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ABSTRACT

On November 8th 2013, Typhoon Yolanda hit the Philippines, causing widespread destruction, damage and loss of life. The area of San Jose, in Tacloban City, was particularly hard hit due to its proximity to the coast and flat and low-lying terrain.

Through first-hand research carried out in two Barangays within the San Jose area of Tacloban in June 2014 this paper investigates the impact of Yolanda on those living there, framing the investigation through the idea of ‘resilience’, and asks: What were the post-disaster priorities for building resilience for those affected and how do these differ from how resilience is defined in current academia and policy? It finds that resilience for those affected by Yolanda is not something that can easily be measured qualitatively. It is not just based around physical assets but also feeling safe and secure, having the capacity for independence and being included in the rehabilitation process. Given the early recovery context of this research the role of resilience in humanitarian responses is also investigated through the San Jose case study, with findings suggesting there is scope to build resilience during the post disaster phase as well as through longer-term development projects.

The paper argues that resilience does not need to be wrapped up in a complicated multi-scale or long-term project to be an effective or relevant approach and that even small measures can make a household or community resilient, especially to immediate and seasonal threats. Small-scale cash transfers, effective and relevant training, capacity building and localised but well-organised evacuation plans can all be effective in building resilience at the community level.
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RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

Anonymity
All names of participants have been removed from this research paper, as have the numbers of the Barangays in which I worked and the names of the agencies and government officials. This was done to protect all those interviewed and encourage open and honest discussions during the research phase. While some participants stated they would be happy for their names to be used, for consistency a policy of not naming interviewees and sources has been used throughout. As such the two Barangays in which I worked (while identified as within San Jose) are not identified by their Barangay numbers and are instead referred to as Barangay A and Barangay B.

Ethical Considerations
All those interviewed during the research had been affected by Typhoon Yolanda in some way; through loss of property, livelihoods and in many cases friends and family and as such it was an emotive area to discuss. With the help of my translator I spent time making it clear to all those I spoke to what the focus of my research was and that participation was completely optional (See Appendix 6 for more details). In a number of cases we stopped interviews part way through if it became clear that the topics being discussed were too distressing for the interviewee. The interviewees always had the final say on whether they wanted to carry with an interview.
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KEY TERMS AND ACRONYMS

**Barangay**
The smallest unit into which municipalities and cities within the Philippines are divided. Barangays have a population of less than 1,000 inhabitants and are run by a number of elected officials, led by a Barangay Captain or Chairman (punong barangay) (NSCB, 2014). This study focused on two Barangays in the San Jose area of Tacloban City.

**Tacloban City**
The capital city of the province of Leyte, located in the north east of the island. Leyte is in Eastern Visayas, one of 17 regions of the Philippines (City of Tacloban, 2014). Tacloban was one of the areas most severely affected by Typhoon Yolanda.

**Typhoon Yolanda**
Super Typhoon Yolanda (known internationally as Typhoon Haiyan) hit land on November 8th 2013 (UNHCR, 2013) and caused damage to over one million homes across the Philippines, displacing approximately 4.1 million people (USAID, 2014). This paper uses the local Philippines name ‘Yolanda’, given this is how it was referred to by those interviewed in country.

**San Jose**
A district on the eastern outskirts of Tacloban City, comprised of ten Barangays (83, 83A, 83C, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90) and the geographical focus of this paper. San Jose was one of the areas most severely affected by Yolanda.

**Resilience**
As discussed throughout this paper I do not attempt to redefine resilience, a term that has been defined many times in humanitarian policy and academia already. However, I do use five themes that are consistent in resilience definitions as a framework for part of my analysis. These are: community-focused programming and planning, promoting and enabling adaptability, coping with shocks and stresses, long-term planning, and a holistic and cross-cutting approach to humanitarian and development programming.

‘Mga Pamaagi para dire na duro nga maapektuhan hin mga calamidad’
A term in the local language Waray-Waray, which literally translates as ‘Ways to do in order to be less affected during calamities’, meaning ‘things that can be done in order to be less affected during disasters’ and was used as an entry point to discuss ideas around ‘resilience’ with many of the interviewees.
Community
Much of the focus of this paper is a discussion around what resilience means at the ‘community’ level. The paper uses the following definition to define the term: ‘a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and often have a common cultural and historical heritage’ (Collins English Dictionary, 2009). The community discussed here is the two Barangays, A and B where the research took place, which are linked together by government, locality and history. This is often referred to as the ‘local community’ in this paper.

Cash for Work Programme (CfW)
A (normally) short-term programme, used by humanitarian actors, organisations and governments, that provides temporary employment in public projects, usually targeting the most vulnerable sections of society. CfW has become increasingly common in post-disaster contexts in the last five to ten years (Mercy Corps, (2007) and Harvey and Bailey, (2011)). CfW programmes in Tacloban were being run by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and include small-scale agriculture programmes and drainage clearing.

Corrugated Galvanized Iron (CGI) Sheet
Material used for much of the roofing in San Jose, both pre and post disaster. CGI sheets were provided in the emergency phase by INGOs for a large number of households.

Tacloban Recovery and Rehabilitation Plan
A plan led by the City Government of Tacloban in coordination with UN-HABITAT that has developed immediate action and operational strategies needed to lead the recovery and rehabilitation of Tacloban after Typhoon Yolanda. It should be noted that this is a working document. The version referenced in this paper was last updated on May 9th 2014 (City Government of Tacloban, 2014).

Households
Used to describe those interviewed in most cases. This term was used since for many interviewees more than one household member would contribute to the interview. Details of the primary contributor are given in Appendix 2.

No Build Zones
Originally implemented by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources at the national government level, this is a 40-metre strip around vulnerable coastline areas where rebuilding of housing and infrastructure is not permitted (GMA, 2014). This is currently under review by the City Government of Tacloban, which has recommended that it is the elevation of the land, not the distance from the shoreline that affects vulnerability to flooding (City Government of Tacloban, 2014).
**UN**: The United Nations

**NGO**: Non-Governmental Organisation

**INGO**: International Non-Governmental Organisation

**MSF**: Médecins Sans Frontières

**WASH**: Water and Sanitation
SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND, AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

This section provides a short background to Typhoon Yolanda and its impact on Tacloban City, as well as outlining the focus of this research and the key research questions.

CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

A significant amount of focus in the humanitarian and development world has recently centred on the idea of ‘resilience’ both by donors (e.g. DFID, 2011) and in academia (e.g. Mitchell, 2012 and Béné, et. al. 2013) and how this can be increased at a local level to reduce the impact of disasters. Where there still appears to be a research gap is a focus on exactly what resilience looks like at a local community level and how an effected population might define this themselves. This paper attempts to investigate this gap and frame this investigation within the example of the Typhoon Yolanda, which hit the Philippines in November last year. The paper is based around primary research, collected during a two and a half week trip to Tacloban, in the region of Eastern Visayas in the Philippines during June this year. It also takes a look at the current discussions around resilience and resilience communities in recent policy and academic papers.

The paper is driven by three primary goals:

1. To add to the debate around what resilience looks like at a community level through the specific example of Tacloban City.
2. To propose practical solutions that may be effective in building resilience for those that are still recovery from the impact of Typhoon Yolanda.
3. To put forward recommendations that may be useful for agencies and actors working in humanitarian responses and resilience building in future post disaster contexts similar to those affecting the people of Tacloban.

TYPHOON YOLANDA AND TACLOBAN

At 4.40am, on November 8th, 2013 Typhoon Haiyan (known locally as Typhoon Yolanda) hit the Philippines. One of the strongest Typhoons ever recorded, over 16 million people were affected, (USAID 2014) including over four million people displaced, with over 6000 people loosing their lives and more than one million homes damaged or destroyed (DFID, 2014).

The region of Eastern Visayas suffered the most; accounting for almost 50 per cent of all houses damaged nationally, with the financial impact of Yolanda estimated to be in the region of USD 1.3bn (City Government of Tacloban (2014)). The capital of Eastern Visayas, Tacloban City, with a population of more than 220,000, suffered a greater loss of life than any other part of the Philippines (DEC, 2014). The financial impact on the city itself has been estimated at USD160 million.
Within Tacloban the area of San Jose was more of the areas most badly, due to its proximity to the coast and flat, low-lying terrain and high level of structurally vulnerable housing (City Government of Tacloban, 2014) and this area is the geographical focus of my research, with two Barangays (referred to as Barangay A and Barangay B) selected as my field study site.

Investigating at the situation in the Philippines after Yolanda, in what is still regarded as the early recovery phases (OCHA, 2014), has allowed this paper to investigate what space there is for a resilient programming in a humanitarian context. By focusing geographically on two Barangays the paper attempts to reflect through a specific example on what resilience looks like at a community level. The seasonality of the typhoon threat in the Philippines also adds another interesting element to this research, allowing the paper to consider if we can build resilience that reduces the impact of immediate hazards, while also planning long-term resilience and rehabilitation programmes.

It was established, through discussions with senior government officials and triangulation through discussions with humanitarian practitioners, that some areas had a very low NGO presence and large-scale or long-term government programmes had yet to begin or even be planned and Barangay A and B were two of these areas. This offered an interesting research opportunity, as it allowed me to focus my research on areas where there might be scope to

---

1 Further details on site selection are covered in Section Three of this paper.
feed my findings back into future development programmes, if and when they are developed.

THE RESILIENCE CONTEXT
As Simon Levine (2014) has so eloquently argued, resilience, a word with a history of over 500 years does not need to be defined yet again and while this is explored in the literature review, this paper does not attempt to add to that long history of definitions. Whilst it touches on the issue of resilience and the on-going ‘resilience debate’, currently so central to the humanitarian and development sectors, the central focus of this paper is and always aimed to be the people affected by the catastrophic events of Typhoon Yolanda. What it tries to add is a unique case study of what resilience means to a specific group of people heavily affected by a major disaster, what this means for the ‘resilience’ building programme in Tacloban and what lessons we may be able to learn to inform post-disaster people-focused resilience building elsewhere.

YOLANDA: KEY RESEARCH TO DATE
Sanderson and Willison’s (2014) DEC report on the humanitarian response to Yolanda found that much of the agency’s success was down to the resilience of the Filipino society itself. It was noted that compared to other recent disasters of a similar scale the recovery in the Philippines was rapid with many agencies stating the need to ‘keep up’ and be both flexible and relevant in their responses. They also found a desire amongst both government and agency staff to develop a ‘culture of resilience’ and to see the disaster as an opportunity to integrate resilience into all aspects of programming to reduce future risk. They found that vulnerable groups had been identified and supported well in the emergency phase and that the main challenges to be addressed were associated with livelihoods and shelter. For livelihoods the impact of Yolanda on the coconut and fishing industries was largest, with the provision of fishing boats and equipment essential. Shelter and resilience-building recommendations included the need for timely vulnerability-focused livelihoods assessments, CfW programmes that are relevant and productive,
building of reconstruction skills and full programme engagement with the community stakeholders.

