

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)**

**Additional Financing**

Report No.: PIDISDSA22139

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 03-Oct-2017

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Philippines	<b>Project ID:</b>	P161944
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P132317
<b>Project Name:</b>	Philippine Rural Development Project Additional Financing (P161944)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Philippine Rural Development Project (P132317)		
<b>Region:</b>	EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	29-Aug-2017	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	14-Dec-2017
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Agriculture	<b>Financing Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Borrower(s)</b>	Government of the Philippines		
<b>Implementing Agency</b>	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			170.00
Local Govts. (Prov., District, City) of Borrowing Country			42.50
Financing Gap			0.00
Total Project Cost			212.50
<b>Environmental Category:</b>			
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**B. Introduction and Context**

**Country Context**

Although the Philippines is experiencing a growing urbanization trend, nearly 55 percent of the

population resides in rural areas where poverty is pervasive with about 38.2 percent of the rural population classified as poor. Farmers and fishers are among the poorest groups of the rural population. Rural-urban income gap continues to be wide. Nevertheless, in recent years the economy displayed robust growth averaging 5.4 percent per annum in 2006-2015 and reached 6.4 percent in 2016. Real gross domestic product (GDP) grew by 6.1 and 5.8 percent in 2014 and 2015, respectively. During 2012-2015 period, the poverty rate declined from 25.2 to 21.6 percent and household per capital incomes increased in all income deciles (2015 Family Income and Expenditure Survey). Increased income, and employment as well as stable inflation were key drivers for the reduction in poverty.

The overall economic outlook is characterized both with optimism and risks. Improvements in macroeconomic stability during the past decade contributed to robust economic growth and this is expected to continue supported by the ongoing public infrastructure investments, and continued remittance inflows. Some of the risks include ensuring that the growth is inclusive, vulnerabilities in the agriculture sector, constrained private investment, structural challenges in the business environment, and lack of competition in key economic sectors.

### **Sectoral and Institutional Context**

Agriculture continues to be relevant for the economy in the Philippines. In 2016 the contribution of the agriculture sector to GDP was 11.3 percent. The sector employs around thirty percent of the total labor force in 2013. Around 50% of the country's manufacturing output (value added) is linked to food and obtains its raw materials vastly from agriculture. Although agriculture is the main source of livelihood of more than 30 percent of the population, poverty is prevalent among small-scale farmers.

The agribusiness sector which accounts for 35% of the GDP and supports nearly 50% of the labor force continues to be afflicted with several challenges. Primary producers are faced with climate variability, poor rural infrastructure development, especially farm-to-market roads, weak extension systems, small farmers lack economies of scale due to their limited production capacity and high input costs, high post-harvest losses, limited access to agricultural technology, limited market access, weak producer organizations, inefficient supply chain and logistics system, limited access to finance; and ineffective regulation of product standards and quality.

The Philippines Rural Development Project (PRDP), implemented nationwide by the Department of Agriculture (DA), seeks to address some of the aforementioned sector and institutional bottlenecks. This is done by supporting farmers and fisherfolks through enterprise and infrastructure investments informed by institutional reforms as part of local and national level planning initiatives.

The Government of the Philippines is seeking additional financing for PRDP to continue supporting investments critical for achievement of expected project impacts, and to enable further support. The AF would also support expansion of the institutional reforms embodied in the project through further cementing new ways of doing business across the DA.

## **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

### **Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

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

## Key Results

Project impacts so far show increase in household income, increase in on-farm income, increase in production areas, reduction in travel time from farm to market site, reduction in hauling costs of agricultural output, reduction in hauling cost of production inputs, and more than doubling of traffic density in farm-to-market road sites.

## D. Project Description

PRDP became effective December 3, 2014 and is designed to be implemented by the Department of Agriculture (DA) over a six-year period (IBRD funding of US\$501.25 million; around 75% of total project costs). PRDP is national in scope, designed to cover all 81 provinces in the country. It builds on earlier World Bank support through two consecutive Mindanao Rural Development Projects.

