

INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA10306

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 26-Aug-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 22-Feb-2013, 06-Jun-2014, 26-Aug-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Philippines	Project ID:	P132317
Project Name:	Philippine Rural Development Project (P132317)		
Task Team Leader:	Carolina V. Figueroa-Gero		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	14-Feb-2013	Estimated Board Date:	29-Aug-2014
Managing Unit:	GFADR	Lending Instrument:	Investment Project Financing
GEF Focal Area:	Multi-focal area		
Sector(s):	General agriculture, fishing and forestry sector (50%), Rural and Inter-Urban Roads and Highways (40%), Irrigation and drainage (10%)		
Theme(s):	Rural services and infrastructure (40%), Climate change (20%), Rural markets (20%), Decentralization (10%), Rural non-farm income generation (10%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?			No
Financing (In USD Million)			
Total Project Cost:	671.59	Total Bank Financing:	501.25
Financing Gap:	0.00		
Financing Source			Amount
Borrower			163.34
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			501.25
Global Environment Facility (GEF)			7.00
Total			671.59
Environmental Category:	B - Partial Assessment		
Is this a Repeater project?	Yes		

2. Project Development Objective(s) / Global Environmental Objective(s)

A. Project Development Objective(s)

The PRDP aims to increase rural incomes and enhance farm and fishery productivity in the targeted areas by supporting smallholders and fisher folk to increase their marketable surpluses, and their access to markets. This will be achieved through: (a) supporting changes in agricultural and fisheries planning, resource programming and implementation practices; and (b) financing priority local investments in rural infrastructure and enterprise development derived from agricultural and fisheries modernization plans, using a value chain approach, and through stakeholder consultations.

The results indicators for the Project are: (a) at least five (5) percent increase per year in real household annual incomes of farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries; (b) thirty (30) percent increase in incomes for targeted beneficiaries involved in enterprise development; (c) seven (7) percent increase in value of annual marketed output; and (d) twenty (20) percent increase in the number of farmers and fisherfolk with improved access to Department of Agriculture services.

B. Global Environmental Objective(s)

The Global Environment Objective (GEO) is to strengthen the conservation of the coastal and marine resource base in targeted project areas. This will be achieved through (a) enhancing institutional and planning capacities of local governments and communities; (b) providing support to marine protected areas with global biodiversity significance and select fishery co-management arrangements; and (c) sharing of knowledge and best practices.

3. Project Description

PRDP would have four inter-linked components: Local and National Level Planning, Infrastructure Development, Enterprise Development, and Project Implementation Support. The Local and National Level Planning Component will strengthen the institutional planning and budgeting modalities needed to implement the Project, while the Project Implementation Support Component will encompass the implementation aspects, including the mainstreaming and harmonizing of PRDP modalities with the Department of Agriculture's other programs. The Infrastructure and Enterprise Development Components would support small-scale producers and enterprises to increase their productivity and marketable surpluses through improvements in infrastructure, technical services and facilitated market linkages, marketing contracts and use of private sector providers, agricultural and fisheries state universities and colleges, for the delivery of extension services.

Component 1: Local and National Level Planning (US\$ 14.29 million IBRD and US\$ 1.40 million GEF grant)

(a) Subcomponent 1.1: Enhancing the Agricultural and Fisheries Modernization Planning (AFMP) Process (US\$ 11.61 million IBRD and US\$ 1.40 million GEF grant). (a) Rationalization of the DA's planning, programming and budgeting processes related to the development of AFMPs as the main basis of decision making and operations in the DA at the national, regional and local levels; and (b) Support for natural resource planning, management and resource utilization in selected marine protected areas.

(b) Subcomponent 1.2: Supporting AFMP Implementation (US\$ 2.68 million IBRD). Design of coordinated systems of technical support for the implementation of Sub-projects prioritized in the provincial commodity investment plans (PCIPs).

Component 2: Infrastructure Development (US\$ 361.71 million IBRD)

(a) Sub-component 2.1: Value Chain Infrastructure Support (US\$ 354.47 million IBRD). Carrying out of specific Sub-projects to support infrastructure development by LGUs in priority commodity value chains (including, among others, farm-to-market roads, bridges, tire tracks, communal irrigation, potable water systems, post-harvest facilities, production facilities, fish landings, fish sanctuaries, tram lines, storage facilities, trading posts, green houses, solar driers, watch towers, and slope stabilization works).

