



Lessons From Areas Affected by Disasters: Implications for Fieldwork Instruction Program in Community Development

Emmanuel M. Luna

Disaster Management Experiences in the Fieldwork Program

It is not an exaggeration to say that the people and communities, with whom the Department of Community Development, College of Social Work and Community Development (CSWCD) deploys its students for fieldwork instruction, are the most vulnerable to both natural and human-induced disasters, including oppression, sufferings, and losses. Even without typhoons, earthquake, flooding, landslide or volcanic eruption, the poor people suffer all kinds of losses- economic, social, political, environmental, physical and so on because of inequity and the lack of access to resources, decision making and opportunities to uplift one's life. Learning experiences in the field, in addition to actual researches, generate resources that can help bridge the gaps between theory and practice in integrating disaster management in community development.

The recent flashfloods in the municipalities of Real, Infanta and General Nakar in the province of Quezon and the magnitude of losses from tsunami in South Asia point to the need to create more awareness on disasters and to address the challenge of reducing the vulnerabilities of people and communities. It is ironic that the Department of Community Development had been placing students in these vulnerable communities, including Infanta and General Nakar even prior to the flash flood, but no formal course on disaster management exists.

In 1999, an initial framework was presented on Community Disaster Management as an area of study and practice of Community Development (Luna, 1999). This current paper is a sequel to that, basing on the experience of the Department of Community Development in placing



fieldwork students in disaster affected communities during the 1990s to the present. The experience has generated raw materials that can contribute in improving the field instruction program of the Department and in setting perspective on the relationship between disaster management and community development.

The Field Placements

When Central Luzon was hit by an earthquake in July 16,1990, three students were already having their practicum in Nueva Ecija through the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement. The following semester, the College of Social Work and Community Development launched its own Earthquake Rehabilitation Program in Brgy. Estrella, Municipality of Rizal, Nueva Ecija. On June 12, 1991, Mt. Pinatubo erupted, devastating a number of communities and giving rise to evacuation centers and resettlements in Central Luzon. A number of students were placed in different evacuation and resettlement communities starting first semester 1991-1992 in partnership with non-governmental organizations such as the Citizen Disaster Response Center (CDRC), Central Luzon Center for Emergency and Rehabilitation (CONCERN) in Pampanga and Tarlac, Social Action Center of Pampanga (SACOP), U.P. Pahinungod Program, Philippine Peasant Institute and Project Development Institute in Zambales.

In the late 1990's, students were placed in new areas as the college forged partnerships with other NGOs and People's Organizations such as Buklod Tao in San Mateo, Rizal, the Center for Disaster Preparedness (CDP) in Antipolo, Rizal, the World Vision Development Foundation in their Center of Learning for Community-Based Disaster Management in Bataan, and the Tabang sa Biktima sa Bikol (TABI) in Sorsogon, Camarines Sur and Masbate, the Aniban ng mga Magsasaka sa Bulacan and the Center for Environment and Development Studies in Bulacan and Pampanga.

When the flashflood struck in Quezon municipalities in December,2004, the Department of Community Development had four students fielded in two communities in Infanta and General Nakar. This prompted the department to conceptualize and launch a rehabilitation program for the communities.

Purpose of the Paper

The DCD is currently reviewing its experiences in the fieldwork program. This paper presents and analyzes experiences in two fieldwork areas in Central Luzon where the communities were affected by disasters,



namely, the 1990 earthquake and the 1991 Mt. Pinatubo eruption, based on the documentation done by the students fielded in the affected communities. The author served as faculty supervisor in the placement. The paper identifies community development processes and strategies used in disaster management. It analyses issues and concerns relevant in integrating disaster management perspective and processes in Community Development and in Fieldwork Instruction Program of the Department.

To do this, available materials such as the integrated fieldwork papers of the students were reviewed. While there are many experiences that can be included as cases, only two were taken due to resource limitation and documentation. Also cases that could show actual responses to disaster events were selected to provide a better picture of the processes. The two cases showed different disaster management components. The disaster management components are the prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. In community-based disaster management, these components take place at all times, but the relative focus of each component varies depending on the hazards and vulnerability of the community (Kotze and Holloway, 1996:33). The two cases in this paper involved one caught in an emergency response situation and the other in an evacuation area waiting for resettlement.

