washi/Sendong in 2011, Typhoon Haiyan/Yolanda in 2013, and the Marawi Siege in 2017). UN-Habitat is engaged in many SHIELD target areas, including: Marawi, Angeles, Legazpi, Ormoc, Cagayan de Oro, Tagum, Cebu and New Clark City, and a number of Metro Manila cities.

63 **PBSP** is the country's largest corporate-led foundation and is recognized as an influential NGO with an ability to convene the country's senior business leaders. It has been in operation for 50 years and brings to the consortium its large network and deep experience working with both private sector and local communities in building economic resilience. It taps into core business competencies of companies and promotes inclusive business as a strategy, engaging members through social investment, business practices, and philanthropy. It has been a key conduit of the private sector in responding to disasters, supporting preparedness, mitigation, recovery and resilience building. PBSP can leverage the corporate social responsibility resources, value chains and business continuity efforts of its more than 236 members.

64 **NRC** is a science and technology-focused public-private partnership-pursuing climate and disaster resilience in the Philippines. It aims to strengthen and sustain high-level collaboration with National Government Agencies and key decision makers by working with resilience champions from Congress and Senate to advance policy advocacy for resilience. NRC works to enhance capacities of local resilience councils through co-generation of resilience priorities and actions utilising science and technology. Nine LGU partners have issued executive orders creating and establishing a multi-stakeholder local resilience council to identify, implement, oversee, and evaluate context- and demand-driven resilience solutions. Through its Adopt-a-City Program it has facilitated partnerships between private corporations and LGUs for risk reduction and resilience investments and established a network of Academic Institutions and scientific organizations to effectively bridge the gap between science, policy and practice in resilience building. NRC has also developed the Resilience Scorecard to measure LGU capacity for resilience.

65 **CBCS** is a network of 160 civil society organizations with a strong presence in Bangsamoro areas in Mindanao. CBCS strength lies in its capacity to peacefully engage and mobilize Bangsamoro civil society especially at the community level while maintaining its integrity and neutrality. CBCS pursues common advocacy platforms for peace and development for marginalized grassroots communities and socially excluded sectors; human rights and transitional justice; good governance; empowerment of women, youth and children; development of socio-economic livelihoods, and building resilience of communities for effective DRRM/CCA. CBCS has provided emergency response and recovery and rehabilitation assistance to communities affected by armed conflicts and crises brought about by the confluence of conflict and natural hazards. CBCS works closely with the Bangsamoro government on vital governance issues such as transparency and accountability.

66 Each consortium member has extensive experience in complex and multi-stakeholder contexts as indicated in the examples and accomplishments in this proposal. Coalition building and thinking and working politically are intrinsic to the way each operates, having to navigate complex political economy issues and partnerships and to drive reforms in often reform resistant environments. All understand deeply the nuances of working in both national and sub-national contexts. UNDP's work on the legislative agenda, UN Habitat's engagement on sustainable built environments, NRCs building of

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

public - private coalitions and PBSP's convening capacity of key private sector entities, and collectively with decades of program delivery experience in the Philippines, speak clearly to this capability.

UNDP, as consortium lead, has extensive experience in managing large-scale programs in complex and multi-stakeholder contexts. By way of example, the USD$25M Multi Donor Program - ACT for Peace - with Australia as the largest donor - covered 278 communities, provided immediate peace dividends, transformed MNLF combatants into peace and development advocates and their camps into peace and development communities. It necessitated working at the national and sub-national level, with CSOs and community groups and operated in active conflict areas. An independent study (2013) by The Asia Foundation on donor-supported peace and development programs cited ACT for Peace for its "transformative outcomes", as the program not only addressed physical and social rebuilding but more importantly contributed to sustaining stability and peace, and contributed to enabling communities to transition to development.

Government agencies have fully financed UNDP to build agency capacity and support accelerated implementation of slow-moving priority national programs drawing on UNDP's recognized capacity for effective implementation and system reform. Over the last five years government financing for such projects total USD$127M. UNDP has equipped 4,000 schools across the country with ICT infrastructure and solar power, established a national citizen monitoring mechanism, strengthened capacity for project and public financial management, quality assured hundreds of kilometers of provincial road construction, strengthened the national monitoring and evaluation system and helped to bridge the digital divide by providing connectivity in 6,000 locations.

67 Members of the consortium have provided support to the enactment of key policies, legislation, strategies and guidelines on climate and disaster resilience, including: the Climate Change Act; National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act, including the sunset review which informed the draft Bill to establish the Department of Disaster Resilience; the National Framework and Strategy for Climate Change; the National Climate Change Action Plan; Philippines' New Urban Agenda (2018-2038); and the Updated National Urban Development and Housing Framework (NUDHF 2019-2022). Key guidelines and internal rules and regulations supported include: HLURB's Supplemental Guidelines for Mainstreaming CC-DRR in Comprehensive Land Use Planning (CLUPs); DILG's Mainstreaming of CC-DRR in Comprehensive Development Plans (CDPs); and NEDA's Supplemental Manual on Mainstreaming CC-DRR in Project Development and Evaluation.

Consortium partners have extensive experience in mainstreaming CC/DRR in partnership with both national government and LGUs, including in the collection, analysis and application of data to enhance evidence-based decision making related to CC/DRR. Risk informed physical framework plans of 79 provinces have been formulated. Probabilistic climate hazard-risk modeling has been applied to update CLUPs and CDPs in 12 municipalities. The country's first climate exposure database for LGUs was developed and with further adaptations as a development planning platform will be rolled out across the entire BARMM. 16 cities now conduct climate vulnerability and risk assessment to inform CLUPs, CDPs and local investment plans. The Local Government Academy has been capacitated to guide LGUS in developing LCCAPs.