Cost sharing between the Department of Agriculture and the concerned LGU would be on 90:10 basis. Provincial Governments would be responsible for funding the O& M of investments. Criteria for the selection, design, implementation, O&M and sustainability are detailed in the Operations Manual for the component. Geo-tagging would be used to facilitate planning, procurement, and monitoring of sub-projects.

(b) Sub-component 2.2: Approaches for Improving the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Infrastructure Investments (US\$ 7.23 million IBRD). Development of technical specifications for climate resiliency and disaster risk mitigation for local infrastructure.

Technical training and workshops to enhance the capabilities of DA-RFOs and LGUs will also be conducted.

Component 3: Enterprise Development (US\$ 100 million IBRD and US\$ 5.60 million GEF grant).

(a) Subcomponent 3.1: Rural agri-fishery enterprise and productivity enhancement (US\$ 90 million IBRD and US\$ 3.36 million GEF Grant). (i) Carrying out of specific Sub-projects to support vertical and horizontal clustering, joint business planning and investments by producer groups/enterprises operating within priority commodity value chains; and (ii) Promotion of biodiversity conservation and coastal resource co-management arrangements, as well as carrying out sustainable income-generating livelihood activities.

Funding would be shared by the DA and provincial LGUs (PLGUs) on 80:20 basis. PLGUs would assist proponent groups through capital investments, facilities, inputs and technical assistance. Funding for enterprises would range from PhP 1-15 million with proponent groups contributing an amount equal to at least 20% (in cash or in kind) of the incremental enterprise cost. The lead proponent, an organized producer group or small- or medium-scale processor, would be responsible for procurement and O&M of the approved investments. Criteria for lead proponent selection would be: (a) acceptability to proponent group members; (b) broad network within the commodity sector; (c) access to resources; and (d) proven track record in managing an organization.

GEF support will be catalytic in terms of ensuring that biodiversity conservation and coastal resources co-management arrangements are included in the determination of interventions needed to support commodity value chains.

(b) Subcomponent 3.2: Technology and Information for Enterprise and Market Development (US\$ 10 million IBRD and US\$ 2.24 million GEF Grant). Provision of technical assistance to producers to increase their productivity and incomes through improved and sustainable technological, operational and market knowledge and facilitation of market linkages.

A particular focus would be on facilitating vertical integration and trade facilitation. New and

sustainable technologies and approaches would be introduced in collaboration with other agencies. Technical assistance requirements would be determined as part of the annual PCIP process and would be provided by DA agencies or contracted by the Province with private service providers based on available expertise.

Component 4: Project Implementation Support (US\$ 24million IBRD)

(a) Provision of technical and operational assistance for the day-to-day coordination, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and audit of the Project.

To accommodate the short-term staff constraints, the project would provide for the contracting of service providers (from within and outside the region) to meet specific project needs.

4. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

The PRDP will be implemented nationwide, in all 16 regions of the Philippines. In general, sub projects will be located in rural, agricultural and coastal areas of Luzon, Mindanao and Visayas islands. Some sub projects will be located in areas with indigenous people or in areas that have been declared as the ancestral domain of certain indigenous people groups.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Josefo Tuyor (OPSOR)

Jonas Garcia Bautista (GENDR)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The Project will fund rural infrastructure, agri-enterprise development sub projects and technical assistance to the Department of Agriculture (DA) and Local Government Units (LGUs). These activities are expected to have environmental and social impacts, hence the policy is triggered.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Given that the sub projects are implemented nationwide, most of which will be identified during implementation, it is highly likely that some sub projects would affect natural habitats, hence this policy is triggered. However, the Project will not finance sub projects that would significantly degrade or convert critical natural habitats. The Project however will support sub projects that would improve the management of natural resources such as near shore marine areas by supporting community-managed marine protected areas, fish sanctuaries, mangroves and coral reef rehabilitation.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The policy is triggered as the Project may fund mangrove rehabilitation as part of its support to coastal/marine resource management. Other NRM activities that will benefit existing forests may

