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This Planning Framework on Indigenous Peoples (IPs) aims to ensure compliance of KALAHI-CIDSS Project with the Philippine Indigenous People’s Rights Act or IPRA (Republic Act No. 8371) and the World Bank’s Revised Operational Policy On Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10)

1. The Project

2. The Government of the Philippines (GoP) is undertaking a country-wide anti-poverty program based on its overarching KALAHI framework. The central component of this program is the KALAHI-CIDSS project, a community-driven initiative, which aims to empower communities through enhanced participation in barangay governance and involvement in the design, implementation, and management of development activities that reduce poverty.

3. Based on a facilitated participatory planning process, communities will submit sub-project proposals which will be reviewed for funding by an Inter-Barangay Forum with representation from all participating Barangays within a KALAHI-CIDSS covered municipality. Proposals for sub-projects will be based on an open menu supplemented by a negative list of prohibited activities with adverse environmental and social impacts. A community will be able to choose any activity it agrees is important for its development, be it economic infrastructure such as roads, bridges or irrigation facilities, social service infrastructure such as school or clinic, water supply and sanitation facilities, environmental conservation measures such as watershed management, or capacity building. Communities will be able to coordinate among themselves on activities that would benefit from joint planning.

4. The original KALAHI-CIDSS Project was approved by the Board on August 23, 2002, with a loan amount of US$100 million and was declared effective on December 16, 2002. The Project reached full-scale implementation in 2006 with a coverage of 4,229 barangays (villages) in 184 municipalities of the poorest 42 provinces, with almost all barangays committing to sustain the participatory processes introduced by the Project.

5. As of December 31, 2009, the KALAHI-CIDSS had financed 5,326 community sub-projects which benefited approximately 1.1 million households. About 44 percent of the sub-projects were basic social services facilities (e.g., water system, school buildings, health station and day care centers), with 36 percent for basic access infrastructure, such as access roads and small bridges. The rest of the sub-projects were environmental and disaster control infrastructure (10 percent) and community enterprise facilities (10 percent). A total of approximately $121 million has been invested in community sub-projects was, leveraging more than $38 million in local counterpart contribution, equivalent to 31 percent of the total sub-project cost. In addition, about 17 percent of the barangays have accessed funding from other sources to support their priority sub-projects.
6. Building on the Project’s strong performance, the Additional Financing (AF) will expand the project’s reach to 220 of the poorest municipalities within the 42 poorer provinces already covered. The AF will also introduce the following key enhancements to further improve project impact: (i) a reformulation of the Project’s Development Objective (PDO) to better capture the focus on community empowerment, (ii) strengthening the roles of the municipal local government units to integrate the key principles and mechanisms of KALAHI-CIDSS in local development planning; (iii) systematizing the engagement with the provincial local government units; (iv) the design and testing of the a CDD approach in urban areas, (v) further simplification of the project’s key performance indicators linked to a strengthened monitoring and evaluation system. The Additional Financing will support the original three (3) components with one additional component to cover the pilot-testing of the urban KALAHI-CIDSS as follows:

a. **Component 1 - Barangay Grants**, will include not only direct sub-project investment grants but also technical assistance funds for communities and to cover the costs of capacity building activities for community volunteers;

b. **Component 2 – Capacity Building and Implementation Support** will cover: (i) the costs incurred by Area Coordination Teams that support community facilitation activities.; (ii) capacity building for barangay and municipal LGUs; and, (iii) a clearly defined set of social accountability activities, covering the grievance redress system, third-party monitoring, and active information disclosure.

c. **Component 3 – Urban KALAHI-CIDSS** will support the project’s piloting of a KALAHI-CIDSS model in urban poor communities.

d. **Component 4 – Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation** focuses on the project costs that are specifically related to DSWD’s management and monitoring of the project.

_Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines_

7. The IPRA defines indigenous people as a “group of people or homogenous societies identified by self-ascription and ascription by others who have continuously lived as organized communities on communally bounded and defined territory, and who have, under claims of ownership since time immemorial, occupied, possessed and utilized such territories, sharing common bonds of language, customs, traditions and other distinctive cultural traits, or who have, through resistance to political, social and cultural inroads of colonization, non-indigenous religions and cultures, became historically differentiated from the majority of the Filipinos”.