UNDP supported the government in accessing the Green Climate Fund, which resulted in accreditation of Land Bank of the Philippines, and submission of the first full country proposal. The proposal adopted climate hazard risk modeling to improve adaptation in 38 municipalities along the eastern seaboard. PBSP established a Resiliency Fund as a credit window for microfinance institutions in disaster-affected areas. A total of 40,000 micro- enterprises benefitted through four MFIs. 99% of the borrowers were women. UN-Habitat, meanwhile, is working with five cities in developing resilience project proposals/Pre-Feasibility Studies and scale models to secure funding.

68 UNDP has successfully established Governance HUBS (G-HUBS) in 16 Regions, composed of different networks of state universities, CSOs, and the private sector that collectively provide technical support to LGUs in the design and implementation of development interventions. UNDP has also supported the Philippine Government's Cabinet Cluster on Participatory Governance on a number of initiatives to deepen state-society relations, including the current national action plan on open government that was co-created with 100+ CSOs across the country; a citizen participation roadmap for 14 national government agencies and roll out of a UNDP-support mobile application (Development LIVE) that enables citizen monitoring of government-financed infrastructure projects. Together with the Philippine Disaster Resilience Foundation, UNDP has developed an action plan on the role of the private sector in DRRM.

Other consortium partners have supported efforts to improve LGU leadership on resilience implemented in partnership with scientists and technical experts, local academic institutions, and multi-stakeholder networks including local communities (NRC); strengthened DRR capabilities of provincial and municipal DRRM offices in high disaster-prone provinces, including preparation of barangay contingency plans, and supported private sector-funded rehabilitation efforts in typhoon Yolanda-affected areas, including disaster-resilient infrastructure, livelihood assistance and skills development (PBSP); and awareness raising seminars conducted on DRRM/CCA that included discussions on how potential conflict and nature-induced risks can be addressed proactively by local leaders, as well as leadership coaching to ensure resilience, gender sensitivity, inclusivity and peace building perspectives are integrated into their local development plans (CBCS).

69 Resilience Brokers will facilitate LGUs to establish participatory and inclusive partnerships to design and deliver bankable proposals for resilience initiatives. The role of the Resilience Broker is to convene the technical and community stakeholders required to inform and design a bankable proposal and build relationships between relevant scientific information providers (national and/or local) and information users such as LGUs. They will achieve this by brokering local

DocuSign Envelope ID: 0D217D74-1A80-4894-BFCA-A0BC21A75DF5

MSPs that nurture collaboration and cement institutional linkages between the necessary stakeholders for success (SHIELD IDD, p. 35)

Resilience Brokers will be high calibre facilitators that can broker local MSPs that are inclusive of technical experts, civil society, and private sector actors. They will also have expertise in the coordination and preparation of proposals and project management for implementation – they will pass these skills on to the local MSPs in order that they become self-sustaining. SHIELD may need to invest in additional technical expertise to develop bankable proposals; if this is required then the priority will be to first draw on local expertise rather than buy fly-in/fly-out expertise. These funds will need to be made available by the LGU. Resilience Brokers are not intended to be full-time adjuncts to LGUs.

They will be attached to and work collaboratively with provincial governments, and shift between cities and municipalities within the province (Figure 3). It is envisaged that a single Resilience Broker could support up to four cities/municipalities each year (depending upon geography) to develop local MSPs, design bankable proposals, and build their capacity to oversee and implement their proposals. (SHIELD IDD, p. 36)

Resilience Brokers will not only establish the local MSPs within LGUs, but also work with the SHIELD Provincial Coordinator to broker relationships between cities, municipalities, and provincial governments – supporting a strengthened role for provinces in supporting LGUs and in promoting cross-boundary resiliency actions. Resilience Brokers implementation support will be 'front-loaded' to assist the target LGUs to mobilise and manage local multi-stakeholder governance arrangements and establish good foundations for long-term implementation.

The Resilience Broker will facilitate coordination of resilience action at different scales, by networking with national, provincial level, and regional planners to integrate mutually reinforcing approaches, including proposals for joint implementation of activities that work across neighbouring LGUs. SHIELD financing of a Resilience Broker to a single LGU will be reviewed after two years of support to determine progress to date and likelihood of future success. Based on this review, SHIELD will decide to either exit the LGU or continue support. Where exit strategies are planned, new LGUs will be selected for future support – enabling rolling support. A schedule to roll-out support will be developed with the provincial government and with participating LGUs (who will also be expected to contribute resources to the process).

The roles and responsibilities of the Resilience Broker will be:

- Broker an inclusive, local MSP model for proposal design, governance, and implementation, and ensure engagement of mandated GPH agencies, representation of marginalised groups, academia, and private sector.
- Work with provincial governments and their LGUs (cities and municipalities) to develop a schedule to roll-out support (both across the province and within each LGU).
- Build the capacity of local MSPs to manage proposal development, project implementation, and partnership maintenance.
- Promote and support cross-boundary linkages and strengthen province-LGU linkages.

70 All Provincial Coordinators and Resilience Brokers should have (or be trained in) skills for applying the methodology and supporting its implementation. All Provincial Coordinators and Resilience Brokers, at the minimum, should have entrenched understanding and working experience on DRRM/CCA and project design and management. (SHIELD IDD, p. 38)

Technical Notes for Section IV – Project Management

71 The UNDP Transparency Portal is part of UNDP's long-standing commitment to transparency, as evidenced by UNDP's ranking as the second most transparent aid organization in the world (rated by the Aid Transparency Index, which assessed 45 of the largest donors of aid and development finance). It allows open and comprehensive public access to data on more than 3,400 ongoing UNDP projects and publishes over US$4.5 billion in annual project data.