This Additional Financing is to provide an additional loan in an amount of US\$170 million to PRDP. This is proposed as an initial response to the request from the Philippine Government for US\$450 million of additional financing from the World Bank for PRDP that is based on a pipeline of sub-projects requested for project support by LGUs. Further financing could be considered subsequently in response to the overall Government's request, based on continued strong performance and financing needs of the project. The Additional Financing (AF) is sought to finance the strong demand from Local Government Units (LGUs) for rural infrastructure support under PRDP, especially farm-to-market roads (FMRs). It would also provide for the increased construction costs due to a Government decision early in the implementation of PRDP, that all roads should be constructed of concrete.

The AF would support expansion of the institutional reforms embodied in the project through further cementing new ways of doing business across the DA. At the local level, the AF would be used to further institutionalize the joint-planning with PLGUs through Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs), and to strengthen the mechanisms through which PCIPs are used by LGUs to leverage additional resources, and to converge with programs of other Government agencies, and the private sector. At the national level, the closer linkages and synergies with the programs across DA technical and regulatory agencies that have been forged through PRDP would be further accompanied and strengthened.

The proposed AF would largely scale-up infrastructure development activities which remain within the scope of the current PDO and would help the project to reach out to more provinces and facilitate additional sub-projects in support of the PDO.

### **Component Name:**

Component 1: Local and National Level Planning

### **Comments ( optional)**

This component focuses on DA agricultural support providing planning that links national strategic objectives with regional and local level plans and strategies.

### **Component Name:**

Component 2: Infrastructure Development

### **Comments ( optional)**

Infrastructure investments under the project are designed to support the priority commodity value chains identified through the PCIPs.

**Component Name:**

Component 3: Enterprise Development

**Comments ( optional)**

Enterprise investments under the project are designed to support the development of agricultural, livestock and fishery-based entrepreneurial activities, based on value chain analysis and identified priorities in the PCIPs.

**Component Name:**

Component 4: Project Implementation Support

**Comments ( optional)****E. Project location and Salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)**

PRDP is being implemented nationwide, in all 16 regions of the Philippines and the sub-projects are in rural, agricultural, and coastal areas. Indigenous people reside in some of the sub-project locations. The AF would in general fund sub-projects in the similar locations but would also include provinces that have not yet availed of PRDP infrastructure sub-project funds.

**F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Gerardo Pio Francisco Parco, Environmental Safeguards Specialist

Jonas Garcia Bautista, Social Safeguards Specialist

Marivi Amor Jucotan Ladia, Social Safeguards Specialist

**II. IMPLEMENTATION**

The Additional Financing is designed to (i) expand the impact of the project through the provision of additional rural infrastructure; (ii) enhance the mechanisms for prioritizing infrastructure investments by type and provincial distribution; and (iii) further promote and consolidate the institutional reforms under the project. The comprehensive Operations Manuals adopted for the project have been progressively refined and updated.

There are no changes in the institutional and implementation arrangements. The Office of the DA Undersecretary for Field Operations would have overall management responsibility. Infrastructure investments are managed by Provincial LGUs with technical back-stopping from the Regional Program Coordination Offices (RPCO) and Project Support Offices (PSO). The RPCOs, under the leadership of the Regional Technical Director for Operations, is responsible for coordinating inputs from DA Technical Agencies and other public and private sector providers, in supporting the implementation of the various sub-projects of the Provincial LGUs. Overall implementation is overseen by four Program Support Offices (Mindanao, Visayas, Luzon North and South) and coordinated through the National Program Coordinating Office.

**III. SAFEGUARD POLICIES THAT MIGHT APPLY**

<b>Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Project will fund rural infrastructure sub-projects and technical assistance to the Department of Agriculture (DA) and Local Government Units (LGUs). These activities