The first case is the PRRM experience in Caranglan where the students were fielded in a rural development program, only to find themselves in the middle of relief operations due to the 1990 earthquake. The second case study deals with evacuation management in Sapang Maisac Evacuation Center in Pampanga under the Social Action Center of Pampanga. The people in the latter case were affected by the Mt. Pinatubo eruption and lahar movement.

CASE ONE: From Development to Disaster Management: Re-Orienting Organizing Work to Relief and Rehabilitation in Caranglan, Nueva Ecija

Three students were fielded in the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Program in 1990. The PRRM then was implementing the rural democratization program that aimed to empower rural communities through integrated socio-economic services for people's empowerment. The people were being organized not only for financial assistance



but for capability-building and for enhancing self reliance. To minimize dependency on the program, the funds and material assistance were released only after ensuring that the people understood the reason for assistance and when the people had deeper level of consciousness. PRRM and the students were doing social analysis, organizing, training and mobilization of people to respond to community issues.

When the great earthquake struck Central Luzon in July 1990, the municipality of Caranglan was isolated due to landslide in Sta. Fe Road. The earthquake loosened the rocks and the heavy rains eroded the soil. Some portions of the highways collapsed covering the houses and farms of the peasants along the road with rocks and mud. People from the interior barangays could not bring out their products due to dangerous paths. There was a blockade of food and other basic supplies.

PRRM took the initiative to reach four communities which were still isolated and needing much help. The PRRM office was based in the municipality of Munoz while Caranglan was along the Sta. Fe Road going to Nueva Viscaya. Their problem was bringing in the relief goods because of limited manpower. The vehicles could only reach the base of the Sta Fe Road and from there, all the relief goods had to be carried manually up to the upland communities.

Initially, the community organizers (CO) of the PRRM and the students brought some relief goods first in a community isolated by the erosion. After distributing the goods to some families, the community residents were informed that there were more relief goods in Munoz, but they could not bring them due to limited human power. The COs asked for volunteers and mobilized them to bring relief goods to the community. Then, they went to the next upland community, distributed relief and asked for volunteers who would get the goods from the base. Due to the difficulties in doing this, some residents ended up with having two relief bags while others had none. The community organizers felt the need to have a system in systematizing the relief operation.

The system established included the setting up of a camp where the COs and the students could stay while doing relief operation. They also used the base as storage for goods. Radio communication was set up between the base and the office in Munoz, as well as with the isolated upland communities. Community organizing techniques were adopted by social integrating with the people. They called up meetings to discuss



the situation. A relief committee was formed that handled the relief operations.

While relief operation was taking place, the COs and students did rapid rural appraisal to determine the extent of the damage to the families and to the farm. They conducted Village Social Analysis (VSA) and community meetings to determine other needs. They also mobilized volunteers and mountaineers from U. P. and Philippine Airlines in determining damages even in remote areas. The VSA was very useful in determining what kind of goods should be given to the families. Thus big families were given more goods and those with children were given milk. Priority list of families that should be given relief was also done. Sitio meetings became very useful in clarifying issues and in resolving intrigues and conflicts.

After a week of doing relief operations, the PRRM staff saw the need to go beyond relief and launched a more comprehensive program that will prepare the communities for rehabilitation. They called this the Relief and Rehabilitation Program which had four parts:

1. Sustained Relief Distribution for three weeks. This was done through the active participation of the Relief Committees and meeting of the people at the sitio level. The relief was composed of 25 kilos of rice, two kilos of dried fish, two kilos of monggo, instant noodles, coffee, salt, sugar and kerosene.
2. Disaster Monitoring. This was done through a committee whose members were trained to do monitoring of damages and possible threats of more landslide and erosion.
3. Establishment of evacuation centers for a number of families who lost their houses and were living in dangerous areas where possible landslide may occur. Committees were formed and were put in-charge of establishing the temporary evacuation center.
4. Study on Alternative Sources of Livelihood. Through the sitio meetings, the people were able to analyze their situation and the possible courses of action. Due to the massive destruction of the farm and the difficulty of



transporting goods, some families considered relocating to other areas. But others were reluctant because they considered their place as their ancestral land. They were also uncertain of living in a new location they have not seen.

As a result of the meetings with the people, the PRRM did not promise that it can provide a relocation area. However, it facilitated establishing linkages with government agencies so that the communities would be able to know their plans. Other planned assistance included transport assistance, provision of soft loans, use of the logs carried by the flood for housing, relief provision and doing communal farming.

