

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE**

Report No.: ISDSA9342

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 06-Jun-2014

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

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Philippines	Project ID:	P132317
Project Name:	Philippine Rural Development Program (P132317)		
Task Team Leader:	Carolina V. Figueroa-Gero		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	14-Feb-2013	Estimated Board Date:	29-Aug-2014
Managing Unit:	EASPS	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 targeted areas.

The Project will promote more inclusive rural development by supporting smallholders and fishers to increase their marketable surpluses, and their access to markets. The PRDP would also support changes in the planning, resource programming and implementation practices of the Department of Agriculture. It will facilitate the integration and financing of priority local investments derived from the DA's agricultural and fisheries modernization plans which have been developed using a value chain approach, and through a consultative process with local stakeholders.

The results indicators for the Program are: (a) at least five (5) percent increase in annual real household incomes of farmer beneficiaries and 30% increase in incomes for targeted beneficiaries of Enterprise development, (b) seven (7) percent increase in value of annual marketed output, and (c) twenty (20) percent increase in the number of farmers and fishers with improved access to DA 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 program areas through biodiversity conservation and fisheries resources management. This would be achieved through (i) enhancing institutional and planning capacities of LGUs and communities, (ii) providing support to MPAs in particular areas of global biodiversity significance and select fishery co-management arrangements, and (iii) sharing of knowledge and best practices.

3. Project Description

PRDP would have four inter-linked components: Local Planning, Infrastructure Development, Enterprise Development, and Program Support. The Local Planning Component will strengthen the institutional planning and budgeting modalities needed to implement the Project, while the Program 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 Planning (US\$14.29 M equiv. IBRD&US\$1.40 M equiv. GEF grant)

a) Subcomponent 1.1: Enhancing the AFMPs Process (\$11.61 M IBRD and US\$1.40 M GEF grant). This would support the institutional reforms of the Department of Agriculture's (DA) planning, programming and budgeting processes through technical assistance, training and workshops. At the national level, processes will be developed to ensure coherence and consistency of DA agency and commodity programs with the AFMP. At the regional level, some realignment of the DA's budget programming and execution processes would be made to divest authority and accountability for AFMP implementation and budget execution to the RFOs, and to ensure that DA Technical Agencies align their support to the priorities and programs of the RAFMPs. Institutional processes will also be established to undertake joint work programming with LGUs and to administer co-financing and

fund flow arrangements with LGUs. The key intermediate results would be: (i) Enhanced Planning, Programming and Budgeting Guidelines, (ii) Harmonized Operation Manuals for Planning, Programming, and Budgeting, (iii) Enhanced/ Validated AFMP and RAFMPs, (iv) Provincial Commodities Investment Plans (PCIPs) and (v) by mid-term, updating of the AFMP and RAFMPs. GEF-financed activities would focus on incorporating measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity in policy and regulatory frameworks at the provincial and local levels, especially the PCIPs. In addition, improved MPA management plans and fishery co-management plans would also be financed under this component.

b) Subcomponent 1.2: Supporting AFMP Implementation (\$2.68 M IBRD). This would fund technical assistance, studies, training and workshops that will help in the design of coordinated systems of technical support for the value chains and sub projects prioritized in the PCIPs. Prior to mid-term, the key intermediate results would be the approved program agreements for PCIP technical support between the DA-RFOs and national technical agencies, as well as the evaluation of best practices for wider application on approaches for providing integrated technical support to small scale producers following the commodity value-chain approach. It will also inventory various modalities of integrated technical support delivery for pilot-testing under the Enterprise Development Component. After mid-term, it is expected that this joint annual work programming and budgeting between DA-RFOs and national technical agencies of the DA and other departments are expected to be mainstreamed and institutionalized into the regular planning and budgeting processes of the Department.

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

a) Sub-component 2.1: Value Chain Infrastructure Support (US\$354.47 million IBRD). This would finance infrastructure investments by LGUs supporting priority commodity value chains. Support would be provided for a flexible menu of investments, including farm-to-market roads, bridges, tire tracks, communal irrigation, potable water systems, post-harvest facilities, production facilities, fish landings, fish sanctuaries, tram lines, cold storage facilities, trading posts, green houses, solar driers, watch towers, nurseries and slope stabilization works. Cost sharing between the Department of Agriculture and the concerned LGU would be on a 90:10 basis. Provincial Governments would be responsible for the O& M of investment s. Geo-tagging would be used to facilitate planning, procurement, and monitoring of sub projects. Intermediate results would include (i) improving the links from production areas to markets to enhance the efficiency of transporting agricultural products, (ii) higher productivity as a result of increased cropping intensity and yields, and (iii) lower post-harvest losses resulting in higher volume of outputs and more efficient support infrastructure.

b) Sub-component 2.2: Approaches for Improving the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Infrastructure Investments (US\$7.23 million IBRD). Consultancy services, training, workshops, supplies and travel expenses would be provided for developing technical specifications which will improve 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 M IBRD and US\$5.60 M GEF grant)

a) Subcomponent 3.1: Rural agri-fishery enterprise and productivity enhancement (estd. US\$90 M IBRD and estd. US\$3.36 M GEF). This would support vertical and horizontal clustering, joint business planning and investments of producer groups comprising smallholders (farmers and fishers) associations. Funding would be shared by the DA and provincial LGUs (PLGUs) on an 80:20 basis.

