LEARNING FROM TACLOBAN - JAGO BOASE

Rebuilding Tacloban after Typhoon Haiyan/Yolanda 2014-2016
RESETTLEMENT TO TACLOBAN NORTH

STORM SURGE HAZARD MAP

TACLOBAN CITY MAP & LfT SITE VISITS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
<th>IOM</th>
<th>SvN</th>
<th>SEVANATHA</th>
<th>CRS</th>
<th>DSWD</th>
<th>Ramboll UK</th>
<th>UAP Emergency Architects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KALAHICIDSS</td>
<td>IFRC &amp; IFRC Philippines &amp; Philippines Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attendees**

- **IOM**
- **SvN**
- **SEVANATHA**
- **CRS**
- **DSWD**
- **Ramboll UK**

**Hosted by:**

- Ramboll
- Workshop Architecture
- Streetlight
• Inner city informal settlement
• No Build zone
• Rebuilt w/o gov’t / NGO assistance
• Due for resettlement
• Vulnerable location
• Poor sanitation
• Increased trauma from being next to sea
• Close to jobs & city centre
• High density inner city transitional housing
• Houses were “too small, too hot”
• Not built to IOM specification due to post-Yolanda rush
• Kitchens too far away —> fires on doorsteps
• Residents complained of crime and drugs
• High turnover of residents —> poor community cohesion
• Close to jobs & city centre
CALI

- Transitional housing ~10km from city centre
- Good build quality and generous site layout (w. break-out spaces, vegetable patches, etc.)
- Community active in maintaining site
- Men employed on neighbouring construction sites
- Residents able to chose between 4 nearby permanent housing developments
- Provision of water is a problem
NEW KAWAYAN

- Heart of Tacloban North
- ~15km from city centre
- Transitional and Permanent Housing
- Transitional residents complained of lack of jobs & training
  - Nothing to do but “make babies, make babies!”
- Poor communication with City Hall
- Permanent residents excited to move in but mood may change (as was case with T-Shelters)
- No mains water & limited electricity
• Self-Build resettlement village & Home Owners’ Association
• ‘Site & Services’ but minimal services
• Poor site planning & coordination
• No effort made to form a community
• ‘Architectural playground’ with proponents of innovative solutions pushing their product (e.g. Butterfly houses)
CONCLUSIONS

• Housing can’t be approached in isolation
  • Infrastructure, Services and Livelihoods must be integrated in the resettlement strategy

• No resettlement without an integrated strategy
  • In situ transitional shelters would be better, if politically acceptable
  • Increased physical vulnerability is outweighed by livelihoods & community cohesion (not possible after an earthquake due to risk of aftershocks)

• Less haste, more patience & coordination
  • Resettlement plan is over-ambitious / timeframe is unrealistic
  • Lack of planning led to poor decisions and lack of coordination

• Communities given little choice or agency in resettlement