



# **PHILIPPINE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SCALE - UP**

---

## **INDIGENOUS PEOPLES POLICY FRAMEWORK (IPPF)**

**April 18, 2023**

**Department of Agriculture  
Philippine Rural Development Project (PRDP) Scale-up  
Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework (IPPF)**

**Table of Contents**

List of Acronyms .....	1
Definition of Terms.....	2
I. Project Background and Rationale.....	3
II. Legal Framework.....	6
III. IP Policy Framework Principle and Objectives.....	7
IV. Indigenous Peoples Defined .....	8
V. Social Assessment .....	9
VI. IP Development under PRDP Scale-up .....	10
VII. Meaningful consultation and participation of IP communities .....	10
VIII. Requirements for Subprojects.....	11
IX. Significant impacts to Cultural Heritage and Damage to Cultural Properties or Resources .....	16
X. Land Acquisition and Affected Assets .....	16
XI. Grievance Redress Mechanism .....	17
XII. Institutional Arrangements and Capacity .....	17
XIII. Supervision, Monitoring and Evaluation.....	18
XIV. Costs and Financing.....	18

## List of Acronyms

AD	- Ancestral Domain
ADSDPP	- Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan
BARMM	- Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao
CERC	- Contingent Emergency Response Component
CP	- Certificate of Pre-condition
DA	- Department of Agriculture
ESS	- Environmental and Social Standards
ESF	- Environmental and Social Framework
ESMF	- Environmental and Social Management Framework
ESMP	- Environmental and Social Management Plan
FCAs	- Fisherfolk Cooperative and Associations
FPIC	- Free Prior Informed Consent
GRM	- Grievance Redress Mechanism
IESSF	- Integrated Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework
IKSPs	- Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices
IP/ICC	- Indigenous Peoples/Indigenous Cultural Communities
IPPF	- Indigenous Peoples Policy Framework
IPRA	- Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
LGUs	- Local Government Units
MIPA	- Ministry of Indigenous Peoples' Affairs
NAFMIP	- National Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization and Industrialization Plan
NPCO	- National Project Coordination Office
OP	- Operational Policy
PDO	- Project Development Objective
PSOs	- Project Support Offices
PRDP	- Philippine Rural Development Project
PCIPs	- Provincial Commodity Investment Plans
P/M/CPMIU	- Provincial/Municipal/City Project Management and Implementation Unit
RPCOs	- Regional Project Coordination Offices
VCA	- Value-Chain Analysis
WB	- World Bank

## Definition of Terms

**Ancestral Domains (AD)** - The 1997 IPRA Law defines ancestral domains as “all areas generally belonging to ICCs/IPs comprising lands, inland waters, coastal areas, and natural resources therein, held under a claim of ownership, occupied or possessed by ICCs/IPs, by themselves or through their ancestors, communally or individually since time immemorial, continuously to the present except when interrupted by war, force majeure or displacement by force, deceit, stealth or as a consequence of government projects or any other voluntary dealings entered into by government and private individuals/corporations, and which are necessary to ensure their economic, social and cultural welfare. It shall include ancestral lands, forests, pasture, residential, agricultural, and other lands individually owned whether alienable and disposable or otherwise, hunting grounds, burial grounds, worship areas, bodies of water, mineral and other natural resources, and lands which may no longer be exclusively occupied by ICCs/IPs but from which they traditionally had access to for their subsistence and traditional activities, particularly the home ranges of ICCs/IPs who are still nomadic and/or shifting cultivators”

**Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP)** - Ancestral Domains Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) refers to the consolidation of the plans of ICCs/IPs within an ancestral domain for the sustainable management and development of their land and natural resources as well as the development of human and cultural resources based on their indigenous knowledge, systems and practices. Such plan shall be the basis of the Five-Year Master Plan for ICCs/IPs. (as per NCIP AO No. 02 Series of 2018)

**Intergenerational well-being** – the term “intergenerational” means involving or affecting several generations. Intergenerational well-being values the concept of intergenerational equity which focuses on the rights of future generations - emphasizing the need for thinking about how human actions directly or indirectly degrade the environment in the present will affect future generations of humans and other life forms. Each generation has the right to inherit the same diversity in natural and cultural resources enjoyed by previous generations and to equitable access to the use and benefits of these resources. The present generation is a custodian of the planet for future generations, obliged to conserve this legacy so that future generations may also enjoy these same rights.

**Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs)** - refer to systems, institutions, mechanisms, and technologies comprising a unique body of collective wisdom evolved through time that embody patterns of relationships between and among peoples and between peoples, their lands and resource environment, including social, political, cultural, economic and spiritual dimensions, consisting as well of adaptive mechanisms which have allowed indigenous peoples to survive and thrive within their given socio-cultural and biophysical conditions. IKSPs consist of a body of knowledge and traditional methods of land and natural resources utilization and management such as knowledge of the properties of flora and fauna, the seasons, soils, climate, land and water. It includes knowledge and practice of traditional medicine, science and health practices, vital medicinal plants, animals and minerals. It also includes knowledge and practices of traditional arts and crafts, ritual, family and community life relations.

**Cultural heritage** - is defined as resources with which people identify as a reflection and expression of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions.

**Disadvantaged or vulnerable** - refers to those who may be more likely to be adversely affected by the project impacts and/or more limited than others in their ability to take advantage of a project's benefits. Such an individual/group is also more likely to be excluded from/unable to participate fully in the mainstream consultation process and as such may require specific measures and/or assistance to do so.

