The Future of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles for Strategic Disaster Management in the Philippines: A Strategic Foresight Study through Scenario Building

Comprehensive Project Plan

---

1. Background

Context and Significance

The Philippines faces unprecedented vulnerability to multiple hazards, experiencing an average of 20 tropical storms annually while remaining highly susceptible to typhoons, floods, earthquakes, and landslides[1]. The current disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) landscape is undergoing strategic evolution following the Updated National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan (NDRRMP) 2020-2030, which emphasizes climate-resilient governance and technology-enabled disaster response[2].

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) represent a transformative technology for Philippine disaster management, offering rapid assessment capabilities for hard-to-reach disaster-stricken areas, multi-sensor data collection, and real-time situational awareness[1]. The locally developed DOST UAV Research and Development Program demonstrates the potential for domestically fabricated UAV platforms with modular flight controllers and customizable payload systems suited to Philippine geographic and operational contexts[1].

However, the strategic integration of UAV technology into the national disaster management architecture remains unclear. Critical uncertainties surround: technology adoption timelines across LGUs, regulatory framework evolution, capacity building requirements, infrastructure investments needed, and the configuration of future disaster response systems incorporating autonomous and AI-enabled UAV networks[3].

Relevance to Policy and Practice

This study directly addresses the gap between emerging UAV technology capabilities and strategic disaster management planning in the Philippine context. It provides policymakers, national government agencies (NGAs), local government units (LGUs), and disaster management practitioners with evidence-based scenarios and strategic foresight insights to inform:

- Technology investment decisions and procurement frameworks
- Regulatory and operational guideline development
- Capacity building and training program design
- Inter-agency and inter-LGU coordination mechanisms for UAV-enabled disaster response

- Integration with the national DRRM architecture and climate adaptation strategies

Capstone Objectives

This capstone research project aims to:

1. Systematically analyze current and emerging UAV applications in disaster management globally and within Southeast Asia
2. Develop a robust conceptual framework integrating technology assessment, scenario foresight, and strategic management literature
3. Engage Philippine disaster management stakeholders and technology experts through structured foresight processes
4. Build 3-4 strategically differentiated scenarios depicting alternative futures (2026-2035) for UAV-enabled disaster management
5. Extract strategic implications and actionable recommendations for policy, practice, and research
6. Demonstrate advanced application of scenario-based strategic foresight methodology in development and disaster contexts

---

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles in Disaster Management

Recent literature emphasizes UAVs' critical role in emergency response operations. Key application areas include:

Rapid Damage Assessment and Situational Awareness: UAVs equipped with optical, thermal, and multispectral sensors enable rapid post-disaster assessment of affected areas, particularly in regions with challenging terrain or limited road access[1]. This capability significantly reduces response time compared to traditional ground-based surveys[3].

Real-time Data Collection and Monitoring: AI-powered autonomous drones with advanced flight control systems support autonomous navigation, obstacle avoidance, and optimized flight paths in complex environments[3]. UAV networking capabilities enable information exchange and coordination for time-critical missions[3].

Search and Rescue Operations: Emerging technologies such as specialized microphone-equipped drones can detect and locate victims by sound, while thermal imaging supports crowd monitoring and night-time rescue operations[4].

Early Warning and Predictive Monitoring: UAVs with appropriate sensor payloads support hydrological monitoring, landslide risk assessment, and early warning system development for flood-prone and geologically hazardous areas[1].

Capacity Limitations and Barriers: Despite technological promise, significant barriers to widespread UAV adoption include regulatory uncertainty, pilot licensing and training requirements, cost structures limiting accessibility for resource-constrained LGUs, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, airspace management complexity, and limited institutional capacity for sustained operations[3].

2.2 Technology Assessment and Adoption Frameworks

Technology assessment literature provides frameworks for analyzing UAV adoption across governance contexts. Relevant dimensions include:

Technical Performance Factors: Sensor capabilities, flight endurance, payload capacity, operational range, weather tolerance, autonomous functionality, and integration with existing information systems[5].