		also be financed.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will fund crop production and post-harvest activities which may inevitably involve use of pesticides, although the project itself would not finance purchase of pesticides. Use of pesticides may also increase in PRDP-supported areas when commercial production increases in these areas. For these reasons, the policy is triggered.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The PRDP is unlikely to affect any physical cultural resources.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	Some provinces where PRDP will operate have known presence of indigenous peoples (IPs). For this reason, OP 4.10 is triggered. The Social Assessment conducted during the preparation of MRDP found that indigenous peoples are often socially and economically marginalized. There is a possibility that they will be unable to participate in the planning and development process and/or share the benefits of the project, if measures are not properly in place.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Rural infrastructure sub projects may involve involuntary land acquisition which in rare cases may entail displacement of homes and/or livelihood. Crops and properties may also be damaged or temporarily affected by construction activities and farm owners would need to be justly compensated.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	The PRDP will finance communal irrigation systems which may involve dam construction or rehabilitation. These dams will be small dams as defined under OP 4.37 (i.e., dams with height of less than 15 meters) and most likely be ogee weirs for run-of-river irrigation systems or dirt dams for small water impounding.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:

OP/BP4.01 (Environmental Assessments) - The project is not expected to have large scale,

significant and/or irreversible impacts based on the actual experience of implementing the First and Second Mindanao Rural Development Projects (MRDP1 and MRDP2), which are the predecessors of PRDP. The types and nature of sub projects to be supported are assessed to cause localized and temporary environmental and social impacts, which can be readily mitigated through proper planning, design and engineering measures. These impacts include loss of vegetation, soil erosion and sedimentation of waterways, and elevated levels of noise and dust during construction.

OP/BP 4.09 (Pest Management) – It is a policy of the Philippine Department of Agriculture not to fund purchase of pesticides hence the project will not be financing the procurement and purchase of chemical pesticides. However, the Project could indirectly result in increased use of pesticides. The Project will be financing crop and animal production, post-harvest handling and processing enterprises which may involve the use of pesticides from time to time using other sources of funds. Also, pesticide use may increase over time in the influence areas of infrastructure sub projects as commercial production increases in these areas due to improved market access.

OP/BP 4.04 (Natural Habitat) – Based on experience with MRDP1 and MRDP2, rural infrastructure may affect natural habitats during construction. The year 1 Infrastructure sub projects have been assessed and some sub projects could affect natural habitats.

OP/BP 4.36 (Forests) – The World Bank Policy on Forests was not triggered under MRDP1 and MRDP2. However, experiences under these projects indicate that the PRDP's support to natural resource management would include management and rehabilitation of mangrove areas and watersheds, which may change and improve the management regimes of these areas.

OP/BP 4.37 (Safety of Dams) – MRDP2 did not trigger this policy. However, based on MRDP2 experience, there will be sub projects that would involve construction or rehabilitation of ogee weirs for run-of-river irrigation systems. It was observed that small run-of-river diversion dams do not really impound large volume of water. The safety issues for these dams often relate to accidental drowning of children at intake and the ogee weirs which are sometimes used by residents as footpaths to cross rivers. The same issues are expected under PRDP. The Borrower has indicated that the Project may fund water impounding dams of up to less than 15 meters high, the safety concerns would now also include potential breach of dam structures.

OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) – Under MRDP2, minority groups were purposively targeted as beneficiaries of the project to meet the project's poverty alleviation objectives. Under PRDP, sub projects could be located in areas where there are IP communities as well.

OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) – Infrastructure sub projects and facilities to be rehabilitated or constructed under the project could involve involuntary land acquisition which, in rare cases (based on MRDP experience), may entail displacement of homes and/or livelihood. Crops and properties may also be damaged or temporarily affected by construction activities and farm owners would need to be justly compensated.

Procedural and Capacity Issues – Since social and environmental safeguards for this project would rely on frameworks, the greatest challenge would be the establishment of an internal system of screening, assessment, planning, review and approval of sub projects on safeguard aspects and the building of capacities within the various units of the project organization to implement safeguards system. These will be addressed through enhanced staffing for safeguards, capability trainings, and close supervision and monitoring, especially in the first two years of the project.

