



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

---

Appraisal Stage | Date Prepared/Updated: 13-Oct-2020 | Report No: PIDISDSA28606

**BASIC INFORMATION****A. Basic Project Data**

Country Philippines	Project ID P161833	Project Name PH National Community Driven Development Program -Additional Financing	Parent Project ID (if any) P127741
Parent Project Name Philippines National Community Driven Development Program	Region EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC	Estimated Appraisal Date 06-Oct-2020	Estimated Board Date 15-Dec-2020
Practice Area (Lead) Social Sustainability & Inclusion	Financing Instrument Investment Project Financing	Borrower(s) Department of Social Welfare and Development	Implementing Agency Department of Social Welfare and Development

## Proposed Development Objective(s) Parent

To empower communities in targeted municipalities to achieve improved access to services and to participate in more inclusive local planning, budgeting and implementation.

## Components

Barangay (community) Sub-grants for Planning and Investment  
Local capacity building and implementation support  
Project administration, monitoring and evaluation

**PROJECT FINANCING DATA (US\$, Millions)****SUMMARY**

<b>Total Project Cost</b>	530.47
<b>Total Financing</b>	530.47
<b>of which IBRD/IDA</b>	300.00
<b>Financing Gap</b>	0.00

**DETAILS****World Bank Group Financing**

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)	300.00
--	--------



**Non-World Bank Group Financing**

Counterpart Funding	230.47
Borrower/Recipient	140.01
Local Communities	90.46

Environmental Assessment Category

B-Partial Assessment

Decision

The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate

Other Decision (as needed)

**B. Introduction and Context**

Country Context

**Stable economic growth, combined with good governance, has helped reduced poverty in the Philippines.**

Despite robust economic growth, poverty reduction was slow from 2006-2015 at an average of 0.6 percentage points per year.<sup>1</sup> However, significant strides were achieved during 2012-15 when the incidence of poverty decreased by 1.2 percentage points per year to 21.6 percent. The Philippine Development Plan (PDP): 2017-2022 attributed the poverty reduction primarily to the strategic combination of economic growth and good governance. With stable economic growth, government was able to expand the provision of public goods, promote private sector investment and broaden economic opportunities. The sustained growth was complemented by enhanced governance that promoted transparency, social accountability and citizen engagement.

**The COVID-19 outbreak poses a serious threat to the country’s economic growth and poverty reduction.**

As of August 2020, the Philippines had the highest number of confirmed cases in East Asia with more than 180,000 COVID cases. In conjunction with the imposition of enhanced community quarantine (ECQ), the Government of the Philippines (GOP) has taken a variety of measures to mitigate the impact of COVID-19, central to which is the passage of the *Bayanihan* to Heal as One Act (Republic Act No. 11469) in March 2020, granting the President additional authority to combat the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, the Government adopted fiscal and monetary policies to mitigate the economic impact; testing and treatment facilities were designated in all regions; cash assistance was provided to poor households and/or displaced workers; subsidies were given to marginalized farmers; and the prices of basic goods were regulated.

<sup>1</sup> World Bank. 2018. Making growth work for the poor.



**Despite the aggressive response of the GOP, the adverse impact of the COVID-19 outbreak has progressively had ripple effects that disproportionately affect the poor.** With negative economic growth in the first two quarters of 2020, the Philippines has entered a recession. The economy contracted by 16.5 percent during the second quarter, largely due to the pandemic. The pandemic has heightened the vulnerabilities of the poor and marginalized groups, resulting in economic displacement; food shortages; and disruption in health, education and other basic services.

**A compounding factor in the economic development of the Philippines is its extreme vulnerability to climate variability and climate change is expected to only strengthen the frequency and strength of natural hazard events.** The country is especially vulnerable to a wide range of hydro-meteorological hazards including typhoons, floods, droughts, sea-level rise and landslides. Communities, especially those in the poorer rural and remote areas, rely on natural resources and resilient infrastructure for their livelihood and access to markets as well as to basic social services. It is critical to provide support for strengthened adaptation and social resilience at the community level to ensure communities are better protected from and prepared to deal with climate variability.

#### Sectoral and Institutional Context

**The Philippines Social Protection Operational Framework<sup>2</sup> includes community-driven development (CDD) as a core strategy.** While the Philippines has a long history of community-driven initiatives, the issuance of the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC) provided the impetus for its adoption as a major strategy for good governance. Against a background of low capacities of poor municipalities, several national government agencies adopted CDD approaches, foremost of which is the Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (CIDSS) program managed by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). This Program was initiated in 1996 as one of the flagship programs under the Social Reform Agenda (SRA) and was expanded through the KALAH<sup>3</sup>-CIDSS (KC) during 2002-2013. The end-line impact evaluation of KC found that the project had a positive impact on per capita consumption, especially for households that were classified as poor before the project started and are associated with a reduction in poverty rates. The National CDD Program (NCDDP) was launched in 2014 to scale-up the KALAH-CIDSS Program in all poor municipalities.

### C. Proposed Development Objective(s)

#### Original PDO

To empower communities in targeted municipalities to achieve improved access to services and to participate in more inclusive local planning, budgeting and implementation.

Current PDO The PDO of the proposed AF would be the same as that of the parent project.

---

<sup>2</sup> NEDA Social Development Committee Resolution No. 3, series of 2012, adopting the Social Protection Operational Framework

<sup>3</sup> KALAH stands for Kapit-bisig Laban sa Kahirapan (English translation – Linked-arms against poverty)



## Key Results

**The results framework of the proposed AF would reflect the same performance indicators as that of NCDDP but with adjusted target values, whenever relevant.** It will also include additional or new intermediate indicators under Component 1 to reflect specific responses to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as new indicators under Component 2 to measure the achievement of the capacity building for LGUs.

## D. Project Description

The proposed additional loan will scale up the impact of KC-NCDDP, in particular by supporting the Government in implementing a community-based response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 676 poor municipalities. The AF operation would support 676 poor municipalities and facilitate the institutionalization of CDD in local development planning. The proposed AF loan will close on December 31, 2023.

An IBRD loan of \$479 million was approved for KC-NCDDP (P127741) on February 20, 2014 and became effective on June 13, 2014. The project was restructured in 2019 to extend the original closing date from December 31, 2019 to December 31, 2020. As of November 2019, the project is fully disbursed. The Project has been compliant with Bank safeguards and fiduciary policies and other legal covenants. NCDDP has covered a total of 18,781 barangays in 830 municipalities (98 percent of the target 847 poor municipalities), benefitting a total of 7.8 million households. The Project is on track to achieving its development objective as indicated by the progress made in terms of the key performance indicators (KPIs), most of which have achieved the target values.

**The CDD approach has been proven as a viable and responsive approach to reach the marginalized and vulnerable communities.** The Philippines being a disaster-prone country, the DSWD developed the Disaster Response Operations Modality (DROM) under the NCDDP. The key advantages of the DROM, as a community-based approach to DRM, is its ability to mobilize a network of community volunteers and service providers as well as its transparent operational system that promotes efficiency and inclusion in service delivery. The DROM has been implemented since 2014 in 547 municipalities which were seriously affected by Typhoon Haiyan. An assessment of the Rehabilitation Action Plan for Yolanda (RAY) cited the DROM-NCDDP as a commendable platform that could speed-up post-disaster recovery and rehabilitation.

**When the COVID-19 pandemic hit the country, the KC-NCDDP was able to switch to DROM implementation in 2,566 barangays in 123 municipalities.** The DROM guidelines were further adjusted by expanding the menu of sub-projects to support community-based activities in terms of preparedness and/or early recovery/early rehabilitation responses to the pandemic as well as to comply with COVID19-related protocols, which includes the conduct of community mobilization in small groups rather than general assemblies to ensure physical distancing.

**The proposed AF will finance a community-based response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic which has disproportionately affected the poorest and most vulnerable municipalities.** It will also provide sufficient time and resources for the DSWD to further pursue the institutionalization of CDD in the local development process as well as for the adoption of the DROM for post-disaster management.



**The proposed AF is fully aligned with the Bank’s twin goals of eradicating extreme poverty and promoting shared prosperity by enabling poor and vulnerable communities** to identify and manage their responses to the impact of COVID-19 pandemic through participatory and transparent mechanisms. The proposed AF is consistent with the World Bank Group’s Country Partnership Framework (2019-2023) for the Philippines (Report No. 143605-PH) that **specifically mentions NCDDP and CDD as critical elements** to support the strengthening of the **implementation capacity of LGUs as a central strategy for addressing the challenges on delivery of key services (Cross Cutting Theme on Governance)**. The proposed AF is also aligned with **Focus Area No. 1 (Investing in Filipinos)**, which aims to improve access of poor municipalities to basic services, as well as with **Focus No. 3**, which aims to increase resilience to natural disasters and climate change. The AF is also aligned with the pillars/strategies under the PDP (2017-2022) on ensuring people-centered and efficient governance (Chapter 5), reducing vulnerabilities (Chapter 11), and building safe communities (Chapter 12).

**An AF operation will allow the project to benefit from the existing NCDDP implementation framework and be able to quickly provide much needed support for the communities in the COVID-19 situation.** A new operation would result in additional preparation time, also to apply the new ESF, and in a dismantling of the NCDDP set-up and staff. This would significantly delay the provision of services at the community level where poor people are struggling. An AF operation would also support a continued focus on the core agenda to institutionalize CDD in the local development process (LDP). No other development partner is available to finance this operation and considering the challenging fiscal context, government is unlikely to have sufficient resources available without World Bank financing.

**The proposed AF would have the same components as the parent project:** Component 1 – Community Grants; Capability Building and Implementation Support; and Project Management and M&E. The AF will contribute to a reduction in climate change vulnerabilities from increased temperatures, typhoons and flood risk. It will continue to use the DROM, which includes community-based hazard mapping and is designed to respond to disaster events, including public health emergencies, to strengthen adaptation efforts at the community level and support the institutionalization of the DROM as part of the local development process.

**Component 1: Community Grants** (*Total cost: US\$441 million, AF loan US\$231 million*). The AF would continue to provide planning grants and investment grants to the 676 poor municipalities that are affected by COVID19 pandemic. The planning grants would continue to support the conduct of the participatory local (Barangay and Municipal) development processes (PLDP). The investment grants will continue to support community sub-projects that have been identified through the enhanced participatory local development process and informed by the rapid assessment. Community sub-projects will be based on an open menu, including livelihood-related and local disaster response and prevention proposals, except for those in the negative list<sup>4</sup>.

**Component 2: Capability Building and Implementation Support** (*Total Cost: US\$81million, AF loan: US\$44 million*). This component would involve the roll out of the enhanced guidelines on PLDP, (with sharper dimension on participatory disaster response) as jointly developed by the DSWD and DILG as part of the strategy to institutionalize CDD in local government. Specifically, this component would provide capacity building for over 110,000 staff/officials of M/BLGUs and about 40,000 core group of community volunteers

---

<sup>4</sup> The list will be identified together with the DILG.



on the enhanced guidelines on PLDP, in the context of the pandemic.

**Component 3: Project Management and M&E** (*Total cost: US\$47 million, AF loan US\$25 million*). Program management includes support for the hiring of project staff as well as other operational, systems and activities at the regional and national levels that provide oversight, coordination and overall management of the AF. This component would support enhancements and streamlining of the NCDDP DROM for alignment with the DSWD program monitoring and evaluation system

#### Institutional and Implementation Arrangements

**The AF would adopt the same institutional and implementation arrangements of NCDDP, but with a streamlined staff complement at the municipal level**, since CDD will now be embedded in the LDP and facilitation roles would be assumed by the B/MLGUs. These arrangements and procedures would be described in an updated Operations Manual to reflect the various enhancements, particularly in terms of the DROM, including adjustments in community mobilization as well as operational systems/procedures on financial management, procurement and safeguards in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>5</sup>

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

The AF will be implemented nationwide in 676 poor municipalities affected by COVID19 pandemic. The Philippines has varied topography comprising mountainous and hilly areas, steep and relatively flat valley bottoms, and coastal areas. The country is especially vulnerable to a wide range of hydro-meteorological hazards including typhoons, floods, droughts, sea-level rise and landslides. Accordingly, subproject activities will, as part of their respective ESMP and ESSC development, identify risks due to topography and meteorology and include relevant mitigation measures for these.

#### **G. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists on the Team**

Juliette E. Wilson, Social Specialist  
Maurice Andres Rawlins, Environmental Specialist  
Marivi Amor Jucotan Ladia, Social Specialist

<sup>5</sup> The KALAHY-CIDSS and KC-NCDDP Operations Manual includes various “sub-manuals” that deal with specific subjects including, but not limited to: Project finances, procurement, community financial management, the CEAC process, Monitoring and Evaluation, and the Environmental and Social Management Framework.



**SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY**

Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	As with the parent project, the subprojects will be screened through an Environmental and Social Screening Checklist (ESSC) to assess the level of risk. An EA may be required depending on the scale and nature of the subproject. For other subprojects an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) is prepared. The project staff will screen all subprojects early in the identification stage of the CEAC and determine project boundaries and classify projects into the appropriate safeguards category. Preparation of safeguards instruments such as EA, ESMP must be completed before beginning actual civil works. The regional staff will review and clear the safeguards instruments prepared by the subproject beneficiary for impact identification and appropriateness of proposed mitigation measures.
Performance Standards for Private Sector Activities OP/BP 4.03	No	Not applicable
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	Not applicable
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Not applicable
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	Purchase of pesticides are not eligible for financing under this Project. However, where there are irrigation projects implemented, there may be an increase in the use of pesticides in agriculture as production increases. An established practice in the parent project has been to train beneficiary communities that are investing in small-scale irrigation in Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Under the AF, the IPM training will be continued for communities investing in small-scale irrigation and coordinated with the Municipal Agricultural Officer of the LGUs and the DA's extension services.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The small footprint of community infrastructure projects, inherent flexibility in selecting a site for these structures, and the fact that the community members themselves would be involved in identifying the site makes it highly unlikely that there would be any impact on Physical Cultural Resources.



Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	As with the parent project, the AF will continue to be implemented in areas where Indigenous Peoples are present and are among the beneficiaries. In engaging with Indigenous Peoples, the AF will continue to be guided by the Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework of the parent project including those processes and procedures in sub-manuals and field guidelines that have mainstreamed IP safeguards requirements in project operations. To ensure the safety of IPs during Covid-19, the ESMF includes safeguards guidelines related to social distancing during public consultations and civil works.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Based on experience with the parent project, involuntary resettlement is highly unlikely. However, should physical or economic displacement be encountered, the AF will utilize the Land Acquisition, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation Framework (LARRF) included in the ESMF prepared under the parent project. Isolation, health, and WASH facilities may require land acquisition, which will most likely be done through voluntary land donation (VLD) by the government. For donations by private individuals, the LARRF includes VLD protocols.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The Project will not finance dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	not applicable
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	not applicable

**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:

As is the case globally, Covid-19 poses health-related risks to the stakeholders and beneficiaries of this project. As the Covid-19 virus is transmitted by human contact and is airborne over short distances, the Philippine government has implemented social distancing measures. The social distancing measures discourage gathering of people, and this therefore presents some challenges for community collaboration and participation that are hallmarks of the NCDDP project. To mitigate this impact a set of guidelines for conducting public consultations has been prepared, requiring community assemblies to be done in small groups of about 10 people rather than whole village assemblies as well as observance of basic protection (e.g. wearing of face masks and washing of hands) during meetings. Similar guidelines for social distancing were also adopted in relation to construction of community sub-projects, which limits the



number of community labor/workers in a given time or by shift as well as use of PPEs in accordance with government protocols. These guidelines were incorporated into the field guidelines of the Project and included in the ESMF for the AF. Covid-19 also poses employment challenges in the Philippines due to job losses as a results of the pandemic. The need to create income-earning opportunities through the NCCDP project becomes even more critical.

The AF will finance community infrastructure subprojects such as health centers, classrooms, day care centers and the conversion of such into isolation facilities in response to Covid-19. The potential impact of any subproject will depend on the nature, location and specific characteristics of the investment but is expected to be minimal. Based on experience with the parent project, in most cases the environmental and social impacts of such projects are minor, temporary, site-specific, and reversible, and occur primarily during the construction phase. They include typical construction related impacts such as vehicle emissions and dust, small-scale vegetation loss, management of construction waste and temporary and intermittent elevated noise levels. Subprojects will identify in their respective ESMPs measures to mitigate management of noise pollution, construction wastes, and emissions. Subprojects will also include their respective ESMPs OHS measures for workers involved in construction. There is also a potential for the increased use of pesticides in areas where small irrigation projects are selected by the community (which happened in 1% of KALAHI subprojects). Termiticides are also commonly used to treat the soil around structures. Nonetheless, the purchase of pesticides would not be financed under the project and integrated Pest Management methods and practices will be promoted. Given the highly contagious nature of the COVID-19 virus, the management of medical waste needs careful attention, and therefore the ESMF has been updated to include most up to date guidance from the DOH on health waste disposal. The DOH's Health Care Waste Manual provides guidance on medical waste handling, treatment, storage, transport, and disposal in chapters 5 and 6.

The AF will cover poor regions that are home to Indigenous Peoples (IP) who have a long history of marginalization and neglect. With the Covid-19 situation, IPs are more vulnerable as they may lack access to information about the pandemic and to health services if they get infected. If not properly managed, project activities including public consultations could potentially further exclude them or harm their lives and culture. To ensure that IP communities remain safe from Covid 19 infection, a set of guidelines for conducting public consultations has been prepared and incorporated into the field guidelines of the Project and included in the ESMF for the AF. To ensure that IP communities under the AF receive culturally appropriate benefits, the AF will continue to adopt agreements made with DSWD for the parent project such as:

1. additional IP specific staff, training and improved facilitation guidelines,
2. explicit engagement of elders and the National Commission on Indigenous People (NCIP), increased weighting for IP community sub-project proposals,
3. enhancements to the Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (the process used to engage with communities and facilitate decisions around priority development needs) to ensure free and prior informed community consultations resulting in broad community support.

As with the parent project, government or public lands are expected to be used for new infrastructure, and government donations would be the main mode of land acquisition. Under the parent project, instances which required private land were for very small areas (e.g., pathways for the laying of water pipes) that were readily and voluntarily donated as part of the community mobilization processes and negotiations. Such acquisitions were executed through a deed of donation in accordance with Philippine laws and protocols specified in the LARRF. The AF will utilize the same safeguards instruments and approach.



2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area: Overwhelmingly, the long term impacts of the subprojects are positive-- such as better access to basic services among poor households due to improved community infrastructure, and enhanced economic activity in the community. As well, there are expected to be no long-term or indirect environmental or social impacts due activities in the project areas as the activities financed by the project are small-scale and spread throughout the country. Each participating community will only be receiving financing for two rounds of CDD activities during the AF.

3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.  
not applicable

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

The AF will continue to use the Environment and Social Management Framework (ESMF) prepared for the parent project to ensure compliance with World Bank's safeguards policies, with enhancements to meet the COVID-19 pandemic. The ESMF includes an IPPF and LARRF. However, as the AF will be implemented during and responds to the pandemic, the ESMF was revised to include guidelines for public consultations and civil works during Covid. The revised ESMF was disclosed in country in September 2020.

Safeguards compliance of the parent project has been satisfactory owing to the systems and personnel that have been put in place to support the implementation of the ESMF. Focal persons/specialists have been assigned at various levels to oversee and assist with safeguards compliance. The ESMF has been integrated into the CEAC in sub-manuals and field guidelines to ensure that key safeguards processes and procedures are mainstreamed and taken into consideration. This resulted in community volunteers and organizers being cognizant of protocols for engaging with Indigenous Peoples and voluntary land donations which is the most common mode of land acquisition. This approach also enabled the Project to adapt quickly with the requirements for DROM when typhoon Yolanda struck. Using the same approach, the safeguards guidelines during Covid have been communicated with the regions and integrated into the field guidelines. It is expected that the AF will continue to ensure that Indigenous Peoples are engaged and that project benefits reach them, and impacts related to land acquisition are minimized and mitigated while ensuring the health of safety of PAPs, IPs, and the community.

While involuntary land acquisition is not expected as per experience under the parent project, all types of land acquisition will be done and documented through the procedures and forms outlined in the Land Acquisition, Resettlement and Rehabilitation (LARR) framework, an annex to the ESMF, and which includes a comprehensive compensation matrix. This would include the preparation of Voluntary Land Acquisition forms for voluntary land donations, or a Land Acquisition, Resettlement and Rehabilitation Plan (LARRP) in the unlikely event of land acquisition or displacement. The LARRF is fully consistent with World Bank OP 4.12, including the requirements for a Resettlement Action Plan.

The AF will use the same IP Participation Framework (IPPF) applied for the parent project. It requires (i) the development of specific facilitation modules for IP areas with a strong focus on capacity building of communities, awareness raising on IPRA and meeting the documentation requirements for Ancestral Domain Claims (ii) changes in the sub-project criteria setting process in mixed communities to ensure that greater weight is given to proposals from IP communities (therefore making some adjustments to the competitive process to the advantage of IP groups). The IPPF also includes requirements on the mechanisms for participation and representation of IPs in all phases of the community-driven development program; documentation/preparation and implementation of sub-projects, social analysis, and free, prior and informed consultations leading to broad community support that are proportional to the



scale of potential impacts on IP communities. Sub-project plans whose beneficiaries are mostly Indigenous Peoples (including related social investigations and participatory situational analysis) would include the relevant elements of an IPP. Under the parent project, DSWD has established a protocol with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) for addressing land issues and clarify roles and responsibilities at National, Regional and Municipal levels. Finally, IP specialist positions have been established at NPMO and Social Development Unit staff at Regional level are tasked with the coordination of the additional activities proposed; and a Technical Working Group on IP issues was created at National level for closer engagement with NCIP and civil society organizations active in this area.