Organizational Readiness: Institutional capacity, technical expertise, infrastructure availability, budget allocation, and internal coordination mechanisms. Philippine LGUs demonstrate heterogeneous capacity, ranging from well-resourced urban centers to resource-constrained municipalities[2].

Regulatory and Policy Environment: Licensing frameworks, airspace management protocols, data governance standards, liability regimes, and interagency coordination mechanisms. Current Philippine Civil Aviation Authority (CAAP) regulations continue to evolve to accommodate growing UAV applications[5].

Socio-Technical Factors: User acceptance, trust in technology reliability, integration with existing operational procedures, and stakeholder perceptions of technology benefits relative to costs.

2.3 Strategic Foresight and Scenario Methodology

Strategic foresight provides structured approaches to exploring alternative futures in contexts of deep uncertainty. The scenario building method, grounded in "Intuitive Logics" developed at the RAND Corporation and refined through practice at Royal Dutch Shell and other institutions, enables strategic planning despite uncertain long-term trajectories[5].

Core Principles: Scenario methodology combines quantitative trend analysis with qualitative expert judgment and stakeholder input to construct internally consistent narratives about alternative futures[5]. Effective scenario processes typically include:

1. **Trends and Signals Analysis**: Systematic identification and interpretation of weak signals and emerging trends in technology, policy, market dynamics, and social factors
2. **Driving Forces Identification**: Specification of critical uncertainties and key drivers shaping future development
3. **Scenario Archetypes**: Development of 2-4 strategically differentiated scenarios representing alternative combinations of driving forces
4. **Narrative Development**: Detailed storylining for each scenario with explicit attention to internal consistency and plausibility
5. **Strategic Implication Analysis**: Systematic examination of implications for policy, practice, and organizational strategy across scenarios[5][6]

Application to Technology and Disaster Management: Scenario foresight has proven valuable in exploring technology futures in development contexts, climate adaptation pathways, and disaster risk reduction strategy formulation. This approach accommodates multiple stakeholder perspectives and generates strategic conversations that enhance institutional learning[6].

2.4 Disaster Risk Governance in the Philippines

The Philippine disaster management ecosystem has undergone substantial institutional evolution. The NDRRMP 2020-2030 reflects integrated approaches to disaster and climate risk governance, emphasizing:

- Multi-level governance coordination (national, regional, provincial, municipal, barangay)
- Convergence of DRRM and climate change adaptation (CCA) frameworks
- Private sector and civil society engagement
- Community-centered resilience building[2]

Current DRRM capacity across LGUs remains heterogeneous, with significant variation in technical expertise, equipment availability, financial resources, and institutional coordination. Technology adoption decisions at LGU level reflect both opportunity and constraint contexts specific to geographic location, hazard exposure, and governance capacity[2].

---

3. Statement of the Problem and Specific Research Questions

Problem Statement

Philippine disaster management faces a critical strategic decision point regarding technology-enabled response systems. While UAV technology demonstrates clear operational promise for rapid assessment, real-time monitoring, and remote area access, the strategic pathway for integrating UAVs into the national DRRM architecture remains uncertain. Key uncertainties include: technology development and commercialization trajectories; regulatory framework evolution; adoption patterns across heterogeneous LGU contexts; capacity building requirements and timelines; infrastructure investments needed; and the optimal configuration of future disaster response systems.

Without systematic strategic foresight analysis, policy and investment decisions risk either: (a) under-investment in transformative technology capabilities, or (b) premature or misaligned adoption leading to stranded asset and capability gaps. This research addresses this strategic gap through rigorous scenario-based foresight analysis.

Research Questions

Primary Research Question (RQ1):
What are the plausible alternative futures (2026-2035) for the integration of UAV technology into Philippine disaster management systems, and what are the strategic implications of each scenario for policy, practice, and capability development?

Secondary Research Questions:

RQ2 - Technology and Capability Factors: What trajectory of UAV technology development, regulatory framework evolution, and technical capability building is most likely to support effective integration into Philippine disaster management contexts?

