

Ordinance Analysis of Camaligan Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Prescribing the Guidelines for The Implementation of Emergency” Measures During Impending and in Times of Natural or Humanly Induced Hazard Happening or About to Happen in The Municipality of Camaligan, Camarines Sur Series Of 2014: Forced Evacuation, Prohibited Acts, And Penalties

Johanna Marie R. Estrella

LDRRMO Assistant, MDRRMO Camaligan, MDRRMO

Abstract

This article analyzes Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014 of the Municipality of Camaligan, Camarines Sur, which outlines emergency measures for impending and ongoing natural or human-induced hazards. The analysis centers on provisions on pre-emptive and forced evacuation, prohibited acts during emergencies, and penalties and accountability for violations, with supporting review of governance activation, early warning processes, and emergency control measures. Using qualitative document analysis and policy-content review, the ordinance is assessed in terms of clarity, implementability, enforceability, and alignment with disaster risk reduction principles. Findings highlight strengths such as defined institutional responsibilities and enumerated prohibited acts, but also identify areas for improvement including clearer operational triggers for forced evacuation, stronger implementation support mechanisms, and safeguards to promote consistent, rights-sensitive enforcement. The article recommends targeted policy refinements and complementary implementation guidelines to strengthen compliance, improve public understanding, and support effective emergency operations at the barangay and municipal levels.

Keywords: Ordinance Analysis; Forced Evacuation; Emergency Measures;

Introduction

Local ordinances are practical policy tools that translate disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) into clear actions, responsibilities, and enforceable rules for communities during emergencies. In the Municipality of Camaligan, Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014—often referred to as the Disaster Emergency Measures Ordinance—prescribes guidelines for implementing emergency measures during impending and ongoing natural or human-induced hazards (Municipal Ordinance No. 04, s. 2014, Sec. 1).

A central feature of the ordinance is its emphasis on evacuation as a protective action, including provisions that recognize forced evacuation when danger is imminent. The ordinance provides definitions and general direction for early warning and evacuation processes, including the issuance of recommendations and orders for pre-emptive or forced evacuation when necessary (Municipal Ordinance No. 04, s. 2014, Sec. 2–3). Alongside evacuation authority, it also addresses emergency control by regulating public behavior through a set of prohibited acts and corresponding penalties, aiming to prevent interference with emergency operations and encourage compliance during critical periods (Municipal Ordinance No. 04, s. 2014, Sec. 4–5). This article presents an ordinance analysis of Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014, focusing on how its provisions on forced evacuation, prohibited acts, and penalties are written and how these provisions may function during actual emergency implementation. In particular, the analysis examines the clarity of evacuation authority and procedures, the scope and intent of prohibited acts during emergencies, and the strength of penalty provisions in supporting accountability and enforceability at the municipal and barangay levels (Municipal Ordinance No. 04, s. 2014, Sec. 2–5).

Materials and design

This study employed a qualitative document analysis (policy-content review) to examine Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014 of the Municipality of Camaligan. The ordinance served as the primary material for analysis, focusing on provisions that shape emergency operations and public compliance during impending or ongoing hazards.

The analysis concentrated on four ordinance components: (1) provisions defining evacuation authority and procedures, including pre-emptive and forced evacuation; (2) general rules that guide emergency measures and coordination; (3) prohibited acts during emergencies; and (4) penalties and accountability provisions supporting enforcement.

A coding matrix was used to classify ordinance statements into themes aligned with the study focus—forced evacuation, prohibited acts, and penalties/enforcement—and to identify how each provision may operate during implementation. The ordinance content was then assessed using policy criteria: clarity (specificity of provisions), implementability (practical requirements for action), and enforceability (presence of duties, restrictions, and sanctions). Results were synthesized by summarizing strengths, gaps, and areas for improvement relevant to municipal and barangay-level emergency response.

Result and Discussion

Result

The findings reveal that Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014 provides a structured legal basis for disaster emergency measures in Camaligan by combining (1) authority to compel action during imminent danger, (2) behavioral regulation to protect response operations, and (3) enforcement provisions to strengthen compliance. While the ordinance addresses broader emergency actions, its most operationally significant provisions are concentrated on forced evacuation authority, prohibited acts during emergencies, and penalty and accountability mechanisms.