Reflecting on the experience, the students culled some of the realities in the field during crises situation. During crises, they found out that the people in the area could be easily mobilized. The same observation was true for support groups and individuals such as volunteers and donors of goods and funds. During crises situation, local leaders also surfaced naturally. It is interesting to note that the four communities that were given assistance, with approval of their barangay councils, were able to come out with the rule that required any agencies wanting to assist them to work with in the committee system and procedures agreed by the community. They found out that relief work was a physically and emotionally draining and difficult task. Despite this, they realized that the relief workers' fear due to exposure to danger, their exhaustion and frustration should not be explicitly shown to the people, lest the latter might be adversely affected. The people, once given relief assistance showed gratitude, reciprocity or "utang na loob".

The relief work was considered draining and difficult because of so many problems and issues they encountered. Physically, the relief workers were exhausted by the long distance uphill and muddy terrain that made carrying and handling of goods difficult. There were cases when the people in the community placed themselves first before their neighbors who were more in need. Since there were relief goods that were distributed in excess to some families who were not really in need, the goods ended up in stores to be sold. The students also realized that uncoordinated and sporadic relief distribution can lead to dependency and hamper plans for rehabilitation.



Working with other support groups was found problematic too. With the PRRM becoming very active in the relief distribution and the inadequate response of the concerned government agencies, the former became very visible and the latter paranoid. There was overlapping and sense of competition between the GO and the NGOs. According to the students, the workers from the government did not really stay in the areas which were difficult to reach and relied on the information that the NGO workers were able to get. Those from the government worked independently of the committee system set by the community. Within the NGO community in which the PRRM was a member, the students found out too that despite good networking, there were still conflict of interest due to funding, desire to direct the goods to the NGO's program areas and desire to project one's name.

The relief and rehabilitation program in Caranglan brought about unique experiences to the the students too. For the first time, they experienced the thrill of riding helicopters, walking in waist-deep mud, and being confronted by the New Peoples Army elements regarding proper distribution of relief goods. They concluded that relief and rehabilitation should have the component of organizing.

CASE TWO: Prolonged Living in Evacuation Center: A Temporary Community in Transition in Mexico, Pampanga

The Sapang Maisac Evacuation Center (SMEC) in Mexico Pampanga was one of the many evacuation centers that catered to the victims of Mt. Pinatubo eruption in 1991. Although the eruption took place in 1991, the devastating impact was felt more with the lahar flow that destroyed and buried communities till 1995.

Built in 1996, the evacuation center was only six kilometers away from the Magalang town proper and seven kilometers from Angeles City. It was one of the programs of the Social Action Center of Pampanga (SACOP) based in San Fernando, Pampanga. It had 18 bunkhouses, 10 from Phase I and eight from Phase II. The first phase was put up with the support of the Holy Resurrection of the BF Homes, Paranaque and by the Save the Children Foundation. The second phase was supported by the Canadian and British government fund for disaster preparedness. Each bunkhouse had ten units, each with a floor area of 1,250 square feet (25x50 ft). If fully occupied, the SMEC can accommodate 180 families.



At the height of lahar threat, the SMEC was fully occupied. But due to transfer to resettlement areas and non-occupancy of some families, there was a decreasing trend in number of family occupants. In July 1997, there were 120 families living in the SMEC.

The SMEC was known to be the model staging area of all evacuation centers in Pampanga (Fernandez and Siojo, 1997). A staging area was a temporary place for residents evacuated while waiting for a final resettlement area where they could live permanently. The community was organized with established system for decision making, program planning, implementation, coordination and liaison work with outside agencies. The community was organized with a General Assembly (GA) composed of residents 18 years old and above. The GA set the general direction and defined the programs and policies of the organization. There was an Executive Committee composed of the leaders of the 18 bunkhouses. A presiding officer was elected on a quarterly and then on monthly basis to give each bunk leader a chance to be the presiding officer. There were also five working committees composed of two representatives from each bunkhouse. The committees were the Committee on Finance, Ways and Means; Committee on Health and Sanitation; Committee on Livelihood, Education and Training; Committee on Peace and Order and the Committee on Youth, Culture and Sports. The organization was very active in managing the evacuation but there were also conditions that triggered its downfall.

