

Environmental and Social Monitoring Report

Semi-annual Report
July-December 2015

PHI: KALAHI-CIDSS¹ National Community-Driven Development Project (L3100)

Prepared by the KALAHI-CIDSS National Project Management Office (NPMO) of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) for the Asian Development Bank.

¹ *Kapit-Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan* (Linking Arms Against Poverty)-Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
CDD	Community Driven Development
CEAC	Community Empowerment Activity Cycle
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
EA	Executing Agency
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
GRS	Grievance Redress System
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IR	Involuntary Resettlement
KALAH-CIDSS	<i>Kapit Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan</i> (Linking Arms Against Poverty) – Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services
KC-NCDPP	KALAH-CIDSS National Community-Driven Development Project
NPMO	National Project Management Office
RPMO	Regional Project Management Office
SPS	ADB Safeguards Policy Statement (2009)

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	II
CONTENTS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
II. STATUS OF SUBMISSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (ESMP)	3
III. ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING	4
a. Summary of compliance on environmental safeguards	4
b. Issues and recommendations	4
IV. SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS PERFORMANCE MONITORING	6
a. Summary of Compliance with RP/IPP Requirements	7
b. Compliance Per Mission Results	11
V. OCCUPATIONAL, HEALTH AND SAFETY (OHS) PERFORMANCE MONITORING	13
VI. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE AND SOCIALIZATION INCLUDING CAPABILITY BUILDING	13
VII. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM	14
VIII. CONCLUSION	15
ATTACHMENT: PHOTODOCUMENTATION	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The KALAH-CIDSS National Community-Driven Development Project (the Project), supports the implementation of the government's KALAH CIDSS-National Community-Driven Development Project (KC-NCDDP) which aimed to restore basic social services and rebuild communities affected by Typhoon Yolanda (international name: Haiyan).
2. The project impact is improved resiliency of poor communities to natural hazards. The outcome is improved access to services and infrastructure for communities in affected provinces and their participation in more inclusive local disaster risk reduction and management planning, budgeting, and implementation. The project outputs are: (i) community-driven development (CDD) subprojects selected, implemented, and completed; (ii) institutional and organizational capacity strengthened; and (iii) program management and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems enhanced. The project has an implementation period of four years, from 2013 until 2017 and covers approximately 554 Yolanda-affected municipalities in 39 provinces across nine (9) regions.
3. The executing agency (EA) of the Project is the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). The program management structure is generally divided between the National Program Management Office (NPMO) (responsible for national policy and technical assistance) and the Regional Program Management Office (RPMO) (responsible for field operations)
4. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) of the Project was developed and prepared to guide Program staff in complying with the Project's environmental and social safeguards requirements for all subprojects. It was finalized and issued a No Objection Letter from Asian Development Bank on 29 January 2015.
5. As of December 2015, in Cycle 1, 542 of the 547 enrolled Yolanda areas have reached Stage 3, undertaking community-managed implementation activities. Furthermore, 93 have entered Stage 4. As for the 220 non-Yolanda areas that have enrolled to date, 193 have officially started with the social preparation activities of Stage 1, whereas the remaining 27 municipalities comprise areas that are just newly-enrolled under the Program. Meanwhile, majority of 127 have begun Stage 3, with 66 municipalities having entered Stage 4 already. Additionally, a total of 43 municipalities (26 Yolanda-affected and 17 from the non-Yolanda group) are already in Cycle 2 of implementation under NCDDP.
6. About, 506,528 community volunteers (CVs) have been recorded as of the end of December 2015. Of this figure 333,308 (66%) have been trained on situational assessment, needs identification, project proposal preparation, project implementation and management and local planning and resource allocation, among others. In the implementation of sub-projects, a total of 254,812 community members were employed.
7. As of December 2015, the compliance status of the 14,391 SPs is as follows: (i) 32% (4,639) with environmental and social management plan (ESMP); (ii) 8% (1,216) with environmental compliance certificate (ECC); and (iii) 12% (1,685) with certificate of non-coverage (CNC).
8. The total grievance received during the reporting period is 3,690, of which 98.1% (3,619) have been satisfactorily resolved. Most of the grievances (93.9%) are classified as Type A or

non-contentious and merely queries and/or comments about the Project. Most of the concerns or grievances filed during the reporting period are on the program's design/guidelines, subproject implementation, procurement processes and community participation.

9. Since the start of NCDDP, the cumulative total of grievances received through the grievance redress system (GRS) is at 10,405 of which 99.03% have been satisfactorily resolved. Most of the grievances received were Type A (92.25%) or non-contentious, queries and comments.

10. The participation rate of households in KC-NCDDP barangay assemblies (BA) remains relatively high at an average of 78 %.

11. The project is partially compliant to both environmental and social safeguards. Key issues identified for social safeguards had to do more on the documentary requirements for both land acquisition and indigenous peoples, condition of precondition (CP) processing/validation with National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), applicability of the environmental and social management checklist/plan (ESMC/P), sensitivities during consultations/engaging with IP communities, capacity building, and monitoring. On the other hand, issues identified on environmental safeguards are: (i) ESMP format/templates used are not consistent across the regions; (ii) incorrect information provided in the ESMP; and (iii) lack in coordination between the municipal inter-agency committee (MIAC) and project preparation team (PPT).