A rapid review of the UK government’s response to Yolanda (ICAI, 2014) found that while DFID’s response had been rapid and effective overall during the emergency phase there was still scope for DFID to support the long-term resilience of vulnerable areas if they worked closely with the government at national and local level. The review also highlighted that due to its location and the national government’s will to build resilience there may be a real opportunity for the Philippines to be at the forefront of climate-change risk reduction and adaptation. In addition it was felt there was real scope for DFID to effectively support resilient livelihood opportunities that would decrease risk from climate change. In keeping with the debate outlined above there was also recognition that DIFD needed to reflect on what linking resilience and humanitarian aid means in the Philippines.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
This project focuses specifically on three central research questions that evolved through an exploration of the situation in Tacloban during the scoping stage of the research and through a survey of the key literature around resilience. Figure 3 below outlines these key questions, also indicating the evidence used to answer them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What were the post disaster priorities for building resilience for the residents of Barangay A and B?</td>
<td>Semi Structured Interviews with residents in Barangay A and B. Interviews with Barangay officials in Barangay A and B. Interview with government officials at City Hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What does Resilience mean to Barangay A and B as Compared with Current Policy and Academia?</td>
<td>As Research Question 1 and a literature review of current literature and policy on resilience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What steps can be taken to make the people of San Jose more resilient in the immediate term while also meeting long term recovery and development goals?</td>
<td>Propose practical actions that may be effective in building resilience, meeting immediate need and long-term goal based on the analysis of data collected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3: The three key Research Questions and how they will be answered
SECTION TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Resilience is now a widely-used, and even more widely-discussed, topic amongst humanitarian actors and academics (Levine, 2014). This literature review does not attempt to tackle all aspects of that discussion, but rather concentrates on the aspects of resilience that are most relevant to the focus of this research paper, namely: resilience and its place in humanitarian programming, resilience communities and how resilience links to recent thinking on shelter programming, given the vast shelter required in Tacloban.

THE EMERGENCE OF RESILIENCE

During the last two decades work around emergencies and development has focused more and more on the ability of those affected to respond to and recover from ‘shocks’ without the need for external assistance (Manyena, 2006). This has required a greater focus on ideas around risk reduction, rather than merely on people’s need or level of vulnerability (IFRC, 2004). More recently the concept of ‘resilience’ has become central to discussions about development, humanitarian aid and climate change adaptation (Paine and Levine, 2012) with the emergence of the term in both policy and academia. (Mitchell and Harris, 2012).

As DRR (disaster risk reduction) has progressively moved from a predict-and-prevent approach to one where building the capacity of those who are likely to face shocks and stresses is the priority, the importance of a ‘resilience approach’ has also grown (IFRC, 2012).

There is a wide agreement that the idea of resilience originates from the ecology world (Mayunga, 2007) with Holling (1973) frequently cited as the first to offer a ‘modern’ definition of the concept. For Holling (1973) a resilient ecosystem was one that had the ability to ‘absorb changes and still persist’. Since there have been a number of attempts to define the concept in relation to disaster, climate change and ecosystems, a summary of some of these definitions is offered in Figure 5.

FIGURE 4: ‘What Does Resilience Look Like?’
The Rockefeller Foundation (2009) has asked this question, specifically in response to climate change, highlighting how resilience can take many different forms depending on the context. In the Netherlands, extensive dams, dikes and floating homes have been developed to cope with higher sea levels and increased flooding. London’s resilience has been improved by the strengthening of the Thames River barrier system to manage sea-level and flooding, while in Perth, Australia, a large scale desalination plant has been built to manage drought and reduced precipitation. In comparison, they highlight a number of very low-cost community-focused strategies for increasing resilience. For example, Bangladesh’s evacuation plans and early-warning systems for cyclones have led to a reduction in deaths, even with an increase in cyclone frequency and severity while smallholding farmers in South African’s Limpopo Province use seasonal information on climate and market demand to determine crop selection, increasing resilience to variations in rainfall.
Resilience derives from the Latin term *resilio* meaning ‘to jump back’ (Klein, Nicholls and Thomalla, 2003) and it is in this context, i.e. ‘bouncing back’ post disaster, that it has been most widely used in current policy development (Béné et al, 2013).

The majority of major bilateral donors have adopted a resilience agenda over the last three to five years. DFID, since 2011, have used resilience as their core approach to tackling disasters. DFID (2011) aim to integrate ‘resilience policy’ into their work, strengthening their ability to provide a coherent approach to development and humanitarian programming across a number of sectors including climate change, conflict prevention and social protection (DFID, 2011). DFID (2011) also aim to use a holistic and cross-cutting approach to establish how humanitarian and development work can complement each other and improve networks and knowledge sharing across all aspects of its work. In this way, DFID hope to improve the cost-effectiveness of their programming through sharing of expertise and funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Approach to resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Cops (2013)</td>
<td>The capacity of communities in complex socio-ecological systems to learn, cope, adapt, and transform in the face of shocks and stresses (Mercy Cops, 2013, p. 3)</td>
<td>Understanding how systems support the communities Mercy Cops serve, and ensuring the poor and vulnerable have opportunities and options to become fully integrated into resilient systems. (Mercy Cops, 2013, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID (2012)</td>
<td>The ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth. (USAIDa, 2012, p. 1)</td>
<td>A focus on areas where chronic poverty intersects with shocks and stresses to produce recurrent crises and undermine development gains. Aim for a sustainable reduction in vulnerability and more inclusive growth through improving adaptive capacity, ability to address risk as well as social and economic conditions of vulnerable groups with a long-term aim of reducing humanitarian need. (USAIDb, 2012, p 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>The ability of countries, communities and</td>
<td>Adopting resilience as a core approach to tackling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td>households to manage change, by maintaining or <strong>transforming</strong> living standards in the face of shocks or stresses - such as earthquakes, drought or violent conflict - without compromising their long-term prospects. (DFID, 2011, p. 6)</td>
<td>disasters. The pulling together and integration of DRR, climate change adaptation and social protection in DFID programming. Recognition that resilience can exist and be built at different levels, from household up to global.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Good' Resilience Béné, Godfrey Wood, Newsham and Davies (2012)</td>
<td>The ability of a <strong>system</strong> to <strong>accommodate</strong> positively adverse changes and shocks, simultaneously at different scales and with consideration of all different components and agents of the system, through the complementarities of its absorptive, <strong>adaptive</strong> and <strong>transformative</strong> capacities (Béné et al, 2012, p. 48).</td>
<td>Emphasises that resilience is not always good, highlights risk of the poorest being left behind and that resilience is <strong>not</strong> the new ‘catch all’ panacea. Potential for resilience to be a term that links disciplines effectively, highlighting ‘politics’ of resilience and significance of power relationships in resilience programming. (Béné et al, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Resilience Rockefeller Foundation (2009)</td>
<td>The capacity of an individual, community, or institution to <strong>dynamically</strong> and effectively respond to <strong>shifting</strong> climate impact circumstances while continuing to function at an acceptable level. Simply put, it is the ability to survive and recover from the effects of climate change (Rockefeller Foundation, 2009, p. 1).</td>
<td>Argues that no one individual can be resilient to all potential outcomes alone so resilience programming must be <strong>systemic</strong> and multi-sectorial. ‘Climate change resilience must be a part of the plans, infrastructure, and day-to-day operations of existing <strong>institutions and systems</strong>.’ (Rockefeller Foundation, 2009, p.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem Resilience The Resilience Alliance (2005)</td>
<td>The capacity of an ecosystem to tolerate disturbance without collapsing into a qualitatively different state that is controlled by a different set of <strong>processes</strong>. A resilient ecosystem can withstand shocks and rebuild itself when</td>
<td>Natural systems are inherently resilient but that their capacity can be both degraded and enhanced. Key to resilience in a social-ecological system is <strong>diversity</strong>, which can provide functional redundancy. Resilience can cause unsustainable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
necessary. Resilience in social **systems** has the added capacity of humans to **anticipate** and **plan** for the future (Manyena, 2006).

use of resources, loss of biodiversity and inflexible or ‘closed’ institutions (Resilience Alliance, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Disaster Resilience</th>
<th>Mayunga (2007)</th>
<th>The capacity or ability of a community to <strong>anticipate</strong>, <strong>prepare</strong> for, respond to and <strong>recover quickly</strong> from impacts of disaster (Mayunga, 2007).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focuses on the community’s ability to cope with, learn from and **adapt** to hazards. Resilient communities should be **organised** so that the effects of a disaster are minimal and recovery is quick (Mayunga, 2007).

**FIGURE 5: A summary of a range of definitions of resilience to date**

Figure 5 shows just a cross-section of definitions of resilience, drawing on material from donors, operational agencies, academia, resilience-focused think tanks and foundations. While the definitions differ there are key patterns. Resilience seen as system driven must integrate both the community and multiple sectors in its approach, have a long-term aspect and should be accepting of and adaptable to change. There is also a consistent emphasis on resilience being key to dealing with ‘shocks’ and ‘stresses’. Béné et al’s (2012) definition of ‘good’ resilience recognises the importance of system dynamics and how they can be affected at multiple scales and by multiple actors. However it is perhaps dangerous to insist that resilience is only ‘good’ if it tackles all elements outlined here and at all scales. An intervention programme could build resilience at a household level (Venton 2012, for example) but Béné et al (2012) would not define this as ‘good resilience’ if it did not improve the overall resilience of the wider community. While there are many parallels between resilience and previous capacity-building approaches such as the suitable livelihoods model (Levine, 2014; Twigg, 2009), which argues that resilience is a broader concept that goes further than the idea of capacity building because it goes beyond the specific strategies and behaviours, that previous capacity building models have used, to reducing risk. Resilience works on multiple scales and is complex and multi-dimensional. Different levels and features of resilience are needed depending on the severities and types of risk, stress, shock or change faced. Certainly, there must be scope for resilience to work at different levels and that is a key aspect that this paper investigates - from the household level to the role of resilience in regional redevelopment policy.

**RESILIENCE AND HUMANITARIANISM**

While traditionally resilience has been seen as a long-term approach to development programming (Kellett and Mitchell, 2014) there has been an
increasing debate about its role in short-term humanitarian action\(^2\) as well. Levine and Mosel (2014) have asked, ‘What is the relationship between humanitarian action and resilience-building?’ [p. 6] and if a post-disaster context is the right time to be making structural changes through resilience programming, a relevant question given the early recovery-phase context in which my research took place. An MSF blog (Whittall et al, 2014) argued that resilience has become no more than “a new buzzword of a floundering aid\(^3\) system, pushed by donors increasingly looking for cost effectiveness and a way to marry all components of aid to a process of state [capacity] building”. They argue that while initially resilience was about resisting and ‘bouncing back’ it is now being promoted as a concept that can bridge the gap between humanitarian and development work, and it is this that troubles them in particular. Whittall et al (2014) summarise their three key concerns as follows:

1. **The problem with the state**: Aid (and subsequently resilient programming) has become about building state capacity, raising the question of whose resilience will the aid community attempt to support? In a situation where the authorities promote policy that is detrimental to the most vulnerable will international aid agencies still attempt to build resilience?

2. **An excuse for inaction**: Resilience represents a shift during a time of financial crisis towards a ‘value for money’ approach, however they argue it has become a mixture of ‘all things to everybody’, about reducing vulnerability, capacity building and strengthening sustainably. This risks the basics being overlooked, with ‘building resilience’ becomes an excuse for inaction on the basic humanitarian imperatives of reducing suffering and savings lives.

