

Environmental and Social Monitoring Report

Semi-annual Report
January-June 2017

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
CEAC	Community Empowerment Activity Cycle
CDD	Community Driven Development
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
EA	Executing Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMB	Environmental Management Bureau
GRS	Grievance Redress System
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
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
SERD	Southeast Asia Regional Department
SPS	ADB Safeguards Policy Statement (2009)

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	II
CONTENTS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW	1
II. ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE MONITORING	3
a. Summary of compliance on environmental safeguards	4
b. Issues and recommendations	4
III. SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS PERFORMANCE MONITORING	7
a. Summary of Compliance with RP/IPP Requirements	7
b. Compliance Per Mission Results	10
IV. OCCUPATIONAL, HEALTH AND SAFETY (OHS) PERFORMANCE MONITORING	13
V. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE, SOCIALIZATION INCLUDING CAPABILITY BUILDING	13
VI. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM	14
VII. CONCLUSION	16
ATTACHMENTS: 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 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 (SPs). The objectives of the ESMF are: (i) to ensure that selected SPs under the project are designed to avoid 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.
5. As of June 2017, there are 800 implementing KC-NCDDP municipalities, which is 94% of the targeted Program coverage of 847 municipalities. Out of these, 547 were affected by Typhoon Yolanda in November 2013.
6. Meanwhile, the Program has mobilized a total of 764,465 community volunteers (CVs). KC-NCDDP CVs are involved in various committee or representation work, and receive training on topics such as situational assessment, needs identification, project proposal preparation, project implementation and management, or local planning and resource allocation, among others. Similar to the barangay assemblies conducted, records show that more women participate in volunteer committees in terms of both membership and leadership.
7. About, 21,907 or 95% out of the 23,139 sub-projects have submitted the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), the safeguards instrument which identifies risks and corresponding mitigating measures related with the location and nature of sub-projects. On the other hand, the remaining 5% or 1,232 ESMPs have been prepared by the communities but are yet to be encoded in the safeguards database.
8. The participation rate of households in KC-NCDDP barangay assemblies (BA) remains relatively high at an average of 78%.

9. Since the start of NCDDP, the cumulative total of grievances received through the GRS is at 104,423 of which 99.9% have been satisfactorily resolved. Most of the grievances received were Type A or non-contentious, queries and comments with 95%.

10. The project is partially compliant to both environmental and safeguards. Recommendations are: (i) ensure that the mitigation measures, including occupational safety and health, indicated in the ESMP are implemented during construction activities; (ii) finalized the simplified ESMP template; and (iii) continuously enhance the capacity of area coordinating teams and community volunteers on environmental and social safeguards.

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT OVERVIEW

Project Number and Title:	46420-002 PHILIPPINES: KALAH-CIDSS National Community-Driven Development Project																																																																																																																																												
Safeguards Category	Environment	B																																																																																																																																											
	Involuntary Resettlement	B																																																																																																																																											
	Indigenous Peoples	A																																																																																																																																											
Reporting period:	1 January – 30 June 2017																																																																																																																																												
Last report date:	1 July – 31 December 2016																																																																																																																																												
Key Project Activities:	<p>To date, 800 municipalities, or about 94% of the total target coverage, have implemented KC-NCDDP. This figure is composed of 547 Typhoon Yolanda-affected municipalities and 253 poor municipalities not devastated by Yolanda. Breakdown of enrollment is provided in Tables below.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Actual Coverage as of June 2017 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>13,935</td><td>99%</td></tr><tr><td>Non-Yolanda affected municipalities</td><td>293</td><td>5,508</td><td>253</td><td>4,833</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>847</td><td>19,647</td><td>800</td><td>18,768</td><td>95%</td></tr></table> <p style="text-align: center;">Actual Coverage as of June 2017 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 Muns</th><th>No. of Brgys</th><th>No. of Muns</th><th>No. of Brgys</th><th>Municipalities Covered</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>50</td><td>624</td><td>37</td><td>477</td><td>74%</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>771</td><td>82%</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>67</td><td>1,278</td><td>67</td><td>1,278</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>101</td><td>2,902</td><td>99</td><td>2,864</td><td>98%</td></tr><tr><td>NIR</td><td>37</td><td>713</td><td>36</td><td>689</td><td>97%</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>98</td><td>3,111</td><td>97</td><td>3,078</td><td>99%</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>90</td><td>1,966</td><td>84</td><td>1,825</td><td>93%</td></tr><tr><td>VIII</td><td>136</td><td>3,705</td><td>134</td><td>3,654</td><td>99%</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>52</td><td>1,205</td><td>46</td><td>1,068</td><td>88%</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>73</td><td>1,390</td><td>64</td><td>1,182</td><td>88%</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>55</td><td>803</td><td>96%</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>847</td><td>19,647</td><td>800</td><td>18,768</td><td>95%</td></tr></table> <p>Out of the 800 municipalities enrolled under the Program under Cycle 1, 797 have reached Stage 1 or the Social Preparation stage. The variance is due to areas that had just enrolled and are yet to start with formal social preparation activities. All the same, bulk of the municipalities has reached the latter stages</p>					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	13,935	99%	Non-Yolanda affected municipalities	293	5,508	253	4,833	87%	Total	847	19,647	800	18,768	95%	Region	Target		Actual		% Target	No. of Muns	No. of Brgys	No. of Muns	No. of Brgys	Municipalities Covered	CAR	50	624	37	477	74%	I	11	133	11	133	100%	III	3	64	3	64	100%	IV-A	28	853	23	771	82%	IV-B	67	1,278	67	1,278	100%	V	101	2,902	99	2,864	98%	NIR	37	713	36	689	97%	VI	98	3,111	97	3,078	99%	VII	90	1,966	84	1,825	93%	VIII	136	3,705	134	3,654	99%	IX	52	1,205	46	1,068	88%	X	73	1,390	64	1,182	88%	XI	27	496	27	496	100%	XII	17	386	17	386	100%	Caraga	57	821	55	803	96%	TOTAL	847	19,647	800	18,768	95%
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	13,935	99%																																																																																																																																								
Non-Yolanda affected municipalities	293	5,508	253	4,833	87%																																																																																																																																								
Total	847	19,647	800	18,768	95%																																																																																																																																								
Region	Target		Actual		% Target																																																																																																																																								
	No. of Muns	No. of Brgys	No. of Muns	No. of Brgys	Municipalities Covered																																																																																																																																								
CAR	50	624	37	477	74%																																																																																																																																								
I	11	133	11	133	100%																																																																																																																																								
III	3	64	3	64	100%																																																																																																																																								
IV-A	28	853	23	771	82%																																																																																																																																								
IV-B	67	1,278	67	1,278	100%																																																																																																																																								
V	101	2,902	99	2,864	98%																																																																																																																																								
NIR	37	713	36	689	97%																																																																																																																																								
VI	98	3,111	97	3,078	99%																																																																																																																																								
VII	90	1,966	84	1,825	93%																																																																																																																																								
VIII	136	3,705	134	3,654	99%																																																																																																																																								
IX	52	1,205	46	1,068	88%																																																																																																																																								
X	73	1,390	64	1,182	88%																																																																																																																																								
XI	27	496	27	496	100%																																																																																																																																								
XII	17	386	17	386	100%																																																																																																																																								
Caraga	57	821	55	803	96%																																																																																																																																								
TOTAL	847	19,647	800	18,768	95%																																																																																																																																								