12. Recommendations are: (i) to improve the integration of environmental and social safeguards in project screening, implementation and monitoring; (ii) simplify the ESMP; (iii) enhance the capacity of area coordinating teams (ACTs) on how to fill out the ESMP; (iv) conduct workshop involving all stakeholders (MIAC, PPT, SRPMO, RPMO) to clearly establish the institutional responsibility in safeguards screening and monitoring.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Number and Title:	46420-002 PHILIPPINES: KALAHI-CIDSS National Community-Driven Development Project																																																																																																																																
Safeguards Category	Environment	B																																																																																																																															
	Involuntary Resettlement	B																																																																																																																															
	Indigenous Peoples	A																																																																																																																															
Reporting period:	1 July – 31 December 2015																																																																																																																																
Last report date:	1 January – 30 June 2015																																																																																																																																
Key Project activities:	<p>Coming from the previous monitoring period, an additional 94 municipalities have enrolled under the Program, raising the total of actual covered municipalities to 767, which is 91% of the total target coverage. This figure is inclusive of 547 Typhoon Yolanda-affected municipalities, and 220 poor municipalities not devastated by Yolanda. The breakdown of LGU enrollment is detailed in the below table and takes into account all subprojects under both ADB and WB financing.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Actual Coverage as of December 2015 by Municipal Grouping</p> <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Municipal Grouping</th><th colspan="2">Target</th><th colspan="2">Actual</th><th>% Target</th></tr><tr><th>No. of Mun</th><th>No. of Bgys</th><th>No. of Mun</th><th>No. of Bgys</th><th>Mun Covered</th></tr><tr><td>Yolanda-affected municipalities</td><td>554</td><td>14,139</td><td>547</td><td>13,896</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>Non-Yolanda affected municipalities</td><td>293</td><td>5,508</td><td>220</td><td>4,196</td><td>75%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>847</td><td>19,647</td><td>767</td><td>18,092</td><td>91%</td></tr></table> <p style="text-align: center;">Actual Coverage as of December 2015 by Region</p> <table><tr><th rowspan="2">Region</th><th colspan="2">Target</th><th colspan="2">Actual</th><th>% Target</th></tr><tr><th>No. of Mun</th><th>No. of Bgys</th><th>No. of Mun</th><th>No. of Bgys</th><th>Mun Covered</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>50</td><td>624</td><td>25</td><td>317</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>11</td><td>133</td><td>11</td><td>133</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>III</td><td>3</td><td>64</td><td>3</td><td>64</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>28</td><td>853</td><td>23</td><td>719</td><td>82%</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>67</td><td>1,278</td><td>62</td><td>1,204</td><td>93%</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>101</td><td>2,902</td><td>92</td><td>2,691</td><td>91%</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>117</td><td>3,451</td><td>116</td><td>3,418</td><td>99%</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>108</td><td>2,339</td><td>97</td><td>2,096</td><td>90%</td></tr><tr><td>VIII</td><td>136</td><td>3,705</td><td>133</td><td>3,585</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>52</td><td>1,205</td><td>45</td><td>1,038</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>73</td><td>1,390</td><td>63</td><td>1,166</td><td>86%</td></tr><tr><td>XI</td><td>27</td><td>496</td><td>27</td><td>496</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>XII</td><td>17</td><td>386</td><td>17</td><td>386</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>Caraga</td><td>57</td><td>821</td><td>53</td><td>779</td><td>93%</td></tr></table>					Municipal Grouping	Target		Actual		% Target	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	Mun Covered	Yolanda-affected municipalities	554	14,139	547	13,896	98%	Non-Yolanda affected municipalities	293	5,508	220	4,196	75%	Total	847	19,647	767	18,092	91%	Region	Target		Actual		% Target	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	Mun Covered	CAR	50	624	25	317	50%	I	11	133	11	133	100%	III	3	64	3	64	100%	IV-A	28	853	23	719	82%	IV-B	67	1,278	62	1,204	93%	V	101	2,902	92	2,691	91%	VI	117	3,451	116	3,418	99%	VII	108	2,339	97	2,096	90%	VIII	136	3,705	133	3,585	98%	IX	52	1,205	45	1,038	87%	X	73	1,390	63	1,166	86%	XI	27	496	27	496	100%	XII	17	386	17	386	100%	Caraga	57	821	53	779	93%
Municipal Grouping	Target		Actual		% Target																																																																																																																												
	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	Mun Covered																																																																																																																												
Yolanda-affected municipalities	554	14,139	547	13,896	98%																																																																																																																												
Non-Yolanda affected municipalities	293	5,508	220	4,196	75%																																																																																																																												
Total	847	19,647	767	18,092	91%																																																																																																																												
Region	Target		Actual		% Target																																																																																																																												
	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	No. of Mun	No. of Bgys	Mun Covered																																																																																																																												
CAR	50	624	25	317	50%																																																																																																																												
I	11	133	11	133	100%																																																																																																																												
III	3	64	3	64	100%																																																																																																																												
IV-A	28	853	23	719	82%																																																																																																																												
IV-B	67	1,278	62	1,204	93%																																																																																																																												
V	101	2,902	92	2,691	91%																																																																																																																												
VI	117	3,451	116	3,418	99%																																																																																																																												
VII	108	2,339	97	2,096	90%																																																																																																																												
VIII	136	3,705	133	3,585	98%																																																																																																																												
IX	52	1,205	45	1,038	87%																																																																																																																												
X	73	1,390	63	1,166	86%																																																																																																																												
XI	27	496	27	496	100%																																																																																																																												
XII	17	386	17	386	100%																																																																																																																												
Caraga	57	821	53	779	93%																																																																																																																												