To further interpret these findings, the ordinance provisions were organized into three core themes:

Theme 1: Forced Evacuation Authority and Operational Direction

The ordinance formally recognizes evacuation as a protective measure and identifies forced evacuation as an option when risk to life becomes imminent. It establishes that local authorities can recommend pre-

emptive evacuation and issue forced evacuation orders when urgent conditions require immediate protective action.

Interpretation: This provision strengthens decisiveness during fast-changing hazards. However, without clearer triggers and decision thresholds, implementation may vary across barangays, affecting consistency and public compliance.

Theme 2: Prohibited Acts as a Tool for Protecting Emergency Operations

The ordinance outlines prohibited acts intended to prevent interference with emergency response. These include behaviors that obstruct operations, undermine safety controls, disrupt order, or compromise emergency procedures and relief-related actions.

Interpretation: The ordinance treats disaster response as both a safety operation and a public-order issue. The effectiveness of these provisions depends on whether enforcement roles and documentation procedures are clear during actual emergencies.

Theme 3: Penalties and Accountability Provisions

The ordinance includes enforcement measures by prescribing penalties for violations and emphasizing accountability, including standards applicable to public officials and personnel. These provisions signal that compliance during emergencies is expected and violations have consequences.

Interpretation: Penalties increase enforceability, particularly for evacuation compliance and preventing obstruction. Still, applying the same penalty range to different violations may create challenges in proportionality and consistent implementation.

Discussion

The results show that the ordinance operates as a local DRRM governance tool by linking three essential components of emergency management: authority to act (forced evacuation), behavior regulation (prohibited acts), and enforcement (penalties and accountability). This structure is significant because disaster response effectiveness often depends not only on the availability of responders and resources, but also on whether the LGU has clear authority to compel protective action, prevent obstruction, and enforce compliance during high-risk periods.

Theme 1: Forced Evacuation Authority and Operational Direction

The ordinance's recognition of forced evacuation strengthens the ability of local officials to respond decisively when danger becomes imminent. In practice, forced evacuation provisions are most effective when communities understand who can issue orders, what conditions justify evacuation, and what procedures follow once an order is released. However, the analysis suggests that the ordinance would benefit from greater operational clarity. When forced evacuation authority is framed broadly, implementation can become inconsistent across barangays, leading to confusion, delayed compliance, or perceived unfairness. Strengthening this provision through a clear trigger system (for example, linking evacuation orders to formal warning levels, risk assessments, or defined hazard indicators) can improve predictability and legitimacy, which supports faster public response.

Theme 2: Prohibited Acts as a Tool for Protecting Emergency Operations

The ordinance's list of prohibited acts reflects a realistic view of disaster operations: emergencies are not only technical events but also social situations where unsafe behavior, resistance, or disruption can slow down response and increase risk. By prohibiting obstruction and other actions that interfere with emergency measures, the ordinance aims to protect coordination, maintain order, and ensure that response and relief activities can proceed without delay. Still, the effectiveness of prohibited-act provisions depends

on implementability. If enforcement roles are unclear or if documentation procedures are weak, prohibited acts may be enforced inconsistently. This can reduce deterrence, create community misunderstanding, and weaken trust. Practical implementation is stronger when the ordinance is paired with community orientation before disasters and when enforcement follows a standard process for warnings, citation, and reporting.

Theme 3: Penalties and Accountability Provisions

The penalty and accountability provisions provide legal weight to the ordinance and strengthen compliance, particularly in relation to forced evacuation and acts that obstruct emergency response. These provisions reinforce that the ordinance is not merely advisory, but enforceable during critical periods. At the same time, applying a general penalty range to violations with different levels of seriousness may limit proportionality and consistency. A more implementable approach is to support the ordinance with an enforcement matrix that categorizes violations (minor, serious, grave), clarifies who issues citations, and outlines administrative actions alongside fines or imprisonment. This promotes fairness, strengthens public understanding, and supports rights-sensitive enforcement.

Overall, the ordinance demonstrates strong policy intent by combining evacuation authority, behavioral controls, and sanctions. To maximize effectiveness, the ordinance should be supported by implementing guidelines that clarify decision triggers for forced evacuation, establish consistent enforcement and documentation procedures, and operationalize penalty application in a proportional and transparent manner.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This ordinance analysis shows that Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014 serves as an important local policy instrument for disaster emergency management in the Municipality of Camaligan, Camarines Sur. The ordinance strengthens emergency governance by establishing a legal basis for decisive protective action through forced evacuation, regulating community behavior through prohibited acts during emergencies, and reinforcing compliance through penalty and accountability provisions.