8. The IPRA also stipulates that IPs have the right to an informed and intelligent participation in the formation and implementation of any project be it initiated by government or private entities. IPRA safeguards possible project impacts on ancestral domains. It also ensures that IPs have the right to participate in decision-making, in all matters that may affect their lives.

9. The indigenous population in the Philippines comprises a wide range of different groups that vary in terms of settlement patterns, economic subsistence, social structure, stratification and sociopolitical organization, as well as articulation with the wider society. These groups are found within three major geographical areas, namely, Luzon, the Visayas, and Mindanao. Based on the 2000 Census of Population and Housing, it was estimated that
around 8% or 5.3 million of the total population of 76.5 million is from 85 ethno linguistic groups.

10. Although there is a dearth of information on the situation of the IP communities, there is a prevailing perception that IPs are among the poorest sector in the country. They have resisted assimilation and have been adversely affected by previous development project that drove them to remote rural areas, mostly mountainous communities with no or inadequate access to basic services. Even the basic services that reach the IP communities are generally not sensitive to indigenous culture and practices.

Policy Context

A. The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA):

In 1997, the Philippine Congress passed Republic Act (RA) 8371 entitled Indigenous Peoples’ Rights Act, which uses the term “indigenous peoples” as the collective label for non-Christan and non-Muslim ethnic groups in the Philippines. The IPRA Law safeguards possible projects impacts on ancestral domains. It also ensures that IPs have the right to participate in decision-making, in all matters that may affect their lives. The law stipulates that IPs have the right to an informed and intelligent participation in the formation and implementation of any projects be it initiated by government or private entities.

B. UN Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples:

The declaration explicitly defines the right of the Indigenous Peoples to participate in decision-making in matters which would affect their rights, and the responsibility of the state to consult and cooperate in good faith the indigenous peoples concerned to obtain their free, prior and informed consent before adopting and implementing legislative or administrative measures that may affect them.


The World Bank Policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10) provides that all World Bank-assisted projects shall be designed and implemented “in such as way that Indigenous People do not suffer adverse effects during the development process, or when avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate or compensate for such effects (paragraph 1)”. Moreover, Bank-financed projects are also ‘designed to ensure that the Indigenous Peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive (paragraph 1)”.

Assessment of IP engagement in the KALAHI-CIDSS Project

11. The KALAHI-CIDSS Project covers a total of one hundred eighty four (184) municipalities in forty-two (42) provinces considered “poorest” by the National Statistical Coordinating Board (NSCB), in twelve (12) regions. Of these 184 municipalities, thirty-four percent (34%), or sixty-three (63) municipalities, are wholly or partly occupied by indigenous peoples with diverse ethnicities and tribal affiliations. They are located in seven
hundred sixty-one (761) barangays, representing eighteen percent (18%) of the total KC barangay coverage. These barangays are either fully occupied by IPs or living with the presence of other non-IP residents. Of these 761 communities, an average of sixty percent (60%) is in use by the various indigenous groups.

12. In the six (6) years since KALAHI-CIDSS has been operational (2003 up to June 30, 2009), the Project has approved five thousand three hundred thirty five (5,335) various community sub-projects nationwide. Of these, 962 sub-projects, or eighteen percent (18) are in IP communities covering 761 Barangays. The total investment in IP areas amounted to Php 1.103 billion worth of sub-projects, made up of sixty-seven percent (67%, or a total of Php 737.435 million) worth of grants funded by DSWD through a World Bank loan, and thirty-three percent (33%, or Php 365.79 million) worth of local counterpart contributions. Total project investment in IP areas comprises about eighteen to twenty percent (18% to 20%) of the national total project investments.

13. Indigenous Peoples (IP) communities played a significant role in the implementation of the KALAHI-CIDSS Project. Contrary to expectations during Project start-up of low participation of IP communities, the participation rate in IP Project areas reached above 80% during assemblies. Field reports, including field visits and dialogue with community members and local government officials, show the following effects of the Project on the indigenous communities:

a) LGU officials opined that KC had more extensive meetings/workshops to make sure that the Project is well understood by the IPs and ensure their participation.

b) The KC participatory process also enabled MLGU to reach isolated barangays and purok/sitio in the municipality, as well as mainstream IP concerns in local development planning. This is illustrated in the Municipality of Jabonga where the Mayor hired an IP Coordinator who sits as temporary representative on the Local Development Council. The IP Coordinator also serves as the advisor of the Mayor on IP concerns.

c) The participatory planning process has build the capability of IPs to prepare their Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP). In some areas, the plans generated through the KC processes served as inputs to the ADSDPP.

d) The participatory process of the project reinvigorated the tribal meetings/councils (e.g. “Tagpuanan” for the Ata Manobo tribe in Talaingod). Verbal accounts from the Mamanwa and Ata Manobo tribes reveal that the participatory process allows them to exercise their cultural practices and learn new things from the activities.

e) Certification was issued by the provincial NCIP that Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) has been ensured through the wide participatory processes of the Project.

f) In Paracelis, Mountain Province, the cultural practice on deepening relationship among the neighbourhood as one family called “Makkolak and sussunod” was observed again by the communities\(^1\). The practice made possible the reunification of tribal members,

---
\(^1\) Indigenous Practice Gives Way to KALAHI-CIDSS, short story written by Rogerson Dennis Fernandez and published in Trials and Triumphs: Communities Fighting Poverty by DSWD, 2009
through a PSA activity. Members also practiced equitable sharing of resources, depending on the capacity of the clan, for their sub-project completion.

14. The KALAHI-CIDSS Project has, in various ways, ensured that the indigenous people’s rights are upheld. The Project’s Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (CEAC) processes promote decision-making through community participation at the grass-roots level. The entire KC processes, from project selection to implementation, are community-driven and well participated by the community member, hence, serving as a direct translation of the right to self-governance and empowerment as embodied in the IPRA.

**The Strategy in the scale-up operations under the Additional Financing**

15. This strategy aims at achieving the twin policy objectives of (a) ensuring the informed participation of indigenous peoples in the activities of the KALAHI-CIDSS in both new and repeat municipalities under the Additional Financing Project, so that they are in a position to receive culturally compatible social and economic benefits, and (b) ensuring that indigenous peoples are not adversely affected during the development process.

16. The key element of the project approach is facilitated participatory planning and management of development activities at the community (barangay) level, using appropriate mechanisms and structures through which different stakeholders, most especially indigenous groups, will be able to (a) provide input to local planning data used to determine development priorities, (b) influence the choice of community projects to address local development challenges, (c) lead in the design, development, and implementation of community projects, and (d) provide feedback on project implementation, and benefits and risks to IP groups.

17. The design elements that define the strategy to address indigenous peoples concerns are imbedded throughout the various stages and activities of the CEAC, and include;

   a. **Social Preparation:**
      - Demographic and other data on the situation of IP communities shall be gathered by members of the Area Coordinating Teams (ACT) as part of Social Investigation (SI) activities. These shall be used by the ACT in crafting appropriate social facilitation plans for IP groups within their covered municipalities.
      - The project shall ensure the presence of leaders and representatives of IP groups and of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) during the conduct of Municipal Orientations.
      - The Barangay Assembly requires that eighty percent (80%) of families are represented. The attendance forms will capture membership of attendees in a particular IP group. In cases where underrepresentation of a particular purok or sitio is detected, project staff are required to conduct additional purok meetings in these areas.
      - Participatory Situation Analysis (PSA) activities require representation of all puroks in the sharing, crafting, and analysis of data. Project staffs are required to ensure participation of representatives from IP groups in the PSA committee. In addition, techniques on Baseline Gap Analysis (BGA) learned from the JSDF-
funded Social Inclusion Project (SIP) shall be integrated into the conduct of the PSA.