RQ3 - Governance and Institutional Factors: How are governance structures, institutional coordination mechanisms, and multi-level coordination likely to evolve in ways that facilitate or constrain UAV-enabled disaster response across national, regional, and local levels?

RQ4 - Resource and Investment Factors: What investment requirements, financing mechanisms, and resource allocation patterns are necessary to support different UAV integration pathways, and how are these likely to evolve across LGU contexts of varying capacity?

RQ5 - Strategic Positioning: What strategic positioning, capability development priorities, and policy interventions should disaster management agencies and LGUs prioritize to enhance resilience and responsiveness across different future scenarios?

---

4. Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

4.1 Integrated Framework Structure

This research integrates three primary theoretical and conceptual domains:

Integrated Conceptual Framework

1. Technology Assessment and Innovation Systems

- Mapping technology readiness levels (TRL), commercialization pathways, and performance trajectories
- Analyzing innovation system actors and their roles (public research institutions, private manufacturers, regulatory bodies, end-user organizations)
- Examining technology diffusion factors and adoption dynamics across organizational contexts

2. Strategic Management and Organizational Change

- Strategic choice frameworks examining how organizations respond to technological opportunities and institutional pressures
- Organizational capacity and readiness factors for technology adoption
- Change management dynamics in government and public sector contexts

3. Strategic Foresight and Scenario Analysis

- Systematic identification of driving forces shaping alternative futures
- Scenario construction through combination of key uncertainties and critical decisions
- Strategic implication analysis across scenarios
- Policy and practice recommendations emergence from structured scenario analysis

4.2 Key Analytical Dimensions

Technology Dimension:

- UAV technical capabilities (sensor types, autonomous functionality, networking capability, AI integration)
- Cost evolution and cost-effectiveness improvements
- Integration with existing disaster information systems
- Cybersecurity and data governance maturity

Governance Dimension:

- Regulatory framework completeness and operationalization
- Inter-agency and inter-LGU coordination mechanisms
- Public-private partnership models for UAV operations
- International standards adoption and harmonization

Capability Dimension:

- Human capacity (pilots, technical operators, data analysts, system managers)
- Institutional capacity (organizational structures, standard operating procedures, training systems)
- Infrastructure capacity (airfields, maintenance facilities, communication systems)
- Financial capacity (capital investment, operational funding, sustainability)

Demand and Context Dimension:

- Geographic exposure and hazard vulnerability across LGU contexts
- Current disaster response capacity and capability gaps
- Existing technology adoption patterns and organizational readiness
- Community and stakeholder acceptance and trust factors

---

5. Methodology

5.1 Research Design

This capstone research employs a mixed-methods research design combining qualitative scenario foresight analysis with quantitative assessment of technology and capability factors. The design follows established scenario methodology protocols grounded in strategic foresight practice literature.

Research Approach: Integrative scenario foresight combining:

- Systematic literature review and environmental scanning
- Structured stakeholder engagement and expert elicitation
- Multi-round scenario development and refinement
- Narrative scenario construction and strategic implication analysis

5.2 Data Collection Methods

Phase 1: Literature and Environmental Scanning (Months 1-3)

- Systematic review of peer-reviewed and grey literature on:
    - UAV applications in disaster management and emergency response
    - Technology assessment and adoption frameworks
    - Scenario foresight methodology and practice
    - Philippine disaster management governance and DRRM policy
    - Technology and innovation in Southeast Asian contexts
- Environmental scanning of:
    - Current regulatory frameworks and government policy documents
    - Commercial UAV market data and technology trends
    - Implementation case studies and pilot programs (national and regional)
    - International standards and best practice guidelines

Phase 2: Stakeholder Engagement and Expert Elicitation (Months 4-6)

- Structured expert panel discussions (2-3 sessions) with 15-20 participants from:
  - National disaster management agencies (NDRRMC, OCD)
  - Technology and innovation bodies (DOST, NCS)
  - LGU disaster management offices (urban and rural representatives)
  - Civil aviation authority (CAAP)
  - Private sector UAV manufacturers and operators
  - Academic and research institutions
  - International development partners and NGOs
- Key informant interviews (12-15) with:
  - Senior government technology and DRRM officials
  - University researchers and technology specialists
  - Operational disaster management practitioners
  - Private sector technology leaders
- Focus group discussions (2-3) with:
  - LGU disaster management staff and community coordinators
  - UAV operators and technical specialists
  - Emergency responders