2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:

The indirect and long term impacts would include: (a) potential agricultural encroachment into forest areas where farm-to-market roads will be rehabilitated and/or built; and (b) potential increased use of pesticides due to increased commercial production in project-supported areas. The LGUs and Regional Project Coordination Offices need to be aware of these potential impacts. In very critical areas such as upland areas near public forests, LGUs would be required to submit sustainable agriculture development/watershed management plans and to implement measures to prevent further human encroachments into the forests. LGUs are also required to avail of the Department of Agriculture's Integrated Pest Management – Farmer Field School (IPM-FFS) program, which the project will support.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.

The Project has adopted a set of general policies pertaining to the types and location of infrastructure or development in the project areas, which were formulated under MRDP2. These policies will guide LGUs on the proper use of the uplands, lowlands, and coastal areas. In addition, alternatives will be considered at the sub projects level. All sub projects are subjected to social and environmental screening in order to encourage LGUs to consider various environmentally and socially sound alternative sites and subproject configurations.

4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

Under MRDP1 and 2, three separate frameworks were prepared by the Borrower: (A) Environmental Management Framework and Guidelines (EMFG), (B) IPPF, and (C) LARRF. These frameworks would govern the processes and procedures, and documentary requirements in the validation, screening, preparation, evaluation, approval and monitoring of sub projects in order to ensure compliance with the various applicable safeguard policies of the World Bank. Under PRDP, these frameworks have been updated and consolidated into an Integrated Environmental and Social Safeguards (IESSF) to facilitate on-the-ground application and implementation and to have better integration between environmental and social issues and measures at the subproject level. Public consultations on the IESSF were held from October 2012 to June 2014. The IESSF had been disclosed in-country on December 12, 2012 and in the Infoshop on December 17, 2012. This was re-disclosed in-country on June 5, 2014 and in the Infoshop on July 18, 2014.

In addition to EMFG, IPPF and LARRF, a Grievance Redress Mechanism Framework (GRMF) has been adopted which requires that a grievance redress procedure shall be set up within each participating LGU for airing and resolving grievances pertaining to the implementation of the project activities.

(A) EMFG. This is designed to ensure that PRDP sub projects comply with the Philippine Environmental Impact Statement Law (P.D. 1586) as well as the World Bank policies on Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01), Natural Habitat (OP 4.04), Forest (OP 4.36), Pest Management (OP 4.09) and Safety of Dams (OP 4.37) which are triggered in PRDP. It contains: (1) general policies pertaining to types and locations of agricultural development; (2) technical environmental guidelines and design specifications for the most common sub projects; (3) detailed description of the documentary requirements and the processes and procedures for screening and evaluating the environmental aspects of subproject proposals; the procedures were designed to facilitate compliance and ensure sub projects are cleared of safeguards requirements before being

approved for implementation; (4) guidance in preparing and evaluating the environmental aspects of subproject proposals; and (5) various forms and templates. Under the EMFG, participating LGUs are encouraged to adopt land use and protection policies which would help determine the types and locations of agricultural development in their areas. All Sub project proposals will undergo environmental and social screening to determine their eligibility and the applicable safeguard requirements vis-à-vis other World Bank safeguard policies, and to determine coverage under the Philippine Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) law (PD 1586). Sub projects that are deemed covered under the Philippine EIS law be required to secure Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) from DENR. For sub projects deemed not covered under the PD 1586, the Feasibility Studies of these sub projects shall include sections on Environmental and Social Assessments which shall be the bases for the preparation of sub project's Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs). The Environmental and Social Assessment sections of the FS will include assessments of impacts to natural habitats, forests, pesticide use, physical cultural properties, involuntary resettlement and land acquisition and Indigenous People. The mostly localized impacts of construction will be mitigated through strict adherence to guidelines in terms of site selection, technical and engineering design and adoption of measures in operations and maintenance systems. The required management measures of the applicable safeguard policies will also be reflected in the ESMPs. The EMFG also provides for the following requirements:

(1) Pest Management. Sub projects proposals which involve procurement of chemical pesticides using Project funds (i.e. including proponent's equity) shall be ineligible for funding, consistent with the policy of the Department of Agriculture. The potential increase in use of pesticide will be addressed through the promotion and support of Integrated Pest Management system under the DA's successful KASAKALIKASAN program, which is already widely practiced in the Philippines. Hence, no separate Integrated Pest Management Plan for the Project was prepared. For sub projects that would require regular application of pesticides, beneficiaries will be required to attend a seminar on the proper use, handling and storage of pesticides and IPM.