## I. Project Background and Rationale

1. The Philippine Rural Development Project (PRDP) Scale-up project responds to the Government's goal of transforming the agri-fishery sectors to be more competitive, sustainable, and technologically-based, so as to contribute to inclusive growth and poverty reduction. It shall build on the experiences of PRDP and its two additional financing, being implemented by the Department of Agriculture (DA) since 2014 and set to close in 2025. Eight (8) years into its implementation, the PRDP has gained a wealth of experience in its engagement with various partner agencies, particularly with the Local Government Units (LGUs), in the delivery of the needed agriculture and fisheries services for rural development. The PRDP Scale-up will adopt the clustering and consolidation strategy of farmers and fisherfolk groups producing priority commodities that are within the Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs) and aligned with the National Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization and Industrialization Plan (NAFMIP). The PRDP Scale-Up is envisaged to introduce a more holistic design and strategies by looking at a broader agri-food/commodity system to address the gaps in the whole commodity value chains, level up approaches and innovations based on lessons learned, contribute to improving climate resilience and modernizing the agriculture and fisheries sector. Interventions include the emphasis on rebuilding the whole value chain, improving the food supply chain and logistics, prioritizing farm-to-market roads (FMRs) with value chain infrastructure support, the inclusion of rice and corn focusing on value addition, and mainstreaming of institutional reforms in the DA programs and projects.
2. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is "to improve farmers and fisherfolk access to markets and increase income from selected agri-fishery value chains."
3. Project Components. The project components remain the same as those of the original PRDP with some improvements as described as follows:

### **Component 1. National and Local Level Planning (I-PLAN)**

The I-PLAN component of the PRDP Scale-Up will lay down the strategic framework in the context of overall project operation and implementation of interventions. Invoking NAFMIP as the medium-term strategic framework for the rationalization of DA's plans and budgets, the primary goal of the I-PLAN Component of the PRDP Scale-Up is to strengthen the framework and linkages for the delivery of devolved but integrated agriculture and fishery services by the national and local government units. The component anticipates seeing the results of capacity development activities reflected in the updated and enhanced Value Chain Analysis (VCAs) and Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs).

### **Component 2: Rural Infrastructure Market Linkage (I-BUILD)**

The I-BUILD component will focus on delivering climate-resilient access and value chain infrastructure support with the end goal of building up food distribution hubs and logistics systems to provide unhampered mobility, access and stable supply of food commodities and other agri-fishery products with reduced transport, handling, and hauling costs thereby improving product quality and prices in target markets. It will take off from I-PLAN's strategic overlay of criteria and parameters in coming up with key investment areas in the value and supply chains from the regional perspective. To further ensure more climate-resilient and sustainable rural infrastructure investments, hazard mapping analysis will be considered in the design and planning of infrastructure subprojects with the incorporation of the Philippine Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Standard (PABES) and the compliance with the new environmental and social framework.

### **Component 3: Enterprise Development (I-REAP)**

The Enterprise Development component aims to increase productivity, value addition and improve access to the market of enterprise clusters through efficient cluster-based agricultural and fishery productivity enhancement interventions. Strategically, I-REAP will aim to support small to large-scale, high-impact investments and enterprise development through common service facilities, capacity-building, and other agri-aqua-support services for Farmers and Fisherfolk Cooperative and Associations (FCAs) and FCA clusters. It will also support FCA groups and clusters in increasing private sector investments in the agricultural and fishery sector by strengthening the productive alliance with the private sector aimed to enable FCAs to access proven new technologies and systems, and provide additional resources such as finances and expertise. Adoption of clustering and consolidation strategies which would cater to a wide array of commodities and beneficiaries will be the centerpiece of I-REAP subprojects implementation. The provision of common service facilities under I-REAP will consolidate and integrate the production, value-addition, and distribution of agri-fishery produce. Delineating value chain infrastructure support investments from I-BUILD portfolio, I-REAP will focus on interventions that will support the operations of private enterprises. Considering the new model being adopted for PRDP Scale-Up, I-REAP will implement flexible modalities for business plan initiation, which include private agribusiness entities-initiated aside from the LGUs and FCAs/FCA cluster, provided that business plans shall show linkages between the FCAs and the private sector whether in terms of assured market, technology support, and other technical assistance.

### **Component 4: Project Implementation Support (I-SUPPORT)**

The I-SUPPORT component provides the backbone of PRDP Scale-Up implementation. It will ensure the crucial role of ensuring coordinated approaches and strategies among the three components by providing support for effective and efficient project management, project oversight, capacity building/strengthening complementary project staffing, technical assistance and operating costs for its implementation. Full institutionalization of all innovations developed in the Original Loan (OL) and Additional Financing (AF) of the PRDP will be further pursued in the DA central and regional offices. The various functions would be implemented by units comprising; Administration, Finance, Legal, Economics, Social & Environmental Safeguards, Monitoring & Evaluation, InfoAce, Geo-mapping and Governance, and Budget & Accounting.

### **Component 5. Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC)**

The Contingent Emergency Response Component (CERC) is a new component and will provide the Government a rapid access to financing to respond to an eligible crisis or emergency through an ex-ante mechanism. Anchored on the agreed triggers and specific operational guidelines, this would allow rapid access and reallocation of uncommitted project funds to immediately respond to urgent situations particularly in the event of disasters (geophysical, climate-related, or man-made) such as typhoons, floods, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, droughts and disease outbreaks, and public emergencies (e.g. pandemic). The utilization of funds for CERC may consider reallocation of uncommitted funds within the component (e.g. from Subcomponent 2.2. to Subcomponent 2.1) and/or from one component to another (e.g. from I-BUILD to I-REAP) based on the immediate needs of the concerned component. Utilization of funds would be in accordance with the eligible list of items, goods and civil works required to support the immediate response and recovery interventions, invoking the agency's mandate under various emergency response and contingency plans.