Phase 3: Scenario Building and Analysis (Months 5-8)

- Multi-round scenario construction process:
  - **Round 1**: Expert identification of driving forces, uncertainties, and critical decisions shaping UAV integration futures
  - **Round 2**: Systematic mapping of driving force relationships and construction of scenario archetypes through combination of key uncertainties
  - **Round 3**: Narrative development and stakeholder refinement of scenarios
  - **Round 4**: Strategic implication analysis and recommendations development
- Scenario workshops (2-3 sessions) with stakeholders to:
  - Present and refine scenarios
  - Identify strategic implications and risks
  - Develop strategy and policy recommendations
  - Build stakeholder consensus and strategic direction

5.3 Analytical Approach

Scenario Construction: Each scenario represents an internally consistent narrative depicting alternative futures along key dimensions:

- Technology development and capability trajectories
- Regulatory and governance evolution
- Adoption patterns and institutional implementation
- Resource availability and investment orientation
- International cooperation and knowledge transfer dynamics

Strategic Implication Analysis: For each scenario, systematic analysis of:

- Policy implications and required government interventions
- Technology investment and procurement priorities
- Institutional and capacity development requirements
- Risk factors and mitigation strategies

- Success indicators and monitoring frameworks
- Inter-agency and inter-LGU coordination requirements

5.4 Stakeholder Participation and Validation

Iterative stakeholder engagement throughout the research process ensures:

- Inclusion of diverse perspectives and expertise
- Validation of assumptions and scenario plausibility
- Meaningful participation in strategy development
- Enhanced institutional learning and buy-in
- Research relevance to policy and practice

5.5 Quality Assurance

Validity and Rigor Measures:

- Triangulation across data sources (literature, expert judgment, stakeholder input, government policy)
- Scenario internal consistency checking and plausibility assessment
- Expert panel feedback and iterative refinement
- Clear documentation of assumptions and judgments
- Explicit treatment of uncertainty and confidence levels
- Sensitivity analysis across scenarios

---

6. Schedule and Deliverables

6.1 Project Timeline (January 2026 - December 2026)

See accompanying Gantt chart showing detailed project phases and milestones.

Phase	Duration	Timeline	Key Milestones
1. Literature Review & Framework Development	3 months	Jan-Mar 2026	Literature map completed; Framework finalized
2. Stakeholder Engagement & Expert Panels	3 months	Apr-Jun 2026	Expert panel completed; Driving forces identified; Scenario archetypes drafted
3. Scenario Building & Analysis	4 months	May-Aug 2026	Scenarios refined; Strategic analysis completed
4. Findings Integration & Strategy Development	2 months	Aug-Sep 2026	Integration complete; Strategy recommendations finalized
5. Report Writing & Finalization	3 months	Oct-Dec 2026	Full report drafted; Final presentation prepared

Table 1: Project Implementation Timeline

6.2 Key Deliverables

Research Outputs:

1. **Comprehensive Literature Review Map** (Month 3)
    - Systematic review of 80-100 sources across six thematic areas
    - Environmental scan summary
    - Conceptual framework specification
2. **Expert Panel Documentation** (Month 6)
    - Driving forces identification report
    - Stakeholder perspectives summary
    - Scenario archetype proposals
3. **Scenario Package** (Month 8)
    - Four detailed scenario narratives (30-40 pages per scenario)