When the SMEC was formed, the original plan was to establish just one resettlement area for affected families. But this was not followed when SACOP and the government agencies started to resettle the families in different areas and at different times. Most of the active and reliable leaders of SMEC were resettled, leaving the rest of the members in a state of emptiness and insecurity.

When a new batch of students were deployed in the community, the evacuees were uninterested to participate in the organization's activities and programs because of the organizational change. Thus, the students assisted in the reactivation of the organization. Specifically, they helped in determining and responding to the needs of the people through participatory management. But by June, 1997, the students realized that "they turned out to be supervisors or commanding officers... in monitoring the activities and behavior of the people". There was no levelling-off between the students and the agency, leaving them with an unclear knowledge of their roles" (Fernandez and Siojo, 1997).



There were some concerns observed by the students like the emphasis given by the SACOP on the moral values, more than the economic needs of the evacuees; formulating policies without consulting the community leaders; personal use of the Social Credit Fund by the chairperson of the livelihood committee, causing the people to become restless since their project proposals could not be funded; the apparent knowledge of the scam by the agency's CO in the center, but without informing the organization; polarity among the residents due to the scam; and the re-application rule of the agency that required the evacuees to comply. Re-applications meant that the evacuees had to submit application paper to the agency asking the latter to allow the evacuees to continue staying at the SMEC. This move was seen by the evacuees as the agency's organizing strategy to oust evacuees who were delinquent and not sympathizers. The community leaders aired their disapproval of the rule and their feeling that this ignored what the organization stood for. There was an apparent discordance between the agency CO and the students.

When the results of the re-application rule came out in August, 1997, a number of residents were considered as having pending cases or "not in good standing" based on certain criteria like not attending meetings regularly, caught gambling, drinking or causing public disturbance. By September, the SACOP sent out eviction notice to 21 families who failed to come for a review of their cases. This caused another outrage in the SMEC, though 15 families who appealed were given a second chance to stay. After this experience, the people raised their sentiments such that the CO of the agency have settled disputes first with them before bringing them up to the higher authority; that they should be informed and consulted first on rules being implemented in the SMEC. They also said that most of them were engaged in gambling because they were already senior who could no longer apply for jobs and had no livelihood opportunities.

From this experience, the students shared the following reflections:

As a CO, one should never give the impression that s/he is above the people. But how could one be in a place where the people know for a fact that the land where they live is not theirs? What happens in a place where the people are supposed to obey the rules and policies of the people who were kind enough to lend



their land for these lahar victims? How are you supposed to reconcile the fact that you want them to know you are there to help, but at the same time make sure that everyone should comply with the rules and the policies of the center? Through all these experiences and observations that I had in dealing with an evacuation center like Sapang Maisac, I could say that this gave me a huge dose of reality. Being inside the four walls of the college, I had an unrealistic view of the outside world (Siojo,1997).

I know I have grown stronger after the fieldwork experience. It made me realize that what I learned in the College of Social Work and Community Development could not be true at all times, especially when we talk about temporary communities that have different needs and undergo lots of changes (Fernandez,1997).

Lessons From the Fieldwork Experience

The experience in the field brought out deconstruction of some of the realities of the people, who were not only poor but were further devastated by the natural and social events that followed. Losing ones home and community meant also losing the neighborhood and the wave of social relationships and support systems available. No wonder, the organizing process was also very vulnerable to issues that can be considered petty in a non-disaster situation. The sensitivity of the people seemed so high, so with the CO, volunteers and students. In a very stressing situation like this, caregivers like them need extra care and endurance as well. As one student said, "How can we learn to help others when we ourselves are emotionally unstable?"

Evacuation center was seen as a temporary community. It was a place where the people can find refuge when affected by lahar flooding. For those who were totally devastated, it was a staging area before they could find a final resettlement. The people had three options available: to return to their community if it was still livable; to go to a final resettlement area; and to continue waiting at the evacuation center, without any assurance of what changes will take place and further shaking their very unstable condition.



The people were struggling against external issues confronting them such as unexpected resettlement schemes, non-payment of electric bills, new policies imposed without consultation, fund scam, and possible sources of income. At the same time, they were struggling from within. There were feelings of being neglected, deceived, and the fear of the future. This was true not only for the individual but for the whole community as well.