4. As with the original PRDP, this Project will continue to implement subprojects in areas where there are Indigenous Peoples. This Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) has been developed in accordance with the World Bank's Environment and Social Framework (ESF) particularly Environment and Social Standard 7 Indigenous Peoples to ensure that negative impacts on IPs will be mitigated and positive impacts will be enhanced. This is to ensure that IPs also partake in project benefits in a manner that is consistent with their points of view. This IPPF builds on the experience from applying the IPPF of the original PRDP which was developed as part of the Integrated Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (IESSF) developed under World Bank's Operational Policy (OP) 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples.
5. Under the original PRDP, Indigenous Peoples have been beneficiaries of farm-to-market roads under I-BUILD and members of proponent groups under I-REAP to ensure that they are included and have the same opportunities to access project benefits. As of the last PRDP 2022 Report, PRDP has benefitted 638,725 IPs or about 127,745 IP households who are within the subproject influence areas. PRDP has worked with a wide range of IPs in the country including the Ivatans in Batanes; the Kalinga, Ibaloi, Kankanaey, Tinggian in the Cordillera Autonomous Region (CAR); the Aetas of Central Luzon, Cuyunon and Tagbanua from Palawan; Ati and Panay-Bukidnon in Visayas and the Manobo, Talaandig, Higaonon, B'laan, Mamanwa, Subanen in Mindanao. A total of twenty-seven (27) Indigenous Peoples Plans have been prepared and have been/are being implemented across the country with majority in Mindanao (20). Implemented Indigenous Peoples Plans have benefitted various Indigenous Cultural Communities such as the Mansaka, Mandaya, Ata-Manobo, Dibabawon, Bagobo, Blaan in Mindanao; Tagbanua and Batak Tribe in Palawan and Panay-Bukidnon and Ati communities in Iloilo. The PRDP Scale-up shall continue to ensure that subproject proponents such as the LGUs conduct meaningful consultations with Indigenous Peoples communities so that their needs, interests and concerns are considered in the design and final configuration of specific subprojects under I-BUILD and I-REAP components as well as in the formulation of VCA and PCIP under the I-PLAN component. Further, the PRDP Scale-up will adopt the existing Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) which incorporates the traditional grievance resolution processes of the IP communities such as the involvement of IP Council of Elders.
6. PRDP Scale-up will continue to carry out subprojects that may be within Ancestral Domains (AD). The Project shall further strengthen its partnership with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) to ensure the timely release of requisite certifications such as the Certificate of Pre-condition (CP) which in the past involved quite a long time to secure. As of December 31, 2022 data of PRDP, there have been twenty (20) CP secured for I-REAP subprojects and ninety-four (94) CP for I-BUILD subprojects. For PRDP Scale-up the recently issued Commission En Banc Resolution No. 08-083-2021 Series of 2021 "Resolution approving the guidelines on the validation and assessment process of government projects for the delivery of basic service to be undertaken within or affecting ancestral domain/s" is intended to fast track CP issuances.
7. The IPPF of the PRDP Scale-up includes ESS 7's new provisions related to Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC). However, it must be noted that the country's Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) already contains provisions for FPIC that the PRDP has been

abiding by over the years. In addition, it is unlikely that the Project will trigger any of the three (3) conditions for FPIC under ESS 7 as none of such circumstances have been encountered in implementing PRDP to date. Farm-to-market roads did not result in adverse impacts on ancestral domains and many of these subprojects are already existing. If relocation of Indigenous Peoples along the roads was necessary, it would likely still be relocation within their ancestral domains.

## II. Legal Framework

8. The WB ESS 7 is intended to ensure that the development process fosters full respect for human rights, dignity, aspirations, identity, culture, and natural resource-based livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples (IPs) through promotion of sustainable development benefits and opportunities in a manner that is accessible, culturally appropriate, and inclusive. It also aims to avoid, minimize, mitigate, and/or compensate adverse impacts of projects on IPs. ESS 7 requires the Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) of affected IPs in instances when a project (i) will have adverse impacts on land and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use or occupation; (ii) cause relocation of IPs; and (iii) have significant impacts on IPs' cultural heritage that is material to the identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of the affected IPs.
9. The Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA) of 1997 is consistent with requirements of ESS 7. The law contains elements of fostering full respect for the rights, dignity, aspirations, identity, culture, and natural resource-based livelihoods of IPs as well as mechanisms for development initiatives to avoid adverse impacts of projects on IPs, or when avoidance is not possible, to minimize, mitigate and/or compensate for such impacts. Meaningful consultations, FPIC, and grievance redress mechanisms are observed across the development stages. Meaningful consultations are also provided for IPs outside AD/Ls under IPRA and other Philippine laws though procedures are less rigid compared to IPs within AD/Ls. For Indigenous Peoples in Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), the RA 11054 of 2018 known as the "Organic Law for the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao" has provisions that further protect the rights of non-Moro Indigenous Peoples in BARMM.
10. It is to be noted that the ESS 7 and IPRA are consistent except on (i) when FPIC applies and (ii) who determines consent. On the first item, ESS 7 requires FPIC under 3 conditions only as previously stated. In contrast, IPRA requires FPIC when subprojects are located in ancestral domains. The Project will undergo and secure FPIC if either the conditions of ESS 7 or IPRA are encountered. WB ESS 7 states that *"FPIC does not require unanimity and may be achieved even when individuals or groups within or among affected Indigenous Peoples disagree"* while the IPRA defines FPIC as *"the consensus of all members of the ICCs/IPs to be determined in accordance with their respective customary laws and practices, free from any external manipulation, interference and coercion, and obtained after fully disclosing the intent and scope of the activity, in a language and process understandable to the community"*. WB ESS 7 does not require unanimity however IPRA requires a consensus decision among all members of the ICCs/IPs. As a rule, the more stringent policy will prevail over the less stringent. In this case, the Project shall adopt the definition of FPIC as per RA 8371 (IPRA) which PRDP has always adhered to.
11. The FPIC processes shall be further guided by the NCIP Administrative Order No. 3 s. 2012 "The Revised Guidelines on Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and Related Process of 2012" and the Commission En Banc Resolution No. 08-083-2021 Series of 2021 "Resolution



approving the guidelines on the validation and assessment process of government projects for the delivery of basic service to be undertaken within or affecting ancestral domain/s” and any succeeding policy issuances that is deemed consistent with the ESS 7.

### III. IP Policy Framework Principle and Objectives

12. This Framework complies with the Philippines Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (RA 8371) and the WB ESS 7. It shall uphold the main principle that the development processes of PRDP Scale-up foster full respect for the human rights, dignity, aspirations, identity, culture, indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSPs), natural resource-based livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and intergenerational<sup>1</sup> well-being of IP communities.
13. Its main objective is to ensure that the interests, needs and concerns of IP/ICCs are taken into consideration in the formulation of regional and provincial plans and in the design and implementation of specific subprojects near or within their communities and/or territories. More specifically, this Framework has the following objectives:
  - a. To ensure that IP/ICCs in the regions and provinces are able to meaningfully participate in the conduct of I-PLAN activities, including the preparation of the Provincial Commodity Investment Plan (PCIP);
  - b. To ensure that the selection, screening and preparation of subprojects under I-BUILD and I-REAP will be undertaken with the involvement and participation of the IP communities in the target areas in partnership with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP); Ministry of Indigenous Peoples’ Affairs (MIPA) and the Local Government Units (LGUs) and that:
    - i. Whenever the proposed subproject site is located within or will directly impact on any declared or proposed IP Ancestral Domain, the requirements for government-sponsored development projects under IPRA as stipulated in the Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) Guidelines are complied with; otherwise,
    - ii. If the project site is situated outside any declared or proposed Ancestral Domain and does not meet the 3 criteria for FPIC under ESS 7 but nevertheless will directly affect and/or benefit any extant IP community or communities, meaningful consultation is undertaken for the subproject in coordination with NCIP/MIPA .
  - c. To avoid adverse impacts of the specific subprojects under I-REAP and I-BUILD on Indigenous Peoples or when avoidance is not possible, to minimize, mitigate, and/or compensate for such impacts;
  - d. To improve subproject design and promote local support by establishing and maintaining an ongoing relationship based on meaningful consultation with the Indigenous Peoples affected by a project throughout the project’s life cycle;

---

<sup>1</sup> involving or affecting several generations

- e. To promote sustainable development benefits and opportunities for Indigenous Peoples in a manner that is accessible, culturally appropriate, and inclusive;
- f. To recognize, respect, and preserve the culture, knowledge, and practices of Indigenous Peoples and to provide them with an opportunity to adapt to changing conditions in a manner and in a time frame acceptable to them.

#### IV. Indigenous Peoples Defined

14. The World Bank ESS 7 defines “Indigenous Peoples” as a distinct, social, and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:
  - a. Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
  - b. Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
  - c. Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and
  - d. A distinct language, often different from the official language or languages of the country or region in which they reside.
  
15. This IPPF also applies to communities or groups of Indigenous Peoples who, during the lifetime of members of the community or group, have lost collective attachment to distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area because of forced severance, conflict, government resettlement programs, dispossession of their land, natural disasters, or incorporation of such territories into an urban area. However, generally, the IPPF does not apply to individuals or small groups migrating to urban areas in search of economic opportunity. It may apply, however, where Indigenous Peoples communities have established distinct communities in or near urban areas but still possess the characteristics (a) to (d) as stated above.
  
16. These characteristics are consistent with the definition of Indigenous Peoples under the Republic Act No. 8371, otherwise known as the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997 (IPRA):
  - A group of people or homogenous societies identified by self-ascription and ascription by others, who have continuously lived as organized community on communally bounded and defined territory, and who have, under claims of ownership since time immemorial, occupied, possessed and utilized such territories, sharing common bonds of language, customs, traditions, and other distinctive cultural traits, or who have, through resistance to political, social, and cultural inroads of colonization, non-indigenous religions and cultures, become historically differentiated from the majority of Filipinos.
  - Peoples who are regarded as indigenous on account of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present state boundaries, who retain some or all of their social, economic, cultural, and political institutions, but who may have been displaced from their traditional domains or who may have resettled outside their ancestral domain.