	<table><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>847</td><td>19,647</td><td>767</td><td>18,092</td><td>91%</td></tr></table>	TOTAL	847	19,647	767	18,092	91%				
TOTAL	847	19,647	767	18,092	91%						
	<p>As for non-Yolanda areas, 220 (75%) out of 293 are currently enrolled. Non-engagement with KC-NCDDP is largely due to municipalities' ongoing implementation under KC-MCC. Among the 541 enrolled Yolanda-affected municipalities, 528 have reached CEAC Stage 3, undertaking community-managed implementation (CMI) activities. Furthermore, 23 have already entered Stage 4 which is community monitoring.</p> <p>Considerable movement in sub-project implementation was observed during the 4th quarter of 2015. Coming from the previous quarter in which two-thirds of the funded SPs were yet to start, the proportion of funded SPs now shifted more to completed (42%) and on-going (31%) status, as compared to those that have not yet started (27%).</p> <p>The distribution of project types is illustrated as below:</p> <div><p style="text-align: center;">Distribution of Prioritized Community Sub-Project by Major Sub-Project Category</p><table><thead><tr><th>Sub-Project Category</th><th>Percentage</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Basic Access</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>Infrastructure Sub-Projects</td><td>0%</td></tr><tr><td>Basic Social Services</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>Community Production, Economic Support and Common Service Facilities</td><td>14%</td></tr></tbody></table></div> <p>As of 31 December 2015, 759 (98.96%) out of the 767 enrolled municipalities have conducted their municipal-level GRS orientation during the Municipal Orientation. Meanwhile, out of these municipalities, 17,762 out of 18,092 (98.18%) barangays have conducted the GRS orientation and formed GRS committees during the 1st BA. Meanwhile, 15,448 barangays have already displayed their GRS information materials such as tarpaulins and brochures. From January to September 2015, all regions have conducted their RPMO/SRPMO level trainings while a total of 655 municipalities have conducted their municipal level GRS-ADR trainings.</p> <p>At the end of December 2015, a total of 5,633 subprojects (SPs) were completed during the reporting period.</p> <p>During this monitoring period, the following key activities were carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Joint DSWD-ADB-WB Safeguards Mission on June-August 2015• Loan review mission on 15-16 October 2015• Training and capacity building activities on safeguards requirements	Sub-Project Category	Percentage	Basic Access	33%	Infrastructure Sub-Projects	0%	Basic Social Services	33%	Community Production, Economic Support and Common Service Facilities	14%
Sub-Project Category	Percentage										
Basic Access	33%										
Infrastructure Sub-Projects	0%										
Basic Social Services	33%										
Community Production, Economic Support and Common Service Facilities	14%										
Report prepared by:	KC-NCDDP National Program Management Office (NPMO)										

II. STATUS OF SUBMISSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (ESMP)

13. The Project prepared an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to guide Program staff in complying with the Project's environmental and social safeguards requirements for all subprojects. The objectives of the ESMF are: (i) to ensure that selected SPs under the project are designed to avoid or minimize negative environmental impacts; and (ii) identify any negative impacts and develop and implement appropriate mitigation measures as part of the SP design and implementation.

14. The environmental and social safeguard requirements of subprojects are integrated in the Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (CEAC) and the accelerated CEAC to ensure that the construction and implementation of all subprojects are in compliance with ADB's safeguard requirements and with the applicable laws and regulations in the country.

15. Eligible subprojects are subjected to environmental and social safeguards screening and all subprojects are required to prepare an environmental and social management plan (ESMP) that presents the anticipated environmental and social impacts and the prescribed mitigation measures to address these impacts. The completion of ESMP is the major accomplishment for the 4th quarter. It identifies the risks and corresponding mitigating measures related to the implementation of the subproject.

16. The table below reflects the ESMP submitted per region and it is noted that while there is low completion rate (32%), completion of ESMPs is significant to ensure safeguards are attended to during the remaining project duration. It is noted that in Region X, none have reported to have complied with the ESMP submission.

