



Integrated Safeguards Data Sheet Appraisal Stage

Appraisal Stage | Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 17-Dec-2017 | Report No: ISDSA23939

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Regional Vice President: | Victoria Kwakwa |
| Country Director: | Mara K. Warwick |
| Senior Global Practice Director: | Ede Jorge Ijjasz-Vasquez |
| Practice Manager/Manager: | Susan S. Shen |
| Task Team Leader: | Roberto B. Tordecilla |



Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA

| | |
|--|---|
| Project ID P164019 | Project Name Mindanao Trust Fund-Reconstruction and Development Project Phase II |
| Task Team Leader(s) Roberto B. Tordecilla | Country Philippines |
| Approval Date 15-Mar-2018 | Environmental Category Partial Assessment |
| Managing Unit GSU02 | Is this a Repeater project? No |

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (IN USD MILLION)

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Total Project Cost 3.20 | Total Financing 0 |
| Financing Gap 0 | |

| Financing Source | Amount |
|---|-------------|
| Philippines - Multi-donor Trust Fund Program for Mindanao | 3.20 |
| Total | 3.20 |

2. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE

Project Development Objective

The development objective of the proposed project is to improve access of targeted communities in conflict-affected areas in Mindanao to basic socio-economic infrastructure and alternative learning system.

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content, document is editable from here.



3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Note to Task Teams: The following sections are system generated and can only be edited online in the Portal.

4. PROJECT LOCATION AND SALIENT PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS RELEVANT TO THE SAFEGUARD ANALYSIS (IF KNOWN)

The project location for Phase II will be mainly at the heart of the Central Mindanao Region, in the six acknowledged major camps of the MILF. These six camps are located in four provinces namely, Maguindanao, North Cotabato, Lanao del Sur and Lanao del Norte. All these four provinces are poverty- and conflict-stricken areas, with Lanao del Sur having a 72% poverty incidence. The four provinces are home to three groups of people: (i) Moros or Muslims, (ii) Lumads or indigenous peoples, and (iii) “settlers” who are mostly Christians whose families or ancestors were resettled people from Luzon and the Visayas. The Muslims comprise the overwhelming majority in the five provinces and one city of ARMM while the total population of indigenous people in ARMM in 2010 was 606,452. Due to its protracted nature, the conflict in the Bangsamoro area has mutated in various forms. Vertical conflict (state versus rebel groups) is primarily between the government and the MILF, but other armed groups such as the remnants of the Moro National Liberation Front, the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters, and elements of the Abu Sayyaf Group pose challenges to state authority. Horizontal conflicts abound such as political elites competing for key electoral positions in the government or control over scarce resource in the area, inter-ethnic competition, or inter-communal conflict. An important geographic feature of the project area is the river basins that encompass the area. The four provinces are located within the Mindanao River Basin, the second largest river basin in the country, and span across four regions in Central and Southern Mindanao including ARMM. There are also lakes located in the four provinces. The largest of these are Lake Lanao and Lake Buluan with areas of 34,000 and 6,134 hectares respectively. These bodies of water are considered to be major lakes in the Philippines and are the third and sixth largest lakes in the country. There are ten (10) protected areas in the region. The biggest of these is the Lake Lanao Watershed Reservation with a total area of 180,460 hectares and the South Upi Watershed Forest Reserve with 1,894 hectares.

5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS SPECIALISTS ON THE TEAM

Maya Gabriela Q. Villaluz, Environmental Safeguards Specialist
Maria Loreto Padua, Social Safeguards Specialist