## V. Social Assessment

17. There is no official figure yet from the PSA on the total population of the Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines, however it is estimated that the country's indigenous population is between 10% and 20% of the national population scattered all over the country. The Ivatans are in the northernmost part in Batanes; the Cordillera Autonomous Region has a myriad of Indigenous Peoples including the Kalinga, Ibaloi, Kankanaey, Tinggian; and the Aetas are mostly in central Philippines, the Mangyans in Mindoro, Ati and Bukidnon in Visayas and the Badjao, B'laans, Subanen, Manobo in Mindanao, to name a few of the Indigenous Peoples communities. Refer to Annex 1 for the NCIP data on the estimated population of Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines as of 2007.
18. Indigenous Peoples who are traditionally farmers, hunters and fishers, have great knowledge about their environment. Indigenous Peoples communities are generally situated in areas that are rich repositories of high biodiversity. This is largely due to their sustainable practices in natural resource management which have conserved the natural wealth of the land. Through generations, Indigenous Peoples have established systems and coping mechanisms, to at times very harsh conditions, rooted in their traditional knowledge, customs, and practices to different circumstances affecting their communities. These are all founded on one fundamental principle: to ensure that the community survives.
19. However, because Indigenous Peoples have been historically marginalized and continue to be marginalized, indigenous cultural communities are economically disadvantaged. IP communities have very limited or no access to information and knowledge on new, modern sustainable agricultural practices, inputs and technologies, as well as improved plant stock/seeds that will complement their Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs). Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) refer to systems, institutions, mechanisms, and technologies comprising a unique body of collective wisdom evolved through time that embody patterns of relationships between and among peoples and between peoples, their lands and resource environment, including social, political, cultural, economic and spiritual dimensions, consisting as well of adaptive mechanisms which have allowed indigenous peoples to survive and thrive within their given socio-cultural and biophysical conditions.
20. With depleting environmental resources and competing demands for these natural resources, farmers and fisherfolks usually resort to unsustainable and suboptimal farming practices, perpetuating an environmental vicious cycle. Slash-and-burn farming practices lead to depletion of the forest cover, pushing some animals further into the wild resulting in diminished catch for hunters. For fisherfolk, non-IP migrant fishers using destructive fishing methods such as dynamite & cyanide fishing destroys habitats resulting in depleted fish stocks. The lack of or badly deteriorated access roads result to more costly farm- produce of IPs making them economically uncompetitive in the open/free market.
21. These social assessments will be among the bases for designing specific assistance for the IPs as well as to orient and sensitize LGUs and other institutions working with IPs.

## **VI. IP Development under PRDP Scale-up**

22. The PRDP Scale-up, primarily through Infrastructure Development (I-BUILD) and Enterprise Development (I-REAP), shall continue to support and complement activities included in the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Protection Plan (ADSDPP). The ADSDPP is the Philippine Government's main instrument at the local level that consolidates the plans of ICCs/IPs within an ancestral domain for the sustainable management and development of their land and natural resources as well as the development of human and cultural resources based on their indigenous knowledge, systems and practices. PRDP Scale-up shall ensure that technical assistance is provided to enable the indigenous peoples to participate meaningfully in the planning process under the I-PLAN component. This means, among others, deployment of competent and committed Project partners who can work with indigenous communities to ascertain that the prioritized plans and projects of IPs as reflected in their ADSDPPs are supported by LGUs and integrated into barangay, municipal and provincial investment plans.

## **VII. Meaningful consultation and participation of IP communities**

23. The Project shall conduct meaningful consultation with Indigenous Peoples communities, when applicable based on the social assessment, throughout the project cycle in a manner that is culturally appropriate and gender and intergenerationally inclusive.
24. The Project shall proactively engage with the Indigenous Peoples to ensure that their inputs are incorporated in the conduct of I-PLAN activities, including the formulation and updating of Value-Chain Analysis (VCA) and Provincial Commodity Investment Plans (PCIPs) as well as in the selection, screening, preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of subprojects under I-BUILD and I-REAP. Conduct of consultation will seek to identify and address any economic or social constraints faced by the IP communities, including those relating to gender, that may limit opportunities to benefit from, or participate in, the project.
25. The engagement processes that the Project shall undertake with Indigenous Peoples communities are further detailed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) compliant to ESS 10 which include stakeholder analysis and engagement planning, disclosure of information, and meaningful consultation in a culturally appropriate and gender and intergenerationally inclusive manner. In particular, the process of meaningful consultations with Indigenous Peoples should:
  - a. make use of existing indigenous structures and mechanisms such as but not limited to, their Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) and Indigenous Political Structure (IPS) making sure the participation of representative bodies and organizations (e.g. councils of elders or chieftains) and, where appropriate, other community members.
  - b. Provide sufficient time for Indigenous Peoples Communities' decision-making processes;
  - c. Allow for Indigenous Peoples Communities' effective participation in the design of subproject activities or mitigation measures that could potentially affect them either positively or negatively.

## VIII. Requirements for Subprojects

26. **Social Assessment and Social Management Plan.** All subprojects shall undergo rapid social and environmental assessment as part of their Feasibility Studies and Business Plans. This should result in the preparation of an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP). A targeted social assessment on Indigenous Peoples is conducted to determine if IPs are present in, or have collective attachment to, the subproject area or if there are IP communities who will be affected whether or not they are within the subproject area. If the social assessment indicates the presence of Indigenous People Communities the subproject ESMP should appropriately reflect that IP Policy is triggered.
27. The social assessment should also determine whether there are any potential significant impacts on the cultural heritage of IPs and whether the cultural heritage is material to the identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of their lives. Mitigation measures to address identified impacts to Indigenous Peoples communities should be reflected in the subproject's ESMP.
28. A key aspect of the social assessment is understanding the relative vulnerabilities of the affected IP community and how the subproject may affect them. The assessment is proportionate to the nature and scale of the proposed subproject's potential risks to, and impacts on, as well as the vulnerability of, the IP community.
29. The assessment should consider differentiated gender and intergenerational impacts of subproject activities as well as impacts on potentially disadvantaged or vulnerable groups within the community of Indigenous Peoples. Input from qualified specialists and accompanying meaningful consultation with IP communities are important to inform and support the assessment.
30. In order to be approved for funding, all Infrastructure Development (I-BUILD) and Enterprise Development (I-REAP) subprojects must comply with the following requirements:
  - a. **Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC)**
31. This Framework shall adopt the definition of FPIC as stipulated in the RA 8371, which shall mean "the consensus of all members of the ICCs/IPs to be determined in accordance with their respective customary laws and practices, free from any external manipulation, interference and coercion, and obtained after fully disclosing the intent and scope of the activity, in a language and process understandable to the community".
32. Compliant to ESS 7 and the RA 8371, the following subprojects require FPIC:
  - i. Subprojects that overlap or are located inside any declared or proposed IP Ancestral Domain or those that, while not located inside, will directly affect any declared or proposed IP Ancestral Domain.
  - ii. Subprojects that cause relocation of Indigenous Peoples from land and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or under customary use or occupation or those that are referred to as Ancestral Domains;
  - iii. Subprojects that have significant impacts on Indigenous Peoples' cultural heritage that is material to the identity and/or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual

aspects of the affected Indigenous Peoples

- iv. Subprojects that locate or commercially develop natural resources on land traditionally owned by, or under the customary use or occupation of Indigenous Peoples or those that are referred to as Ancestral Domains;
- v. Subprojects that propose to use for commercial purposes the cultural heritage and Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSPs) of Indigenous Peoples communities, whether tangible or intangible or both.

33. In these circumstances needing FPIC, subproject proponents need to secure the Certificate of Precondition (CP) issued by the NCIP and the MIPA for BARMM. The FPIC processes shall be further guided by the NCIP Administrative Order No. 3 s. 2012 “The Revised Guidelines on Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and Related Process of 2012” and the Commission En Banc Resolution No. 08-083-2021 Series of 2021 “Resolution approving the guidelines on the validation and assessment process of government projects for the delivery of basic service to be undertaken within or affecting ancestral domain/s” and any succeeding policy issuances that is deemed consistent with the ESS 7.

**b. IP community-solicited or initiated subprojects.**

34. For subprojects that are being solicited by the IP community themselves or those that are already identified in their ADSDPPs, there would be no need to undergo the Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) process. Instead, the NCIP/MIPA will only need to validate the following:

- i. The IP/ICC, in fact, voluntarily solicited or initiated the plan, Project, project or activity to be undertaken;
- ii. The plan, Project, project or activity conforms with the community’s ADSDPP or in the absence of the ADSDPP, the concerned community considers the same to form part already of the ADSDPP that they will formulate in the future;
- iii. The IP/ICC knows the extent of the plan, Project, project or activity and its socio- cultural/ environmental impact to the community;
- iv. The concerned LGU and the IP/ICC community acknowledge their obligations; or
- v. The subproject activity is for the delivery of basic services or for the establishment of social enterprise or enterprise development involving community interest affecting land and resource use that would provide employment or generate income to improve the living condition and economic development of the concerned IP/ICC.

35. For these types of subprojects, an NCIP/MIPA validation report or an NCIP/MIPA certification affirming that conditions (i) to (v) above have been met should be submitted to the NPCO, PSO and RPCO as part of the subproject proposal package.

**c. Subprojects that were neither solicited by the IP/ICC nor identified in their ADSDPP but the IP/ICC are themselves the primary beneficiaries**

36. For subprojects that were neither solicited by the IP/ICC nor identified in their ADSDPP but the IP/ICC are themselves the primary beneficiaries, the FPIC process will not be required. The concerned LGU only needs to formally coordinate with NCIP/MIPA (or include the NCIP/MIPA as co- implementer of the subproject) who will then validate that the subproject is acceptable to the intended IP/ICC beneficiaries, either because the same conform with the community's ADSDPP or shall become part thereof in the future. For these subprojects the following document should be submitted to the NPCO, PSO and RPCO as part of the subproject proposal package:
- A certification by NCIP/MIPA affirming that the subproject is acceptable to the intended IP/ICC beneficiaries, either because the same conform with the community's ADSDPP or shall become part thereof in the future have been met.
37. However, if the concerned ICCs/IPs are not the primary beneficiaries of the subproject, compliance with the FPIC process will be required. For these subprojects, the following documents will be required:
- Memorandum of Agreement with the IP community
  - Certificate of Precondition issued by NCIP/MIPA
  - Resolution of Consent issued by the elders/leaders of the IP Community
- d. **Subprojects located outside any declared or proposed ancestral domains but are situated within or will affect any extant IP community or communities and does not meet the 3 criteria for FPIC under ESS 7**
38. Subprojects under this category are those subprojects that would affect IP communities that are outside of their ancestral domain but have retained their IP identity as defined in Chapter IV of this Framework. Such subprojects are required to undergo meaningful consultations. Consultations should occur freely and voluntarily, without any external manipulation, interference, or coercion, for which the parties consulted have prior access to information on the intent and scope of the proposed project in a culturally appropriate manner, form, and language.
39. Local patterns of social organization, religious beliefs, and resource use should be taken into account in the consultation/participation process as well as in the design of subprojects. Existing tribal councils recognized by the NCIP/MIPA and the LGU shall be tapped as the liaison between the participating LGU and the IP/ICC community in all activities relating to PRDP Scale-up. The following should be observed in the conduct of free and prior informed consultation:
- i. Prior to consultation, the LGU must ensure that IP members have access to information about the project in general and the subproject in particular. Information campaign shall be conducted in local language or in language that is widely understood by the IP community. This could be done through the local tribal council and in culturally appropriate and effective manner. Aside from providing information about the objectives and scope of the proposed subproject, the information campaign should inform the IP community of their rights to participate in changing the subproject design if it violates any rights or is contrary to the traditions and cultural practices of their community; their rights to compensation if any of their properties are affected; and, their rights to partake of the benefits resulting from the subproject.