	<p>of the CEAC for their first cycle.</p> <p>The number of municipalities that will implement their second, third and fourth cycle is considerably lower compared to Cycle 1 implementation per program plan. The number of cycles that a municipality will receive is a factor of a) years/cycles the municipality has accumulated in KALAHI-CIDSS, b) whether the municipality is Yolanda affected or not, and c) whether its pre-Yolanda poverty incidence is high or low.</p> <p>At the end of the quarter, 591 municipalities have started with their second cycle of implementation, majority of which have reached Stage 3. Over one fourth has been able to progress to the last stage of the cycle to date.</p> <p>For third cycle implementation, 400 municipalities have started, with fairly good progress toward Stages 2 and 3. It should also be noted that a number of municipalities have already begun with their third cycle while still in the process of completing the last stage of their second cycle.</p> <p>A total of 23,139 community SPs funded under KC-NCDDP with a total project cost of Php 25.3 billion, of which Php 23.9 billion are KC community grants. These are expected to directly benefit a total of 5,976,398 household beneficiaries.</p> <p>Mirroring past trends, the largest bulk of prioritized SPs fall under the basic access infrastructure (36%) and basic social service (33%) categories. The following figure shows the distribution of prioritized SPs by major sub-project category.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Figure 1. Proportion of All Funded Sub-Projects to Total, by Major Sub-Project Category</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Data for Figure 1: Proportion of All Funded Sub-Projects to Total, by Major Sub-Project Category</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Major Sub-Project Category</th> <th>Proportion (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Basic Access Infrastructure Sub-Projects</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Basic Social Services</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Environmental Protection & Conservation Sub-Projects</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Community Production, Economic Support and...</td> <td>12%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others</td> <td>2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skills Training and Capability Building Sub-Projects</td> <td>1%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As of June 2017, 800 enrolled municipalities have conducted their municipal-level GRS orientation during the Municipal Orientation. Moreover, 18,768 barangays in enrolled municipalities have conducted the GRS orientation and formed GRS committees during their first BA. Meanwhile, 15,448 barangays have displayed their GRS information materials such as tarpaulins /posters and brochures /leaflets.</p>	Major Sub-Project Category	Proportion (%)	Basic Access Infrastructure Sub-Projects	36%	Basic Social Services	33%	Environmental Protection & Conservation Sub-Projects	18%	Community Production, Economic Support and...	12%	Others	2%	Skills Training and Capability Building Sub-Projects	1%
Major Sub-Project Category	Proportion (%)														
Basic Access Infrastructure Sub-Projects	36%														
Basic Social Services	33%														
Environmental Protection & Conservation Sub-Projects	18%														
Community Production, Economic Support and...	12%														
Others	2%														
Skills Training and Capability Building Sub-Projects	1%														
Report prepared by:	KC-NCDDP National Program Management Office (NPMO)														

II. Environmental Performance Monitoring

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. As of the end of June 2017, 95% (21,907) of the 23,139 subprojects have submitted the ESMP. The remaining 5% or 1,232 ESMPs have been prepared by the communities but are yet to be encoded in the safeguards database.

15. In terms of compliance on securing environmental clearances, none of the 23,139 subprojects was classified as category A (projects which are considered environmentally critical) or category B (projects which are not classified as A but are located within environmentally critical areas). However, it should be noted that based on field investigations, there are a number of subprojects which are located within environmentally critical areas but were permitted by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) to apply for a certificate of non-coverage (CNC) instead of an environmental compliance certificate (ECC) since the impact to the physical and biological environment, including to people's health is negligible and insignificant.