The initial stage of the SMEC was considered as an ideal state of participatory management of an evacuation center because there was high hope that something could happen if they would get involved. But when they found out that what they were looking up to- a common resettlement area for all and a viable source of livelihood- was not falling in place but falling apart, the idealism of participatory management also started to disintegrate. Thus they were not interested, refused to participate and worse, were very much into personal conflict with the community workers.

The experience in field instruction shows that community disaster is one agenda that can not be ignored. Disasters take place with in the community and the people suffer the losses. These include economic dislocation, break down of social support system such as neighborliness and kinship, deprivation of services necessary for human survival, discrimination and isolation, and psychological impact that trigger self-pity, depression, loss of self-esteem and hope, anger and faithlessness, as well as dependency due to the notion that they have been victimized and therefore have the right to be served always. Even if there were relief assistance in the forms of goods, temporary shelter and evacuation, the same feelings continue to exist, especially if they felt that they are being abused or short-changed.

The issues posed by disasters are very concrete and require urgent action. Most of them affect the person's state of well being and even life itself. In times of emergencies, time element becomes too crucial in addressing the situation. As shown in the Caranglan case study, the issue was isolation from food acquisition and other basic necessities. In the SMEC, the frustration over the prolonged stay at the evacuation center and the feeling of being left out as other members of the community were transferred to resettlement caused people to lose faith, feel neglected and ignored. These further aggravated their misery.



Responding to these complicated issues is not only a significant contribution for learning in the field. Lest, it becomes too extractive if the students were only in the field to learn from the people and the situation. Somehow, they have to do something and to act sensibly and carefully. Sad to say, they came to the community with the theoretical knowledge of organizing and other skills in community work, but with inadequate understanding and skills in Disaster Management (DM). Even the partner agencies lacked the knowledge and skills necessary to handle emergency situation. More so with the community and their leaders who were confronted with the need to respond to their own issues. Apparently, many problems and issues surfaced in the process of relief operations, evacuation management and rehabilitation. The students were very vocal in their sentiments that they did not have any background in disaster management and their exposure to this took place only when they were confronted right in the field. This has implications in the preparedness of the Department, the faculty supervisors and the students themselves in disaster management.

Despite this feeling of inadequacy, it was also evident that the students' stock knowledge in community development processes, especially social analysis, organizing, planning and mobilization have helped them come up with innovative ways to respond to the disaster situation of the community.

What have been the contributions of the students in these communities? The students have been taught not to claim any significant changes or impact in the community were brought about solely by their field involvement. In the first place, they have been instructed to act as facilitators for change and whatever results are outcome of the people's decision and action. The students have been taught on the value of not claiming credit for any achievement in the community, but instead attribute these to the people who were the prime movers. However, it was fulfilling to see changes or developments in communities like the rise of volunteerism, the mobilization of the people and the small initiatives to respond to the situation. The fieldwork experiences have also broadened the students' perspectives, their understanding of the situation of the communities they were in and the complexities of the responses made. From the very ideal perspective, they have seen that life and events were not that simple. They have learned how to understand the people's sentiments, feelings and reactions, especially those who experienced loss and sufferings.



Implications to the Fieldwork Instruction Program and Community Development Processes

The value of these past experiences lies both in the material and personal benefits that have been accrued to the community and to the students, but also in the academic discourses, particularly in the re-conceptualization of ways of looking and doing community development. Communities are of different kinds and situation. Those affected by disaster require a special handling because of the sensitivity involved. How then can the Fieldwork Instruction Program and the community development processes become disaster sensitive? Since it is premised that disaster and development are two faces of the same coin, then it follows that the two must not be separated. Sad to say, the tendency in development work is to neglect the side of disaster. Little is paid attention to the fact that any development in the community can be easily washed out by a disaster event.

Integrating Disaster Management Perspective in the Fieldwork Instruction and Community Development

It is imperative for the Fieldwork Instruction Program to adopt a disaster management perspective. All communities, even the least vulnerable, must have disaster management plan. In some affluent communities, the task of ensuring the protection of the community is relegated to security agencies and other formal mechanisms. More significant is the need for the poor communities to have greater protection. But the approach has to be community-based to ensure a more appropriate way to prepare and respond to disasters. This is the reason why all communities are potential areas for Community-Based Disaster Management (CBDM).