b. Project Identification and Development:
   - The basis for identification and selection of proposed community projects at the Barangay level shall include criteria on effects to IPs, including projected benefits for, and potential risks to IP communities.
   - The open menu for sub-project identification provides scope for indigenous groups to develop proposals that address their specific concerns, and in form and manner that is sensitive to and reflect their cultural identity.
   - The format for sub-project proposals require that the community profile and needs assessment provide baseline data on indigenous groups in a particular barangay.

c. Prioritization:
   - The Inter-Barangay Forum (IBF), which shall prioritize proposed community projects for funding, is composed of representatives from the different barangays within the municipality, including representatives from IP communities.
   - Prioritizing community projects for funding are based on criteria developed and agreed on by representatives elected by the Barangay Assemblies of each barangays within the municipality. This ensures that IP barangays are adequately represented in the crafting of the prioritization criteria.

d. Project Implementation
   - All community projects implemented under the KALAHI-CIDSS Project are managed by community volunteers elected by their respective barangay assemblies. This ensures maximum opportunities for all, including IP leaders and community members, to participate in crafting of decisions attendant to implementation of community projects, such as counterparts, labor and remuneration for work, and others.
   - In addition, most of the community projects under the KALAHI-CIDSS Project are constructed through community force account. Community volunteers manage all aspects of project implementation, from procurement to implementation and construction (for infrastructure projects), to managing finances. This ensures that the community members acquire bookkeeping, simple accounting, procurement, and resource management skills during design and implementation stages.

18. The training of community facilitators include orientation on the IPRA as well as the project’s strategy to address indigenous peoples issues. In addition, lessons from the JSDF-SIP on promoting IP rights and participation as well as orientation on the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) or NCIP Administrative Order No. 1, series of 2004, shall be provided in order to better prepare Project staff in engaging IP communities in the KC Project.

Monitoring

19. Project monitoring shall include (a) database and monitoring arrangements to track engagement of indigenous groups in the various activities along the CEAC, (b) conduct of
community self-assessments of sub-project preparation and implementation, which provides an avenue for indigenous groups to communicate whether they have been involved in project activities and whether the final sub-project addresses their needs, and (c) independent monitoring by civil society (NGO’s and the press), to provide another avenue for identification of cases where indigenous groups have been bypassed or marginalized in the sub-project planning and selection process.

20. In addition, the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) established under the Indigenous People’s Rights Act will be involved in monitoring of project implementation in relation to indigenous peoples, as mandated under Chapter III, Section 44 (h) of the Act. Such monitoring will be carried out by the NCIP as a member of the KALAHI-CIDSS National Steering Committee, and through representation of NCIP Commissioners at the regional level, as well as NCIP’s provincial offices and Community Service Centers where these exist. The NCIP will report quarterly to the National Steering Committee, the National Project Management Office, and the Regional Project Management Offices.

**Grievance Redress**

21. The project design includes a grievance redress mechanism that provides the indigenous groups within a particular barangay or municipality with an avenue for complaints if bypassed or marginalized in the sub-project planning and selection process. During the initial community orientation and mobilization, the community facilitators inform indigenous groups about this avenue for submission and redress of grievances. Complaints may likewise be registered by the NCIP and included in their quarterly reporting. The NCIP will likewise disseminate this information through its staff to indigenous groups, local NGO’s and the press.

22. In addition, the project will continue to maintain a grievance register, which will provide information on the number and type of grievance and complaints from indigenous groups at the municipal and provincial levels, and on the way these complaints have been addressed. This information will be included in the quarterly project reports to the National Steering Committee.

**Institutionalization**

23. The KALAHI-CIDSS Project adopts an institutionalization framework and strategy that seeks to integrated lessons in the implementation of CDD processes and strategies into the regular planning, budgeting, implementation, and monitoring processes, systems, and structures of the barangay and municipal LGUs. In Project areas where IPs and ICCs are found, the KC institutionalization framework and strategy shall be enhanced to include approaches for advocating integration of IP and ICC concerns into the LGU local development planning process. These can include advocating integration of key features of this safeguards framework and strategy into the LGUs governance systems, such as but may not be limited to (i) establishment and maintenance of IP and ICC databases, (ii) integration of ADSDPP processes into the MLGU local development planning instruments and manuals, and; (iii) facilitating review and/or development of ADSDPPs, among others.