PLGUs would assist proponent groups through capital investments, facilities, inputs and technical assistance. Funding for enterprises would range from PhP 1 million to 10 million with proponent groups contributing an amount equal to at least 20% (in cash or in kind) of the incremental enterprise cost. 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. The types of activities supported at each GEF target site will be adapted based on regional and local needs. Specific activities will be selected at the site level based on the information generated by the VCA, PRA-RSA, and GEF Tracking Tools.

b) Subcomponent 3.2: Technology and Information for Enterprise and Market Development (US \$10M IBRD and US\$2.24M GEF). This would complement the enterprise sub-project development under Component 3.1 through technical assistance including support for GEF-supported activities. A particular focus would be on facilitating vertical and horizontal integration and include trade facilitation, trial shipments, assistance in preparing market contracts; market promotion, field days, trade fairs and caravans, cross visits, training and workshops. New and sustainable technologies and approaches would be introduced in collaboration with agencies such as the Department of Science and Technology (DOST), the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), and State and Private Universities and Colleges. 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. Program Agreements would be used as a temporary instrument to provide the incentive for DA agencies to tailor their services to local needs, until planning and budgeting guidelines are issued (see Component 1.2).

Component 4: Program Support (US\$24M IBRD). This would support the day-to-day coordination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the PRDP across each of the 16 regions of the country. The management support will follow the system that has worked well in Mindanao for MRDP2. Under PRDP, expansion to include the rest of the country (Central & Northern Philippines) has entailed the establishment and mobilization of a National Program Coordination Office (NPCO), additional Project Support Offices (PSOs) for Visayas and Luzon, and designation of staff to Regional Program Coordination Offices (RPCOs) for Luzon and Visayas. Technical assistance, training, workshops, equipment and incremental operating costs would also be supported.

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 (EASDE)

Jonas Garcia Bautista (EASPS)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/ BP 4.01	Yes	The Program 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	Sub projects could be located in areas where there are IP communities or in areas declared as ancestral domain of certain IP groups. IPs are often socially and economically marginalized and there is a possibility that they would be unable to participate and 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. The same types and magnitude of impacts have been assessed in the PRDP year-1 sub projects.

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. The increase in pesticide usage, however, is likely to be mitigated by the promotion and support of DA’s Integrated Pest Management Program through the KASAKALIKASAN program under PRDP.

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 for sub projects which will affect natural habitats, the EMP includes measures to address such impacts.

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 volumes 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 in height; the safety concerns would now also include potential breach of dam structures. Based on assessments done, none of the proposed year 1 sub projects have so far involved dams.

OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) – Under MRDP2, minority groups were purposively targeted as beneficiaries of the project to fulfill the project's poverty alleviation objectives. This would no longer be done under the PRDP. However, under PRDP, sub projects located in areas where there are IP communities would be undertaken in accordance with the Indigenous Peoples Framework which was implemented quite successfully under MRDP and now has been enhanced for PRDP use.

OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) – Based on MRDP1 and MRDP2 projects, there will be a few infrastructure sub projects that would require physical relocation of residents, particularly where there are no alternative sites such as in the construction of bridges and roads near the village centers. Under MRDP2, almost all sub projects have required land or right-of-way acquisition and only two have required physical relocation of households. All of the year 1 sub projects have involved minor land acquisition and/or updating and firming up of the documentation of existing right-of-ways but none will involve displacement of homes or livelihoods.

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: (i) potential agricultural encroachment into forest areas where farm-to-market roads will be rehabilitated and/or built; and (ii) potential increased use of pesticides due to increased commercial production in project-supported areas. The LGUs and RPCOs 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.

The Borrower has developed an Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF) which builds on the existing MRDP2 frameworks and instruments. Included in this ESSF document are the Environmental Management Framework and Guidelines (EMFG), the Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework (IPPF), the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Framework (LARRF) and the Grievance Redress Mechanism Framework (GRMF). 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.

The EMFG 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), Forests (OP 4.36), Pest Management (OP 4.09) and Safety of Dams (OP 4.37) which are triggered in PRDP. It contains: (i) general policies pertaining to types and locations of agricultural development; (ii) technical environmental guidelines and design specifications for the most common sub projects; (iii) 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; (iv) guidance in preparing and evaluating the environmental aspects of subproject proposals; and (v) 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:

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) 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.

(d) 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.

(e) To address the 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.

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: (i) 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); (ii) 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 (iii) 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, resulting in “broad community support” for the subproject. An IPP will be required where the affected/benefited ICC/IP community is not the proponent or constitute only a minority of the proponents of the Subproject. Environmental and Social Screening will determine whether a subproject would require an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP). To guide IPP preparation, an IPP template has been developed and provided as an Annex in the ESSF.

The LARRF on the other hand, 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.

The Grievance Redress Mechanism Framework (GRMF) for the Project requires that a Grievance Redress Mechanism shall 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.

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 ESSF has been updated and integrated into the Project Operations Manuals.

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). None of the year-1 sub projects thus far has caused physical or economic dislocation and hence, no RAP has been

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

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 Sector Manager (SM) 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 SM? 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 Sector 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 Sector 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 Sector 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	
Approved By		
Sector Manager:	Name: Ousmane Dione (SM)	Date: 06-Jun-2014