		are expected to have environmental and social impacts, hence the policy is triggered. The infrastructure sub-projects to be supported would comprise concreted farm-to-market roads, potable water systems, small irrigation schemes, post-harvest facilities like small warehouses and solar dryers. The sub-projects will be the same in nature as under the ongoing project.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	Given that the sub-projects are implemented nationwide and are selected during implementation, it is likely that some sub-projects would affect natural habitats, hence this policy is triggered. The project will not finance sub-projects or activities that would significantly degrade or convert critical natural habitats. The ongoing project supports sub-projects that improve the management of natural resources such as near shore marine areas by supporting community-managed marine protected areas, fish sanctuaries, mangroves, and coral reef rehabilitation under its GEF-financed activities.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The policy is triggered as the project may fund mangrove rehabilitation as part of its support to coastal/marine resource management. The AF will not finance any mangrove rehabilitation.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	The project will fund crop production and post-harvest activities which may inevitably involve use of pesticides, although the project itself would not finance purchase of pesticides. Use of pesticides may also increase in PRDP-supported areas when commercial production increases in these areas. For these reasons, the policy is triggered. The AF will not provide funds for enterprise support and only finance infrastructure sub-projects.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	PRDP is unlikely to affect any physical cultural resources. For each sub-project site screening is being conducted and related procedures and contacts are being displayed.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	In some provinces where PRDP operates Indigenous Peoples (IPs) are present. The AF will expand activities in provinces already included under PRDP and engage in additional provinces that have not yet benefited from the project. The additional

		provinces will largely not increase the project coverage of IP areas as those are already substantially covered under the ongoing project. For this reason, OP 4.10 is triggered. PRDP's ESSF contains an Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework that is in use and proved adequate. The ESSF includes information (Table 3-1) which lists the likely IPs present in various regions of the country.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	Rural infrastructure sub-projects for PRDP have sometimes involved involuntary resettlement. As the AF mainly involves farm-to-market roads, minor involuntary resettlement can be expected to ensue. The ESSF for PRDP which has a Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy Framework has proven an adequate tool to deal with such cases. So far under PRDP, resettlement cases are few and economic displacement is small in nature. Upon identification of the specific locations of the infrastructure investments, a site-specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) may be undertaken contingent on the scale of resettlement.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	Yes	PRDP may finance communal irrigation systems which may involve dam construction or rehabilitation. These dams would be small dams as defined under OP 4.37 (i.e., dams with height of less than 15 meters) and most likely be ogee weirs for run-of-river irrigation systems or dirt dams for small water impounding. It is unlikely that any dams would be supported under the AF, but if they would, the design and supervision of dam construction would be undertaken by a qualified engineer. The sub-project's ESMP would encompass any identified risks and corresponding mitigation measures based on the environmental assessment section of the feasibility studies of sub-projects involving dams would include a risk assessment of dam failure and impacts on environment and downstream communities/assets with corresponding mitigation measures reflected in the ESMP.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	

Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	
--	----	--

#### IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

##### *A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues*

**1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:**

OP/BP4.01 (Environmental Assessments) - PRDP is expected to continue to have no large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts. Based on the actual experience with MRDP1 and MRDP2 and during the first three years of PRDP implementation, the scale, types, and nature of sub-projects have been assessed to only cause localized and temporary environmental and social impacts, which can be readily mitigated through proper planning, design and engineering measures. These impacts include loss of vegetation, soil erosion and sedimentation of waterways, and elevated levels of noise and dust during construction.

OP/BP 4.09 (Pest Management) – The project does not finance the procurement and purchase of chemical pesticides. However, the project may indirectly result in increased use of pesticides in the influence areas of project-funded infrastructure sub-projects as commercial production increases in these areas due to improved market access.

OP/BP 4.04 (Natural Habitat) – The project does not finance any sub-project that would significantly convert or degrade natural habitats. However, based on experience with MRDP1 and MRDP2 and during the last three years of PRDP, rural infrastructure may directly affect natural habitats during construction. Rural roads could also in the long run indirectly facilitate the degradation of primary forests by making it easy for poachers, illegal loggers and slash and burn cultivators to access the area.

OP/BP 4.36 (Forests) – The World Bank Policy on Forests was not triggered under MRDP1 and MRDP2. PRDP’s support to natural resource management and enterprise development would include management and rehabilitation of mangrove areas, watersheds and social/agro-forestry areas which may improve or change the management regimes of these areas. The AF financing does not provide funds for mangrove rehabilitation.