Overall, the ordinance demonstrates strong policy intent in promoting public safety and supporting orderly emergency operations, particularly by empowering local authorities to act when danger becomes imminent and by discouraging behaviors that may obstruct response and relief efforts. At the same time, the analysis indicates that the ordinance's effectiveness depends on how clearly its provisions can be operationalized in real emergencies. More specific decision triggers for forced evacuation, clearer guidance on enforcement roles and coordination, and standardized communication and documentation procedures would help ensure consistent, fair, and practical application across barangays.

In conclusion, the ordinance provides a strong foundation for emergency governance in Camaligan, but its impact can be further improved through complementary implementing guidelines and targeted refinements that enhance clarity, enforceability, and community understanding.

Recommendations

1. Strengthen Forced Evacuation Implementation Guidelines

- Develop an Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR) or ordinance guideline that translates the forced evacuation provisions into clear, step-by-step procedures.

- Define specific operational triggers for pre-emptive and forced evacuation (for example, warning levels, PDRA results, or hazard indicators) to ensure consistent application across barangays.
- Standardize evacuation documentation, including written advisories/orders, household or zone lists, and post-evacuation reporting.
- 2. Improve Risk Communication and Public Orientation on the Ordinance
 - Conduct barangay-level orientations explaining forced evacuation authority, prohibited acts, and penalties using simple language and local examples.
 - Strengthen warning dissemination methods (megaphones, SMS, barangay patrol, community leaders) to ensure hard-to-reach households receive timely instructions.
 - Produce quick-reference materials (posters, infographics, checklists) on what residents must do during mandatory or forced evacuation.
- 3. Strengthen Enforcement Roles and Inter-Agency Coordination
 - Clearly define enforcement responsibilities among municipal offices, barangay officials, responders, and partner agencies during evacuation and restricted access enforcement.
 - Establish standard procedures for checkpoints, restricted-area control, and evacuation center security to avoid confusion and overlapping authority.
 - Require coordination protocols for reporting violations, issuing warnings, and escalating to penalties when non-compliance persists.
- 4. Enhance Prohibited Acts Enforcement and Compliance Measures
 - Develop a clear enforcement process that prioritizes warnings and corrective actions while maintaining firm action for serious violations
 - Create a documentation system for violations (incident logbook, citation forms, evidence documentation) to support fair and accountable enforcement.
 - Integrate prohibited acts enforcement into drills and simulations so implementers practice realistic scenarios before disasters occur.
- 5. Adopt a Proportional Penalty and Accountability Framework
 - Develop a penalty matrix that categorizes violations as minor, serious, or grave, with corresponding sanctions to ensure proportionality and consistent application.
 - Clarify administrative accountability pathways for public officials and personnel involved in violations or neglect of duty.
 - Include safeguards for rights-sensitive enforcement, ensuring penalties are applied fairly and do not disproportionately harm vulnerable groups.
- 6. Institutionalize Ordinance Integration into Local DRRM Systems
 - Embed ordinance procedures into barangay DRRM plans, contingency plans, early warning systems, and evacuation protocols.
 - Conduct regular simulation exercises focused on forced evacuation, restricted access control, and prohibited acts enforcement.
 - Establish a periodic ordinance review mechanism to update provisions based on lessons learned from actual hazard events and post-incident assessments.

LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Limitations

This study is limited to a document-based ordinance analysis of Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014. The findings are based on the written provisions of the ordinance and do not directly measure how these provisions are implemented during actual disaster events. Because the study did not include interviews, surveys, field observation, or review of incident records, it cannot fully capture community compliance behavior, enforcement practices, operational constraints, or the perspectives of implementers and affected households. In addition, the analysis did not include a systematic comparison with similar ordinances from other municipalities, which limits the ability to identify best practices or benchmark Camaligan's ordinance against other local policy models.

Directions for Future Research

Future studies may expand this ordinance analysis by examining how Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014 functions during real hazard events. Research may document how forced evacuation decisions are triggered, who initiates and approves evacuation orders, and how warnings are communicated to households in different barangay zones. Studies may also assess community compliance, including why some residents delay or refuse evacuation, and how vulnerable groups experience evacuation implementation.