6. SAFEGUARD POLICIES TRIGGERED

| Safeguard Policies | Triggered | Explanation |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------|
|--------------------|-----------|-------------|



| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|---|
| Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01 | Yes | <p>In general, most sub-projects under the MTF-RDP/2 are categorized as non-environmentally critical projects and are exempted in securing environmental compliance certificates (ECC) under the Philippine EIA policy. Temporary, short-term and minimal construction-related environmental impacts such as the increase in dust, noise, and vibration, generation of construction debris and solid wastes, vegetation loss, and siltation due to loose soil and unstable slopes as well as occupational health and safety are anticipated and will be mitigated during construction period. Potential social risks relate to loss of structures, crops, trees and other assets as a result of acquisition of small parcels of land for required civil works and exclusion/marginalization of vulnerable groups.</p> |
| Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04 | No | <p>The project has an environmental and social screening and management mechanism that identifies prohibited sub-projects (e.g. community roads into protected areas or procurement of pesticides) and those with adverse social and environmental impacts. The project has planned and earmarked resources for marginalized groups such as women and IPs. The POs and Camp JTFCTs will be properly informed of the prohibited sub-projects so that they will be guided accordingly at the outset of preparing the subproject proposals.</p> <p>This policy is not triggered because the small-scale nature of the community sub-projects under this project is unlikely to impact natural habitats. As practiced under the previous phase, safeguards screening under OP 4.01 provides sufficient guidance and process for the project team and communities to avoid creating adverse impacts on people and environment. Impacts on natural habitats are avoided as socio-economic infrastructures were sited either on existing barangay roads (in case of access path or village road rehabilitation), residential areas or village centers.</p> |
| Forests OP/BP 4.36 | No | <p>The project activities are not expected to create or induce deforestation and their environmental impact is not expected to compromise the integrity and health of forested areas. Some minor clearings of trees, shrubs and undergrowth within urban</p> |



| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| | | areas may be necessary under the physical investments. |
| Pest Management OP 4.09 | No | This policy is not triggered as activities under the Project are not expected to trigger or require use of pesticides, herbicides and other harmful substances. |
| Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11 | No | The EA screening described in the ESSF was sufficient in guiding the project team and communities in avoiding sites with PCR, which are mainly graves and mosques in the Bangsamoro areas. Community volunteers who will supervise the civil works are knowledgeable of their PCR. Only small excavations will be required for some civil works. |
| | | The MILF camps do not have defined boundaries but they usually span several villages, municipalities or even provinces. The selection of communities to be assisted by MTF-RDP Phase II will be done during project implementation. There are IP communities in four of the six previously acknowledged MILF camps, mostly belonging to the Teduray and Ata Manobo groups. Some of them have been served by MTF-RDP between January 2016 and March 2017. |
| Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10 | Yes | <p>The Project aims to promote protection and welfare of IP communities by (a) ensuring free, prior and informed participation of indigenous peoples in the activities of the Project, so that they are in a position to receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits, (b) that IP are not adversely affected during the development process by ensuring their participation in the decision-making processes of the project, (c) providing avenues for IPs to determine their own development priorities, through their indigenous political structures, for sub-projects intended for the IP communities, and (d) earmarking project resources under the Community Development Assistance Component.</p> <p>The IPPF that is embedded in the ESSF has been proven effective and sufficient in screening IP presence once specific communities are selected and in providing culturally-appropriate interventions. When IPs are present, subproject proposals describe targeted activities for IPs and</p> |



| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| | | the ESMP embeds the elements of an IP Plan. To strengthen project performance on IP, a social development specialist with IP expertise will be hired by the grant recipient. |
| Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12 | Yes | <p>Small parcels of lands will be required for socio-economic infrastructure subprojects. Lands required for a community small-scale socio-economic infrastructure sub-project under MTF-RDP/2, similar to the previous phase, will most likely consist of government lands free of claims or encroachments, or of lands voluntarily donated by community members. The ESSF where the elements of an RPF is embedded will be the main instrument to address OP 4.12-related impacts. The ESSF now contains a voluntary land donation protocol. It should be noted also that resettlement is in the negative list of MTFRDP Phase I and will be kept under Phase II.</p> <p>The ESSF provides a process where arrangements and proper documentations will ensure that the land donation is indeed voluntary, given that the donors is the legitimate owner of the land and is fully informed of the nature of the sub-project and the implication of donating the property. Implications refer to current and future implications.</p> |
| Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37 | No | This policy is not triggered as no dams will be constructed. |
| Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50 | No | The project will not have activities on international waterways. |
| Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60 | No | The project will not have activities in any disputed areas. |