3. **A lack of evidence**: The humanitarian sector is increasingly evidence driven. However, there is little evidence of what sort of ‘resilience’ approaches would be more effective than those currently in place. The risk is that the resilience agenda is driven by what is largely a political concept, without a real desire to objectively measure its benefits and potential negative impacts.

In summary, Whittall et al’s (2014) argument is that humanitarian work should be purposely left outside resilient and sustainable objectives, that humanitarian and development aid are ‘deliberately in contradiction’ and

\(^2\) ‘Humanitarian action’ is generally accepted to refer to the action and aid intended to save lives, reduce suffering, protect and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of disasters and is based on the ideas of independence, impartiality, humanity and neutrality (GHA, 2013)

\(^3\) Whittall et al (2014) seem to use ‘aid’ here as an overarching term to cover all types of international response by NGOs.
therefore any concept, such as resilience, that tries to bring them together’ will be [more] problematic than beneficial.

In response Harvey (2014a) has argued, that while Whittall et al (2014) are right to question the lack of evidence on resilience, humanitarian work cannot exist in isolation; and that there is space for long-term resilience building. Indeed, Harvey (2014) points out that many of the humanitarian contexts that MSF are involved in are long term, 30 years in South Sudan, for example. Whittall (2014) has responded that MSF are interested in the here and now, not in building long-term capacity, which they are happy to leave to others, and makes the valuable point that long-term resilience building must not be done at ‘the expense of effective responses today’. However, as Harvey (2014b) points out, many agencies have always had a multi-mandate approach that tries to link development and humanitarian work, so it is not entirely clear why now, with the advent of ‘resilience’, this would start to affect humanitarian capacity.

For Labbé (2014) the danger is not so much about humanitarian agencies engaging in resilience (which he rightly argues is a worthy aim) but that resilience might become the latest ‘context-blind diktat, a cover-up for a donor-imposed one-size-fits-all approach’ that ignores the different contexts in which the aid industry operates. Labbé (2014) also highlights that MSF’s criticisms are largely based on the role resilience has in a conflict situation and that as yet the fundamental differences between humanitarian work in disasters and in conflict have not been clearly articulated within the resilience debate. While Labbé (2014) agrees with Whittall (2014) that resilience building in conflict situations does threaten the impartially of humanitarian work this same risk does not necessarily exist in a ‘peacetime natural disaster’, especially when ‘well-meaning’ governments and well-planned projects are in place.

For Levine (2014b), Whittall et al (2014) are right to argue that a resilience approach should not be the basis for humanitarian programming. Levine (2014b) argues, however, that this is different from keeping development and humanitarian programming ‘at arm’s length’. Levine (2014b) agrees that it is for the development sector to strengthen people’s ability to deal with what ‘life throws their way’ but when crises are long-lasting or frequent there must also be a certain level of engagement in humanitarian programming. If not, there is a risk that development and humanitarian strategies could undermine one another.

The arguments raised by Whittall et al (2014) highlight that resilience should not be unequivocally accepted as a positive movement and, as Béné, et al (2012) have argued, those working in resilience should keep in mind that it is not a universal good, that both ‘good’ resilience and ‘bad’ resilience exist, but defining exactly what ‘good’ resilience looks like is not always straightforward
and can differ depending on context (Levine, 2014a; Rockefeller Foundation, 2009; Levine and Mosel, 2014). It is important that any resilience programme is relevant to the community with which it is working, and for Twigg (2009) a resilience approach is a useful one because it places an emphasis on the community and it is resilience at the community level which this paper explores.

A RESILIENT COMMUNITY

While no community can ever be 100 per cent resilient (Geis, 2000), for Hirunsalee et al (2012) to create the most resilient community possible is to find ways in which those affected can live as safely as possible during a disaster and the recovery phase, to continue their daily lives as usual and to be able to reach this level as possible. For Heijmans (2013) what makes a community resilient differs from situation to situation and as such resilience should be operationalised in different ways depending on this context. She argues that a resilient community is one that has the ability to adapt, prepare and live through stresses and shocks while not undermining basic assets. However what it is that makes communities resilient differs from place to place and, while a common understanding of resilience is useful as a basis for programming, this must be adapted to the specific context to be effective. Twigg (2009) agrees that every community, project and location is unique, but suggests that for any community to be resilient it should have the capacity to:

- **Anticipate, minimise and absorb potential stresses or destructive forces through adaptation or resistance**
- **Manage or maintain certain basic functions and structures during disastrous events**

A safe and resilient community

1. **Knowledgeable and healthy:** It has the ability to assess, manage, and monitor its own risks. It can learn new skills and build on past experiences.

2. **Organised:** It has the capacity to identify problems, establish priorities and act.

3. **Connected:** It has relationships with external actors (family friends, faith groups, government) who provide a wider supportive environment and supply goods/services when needed.

4. **Infrastructure and services:** It has strong housing, transport, power, water, sanitation systems and the ability to maintain, repair and renovate them.

5. **Economic opportunities:** It has a diverse range of employment opportunities, income and financial services. It is flexible, resourceful and has the capacity to accept uncertainty and responds (proactively) to change.

6. **Manages its natural assets:** It recognises their value and has the ability to protect, enhance and maintain them.

**FIGURE 6:** Adapted from IFRC, *Characteristics of a Safe and Resilient Community* (2011, p. 7)
Kafle (2010) believes that a resilient community is one with:

- Community-based organisations with trained volunteers;
- Hazard, vulnerability and capacity assessment completed and socialised in the community;
- Community risk-reduction plans formulated and implemented;
- Involvement of women, children and vulnerable groups in decision-making processes;
- Integration of community plans into local development planning;
- Linkage development with local government agencies and non-government organisations.

(Kafle, 2010, p. 28)

While this definition seems quite specific, particularly the emphasis on ‘trained volunteers’, (would skilled community members not add to resilience just as much if paid, for example?) both Twigg’s (2009) and Kafle’s (2010) descriptions echo many elements of the definitions in Figure 5, specifically the ability to anticipate, adapt, integrate and link with other actors both within and outside the community. Communities do not exist in isolation. A community’s resilience levels will be affected by external influences, including public infrastructure, and political and socio-economic links on larger scales (Twigg, 2009). Within the community itself the different scales and relationships must also be considered (Levine and Mosel, 2014). While resilience is promoted at the household, community and macro-system level, the relationship between different scales within a community has largely not been investigated. Do ‘resilient communities have fewer vulnerable people’, for example, and which scale should be the priority for international aid agencies? Furthermore, community-level resilience programming in post-disaster contexts must keep in mind that at a local level, people will often have more to contend with than just natural hazards, including potential poor governance and unemployment, disease, crime and conflict (Heijmans, 2013).

For Denkens (2009) local knowledge plays a vital role in community-level resilience, particularly in terms of disaster mitigation and preparedness. Furthermore, a resilient community is one that does not just have the ability to recover after a disaster but is also able to use local knowledge to seize opportunities that disasters can present, and in turn reduce the risk from future disasters (Vallance, 2011). The relationship between its people, parts and leaders is vital in doing this successfully. It is also important to be locally sensitive when engaging with communities in resilience programming (Coles and Buckle, 2004), specifically around the language used, while aid practitioners and donors routinely assign labels such as ‘vulnerability’, ‘disaster’, ‘climate change’ and ‘resilience’, the notions may have little meaning locally (Heijmans, 2013).
Beyond shelter: A holistic and people-focused approach to resilience

The physical destruction caused by Yolanda, particularly to housing, was on a huge scale, meaning shelter provision is a vital part of the recovery and rebuilding process in Tacloban. The cross-sector approach resilience programming takes ties in well with much of the recent thinking on the need for post-disaster shelter provision to encompass more than just the physical structure of a roof over a family's head (Corsellis and Vitale, 2005). As Shilderman and Lyons (2013) have argued, agencies should look beyond just the delivery of safe housing in their response. In order to avoid natural hazard (such as Yolanda) becoming disasters again, programmes should aim to increase the resilience of the people themselves, not just the infrastructure. This requires a focus on improving social capital, livelihood opportunities and a reconstruction process that involves those affected (Shilderman and Lyons, 2013).

Shelter can provide a critical platform for health, livelihoods, protection, water, sanitation, and hygiene. Therefore, shelter, even if it seems the most apparent need, is never adequately addressed without consideration of these other aspects (Davis, 2011). As Davis (2011) emphasised, “shelter is not merely about housing, but also about accommodating other activities, from workshops to worship, to community gatherings, clinics, libraries, and so on” [p. 13]. Even a programme that is focused on the construction of shelters, when adequate, should also provide other instrumental components, which support basic needs and improve lives (Corsellis and Vitale, 2005).

The need for practitioners to look beyond shelter is emphasised from the global level down by Babister (2010), who has suggested a number of solutions to improve the holistic nature of shelter programming at the global cluster level. These include: a more systematic approach to facilitating rapid assessments, working with national authorities and other humanitarian sectors, avoiding working in silos, and having systematic and transparent funding mechanisms during and between emergency responses. Alexander (2011) believes that the lack of coordination between shelter and other sectors in humanitarian responses has caused mismanaged and uncoordinated assistance, which results in both gaps in aid and overlapping activities. Opportunities for disaster recovery will be restricted if the focus remains on solely providing housing (Alexander, 2011). According to Corsellis and Vitale (2005), “[the] responses should instead be based on a holistic interpretation of the need for shelter”. Housing goes beyond the traditional provision of a ‘roof’. A holistic approach to disaster-relief efforts improves the effectiveness of the response by strengthening collaboration and communication among sectors. The same approach is emphasised in the Sphere Standards, where the need to coordinate across different scales is also emphasised, echoing the apparent strengths of the resilience approach:
“Coordination with local authorities, other responding agencies and community-based and representative organisations is also necessary to ensure that needs are met, that efforts are not duplicated and that the quality of shelter, settlement and non-food item interventions is optimised”. The Sphere Project (2011, p.85)

KEY THEMES OF RESILIENCE AND FRAMING THE RESEARCH APPROACH

From the resilience literature and definitions discussed above a number of key themes have emerged which help to frame the research approach.

- Given the community-level nature of this research community-focused programming is obviously a key theme to explore.
- Early scoping research into the Philippines suggested that it would be essential to investigate livelihood adaptability.
- The seasonal nature of the flood and typhoon threat in Tacloban make shocks and stresses an important factor to consider in long-term planning, and a fundamental characteristic of any resilience planning.
- An holistic approach to programming, both shelter and other types, must also be considered given the great shelter need in Tacloban and the cross-cutting nature of Yolanda's impact.
SECTION THREE: THE RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT, DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This section outlines the research approach taken in this paper, why this approach was used and the challenges encountered during the process, with particular focus on the limitations of a short research trip and of investigating such a contested term as ‘resilience’.

RESEARCH FOCUS

The initial research approach was to identify potential interviewees and a possible field site through NGOs active in the Tacloban area. This approach was planned for four reasons:

1. Initial interest in focusing on how effective the humanitarian response had been (working through an agency might allow me to measure their impact by engaging with their beneficiaries).
2. Unknowns about how accessible interviewees might be in Tacloban City suggested that working through established NGOs would be a good way to guarantee interviewees.
3. An NGO might be able to provide resources such as transport and a translator, whilst also ensuring my personal safety and security in the field.
4. It was anticipated that with the international NGO presence so large in Tacloban that there would be a need for NGO permission, or at the very least awareness, of any research carried out.