Status of ESMP submission (as of December 2015)

Region	No. of SPs	No of SPs with ESMP	% SPs with ESMP	No. of SPs with CNC	% of SP with CNC
CAR	86	86	100%	-	-
I	49	49	100%	49	100%
III	22	22	100%	21	95.5%
IV-A	630	406	64%	25	4%
IV-B	1,143	237	21%	10	0.9%
V	1,304	475	36%	611	47%
VI	3,542	590	17%	423	12%
VII	1,612	1599	99%	10	0.6%
VIII	4,114	215	5%	2	0.05%
IX	556	64	12%	99	18%
X	186		0%	-	-
XI	298	167	56%	134	45%
XII	162	138	85%	102	63%
Caraga	687	591	86%	199	29%
TOTAL	14,391	4,639	32%	1,685	12%

ESMP: Environmental and Social Management Plan
CNC: Certificate of Non-Coverage

17. As a result of the last safeguards mission, the ESMP was simplified according to the comments made by development partners. In addition, the guidelines in filling up both the environmental and social safeguards checklist (ESSC) and ESMP were simplified to have a better understanding of the connection between ESSC and ESMP.

18. Finally, the translation of the ESMP in Tagalog and Bisaya is ongoing and expected to be finished by the first quarter of 2016.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING

19. This section presents the status of the compliance of the Project on national regulations and loan covenants on environmental safeguards.

a. Summary of compliance on environmental safeguards

Requirements	Compliance Status (Yes, No, Partial)	Comment or Reasons for Non-compliance
Submission of subprojects' ESMP	Partial	<p>The environmental safeguards compliance is monitored through the Project's geotagging web application and verified by physical inspection</p> <p>As of December 2015, the compliance status of the 14,391 SPs is as follows: (i) 32% (4,639) with ESMP; (ii) 8% (1,216) with environmental compliance certificate (ECC); and (iii) 12% (1,685) with certificate of non-coverage (CNC). See table on the status of ESMP submission</p> <p>Based on the database, there are 1,216 SPs which are category B and will require the submission of initial environment examination (IEE) for disclosure in the ADB website. The number of SPs with ECC will be further verified by NPMO and updates should be reported in the next monitoring report.</p>

b. Issues and recommendations

20. The table below shows the series of field visits conducted part of the safeguards technical mission during the reporting period.

Region	Area	Inclusive dates
IV-B	Naujan, Oriental Mindoro	June 16-19, 2015
	Bongabong, Oriental Mindoro	

V	Buhi, Camarines Sur Goa, Camarines Sur	June 30-July 3 2015
CARAGA	Cortes, Surigao del Sur Carmen, Surigao del Sur	July 21-24, 2015
VIII	Burauen, Leyte Capoocan, Leyte Kawayan, Biliran	August 25-28, 2015

21. The summary of the issues and corresponding recommendations from the field missions are summarized in the table below.

No.	Issues	Recommendations
1	Members of the Municipal Inter-Agency Committee (MIAC) are not familiar with the Program's safeguard policies	Area Coordinating Teams (ACTs) to mobilize/maximize the presence of MIA during consultation activities and provide them with an orientation on the Program's safeguard policies
2	Entries in the ESMP translated to English conveys a different idea and does not capture the impacts identified by the community volunteers (CVs)	Inform the CVs that information and/or answers in the ESMP can be written in local dialect.
3	The Community Empowerment Facilitator (CEF) answers the ESMP in behalf of the community	Filling out of the ESMP should be in a form of workshop with the community volunteers/members.
4	The Environmental and Social Safeguard Checklist is not properly filled out and does not reflect the real condition of the community	To inform the ACT the importance of the checklist as a screening tool in identifying the safeguards that will be triggered for the sub-project. Similar to the ESMP, this should be accomplished by the community.
5	Data are available in the community level but are not being consolidated.	A safeguard reporting template will be prepared while the safeguards database is being set up.
6	Limited capacity of ACTs on how to fill out the ESMP.	Capacity building activities should be provided to ACTs as well as the Sub-regional Project Management Office (SRPMO) staff.
7	The proposed SP is located within the watershed, an environmentally critical area (ECA)	Consult with Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and Mines and Geosciences Bureau of the necessary permits and clearances required for the subproject
8	There is no proper coordination between the MIAC and the project	Close coordination between MIAC and PPT to ensure that the SPs are implementing all the mitigation

No.	Issues	Recommendations
	preparation team (PPT).	measures indicated in the ESMP.
9	ESMP at the barangay level is different from the submitted with NPMO.	Refresher training at the barangay level on the ESMP and its importance in the continuous monitoring of the SPs
10	Some of the SPs do not implement mitigation measures on occupational health and safety	Refresher training on occupational health and safety (i.e. wearing proper and adequate personnel protective equipment (PPE), first-aid kit) during the construction phase of SPs.