(2) Natural Habitat. Sub projects that would significantly convert or degrade critical natural habitats shall not be eligible for PRDP funding. The EMFG includes provision for screening of sub projects for impacts on natural habitats and measures to address these impacts.

(3) Forests. The EMFG has the provisions for screening of sub projects for impacts on forest, forest health and forest-dependent communities and measures in case impacts arise.

(4) Safety of Dams. Only small dams as defined in OP/BP 4.37 will be eligible for funding which include dams of less than 15 meters in height. Proposals for dams of up to 10 meters will follow the procedures outlined in the EMFG, while those which are more than 10 meters to less than 15 meters in height would need to follow the procedures outlined in OP/BP 4.37 and would require prior evaluation and approval from the Bank. All dams that qualify for funding should be designed and supervised by a qualified engineer. The environmental assessment section of the feasibility studies of sub projects involving dams shall include a brief risk assessment of dam failure and impacts on environment and on downstream communities and assets with corresponding mitigating measures reflected in the ESMP. Moreover, sub projects involving dams should submit dam safety plans which should include measures against accidental drowning at dam sites.

(B) IPPF. Based on the social assessment conducted during the preparation of MRDP, indigenous peoples are often socially and economically marginalized in the areas where they are a minority. Unlike the First and the Second MRDP, PRDP will not purposively target IP communities.

Instead, under the IPPF prepared by the Borrower, the Project will ensure that: (1) IP communities in the regions and provinces are able to meaningfully participate in the conduct of I-PLAN activities, including the preparation of the Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs); (2) the selection, screening and preparation of sub projects under the infrastructure and enterprise development components will be undertaken with the involvement and participation of the IP communities in the target areas in partnership with National Commission on Indigenous People (NCIP) and the Local Government Units; and (3) whenever the proposed subproject site is located within or will directly impact on any declared or proposed ICC/IP Ancestral Domain, the requirements for government-sponsored development projects under the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) as stipulated in the Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) Guidelines (i.e. NCIP Admin Order No.1 Series of 2006 or its successor issuances) are complied with. Otherwise, if the project site is situated outside any declared or proposed Ancestral Domain but nevertheless will directly affect and/or benefit any ICC/IP community or communities, a “free and prior informed consultation” is undertaken, to provide for broad community support for the subproject. The updated IPPF also requires that sub projects in IP areas undertake “free and prior informed consultation” to provide for “broad community support”. In addition, the updated IPPF also requires an IP Plan where the affected/benefited ICC/IP community is not the proponent or where they constitute only a minority in the sub project area. To guide IPP preparation, an IPP template has been developed and provided as an Annex in the IESSF.

(C) LARRF. This framework will ensure that all involuntary losses (i.e. whether lands, structures, crops or other properties) of project-affected persons (PAPs) are properly and justly compensated and all those who are displaced (whether physically or economically) are resettled and/or provided with assistance to improve, or at least maintain, their pre-Project living standards and income earning capacities. The LARRF prepared by the Borrower spells out the documentary requirements and the processes and procedures to be followed in securing sites and easement for sub projects and in compensating project-affected persons for any damaged crops or properties. Under the LARRF, subproject proponents are required to conduct and submit the results of PAP and entitlement survey, conduct and submit evidences of consultations with the PAPs regarding their compensation, and proper land acquisition documents. A Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) would be required whenever there are PAPs to be physically or economically displaced by the subproject.

(D) GRMF. The project requires that a Grievance Redress Mechanism be set up within each participating LGU which shall conform to the Framework and which shall serve all components and activities of the Project being undertaken within the LGU, including implementation of any RAP. The framework which can be found in the PRDP ESSF outlines the key aspects of the grievance redress process from submission to the resolution of complaints.