However, much of this reasoning was challenged during the scoping stage of the research. It became apparent that Tacloban was a safe, secure place to work with affordable and safe transport, negating the need for the support of an NGO to access interviewees. Additionally the presence of an active regional government in Tacloban presented the alternative opportunity of establishing a field site with their support. Most interestingly, despite the wide international and NGO presence during the early emergency phase, there appeared to be a number of areas where vulnerable groups were not receiving any significant support. It was established (through discussions with senior government officials, contacts made through existing networks with people living in these areas and triangulation through discussions with humanitarian practitioners) that some areas had a very low NGO presence and large-scale or long-term government programmes had yet to begin or even be planned. Working in these areas presented a good research opportunity for a number of reasons:

1) It would allow my research to be carried out largely independently. No NGOs were working in the area and the low level of government presence in the area would not influence access or the data collected.
2) The lack of government or NGO programmes in the area would mean that any findings around the needs of the community could be fed
back to government and NGO contacts, which might be beneficial to both them and those living in the research area.

3) There would be less possibility of those being interviewed experiencing (Van de Walle/OCHA, 2010) assessment fatigue which could affect both the interviewees wellbeing and the validity of the results (IASC, 2011).

THE FIELD SITE SELECTION
Owing to the time constraints of the field research (two and a half weeks) and of the overall research length it was decided it would be impossible to collect and analyse enough data to offer a true picture of the situation for the entirety of the Tacloban area. The area of San Jose was quickly identified as a potential part of Tacloban to focus on. The location of San Jose as well as its low-lying landscape meant that it was one of the mostly widely-affected areas of Tacloban.

Within San Jose the following selection criteria was then used to select the primary research area:
• A field site that was easily accessible with good security.
• An area where my presence would have the minimum or no impact on the security of the community in which I was working as well as any agency and/or government staff with which we were engaged.
• An area where research findings might add value for the community and actors with which we were engaged and, if possible, the largely-affected community within Tacloban.
• An area that would be representative of the wider San Jose area in terms of challenges faced, demographic and recovery phase.
• An area where there had not previously been academic research carried out in order to avoid participation fatigue amongst interviewees.

Following initial discussions with government officials and in-country staff six potential Barangay within San Jose were identified that met the above criteria most closely. Initial scoping interviews were then carried out with the Barangay Captains in all six areas. As a result two Barangays were chosen where no academic research had yet been carried out and where they appeared to have the lowest level of NGO programming of the six. In this way it was hoped to maximise the opportunity for independent research and the potential for such research to feed into any NGO programmes that might be developed in the future.
DATA COLLECTION

In total 43 interviews were carried out during the research and these are detailed in Appendix 2 and included interviews both within Barangay A and B and outside of the primary field site.

The interviews undertaken outside of the field site were used to establish the field sites and to try and triangulate the evidence found in the research area and ascertain whether this was representative of the city at large. Furthermore, interacting with NGOs running effective long-term programmes in other areas of Tacloban also informed a number of the recommendations presented later on in this paper.

Initial NGO interviews were arranged through pre-existing networks developed before going in country. Interviews with government staff were also organised before the trip due to the obvious key role the government had in the rebuilding process and as they were likely to provide access to the Barangays in which I expected to be working. The initial interviews with Barangay Captains were arranged through a senior government official, who also provided transport to and between these interviews. Interviews arranged with affected households outside of my research area were done with the help of another researcher who was working on a similar project in another area of Tacloban. This supporting data was vital in developing the focus of the research and is included in the Table of Interviews (Appendix 2).

The identification of interviewees in Barangay A and B was done through a number of techniques. Purposive sampling\(^4\) was done with the assistance of my translator who knew both the research brief and was a resident of Barangay A so was well placed to assist with this. Given the short time available for the research Snowball sampling was used as an effective way of identifying interviewees quickly.\(^5\)

Efforts were made to keep the sample as representative as possible; ensuring a gender balance throughout both an all-male and all-female focus group, a range of ages of interviewees were targeted and that the interviewees were geographically spread by visiting a new area of the field site each day.

---

\(^4\) Where those with key knowledge on the topic under investigation are targeted for interviews. (Schutt, 2011)

\(^5\) Given that we were the first research team to carry out work in this area (according to the Barangay Captain in Barangay A and many of those I interviewed) there was a lot of interest in our presence meaning more snowball sampling was done than initially planned
RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

Time constraints
In order to afford opportunities for comparison, the proposal of investigating two field sites, one within Tacloban City and one in a more rural area, was explored and initial contact made with government officials and NGOs in this area. However this idea was rejected again due to the time constraints and because of the strong contacts already established in Tacloban City before the field visit which would provide the support to identify a strong field site quickly, maximising the time available for relevant data collection. Had a longer field trip been possible this comparison would have made for an interesting focus.

The time limitations on the trip also meant that it was imperative the field work was focused on those affected by Yolanda. Although this was achieved and a good number of households were interviewed, there was a lack of opportunity to speak with more NGOs and government staff working in the region, which would have given greater scope to triangulating my findings. Again a longer field trip would have allowed for this.

Overcoming the ‘resilience’ research challenge.
It became clear early in the research that the majority of those interviewed within Barangay A and B were not familiar with the term ‘resilience’. While an interesting finding in itself it also presented a research challenge. How do we talk about a word that those we are speaking with do not know or do not understand? My approach was to identify a phrase locally, through discussion with my translator, which would help to explain to the interviewees what I was trying to find out. The appropriate phrase was; ‘Mga Pamaagi para dire na duro nga maapektuhan hin mga kalamidad’ which literally translates as ‘Ways to do in order to be less affected during calamities’ meaning, ‘things that can be done in order to be less affected during disasters’. This became an incredibly useful phrase, enabling me to explain to interviewees what I was interested in and ask questions on the same. In terms of talking about the key aspects of resilience identified in the literature it was important not to ask leading questions and to avoid buzzwords or development lingo as much as possible. For example, rather than ask about ‘What long-term development should be put in place to help make the community sustainable or resilient?’ I might ask ‘Is there anything else you think could be done moving forward?’

This challenge turned into a strength of the research. We were engaging with a group about resilient issues who had no preconception about what the term meant or what a resilience programme ‘should’ look like. The interviewees had no preconceived notions about what they thought they should say or might want me to hear. Further, through the process of having to break down the term myself into ideas that would be relevant and understandable to the interviewee I probably ended up collecting more detailed data than if I had simply been asking, ‘What makes you resilient?’
It also became apparent early in the research process that the ideas of ‘safety’ and ‘security’ were both vital to the interviewees and also terms that were used frequently, so I was able to engage the interviewees about resilience through these familiar terms, for example asking ‘Is there anything that is more important than others in making you feel safe and secure?’ or ‘Is there anything missing that would make you feel safer if you had it?’

---

6 It should be noted that the interview approach, selection of questions and terms used was developed carefully to make sure questions could be understood while not being patronising or condescending to the interviewees, which of course had to be avoided (Bless et al, 2007)
SECTION 4: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This section outlines the key findings of the paper, analyses the information collected through the data-coding process and directly addresses the research questions and to what extent these questions can be answered.

KEY FINDINGS

The central findings of the paper our outlined below. It is worth noting that these findings relate only to the area in which my research was carried out, they are accurate in so far as they represent the findings within the two Barangays in which I worked. As noted however interviews carried out within other areas of Tacloban suggest that these findings may be representative of the wider area, especially throughout San Jose.

1. Resilience for those affected by Yolanda is not something that can easily be measured qualitatively. It is not just based around physical assets but also feeling safe and secure, having independence and being included in the rehabilitation process.

2. A house that is perceived as strong and expensive in relative terms (concrete, large in size, etc) is central to the affected population's definition of what feeling secure (resilient) is.

3. Access to work (livelihoods) is both a key aspect of allowing people to meet basic needs and a central component of making those affected by Yolanda feel less vulnerable to future shocks.

4. Cash Transfers (especially when unconditional) can be very effective in allowing those affected to start to rebuild their assets as well as to meet basic needs in the immediate post-disaster phase.

5. The huge scale of Yolanda’s impact meant that community-level support networks that might in other situations have enabled people to build back more quickly were not in place during the emergency phase, meaning most of those building back did so individually (at a family or household level).

6. A perceived lack of communication from government, and in some cases NGOs, left those affected by Yolanda feeling unsupported and vulnerable.

7. Using development terms such as resilience and livelihoods is not always the best way to frame recovery programmes, especially when trying to engage with the affected population. They can leave the target beneficiaries feeling isolated and confused about the programmes aims and goals.
8. Resilience for those affected by Yolanda is not just about long-term planning and development; it is also about feeling safer and more secure when the next typhoon hits or the rainy season starts again. This represents a disconnection between the findings in this case study and much of the literature and policy around resilience.

ANSWERING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS
Below I directly address the three research questions outlined in Section One. While there is inevitably some overlap to the three sections this structure adds clarity to the research analysis, building towards suggestions for building resilience in Barangay A and B under the final research question.

WHAT WERE THE POST DISASTER PRIORITIES FOR BUILDING RESILIENCE FOR THE RESIDENTS OF BARANGAY A AND B?
Seven key themes emerged during the interviewee analysis in answer to this question. Figure 7 below shows the frequency of references to each theme as well as the direct references to the word ‘resilience’ by way of comparison.\(^7\) While there was little direct reference to the word ‘resilience’ at the household level it was apparent that many of their priorities could be interpreted as efforts to build resilience, with a specific emphasis on a safer and more secure house and building both financial capacity and livelihood opportunities. These are explored in more detail below.

| FIGURE 7: Priorities for residence of Barangay A and B by interviewee group |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Code                        | Households (24) | Barangay Officials (6) | Local government officials (2) |
|                             | Primary | Secondary | Primary | Secondary | Primary | Secondary |
| ‘Resilience’*               | 0       | 3         | 6       | 0         | 2       | 0         |
| Safe, strong and secure house | 16      | 4         | 1       | 4         |         |           |
| Financial Security          | 18      | 3         | 5       | 1         | 0       | 2         |
| Access to Livelihoods       | 13      | 8         | 6       | 1         | 2       | 0         |
| Community-focused Support** | 4       | 12        | 0       | 4         |         |           |
| Independence                | 14      | 5         | 0       | 0         | 0       | 0         |
| Feeling included in government planning | 11  | 5         | 0       | 2         | 0       | 1         |
| Meeting immediate/day-to-day need | 15  | 3         | 2       | 4         | 0       | 0         |

*this is a direct use of the word rather than discussions of resilience under a different name/phrase
**this refers to programming that is directly focused and specific to the needs of Barangay A and B

\(^7\) Theme was coded as primary when it was a central theme to the discussion or something repeatedly mentioned as a concern/priority. Themes were coded as secondary, when present in the interview transcript and highlighted as a concern/priority/factor but not repeatedly.
Shelter Needs: A Strong and Secure House

There was undoubtedly a huge need for shelter provision in Barangay A and B. Of the 24 households interviewed 14 had had their house completely destroyed while all had been damaged to some degree. Of these, 20 had rebuilt their home to some extent, while four were living in temporary accommodation, provided by friends or family.

Many of those that had rebuilt had done so using a mixture of recycled material (from other houses destroyed in the Typhoon and hand-outs received from NGOs during the emergency phase. All but three households interviewed had received some CGI sheeting from an NGO but these had not been enough to completely rebuild a house but had all been used to partly rebuild. In some cases where damage was partial the CGI sheets had been sufficient to repair the house to the same standard as previously. The three households which did not receive the CGI sheets had not been present while the distribution was taking place because they were sheltering with family outside San Jose. This explains the anomaly to the norm but also suggests that there may need to be a reassessment of the area covered during distributions and the duration of support provided to capture those who were unable to remain within the immediate vicinity of the disaster and may have missed out on early support.

Although many had managed to rebuild to some level the need for improved housing was still very evident and also seen as a priority by those interviewed. Many households were living in shelters that were ‘not as safe or as large as the house we had permanently, it is not so strong, if there is another Typhoon, like Yolanda, I may see my house washed away again’.

16 households saw a ‘strong home’ as a priority and ‘strong’ equated to a concrete house. A number of houses had been previously constructed of a mixture of materials and in many places it was only the concrete that remained, reinforcing the idea with the residents that concrete was the material of choice as it ‘can withstand the strength of Yolanda’. Interestingly one household had a different approach. The father, who had built the house said ‘I have not used expensive materials, I have made a bigger house, but not an expensive one, then, if there is another storm it can be washed away again and I will not lose so much’.

Financial Security

Financial security was identified as key to building resilience by the majority of those interviewed. Yolanda had affected their financial capacity in a number of ways:

- The damage or destruction of their house meant that they were having to spend financial reserves to rebuild and in many cases were also having to spend time rebuilding where normally they would have been working and bringing in an income.

Financial Security
Household income had also been hugely affected by Yolanda. Many of those interviewed were fishermen and had had their boats destroyed by the Typhoon. Furthermore, the areas in which they fished had in some cases been destroyed or damaged, meaning that there were fewer fish available even when boats were intact or had been provided. A number of those interviewed were tricycle or cab drivers and had suffered as their vehicles had been damaged or destroyed. This may have been a particular issue in the San Jose area, as its location next to the airport meant that cab driving was a key form of employment.

A number of those interviewed owned Sari-Sari stores (sari-sari means ‘variety’ in Tagalog, hence a ‘convenience store’, often attached to a house) and highlighted how their business had been affected in a number of ways. During the Typhoon itself the infrastructure of the store and the goods within had in many cases been severely damaged. This was exemplified by looting that had taken place in the immediate aftermath of the disaster. Interestingly those interviewed, while frustrated by the loss they had suffered were largely not directly frustrated at those who had looted. ‘I do not blame them, they had no choice. After Yolanda many people had nothing, this was the only way for them to get something, to get some food, perhaps. If the government or others could have provided more it would not have been so much [looting]’.

An age divide was revealed with the older interviewees, in general, having a greater need for financial support. It is likely that among the older population many people were no longer working resulting in less financial reserve for rebuilding. Furthermore, some of the older interviewees stated that they had to hire help to rebuild, as physically this is not something they could do, further reducing their financial capacity.

A cash hand-out provided to the majority of those affected by Yolanda by a faith-based NGO in the few weeks after the Typhoon was identified as vital in allowing people to rebuild or repair their home. “We would not have been able to have a home without the money from [the NGO]”, stated one interviewee, while another agreed that: “This money allowed us to build something that is like our old home; without this money I do not know where we would be right now”. These statements are both representative of the importance of this support to the majority of those I interviewed. There was, however, one household which had not received the money. This was interesting in two ways: first, the size and quality of the house he had built was inferior to many of those that had received the cash hand-out, indicating the importance of the hand-out in people’s ability to rebuild; second, there was confusion from the household why he had not received the cash. This was representative of a pattern throughout relating to NGO and government response, with many households unclear about what NGO and government

---

8 The handout varied in value between 12000 and 15000PHP (270-340USD) depending on the size of family.
projects were in place, or were due to be running and how they were targeted. In both CfW focus group interviews there was a lack of clarity as to how participants had been selected. One participants stated ‘It is just those that seem keen, and have heard about it and so go and sign up’ while another believed ‘It is those that know the Barangay Captain that are selected; it is his friends, they are the ones of these projects’. The Barangay Captain himself had stated that selection for CfW was done based ‘on need’ but it seemed some of those taking part were not aware of this.

*Livelihoods*

As already indicated access to livelihoods was a key priority in building resilience for those within Barangay A and B. Over half (13 households) outlined this as a primary factor with all but three houses agreeing it was important to some degree. This is also closely linked to both the need for financial security and the theme of independence, with many feeling that improved opportunities to work and earn would allow them to make their own decisions about if, when and where to rebuild their homes and their lives, and reduce the need to decide between spending in one key area over another as a coping strategy.

There were a number of cases where a lack of livelihood opportunities had severely affected not just a household’s quality of life but also their resilience to future shocks. One fisherman, a father, supporting a pregnant wife and three other children explained: ‘I used to have enough money to pay for all my children to eat and for their [school] fees and also to save some money; now I have to sometimes decide between the two [and there is] no money left [to save]’. Having lost his boat in Yolanda he now had to go out on a friend’s boat, meaning they would share the catch and therefore any income made from it. He had had three boats beforehand and estimated it would take ‘many, many years, maybe 20’ to have enough money to purchase just one boat. This was echoed elsewhere with some people having to decide between trying to rebuild their home (which takes time and money) or investing in the tools needed to secure a livelihood (such as fishing equipment). ‘I cannot do both, I must rebuild my home first, then if I have the money it will be for [buying] a boat, but this will [be in] a long time’.

For others the impact of livelihoods had been less direct. One man interviewed worked as a beautician and described the impact of Yolanda on his business as being indirect. He travelled to people’s homes to work so did not have a ‘shop’ or ‘store’ that could be damaged but with people losing so much they ‘maybe do not have the money now’ to invest in services such as his. More directly he described how he had fewer clients now as ‘many of them have been washed away’ in Yolanda – a reminder of the great human loss that Yolanda caused. It is important to remember that this is the context in which people are trying to recover and build their resilience. Almost all those I interviewed had been affected by loss because of Yolanda, sometimes family,
sometimes close friends, and the potential impact of this, while difficult to measure (and not the direct focus of this paper), should not be ignored.

Of the three households that did not mention the importance of access to livelihoods, two were elderly couples that were receiving support from family from outside of Tacloban and therefore may not have prioritised livelihoods for themselves due to already having some financial security. Another not to discuss livelihoods was a young mother living in a makeshift shelter on the side of the road who was very focused on finding safer and more secure housing for her children, with this aim dominating the interview.

**Community and Family Support**

A key theme that emerged in the research was the role of community and family support in recovery and resilience building at the household level. To add some context here we must discuss the idea of ‘Bayanihan’. This Filipino tradition refers to the way in which a community, when working together can overcome seemingly impossible obstacles (DSWD, 2004). It is seen as a key part of Filipino culture and of how communities can pull together to overcome adversity. While it may be traditional the evidence from my research suggested that it was not something that was universally present, at least during the early recovery phase. Only three of the households interviewed outlined community support as vital to recover, while nine households referred to the inability of the community to support them and their own lack of ability to support others in the community. The findings suggest that the sheer scale of Yolanda’s impact meant that community-level support networks that might in other situations have enable people to build back more quickly were not in place during the emergency phase, meaning that most of those building back did so individually (at a family or household level).

Many of those interviewed spoke about how they wished they could have done more to help others but they just did not have the means to do so as resources for themselves were so scarce, and for the same reason they did not receive community support.

‘No, no I got no help at all, there was so much to do, so many people lost their own homes, their own houses were also damaged, people had to rebuild those first.’

‘I wish I could have done more to help but my house of course was damaged also; we lost a lot, as did many people; we all had to rebuild as best as we could.’

---

9 Originally the term refers to the process whereby neighbours would help relocate a family by picking up their entire house and moving it to a new location, but it has now taken on the wider meaning of supporting and working together as a community
At a family level, there was a similar pattern. Almost half of the households interviewed outlined family support as vital to recovery; however, a quarter of households discussed how other family members did not have the ability to support them, while some stated that they could not support their own families, beyond those within their own household.

This suggests that the way in which community-focused resilience building is developed through the emergency and early recovery phase must be carefully managed, especially during disasters of the scale of Yolanda, which had such severe impact on the capacity of the entire community. In these cases people’s priorities seem understandably to be to meet basic needs for one’s own home and own immediate family before thinking on a community-wide scale, so this may mean that any resilience-focused programming during this early stage needs to focus on the household level, at least as a starting place.

It should be noted also that family support did play a key role in the recovery of a number of families, with some stating that it would have been impossible for them to recover at all had it not been for family help. Some went to stay with other family members outside of Tacloban during Yolanda: ‘I was lucky that I could move away [when Yolanda hit] and stay with my niece. Otherwise I do not know what would have happened to me’; while others remained living within Barangay A or B but with family while they worked out if and how to rebuild their own home.

It is interesting to note that although there was a lack of community help it was still seen as of importance to 16 of the households interviewed (four as of primary importance, 12 as secondary). This suggests that if the capacity of the community to respond itself is strengthened there could be a key role here in recovery. It also shows the link between household and community-level resilience, as discussed by Twigg, 2009. In this case study the scale of the individual loss at the household level meant the community’s ability to help each other and have a coordinated response was undermined. This suggests

---

| FIGURE 8: Key themes on family and community support in the recovery process |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Code                       | Households*     | Total frequency** |
| Family support vital to recovery | 9               | 15              |
| Inability of other family members to support household | 6               | 9               |
| Inability to support other family members | 4               | 7               |
| Inability to support other community members in recovery | 8               | 11              |
| Inability of community to support household | 9               | 15              |
| Community support vital to recovery | 3               | 5               |

*Number of HOUSEHOLDS code was present in
**Total frequency of code across all HOUSEHOLD interviews
that strengthening household-level resilience would in turn lead to a more resilient community. A household with more financial capacity for example may be able to rebuild more quickly and then turn to helping others in the vicinity, or may be able to hire skilled help to rebuild, not only speeding up and improving the quality of their own home but also reinvesting into the community.

‘Independence’ and feeling included in government planning

Two key themes that emerged were interviewees wanting to have ‘independence’ and wanting to feel included in government planning for post-Yolanda recovery. These may seem contradictory ideas but were not so in all cases. Some households did state that they did not want to have anything to do with the government anymore: ‘We cannot trust them; they said that we would have [shelter] kits and supplies, but they [the supplies] have just disappeared’ and as such wanted to be independent in this regard: ‘I will build my house myself as no support is coming, it is better for me to do it this way’. Interviewees argued that this would make them feel safer and more secure in the rebuilding process (resilient) because they would have their future in their own hands and did not have to rely on government that they felt they could not trust. In contrast others actually wanted to be more involved in government plans because they had lost faith; ‘yes this would be good, because how can we trust them if we do not know what they are doing?’ Meanwhile some wanted to be independent of having to rely on hand-outs and support from elsewhere and were keen to either have a secure income that would allow them to ‘look after myself, and be able to build my home and look after my family also’ or to have financial support that would be of significant enough value to allow them to then become independent through starting to rebuild their own business or having the financial flexibility to make their own decisions around recovery priorities. There is a balance to be struck between inclusion and enabling beneficiaries to have the ability to make their own independent decisions.