IV. SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS PERFORMANCE MONITORING

22. Partial compliance is noted.

23. As regards ACT training on social safeguards, these have been ongoing since Q1 until Q3 2015 to supplement the safeguards orientation during the basic training on accelerated CEAC. Continuous learning and mentoring sessions are done to support safeguards due diligence and implementation. Modules on environmental and social safeguards to be used by ACTs for training CVs have been prepared for roll-out beginning Cycle 2.

a. Summary of Compliance with RP/IPP Requirements

24. Compliance status is partial. The following are the key activities and some issues with way forward for the monitoring period:

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action																																																																																				
Interagency cooperation: On 22 July 2015, the DSWD and the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to strengthen their partnership in the implementation of KC-NCDDP in municipalities with IP communities. The MOA provides for culture-sensitive facilitation, securing of free and prior informed consent (FPIC), and institutional arrangements for coordination and collaboration. While program staff are aware of the MOA, a CP or clearance for the subproject to proceed has yet to be issued by the NCIP regional office.	The issuance can be fast tracked through submission of documentation of the subproject identification process to the NCIP regional offices and visit to the proposed subproject sites.																																																																																				
Social safeguards planning:																																																																																					
a. Completion of Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).	Only 32% of total SPs (14,391) were able to produce, see above table.																																																																																				
b. Community proposals for infrastructure projects supported by various land acquisition instruments/ documentation	As below: <table><tr><th>Region</th><th>No. of SPs</th><th>Deed of Donation</th><th>Usufruct Agreement</th><th>M/BLGU Resolution</th><th>DEPED Certification</th><th>Other Instruments</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>86</td><td>11</td><td>20</td><td>27</td><td>8</td><td>28</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>49</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>III</td><td>22</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>17</td><td>1</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>630</td><td>251</td><td>10</td><td>49</td><td>7</td><td>37</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>1,143</td><td>3</td><td>-</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>1,304</td><td>44</td><td>12</td><td>254</td><td>79</td><td>101</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>3,542</td><td>116</td><td>20</td><td>126</td><td>20</td><td>60</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>1,612</td><td>102</td><td>394</td><td>1,356</td><td>69</td><td>76</td></tr><tr><td>VIII</td><td>4,114</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>556</td><td>5</td><td>-</td><td>33</td><td>12</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>186</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr></table>	Region	No. of SPs	Deed of Donation	Usufruct Agreement	M/BLGU Resolution	DEPED Certification	Other Instruments	CAR	86	11	20	27	8	28	I	49	-	-	-	-	-	III	22	3	1	17	1	-	IV-A	630	251	10	49	7	37	IV-B	1,143	3	-	4	1	2	V	1,304	44	12	254	79	101	VI	3,542	116	20	126	20	60	VII	1,612	102	394	1,356	69	76	VIII	4,114	-	-	-	-	-	IX	556	5	-	33	12	-	X	186	-	-	-	-	-
Region	No. of SPs	Deed of Donation	Usufruct Agreement	M/BLGU Resolution	DEPED Certification	Other Instruments																																																																															
CAR	86	11	20	27	8	28																																																																															
I	49	-	-	-	-	-																																																																															
III	22	3	1	17	1	-																																																																															
IV-A	630	251	10	49	7	37																																																																															
IV-B	1,143	3	-	4	1	2																																																																															
V	1,304	44	12	254	79	101																																																																															
VI	3,542	116	20	126	20	60																																																																															
VII	1,612	102	394	1,356	69	76																																																																															
VIII	4,114	-	-	-	-	-																																																																															
IX	556	5	-	33	12	-																																																																															
X	186	-	-	-	-	-																																																																															

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action																																																														
	XI	298	24	3	103	7	4																																																								
	XII	162	8	-	74	10	-																																																								
	Caraga	687	16	-	101	1	5																																																								
	TOTAL	14,391	583	460	2,144	215	313																																																								
c. Among the 847 municipalities, 112 municipalities overlap with approved CADT areas while 93 municipalities overlap with areas with in-process CADTs. Of these areas, 50 have ADSDPPs	As below: <table><tr><th>Region</th><th>Mun with Approved CADTs</th><th>Mun with On-process CADTs</th><th>Mun with ADSDPP</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>11</td><td>16</td><td>23</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>23</td><td>21</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>7</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>5</td><td>9</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>8</td><td>5</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>9</td><td>13</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>XI</td><td>15</td><td>9</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>XII</td><td>8</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Caraga</td><td>20</td><td>7</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>112</td><td>93</td><td>50</td></tr></table> <p>Source: National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)</p>							Region	Mun with Approved CADTs	Mun with On-process CADTs	Mun with ADSDPP	CAR	11	16	23	I	4	3	2	IV-A	0	2	-	IV-B	23	21	3	V	7	3	4	VI	5	9	3	VII	2	4	-	IX	8	5	2	X	9	13	2	XI	15	9	7	XII	8	1	1	Caraga	20	7	3	TOTAL	112	93	50
Region	Mun with Approved CADTs	Mun with On-process CADTs	Mun with ADSDPP																																																												
CAR	11	16	23																																																												
I	4	3	2																																																												
IV-A	0	2	-																																																												
IV-B	23	21	3																																																												
V	7	3	4																																																												
VI	5	9	3																																																												
VII	2	4	-																																																												
IX	8	5	2																																																												
X	9	13	2																																																												
XI	15	9	7																																																												
XII	8	1	1																																																												
Caraga	20	7	3																																																												
TOTAL	112	93	50																																																												
d. Through CEAC, facilitate participation of IP communities	As below:																																																														