Status of submission of ESMP per Region

Region	No. of SPs	With ESMP	With CNC	% with ESMP
CAR	302	279	2	92.38
I	96	92	85	95.83
III	35	34	26	97.14
IV-A	1,069	973	33	91.02
IV-B	1,380	1,361	389	98.62
V	2,511	2,229	1,765	88.77
NIR	1,044	944	449	90.42
VI	3,573	3,459	3,174	96.81
VII	2,508	2,308	56	92.03
VIII	6,016	5,892	1,517	97.94
IX	1,522	1,452	1,072	95.40
X	664	649	608	97.74
XI	695	564	213	81.15
XII	489	447	345	91.41
Caraga	1,235	1,224	672	99.11
Total	23,139	21,907	10,406	94.68

16. During the first quarter, a technical assistance was extended to Regional Community Infrastructure Specialist during the Program Review and Evaluation Workshop where the need to maximize the function of the Municipal Inter-Agency Committee, specifically the membership of the Municipal Engineer and the Municipal Planning and Development Office, was noted. A learning mission was also conducted, which provided an opportunity to monitor and assess the quality of environmental safeguards compliance by NPMO. The community demonstrated a good example of ESMP preparation and implementation as evidenced by their regular updating of ESMP compliance. The ESMP was prepared by the community volunteers and facilitated by the community facilitator. Posting updated ESMPs as practices encourages the community of their commitment to the project. It also illustrated an example of ESMP as a dynamic document. This is specifically true for the field office in Caraga.

17. An ESMP facilitator's guide had been developed for the use of the ACTs. The guide will be used in operation for refinement-updating, monitoring and reporting of ESMP compliance by 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>Of the 23,139 SPs, 21, 907 (94.68%) are compliant with the submission of ESMP. The remaining 5% or 1,232 ESMPs have been prepared by the communities but are yet to be encoded in the safeguards database.</p> <p>The compliance status is partial because the safeguards database still reflects SPs with environmental compliance certificate (ECC) even if there are no category B SPs. Based on the review mission on November 2016, safeguards-related information (i.e. CNC, CP, grievance) are still being validated.</p>

b. Issues and recommendations

18. The table below shows the status of the issues identified in the previous monitoring reports.

No.	Issues	Recommendations	Status
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	Done Trainings were provided. Details on the trainings are discussed in Section V of the report
2	Entries in the ESMP translated to English conveys a different idea	Inform the CVs that information and/or answers in the ESMP can be written in local dialect.	Done CVs were informed by ACTs and SRPMO. Also,

No.	Issues	Recommendations	Status
	and does not capture the impacts identified by the community volunteers (CVs)		answers in the ESMP template are 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.	Ongoing EA developed a simplified template which is currently being reviewed and finalized. Target date to be implemented to SPs in by the first quarter of 2017. ADB issued a No Objection Letter on February 2017. Update on the status of the implementation of the simplified ESMP template will be on the next monitoring period.
4	The Environmental and Social Safeguard Checklist (ESSC) 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.	Ongoing During safeguards training, workshop on how to fill out the ESSC was conducted. Also, during field visit monitoring, it is being reiterated to program staff that the ESSC should be accomplish as early as the subproject has been identified 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.	Done Safeguards database is already set-up for the project.
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.	Ongoing Training and coaching session on safeguard policies and on ESMP preparation.
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	Done Consultation with DENR and other national government agencies was conducted on 23 October 2015. It was recommended that CNCs be secured for environmental protection projects (e.g. seawall, flood control).
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	Ongoing The EA developed the institutional arrangements on safeguards implementation

No.	Issues	Recommendations	Status
	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	Ongoing Training and coaching session on safeguard policies and on ESMP preparation.
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.	Ongoing The trainings on occupational health and safety (OHS) are usually provided by engineers in the RPMO.
11	ESMP were prepared and completed but the mitigation measures were not implemented during the construction and operation phases of the subprojects. Community volunteers in all of the barangays visited said that after the ESMPs were prepared, the documents were just kept on file and not applied during the actual project implementation.	Refresher training on the importance of ESMP in project monitoring. The mission and EA agreed: (i) to immediately finalize the simplified ESMP; (ii) enforce close monitoring of ESMP during subproject implementation by posting it on community bulletin boards; and (iv) remind the community empowerment facilitators (CEF) and CVs about the importance of ESMP monitoring	Ongoing ADB issued a No Objection Letter on February 2017. Update on the status of the implementation of the simplified ESMP template will be on the next monitoring period. In addition, preparation of and implementation of the ESMP will be verified in the next review mission (tentative date is on July 2017).
12	Some of the communities are still having hard time answering the questions in the ESMP	Simplify the ESMP template and translate the template to the local dialect.	
13	Incorrect encoding of safeguard information in the Program's database	Provide refresher training on community volunteers and municipal encoders about the different safeguard documents and environmental laws (i.e. difference between an ECC and CNC)	Ongoing Trainings were provided. Details on the trainings are discussed in Section V of the report As mentioned, information in the safeguards dataset are still being validated.

III. SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS PERFORMANCE MONITORING

19. As mentioned above, 95% of SPs submitted the ESMP. The percentage only represents the number of documents submitted and encoded in the database. Considering the wide scope of the Program and number of funded subprojects, there is currently no mechanism to check the quality of all ESMPs. However, the NPMO is developing a spot check monitoring guidelines to ensure that ESMPs are acceptable and that mitigation measures are being implemented. The update will be discussed in the next monitoring period..