- Scenario comparison matrix
    - Strategic implication analysis (20-30 pages)
    - Success indicators and monitoring framework for each scenario
4. **Comprehensive Final Report** (Month 12)
    - Executive summary (10-15 pages)
    - Findings and analysis (80-100 pages)
    - Strategic recommendations and roadmaps (20-30 pages)
    - References and appendices (including scenario narratives, detailed interview summaries)
    - Total length: 150-200 pages
5. **Policy Briefs and Knowledge Products** (Month 12)
    - 2-3 targeted policy briefs (5-8 pages each) for key stakeholder groups
    - Strategic foresight summary for practitioners
6. **Presentation Materials** (Month 12)
    - Capstone presentation (45-60 minutes)
    - Stakeholder workshop presentation materials
    - Infographics and visual scenario summaries

---

7. Budget and Resources

7.1 Budget Summary

Budget Category	Unit	Total (PHP)
Personnel and Consultant Time		
Research Director/Principal Investigator	12 months	120,000
Research Assistants (2 FT)	12 months	240,000
Expert Panel Facilitators	3 sessions	45,000
External Data Analyst Consultant	2 months	30,000
Subtotal		**435,000**
Travel and Stakeholder Engagement		
Expert Panel Sessions (3 events, Manila area)	per session	75,000
Key Informant Interview Travel	15 interviews	60,000
Regional Focus Group Sessions (3 events)	per event	50,000
Scenario Workshop Travel	2-3 workshops	60,000
Subtotal		**245,000**
Materials and Supplies		
Literature Database Access	annual	15,000
Office Supplies	12 months	10,000
Printing and Binding (Reports)	per copy	8,000
Workshop Materials and Catering	per event	12,000
Subtotal		**45,000**
Technology and Equipment		
Software Licenses (analysis, visualization)	annual	20,000
Recording and Transcription Services	30 sessions	45,000
Data Management Platform	12 months	8,000
Subtotal		**73,000**
Dissemination and Communication		
Graphics and Infographics Design	project	25,000
Final Report Printing (100 copies)	per copy	15,000
Presentation and Conference Costs	project	20,000
Subtotal		**60,000**
Contingency (10%)		
Reserve for Unforeseen Costs		85,800
TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET		**943,800**

Table 2: Detailed Project Budget Summary

7.2 Budget Justification

Personnel Costs (46% of budget):

- Full-time research director provides project leadership, quality assurance, and expert engagement
- Two full-time research assistants conduct literature review, data management, interview coordination, and preliminary analysis
- Expert facilitators bring specialized foresight methodology expertise
- External data analyst supports scenario modeling and strategic analysis

Travel and Engagement (26% of budget):

- Geographic distribution of stakeholders (NCR, provincial centers, regional offices) requires meaningful engagement investments
- Expert panels, interviews, and workshops conducted in-person to capture rich qualitative data and build stakeholder relationships
- Regional representation ensures inclusion of diverse LGU contexts and hazard exposure scenarios

Materials and Technology (12.5% of budget):

- Literature database access ensures comprehensive research coverage
- Professional recording and transcription services ensure data quality and accessibility
- Scenario visualization and analysis tools support complex analytical work

Dissemination (6.4% of budget):

- High-quality report production and graphics support policy relevance and stakeholder uptake
- Professional presentation materials enhance capstone presentation quality

Contingency (9.1% of budget):

- Reserve for unexpected travel costs, additional expertise needs, or workshop expansion

7.3 Resource Requirements

Human Resources:

- Project director: 1.0 FTE (academic researcher with foresight methodology expertise)
- Research assistants: 2.0 FTE (literature management, coordination, preliminary analysis)
- Expert consultants: 0.5 FTE equivalent (scenario facilitation and analysis)
- Stakeholder participants: 40-50 individuals across panels, interviews, and workshops

Equipment and Technology:

- Computer systems and office infrastructure
- Reference management software (Mendeley, EndNote, or similar)

- Qualitative data analysis software (NVivo or similar)
- Scenario visualization tools
- Secure data management platform (for participant confidentiality)

Institutional Support:

- Office space and meeting facilities
- Internet connectivity and communications systems
- Administrative support for scheduling and coordination
- Access to government and institutional networks for stakeholder engagement