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action				
present in 2,670 barangays across 264 KC-NCDDP municipalities in 12 regions. IP households estimated at 396,041.	Region	Project Mun to Date	Mun with IP Population	Brgys with IP Population	IP HH
	CAR	50	25	315	56,658
	I	11	11	72	10,035
	III	3			
	IV-A	28	7	35	766
	IV-B	67	21	154	25,412
	V	101	15	117	11,022
	VI	117	54	221	26,017
	VII	108	12	29	1,900
	VIII	136			
	IX	52	44	868	68,944
	X	73	4	41	7,746
	XI	27	27	467	145,304
	XII	17	15	210	29,407
	Caraga	57	29	141	12,830
	TOTAL	847	264	2,670	396,041
Public consultation and socialization process. Various challenges have been encountered in making sure that the Program goes beyond the tokenistic participation of IPs. Staffs are oriented that quality participation is not just measured through mere attendance, but rather through ensuring that IP representatives or groups are given the opportunity to be involved in any community engagement activity. Some areas also faced difficulty in the identification of genuine IP leaders, as well as in handling minority-majority dynamics.	For these, trainings to reiterate the importance of understanding indigenous governance and engaging the leaders identified by the community. In areas where IPs are the minority, the conduct of separate consultations are to be observed. In all these, the use of indigenous terminology and simple language to clarify project concepts are emphasized as necessary to bridge the language gap.				
	In particular, discussions with the mission resulted to the following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fine tuning the CEAC process to ensure that IPs have substantive and meaningful participation in identifying priority subprojects based on their own decision-making processes;• Effective facilitation as key to KC-NCDDP implementation in IP areas, which will ensure participation of IPs and culturally appropriate interventions throughout the CEAC process;• Systematic guidance on how best to respond to the needs of IPs in a way that is sensitive to their customs and practices;• Sensitizing municipal government to the IP situation and rights through the Indigenous People Mandatory Representative and NCIP in the Municipal Inter-Agency Committee (MIAC);• Securing FPIC as a subproject requirement as provided for in the MOA; and• Continued capacity building interventions for regional staff, ACTs, an MIAC on the ESMF and safeguards				

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action
	<p>requirements including the importance of ESMP, (e.g., supplementary training for ACTs in program safeguards requirements, instruments, IP issues, and screening).</p>
<p>Land acquisition - issues on overlapping claims and documentary evidences of ownership/claim. The NIAPIT sought the guidance of the NSC on the (i) documentary requirements for housing projects not intended for selling and for subprojects that will only involve repair, and (ii) documentary requirements and types of projects allowed to be constructed on environmentally critical areas and/or areas with overlapping claims.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the documentary requirements for settlements, it was recommended that resettlement projects involving usufruct arrangements will only need to secure permits and clearances from the LGU and a clear document stipulating the agreements between the owner and the rights holder will be prepared. For simple repairs, the NIAPIT recommended requiring only a barangay certification and a resolution from the municipal government while for temporary structures in critical areas, a barangay certification, municipal resolution, and MOA stipulating the plans during the phase of abandonment will be required. On the issue of environmentally critical areas with overlapping claims, the NSC will immediately convene a meeting between the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and NCIP to further discuss the issue.
<p>Capacity building: A series of field visits were conducted within the monitoring period. Significant findings are as follows pertaining to compliance with the Environmental and Social Safeguards Checklist (ESSC) and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESMP formats/templates used are not consistent across regions Inconsistencies in the information provided in the ESSC and ESMP <p>Identified impacts and mitigation measures in the ESMP are not linked with each other or with the sub-project phase and monitoring parameters did not coincide with the proposed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>In response to the above-mentioned findings, a Safeguards Review and Writeshop were conducted for the enhancement/simplification of the safeguards templates. Further, the conduct of coaching and mentoring sessions in filling out said forms was recommended among the Area Coordinating Teams.</p> <p>Specifically,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Consultations and meetings (date; time; location; agenda; number of participants disaggregated by sex and ethnic group, not including project staff; issues raised by participants and how these were addressed by the project team) Training (nature of training, number of participants disaggregated by gender and ethnicity, date, location, etc.) Ongoing translation of the ESMP in Tagalog and Bisaya expected to be finished by 2016
<p>Monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No external monitoring of subprojects to date Need to track, monitoring, and document IP issues/data towards meaningful participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare terms of reference (TOR) for external monitoring Develop database on IPs for incorporation in the M&E system and preparing IP profiles that will be included in the safeguards section of the quarterly KC-NCDDP progress report.

b. Compliance Per Mission Results

25. Compliance status is partial. Below are agreements made during the ADB Mission conducted from 5-16 October 2015 and the corresponding status:

Agreed Action	Status
From last monitoring period:	
1. EA to orient project staff on the use of the latest templates for ESMP, IPP and RP and provide training on social safeguards to ACTs in the next round of training in Q3 2015	Continuing ADB reviewed and approved Facilitator's Guide on 6 October 2016
2. Conduct additional social safeguards missions in Q2-Q4 2015 to areas where IPs are deemed to be more vulnerable.	Done Conducted 5-16 October 2015
3. DSWD to submit first quarter safeguards report and TORs for external monitoring; external monitoring to start in June.	Partial: <u>Done</u> - Incorporated in Quarterly report <u>Pending</u> - TORs for external monitoring and conduct of external monitoring
4. The EA identified the following social safeguards-related priorities that require critical TA support and closer collaboration among the EA, NIAPIT, and development partners: (i) immediate review of safeguards policies, guidelines, and forms (i.e., ESMP matrix) by regional safeguards teams; (ii) immediate discussion of regional safeguards teams to clarify requirements for securing land for subprojects; (iii) training of ACTs and RPMOs to improve ability to correctly interpret and execute policies and guidelines. The EA requested consulting services to assist the NPMO on social safeguards and M&E.	Continuing Other facets recommended by Mission to be covered in the KC-NCDDP thematic studies under TA 8590 PH
This monitoring period:	
1. Submit sample subproject proposals (one per region) from the 561 ongoing subprojects for review by ADB to check whether safeguards procedures were followed and proper screening is understood at the field level.	<u>Done</u> Safeguards Specialist and consultant reviewed and provided comments on the proposals
2. Include reviewed subprojects in areas to be covered by external monitoring	<u>Pending</u>
3. Include in the KC-NCDDP quarterly progress report a set of proposals processed during the quarter (one proposal per region) for review by ADB prior to subproject implementation	<u>Not done/Cancelled</u> This did not push through. The EA however ensured that ESMPs are prepared for each subproject, which is requirement for fund release. Quarterly progress reports include a section on safeguards

Agreed Action	Status
4. Submit IP plans for subprojects with negative impacts and provide specific details on safeguards provisions in the loan covenant matrix	Done As of 2 Sept 2016, according to NPMO there have not been any subprojects with negative impacts on IPs. Sample subproject proposals were sent to ADB and these have been reviewed.
5. Document replicable good practices on safeguards, which can be packaged into a knowledge product	Cancelled To be included in the case studies supported by TA 8590

V. OCCUPATIONAL, HEALTH AND SAFETY (OHS) PERFORMANCE MONITORING

26. Trainings are usually provided by engineers in RPMO. The topics discussed in the training are Basic Occupational Safety and Health Framework, unsafe and unhealthy acts conditions, proper housekeeping, material handling and storage, fire safety, electrical safety, machine safety, compliance procedure particular on the personal protective equipment (PPEs), Safety and health inspection, accident procedural investigation, industrial hygiene, control measure, workplace hazard, prevention and mitigation of risk in project implementation. The table below shows the accomplished construction occupational safety and health (COSH) training in regional office on the third and fourth quarter of 2015:

Region	Date conducted	Number of staff trained
FO III	December 7-11, 2015	40
FO IV-A	October 25-30, 2015	140
FO X	April 7-11, 2015	34

VI. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE AND SOCIALIZATION INCLUDING CAPABILITY BUILDING

27. *Community and Municipal Trainings.* At the end of the 3rd quarter, 397, 125 community volunteers (CVs) have been trained on situational assessment, needs identification, project proposal preparation, project implementation and management, and local planning and resource allocation, among others. Good gender balance again observed as 226,215 (57%) of the CVs trained were women.

28. *Social and Environmental Safeguards.* Two sessions of regional environmental and social safeguards were conducted for the reporting period. The main objective of the trainings is to build and enhance the capacities of the ACTs, communities and other stakeholders on the compliance the Program's safeguard policies. The table below shows the regional environmental and social safeguards training conducted during the reporting period. The topics discussed in the training are overview on KC-NCDDP safeguards polices, safeguards thematic areas, safeguards processing along CEAC and preparation of ESSC and ESMP.

Region	Date conducted	Number of staff trained
X	July 29-31, 2015	41
I	August 20-22, 2015	44

29. *Culture-Sensitivity Training.* The NPMO facilitated conduct of four batches of culture-sensitivity training. The training is aimed at building the capacities of regional staff and specialists in implementing KC-NCDDP with IP communities in a manner sensitive to their indigenous knowledge, systems and practices. Also, the training seeks to equip the field staff

with the skills needed for the effective engagement of IP communities in all KC-NCDDP activities.

30. A total of 174 staff and consultants were trained as of December 2015 with details provided in the table below:

Batch	Field Office	Date Conducted	No. of Staff Trained
1	National	October 19-22, 2015	51
2	IV-MiMaRoPa	October 27-30, 2015	58
3	Caraga	November 21-23, 2015	41
4	V	December 1-4, 2015	24
Total			174

VII. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM

31. The grievance redress system (GRS) is one of the features of the KC-NCDDP to promote transparency and social accountability. It was designed to attend to complaints, problems and issues that arise from project implementation.