OP/BP 4.37 (Safety of Dams) – Small irrigation sub-projects may involve construction or rehabilitation of ogee weirs for run-of-river irrigation systems. It was observed that small run-of-river diversion dams do not really impound large volume of water. The safety issues for these dams often relate to accidental drowning of children at intake and the ogee weirs which are sometimes used by residents as footpaths to cross rivers. The Borrower indicated that the project may fund water impounding dams of up to less than 15 meters high. Hence, the safety concerns would also include potential breach of small dam structures. It is unlikely that any dams would be supported under the AF but if they would then the design and supervision of dam construction is undertaken by a qualified engineer. The sub-project's ESMP would encompass any identified risks and corresponding mitigation measures based on the environmental assessment section of the feasibility studies of sub-projects involving dams would include a risk assessment of dam failure and impacts on environment and downstream

communities/assets with corresponding mitigation measures reflected in the ESMP.

OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) – Under MRDP2, minority groups were purposively targeted as beneficiaries of the project to meet the project's poverty alleviation objectives. Under PRDP, some sub-projects are located in areas where IP communities are present. This would apply to the AF as well.

OP/BP 4.12 (Involuntary Resettlement) – Infrastructure sub-projects and facilities to be rehabilitated or constructed under the project could involve involuntary land acquisition which, in rare cases (based on MRDP experience and during three years of PRDP implementation), may entail displacement of homes and/or livelihood. Crops and properties may also be damaged or temporarily affected by construction activities and farm owners would need to be justly compensated.

Procedural and Capacity Issues – The establishment of an internal system of screening, assessment, planning, review and approval of sub-projects on safeguard aspects and the building of related capacities within the various units of the project organization had been flagged as one the main challenges for PRDP during the first two years of implementation.

The ESSF and the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy are formulated such that they allow expansion of the areas (and thus not limited original PRDP areas only). Also, sub-project impacts remain the same even with the scaling-up of infrastructure. Therefore, safeguard instruments are considered up to date and sufficient to also reflect additional investments under the AF. The existing GRM will also be applied to new sub-projects under the AF. Site-specific Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs) will be conducted depending on the scale of resettlement resulting from the additional infrastructure investments.

**2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:**

The indirect and long term impacts would include: (a) potential agricultural encroachment into forest areas where farm-to-market roads will be rehabilitated and/or built; and (b) potential increased use of pesticides due to increased commercial production in project-supported areas resulting from improved market access. The LGUs and Regional Project Coordination Offices need to be aware of these potential impacts. In very critical areas, such as upland areas near public forests, LGUs would be required to submit sustainable agriculture development/watershed management plans and to implement measures to prevent further human encroachments into the forests. LGUs are also required to avail of the Department of Agriculture's Integrated Pest Management – Farmer Field School (IPM-FFS) program.

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

The project has adopted a set of general policies pertaining to the types and location of infrastructure or development in the project areas. These policies will guide LGUs on the proper use of the uplands, lowlands, and coastal areas. In addition, alternatives will be considered at the sub-project level. All sub-projects are subjected to social and environmental screening in order to encourage LGUs to consider various environmentally and socially sound



alternative sites and sub-project configurations.

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

The Borrower has prepared and adopted an Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF) which governs the processes and procedures for screening, validation, preparation, review, approval and monitoring of sub projects in order to ensure compliance with the various applicable safeguard policies of the World Bank (the ESSF has been published with the title Integrated Environment and Social Safeguards Framework, dated June 4, 2014). The ESSF will be used for the AF.

The internal safeguards systems and the Grievance Redress Mechanism are fully established and functioning. The Borrower has set-up Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES) units on all three levels of project organization within DA and has required all participating LGUs to designate safeguard focal persons in their respective project management units. During the first two years of implementation, under the Bank's guidance, the Borrower has made innovations and refinements on the procedures, protocols, forms and templates, and undertaken capacity building for safeguards which included recruitment of staff, conduct of trainings, seminar-workshops and learning by doing through conduct of NPCO-PSO-RPCO joint reviews. The project currently has a total of 74 capable environmental and social safeguards staff comprising of 22 organic DA and 52 hired staff.

Compliance with safeguard policies has been satisfactory under the project and sufficient capacity exists to effectively monitor the scaling-up of activities through the Additional Financing. The safeguard system and the grievance redress mechanism, that have been set-up for the project following the ESMF, are functioning well and also monitors labor influx and potential issues. The Social and Environmental Safeguards units in NPCO, PSOs, and RPCOs are actively involved in all phases of sub-project development (i.e. validation, preparation, review, construction supervision and post-construction evaluation). This has resulted in marked improvements in the quality of the design and delivery of sub-projects.

There are also indications of a stronger sense of community ownerships of the sub-projects as LGUs comply with the mandatory consultations during sub-project preparation. In most sites, the PPMIUs have mobilized their SES officers/focal persons in the implementation of right-of-way acquisition and compensation plans, as well as in the compliance monitoring of constructions activities. The project's grievance system is accessible on-line and includes updates on each case.

The project has adopted a set of general policies pertaining to the types and location of infrastructure or development in the project areas. These policies guide LGUs on the proper use of the uplands, lowlands, and coastal areas. In addition, alternatives will be considered at the sub-project level. All sub-projects are subjected to social and environmental screening in order to encourage LGUs to consider various environmentally and socially sound alternative sites and sub-project configurations.

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

During PRDP preparation, an institutional and stakeholder assessment was conducted nationwide through focused group discussions and interviews involving about 2,000 representatives of government agencies, private sector, civil society and rural farming and fisher communities which included subsistence and commercial smallholders and fishers, women and a sample of IP groups. The stakeholders have voiced out their needs and constraints and these were considered in the project conceptualization and overall project design.

During the three years of PRDP implementation, the project has benefited women and indigenous peoples (IPs). Currently, about 128 sub-projects have been implemented in IP areas, including 102 in Cordillera Autonomous Region while about 479 enterprise development sub-projects where the business aspects of farming and post-harvest handling and processing, which are roles traditionally played by women in the Philippines, have been approved. PRDP has employed and will continue to employ participatory approaches in the planning of interventions at the regional and local levels, particularly in the value chain analysis and resource assessments which would input into the formulation of the Provincial Commodity Investment Plans. Project-affected persons have been consulted and compensated following the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Framework.

About 45% of the beneficiaries of enterprise sub-projects under PRDP are women. In addition to the overall benefits reported for farm-to-market roads, women particularly mention the benefits of increased school attendance, better access to health services, particularly for births, better security when transporting good to the market. Due to the public good nature of infrastructure investments such as farm-to-market roads both, under the original and AF projects, indigenous people communities in the influence area have access to the physical outputs of the investments, thereby, deriving benefits in the same manner as men and women in the non-indigenous communities. As in the original project, the additional financing does not exclude the usage of outputs from the infrastructure investments.

### ***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
"In country" Disclosure	
Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	

Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	05-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	05-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Philippines	05-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<b>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why::</b>	

### C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>						
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>						
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>						
Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>						
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>						
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	TBD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>OP/BP 4.36 - Forests</b>						
Has the sector-wide analysis of policy and institutional issues and constraints been carried out?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the project design include satisfactory measures to overcome these constraints?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the project finance commercial harvesting, and if so, does it include provisions	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

for certification system?						
<b>OP/BP 4.37 - Safety of Dams</b>						
Have dam safety plans been prepared?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have the TORs as well as composition for the independent Panel of Experts (POE) been reviewed and approved by the Bank?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has an Emergency Preparedness Plan (EPP) been prepared and arrangements been made for public awareness and training?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>						
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>						
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input type="checkbox"/>

## V. Contact point

### World Bank

Contact:Frauke Jungbluth  
Title:Lead Agriculture Economist

### Borrower/Client/Recipient

Name:Government of the Philippines

Contact: Department of Finance  
 Title: Director  
 Email: [dminimo@dof.gov.ph](mailto:dminimo@dof.gov.ph)

### Implementing Agencies

Name: DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
 Contact: Emmanuel F. Piñol  
 Title: Secretary  
 Email: [prdpnpco@gmail.com](mailto:prdpnpco@gmail.com)

### VI. For more information contact:

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

### VII. Approval

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Frauke Jungbluth	
<i>Approved By:</i>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Surhid P. Gautam (SA)	Date: 19-Sep-2017
Practice Manager/Manager:	Name: Nathan M. Belete (PMGR)	Date: 27-Sep-2017
Country Director:	Name: Agata E. Pawlowska (CD)	Date: 03-Oct-2017