---

8. Risks and Risk Mitigation

8.1 Identified Project Risks

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Strategy
Stakeholder and Engagement Risks			
Limited expert participation or low engagement	Medium	High	Develop comprehensive stakeholder map; establish early engagement relationships; provide flexible participation formats
Competing institutional priorities	High	Medium	Conduct expert panel events outside business hours; offer virtual participation options; conduct interviews at respondent location/convenience
Political/policy sensitivity around technology adoption	Medium	High	Maintain institutional neutrality; engage across political and institutional boundaries; focus on evidence-based analysis
Research and Analysis Risks			
Scenario plausibility concerns or stakeholder disagreement on futures	Medium	High	Rigorous internal consistency checking; multiple rounds of expert validation; clear documentation of key assumptions
Data quality or gaps in available information	Medium	Medium	Triangulation across sources; systematic gap identification and supplementation; expert judgment to address gaps
Rapidly changing policy or regulatory environment	High	Medium	Establish decision rules for framework updates; conduct mid-project environmental

			scan; document decisions and revisions
Timeline and Resource Risks			
Timeline delays in expert panel scheduling	Medium	Medium	Establish clear scheduling protocols; build 4-week buffer into timeline; develop alternative engagement formats
Budget constraints or limited funding availability	Low-Medium	Medium	Establish contingency reserve; prioritize research outputs; develop phased delivery options
Staff turnover or capacity gaps	Low	High	Document all procedures and datasets; maintain knowledge management system; cross-train team members
Institutional and External Risks			
Limited institutional infrastructure for data management	Medium	Medium	Build collaborative partnerships with DOST, universities; negotiate IT and systems access early
Natural disasters or emergencies disrupting operations	Low	High	Maintain cloud-based backup systems; establish alternative work locations; flexible remote participation protocols
Intellectual property or confidentiality issues	Low	Medium	Establish clear data governance and participant confidentiality protocols; obtain institutional research ethics approval

Table 3: Risk Identification and Mitigation Strategies

8.2 Risk Management Framework

Risk Monitoring:

- Bi-weekly project team meetings to identify emerging risks
- Monthly stakeholder communication to assess engagement and satisfaction
- Quarterly project reviews to assess progress against timeline and deliverables
- Environmental scanning to identify policy or regulatory changes affecting research context

Risk Response Protocols:

- **Stakeholder engagement risks**: Activate backup stakeholders; expand geographic outreach; increase interview-based engagement proportion
- **Research and analysis risks**: Convene expert review panel; conduct sensitivity analysis across key assumptions; document decision rationale
- **Timeline risks**: Implement parallel work streams; adjust engagement geography if needed; extend timeline with institutional approval
- **Resource risks**: Mobilize contingency budget; prioritize core research outputs; develop phased delivery options
- **External risks**: Activate business continuity protocols; maintain distributed backups; establish alternative meeting facilities

---

9. References

[1] Ravaged by an average of 20 storms per year, the Philippines may soon find formidable complements from a fleet of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) in mitigating disaster risk and monitoring environmental concerns in the country. DOST Technology Transfer Program. (2019). Unmanned Aerial Vehicles. https://tapitechtransfer.dost.gov.ph/technologies/disaster-resilience/unmanned-aerial-vehicles

[2] National Government of the Philippines, Office of Civil Defense, Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Bureau. (2020). Updated National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Plan 2020-2030. ReliefWeb. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/philippines/philippines-national-disaster-risk-reduction-and-management-plan-2020-2030

[3] International Telecommunication Union, AI for Good. (2024). Autonomous drones saving lives and powering disaster preparedness. https://aiforgood.itu.int/autonomous-drones-saving-lives-and-powering-disaster-preparedness/

[4] One TV Network Philippines. (2026, January 28). Manila bolsters disaster response with new high-tech drones. Facebook News. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/onetvphilippines/posts/

[5] Valonaintelligence. (2025, April 27). Strategic foresight methodology explained. https://valonaintelligence.com/resources/blog/strategic-foresight-methodology-explained

[6] Polytechnique Insights. (2023, October 29). The scenario method: an aid to strategic planning. https://www.polytechnique-insights.com/en/columns/society/the-scenario-method-an-aid-to-strategic-planning/