- ii. The IP community should be given adequate lead time of at least one full week between the conduct of information campaign and the actual consultation. The consultation shall be conducted early in the subproject preparation and shall, if necessary or if required by the IPs, allow for an iterative process to arrive at consensus.
  - iii. Direct dialogues and focused group discussions, if these are not in conflict with local customs and traditional ways should be the preferred consultation tool. Attendance by IP member to dialogues and meetings should however be strictly voluntary. The concerned RPCO shall ensure that the IPs are not coerced to attend meetings.
  - iv. IP communities shall be assured of access to a Grievance Redress Mechanism that is culturally appropriate utilizing and respecting existing systems of resolving conflict.
40. The entire consultation process shall be undertaken and documented by the concerned LGUs in coordination with NCIP/MIPA. The following documents should be submitted by the LGU to the PSO/RPCO as part of the subproject proposal package:
- Dated information campaign materials in local language or in language widely understood by the community;
  - Dated gender disaggregated attendance sheets of consultation dialogues and photographs of actual consultation sessions undertaken;
  - Dated minutes of meetings and matrix of clarifications, issues and concerns raised and how they were explained or addressed by the LGU.

**e. Indigenous Peoples Plan**

- i. An Indigenous Peoples Plan (refer to Annex 1: Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) Template for Subprojects) should be prepared in cases where Indigenous Peoples/Indigenous Cultural Communities (IP/ICCs) (i.e. an extant, fully functioning IP/ICC community, either organized or only loosely associated but practicing common customs and traditions different from the mainstream society) are present within the Subproject's influence area and when they are either:
  - (a) not the proponent of the subproject; or,
  - (b) only a minority of the proponents.
  - (c) Where IP/ICCs are the majority of the proponents of the Subproject, there is no need to prepare and submit an IPP but a proof that the IP/ICCs are themselves the proponent of the Subprojects must be provided such as but not limited to:
    - (d) Letter of solicitation/intent from the IP/ICCs to the Project Management; or
    - (e) IP/ICC Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) showing that the Subproject is included in the IP/ICC development plan; or
    - (f) A Provincial Commodity Investment Plan (PCIP) showing that the Subproject was proposed by the IP/ICC themselves during a planning which involved consultation with the IP/ICC.



- ii. For subprojects whose proposed sites overlap with any IP Ancestral Domain (AD), IPP based on the template provided (refer to Annex 1) shall be prepared only if:
  - (a) the Subproject is not included in (or not part of) the ADSDPP of the IP/ICC; and
  - (b) the NCIP/MIPA-administered FPIC/CP process (or requirements under the NCIP AO No. 3 series of 2012 otherwise known as “The Revised Guidelines on the Exercise of Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and Related Processes”) did not include an IP Development Plan, developed as a separate document or implied in the Memorandum of Agreement with the IP/ICC and the Project.

iii. Hence, accomplishing the IPP is required only in lieu of:

- (a) ADSDPP showing the Subproject is part of the IP/ICC plan for their AD;
- (b) Any IP Development Plan resulting from the FPIC/CP Process administered by NCIP/MIPA under the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA);
- (c) Memorandum of Agreement resulting from the NCIP/MIPA-administered FPIC/CP Process under IPRA, between the Project and the IP/ICC indicating any IP development plan, rents and other benefits or conditionalities in their favor as conditions for issuing the FPIC;
- (d) A Provincial Commodity Investment Plan (PCIP) showing that the Subproject was proposed by the IP/ICC themselves during a planning which involve consultation with the IP/ICC; and,
- (e) Letter or Petition from IP/ICC to PRDP signed by majority of the members of the community, soliciting or proposing for the said Subproject;
- (f) Other convincing proofs that the majority of the proponents are members of the IP/ICC.

41. It should be noted that the requirement to conduct meaningful consultations in accordance to this Framework must also be fulfilled. Proofs that consultations have been conducted (e.g. Dated Presentation Materials and Minutes of Meetings, Dated Photograph of the Consultation, etc.) must be submitted along with the IPP. The IPP must be signed by the IP/ICC community representatives/leaders.

**f. Subprojects where IPs are not the sole beneficiaries**

42. Where IPs are not the sole beneficiaries of a subproject, the subproject proponents will design and implement the project in a manner that provides affected (positively or negatively) Indigenous Peoples with equitable access to project benefits. The concerns or preferences of Indigenous Peoples will be addressed through meaningful consultation and project design. Documentation will summarize the consultation results and describe how Indigenous Peoples issues have been addressed in project design.

## **IX. Significant impacts to Cultural Heritage and Damage to Cultural Properties or Resources**

43. Cultural heritage includes both the tangible and intangible aspects. Tangible cultural heritage includes movable or immovable objects, sites, structures, groups of structures, and natural features and landscapes that have cultural significance. Intangible cultural heritage includes practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, and skills, as well as the associated instruments, objects, artifacts, and cultural spaces that communities and groups recognize as part of their cultural heritage.
44. Where a subproject may significantly impact cultural heritage that is material to the identity and/ or cultural, ceremonial, or spiritual aspects of the affected Indigenous Peoples communities' lives, priority will be given to the avoidance of such impacts. Where significant project impacts are unavoidable, the subproject proponent will obtain the FPIC of affected Indigenous Peoples.
45. The Project must ensure that none of its infrastructure or related projects will damage irreplaceable cultural property of the IP. Setting guidelines for all subprojects shall include strict avoidance of cultural resources particularly structures of cultural and/or historical significance and known archaeological sites. In case where infrastructure subprojects that already received broad IP community support or consent would pass through sites considered as cultural properties of the Indigenous Peoples, the Project must exert its best effort to relocate, realign or redesign the subprojects, so that these sites can be preserved and remain intact in situ.
46. PRDP will not fund subprojects that would displace damage, render inaccessible and/or render inoperable any structures that are deemed to have high cultural and historical significance by either the IPs or the mainstream population. In case of chance finds or discovery of archaeological artefacts during construction, all activities in the affected sites must be suspended while PRDP management reports the finds to and coordinates with the National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA) and the National Museum or the proper government authority as per RA 10066 or the National Cultural Heritage Act of 2009. All subproject construction sites should display a Chance Archaeological/Paleontological Finds Procedure for Subprojects.