(E) Implementation Arrangements. The PRDP will be implemented by the Department of Agriculture (DA) and participating provincial and local government units all over the country. In terms of the preparation and implementation of safeguards, the accountability would rest primarily on the concerned LGUs with DA providing technical support and oversight. For sub projects under Component 3.1, while sub project implementation will rest primarily with the proponent beneficiary groups, safeguards preparation and implementation will still be the main responsibility and accountability of the concerned LGUs. Within DA, three (3) additional Program Support Offices (PSOs) will be organized, one for Visayas and two for Luzon. The existing Mindanao Rural Development Project PSO will eventually be absorbed under PRDP to serve the Mindanao regions. These PSOs will be responsible for orchestrating project activities and providing support

to participating DA Regional Field Offices (RFOs) within the three main island groups. To facilitate project coordination at the region, a Regional Program Coordinating Office (RPCO) has been organized in each of the sixteen (16) DA RFUs. Except for Mindanao, environmental and social safeguard capacities of these RFOs are still weak. For these RFOs, the Project has provided staffing complement for safeguards in the RPCOs, which are being trained and oriented in the past year on the basic elements of safeguards frameworks and guidelines, environmental and social assessments, subproject screening, preparation, review and approval process, as well as the preparation of ESMPs. DA has already designated Safeguards focal persons for the NPCO, PSO and RPCOs. Consultations on the ESSF have been conducted among DA-RFUs and LGUs in various regions of the country from October 8, 2012 to June 2014. The IESSF has been updated and integrated into the Project Operations Manuals.

(F) Implementation Capacity Aspects. To address any inadequacy of skills in assessing and reviewing environmental and social aspects of sub projects, a guideline for preparing and reviewing the Environmental and Social Assessment section of the Feasibility Studies have been developed while ESMP templates have been developed for the most common infrastructure sub projects based on MRDP2 experience. In particular, the ESMP template for FMRs ensures that slope stabilization measures are applied on critical road slopes, road safety issues are considered in the design including installation of guard rails or planting of hedge rows while the impacts of quarrying and damage to existing roadway are assessed and addressed accordingly. The ESMP template for irrigation ensures that Schistosomiasis control and prevention and concerns for accidental drowning at dam sites and deep canals are addressed.

The Borrower has already prepared the safeguards documents for Year 1 sub projects following the existing subproject preparation and approval processes outlines in the Operations Manuals. These safeguards documents which include ESMPs, PAP and entitlement survey results, land acquisition documents and IP endorsements where applicable, have been disclosed at the LGUs and at the MRDP and PRDP websites (www.damrdp.net and www.daprdp.net).

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

During project preparation, an institutional and stakeholder assessment (ISA) was conducted nationwide through focused group discussions and interviews involving about 2,000 representatives of government agencies, private sector, civil society and rural farming and fisher communities which include subsistence and commercial smallholders and fishers, women and a sample of IP groups. During the discussions, the stakeholders have voiced out their needs and constraints and these were considered in the project conceptualization and overall project design. The project is expected to benefit women and indigenous peoples (IPs). IP areas would be covered by the Project while enterprise development and the business aspects of farming and post-harvest handling and processing, which are roles traditionally played by women in the Philippines will be supported. PRDP will also employ participatory approaches in the planning of interventions at the regional and local levels, particularly in the value chain analyses and resource assessments which would input into the formulation of the Provincial Commodity Investment Plans. The Project will also continue to use the same participatory approach which has been proven effective in MRDP in the identification and preparation of sub projects of LGUs and communities. Project-affected persons will be consulted and compensated following the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Framework.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other	
Date of receipt by the Bank	06-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Jun-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i> Posted in the Department of Agriculture's website (www.da.gov.ph), MRDP and PRDP websites (www.damrdp.net and www.daprdp.net).	
Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process	
Date of receipt by the Bank	06-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i> Posted in the Department of Agriculture's website (www.da.gov.ph), MRDP and PRDP websites (www.damrdp.net and www.daprdp.net).	
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	06-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	06-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i> Posted in the Department of Agriculture's website (www.da.gov.ph), MRDP and PRDP websites (www.damrdp.net and www.daprdp.net).	
Pest Management Plan	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.	
If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:	

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats			
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP 4.09 - Pest Management			
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples			
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement			
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.36 - Forests			
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions for certification system?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams			
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>]	No [<input type="checkbox"/>]	NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]

Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
All Safeguard Policies	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No [<input type="checkbox"/>] NA [<input type="checkbox"/>]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Carolina V. Figueroa-Gero	
<i>Approved By</i>		
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name:	Date: