Combined Project Information Documents / Integrated Safeguards Datasheet (PID/ISDS)

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 09-Nov-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA26481

BASIC INFORMATION

A. Basic Project Data

Country	Project ID	Project Name	Parent Project ID (if any)
Philippines	P169025	Philippine Rural Development Project Second Additional Financing	P132317
Parent Project Name	**Region**	**Estimated Appraisal Date**	**Estimated Board Date**
Philippine Rural Development Project	EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	09-Nov-2020	15-Dec-2020
Practice Area (Lead)	**Financing Instrument**	**Borrower(s)**	**Implementing Agency**
Agriculture and Food	Investment Project Financing	Republic of the Philippines	Department of Agriculture, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

The PRDP aims to increase rural incomes and enhance farm and fishery productivity in the targeted areas by supporting smallholdersand fisher folk to increase their marketable surpluses, and their access to markets.

Components

Component 1: Local and National Level Planning
Component 2: Infrastructure Development
Component 3. Enterprise Development
Component 4: Project Implementation Support

PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US$, Millions)

SUMMARY

Total Project Cost	361.83
Total Financing	361.83
of which IBRD/IDA	280.00
Financing Gap	0.00

DETAILS

World Bank Group Financing	
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	280.00
Non-World Bank Group Financing	
Counterpart Funding	60.00
Local Govts. (Prov., District, City) of Borrowing Country	60.00
Other Sources	21.83
EC: European Commission	21.83

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

B. Introduction and Context

Introduction

1. **This Project Paper seeks the approval of a Second Additional Financing (AF2) to the Philippine Rural Development Project (PRDP) in the amount of US$280 million.** The parent project (P132317) was approved on August 29, 2014 with a loan of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) of US$501.25 million, representing about 75% of total project costs, and a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Grant of US$7 million. The First Additional Financing (AF1) amounting to US$170 million was approved on January 18, 2018, with the provision that further financing would be considered based on the project's continued strong performance and financing needs. The proposed AF2 is the remaining balance of the government's request on January 19, 2017[1] for a US$450 million additional loan to scale up the PRDP. In addition, the European Union (EU) will provide a co-financing grant of EUR18.3 million to the AF2, through a standalone, country-specific, cofinancing trust fund for the PRDP.

2. **The proposed AF2 will scale up PRDP activities to enhance the benefits and impacts of this well-functioning nationwide project and support COVID-19 economic recovery.** Funds from the Original Loan (OL) and AF1 are almost fully committed to specific subprojects (SPs). The proposed AF2 will meet the emerging, diversified, and increasing demand from Local Government Units (LGUs) for rural infrastructure, and from Proponent Groups (PGs)[2] for enterprise development investments and technical

1 DOF letter to DA on January 19, 2017, and subsequently endorsed to the Bank from the DA on February 13, 2017.

2 Proponent Groups (*PGs)* refer generally to producer groups (such as farmers and fisherfolk groups, cooperatives, associations, rural improvement clubs) engaged in the commodity value chain. They are formally registered with

assistance (TA). The AF2 will also scale up oversight and capacity building under PRDP; provide critical institutional, governance, and science-based planning support; and continue mainstreaming PRDP planning approaches and tools across all agencies and units of the Department of Agriculture (DA), other National Government Agencies (NGAs), and LGUs. Finally, it will also finance a cost over-run to cover the increases in the cost of farm-to-market roads (FMRs). Funding will cover the higher implementation costs of the AF1, given that during AF1 preparation, road rehabilitation was estimated at PhP11 million per km, but actual costs during implementation were about PhP15 million per km. For the AF2, PhP17 million per km has been estimated in line with current average costs.

3. **Most notably, the proposed AF2 has been retrofitted to support the government's effort to ensure economic recovery and strong agricultural value chains in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.** The AF2 has been closely re-aligned with the Government of the Philippines' (GOP) "We Recover As One" plan, which directs the agri-fishery sector to focus on food security and sustainability. Plans to ensure that food is available and affordable as set out in the DA's Stimulus Package, also referred as the *Plant, Plant, Plant Program*, which includes the *Ahon Lahat, Pagkain Sapat* (ALPAS) *Kontra COVID-19* (Survive, Reboot, Grow) and a Food Logistics component. This program realigns the current budget of major DA programs and seeks supplemental budget from the national government and financing institutions to achieve food security in the short to long term. The AF2 serves as an important platform to support these initiatives, because it can use the well-established nationwide mechanisms of the PRDP to scale up investments in infrastructure and enterprises that will in turn restore and contribute to improving the availability, accessibility, and affordability of commodities produced by the agri-fishery sector. The main difference from the original AF2 government request is that the Local and National Planning Component (I-PLAN) and the Enterprise Development Component (I-REAP) will now also get funding. The original AF request previously received had only included support for the Infrastructure Development (I-BUILD) and Project Implementation Support (I-SUPPORT) components.

4. **The AF2 also expands the inclusiveness of PRDP by supporting more LGUs in Mindanao that experience poverty and conflict.** The EU Grant will provide incentives for Mindanao LGUs with a higher incidence of poverty (4th–6th-class LGUs), lower capacity, more conflict-affected areas, and larger numbers of indigenous people (IP) to participate in PRDP. The participation of LGUs in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), where capacity has been the lowest, will be particularly encouraged and provided with TA. The project will continue to work with the BARMM's Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Agrarian Reform (MAFAR), which has been the PRDP's implementing institution under the former Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao.

5. **In line with these efforts, the proposed AF2 will entail some restructuring of the PRDP.** The restructuring is needed to reflect changes in the results framework, component costs, Loan closing date, disbursement arrangements, financial management, procurement, and the implementation schedule.

---

government accrediting institutions and have legal personality to enter into legal transactions. PGs could also include micro, small and medium scale enterprises (i.e., agri-processors, consolidators, exporters, etc.), who are willing to assist producer groups in vertical clustering or joint business planning, and forge contract or formal marketing arrangement with producer groups.

Background and Rationale for Additional Financing

6. ***Country Context.*** In 2006-2019, the gross domestic product (GDP) grew by 5.9 percent on average in the Philippines. This rate was even more impressive than the 1996–2005 growth rate (4.1 percent) and the 1986–1995 rate (3.4 percent), and the Philippines became one of the region's three most rapidly growing economies. Yet despite this encouraging economic performance, over the last few decades the country (a lower-middle-income country with about 100 million people) has seen slower, less inclusive growth than other high-performing countries in the region, and poverty has fallen more slowly. According to the 2015 Family Income and Expenditure Survey, household per capita income increased for all income deciles in the Philippines between 2012 and 2015, and some 1.8 million Filipinos were lifted from poverty due to a combination of higher incomes, higher employment, and generally stable inflation rates. Yet 22 million Filipinos still lived below the national poverty line in 2015, and rural households tended to have much lower incomes than their urban counterparts. Approximately 55 percent of all Filipinos reside in rural areas, and about 38 percent are classified as poor. Households engaged mainly in farming and fishing are among the poorest.

7. **The social and economic suffering unleashed by COVID-19 has been more severe in the Philippines than in nearly all other Southeast Asian countries.** As of November 2020, the Philippines is second highest in terms of cases in the region. Control measures imposed in early 2020 at the onset of the outbreak, including a community quarantine that has been eased but not yet lifted, came at a high cost. Severely restricted economic activity pushed the economy into a recession. A contraction in GDP of 0.7 percent in the first quarter was succeeded by a record-breaking 16.5 percent drop in the second quarter. Prior to this crisis, the Philippines was poised to transition from a lower-middle-income economy to an upper-middle-income economy in the medium term. As of July 2020, unemployment stood at 45.5 percent (up from 17.5 percent in December 2019), based on the latest Social Weather Station (SWS) survey, meaning that about 27.3 million Filipinos were unemployed. Half of that number reportedly lost their jobs as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Joblessness has been consistently higher among women than among men with 55.8 percent (up from 30.8 percent in December 2019), compared to 24.8 percent (up from 8.3 percent for men.

8. ***Sectoral and Institutional Context.*** The agricultural sector in the Philippines is lagging behind agriculture in other Southeast Asian countries in terms of production and productivity growth. According to the Philippines Statistics Authority (PSA), agricultural output grew by only 0.7 percent in 2019 - far below the 4 percent target. Aside from climatic shocks, an array of other challenges dampen agriculture's contribution to economic growth, job creation, and poverty reduction. The Philippines' non-agricultural economy has grown substantially faster than the agricultural sector, which accounted for 8.8 percent of GDP in 2019. Even so, agriculture provides livelihoods and employment for more than 30 percent of Filipinos.

9. **Even as the COVID-19 crisis persists, the Philippines remains vulnerable to extreme and variable climate and to climate change more generally.** The country comprises some 7,100 islands in the Pacific typhoon belt, and its discontinuous 32,400-kilometer coastline is exposed to a wide range of hydro-meteorological hazards, including typhoons (more than 20 each year), floods, droughts, landslides, and a rise in sea level (which increased from -0.0913 mm in 1992 to +0.1489 mm in 2008). According to the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) of the Climate Change Commission (CCC), from 1990 to 2006, losses and damages to agricultural production were notably due to typhoons (about 70 percent),

drought (18 percent) and floods (5 percent), among all contributing factors. Typhoon-related damages average an annual cost of US$136 million to the sector. Temperatures in the country are generally high (averaging 27° C) and rainfall is heavy (averaging approximately 2,348 millimeters each year). Because 60 percent of municipalities in the Philippines and 10 of its largest cities are located along the coast, the risk of storm surge is high. Historically, the country has experienced an increase in average temperatures of 0.64°C between 1951 to 2010. The Philippines Atmospheric, Geophysical, and Astronomical Services Administration's (PAGASA) climatic projections show that temperatures are expected to get warmer in the medium term. By 2050, the annual mean temperature in varying areas in Luzon is expected to increase by 1.5°C and in areas in Visayas and Mindanao by 1.4°C. Over the same period, average rainfall is projected to go up by 4 percent in Luzon and Mindanao and by 5percent in Visayas. Increases in water and heat stress caused by climate variability is expected to increase the incidence of pests and diseases, which could potentially contribute to declines in crop yields and shifts in crop production suitability.

10. **The changing and increasingly variable climate is steadily undermining livelihoods and health, particularly among the poor, by damaging physical infrastructure, agriculture, and ecosystems.** For instance, produce cannot be marketed competitively when landslides routinely block or damage roads. Post-harvest losses rise and the quality and nutritional value of food decline when heavy rainfall and flooding ruin crops that producers cannot afford to store or that are stored in facilities that cannot withstand climate hazards. The net effects of climate change are expected to be negative for most crops, including rice, maize, and sugarcane, across all regions of the Philippines.

11. **Gender inequalities and discrimination against Filipino women at the household and community levels still persist in rural areas** (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2018). Agriculture account for a significant share of employment in the Philippines. As of 2016, around 11 million Filipinos (27 percent of the country's total employment) were employed in the agricultural sector. Male and female agricultural workers comprised 33.2 and 17.3 percent of the total male and female employment, respectively (PSA, 2017). While enabling policies, guidelines and mechanisms to close the country's gender gap have been enacted and institutionalized, gender disparities, mainly brought about by societal and cultural norms, still exist in agricultural and rural sector. Rural women's contribution to food production and the rural economy remains generally undervalued, if not invisible (WAGI, 2003). Their roles in farming and fishing are seen as household chores and do not reflect the women's contribution and major role in the food supply chain. Data from the DA (2017) also indicate that only 27 percent of the beneficiaries who were provided with agricultural production support and other services in their regular programs and projects were women.

12. **As COVID-19 bore down upon the Philippines and the community quarantine was imposed in March 2020, agricultural activity contracted sharply.** Transport lines shut down, and the impacts on food supply chains were immediate, especially in the National Capital Region (NCR). Although the government swiftly created food lanes and authorized special food passes, agriculture still suffered from supply chain disruptions such as labor shortages, national and international trade restrictions, price fluctuations, stoppage and slowdowns in port operations, closed borders, input shortages, disrupted logistics, financing limitations, operational distress, and the closure of major markets and the restaurant industry. Agricultural output declined by 1.2 percent in the first quarter of 2020. The rapid response mobilized by government and key stakeholders - the COVID-19 Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) recommendations, alongside the DA's ALPAS Kontra COVID-19 Program and Plant, Plant, Plant Program - quickly turned things around. Agriculture has been the only sector to grow during the pandemic, registering growth of 1.6 percent in the second quarter of 2020.

13. **Even as these occurrences have highlighted the fundamental importance of agriculture in the Philippines, they have also revealed the extent to which poorly developed transport infrastructure - especially all-weather FMRs, port facilities, and inter-island shipping - aggravate the country's pervasive rural poverty, low agricultural productivity, and the weak competitive position of agricultural products.** Inaccessibility (about half of all rural villages lack all-weather access to market outlets), high transport and freight costs, and post-harvest losses are chronic, major constraints. The spread of modern agricultural technology is held back by inefficient supply and logistic systems, which also raise the cost of agricultural inputs. The widespread adoption of improved agricultural technology is also limited by the weak extension system, unorganized producers, limited access to finance, and unclear property rights. As discussed below, under the PRDP, the Philippines is adopting significant reforms and innovations to address the constraints at the root of unproductive agriculture.

14. ***Project Background, Objectives, and Performance.*** Approved on August 29, 2014, the PRDP was initially financed by an IBRD loan of US$501.25 million, representing about 75 percent of total project costs, and a GEF Grant of US$7 million. The government provided counterpart funding of US$163.34 million through the DA, LGUs, and private sector. The PRDP became effective on December 3, 2014 and is being implemented by the DA over a six-year period, with a closing date of May 31, 2021. The AF1 in the amount of US$170 million IBRD loan was approved on January 18, 2018 and became effective on May 23, 2018. On November 7, 2019, the project was restructured so that US$88.92 million from the OL and US$12.51 million from the AF1, equivalent to the foreign exchange gains, were cancelled by the Bank at the request of the government. The closing dates of the OL and AF1 were also extended by two years to May 31, 2023. As of September 21, 2020, disbursement of the OL, AF1, and GEF Grant stood at 86.28 percent, 45.7 percent, and 60.88 percent, respectively.

15. **The Project Development Objective (PDO) of the PRDP is to increase rural incomes and enhance farm and fishery productivity in the targeted areas.** The project supports smallholders and fisherfolk to increase their marketable surpluses and their access to markets. The PDO indicators are: (i) increase in real household incomes of farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries; (ii) increase in income of beneficiaries involved with enterprise development; (iii) increase in value of annual marketed output; and (iv) increase in the number of farmers with improved access to DA services. The Global Environment Objective (GEO) linked to the GEF Grant is to strengthen the conservation of the coastal and marine resource base in targeted project areas. The GEO indicator is the increase in Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) management effectiveness in selected sites in GEF target areas. The PRDP PDO indicators are achieved through four interlinked project components: (i) Local and National Level Planning; (ii) Infrastructure Development; (iii) Enterprise Development; and (iv) Project Implementation Support. The planning component (I-PLAN) provides the policy and institutional framework for determining the selection and type of infrastructure (I-BUILD) and enterprise investments (I-REAP), while the implementation support component (I-SUPPORT) provides for harmonization of procedures, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and implementation support.

16. **The PRDP is on track to achieve its PDO.** Its performance consistently has been rated Satisfactory or Moderately Satisfactory, and its compliance with legal, fiduciary and safeguard requirements has also been Satisfactory. By mid-term, the project had achieved and even exceeded the end-of-project targets for all four PDO indicators. Assessments of project outcomes indicate that beneficiaries have seen a continued increase in real household income, increase in the value of marketed output, reduction in input and output

hauling costs, increases in farmed area, increase in production volumes, reduction in travel time, increase in traffic density, and increase in school attendance. Comparing baseline data with results from the mid-term evaluation, the average household income of farmer and fisher households involved in completed I-BUILD and I-REAP SPs grew by 36 percent compared to its end target of 30 percent. Average real household income of beneficiaries involved in completed I-REAP SPs increased by 113 percent compared to 30 percent end target. Beneficiaries of I-REAP and I-BUILD completed SPs posted an increase of 51 percent in the real value of average annual marketed output, and completed SPs benefited a total of 323,501 beneficiaries (end target is 600,000), of which 260,485 served by I-BUILD and 63,016 served by I-REAP. A total of 147,283 women have benefitted from completed subprojects, or 55 percent of the end-of-project target, of which 24,866 are under I-REAP SPs.

17. The PRDP has also helped to modernize and diversify crop production, industrialize value chains, create jobs, broaden the inclusiveness of value chains, improve infrastructure, and develop science-based instruments to prepare roadmaps for provincial and local development. Additional outcomes have been realized through strengthened accountability and transparency, strengthened planning and implementation capacities in LGUs, and greatly increased convergence between programs of the DA, other national government agencies, and LGUs. Municipal LGUs with large rural areas in their jurisdiction have also benefited from project funds (to date, eight Municipal LGUs are engaged with the project). As the pandemic advanced into the Philippines, the project also took extraordinary steps to help restore and ensure functioning food supply chains in the provinces.

18. **In sum, new ways of doing business and technical innovations introduced by the PDRP are being institutionalized to raise the productivity of key commodities, rural incomes, and employment.** The LGUs and Regional Development Councils (RDCs) are using the three-year rolling Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs) introduced by the PRDP for effective, technically-based planning and for leveraging significant additional resources for investments from other government programs and attracting private sector investments. Through the I-PLAN component of the project, the PCIPs link national objectives, identified in the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Plan (AFMP), with regional strategic plans (Regional AFMPs) and localized plans and priorities developed by the LGUs. Based on the PCIPs and Value Chain Analyses (VCAs), LGUs identify specific investments - focusing on rural infrastructure (through the I-BUILD component) and rural enterprises (through the I-REAP component)[3] - to address constraints in value chains for priority agricultural commodities in their province. Several RDCs also use the PCIP to facilitate agricultural development in conjunction with other government agencies. The PCIP process has leveraged approximately PhP36 billion to develop the value chains of the five most commonly produced commodities supported under the PRDP: banana, cacao, coconut, coffee, and rubber. Fifty-seven provinces have updated their PCIPs, and 21 are working on updates. The PCIP operations manual is incorporating more robust risk analysis in the form of a Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment. This planning tool analyzes climate exposure, sensitivity, and adaptive capacities and permits evidence-based targeting of agricultural investments in climate-resilient agriculture.

[3] *Rural infrastructure investments* developed under the PRDP include FMRs, FMRs with bridges, bridges, potable water systems (PWSs), communal irrigation systems (CISs), and other infrastructure, such as fish landing centers, tramlines, slope protection, solar dryers, warehouses, etc. *Enterprise development investments* include input supply enterprises such as nurseries, hatcheries, and feed mills; production systems such as greenhouses or hydroponic systems; postharvest facilities such as dryers, sorters, or packing facilities; aggregation and assembly facilities such as warehouses, trading posts, logistics systems, trucks, weighing scales, and plastic crates; and processing facilities and structures, such as value-adding equipment, a building to process produce, etc.

19. **The DA is mainstreaming significant institutional reforms across its units and agencies; six of these reforms are particularly important for sustaining the benefits of the PRDP over the longer term, after the project ends.** First and as earlier noted, the DA supports planning that links the national strategic objectives for agriculture with regional and local plans and strategies for the sector. Second, DA programs and investments in order to stimulate the rural economy are now implemented in partnership with the LGUs - in other words, the LGUs have become the primary implementers and owners of the investments, consistent with the LGU Code (1991), while the DA provides technical support and shares the cost of the investments. Third, the VCAs and expanded Vulnerability and Suitability Assessments (eVSAs) provide a stronger technical rationale to support investments. Fourth, infrastructure and enterprise development are implemented based on standardized transparent investment criteria, technical specifications, and procedures. Fifth, the PCIPs increasingly form part of regular LGU investment planning. Lastly, Regional Results Frameworks are in place to monitor annual performance and evaluate achievement of Regional AFMPs.

20. **Technical innovation also features strongly in key PRDP governance systems.** An outstanding example is the best-practice Management Information System, in which interventions and activities are geo-referenced to register progress across project areas in real time, tracks the pace of interventions and activities against prescribed timelines, and generates reports on demand. Geotagging is also used in SPs for identification, validation, procurement, monitoring, supervision, and infrastructure operation and maintenance (O&M). An application has been developed to show the location of all PRDP-financed SPs nationwide. A web-based Document Tracking System enables the National Project Coordination Office (NPCO), the four Project Support Offices (PSOs), and the Regional Project Coordination Offices (RPCOs) to oversee document development and flow. A monitoring system provides a checklist and feedback mechanism for citizen-beneficiaries to track the construction of infrastructure and performance of contractors. A Grievance Redress System (GRS), accessible online (prdp.da.gov.ph), enables grievances to be reported, describes the grievances reported, and reports on the status of the response.

21. **Data on project intermediate outputs highlight the achievements by component to date.** Under the I-PLAN component, all 81 provinces have prepared PCIPs; 78 provinces fielded PRDP investments; and 57 have updated their PCIPs to include additional commodities and 21 are being updated, building on 64 VCAs. Under the I-BUILD component, 455 rural infrastructure SPs benefiting 608,887 households have been approved, and 261 are completed. Some 813 km of FMRs have been completed, and 1,231 km are under construction, representing 89 percent of the end-of-project target. Under the I-REAP component, 623 enterprise SPs have been approved, benefiting 938 Producer Groups with 136,267 members (46 percent women). Of these SPs, 60 percent (374) are completed (i.e., have received all the planned deliverables), while another 40 percent (249) are under implementation. The current portfolio of approved SPs would be fully completed in 2021. Thirty-seven SPs under preparation would use all remaining project funds. Under GEF funding, 33 Marine Protected Areas are being rehabilitated.

22. **The proposed AF2 will integrate best practices and lessons learned under the OL and AF1.** The main lessons for I-BUILD include: (i) greater participation of the LGUs in implementing the SPs; (ii) more focus on income-generating investments; (iii) ways to enhance road safety; (iv) further climate proofing of infrastructure; and (v) development of a country-wide rural road network plan. For I-REAP, some of the lessons include: (i) PGs as direct beneficiaries of the SPs are more knowledgeable on the needs, requirements and operations of the enterprise; (ii) PG procurement has been effective and efficient for I-REAP SPs with small contract amount ,and direct engagement with PGs would empower them to efficiently do procurement and financial management which are essential aspects in enterprise development activities

and will further promote ownership and sustainability of the enterprise; and (iii) TA to the PG through the LGUs is key during the preparation and implementation of enterprise proposals, to ensure the quality of the SPs and mostly to strengthen the PGs to ensure the sustainability of SPs.

23. ***Rationale for the AF2.*** The retrofitted COVID-responsive AF2 will expand the PRDP's benefits and impacts in several ways. It will continue to meet the growing and increasingly diversified demand from LGUs for investments in rural infrastructure and enterprise development. It will also place particular emphasis on investments that directly support the government's COVID-19 recovery plan by strengthening agriculture value and supply chains, making food more widely available and affordable, and creating job opportunities along the value chains and the construction sector. It will further scale up infrastructure and enterprise development, improve science-based SP planning and implementation, strengthen capacity and project oversight, and support the expansion and mainstreaming of institutional and governance reforms across DA units and agencies, other national government agencies, and LGUs at the provincial, municipal, and barangay (village) level.

24. **The demand for catalytic investments in rural economic development remains high.** Under the proposed AF2, investment SPs will catalyze economic development through rural infrastructure, linked with support to strengthen value chains in ways that enhance the incomes and welfare of the large population of small-scale producers and producer cooperatives. The provinces and larger cooperatives are expressing increasing demand for additional investments in post-harvest infrastructure to overcome key value chain constraints, generate income, and serve as a platform to attract private investment. In addition, the demand remains high for SPs to support FMRs and improve connectivity to markets.

25. **The AF2 will also be part of the solution envisioned in major policy changes enacted in 2019.** The Rice Tariffication Law (2019) poses challenges and opportunities for agriculture. The PRDP supports this policy shift by modernizing and diversifying crop production, industrializing value chains and making them more inclusive, improving infrastructure, creating jobs, and developing science-based instruments to support investment planning. In preparation for implementation of the Supreme Court ruling on the Mandanas appeal[4] in 2022, the PRDP is strengthening the planning and implementation capacity of LGUs, along with accountability and transparency, and greatly increasing convergence between programs of the DA, LGUs, and other national government agencies. A significant development is that the PRDP is viewed as the best model for implementing the "New Thinking" for agriculture, the DA's vision for the sector. The New Thinking lays out eight paradigms to frame the sector's development: agricultural modernization, industrialization, export promotion, farm consolidation, roadmap development, infrastructure development, securing budget and investments, and legislative support. Underpinning these eight paradigms are the four pillars of the DA's agro-industrial strategy: inclusive sector, utilization of science-based tools, market-oriented interventions, and resilience to climate risks.

26. **The AF2 co-financing grant from the EU will enable the PRDP to become more inclusive.** As discussed, owing to poverty, conflict, and other factors, some LGUs, especially in Mindanao, have not yet participated PRDP (in BARMM, for instance). Other LGUs cannot provide the required co-financing for SPs, which prevents them from moving ahead with priority investments in rural infrastructure and enterprises identified under the PCIPs. Co-financing through the EU Mindanao Peace and Development Programme (MINPAD - RISE Mindanao) will leverage PRDP engagement in these areas while providing

[4] The Supreme Court affirmed its ruling to increase the Internal Revenue Allocation (IRA) of the LGUs commencing in 2022.

TA to support improvements in the capacity of LGUs and producer groups to prepare and implement SPs. The EU co-financing will also complement GIZ activities under the EU program focused on strengthening the capacities of agricultural cooperatives for better service delivery and creating an enabling environment for the private sector.

27. **As a result of strong demand for SP support under the PRDP, particularly for infrastructure SPs, almost all project loan funds are now committed to specific SPs that have passed a rigorous review protocol.** Tables 1 and 2 show the status of I-BUILD disbursements and I-REAP SPs. All SPs are subjected to technical reviews and approvals before they can receive project funds. The process begins when specific SPs are identified and validated, and technical documents are prepared. This preparatory phase is followed by a review of each SP on its technical merits. If the SP is approved, the PRDP allocates (commits) funds to that SP, and implementation and disbursement of SP funds can begin. As funds are committed, the funding available for SP investment proposals in the pipeline declines.

Table 1: Status of I-BUILD Disbursements as of May 31, 2020 (in PhP million)

Physical Status	Original Loan			Additional Financing			Total		
	Number of SPs	Total Cost	Amount Disbursed	Number of SPs	Total Cost	Amount Disbursed	Number of SPs	Total Cost	Amount Disbursed
Completed	256	9,380.13	8,104.41	5	164.87	142.46	261	9,544.99	8,246.88
Under construction	112	10,100.35	5,474.52	61	7,358.00	1,770.88	173	17,458.35	7,245.40
Under procurement	13	489.02	–	8	819.45	–	21	1,308.46	–
Pipeline				3	171.52		3	171.52	
Total	**381**	**19,969.49**	**13,578.93**	**77**	**8,513.83**	**1,913.34**	**458**	**28,483.32**	**15,492.28**

Table 2: Status of I-REAP SPs as of May 31, 2020

Status	Original Loan			
	Number of SPs	Total Cost[a] (in PhP million)	Amount Disbursed (in PhP million)	Percent Disbursed (%)
Completed	374	476.61	470.79	99
Under implementation	249	1,335.85	694.96	52[b]
Subtotal	**623**	**1,812.46**	**1,165.75**	**64**
Under preparation	37	318.13	N/A	N/A
Total	**660**	**2,130.59**	**1,165.75**	**55**

a Represents funds from Loan Proceeds and counterpart from the National Government; and excludes equity from the Local Government Units (LGUs).

b Remaining disbursement refers to the ongoing procurement/works as well as unliquidated funds for which documents are still being prepared at the LGU and PG level.

28. ***Relationship to the Country Partnership Strategy (CPF).*** The PRDP represents a major engagement by the World Bank Group with the Philippines in support of institutional reform and rural economic growth. The proposed AF2 is fully consistent with the World Bank Group's Country Partnership Strategy (2019–2023) for the Philippines (Report No. 143605-PH) and its overarching objective to reduce core constraints to inclusive growth and poverty reduction in relation to people, competition, and key vulnerabilities. The project also contributes to the World Bank Group's twin goals of ending extreme poverty and promoting

shared prosperity by targeting investments in the agricultural sector, which is the major source of livelihood and employment in rural areas. The proposed AF2 will also foster partnerships in productive investments between farmer groups and commercial buyers along agricultural supply chains, thereby contributing to improved market access and higher income opportunities for all.

29. ***Alignment with national development goals.*** The AF2 aligns with the objective of the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) (2017–2022) to develop a competitive, sustainable, and technology-based agricultural sector that would contribute to inclusive growth and poverty reduction. It is further aligned with the administration's Ten-Point Socio-Economic Agenda, specifically the emphasis on promoting rural and value chain development to increase agricultural and rural enterprise productivity, and on ensuring security of land tenure to encourage investments. The AF2 contributes to the sector outcomes described in Chapter 8 of the PDP, "Expanding Economic Opportunities in Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries," and the recently updated AFMP 2018–2023, supported under the PRDP. As mentioned above, the AF2 fully supports the COVID-19 recovery plans for food security outlined in "We Recover As One," the ALPAS Kontra COVID-19 Program, and the Plant, Plant, Plant initiative of the DA, all of which are geared toward ensuring the availability, accessibility, and affordability of commodities produced by the agri-fishery sector during the COVID-19 crisis and beyond.

C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

Original PDO

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.

Current PDO

The PRDP aims to increase rural incomes and enhance farm and fishery productivity in the targeted areas.

The Global Environment Objective (GEO) linked to the GEF Grant is to strengthen the conservation of the coastal and marine resource base in targeted project areas.

Key Results

The PDO indicators are:
(i) the increase in real household incomes of farmer and fisherfolk beneficiaries;
(ii) the increase in income of beneficiaries involved with enterprise development;
(iii) increase in value of annual marketed output;
(iv) increase in the number of farmers with improved access to DA services (and number of female).

The GEO indicator is the increase in Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) management effectiveness in selected sites in GEF target areas.

D. Project Description

30. **The proposed AF2 and EU Grant will further strengthen agriculture value and supply chains, through rural infrastructure and enterprise development SPs, as well as improved planning and institutional strengthening at the national and local level, by providing financing through PRDP's four components.** This financing will support

an estimated 267 additional climate resilient rural infrastructure SPs under the I-BUILD component and 278 enterprise development SPs under the I-REAP component. It will support the strengthening of planning at the LGU level under the I-PLAN component and will scale up the oversight and capacity-building requirements of the project under the I-SUPPORT component. The AF2 and EU Grant will also fund the institutional mainstreaming of new approaches, tools, and functions developed under the PRDP across all agencies and units of the DA. The AF2 of US$280 million will be complemented by EUR18.3 million EU Grant co-financing, a contribution of US$46.87 million from the central government, US$26.81 million from the LGUs, and US$1.61 million from the PGs, totaling US$375 million. Table 3 shows the proposed project costs by component and funding source.

Table 3: AF2 Component Costs and Sources of Funds

Components and Subcomponents	IBRD (US$)	EU Grant (US$)	Government of the Philippines (US$)	LGU Equity (US$)	Proponent Group Equity (US$)	TOTAL (US$)
I-PLAN	**6,400,000**	**1,320,000**	**1,600,000**			**9,320,000**
1.1 Enhancing AFMP Process	4,289,800	730,000	1,072,400			6,092,200
1.2 Support to AFMP Implementation	2,110,200	590,000	527,600			3,227,800
I-BUILD	**214,000,000**	**11,184,800**	**29,213,600**	**26,813,600**		**281,212,000**
2.1 Infrastructure SPs	204,400,000	10,109,200	26,813,600	26,813,600		268,136,400
2.2 TA/Capacity Support to LGUs	9,600,000	1,075,600	2,400,000			13,075,600
I-REAP	**38,640,000**	**5,008,400**	**12,431,600**		**8,078,400**	**64,158,400**
3.1. Enterprise SPs	26,040,000	3,008,400	9,281,600		8,078,400	46,408,400
3.2. TA/Capacity Support to LGUs and PGs	12,600,000	2,000,000	3,150,000			17,750,000
I-SUPPORT	**20,960,000**	**2,617,000**	**5,240,000**			**28,817,000**
Total	**280,000,000**	**20,130,000**	**48,485,200**	**26,813,600**	**8,078,400**	**383,507,200**

31. **The proposed AF2 will generally follow existing cost-sharing arrangements,[5] including the arrangements for financing I-BUILD SPs, although some adjustments are proposed.** The main adjustment is that the LGU equity will be replaced with PG equity at 20 percent to comply with the requirement of the Philippines' Commission on Audit (COA) for PG counterpart financing. The IBRD and GOP funds will be provided to the LGUs/PGs in the form of a grant from the national government.

32. **The cost sharing arrangements for SPs co-financed by the EU Grant will be slightly different.** For I-BUILD SPs, a 60-10-10-20 (IBRD-GOP-LGU-EU) arrangement is proposed. The sharing arrangement for I-REAP SP is proposed to be 30-20-50 (IBRD-GOP-EU), where the EU Grant will replace the LGU equity with a larger share of SP financing. The PGs will provide 20 percent equity (in-kind contribution) on top of the enterprise cost. In place of cash equity for I-REAP SPs, LGUs will provide technical assistance (such as preparation of the proposal, supervision and monitoring of enterprise operations, etc.) as their counterpart contributions. Table 4 compares the cost-sharing arrangements under the OL and AF1, AF2, and AF2 with the EU Grant.

Table 4: Cost-Sharing Arrangements under OL/AF1, AF2 and AF2 with EU Co-Financing Grant

[5] For I-PLAN, I-BUILD, and I-REAP TA and capacity building, and for I-SUPPORT components and subcomponents, it is proposed to maintain the financing mix of 80% World Bank/Loan Proceeds and 20% Government of the Philippines.

Component	Original Loan and AF1				AF2				AF2 with EU Co-Financing Grant				
	LP	GOP	LGU	PG	LP	GOP	LGU	PG	LP	GOP	LGU	EU	PG
I-PLAN	80%	20%	-	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-
I-BUILD													
2.1 Subprojects	80%	10%	10% [a]	-	80%	10%	10%[a]	-	60%	10%	10%	20% [d]	-
2.2 TA/Capacity Support	80%	20%	-	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-
I-REAP													
3.1 Subprojects	60%	20%	20%	[b]	60%	20%	[c]	20%	30%	20%	[c]	50%	[e]
3.2 TA/Capacity Support	80%	20%	-	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-
I-SUPPORT	80%	20%	-	-	80%	20%	-	-	-	-	-	100%	-

Note: Table shows incremental cost on top of the PRDP financing (LP, GOP, and LGU).
a Excluding the LGU operational cost.
b PG equity provides at least 20 percent cash or in kind on top of the PRDP financing.
c LGU counterpart support will be in the form of TA.
d Aside from 20 percent cash counterpart support, the EU will provide for the LGU operational cost.
e PG equity provides 20 percent contribution.

33. **The proposed AF2 will address the potential effects of climate vulnerability in agriculture through a range of mutually reinforcing investments, especially in climate resilient rural roads.** Those investments will include, among others, prioritized construction of climate-proof FMRs in vulnerable provinces to ensure uninterrupted connectivity and access to markets during adverse climate events; community irrigation facilities to address water scarcity and avoid the risk of large-scale crop failure; warehouse facilities and solar dryers to prevent post-harvest crop losses, including losses from floods induced by typhoons; and greenhouses to protect selected crops from extreme heat and support improved water management. All of these investments in Components 2 (I-BUILD) and 3 (I-REAP) will be based on PCIPs that map the vulnerability and suitability of agricultural production and specific agricultural value chains.

Proposed Changes

34. To facilitate disbursements with the EU co-financing, components and/or subcomponents have been divided into two different geographical areas, being (i) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (ii) in EU Priority Areas.

35. **Component 1: Local and National Level Planning (I-PLAN) - US$9.3 million (IBRD: US$6.4 million; EU Grant: US$1.3 million; GOP: US$1.6 million).** In line with the original component description, the AF2 will finance Subcomponent 1.1 (Enhancing the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Planning Process), (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: (i) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (ii) in EU Priority Areas; and Subcomponent 1.2 (Supporting AFMP Implementation), being the design of coordinated systems of technical support for the implementation of Sub-projects prioritized in the provincial commodity investment plans (PCIPs): (a) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (b) in EU Priority Areas.

36. More specifically, the AF2 will fund the following activities: (i) preparation and updating of VCAs to be incorporated in PCIPs (namely, preparation, updating including to address impact of COVID-19, capacity building, retooling, updating the I-PLAN Operations Manual, training, and piloting); (ii) enhancement of the planning process by examining several PCIPs to develop an overall regional perspective and introduce a regional-level commodity investment planning process for more holistic, strategic investments; (iii) regional prioritization to identify interventions for development into SPs that can be tightly focused on food productivity, consolidation, and marketing; (iv) integration of key innovations in the operations of Regional Field Offices (RFOs), such as cascading of harmonized planning, programming, and budgeting guidelines; (v) capacity building activities of DA and LGUs for VCA and PCIP preparation and updating, especially in view of the implementation of the Mandanas ruling; and (v) the provision of technical services such as research, capacity building and coordination activities with modules on Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) to better understand climate risks and design adaptation options.

37. The EU Grant will fund the following specific activities: (i) TA and capacity support for updating the PCIPs of selected LGUs in Mindanao, giving priority to updating plans in provinces with indigenous community and conflict-affected areas; (ii) conduct additional VCAs of emerging agricultural products with local economic and ecological importance that cannot receive PRDP support without a VCA, and reflect the VCA results in the PCIP; and (iii) the provision of technical services such as research, capacity building, and coordination activities to support the implementation of AFMP.

38. **Component 2: Infrastructure Development (I-BUILD) - US$281.2 million (IBRD: US$214 million; EU Grant: US$11.2 million; GOP: US$29.2 million; LGU Equity: US$26.8 million).** From the original component description, this component will finance Subcomponent 2.1 (Value Chain Infrastructure Support), being carrying out of specific SPs to support infrastructure development by participating 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): (a) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (b) in EU Priority Areas; and Subcomponent 2.2 (Approaches for Improving the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Infrastructure Investments), being the development of technical specifications for climate resiliency and disaster risk mitigation for local infrastructure: (a) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (b) in EU Priority Areas.

39. More specifically, key I-BUILD activities to be supported under the AF2 are: (i) climate resilient strategic infrastructure that supports food productivity by addressing gaps in the food supply and transport flow, such as pre- and post-harvest facilities, and transport and other market-related infrastructure aside from FMRs and bridges; (ii) rehabilitation and/or construction of climate resilient SPs focusing on repairing, retrofitting, and completing pre- and post-harvest facilities (for production, processing, and marketing) in response to COVID-19 and to build back better and greener; and (iii) capacity-building activities for LGUs, including joint technical reviews, audits by Regional Operations and Maintenance Audit Teams (ROMATs), training in contract management and supervision, training in material testing and quality control, and training for citizen monitoring teams and for conducting coordination meetings.

40. The EU Grant will fund: (i) selected priority climate resilient rural infrastructure; (ii) operational costs for LGUs, to address their lack of capacity to provide counterpart funds; (iii) SPs in areas with key development priorities (e.g., areas experiencing conflict or with indigenous populations) but are located in two or more provinces (e.g., an area settled by indigenous people may belong to two provinces); and (iv) TA and capacity support for selected LGUs, particularly in BARMM, to assist them in submitting SP proposals by providing expertise to comply with SP technical requirements and feasibility studies.

41. **Component 3: Enterprise Development (I-REAP) - US$56.1 million (IBRD: US$38.6 million; EU Grant: US$5 million; GOP: US$10.8 million; PG Equity: US$1.6 million).** In line with the original project component,

financing will be provided for Subcomponent 3.1 (Rural Agri-Fishery Enterprise and Productivity Enhancement): (a) Carrying out of specific Sub-projects to support vertical and horizontal clustering, joint business planning and investments by Proponent Groups operating within priority commodity value chains: (i) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (ii) in EU Priority Areas; and Subcomponent 3.2 (Technology and Information for Enterprise and Market Development), being the provision of technical assistance to PGs to increase their productivity and incomes through improved and sustainable technological, operational and market knowledge and facilitation of market linkages: (a) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (b) in EU Priority Areas.

42. The main change is that the DA will enter into Implementation Management Agreements (IMAs) directly with PGs, which will have to meet certain eligibility criteria, and not with LGUs anymore. The role of LGUs will be on the provision of TA to the PGs. The component will continue to encourage women's participation with a target of 50 percent women-beneficiaries in the enterprise subprojects. More specifically, the AF2 would fund: (i) investments to restore and improve the availability, accessibility, and affordability of priority agri-fishery commodities by providing support services to PGs across the value chain segments, to include (a) upscaling or upgrading project-supported enterprises, (b) starting new enterprises aligned with the ALPAS Kontra COVID-19 Program, and (c) the provision of climate-resilient facilities, energy-efficient equipment, and other services to support PGs identified by the LGU to operate and manage completed or proposed post-harvest infrastructure; and (ii) technical assistance and capacity support in business planning with CSA dimensions where applicable, enterprise management, market linkages, digital marketing (e-commerce), and the monitoring and assessment of enterprise operations.

43. The EU Grant will fund: (i) support to climate resilient post-harvest facilities, small infrastructure and civil works, and the logistical needs of enterprises in the supported value chains, including (a) upscaling/upgrading of project-supported enterprises under the OL and (b) starting new enterprises; (ii) technical assistance and capacity support for PGs of ongoing and proposed SPs, particularly in BARMM and poorer areas of Mindanao, through a management consultancy engaged to provide hands-on coaching and mentoring to PGs in business management and operations to assure the sustainability and expansion of their enterprises; and (iii) technical assistance and capacity support for selected LGUs and PGs to overcome gaps in expertise and train LGUs and PGs to undertake all activities in the SP development cycle (such as, preparing SPs in line with the requirements for business planning and development, preparing Detailed Engineering Designs (DED) and Program of Works (POW) and other technical documents, and conducting SP procurement, supervision, and monitoring).

44. **Component 4: Project Implementation Support (I-SUPPORT) - US$28.8 million (IBRD: US$21 million; EU Grant: US$2.6 million; GOP: US$5.2 million).** The component will finance the provision of technical and operational assistance for the day-to-day coordination, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and audit of the Project: (a) nationwide, except for EU Priority Areas; and (b) in EU Priority Areas. The key activities to be funded under this component are: (i) digitalization of project management processes for planning, capacity building, meeting, and other coordination activities, as well as for the monitoring and supervision of investments; (ii) enhancement of community and occupational safety and health with Supplemental Health and Safety Guidelines for implementing Rural Infrastructure and Enterprise SPs, designed to provide guidance in transitioning to the new normal under COVID-19; (iii) increased mainstreaming and institutionalization of innovations and reforms in the systems in DA offices; (iv) development of Knowledge Management Portal for retaining and sharing the lessons learned, experiences and good practices and other information generated by PRDP for the DA's reference point for future projects; and (v) regular missions and a final project evaluation.

45. The EU Grant will fund: (i) provision of additional human resources to accelerate and facilitate the review, supervision, and monitoring of SPs; (ii) provision of workshops and capacity building for provincial and municipal LGUs to prepare business plans and Feasibility Studies (FS), identify climate-resilient infrastructure (including slope protection and drainage technology), and design cost-effective rural infrastructure (small-scale infrastructure and post-harvest

facilities); and local planning and priority setting for agriculture and rural development; (iii) enhancement of geo-mapping system to improve transparency and accountability through the development, application, and deployment of geo-based tools (such as geo-video, video-tagging using Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS), geo-dashboard); and (iv) ongoing and future activities to ensure the convergence of efforts at the regional level and across Mindanao.

46. **The AF2 will continue to integrate climate change adaptation/mitigation features into the design and construction of infrastructure SPs to increase resilience in the agri-food system.** This approach is currently integrated into the OL and AF1 through a climate-resilient infrastructure mainstreaming framework, which provides climate-proofed technical planning parameters for rural infrastructure aligned with the 2015 Department of Public Works and Highway (DPWH) Design Guidelines, Criteria and Standards. The ongoing review of the I-PLAN Operations Manual is exploring ways of enhancing the use of climate risk and resiliency information in updating PCIPs (through specific tools, for example) and understanding the extent to which climate risk information influences decisions on investments. Climate risk and resiliency assessments currently used in designing SPs include: (i) a hazard assessment, which captures the frequency, magnitude, and location of the climate risk; (ii) a vulnerability assessment, which takes into account the population and assets potentially exposed to the climate risk; and (iii) a risk assessment, which focuses on potential climate impacts on SP infrastructure. Together, the technical planning framework and risk and resiliency assessments represent a more comprehensive approach to building resilient infrastructure by eliminating or mitigating the climate hazard and reducing the vulnerability (enhancing the adaptation) of persons, assets, and systems to climate risk. This approach is expected to increase the capacity to manage climate risks that threaten persons, assets, and systems throughout the SP development cycle.

47. ***Climate Co-Benefits***. Six main types of investments in Components 2 (I-BUILD) and 3 (I-REAP) to address the potential effects of climate vulnerability in the agricultural sector (and rural infrastructure) can be considered to provide Climate Co-Benefits (adaptation and mitigation). The first type of investment is *communal irrigation systems (*CISs), which promote adaptation by ameliorating the risk of crop loss from recurrent drought in selected areas. The second type of investment is *FMRs and bridges*. The design standards for PRDP-financed roads, bridges, and roads with bridges require this infrastructure to be climate-resilient and to permit all-weather access, taking into account the potential impacts of increasingly extreme, frequent, and severe weather events. Because roads tend to be inaccessible for extended periods due to flooding and landslides, the design of PRDP roads and bridges gives careful attention to slope protection, drainage and cross-drainage, flood levels, and flood forecasts. Better all-weather connectivity of PRDP roads and bridges will promote adaptation to extreme weather events and thus provide Climate Co-Benefits. The third type of investment to reduce climate vulnerability is *solar dryers and warehouses.* The lack of these facilities is a bottleneck in Philippine agricultural supply chains. Traditionally large portions of harvested rice and corn are dried along roads, which can create road safety hazards, result in substantial post-harvest losses, and degrade the overall quality and nutritional profile of harvested grain. Warehouses also protect against losses and quality reduction in harvested crops. The establishment of warehouses could be considered in assessing Adaptation Co-Benefits, while the use of solar dryers could be considered in assessing Mitigation Co-Benefits. Fourth, *greenhouses* are an investment with considerable potential to reduce production losses and enhance food quality through efficient use of water, pest and disease control, and protection from the elements, yielding adaptation and Mitigation Co-Benefits. Fifth, investments in *slope protection* reduce erosion and siltation and improve water catchment and management for Adaptation Co-Benefits. Sixth, investments in *potable water supply* (PWS) provide clean drinking water and mitigate health risks, especially in times of drought or flooding, and can be considered to yield Adaptation Co-Benefits through improved construction designs.

48. **The project follows the Maximizing Finance for Development (MFD) approach.** The project supports the GOP in addressing binding constraints to enabling private sector solutions in the agriculture and food sector especially in market access and enterprise development. The proposed operations well aligned with the PDP objective especially on the competitiveness angle as well as the CPF on reducing constraints for inclusive growth. Based on the good track record of the project performance, the AF2 will further focus on providing public goods which attract private investment into the commodity value chains. It will further strengthen agriculture value chains, by improving transport and market access

infrastructure, upgrading post-harvest infrastructure capacities, professionalizing small-scale producer groups, and further.

49. **Gender.** The FAO Study (2018) reports that despite women's key contributions to agriculture and fisheries, they are often described as invisible and only account for a quarter of employed persons in the agriculture sector. These statistics do not take into account the various unpaid roles that rural women perform and is an inaccurate measurement of rural women's contribution to the sector. Rural women are underutilized in productive work and are constrained in participating in production/post-harvest activities and value adding opportunities due to limited access to credit and financial services, technology and other productive resources. The lack of mobility and access to markets further inhibit their capacities to participate in the agricultural value chains. Women are also less likely to be targeted for extension services, as many extension agents still do not recognize women as agricultural producers. Preliminary data from DA shows that while almost 41 percent of farmers are female, only 27 percent of beneficiaries who were provided with agricultural production support and other services were women (DA, 2017), indicating a gap in the production services being provided to female farmers. The original PRDP and AF1 narrowed this gap by ensuring that 38 percent of farmers receiving production support were women. AF2 will further narrow the gap by setting a target of 40 percent of PG members receiving production support are women.

50. Under the I-REAP Component, support would be provided to enterprise subprojects of PGs (cooperatives, peoples organizations, producers associations, etc.) that would increase their members' access to resources, know-how and income generation opportunities within the value chain. Funding support would be provided for the enterprise subprojects' requirements (inputs, equipment and capital) as well as technical assistance to the proponent groups on production, processing, marketing and enterprise management. Priority would be accorded to subproject proposals that have women as beneficiaries by giving additional scores in the appraisal and approval process based on the corresponding percentage of women-beneficiaries. The provision of technical assistance and capacity building activities will address the technical and operational needs of beneficiaries, especially women, including facilitation and linkages for credit access and market opportunities. In scheduling and conduct of activities, the women-beneficiaries' domestic and family demands will be taken into consideration to ensure their participation and attendance specially to learning activities.

51. **The O&M requirements for infrastructure investment SPs under the proposed AF2 will be the same as under the OL and AF1.** The LGUs are required to provide adequate O&M as per the Implementation Management Agreement (IMA) between the LGU and DA. This is supported by an O&M Plan for each infrastructure subproject and provided with corresponding budget by the LGUs. Community members/beneficiaries are also mobilized to undertake voluntary, so called "bayanihan" work. Based on the September 2020 O&M audit report by the ROMATs, 94 percent of the 172 SPs that were inspected were evaluated in good and fair condition. Required O&M actions are being followed up to respective LGUs whose SPs (6 percent) were found to be in bad condition.

Other Changes

52. ***Monitoring and Evaluation.*** The proposed AF2 will largely adopt the current Results Framework (RF) which was updated during preparation of the AF1, except for the intermediate results indicator on "specific area based integrated plan, program and budget for technical service delivery being implemented" which is proposed to be dropped as it is considered more of a process output rather than an intermediate results indicator. A new indicator on "PO members receiving production support for enterprise subprojects are women" was also added to address a gender gap on women's access to production inputs and services. (See Section VIII). Targets have also been adjusted given the AF2 additional funds to address demand for more infrastructure under I-BUILD (roads, bridges, irrigation and water, and pre and post-harvest facilities) and more enterprise SPs under I-REAP. Table 5 (infrastructure SPs) and Table 6 (enterprise development SPs) provide the SP targets supported under the various sources of PRDP funding. The project's M&E system will be continuously refined to capture all aspects of tracking progress and measuring outcomes and impacts,

including on productivity, gender inclusion, enterprise performance etc.

Table 5: I-BUILD Targets under Various Sources of Funds

I-BUILD Subproject Type	OL and AF1 Target[6]	OL and AF1 Achievements to Date[7]	AF2 and EU Target	TOTAL TARGET
Total Number of I-BUILD Subprojects	**453**	**275**	**267**	**720**
FMR (km)	2,114	859	501	2,600
Bridge (linear m)	1,895	61	165	2,060
Irrigation (ha)	2,817	1,586	1,570	4,300
Potable water supply (number of households)	22,249	6,163	12,040	34,200
Pre and Post-Harvest Facilities (Number)	113	81	145	250

Table 6: I-REAP Targets under Various Sources of Funds

I-REAP Subproject Type	OL Target	OL Achievements to Date[8]	AF2 and EU Target	TOTAL TARGET
Start-up enterprise	142	35	263	405
Upscaling/upgrading enterprise	92	22	24	116
Total	**234**	**57**	**287**	**521**

53. ***Financial Management and Disbursements.*** The AF2 will adopt the financial management (FM) and disbursement arrangements in place under the OL and AF1, except that only one Designated Account each will be maintained at the NPCO for the AF2 and the EU Grant. Currently, separate Designated Accounts are maintained for each PSO and NPCO. Maintaining one Designated Account at the NPCO will facilitate central monitoring of the Designated Account. Each PSO will open a project account in Philippine pesos to receive funds from the NPCO. A consolidated Interim Financial Report (IFR) will be submitted for each PSO and the NPCO. For I-REAP SPs under the AF2, funds will flow from each PSO to the PGs where applicable, and through the PSO, the project will pay contractors and suppliers for I-REAP SPs directly. The project will also explore the possibility of direct payments from the PSO to contractors for I-BUILD SPs. The project will maximize the use of online banking, subject to government rules and regulations.. The passage of Bangsamoro Organic Law (BOL) does not prohibit downloading of funds to LGUs within the BARMM area.

54. ***Loan Closing Date.*** The AF2 will be implemented over a four-year period. The proposed closing date of the AF2 is July 31, 2024 with an end disbursement date of January 31, 2025.

E. Implementation

55. At the national level, the project management arrangements are in place for the nationwide coverage of the project. An important element in the design of the project management aspects of the PRDP was that it would work within the existing institutional arrangements of the DA, with a view to strengthening its capacity and facilitating the long-term sustainability of interventions and the approach forged under the PRDP. This approach remains a central element in the way the project is being implemented. The process of institutionalizing reforms and new ways of doing business developed under the PRDP are being mainstreamed across the DA as planned. The proposed AF2 would further strengthen this process with refinements and more proactive engagement between the PRDP and other DA Units, Bureaus and Agencies.

[6] Based on actual approved portfolio as of September 29, 2020
[7] Based on Completed Subprojects as of August 31, 2020
[8] Number of enterprises with completed delivery of interventions/operational

a) The National Project Coordination Office (NPCO) is under the Office of the Under-Secretary of Field Operations Services (FOS). All Regional Field Offices (RFOs) of the DA report to the Under-Secretary and through that office to the Secretary of Agriculture.

b) RFOs are clustered for convenience into four groups based on geographical location: Northern Luzon (Luzon A) (Regions 1, CAR, 2, 3), Southern Luzon (Luzon B) (Regions 4A, 4B, 5), Visayas (Regions 6, 7, 8), Mindanao (Regions 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, BARMM). RFOs, under the Regional Executive Director, are responsible for all DA activities in their respective regions.

c) Each DA-RFO has established a Regional Project Coordination Office (RPCO) to manage the PRDP. These offices comprise a composite of skills for managing the infrastructure (I- BUILD) and enterprise (I-REAP) components, as well as the planning (I-Plan) and Support (I-Support) aspects of the project.

d) A Project Support Office (PSO) has been established to serve each of the four RFO clusters. Staff have been drawn both from DA staff and consultants. These units were designed as an interim measure to provide technical support, review and approval backstopping for RPCOs, and as management arms of the NPCO. They have proven to be very effective in helping in the overall management and coordination of the project, and in building the RPCO capacity.

e) Project Advisory Boards comprising multi-agency, farmer, and other stakeholder representatives were established and are functioning effectively at the National (NPAB) and Regional levels (RPAB). At the national level, the NPAB approves policy direction and refinement of procedures as well as monitoring of overall project performance. At regional levels, RPABs approve SP proposals, as well as facilitate the regional harmonization of approach and convergence (inter-institutional linkages).

56. ***Financial Management and Disbursements.*** The AF2 will adopt the financial management (FM) and disbursement arrangements in place under the OL and AF1, except that only one Designated Account each will be maintained at the NPCO for the AF2 and the EU Grant. Currently, separate Designated Accounts are maintained for each PSO and NPCO. Maintaining one Designated Account at the NPCO will facilitate central monitoring of the Designated Account. Each PSO will open a project account in Philippine pesos to receive funds from the NPCO. A consolidated Interim Financial Report (IFR) will be submitted for each PSO and the NPCO. For I-REAP SPs under the AF2, funds will flow from each PSO to the PGs where applicable, and through the PSO, the project will pay contractors and suppliers for I-REAP SPs directly. The project will also explore the possibility of direct payments from the PSO to contractors for I-BUILD SPs. The project will maximize the use of online banking, subject to government rules and regulations. There will be Implementation Management Agreements (IMAs) between the DA and the LGUs for I-BUILD SPs as in the previous arrangements with OL and AF1. The passage of Bangsamoro Organic Law (BOL) does not prohibit downloading of funds to LGUs within the BARMM area.

57. **Procurements under the AF2 will be done in accordance with the World Bank Procurement Regulations, dated July 2016, and revised November 2017 and August 2018.** The procurement arrangements for AF2 are largely similar to those in place for the AF1, although further decentralization will be reflected in higher thresholds for the implementing units on the ground, especially the PGs, RPCOs, and PSOs. Emergency procurement procedures under the AF2 will be incorporated in the updated Project Operations Manual. A Procurement Plan reflecting the additional activities for the first 18 months of the AF2 will be finalized in discussion with the World Bank before appraisal and handled through STEP. A Project Procurement Strategy for Development (PPSD) is under preparation to ensure that the Procurement Plan reflects the best approach to implement procurement on the ground.

58. ***Loan Closing Date.*** The AF2 will be implemented over a four-year period. The proposed closing date of the AF2 is July 31, 2024.

.

F. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

PRDPAF2 will be implemented mostly in the targeted areas in the Philippines where small-scale farmers, fisherfolk and producers are located in remote rural, agricultural, and coastal areas suffering from lack of infrastructure and poor access to markets and financing. Mindanao where many of the LGUs in conflict-affected areas, IP communities, BARMM and 4th-6th class LGUs are located, is the biggest land mass in the Philippines. It has huge tracts of undeveloped land suitable for agriculture but vulnerable to natural hazards and climate change, aggravated by physical and geographical factors and the increasingly unpredictable harsh weather conditions. The entire country is heavily affected by the impacts from climate change and increased variability are already having serious consequences on livelihoods and health, particularly among the poor, farming and fisheries-based households, due to effects on physical infrastructure, agriculture, and ecosystems. Prolonged heavy rainfall and flooding has escalated post-harvest losses with nutritional and food quality degradation for crops that either require storage facilities or are stored in facilities that are not climate resilient. Destabilized soils have severely affected access to and functionality of road infrastructure, compromising market access and competitiveness. In the aggregate, climate-change effects are expected to be negative for most crops, including rice, maize, and sugarcane, across all regions in the Philippines. While the Philippines is vulnerable to a wide range of hydro-meteorological hazards including typhoons, floods, droughts, sea-level rise and landslides, As part of the project's goal to increase inclusivity, many areas in Mindanao including BARMM and ancestral domains which have not been covered by the parent project, are found in floodplains particularly vulnerable to floods, flash floods and landslides. The project operations manual is currently undergoing improvements to incorporate more robust risk analysis through the inclusion of Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment, a planning tool that analyzes climate exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacities to provide evidence-based targeting of agricultural investments towards the establishment of climate-smart agriculture and activities to support the Covid-19 recovery plan of the government including ensuring the continuous supply of food during the pandemic.

G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team

Maya Gabriela Q. Villaluz, Environmental Specialist
Marivi Amor Jucotan Ladia, Social Specialist

SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	

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:

The AF will have similar impacts on the environment and people as those of the parent project as described below. However, subprojects under the AF will be implemented during the pandemic which poses greater health, security and safety risks for beneficiaries, project-affected persons, communities, and project workers.

OP/BP4.01 (Environmental Assessments) – The AF is is expected to continue to have no large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts as the proposed subprojects remain location-specific. As with the parent project, post-harvest facilities, farm-to-market roads, and other proposed subprojects are expected to cause only 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) As with the parent project, the AF will not finance the procurement and purchase of chemical pesticides. The project will continue to adopt the parent project's Integrated Pest Management approach, in compliance with OP 4.09. This is to address the anticipated increase in use of pesticides in the influence areas of the sub-projects as commercial production increases in these areas due to improved market access.

OP/BP 4.04 (Natural Habitat) As with the parent project, the AF will not finance any sub-project that would significantly convert or degrade natural habitats. However, based on experience with the parent project, rural infrastructure may directly affect natural habitats during construction unless mitigation measures are implemented. It is important that farm-to-market roads are carefully located to facilitate the movement of commerce to avoid the intrusion into nearby natural habitats of to poachers, illegal loggers and slash and burn cultivators.

OP/BP 4.36 (Forests) PRDP’s â™s support to natural resource management and enterprise development includes management and rehabilitation of mangrove areas, watersheds and social/agro-forestry areas designed to to improve the protection and management of these areas. This AF financing does not support the cutting and harvesting of trees for timber. On the other hand, mangrove rehabilitation was financed under the parent project’s GEF funding but not covered under this AF.

OP/BP 4.37 (Safety of Dams) No dams will be supported under the AF but may include water impoundment basins or reservoirs less than ten meters in height. The design and supervision of small water holding structures is undertaken by a qualified engineer as was prescribed with the parent project. The sub-project's ESMP would encompass any identified risks and corresponding mitigation measures based on the environmental assessment section of the feasibility studies of sub-projects involving water reservoirs. s

OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) With the AF, greater emphais is placed in targetting Indigenous Peoples communities to be aligned with the AF’s objective of being more inclusive. Indigenous Peoples have particularly become more vulnerable during the pandemic as they lack access to information about Covid, how to protect themselves, and where to get help in case they are affected. They may also become cut off from government support and livelihood opportunities. The AF intends to address these impacts while still ensuring the health and safety of IPs with the implementation of Covid-related guidelines specific for IPs.

OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) As with the parent project, infrastructure sub-projects and facilities to be rehabilitated or constructed under the AF could 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 compensated in accordance with the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation, and Resettlement Framework.

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 acceleration and expansion of agricultural activities in agro-forestry production areas where farm-to-market roads will be rehabilitated and/or built; and (b) increased need for integrated pest management to address the expected increased use of fertilizers and pesticides to accelerate commercial production in project-supported areas resulting from improved market access. The DENR, LGUs and Regional Project Coordination Offices need to address and monitor these potential impacts to protect natural habitats, 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 and institute widespread organic farming.

Once agricultural production increases in the long run, there is a need to ensure that the ecosystem services supporting agricultural lands are conserved, restored and adequately maintained to cope with the increasing population's demand for food. The use of the safeguard instruments must sustainable to avoid value chain disruptions due to the increasing competition for accessible natural resources such as land and water. Further, monitoring of environmental quality must be held regularly to avoid pollution due to the increased agricultural and food production activities, increased water and soil use, and more generation of wastes.

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

The AF will continue to adopt the set of general policies of the parent project pertaining to the types and location of infrastructure or development in the suproject areas. 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-project 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 sub-project 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 prepared and adopted an Integrated Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (IESSF) which governs the processes and procedures for screening, validation, preparation, review, approval and monitoring of sub projects in order to ensure compliance with the various applicable safeguard policies of the World Bank. The IESSF will continue to be used for the AF as it remains relevant for the proposed components and activities. As the AF is in response to the Covid-19 pandemic, the IESSF has been updated to include additional safeguards guidelines to ensure health, security and safety of workers, Indigenous Peoples, project-affected persons and other stakeholders. Specific guidelines have been developed for public consultations, grievance redress mechanism, civil works, etc. Together with the Indigenous Peoples Plan, the Covid-19 protection guidelines specific to Indigenous Peoples will ensure that Indigenous Peoples remain involved in the project while social distancing measures are being observed to keep them from catching the virus.

Compliance with safeguard policies has been mostly satisfactory under the parent project. Involuntary resettlement impacts have been moderate and impacts on the Indigenous Peoples have been adequately managed. A total of 11,845 affected by land and right-of-way acquisition for FMRs and other infrastructure. However, only a small percentage (about 1%) of these were required physical displacement while about 3.3% lost more than 20% of their landholdings. Most of those affected have only lost small portions of their lands, portion of structures, some crops and trees and needed only to be compensated. Of the 1,498 subprojects approved, only 22 had needed RAPs. A similar trend is expected under AF2. An estimated 111,284 Indigenous Peoples households are in subproject influence areas. Most of them are in communities with existing development plans that already included the subprojects being proposed. A total of 30 subprojects prepared IP Plans. A slightly higher number of SPs would probably be needing IP Plans in AF2 due to purposive targeting of low capacity areas which are unlikely to have a ready IP development plan.

PRDP has established a functioning grievance redress mechanism which has addressed stakeholders' concerns on the ground. PRDP has also established a recording and monitoring system to keep track of the grievances and their resolution. The AF will continue to use the GRM established under the parent project including all systems related to documentation, monitoring, and reporting. A PRDP study found that most stakeholders prefer face-to-face interaction for grievance redress which is difficult during the pandemic. The additional guidelines on Covid-19 includes a section for ensuring that the GRM remains functional and responsive while health, security and safety protocols are followed.

The Borrower has set-up Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES) units on all three levels of project organization within DA and has required all participating LGUs to designate safeguard focal persons in their respective project management units. The SES units in the NPCO, PSOs, and RPCOs are actively involved throughout the SP cycle (that is, during validation, preparation, review, construction supervision, and post-construction evaluation), and this involvement has markedly improved the quality of SP design and delivery. With the onset of the pandemic, various SES units have improvised the supervision of and assistance to the subprojects depending on the COVID regulations in force and on the practical options in a given area.

The same staff will be working on the subprojects under the AF. With field work down to a minimum, staff time and inputs will be realigned to balance the support to be provided for the parent project and the AF. Additional staff will be hired when needed. Over the course of project implementation, the Borrower has made innovations and refinements on the procedures, protocols, forms and templates, and undertaken capacity building for safeguards which conduct of trainings, seminar-workshops and learning by doing through conduct of NPCO-PSO-RPCO joint reviews. With the onset of the pandemic, various SES units have improvised their supervision of and assistance to the subprojects depending on the Covid regulations and what works in the area. As PRDP continues to install creative tools and procedures to continue with subproject preparation and monitoring, the AF is expected to benefit from these innovative practices.

Increased involvement of IPs in the AF is not expected to be a challenge for the SES team as they have been dealing with IPs throughout the implementation of the parent project. As with the parent project, IPs will usually be beneficiaries of subprojects. The IPPF will continue to guide screening for IPs, meaningful participation including free, prior and informed consent if needed, and mitigation adverse impacts if any. IP Plans will need to be prepared where IPs do not constitute the majority of subproject beneficiaries. However, engagement with IPs will conform with the Covid guidelines included in the IESSF to ensure their health and safety.

The PRDP is active in areas affected by conflict, including BARMM, and it has instituted measures throughout all project areas that are also relevant in conflict environments, such as ensuring that minority groups, including Indigenous Peoples, are included in consultations; ensuring that representatives from key groups in the community are present during consultations; and ensuring that projects hire local labor. Since project implementation, PRDP has been working in BARMM (previously ARMM) and has not found the need to treat potential conflict areas differently from other project areas, and the requirements, procedures, and approaches for safeguards, from the preparation of PCIPs to the preparation, review, approval and monitoring of SPs, are similar in all regions where it operates. However, in general subproject proposals take a long time to get approved in these regions due to low capacities both at RPCO and at the P/MLGU levels.

The implementation of social and environmental safeguard measures has not been hampered by conflict. According to the PSO in Mindanao, conflict has not affected the ability to supervise and review SPs in BARMM. The project has not experienced any safeguard issues related to conflict, even for right-of-way acquisition, a process that has a high likelihood of attracting conflict. In BARMM, landholding claims often are not formally documented. Landowners usually have Tax Declarations but no land titles. This limits their ability to voluntarily donate their lands if they so wish. In lieu of donation, project-affected persons (PAPs) have the option to waive their claims to their entitlements for their losses. However, in accordance with the IESSF, PAPs need to be aware of their entitlements before they can donate or waive their claims. Public consultations among PAPs are conducted to explain the subproject’s impacts, the process of acquisition of their properties, their entitlements based on the IESSF, etc. These consultations are documented and checked during subproject monitoring. This process has worked well in BARMM.

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies,

with an emphasis on potentially affected people.
The key stakeholders remain to be rural agricultural communities. The AF will continue to employ participatory approaches in the planning of interventions at the regional and local levels, particularly in the value chain analysis and resource assessments which would input into the formulation of the Provincial Commodity Investment Plans.

Project-affected persons will continue to be consulted and compensated following the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Framework but taking into consideration the restrictions imposed due to Covid as well the additional Covid-related guidelines .

The AF puts greater emphasis on Indigenous Peoples. Engagement with Indigenous Peoples will continue to be guided by the Indigenous Peoples Framework and with the additional guidelines related to Covid.

B. Disclosure Requirements (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors

"In country" Disclosure

Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework

Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

Pest Management Plan

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure

"In country" Disclosure

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (to be filled in when the ISDS is finalized by the project decision meeting) (N.B. The sections below appear only if corresponding safeguard policy is triggered)

CONTACT POINT

World Bank

Eli Weiss
Senior Agriculture Economist

Maria Theresa G. Quinones
Senior Rural Development Specialist

Borrower/Client/Recipient

Republic of the Philippines
Carlos Dominguez
Secretary
cdominguez@dof.gov.ph

Implementing Agencies

Department of Agriculture
Emanuel F. Pinol
Secretary
prdpnpco@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Ariel Cayanan
Undersecretary
prdpnpco@gmail.com

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

The World Bank
1818 H Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20433
Telephone: (202) 473-1000
Web: http://www.worldbank.org/projects

APPROVAL

Task Team Leader(s):	Eli Weiss Maria Theresa G. Quinones

Approved By

Safeguards Advisor:	Nina Chee	10-Nov-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Dina Umali-Deininger	10-Nov-2020
Country Director:	Ndiame Diop	10-Nov-2020