32. Installation of the GRS is necessary to inform community members of the mechanism through the following: (i) GRS orientation at the municipal and barangay level; (ii) dissemination of information materials; (iii) formation and training of GRS committees; and (4) reporting and documentation of grievances.

33. As of June 2015, a total of 759 out of the 767 (98.96%) targeted municipalities have conducted their municipal level GRS orientation. Meanwhile, out of these municipalities, 17,762 out of 18,092 (98.18%) barangays have conducted the GRS orientation and formed GRS committees. Further, 15, 448 (85%) barangays have already displayed their GRS information materials such as tarpaulins and brochures.

34. The total grievance received during the reporting period is 3,690, of which 98.1% (3,619) have been satisfactorily resolved. Most of the grievances (92.5 %) are classified as Type A or non-contentious and merely queries and/or comments about the Project. Most of the concerns or grievances filed during the reporting period are on the program's design/guidelines, subproject implementation, procurement processes and community participation. The table below shows the summary of the grievances received during the reporting period.

Grievances received and resolved through GRS as of September and December 2015

Region	Grievances Received								Grievances Resolved							
	Type A		Type B		Type C		Total		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
As of September, 2015																
Regions I, III, IV-A & B, V, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII & Caraga	2,157	92.5%	143	6.1%	31	1.3%	2,333	63.2%	2,153	94.2%	107	4.7%	26	1.1%	2,286	98.0%
As of December, 2015																
I, III, IV-A & B, V, VI VII, VIII, IX, XI, XII & Caraga	1,256	92.6%	74	5.5%	27	2.0%	1,357	36.8%	1,246	93.5%	67	5.0%	20	1.5%	1,333	98.2%

Region	Grievances Received								Grievances Resolved							
	Type A		Type B		Type C		Total		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total for September and December 2015																
I, III, IV-A & B, V, VI VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII & Caraga	3,413	92.5%	217	5.9%	58	1.6%	3,690	100.0%	3,399	93.9%	174	4.8%	46	1.3%	3,619	98.1%

Where: Type A = non-contentious, queries and comments

Type B = compliance to the project processes, MOA and other KC implementation arrangements

Type C = grievance on procurement processes and financial management

35. The table below shows the top three grievances within the two quarters of this monitoring period. KC Process/design/guideline is the outstanding grievance.

Top three (3) grievances for the as of September and December 2015

Category	As of September, 2015								As of December, 2015							
	Type A		Type B		Type C		Total		Type A		Type B		Type C		Total	
	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%	no	%
KC Process/design/guidelines	942	65.1%	40	54.8%	4	21.1%	985	64.1%	278	43.8%	13	37.1%	3	33.3%	294	43.4%
SP Implementation	398	27.5%	24	32.9%	3	15.8%	424	27.6%	220	34.7%	15	42.9%	2	22.2%	237	35.0%
Procurement	106	7.3%	9	12.3%	12	63.2%	127	8.3%								
Administrative									136	21.5%	7	20.0%	4	44.4%	147	21.7%
Total	1,446	100.0%	73	100.0%	19	100.0%	1,536	100.0%	634	100.0%	35	100.0%	9	100.0%	678	100.0%

36. Of the grievances filed during the reporting period, 11 were related to environmental and social safeguards, nine (9) of which are Type A and two (2) are Type B. Specific concerns filed on safeguards issues are land ownership and donation; permits and clearances; and safety during sub-project construction. All of which have been satisfactorily resolved.

Types of Grievance as of September and December 2015

Quarter	Type A	Type B	Type C	Total
Quarter 3 2015	5	1	0	6
Quarter 4 2015	4	1	0	5
Total	9	2	0	11

VIII. CONCLUSION

37. The project is partially compliant to both environmental and social safeguards. Key issues identified for social safeguards are had to do more on the documentary requirements for both land acquisition and indigenous peoples, condition of precondition (CP) processing/validation with National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), applicability of the ESMC/P, sensitivities during consultations/engaging with IP communities, capacity building, and monitoring. On the other hand, issues identified on environmental safeguards during the reporting period are: (i) ESMP format/templates used are not consistent across the regions; (ii) incorrect information provided in the ESMP; and (iii) lack in coordination between the municipal inter-agency committee (MIAC) and project preparation team (PPT).

38. Recommendations are: (i) to improve the integration of environmental and social safeguards in project screening, implementation and monitoring; (ii) simplify the ESMP; (iii) enhance the capacity of area coordinating teams (ACTs) on how to fill out the ESMP; (iv) conduct workshop involving all stakeholders (MIAC, PPT, SRPMO, RPMO) to clearly establish the institutional responsibility in safeguards screening and monitoring.

ATTACHMENT: PHOTODOCUMENTATION



Safeguards Mission, Region V



Safeguards Mission, Region Caraga



Safeguards Mission, Region Caraga



Safeguards Mission, Region VIII



Safeguards Mission, Region VIII