20. In addition, in order to facilitate empowerment of the engaged communities, the Program mobilizes Area Coordinating Teams (ACTs) designated to a municipality. At the end of the quarter, there was 4,687 ACT staff on board the Program, which is 96% of the planned 4,875 positions for hiring. Previously, the planned ACT positions for hiring numbered 4,991. The decrease in the number of required ACT members came alongside with the wrapping up of implementation in some municipalities. As of date, all regions have over 90% of their planned ACT staff positions filled up. It can also be noted that among those hired, there are more females (62% or 2,987) than males (38% or 1,858).

a. Summary of Compliance with RP/IPP Requirements

21. 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
Safeguards specialists and officers also participated in the NPMO learning missions in Regions IX, XII, NIR, VII, VIII and I. The activity provided an opportunity to monitor and assess the quality of environmental and social safeguards compliance in the areas that were visited. The communities demonstrated a good example of ESMP preparation and implementation as evidenced by regular updating of their compliance with the ESMP.	Safeguards specialists and officers to participate in the NPMO learning missions to be conducted in Regions CAR, V, VI, X and XI on the 3 rd quarter of 2017.
Social safeguards planning: a. Completion of Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).	Only 95% of total SPs (23,139) were able to produce, see above table.

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action																																																																																																																																									
b. Community proposals for infrastructure projects supported by various land acquisition instruments/ documentation	<p>As below:</p> <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>302</td><td>1</td><td>46</td><td>44</td><td>6</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>96</td><td>40</td><td>59</td><td>108</td><td>20</td><td>92</td></tr><tr><td>III</td><td>35</td><td>5</td><td>1</td><td>19</td><td>1</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>1,096</td><td>537</td><td>101</td><td>154</td><td>17</td><td>166</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>1,380</td><td>259</td><td>95</td><td>728</td><td>128</td><td>680</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>2,511</td><td>187</td><td>55</td><td>1,421</td><td>377</td><td>468</td></tr><tr><td>NIR</td><td>1,044</td><td>693</td><td>173</td><td>1,225</td><td>217</td><td>1,323</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>3,573</td><td>199</td><td>67</td><td>479</td><td>45</td><td>141</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>2,508</td><td>83</td><td>310</td><td>1,767</td><td>89</td><td>97</td></tr><tr><td>VIII</td><td>6,016</td><td>215</td><td>65</td><td>4,820</td><td>289</td><td>1,539</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>1,522</td><td>171</td><td>6</td><td>994</td><td>270</td><td>24</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>664</td><td>131</td><td>85</td><td>401</td><td>19</td><td>62</td></tr><tr><td>XI</td><td>695</td><td>79</td><td>35</td><td>338</td><td>43</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>XII</td><td>489</td><td>19</td><td>18</td><td>378</td><td>41</td><td>22</td></tr><tr><td>Caraga</td><td>1,235</td><td>199</td><td>1</td><td>945</td><td>102</td><td>129</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>23,139</td><td>2,818</td><td>1,117</td><td>13,821</td><td>1,664</td><td>4,754</td></tr></table> <p>On compliance related to land acquisition, the four (4) major land instruments being executed for KC-NCDDP subprojects are Deed of Donation, Usufruct Agreement, LGU Resolution and DepED Certification. The graph below shows the number of instruments executed depending on the land ownership which is either private or public. Noticeably, most sub-projects are constructed in public or government-owned lots.</p> <p>Figure 3. Number of LARR Instruments Executed</p> <table><tr><th>Ownership</th><th>SPs with DepEd Cert</th><th>SPs with LGU Reso</th><th>SPs with Usufruct</th><th>SPs with DOD</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>Public</td><td>6</td><td>13,821</td><td>46</td><td>1</td><td>13,874</td></tr><tr><td>Private</td><td>1,117</td><td>2,818</td><td>59</td><td>4</td><td>3,998</td></tr></table> <p>The total number of land instruments secured or executed is 24,174 which is higher to the total number of subprojects. This is due to the subprojects that required more than one land acquisition instruments such as water system, access roads, and drainage canals.</p>	Region	No. of SPs	Deed of Donation	Usufruct Agreement	M/BLGU Resolution	DEPED Certification	Other Instruments	CAR	302	1	46	44	6	4	I	96	40	59	108	20	92	III	35	5	1	19	1		IV-A	1,096	537	101	154	17	166	IV-B	1,380	259	95	728	128	680	V	2,511	187	55	1,421	377	468	NIR	1,044	693	173	1,225	217	1,323	VI	3,573	199	67	479	45	141	VII	2,508	83	310	1,767	89	97	VIII	6,016	215	65	4,820	289	1,539	IX	1,522	171	6	994	270	24	X	664	131	85	401	19	62	XI	695	79	35	338	43	7	XII	489	19	18	378	41	22	Caraga	1,235	199	1	945	102	129	TOTAL	23,139	2,818	1,117	13,821	1,664	4,754	Ownership	SPs with DepEd Cert	SPs with LGU Reso	SPs with Usufruct	SPs with DOD	Total	Public	6	13,821	46	1	13,874	Private	1,117	2,818	59	4	3,998
Region	No. of SPs	Deed of Donation	Usufruct Agreement	M/BLGU Resolution	DEPED Certification	Other Instruments																																																																																																																																				
CAR	302	1	46	44	6	4																																																																																																																																				
I	96	40	59	108	20	92																																																																																																																																				
III	35	5	1	19	1																																																																																																																																					
IV-A	1,096	537	101	154	17	166																																																																																																																																				
IV-B	1,380	259	95	728	128	680																																																																																																																																				
V	2,511	187	55	1,421	377	468																																																																																																																																				
NIR	1,044	693	173	1,225	217	1,323																																																																																																																																				
VI	3,573	199	67	479	45	141																																																																																																																																				
VII	2,508	83	310	1,767	89	97																																																																																																																																				
VIII	6,016	215	65	4,820	289	1,539																																																																																																																																				
IX	1,522	171	6	994	270	24																																																																																																																																				
X	664	131	85	401	19	62																																																																																																																																				
XI	695	79	35	338	43	7																																																																																																																																				
XII	489	19	18	378	41	22																																																																																																																																				
Caraga	1,235	199	1	945	102	129																																																																																																																																				
TOTAL	23,139	2,818	1,117	13,821	1,664	4,754																																																																																																																																				
Ownership	SPs with DepEd Cert	SPs with LGU Reso	SPs with Usufruct	SPs with DOD	Total																																																																																																																																					
Public	6	13,821	46	1	13,874																																																																																																																																					
Private	1,117	2,818	59	4	3,998																																																																																																																																					
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.	<p>As below:</p> <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></table>	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																																																																																																	
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																																																																																																																																							

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action																																																																											
	<table><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>	XI	15	9	7	XII	8	1	1	Caraga	20	7	3	TOTAL	112	93	50																																																											
XI	15	9	7																																																																									
XII	8	1	1																																																																									
Caraga	20	7	3																																																																									
TOTAL	112	93	50																																																																									
d. Through CEAC, facilitate participation of IP communities present in 308 KC-NCDDP municipalities across 14 regions. IP households estimated at 490,659.	As below: <table><tr><th>Region</th><th>Project Mun to Date</th><th>Munwith IP Population</th><th>IP HHs</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>37</td><td>37</td><td>81,530</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>11</td><td>5</td><td>10,035</td></tr><tr><td>III</td><td>3</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>23</td><td>7</td><td>882</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>67</td><td>32</td><td>39,299</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>99</td><td>30</td><td>7,700</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>97</td><td>43</td><td>22,379</td></tr><tr><td>NIR</td><td>36</td><td>14</td><td>4,430</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>84</td><td>8</td><td>1,489</td></tr><tr><td>VIII</td><td>134</td><td>13</td><td>333</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>46</td><td>45</td><td>76,757</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>64</td><td>4</td><td>7,963</td></tr><tr><td>XI</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>145,305</td></tr><tr><td>XII</td><td>17</td><td>15</td><td>29,801</td></tr><tr><td>Caraga</td><td>55</td><td>28</td><td>62,756</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>800</td><td>308</td><td>490,659</td></tr></table>	Region	Project Mun to Date	Munwith IP Population	IP HHs	CAR	37	37	81,530	I	11	5	10,035	III	3	-	-	IV-A	23	7	882	IV-B	67	32	39,299	V	99	30	7,700	VI	97	43	22,379	NIR	36	14	4,430	VII	84	8	1,489	VIII	134	13	333	IX	46	45	76,757	X	64	4	7,963	XI	27	27	145,305	XII	17	15	29,801	Caraga	55	28	62,756	TOTAL	800	308	490,659							
Region	Project Mun to Date	Munwith IP Population	IP HHs																																																																									
CAR	37	37	81,530																																																																									
I	11	5	10,035																																																																									
III	3	-	-																																																																									
IV-A	23	7	882																																																																									
IV-B	67	32	39,299																																																																									
V	99	30	7,700																																																																									
VI	97	43	22,379																																																																									
NIR	36	14	4,430																																																																									
VII	84	8	1,489																																																																									
VIII	134	13	333																																																																									
IX	46	45	76,757																																																																									
X	64	4	7,963																																																																									
XI	27	27	145,305																																																																									
XII	17	15	29,801																																																																									
Caraga	55	28	62,756																																																																									
TOTAL	800	308	490,659																																																																									
Public consultation and socialization process:	As of end of June 2017, over-all participation rate of IP households in KC-NCDDP barangay assemblies is 48%. To be able to increase or at least sustain IP participation, RPMOs continuously conducts culture-sensitivity trainings and coaching sessions on how to effectively engage IPs in community activities.																																																																											
a. Indigenous Peoples’ participation in KC-NCDDP barangay assemblies																																																																												
b. Securing of Free and Prior Informed Consent in IP communities	The percentage of SPs that underwent NCIP validation already reached 76%: <table><tr><th>Region</th><th>No. of SPs in IP Areas</th><th>No. of SPs submitted for validation</th><th>No. of Validated SPs</th><th>% Validated</th></tr><tr><td>CAR</td><td>302</td><td>302</td><td>302</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>96</td><td>96</td><td>96</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>IV-A</td><td>14</td><td>10</td><td>9</td><td>90%</td></tr><tr><td>IV-B</td><td>345</td><td>87</td><td>62</td><td>71%</td></tr><tr><td>V</td><td>96</td><td>96</td><td>90</td><td>94%</td></tr><tr><td>VI</td><td>221</td><td>88</td><td>85</td><td>97%</td></tr><tr><td>NIR</td><td>35</td><td>34</td><td>7</td><td>21%</td></tr><tr><td>VII</td><td>33</td><td>19</td><td>15</td><td>79%</td></tr><tr><td>IX</td><td>1,049</td><td>1,095</td><td>655</td><td>60%</td></tr><tr><td>X</td><td>89</td><td>105</td><td>63</td><td>60%</td></tr><tr><td>XI</td><td>691</td><td>691</td><td>691</td><td>100%</td></tr><tr><td>XII</td><td>510</td><td>483</td><td>267</td><td>55%</td></tr><tr><td>CARAGA</td><td>313</td><td>1,199</td><td>963</td><td>80%</td></tr><tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>3,794</td><td>4,305</td><td>3,305</td><td>76%</td></tr></table> <p>The conduct of validation will either result to the issuance of Certification Precondition or Certificate of Non-Overlap by NCIP. As of June 2017, 1,858 SPs or 57% were issued with NCIP certification:</p>	Region	No. of SPs in IP Areas	No. of SPs submitted for validation	No. of Validated SPs	% Validated	CAR	302	302	302	100%	I	96	96	96	100%	IV-A	14	10	9	90%	IV-B	345	87	62	71%	V	96	96	90	94%	VI	221	88	85	97%	NIR	35	34	7	21%	VII	33	19	15	79%	IX	1,049	1,095	655	60%	X	89	105	63	60%	XI	691	691	691	100%	XII	510	483	267	55%	CARAGA	313	1,199	963	80%	TOTAL	3,794	4,305	3,305	76%
Region	No. of SPs in IP Areas	No. of SPs submitted for validation	No. of Validated SPs	% Validated																																																																								
CAR	302	302	302	100%																																																																								
I	96	96	96	100%																																																																								
IV-A	14	10	9	90%																																																																								
IV-B	345	87	62	71%																																																																								
V	96	96	90	94%																																																																								
VI	221	88	85	97%																																																																								
NIR	35	34	7	21%																																																																								
VII	33	19	15	79%																																																																								
IX	1,049	1,095	655	60%																																																																								
X	89	105	63	60%																																																																								
XI	691	691	691	100%																																																																								
XII	510	483	267	55%																																																																								
CARAGA	313	1,199	963	80%																																																																								
TOTAL	3,794	4,305	3,305	76%																																																																								

RP/IPP Activity/Issue	Comment/Further Action															
	Region	No. of Validated SPs	No. of SPs with CP/CNO	% of Validated SPs with CP/CNO												
	CAR	302	170	56%												
	I	96	96	100%												
	IV-A	9	7	78%												
	IV-B	62	22	35%												
	V	90	35	39%												
	VI	85	82	96%												
	NIR	7	2	29%												
	VII	15	2	13%												
	IX	655	218	33%												
	X	63	0	0%												
	XI	691	347	50%												
	XII	267	153	57%												
	CARAGA	963	744	77%												
	TOTAL	3,794	1,878	57%												
c. Consultation-Dialogue with IP Tribal Leaders	<p>The NPMO facilitated two (2) cluster consultation-dialogues with IP tribal leaders. The activity aims to provide a venue to share good practices and at the same time discuss issues and concerns of indigenous communities along KC-NCDDP Implementation. Results of the activity shall also serve as inputs to the upcoming DSWD-NCIP National Assessment or MOA Review.</p> <p>Details of the abovementioned activities are provided in the table below:</p> <table><tr><th>Cluster</th><th>Date</th><th>Venue</th><th>No. of Tribal Leaders</th></tr><tr><td>Mindanao</td><td>May 2-3, 2017</td><td>Davao City</td><td>31</td></tr><tr><td>Luzon</td><td>June 22-23, 2017</td><td>San Juan, La Union</td><td>28</td></tr></table>				Cluster	Date	Venue	No. of Tribal Leaders	Mindanao	May 2-3, 2017	Davao City	31	Luzon	June 22-23, 2017	San Juan, La Union	28
Cluster	Date	Venue	No. of Tribal Leaders													
Mindanao	May 2-3, 2017	Davao City	31													
Luzon	June 22-23, 2017	San Juan, La Union	28													

b. Compliance Per Mission Results

22. Compliance status is partial. Below are agreements made during the ADB Mission conducted from 21-29 November 2016 and the corresponding status:

Agreed Action	Status
ADB conducted its 5 th loan review mission and reviewed the ff: (i) project implementation status and schedule; (ii) finance and procurement; (iii) status of compliance with particular loan covenants; (iv) status of safeguards and gender action plan implementation; and (v) implementation status of associated TA and grant projects	Conducted on 21-29 November 2016
EA reviewed progress of compliance with the loan covenants. From the 27 covenants, 17 are fully complied while 10 are partially and being complied with. Those partially and being complied with are related to safeguards, gender action plan implementation, procurement given the nature of the project.	
The following proposed amendments to the Loan Agreement, which were identified during the midterm review mission are already for review by the Department of Finance (DOF): (i) Schedule 5, para 10; (b) Schedule 5, para 14; and (c) Article IV, Section 4.03 (Appendix 8).	In compliance with Schedule 5, para 14, which requires that all bidding documents and contracts for works shall contain provision requiring contractors to comply with certain safeguards

Agreed Action	Status
	requirements, the EA has revised the Community-Based Procurement Manual (Volume 2) that contains bidding forms and procurement documents. This revised manual will be sent to ADB by Q1 2017 for concurrence.
The mission noted the satisfactory implementation of safeguards particularly the high percentage of compliance with Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) documentary requirements across subprojects. The participation rate of IP households meets the target of 45%. Although participation rate decreased from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2, barangay assemblies under Cycle 2 are still ongoing and the percentage can still increase if sufficient attention is given to strengthen IP participation.	The mission requested the EA to continue to emphasize the importance of IP participation and maximize use of facilitation guidelines.
The mission noted improvement in the pace of validation and issuance of required certifications ⁴ by the National Commission of Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) since the meeting on safeguards in March 2016.	However, the need to increase efficiency of this process was raised during the IP congress ⁵ on 18 November 2016 in Visayas, where NCIP still has to form its Regional Technical Working Group.
An IP congress will also be held in Luzon and Mindanao.	Will be held in 2017 during NCIP Assessment
As of 30 September 2016, majority of grievances received were Type A or non-contentious queries, comments and suggestions (94%) and almost all of these have been resolved (99.9%). ⁶ Types B and C grievances or those related to conformance to implementation arrangements and fiduciary guidelines account for 6% of total grievances, of which 98% have been resolved. Overall, 93% of grievances were resolved within the resolution timeline standards. ⁷ The top 5 grievances in Yolanda-affected areas are related to (i) KC processes, design and guidelines (31%), (ii) positive comments (11%), (iii) community participation (10%), (iv) procurement (8%), and (v) quality and operation of subprojects (7%). Among the Yolanda-affected regions, Eastern Visayas and Central Visayas regions have the biggest number of grievances accounting for more than half of total grievances (55%).	DSWD to closely monitor pending issues related to land acquisition and resettlement and provide details in the safeguards monitoring report to be submitted in December 2016.
The TORs for external monitors ⁸ have been finalized and the target for procurement and mobilization has been set for Q1 2017. The mission advised the EA that monitoring activities have to be carried out until project closure.	The EA assured the mission that arrangements will be made for monitoring activities to extend until 30 June 2018.
On the low utilization of funds for consulting services, an additional consultant is needed.	Procurement will be subjected to prior approval from ADB.
DSWD to provide status of:	
a. ground verifications being done by concerned RPMOs based on the subproject proposal review findings	Done Concerned RPMOs updated NPMO that the problems with the proposals were mainly caused by documentation issues and not having a clear understanding of the safeguards screening

⁴ Certification Precondition (CP), or Certificate of Non-overlap (CNO) as appropriate

⁵ Participants during the activity include Project staff, NCIP representatives and tribal leaders.

⁶ Grievance types: Type A - Non-contentious queries, comments and suggestions; Type B - Conformance to project processes, MOA, & other KC implementation arrangements; and Type C - Conformance to KC procurement and finance guidelines. Status of resolution is either resolved or pending.

⁷ Less than one percent (**0.4%**) of the total grievances exceeded the resolution timeline standards while **7%** were still for data cleaning. The grievance resolution timeline standards for Type B and C grievances are 15 to 30 days and 30 to 60 days, respectively.

⁸ One for IP and one for IR

Agreed Action	Status
	questions/terms and how to prepare the ESMP. NPMO is confident that there are no pending safeguards issues for these sub-projects because the regional project staff validate that safeguards issues are addressed before clearing the release of funds for sub-projects.
b. status of refresher training on safeguards and ESMP preparation	Done ADB has reviewed the facilitator's guide on the use of ESMP as well as provided inputs in the finalization of the simplified ESMP template. The template was supposed to be rolled out in November 2016.)
c. finalization of safeguards database	Done As of 2 September 2016, the database was updated, but still needs additional information that is currently being encoded.
d. conduct of culture-sensitivity trainings	Done Culture sensitivity trainings were facilitated by Jane Austria in all regions with IP areas. Strategy and dates are being planned for trainings in Cycle 3 IP areas.
e. DSWD to submit TORs for safeguards external monitor to ADB for review within Q2 2016.	Done - ADB reviewed the TOR which NPMO posted to CSRN in December 2016.
f. DSWD to submit the revised social safeguards training module to ADB for review	Done
g. DSWD to take into account the initial comments on social safeguards training module provided in November 2015 and those to be provided by ADB after the midterm review mission.	Done
h. DSWD to revise the simplified ESMP template based on discussions between DSWD and ADB on 26 February 2016, and the final template including summary of consultations will be applied for future subprojects.	Done
i. DSWD to submit the final revised ESMP to ADB for translation into Cebuano, Tagalog and Ilocano in Q2 2016.	Done The simplified ESMP template was reviewed by ADB's safeguards consultants.
j. DSWD to provide details on status of compliance with loan covenant on land acquisition and involuntary resettlement <u>in the quarterly progress reports</u> , which include the (i) nature of acquisition of land and right of way; (ii) type of land affected; (iii) agreement with affected households; (iv) whether or not required documentation has been completed.	Continuing - DSWD was reminded to include the information in the Q3 progress report.
k. DSWD to provide details to the status of related covenants which can be generated from the project safeguards database.	Done
l. DSWD to verify partial compliance with covenant on indigenous peoples (para 12) if there are indeed no adverse impacts on subprojects during the ground verification activities.	Done No subproject so far has had adverse impacts on IPs.
m. ADB to conduct a special project administration mission on safeguards, gender action plan, capacity building, including financial management in October 2016, which will coincide with the WB's mid-term review mission.	Done - ADB conducted a field visit to Sorsogon on 17-20 August 2016, which focused on gender, safeguards, and fiduciary (procurement and FM).