Different priorities at different scales

Figure 7 also shows the presumed priorities for households according to two other groups: the Barangay Captains and two government officials. Although these samples are small there are still some interesting patterns here which indicates the relationship between different scales and actors within the response in Barangay A and B.

In keeping with much of the literature and policy (USAID, 2014, DFID, 2011, Levine, 2014, Twigg, 2009) there was agreement across the board that livelihoods and financial security are key however there were also two major differences. There was a marked level of difference in familiarity with the term ‘resilience’ between different interview groups. During my scoping interviews with government staff this was a term that was used quite frequently and comfortably with the interviewees discussing how resilience may be improved through safer housing and ‘livelihood opportunities’. There was also
repetition of the term as it had been used in much news coverage (see: Romero (2013), Yanoria (2013) and Obordo (2013)), i.e. those who had been affected being described as ‘resilient’ in how they had responded during the first few days after Yolanda hit. At the Barangay office level the term was still used universally, with all six Barangay Captains indicating that ‘resilience’ was a key aim for their residents, without offering any significant detail on how that might look in reality. At household level, while there was evidence that many had goals in keeping with a resilience approach, only three of those interviewed were familiar with the word.

This difference in familiarity is perhaps not surprising. As previously discussed, the term ‘resilience’ is one that has become common in humanitarian policy and practice (Levine, 2014) and there is very strong engagement with humanitarian actors at the City Hall level in Tacloban, which will likely have influenced the language used. As noted, Mayor Romualdez had frequently used the term himself (McElroy, 2014) when discussing Tacloban’s recovery. The Barangay Captains will work, or at least interact closely with the City Hall with some engagement with policy plans, meaning that some use of the term ‘resilience’ would be expected; however, it is a concern that this understanding is not at the same level, as it suggests a disconnect between policy development at regional government and local government level.

The second major difference is on the theme of ‘independence’ which is not identified as a priority at all by the government or Barangay Captains. Further investigation would be needed to explore the exact reasoning here but it may be that the Barangay Captains feel closely linked to the residents of their Barangay but also aim to be the link between the people of their Barangay and the government and therefore the idea of being ‘independent’ of the government may seem strange. At both a government and Barangay level it may also be because those affected still appear to need a lot of support so to want to be ‘independent’ from this possible help would not make sense to them.

These two differences suggests that for resilient building to be effective across different scales of a response, from household level, to local government, to regional government and with international actors the use of common language that has the same meaning across all levels should be a priority. In addition there should be a recognition that while there must be strong linkages between different scales these should be carefully managed so that there is still a level of independence allowed for those at the household level to build back themselves.

---

10 It should be noted that The Tacloban Recovery and Redevelopment Plan is a working document, which may explain to some degree why its key message of building resilience appears not to have been fully engaged with at the Barangay level.
What does resilience mean to Barangay A and B as compared with current policy and academia?

To further explore the data collected from a resilience angle I re-evaluated the transcripts and looked for references to the key themes of resilience that had emerged in the literature review. I then explored if, according to the interviewees, any of these were being implemented at all and if so by whom. The importance of community-focused programming was highlighted as a key priority by half the households interviewed, reflecting the will to be included in government programming that we have already seen, while the wish for a good ‘needs assessment’ ties in with the same notion.

**Figure 9: Importance of resilience ‘themes’ according to those in Barangay A & B and Household views of who is implementing them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance to interviewee (24 Households)</th>
<th>Being implemented or promoted by which actor (according to Households interviewed)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Household**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-focused programming</td>
<td>A  B  C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>12  6  1  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7  8  6  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-priority</td>
<td>10  8  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not discussed</td>
<td>9  10  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with shocks and stresses</td>
<td>7  14  1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term planning</td>
<td>Holistic approach to ‘shelter’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A=Yes</td>
<td>B=To some degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When not clear if to code to A, B or C no code was given
**Refers to the household where the interviewee lives rather than at a general ‘household’ level

Community-focused programming here was seen as programming that would engage with the affected community and put them at the centre of the programming by basing the response and planning around the specific needs and context of those affected by Yolanda. This was stated as vital by many households that were interviewed. ‘It is great if there is a plan for rebuilding [Tacloban] but it must also be able to help us, and address what we have lost’ was reflective of much of the response. Two key patterns connected to this were the idea that while the CfW programmes had some value they were not fully appropriate for the community. A number of households suggested that instead of gardening projects and sewerage unblocking CfW programmes could be used to pay people to rebuild people’s homes. ‘It needs to be work that is helpful, this [the current CfW programs] are not so helpful, apart from to keep some [people] busy…they could use this for rebuilding [homes] and fixing roofs’ said one interviewee.
This would seem like a possible approach, if feasible, in that it would also allow for a training element, that would build the capacity of community members to rebuild beyond the CfW programme, providing potential income for those who had been trained (there is no shortage of rebuilding work needed) and increasing the resilience of the overall community. Interestingly the one community member who did not see this as a priority had received a lot of support from family outside of the Philippines and may therefore not have prioritised further community focused support from the government or elsewhere.

In terms of implementation there was largest agreement that this was not happening to a great degree. At the community level itself, there was little community-focused development, tying in with the discussion in Research Question 1. While eight households felt that the government were doing some community-focused work six of these thought this was only to some degree, suggesting there is a gap between the government focus on capacity and the priorities of the communities at Barangay level. An interesting comment made by one interviewee on this topic was that ‘the government and the Mayor have so many things to do, so many people that also have lost things [in Yolanda] so it is OK if they cannot help us completely’

This highlights the wider context of not just this research but community-focused resilience in general: that communities do not sit in isolation, that if one group is being helped this may mean less help for others.

*Adaptability and a holistic approach to shelter*

These were two themes that were closely linked together and also connected to the importance of livelihood opportunities. Both emerged as key themes in seven household interviews, with a common pattern being the need to adapt to the loss of income that Yolanda had caused. One household had used the NGO Cash Hand-out to add a ‘Sari-Sari’ store to the front of their home, showing adaptability (off-setting the loss of income elsewhere by investing in new livelihood opportunities) and an approach that treats the house as more than just a home. Many discussed how it was likely they would have to adapt due to the relocation or potential relocation of their shelter. In four cases households highlighted how they had had to move their house back from the coastline due to coastal damage and that this would mean they may have to look at other livelihoods other than fishing. While one household stated that the CfW programmes ‘give us a new way to earn some money’ largely there was a general feeling that not enough was being done to support the community’s ability to adapt. Of the six that did not prioritise adaptability

---

11 It should be noted that the Tacloban City Government have outlined that CfW programmes have also included ‘clearing operations, medical and financial assistance, temporary/permanent shelter, sanitation and hygiene kits, food and water.’ However only gardening projects and clearing of drainage systems were taking place at the time data was collected in Barangay A and B.
three were retired and felt that there was enough opportunity for work already through traditional means and that the community did not need to change, as ‘it has always been like this, there have always been floods and typhoons’, while one household had suffered only minor damage to the house and felt ‘we should not have to change, this is what I have always done (fishing) and so I do not think I should have to change my life because of this [Yolanda].’

Long-term planning, ‘shocks and stresses’
This was seen as a key theme to some degree in 19 of the 24 interviews. Of the five who didn’t think this, three did not mention it at all in conversation, and only two referred to long-term planning but did not also emphasise it as important. This is perhaps not surprising. The sheer scale of damage caused by Yolanda meant that to all those effected they were aware this would be a long-term recovery process, but also many households were thinking ahead about how to have resources available to recover more quickly for ‘another Yolanda’. This has already been touched on in the discussions above around livelihoods and financial capacity ‘I want to be able to work again quickly, so that next time [there is a typhoon] I have monies available to move my family quickly and then maybe to rebuild a better house than this one if we come back’ said one interviewee. The emphasis on the long-term resonates with much of the thinking around resilience; however, there was also an emphasis on dealing with immediate shocks and stresses. The timing of the research meant that those in Barangay A and B were just about to enter the typhoon season again, so inevitably immediate improvement to their own safety and security was a key. 18 households outlined this as priority, all referring to the seasonal nature of the flooding and typhoons, which are commonplace in the Philippines. The concern for many was that the sheer scale of Yolanda had now left them vulnerable to smaller disasters which normally they would have been able to cope with. ‘There are always floods here, every time it is flooding but we can just wait for the water to go and get on with our lives again in one day or two perhaps. Now, though, our house is weak and even, perhaps a small typhoon will just wash it away’ explained one household, emphasising the need for short-term resilience building to be considered an option as well as longer-term approaches.

WHAT STEPS CAN BE TAKEN TO MAKE THE PEOPLE OF SAN JOSE MORE RESILIENT IN THE IMMEDIATE TERM WHILE ALSO MEETING LONG-TERM RECOVERY AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS?

We have seen from the literature that there is a heated debate around the role humanitarian work has in resilience building vis a vis the role resilience has in humanitarian action (Whittall, et al, 2014). We are of course just exploring some examples here but from the households interviewed it would seem to suggest that there are ways in which early humanitarian or emergency action and resilience can be linked.
Many of those interviewed talked about being happy to take ‘any help we could receive’ and that any financial help or materials provided would make them at least feel safer and more secure than they currently do. Examples given were that this would allow them to at least ‘prepare and improve some of our house’ or ‘extend our house a bit so that we can have more space’. A number of those interviewed also said that even if they did not spend the money they received now, knowing that they had this money as a financial reserve (however small the amount) would make them feel more secure and safe as they would know that even if they lost everything else in ‘another Yolanda’ they would still have something left to at least start rebuilding with. This is surely a resilience of sorts in that it builds capacity at the households level to recover more quickly from future shocks and suggests that there is a role for targeted cash transfers in the immediate term to build resilience beyond this (Holmes and Bhuvanendra, 2013). If this could be unconditional cash transfers this might also help tackle another key priority outlined by those in Barangay A and B: that of wanting ‘independence’. Although the reliance on a cash transfer seemingly contradicts the desire for independence, if given unconditionally it would allow households to prioritise expenditure themselves, investing in the local market and community (for example, hiring skilled labourers to help rebuild their homes), helping the transition towards longer-term development (ECHO, 2013).