Further research may focus on enforcement by evaluating how prohibited acts and penalty provisions are applied in practice, including consistency of enforcement, documentation of violations, and the proportionality of sanctions across different types of offenses. Comparative studies may analyze similar forced evacuation ordinances from other municipalities to identify best practices in ordinance design, implementation guidelines, and graduated penalty systems. Lastly, future work may test whether developing an Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR), enforcement matrix, and standardized templates improves clarity, fairness, and effectiveness of ordinance implementation at both the municipal and barangay levels.

REFERENCES

1. Dariagan, J. D., Atando, R. B., Asis, J. L. B. (2020). Disaster preparedness of local governments in Panay Island, Philippines. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 46, 101464. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7587520/>
2. Department of Social Welfare and Development, Department of the Interior and Local Government, Department of Health, Department of Education. (2021). Joint Memorandum Circular No. 02, Series of 2021: Guidelines on camp coordination and camp management and internally displaced persons (IDP) protection. https://old.dswd.gov.ph/issuances/MCs/JMC_2021-002.pdf
3. Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2012). Primer: The National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (NDRRMP) 2011–2028. https://www.dilg.gov.ph/PDF_File/reports_resources/DILG-Resources-2012116-ab6ce90b0d.pdf
4. Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2024, November 7). DILG to LGUs: Implement forced evacuation amid Typhoon Marce [Press release]. <https://dilg.gov.ph/news/DILG-to-LGUs-Implement-forced-evacuation-amid-Typhoon-Marce/NC-2024-1137>
5. Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2025). Memorandum Circular No. 2025-211: Guidance to local chief executives on forced evacuation and preparedness actions.

https://dilg.gov.ph/PDF_File/issuances/memo_circulars/dilg-memocircular-2025211_0d34c886fc.pdf

6. Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2025, September 23). DILG to concerned LGUs: Implement preemptive evacuations, strict no-sail policy as Typhoon “Nando” intensifies [Press release]. <https://dilg.gov.ph/news/DILG-TO-CONCERNED-LGUs-IMPLEMENT-PREEMPTIVE-EVACUATIONS-STRICT-NO-SAIL-POLICY-AS-TYPHOON-NANDO-INTENSIFIES/NC-2025-1198>
7. Domingo, S. N. (2018). Disaster preparedness and local governance in the Philippines (Philippine Institute for Development Studies Discussion Paper Series No. 2018-52). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1852.pdf>
8. Local Government Academy. (n.d.). Disaster preparedness manual. Department of the Interior and Local Government, Local Government Academy. <https://cdn.lga.gov.ph/publication/attachments/1590478478.pdf>
9. Municipality of Camaligan. (2014). Municipal Ordinance No. 04, Series of 2014: Disaster emergency measures ordinance (Guidelines for the implementation of emergency measures during impending and ongoing natural or human-induced hazards). Sangguniang Bayan, Camaligan, Camarines Sur, Philippines.
10. National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council. (2011). National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (NDRRMP) 2011–2028. https://www.adrc.asia/documents/dm_information/Philippines_NDRRM_Plan_2011-2028.pdf
11. National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council. (2020). National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (NDRRMP) 2020–2030. https://rbmes-api.ndrrmc.gov.ph/download/NDRRMP_RBMEs_Final%20Version_compressed.pdf
12. Office of Civil Defense. (2010). Implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 10121 (Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010). <https://www.rcrc-resilience-southeastasia.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/2010-Implementing-Guidelines-on-the-Disaster-Risk-Reduction-and-Management-Act-of-2010.pdf>
13. Republic of the Philippines. (1991). Republic Act No. 7160: An act providing for a local government code of 1991. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra_7160_1991.html
14. Republic of the Philippines. (2010). Republic Act No. 10121: Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2010/ra_10121_2010.html
15. Republic of the Philippines, Office of the Ombudsman. (1989). Republic Act No. 6713: Code of conduct and ethical standards for public officials and employees. https://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/docs/repUBLICACTS/Republic_Act_No_6713.pdf
16. Republic of the Philippines, Office of the Ombudsman. (n.d.). Implementing rules of Republic Act No. 6713 (Code of conduct and ethical standards for public officials and employees). https://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/docs/repUBLICACTS/Implementing_Rules_of_RA_6713.pdf
17. United Nations General Assembly. (2015). Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 (A/RES/69/283). https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_69_283.pdf