The concept of CBDM was first introduced in the mid-1980s when the Citizen Disaster Response Center formulated its Citizenry-Based and Development Oriented Disaster Response (CBDR-DO) approach that "aims to contribute to pro-people development for the general improvement of the well being and quality of life for the majority of the Filipinos" (Heijmans and Victoria, 2001: 13). The main distinguishing features of this approach are:



- * it looks at disasters as a question of people's vulnerability
- * it recognizes people's existing capacities and aims to strengthen these
- * it contributes to addressing the roots of people's vulnerabilities and to transforming or removing the structures generating iniquity and underdevelopment
- * it considers people's participation essential to disaster management
- * it puts a premium on the organizational capacity of the vulnerable sectors through the formation of grassroots disaster response organizations
- * it mobilizes the less vulnerable sectors into partnerships with the vulnerable sectors in disaster management and development work

These six features are highly inter-related and are all development-oriented in nature (Ibid, 13-14). Considering the advancement of CBDM in the practice, it is imperative that organizing and other processes in community development be infused with DM concepts and methods.

Site selection, community entry and integration

In choosing sites for fieldwork program, there are three possible ways by which this can be done for CBDM. One is for existing sites of development programs to integrate disaster management in their program, thus sites are already given. For examples, those in coastal resources management, women's program or urban poor communities can be given CBDM orientation and this can proceed with the adoption of the DM processes. Another way is to go through the conventional site selection process which includes hazards and vulnerability as primary criteria for selection. This is the reason why the communities in Central Luzon, Payatas, Camiguin and those in Albay became sites of disaster management projects. The localities' experience such as volcanic eruption, lahar movement, flooding or landslide and their continuous exposure to these threats are factors that warrant disaster contingency planning.

In times of emergency, site selection directs one to the community where the disaster is taking place. A huge fire in an urban poor community in Tondo, a war in the hinterlands in Mindanao, a tidal



wave in Mindoro, or settlements being dislocated by a development project attract development and emergency-oriented organization.

As in any community development program, community entry and integration are fundamental processes that can not be taken for granted. The same processes and activities are used in CBDM when there is no emergency. When there is a life or death situation, many of the protocols in entering the community are fast tracked to expedite the rescue or helping process. Doing community integration alone becomes impractical if one is to be saved from an incoming danger. Crises management becomes the tool. Placing people out of danger is the paramount agenda than keeping an ever smiling face just to ensure a good human relation.

Social investigation and analysis.

In CBDM, this is done through the usual socio-economic profiling, but with additional tools used such as hazard and risk analysis, vulnerability, capacity analysis and damage assessment. Hazards and risk analysis looks at the various natural and human induced threats that can cause disasters. Among the factors considered are the characteristics of the hazards such as the frequency of occurrence, the magnitude, the intensity, scope or areas than can be affected, the duration when the hazard takes place, the on-set or the time required before the hazard occur and the possible impact. Vulnerability analysis identifies the people, sector, or geographical areas that will be most likely affected by hazards. It is concerned with the various elements such as the physical, social, economic, political and environmental elements that are at risk and the factors that make these elements very vulnerable. Similar to the usual resource analysis done in community development, the capacity and resource analysis in community-based disaster management determines the innate capacity of the person, the family and the community to prevent, mitigate, prepare and respond to disasters. Usually, the poor, the children, the elderly, the women and those living in dangerous situation are the most vulnerable. Those who have the greatest capacity are those who are aware of the risk, those with adequate resources that enable them to acquire skills, materials or tools that can help mitigate disaster impact and those who live in safe places. Damage assessment is done right after a disaster event. An inventory of the human, physical, economic, social and environmental losses is done to determine the extent and quality of damages in the community.



The various tools for data gathering in participatory rural appraisal such as mapping, transect, historical line, and the like can be used during community disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness. However, during actual emergency, a more rapid way to assess the situation is done by locating and estimating the people who are in danger, simultaneously done with the corresponding response such as rescue operation, relief distribution, evacuation and provision of medical and psycho-social services. In communities where there is an adequate assessment of the situation of its people and resources even before disaster takes place, the analysis during emergency situation is relatively easier to determine. In fact, the situation can be forecasted through contingency planning that can show different scenarios when hazards occur.