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

23. Mitigation and preventive measures on occupational, health and safety (OHS) are included in the ESMP template. Based from the discussions with regional project management office (RPMO), it had been a challenge to implement the wearing of basic personal protective equipment (PPE) like gloves, helmets, and safety shoes during construction activities of SPs. The project is partially compliant to OHS because there was no documentation on the reported number of incidents and/or accidents during project implementation. It is recommended to include the reporting of incidents/accidents in the remarks section of the simplified ESMP template.

24. 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's (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 first and second quarter of 2017:

Region	Date conducted	Number of staff trained
FO NIR	May 25-26, 2017	30
FO CARAGA	March 28-31, 2017 (Batch 1)	37
	April 3-6, 2017 (Batch 2)	38
FO 10	April 24-28, 2017	63

V. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE, SOCIALIZATION INCLUDING CAPABILITY BUILDING

25. The NPMO continues to monitor the provision of capacity building interventions by RPMOs and Subregional Project Management Offices (SRPMOs) on ESMF, including training on safeguard requirements and implementation for different types and thresholds of subprojects based on Philippine Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) requirements and ADB's Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS). Some of the capacity interventions include refresher course for ACTs on environmental screening, assessment of impacts and mitigating measures and implementation of ESMP. The table below shows the trainings conducted by RPMOs related to environmental and social safeguards for the first semester of 2017:

Region	Training	Date	Participants	Number of Participants Trained
FO 1	Training on Environmental and Social Safeguards Compliance for KC Program Implementation	28-31 March 2017	CVs, CEFs & TFs	144

Region	Training	Date	Participants	Number of Participants Trained
NIR	Discussions on Safeguards, Occupational Health and Safety in KC-NCDDP Sub-Project Implementation among TFs	May 25-26, 2017	TFs	30
FO 10	Training on Environment and Social Safeguards	March 19-25, 2017	AC, TF & CEF	38
FO 10	Environment and Social Safeguards Training (Misamis Oriental East)	May 22-26, 2017	AC, TF & CEF	62
FO 10	Environment and Social Safeguards Training (Misamis Oriental West)	May 29-June 2, 2017	AC, TF & CEF	48

VI. GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISM

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. The total grievance received during the reporting period is 6,384, of which 98.93% have been satisfactorily resolved. Most of the grievances (94.8%) 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 June 2017

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 March, 2017																
V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X & Caraga	46,260	94.3	1,935	3.9	864	1.8	49,059	47.0	46,260	94.4	1,904	3.9	831	1.7	48,995	99.9
As of June, 2017																
I, IV-A & B, V, VI VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII & Caraga	52,938	95.6	1,477	2.7	949	1.7	55,364	53.0	52,938	95.7	1,450	2.6	934	1.7	55,322	99.9
Total for March and June 2017																
I, IV-A & B, V, VI VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII & Caraga	99,198	95.0	3,412	3.3	1,813	1.7	104,423	100.0	99,198	95.1	3,354	3.2	1,765	1.7	104,317	99.9

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

The tables below show the top three grievances. KC Process/design/guideline is the outstanding grievance.

Grievances received and resolved through GRS as of June 2017

Category	As of March, 2017								As of June, 2017							
	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	808	62.5%	46	78.0%	1	100.0%	855	63.2%	1,223	54.1%	27	73.0%	3	100.0%	1,253	54.7%
Positive comments	254	19.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	254	18.8%	660	29.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	660	28.8%
Community Participation	231	17.9%	13	22.0%	0	0.0%	244	18.0%	376	16.6%	10	27.0%	0	0.0%	376	16.4%
Total	1,293	100.0%	59	100.0%	1	100.0%	1,353	100.0%	2,259	100.0%	37	100.0%	3	100.0%	2,289	100.0%

29. Issues and concerns raised on community participation are mostly inquiries regarding membership in community volunteer communities, incentives for community volunteers, community members that will be allowed to participate in paid work during SP construction and number of barangay assemblies per implementation cycle. As to status of resolution, these grievances have been responded within the reporting period.

30. Of the grievances filed during the reporting period, 25 were related to environmental and social safeguards, 22 of which are Type A and three are Type B. Specific concerns filed on safeguards issues are land ownership and donation; permits and clearances; water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); and sub-project implementation. Further, all of these safeguards-related grievances have been satisfactorily resolved.

Quarter	Type A	Type B	Type C	Total
Quarter 1 2017	7	1	0	8
Quarter 2 2017	15	2	0	17
Total	22	3	0	25

31. Grievances filed related to land ownership and donation were categorized as Type A grievances or not contentious. These are in the form of questions/inquiries i.e. how land instruments will be executed or what will be the next step if identified owner is not willing to donate the land for the construction of sub-project.

VII. CONCLUSION

32. Safeguard issues identified during the reporting period are: (i) incorrect encoding of safeguards information in the Program's database, (ii) delays in the issuance of applicable permits/clearances/certifications from other government agencies (i.e. CNC from DENR, CP/CNO from NCIP); and (iii) non-updating of the ESMPs.

33. Recommended actions to be completed during the next reporting period are: (i) finalization of facilitator's guide on how to fill out the ESMP; (ii) preparation of guidance notes on environmental and social safeguards spot checks; (iii) ensure functionality of DSWD-NCIP Regional Technical Working Groups; and (iv) review of safeguards database and ensure on-time submission of report with cleaned and updated data.

ATTACHMENTS: PHOTODOCUMENTATION



Culture-Sensitivity Training for Community Volunteers, Region I



Coaching and Mentoring Session with ACTs, Region XI



Consultation-Dialogue with IP Tribal Leaders (Mindanao Cluster)