The table below outlines a number of ways in which it might be possible to improve resilience through effectively tackling the challenges Barangay A and B face, even at the early recovery phase:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues Raised</th>
<th>Current measures in place</th>
<th>Possible solutions</th>
<th>Resilience improved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial insecurity</td>
<td>Some government-funded CfW programmes paying minimum wage for 15 days work. Initial hand out from some NGOs.</td>
<td>Improvement and diversification of livelihood opportunities. Strengthening of current livelihood opportunities (e.g. providing fishing tools along with fishing boats). Appropriate CfW programmes to encourage community engagement. Possible Cash Transfers.</td>
<td>Yes. Many households stated that even a small hand-out would improve their long term security because they would know they still had something left even if another Yolanda hit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling isolated from</td>
<td>Presentations have been made at City</td>
<td>Distribution of fact sheets outlining</td>
<td>Yes. Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government plans</td>
<td>Hall and the Rehabilitation Plan is a publicly-available document</td>
<td>plans to all residents. Presentations made at local level (Barangay Office) to improve access to information.</td>
<td>engagement is a key aspect of resilience, so improving the involvement of the affected population may improve both the resilience of those in Barangay A &amp; B and the Rehabilitation Plan in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/children scared of future disasters</td>
<td>Largely reassurance from parents/other family members. Damage to schools meant disaster preparedness through the education system was a challenge</td>
<td>Community-located training on disaster preparedness and climate change adaptation. Review of early warning systems to improve disaster readiness</td>
<td>To some degree. Preparedness would allow households to reduce loss of property/improve capacity to build back quickly. Improved warning systems would increase chance of an effective evacuation and decrease loss of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving ‘independence’ to the affected population</td>
<td>Many households had stated that they did not want to have to rely on government support (and to a lesser extent support from NGOs). In some cases this was due to a loss of trust in the government in other cases of wanting to have their future in their own hands and not be reliant on ‘hand-outs’. Most households were largely independent in their recovery (apparent lack of support meant this had to be so) but did not have the capacity to rebuild as they wished.</td>
<td>NGOs supporting community-led programmes that could be independent of ‘top down interference’ and pass control to those affected. Livelihood programmes that increase income and reduce dependency on hand-outs. Appropriate training and livelihood programmes that improve capacity and the self-sufficiency of the household or community. Possible targeted Cash Transfers.</td>
<td>Yes. Programmes that initially engage the community but then pass control to the households or community would tackle both issues of isolation and of dependency. Appropriate capacity building would increase diversity and reduce risk. More directly increasing the independence of those affected was explicitly stated as something that would make them feel more secure, and this would be directly addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting a ‘strong’ and ‘safe’ house</td>
<td>Some materials had been provided by NGOs during the immediate aftermath of Yolanda—many discussed having received 12-16 CGI sheets, although these were invariably not enough. Money from the NGO had also been largely used to build/fix/improve housing conditions.</td>
<td>Consult with the affected groups about what would make them feel ‘safe’ and ‘secure’ within their homes. Is it just material or also location and house design? Investigate ways that materials can be safely reused to meet a shortfall in building materials.</td>
<td>To some degree. How safe people felt, as already stated was a key aspect of how they measured resilience, as was involvement in programme development, which this approach would also promote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for appropriate training and increased livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>Itself a way to tackle other challenges this was constantly highlighted by interviewees. Some livelihood opportunities had been created through CfW and the provision of some fishing boats but there were gaps, for example a lack of tools provided in addition to the programmes and a lack of programmes focusing on rebuilding.</td>
<td>Implementation of CfW programmes that improve financial capacity and skills, for example training in good building techniques. Detailed assessment of livelihood programmes to make sure all aspects needed to improve are provided (e.g. both fishing boats and fishing equipment or fishing equipment and access to fishing waters if previous fishing spots have been damaged by Yolanda.</td>
<td>Yes. A diversification of livelihoods reduces the risk of potential financial loss that a flood or typhoon may result in. Furthermore improved capacity increases the community’s ability to deal with shocks and stresses and should also increase the financial capacity of households aiding their ability to absorb and recover.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 10: Possible solutions to building resilience in Barangay A and B**
SECTION 5: REFLECTION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

This final section includes ten recommendation, which, while based on my experience in Tacloban, I hope would be applicable when used in similar disaster responses elsewhere. I then end with a final reflection on my research and the importance of resilience and effective community level programming.

TEN RECOMMENDATIONS

1. NGOs, local actors and government should work together to undertake coordinated and comprehensive needs assessment as quickly as possible to avoid vulnerable groups falling through gaps in the humanitarian response and to make sure aid given during the emergency and early recovery phase is based on need as much as possible.

2. A ‘one size fits all’ approach should be avoided. For example, while blanket unconditional cash transfers can be effective these should be based on need when possible to support the most severely affected and those struggling the most.

3. While ‘building back better’ and for the future should be an underlying priority, it is important to guarantee the supply of basic equipment to increase short-term resilience (especially in cases where vulnerability and risk from natural disasters are seasonal).

4. While a strong and secure shelter is key, any response must be holistic and also include well thought through WASH, health and protection elements.

5. Ways to safely and appropriately reuse housing materials should be investigated from an early stage. In San Jose these were a large source of the materials used for rebuilding, and if used appropriately can provide a cheap and easily-accessible material for housing.

6. Communication with the affected population should be strengthened to manage expectation, explain decision-making and not leave communities feeling unsupported. This is vital for NGOs but also and perhaps more importantly, for the government (NGOs may be able to play an advocacy role here to help improve government to population communication when possible).

7. Utilise local knowledge at all levels (local government to household level) to develop appropriate community responses that meet BOTH international (Sphere) standards and community needs.

8. Using ‘development’ terms such as resilience and livelihoods should be avoided when possible in the wording of recovery programmes, especially when trying to engage with the affected population. They can leave the target
beneficiaries feeling isolated and confused about the programme’s aims and goals.

9. Develop programmes that increase the diversity of livelihood opportunities to spread the risk and potential impact of disasters on income. (For example an over reliance on ecosystem-reliant work such as fishing should be avoided when possible).

10. Cash for Work programmes should be utilized as opportunities to provide meaningful and impact-driven work (for example, programmes that focus on increasing the safety of the community) and as relevant training opportunities, such as training community members in appropriate rebuilding techniques, in turn increasing both individual and community-level capacity.

A FINAL REFLECTION

I began this paper stating that I would not attempt to add another definition of resilience to the ever-expanding list, that this paper was rather about looking at an example of what resilience might look like to a small and vulnerable group and to illustrate concrete examples of what they might need, or priorities in building their own resilience, however it is defined. Nevertheless, what I would offer here is a suggestion that, while resilience does not need to be defined yet again, the way it is used by many in the aid sector does need to be expanded. I would assert that it does not just belong in the world of long-term development programming but does have usefulness in what Whittall (2014) refers to as ‘effective responses today’. Even during the very early phases of a post-disaster recovery, and certainly during the early recovery phase that I witnessed in Tacloban, a holistic approach to ‘resilience’ is useful. Furthermore, making people stronger and increasing their capacity to cope should be a goal of all humanitarian work, especially in contexts such as the Philippines, when the threat of stresses and shocks is a recurrent reality.

What a community considers makes it resilient will vary, of course, from situation to situation. What I have found through this very localised study in San Jose would not have produced exactly the same answers if I had carried out this research in another country, or even another part of the Philippines. However, what it pinpoints is that resilience does not need to be wrapped up in a complicated multi-scale or long-term project to be an effective or relevant approach. I would suggest, based on the evidence of this study, that even small measures can make a household or community resilient, especially to immediate and seasonal threats. Small-scale cash transfers, effective and relevant training, capacity building and localised but well organised evacuation plans would all help in the Barangay A and B and there is certainly a place for these immediate impact-reduction measures alongside long-term ‘resilience’ planning.
Whether those affected or even the humanitarian sector at large refer to these measures as resilience or as something else is perhaps a secondary issue (although the political, funding and cross-cutting nature of the term has its advantages (Levine, 2014), what is most vital is that the measures put in place are effective in making those in vulnerable communities both feel and have the ability to withstand and respond positively to hazards and risk in an independent and empowered manner.
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### Other key themes emerging from research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Households*</th>
<th>Total frequency**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threat of seasonal floods</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity between expected and actual aid</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received (including goods and financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicion of government/authority</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic importance of the house/home</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living ‘day to day’ financially</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling isolated from government plans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young family members scared of future</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disasters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of Households code was present in

**Total frequency of code across all Household interviews

### Long-term priorities for those living in Barangay A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding or improving their house</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocating to a safer location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing of children/family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing/returning to a reliable job</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 2: Table of interviews (Primary Interviews in blue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Government Official</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>16/06/14</td>
<td>At City Hall to establish key contacts and gain permission for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Senior Local Government Official</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>16/06/14</td>
<td>(follow up on 17/06/14) On situation in San Jose to further explore which areas would be worth visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Barangay Captain (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barangay Captain (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barangay Captain (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Barangay Captain (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. CfW Nine people, male 21-51. (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Opportunistic interview with CfW group. Part of tour of the area with Barangay captain. Barangay Captain &amp; government official present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Barangay Captain (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Informal focus group interview Participants:</td>
<td>Informal focus group</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Interview with CfW group, Barangay Captain present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Secretary, Barangay Office (San Jose)</td>
<td>Semi structured Scoping interview</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>Initial scoping interview Senior government official present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Community Engagement team at UN agency</td>
<td>Informal meeting</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>At HQ. Scoping interview to confirm possible research site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Shelter coordinator with INGO</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>16/06/14 and follow up on 17/06/14</td>
<td>At NGO office. Not working directly in San Jose. Background interview to establish programmes going on elsewhere in Tacloban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. INGO community needs consultant</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>17/06/14</td>
<td>At NGO office. Not working directly in San Jose. Background interview to establish how community needs were being established and met elsewhere in Tacloban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Head of Household Female, 58. (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>18/06/14</td>
<td>Took place in Household, with family members present: house was damaged by Yolanda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>CfW Member [Female, 48. (Barangay A)]</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>18/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sari Sari Owner [Female, 47. (Barangay A)]</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>18/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Graduate Student [Female, 20 (Barangay A)]</td>
<td>Community walk/semi structured</td>
<td>18/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Local Business owner (butchers) &amp; wife [Female, 20. Male 25 (Barangay A)]</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>18/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Government liaison officer at UN agency with shelter focus</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>19/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>INGO coordinator</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>19/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>INGO beneficiary</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>19/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Regional Manager of INGO</td>
<td>Semi Structured (Background/scoping)</td>
<td>19/06/14</td>
<td>Leading large-scale shelter, WASH and health programme in Leyte, outside Tacloban City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cash for Work Programme (Barangay A) 10 members present</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>20/06/14</td>
<td>On site of CfW gardening programme funded by DSWD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Homeowner, CfW member and former Community Nutrition Survey Coordinator for government Female, 40s (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi Structured - house tour</td>
<td>20/06/14</td>
<td>Partially-damaged roof, floor completely destroyed. Supporting three children and her mother, husband and niece. Owns house with husband.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Renting accommodation - Unemployed Female, 38 (Husband: self-employed hairdresser) (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>20/06/14 - split in two sessions because of rain</td>
<td>Home completely destroyed by Yolanda - new home built from GI boards, small 14 x 10 ft made with material available. Husband is disabled: relocation not an option. Child (5) present during interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Interviewee Details</td>
<td>Interview Type</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Homeowner&lt;br&gt;Employment status unknown&lt;br&gt;Male, 37 (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi Structured and community walk</td>
<td>20/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Barangay A Office Secretary</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Transect drive with community member (Barangay A and B)</td>
<td>Transect drive with</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>President of homeowners’ association (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Family&lt;br&gt;Father-Carpenter (52)&lt;br&gt;Nephew-Hairdresser (21) (On border of A/B)</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Retired Head of Household.&lt;br&gt;Female, 70s (est) (Barangay A)</td>
<td>Semi Structured</td>
<td>23/06/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Beautician (living alone)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sari Sari owner</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Unemployed Mother</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20s (est)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Community walk with community member</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Home owners</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>early 20s (est) and Male late 20s (est)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender, Age</td>
<td>Barangay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Beautician, Male, 63 (Barangay A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Retired couple</td>
<td>Male, 69 Female, 65 (Barangay A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Construction workers</td>
<td>Male, 20s (Barangay B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Homeowner/former fisherman</td>
<td>Male, 55 (Barangay B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Homeowner/former fisherman</td>
<td>Male, 72 (Barangay B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Single mother</td>
<td>Female, 27 (Barangay B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fisherman and wife</td>
<td>Female, 23 Male, 26 (Barangay B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Supporting letter for Research: i