Leadership Development and Organization Building

One basic principle in CBDM is developing the capacity of the people, organizations and the community to enable them to withstand or overcome hazards affecting them. In addition to the leadership qualities being developed among community leaders, CBDM requires other capabilities and skills such as hazards and risk mapping and monitoring, warning and communication, search and rescue operations, evacuation planning and management, mobilization for emergency response and the like. Specialized training are needed to ensure that losses are minimized and not the otherway around.

Organization building from core group formation, committee system, people's organization, alliances, networks and linkages are likewise essential components of CBDM. Legally, all barangays are supposed to have a Barangay Disaster Coordinating Council. However, findings from field show that the BDCC are seldom organized in communities. If ever they are organized, they are just done to comply with the requirements and no orientation, training or action takes place. They are also reactive and become active only when there are disasters or emergencies.

Alternative organizational mechanisms to handle disaster management can be done. In fact, DM can become an entry point in coming to the communities and start organizing work. In communities where there is already an existing people's organization, committees can be formed to handle specific task for disaster management. Based on the experience of BSCD students fielded in an NGO specializing in CBDM in Bicol provinces, they witnessed the operation of various organizational mechanisms such committees, people's organizations, task forces, NGOs and network formation.



Disaster sensitive community planning

In addition to the general goals of alleviating poverty, enhancing growth and welfare of the people, improving the environment, or increasing access and participation in the development process, there are planning goals and objectives that need to be set if DM will be integrated in the community development planning process. The ultimate goal in DM is the prevention and reduction of losses in all aspects- physical, social, economic, environmental and other areas of community life. This entails reducing the vulnerabilities of the people and of the community and increasing their capacity. Most natural hazards like earthquake, typhoon or volcanic eruption can not be prevented. However, the impact of these hazards can be mitigated such that there would be less casualties and damages. For human induced hazards such as flooding, epidemic, dislocation of settlements, fire, wars and conflict, the hazards can be prevented and this is one goal that DM wants to achieve. More specific goals for DM are increasing the people's awareness and skills in DM, improving their access to resources and facilities that will enable them to prepare and respond effectively to threats and other hazards, developing community systems and procedures for disaster management, organizing them to ensure participation and systematic collective actions.

Both structural and non-structural measures can be planned by the community for disaster management. Among the structural measures are dikes and rip rapping on river side to prevent erosion and flooding; roads, bridges, hanging bridges, footpaths to ensure safe access and mobility; potable sources of water; safe evacuation centers; medical facilities; housing and resettlement.

Non-structural measures for the community include hazards and risk mapping and monitoring; contingency planning; installing warning and communication system; public awareness and informational campaign; training and organizing of volunteers and residents on various aspects of DM; drills and simulation exercises; evacuation planning and management; community land use planning; integration of DM in community development plans; and provision of adequate supplies and equipment appropriate to the hazards threatening the community.

More important than these measures are environmental protection and management initiatives that can prevent or mitigate disasters such as banning logging, reforestation, mangrove plantation, waste



management, drainage clean-up, non-use of inorganic chemicals in agriculture, environmental friendly methods in resource extraction in marine, forestry and quarries, and urban environment protection from pollution, congestion, industrial and transport disasters.

Similarly, development projects like livelihood, health services, land reforms, and other services in both rural and urban communities address people's vulnerability and are therefore indispensable. What matters is the incorporation of DM perspective in these development projects and activities so that the adverse effects are identified and corresponding responses are planned out.

Mobilization, networking and advocacy

Disaster itself is an issue for community mobilization and advocacy. Among those directly hit by disasters, the people have to organize and mobilize to facilitate relief operations. In the evacuation center, the evacuees worked for better services and faster resettlement.

The content therefore of advocacy for DM include the call for better environmental practice; new legislation in disaster management that promote pro-active and community-based approach to DM; implementation of projects that can mitigate disasters; influencing policies of local government and the national government to become more responsive to communities affected by disasters; resource generation for the victims of disasters; mobilizing volunteer workers for disaster response; resisting development projects that pose danger and threat to people and the community; exposing and confronting authorities and groups that are violating disaster management policies and principles.

Communities and NGOs can be mobilized for these purposes. Linkages can be established among concerned entities to enhance greater coordination, collaboration and capacity to exert greater strength. Some NGOs have established network like the Philippine Disaster Management Forum established in 2002 to promote community-based disaster management. It is currently involved in legislative advocacy that will transform the current disaster management system in the country from being reactive and diffused to one that is comprehensive, empowering, participatory and focused on risk reduction and response.



Evaluation, phasing out and follow-up

As shown by experience, the people have the capacity for evaluation and sustaining their work. In a disaster situation where the issue at stake is very concrete, the expected outcome are usually concrete too in terms of the kind of life the people would have after the disaster event. The same participatory processes and tools are also used for DM in evaluation. However, there are some emerging issues that are currently placed in the agenda, one of which is the standard for services for disaster affected persons.

The emergence of the Humanitarian Charter and the Minimum Standards in disaster response highlights the contrast between the realities confronting people and communities and what is just right. The Humanitarian Charter is based on international treaties and convention such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Geneva Convention/International Humanitarian Law and the Refugee Law. It is a recent commitment among humanitarian organizations to emphasize "the rights of disaster-affected people to life with dignity...The minimum standards seek to describe the level of disaster assistance to which all people have a right- regardless of political or ethnic or geographical specificity. The standards define the general requirements for life with dignity ..." (Sphere Project: 2).

Initial reaction of Filipinos in humanitarian work and disaster management points to the ironic situation where the minimum standards for disaster victims are actually better than the normal situation of the people (PDMF,2003). This points to the need to further look at the standards and indicators. This requires greater focus on communities affected by disasters, as well as on the disaster management practice.

Relief distribution is relevant but it has an end in the DM cycle. Similarly, evacuation is not meant for permanence, but just a temporary response to the situation. In both cases, phasing out does not mean leaving the community, but moving to another phase in disaster management, that is towards rehabilitation and reconstruction. As the communities reach these stages, they are also being ushered into the other side of the coin, which is development. From there, the CD principles and processes in phasing out and follow-up are applicable and can be undertaken with greater awareness that the community and the people at stake have undergone traumatic episodes.



Relevant Concerns for DM Integration in Community Development

As disaster management perspective and processes are integrated in the community development practice, there are other concerns that are presently at the table of discourses. These include the integration of gender concern in disaster management, the desire for greater environmental protection for disaster reduction, the development of strategies for sustainability, the views and responses to terrorism, state role in the occurrence of disasters due to development aggression and malfunctioning in terms of long term planning, regulation and control for disaster risk reduction, and the pivotal roles of DM NGOs and their relationship with the government. All these areas need a focal discipline that can help in understanding, synthesizing, and generating new concepts and processes in community disaster management. Incorporating CBDM in the curriculum and in the field instruction is a contribution in reducing the vulnerabilities of our communities.

Bibliography

A. Students papers where the cases were based

- 1990 Cagioia, Andrew, de la Cruz, Juan Carlo and Rosales, Leo
Our Carangalan Experience: A Response to a Disaster
- 1997 Fernandez, Bernadette Joanne and Siojo, Margarita Josefina
Changing Times, Changing Needs: The Sapang Maisac Evacuation Center Experience
- 1998 Fernandez, Bernadette Joanne and Nuyda, Claire Talan
Sapang Maisac Evacuation Center: Transcending Barriers Through Participatory Management

B. Published materials

- 2001 Heijmans, Annalies and Victoria, Lorna
Citizenry-Based and Development Oriented Disaster Response. QC: Center for Disaster Preparedness
- 1996 Kotse, A. and Holloway. Reducing Risk- A Participatory
Learning Activities for Disaster Mitigation in Southern Africa. IFRC and RCS, University of Natal



- 1999 Luna, Emmanuel M.
Community Disaster Management: An Area of Study and Practice in Community Development in CSWCD Development Journal. Vol. IV. No. 1. December, 1999.
n.d. Sphere Project General Information.
Geneva, Switzerland. www.sphereproject.org

C. Unpublished materials

- 2003 Philippine Disaster Management Forum. A Forum on the Sphere Project Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



EMMANUEL M. LUNA is Associate Professor and former Chairperson of the Department of Community Development, CSWCD. He specializes in Community Disaster Management and has presented papers in several national and international conferences. In 1991, he was a recipient of the UP International Publication Award.

He sits in the Board of Directors of the Center for Disaster Preparedness; Philippine Institute of Environmental Planning; Philippine National Red Cross; Center for People's Empowerment and Governance; and is treasurer of The Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi UP Chapter. He also chairs the Philippine Disaster Management Forum, a network of NGOs working in DM. He has a Ph.D in Urban and Regional Planning.