DSWD as well as other partner agencies such as the Department of Agriculture have been implementing World Bank-assisted projects and programs and have shown strong capacity to implement safeguards. For DSWD the same set of staff and units will be involved in safeguards supervision for the AF. Regional safeguards officers will still be in charge of overall supervision, monitoring and reporting at regional level. Additional staff with specialized IP skills were hired in those regions where there are higher relative concentrations of IP communities. Community Facilitators and Deputy Area Coordinators at municipal level will continue to be trained and supervised to ensure that relevant project safeguards are addressed.

The AF will continue to utilize the GRM established through the parent project including all processes related to documentation, monitoring, and reporting. The GRM is fully functioning with grievances and the status of their resolution being recorded and monitored. For the past 2 review missions, NCDDP has resolved over 99 percent of the grievances, with the pending complaint still in the courts.

The AF will also maintain the promotion and practice of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as part of safeguards compliance. It would include additional and refresher training for regional and sub-regional safeguard staff and community facilitators to maintain the high standard of implementation of the safeguard instruments. The AF will also maintain that projects that involve the provision of water should prepare a water safety plan as per DSWD guidelines and Department of Health (DOH) AO 2014-0027.

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

As with the parent project, the key stakeholders are rural poor communities who will be consulted through a participatory process, local government units (barangays and municipalities) and key agencies of the government such as the Department of Agriculture, Education, Health, Local Government, and the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples. Project facilitation will emphasize the inclusion of vulnerable groups within the community, especially the IPs, when they are present, and enhanced IP facilitation procedures have been agreed upon. Participating communities and LGUs will sign an agreement with DSWD, which will require them to support the participatory planning process. The project principle of full transparency will be implemented through a program of disclosure of plans, budgets and expenditures supplemented by independent civil society monitoring. At the national level, DSWD has established strong coordination with NCIP to ensure IP-sensitive activities across implementation levels. All participatory processes will follow international standards for social distancing as described in the guidelines for public consultations, which will be included in the ESMF for the AF. Local regulations for social distancing will also be observed.

Consultations on the updated ESMF have been done particularly in light of the inclusion of various measures to deal with COVID-19 during preparation of the AF. Meetings were held with field offices of DSWD in Regions 5, 7 and 9 with



regional and municipal and Central Office staff to discuss the COVID-19 related measures, and these were found to be manageable and consistent with local guidelines. DSWD will undertake a rapid assessment of the DROM in response to COVID, including the application of the new safeguards measures which will involve virtual field-based consultations among the local government units, community volunteers and other major stakeholders.

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

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>		
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
28-Sep-2020	28-Sep-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>		
Philippines		
28-Sep-2020		
Comments		
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	
28-Sep-2020	28-Sep-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>		
Philippines		
28-Sep-2020		
Comments		
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>		
Date of receipt by the Bank	Date of submission for disclosure	
28-Sep-2020	28-Sep-2020	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>		
Philippines		
28-Sep-2020		
Comments		



**Pest Management Plan**

Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?

Yes

Date of receipt by the Bank

28-Sep-2020

Date of submission for disclosure

28-Sep-2020

**"In country" Disclosure**

Philippines

28-Sep-2020

Comments

**If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.**

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

**C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level (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)**

**OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment**

Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?

Yes

If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?

Yes

Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?

Yes

**OP 4.09 - Pest Management**

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?

Yes

Is a separate PMP required?

No

If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?



Yes

**OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples**

Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?

Yes

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

Yes

If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?

NA

**OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement**

Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?

Yes

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

Yes

Is physical displacement/relocation expected?

No

Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)

No

**The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information**

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

Yes

Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?

Yes



### All Safeguard Policies

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?

Yes

Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?

Yes

Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?

Yes

### CONTACT POINT

#### World Bank

Maria Loreto Padua  
Senior Social Development Specialist

Ditte Marie Gammelgaard Fallesen  
Senior Social Development Specialist

#### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Department of Social Welfare and Development  
Rolando Joselito Bautista  
Secretary  
osec@dswd.gov.ph

#### Implementing Agencies

Department of Social Welfare and Development  
Rhea Penaflor  
Assistant Secretary  
rbpenaflor@dswd.gov.ph



**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):	Maria Loreto Padua Ditte Marie Gammelgaard Fallesen
----------------------	--

**Approved By**

Safeguards Advisor:	Nina Chee	26-Oct-2020
Practice Manager/Manager:	Janamejay Singh	26-Oct-2020
Country Director:	Ndiame Diop	29-Oct-2020