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir or Madam,

This is to confirm that Jane Stangeway and Thomas Brown will be carrying out field work in Manila and Tadobaten between June 14th and 20th 2014. This field work will make up part of their dissertation research as part of their Masters in Development and Emergency Practice at Oxford Brookes University, England. The aim is to provide a positive contribution to current humanitarian programmes in Tadobaten.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]

Dr. Suroyo Abouder
Development and Emergency Practice Programme Leader
03 June 2014

HON. ALFRED S. ROMUALDEZ
City Mayor
Tacloban City Mayor’s Office

Dear Mr Romualdez,

This is to confirm that Jane Strangways and Thomas Banks will be carrying out field work in Manila and then Tacloban between June 14th and 30th 2014. This field work will make up part of their dissertation research as part of their Masters in Development and Emergency Practice at Oxford Brookes University, England. The aim is to provide a positive contribution to current humanitarian programmes in Tacloban.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr Supriya Akerkar
Development and Emergency Practice Programme Leader
Appendix 5: Consent form for Research Participation

Thomas Banks, Oxford Brookes University
Centre for Development and Emergency Practice, Oxford Brookes University.
Research Dates: June 14th-30th 2014.

The research in which you have been asked to participate is being carried out as part of a Masters Dissertation Project as part fulfilment of an MA in Development and Emergency Practice at Oxford Brookes University, England (Please see the attached letter for further details).
This is an academic and independent piece of work that is not linked to any organisations currently working within Tacloban or elsewhere in the Philippines. Although the researcher does plan to provide general feedback to the organisations and communities involved in this study the research is purely academic and will have no impact on the aid, support or services any participants taking part will receive or have access to, or any direct influence on any programming decisions made by participating agencies or organisations or individuals.
The names, organisation and any other details that may allow readers to identify participants will be removed from the final paper allowing all participants to take part in the research and be fully anonymous.

Should any participants have any questions or concerns about the research following their participation in this project they can contact myself by email at 12081337@brookes.ac.uk

I hereby give consent for the information provided in this interview to be used in the submitted dissertation assignment as outlined above.

Name:

Signature:
Appendix 6: E1 Ethics form

Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment

Ethics Review Form E1
This form should be completed by the Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Student undertaking a research project which involves human participants. The form will identify whether a more detailed E2 form needs to be submitted to the Faculty Research Ethics Officer.
Before completing this form, please refer to the University Code of Practice for the Ethical Standards for Research involving Human Participants, available at http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/, and to any guidelines provided by relevant academic or professional associations.

It is the Principal Investigator / Supervisor who is responsible for exercising appropriate professional judgement in this review. Note that all necessary forms should be fully completed and signed before fieldwork commences.

Project Title: Whose Resilience Counts and When? Meeting immediate need and planning for the future: A Case Study of San Jose in Tacloban City after Typhoon Yolanda.
Principal Investigator / Supervisor: Supriya Akerkar

Student Investigator: Thomas Banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the study involve participants who are unable to give informed consent? (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities, unconscious patients)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If the study will involve participants who are unable to give informed consent (e.g. children under the age of 16, people with learning disabilities), will you be unable to obtain permission from their parents or guardians (as appropriate)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Will the study require the cooperation of a gatekeeper for initial access to groups or individuals to be recruited? (e.g. students, members of a self-help group, employees of a company, residents of a nursing home)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Are there any problems with the participants’ right to remain anonymous, or to have the information they give not identifiable as theirs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Will it be necessary for the participants to take part in the study without their knowledge/consent at the time? (e.g., covert observation of people in non-public places?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Will the study involve discussion of or responses to questions the participants might find sensitive? (e.g., own drug use, own traumatic experiences)</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g., food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is pain or more than mild discomfort likely to result from the study?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Could the study induce psychological stress or anxiety?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing of participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Will financial inducements (other than reasonable expenses and compensation for time) be offered to participants?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Will deception of participants be necessary during the study?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Will the study involve NHS patients, staff, carers or premises?</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have answered ‘no’ to all the above questions, send the completed form to your Module Leader and keep the original in case you need to submit it with your work.

If you have answered ‘yes’ to any of the above questions, you should complete the Form E2 available at [http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Ethics-review-forms/](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Ethics-review-forms/) and, together with this E1 Form, email it to the Faculty Research Ethics Officer, whose name can be found at [http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Research-ethics-officers/](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/Research-ethics-officers/)

If you answered ‘yes’ to any of questions 1-13 and ‘yes’ to question 14, an application must be submitted to the appropriate NHS research ethics committee.
Signed: [Signature]

Principal Investigator /Supervisor

Signed: [Signature]

Student Investigator

Date: 11/06

[Signature]
Appendix 7: E2 Ethics form

Faculty of Technology, Design and Environment

Ethics Review Form E2

This form is only for graduate (MSc) and undergraduate students on taught programmes. Before completing this form, Form E1 should have been completed to establish whether a Form E2 is required.

The E2 Form should be completed by the Principal Investigator / Student undertaking the research. Reference should be made to the University Code of Practice for the Ethical Standards for Research involving Human Participants, available at http://www.brookes.ac.uk/Research/Research-ethics/, and to any guidelines provided by relevant academic or professional associations.

1. Name of Principal Investigator / Supervisor: Supriya Akerkar.

2. Name of Student: . . Thomas Banks . . . . . . . . . .

Project Title:
Whose Resilience Count and When? Meeting immediate need and planning for the future: A Case Study of San Jose in Tacloban City after Typhoon Yolanda.

3. Project Type:

- MPhil
- Master's [x]
- Diploma
4. Project funded by (if applicable):
N/A

5. Summary of proposed research:

A significant amount of work in the international development and humanitarian sectors (e.g. Smilie, 2001 and Dekens, 2007) has looked at how ‘local capacity’ is used, and enhanced with an increased emphasis in the last decade on ‘capacity building’ (Kenny and Clarke, 2010) through development programming. Most recently there has been a movement towards the idea of ‘resilience’ both by donors (e.g. DFID, 2011) and in academia (e.g. Mitchell, 2012 and Béné, et. al. 2013) and how this can be increased at a local level to reduce the impact of disasters. Where there still appears to a research gap is a focus on how effectively an internationally led post disaster response utilised pre-existing local capacity and country strategies to increase the effectiveness of their own response.

This paper proposes to investigate this gap and frame this investigation within the example of the Typhoon Haiyan, which hit the Philippines in November last year.

6. Participants involved in the research:

Key informant interviews will be used during the main research phase. Arrangements for a field trip to the Philippines for early June are now in place. Four key groups that will form the focus of the interviews have been identified:
1. International NGOs and UN agencies involved in the humanitarian response
2. Local agencies and actors involved in the response
4. Programme beneficiaries

Meetings have been arranged with a number of in-country international agencies with the process of identifying possible programme beneficiaries underway and to be finalised in discussion with agency and government staff once in country.

The wellbeing of the affected communities is central when picking a field site as highlighted in the criteria I have developed below for selecting the area of Tacloban on which to focus:

- Densely populated urban area of Tacloban affected by Typhoon Haiyan
- An area where the majority of housing is informal
- Active Shelter Programmes by more than one organisation underway (if possible)
- Incorporating coastal areas (no build zone is of interest)
- Away from heart of city centre where government will be motivated to rebuild for economic reasons
- Accessible (good security) and an area where our presence will have the minimum or no impact on the security and wellbeing of the community in which we are working or the agency/government staff with which we are engaged
• An area with a multi-sector humanitarian presence—either currently and/or immediately after Typhoon Haiyan.

• An area where research findings may have added value for the community and actors with which we are engaged and, if possible, the largely affected community within Tacloban.

7. Details of drugs or other substances used:
N/A

Estimate of the risks and benefits of the proposed research:

Risk of interviewing the affected population
Some of the participants that may be interviewed as part of this study will have suffered significant personal loss during the aftermath of Typhoon Haiyan. This may be:
- Injury to themselves or family
- Loss of family members
- Financial and property loss

Interviewing participants who have faced such situations creates a risk with the need to be sensitive to the context in which the research is taking place. Any beneficiaries to be interviewed will be identified with the help of informed in country contacts to reduce this risk.

Security Risk
The Philippines is largely considered a safe and secure country in which to travel. Typhoon Haiyan/Yolanda caused extensive damage across the Visayas region of the country. The provinces of Samar, Leyte and Northern Cebu were particularly badly damaged. Power supplies are still not fully restored in all areas. Although the situation is returning to normal, local conditions vary (FCO). In accordance with advice from the Foreign and Commonwealth office I have sought local advice before travelling. I will be travelling around Tacloban with a local driver. I will be meeting with in country NGO and government staff during my first 24 hours in the city where the current security situation will be discussed.

Research Benefits
As outlined above, part of the selection criteria for the field site will be the selection of:
An area where our research findings may have added value for the community and actors with which we are engaged and, if possible, the largely affected community within Tacloban.

This will be done by picking an area in discussion with local NGOs and government staff and looking at the available data to pick an area where the social, economic and cultural make-up of the community is representative of the wider affected community within Tacloban.

In terms of specific findings there may be scope to identify ways in which the international humanitarian community can work more effectively with local communities as well as learn lessons from how the local community themselves responded, which may be applicable to other similar disasters. Any lessons learnt will be shared with the humanitarian and government contacts in country.

8. Plan for obtaining informed consent: (please attach copy of information sheet and consent form to application)

A consent form will be shared with all those invited to take part in the study. It will clearly outline the context of the study. It will also be clearly outlined to all those taking part that this is a research project and we are not an operational humanitarian agency, or directly working
with an operational humanitarian agency so have no scope to provide humanitarian assistance of any kind or influence those providing such support.

The attached letter from Oxford Brookes will also be shown to all in country contacts to assist in outlining the nature of our research.

9. Steps to be taken to ensure confidentiality of data:

No beneficiaries, community members, agencies or agency staff will be named within the final paper. Any other information that can help to identify participants, for example: job title, exact age, or membership of any clubs or groups will also be removed if required following guidance and discussion with NGO and government and community contacts, and my dissertation supervisor.

10.

Signed: ........... Principal Investigator /

Signed: ........... Supervisor

Signed: ........... Student

Date: ... 11/06/14 ...