II. KEY SAFEGUARD POLICY ISSUES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

A. SUMMARY OF KEY SAFEGUARD ISSUES

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

Most sub-projects under the MTF-RDP/2 are small-scale and location-specific. No significant and irreversible impacts are foreseen. Temporary, short-term and minimal construction-related environmental impacts such as the increase in dust, noise, and vibration, generation of construction debris and solid wastes, vegetation loss, and siltation due to loose soil and unstable slopes as well as occupational health and safety are anticipated and will be mitigated during construction period.



Social impacts under the proposed projects are generally positive, given that the Project aims to provide much-needed socio-economic infrastructures and alternative learning programs in targeted poor and conflict-ridden communities. However, there are risks associated with exclusion of vulnerable groups such as women and IPs.

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

Potential indirect and/or long term impacts are positive, such as improved access to community infrastructures and improved literacy of beneficiaries.

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

Not applicable.

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 grant recipient has revised the Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework based on the lessons learned from the previous phase of MTF-RDP. A Resettlement Policy Framework that contains a Voluntary Land Protocol embedded in the Environment and Social Safeguards Framework has been prepared to manage any minor impacts that any subproject activities may cause. The Grant Recipient committed to hiring an IP expert to provide proper guidance in dealing with IP communities in targeted communities under the Project. Phase 2 continues to target women and the youths for Alternative Learning System while resources are earmarked for IP development projects based on their own prioritization process, with the support of a development specialist with intensive IP experience. On land acquisition, the Project prohibits use of project funds to purchase lands and funding of subprojects that will cause resettlement.

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

Key stakeholders include the following: Members of the Government and MILF Implementing Panels, Members of the Joint Task Force on Camps Transformation, project staff of Community and Family Services International and Bangsamoro Development Agency, other relevant government agencies that the project team will identify during project implementation, and project-affected communities. The Bank has conducted a series of consultations with these stakeholders as part of project preparation. Regular consultations with these stakeholders will continue during project implementation.

B. DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank

Date of submission for disclosure



| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 16-Mar-2018 | 16-Mar-2018 |
| For Category 'A' projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors | |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Country | Date of Disclosure |
| Philippines | 16-Mar-2018 |
| Comments | |
| The Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework was disclosed in the Grant Recipient's website. | |
| Resettlement Action Plan/Framework Policy Process | |
| Date of receipt by the Bank | Date of submission for disclosure |
| 16-Mar-2018 | 16-Mar-2018 |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Country | Date of Disclosure |
| Philippines | 16-Mar-2018 |
| Comments | |
| RPF is embedded in the ESSF. | |
| Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework | |
| Date of receipt by the Bank | Date of submission for disclosure |
| 16-Mar-2018 | 16-Mar-2018 |
| "In country" Disclosure | |
| Country | Date of Disclosure |
| Philippines | 16-Mar-2018 |
| Comments | |
| IPPF is embedded in the ESSF | |



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 |
| If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report? | Yes |
| Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan? | Yes |

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 |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan? | Yes |
| 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? | NA |

OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement

| | |
|---|-----|
| Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared? | Yes |
| If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan? | Yes |

The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information

| | |
|--|-----|
| Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank for disclosure? | Yes |
| 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 |

All Safeguard Policies



| | |
|---|-----|
| Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes |
| Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost? | Yes |
| Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies? | Yes |
| Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents? | Yes |

III. APPROVALS

| | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Task Team Leader(s) | Roberto B. Tordecilla | |
| Approved By | | |
| Safeguards Advisor | | |
| Practice Manager/Manager | Susan S. Shen | 23-Mar-2018 |

Note to Task Teams: End of system generated content