## **X. Land Acquisition and Affected Assets**

47. If a member of the IP community will have either of his land, crops, homes, structures and/or other properties adversely affected by the proposed subproject, he/she must be informed of the his/her rights for just compensation from the LGU as well as his/her rights to partake of the benefits resulting from the subproject. The compensation for affected land, crops, homes and other assets of individual IP members will follow the Land Acquisition and Resettlement Policy Framework (LARPF) of the Project.

## **XI. Grievance Redress Mechanism**

The Project will continue to use the grievance redress mechanism under the PRDP including its system for documenting and monitoring concerns. This is further described in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). Specific to this IPPF, the Project will ensure that the GRM is culturally appropriate and accessible to Indigenous Peoples communities. As such, IP elders or Chieftains are part of the uptake points and GRM process for subprojects with Indigenous Peoples. Also, the GRM shall respect the cultural attributes of the IP communities and their existing traditional mechanisms for raising and resolving issues. It shall take into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms among IP communities. The Project shall use structures and mechanisms already existing in the IP community, such as but not limited to, their Indigenous Political Structure (IPS) which refers to the organizational and cultural leadership systems, institutions, relationships, patterns and processes for decision-making and participation, identified by ICCs/IPs such as, but not limited to, Council of Elders, Council of Timuays, Bodong Holders, or any other tribunal or body of similar nature.

## **XII. Institutional Arrangements and Capacity**

48. The Department of Agriculture (DA), hired-Project staff (NPCO, PSOs and RPCOs) as well as Local Government Units and enterprise proponent groups will be capacitated in order to deliver the required services and provide technical assistance to IP communities as needed. The Project shall ensure that project staff are culture sensitive, imbibe values that respect cultural differences and have high respect for Indigenous Peoples.
49. Partner Local Government Units are required to establish a Provincial/Municipal/City Project Management and Implementation Unit (P/M/CPMIU) to ensure that the LGU has organization, management, and resources for carrying out proposed subprojects. The structure of the P/M/CPMIU includes a counterpart SES Unit that shall prepare subproject proposals and monitor implementation according to the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) including compliance to the IPPF.
50. The NCIP is the government agency responsible for the formulation and implementation of policies, plans and programs to promote and protect the rights and well-being of the Indigenous Cultural Communities/Indigenous Peoples (ICCs/IPs). NCIP is a key partner of the Project as it is anticipated that subprojects will be located within ancestral domains with Indigenous Peoples as beneficiaries and/or as project affected stakeholders. Collaboration with the NCIP is needed for the conduct of Free Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) as stipulated in the RA 8371 or the IPRA law. The NCIP can also be a member of the Project's Regional Project Advisory Board (RPAB) if IP population is deemed significant in the subproject area.
51. The Project shall continuously coordinate and engage with the NCIP and MIPA to ensure that project staff are assisted when engaging with the IP communities by personnel who have cultural knowledge which would mean familiarization with the cultural characteristics, history, values, belief systems, and behaviors of the members of the IP community. When necessary or required depending on the IP community capacities and the nature and complexities of intervention, technical assistance will be provided to IP communities in the planning of priorities and in designing and implementing subprojects.

### **XIII. Supervision, Monitoring and Evaluation**

52. The P/M/CPMIU shall provide direct supervision and monitoring of the implementation of and compliance with this Framework. As part of this responsibility the P/M/CPMIU shall submit monthly to the RPCO compliance reports that include the SES monitoring checklist, status of grievances, status of IP Plan implementation among others. The monthly compliance reports serve as inputs to the semi-annual reports submitted by the SES Unit. Inputs to the semi-annual reports contain the following minimum information:
- Involvement of IPs in the preparation of PCIP (gender disaggregated data on the number of IPs involved/consulted in the preparation of PCIP);
  - List of subprojects located within an IP community and status of compliance with the requirements;
  - Gender disaggregated number of IP Beneficiaries per subproject
  - List of subprojects located within Ancestral Domain and status of compliance with the requirements; and,
  - Status of the implementation of the agreed measures on IP issues, including if any, IP Plan implementation within the project duration, modification of subproject design, site location or alignment, compensation and/or benefits sharing plan.
53. The report shall, together with the reports on the compliance on the other Environmental and Social Standards (ESS), shall be incorporated into one ESS Compliance Report to be submitted by P/M/CPMIU to the RPCO. The RPCO shall review the reports and conduct random spot inspections at PPMIUs/MPMIUs and/or subproject sites to validate and further evaluate compliance. It shall also consolidate all P/M/CPMIU reports and its findings and submit the same to the PSO, which shall in turn consolidate all reports from various RPCOs and submit a copy to NPCO and to the World Bank. The NPCO shall prepare semi-annual reports.

### **XIV. Costs and Financing**

54. Costs to conduct workshop consultations with IPs during the VCA and PCIP formulation are included in the budget of the I-PLAN Component. The cost of subproject validation activities; processing and review of subproject compliance to this Framework; monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of agreed measures resulting from the application of this Framework and needed capacity building activities to comply with this Framework are primarily lodged in the budget of the I-SUPPORT component specifically under the Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES) Unit. However, in cases where there are joint monitoring activities, cost is lodged in SES Unit budget and I-BUILD or I-REAP component budgets depending on the subproject.
55. However, the cost to be incurred in complying with this Framework (e.g. ROW, Land Acquisition and Resettlement Cost; FPIC process; regular monitoring activities) shall be borne by the subproject proponent. Cost mitigation measures that are part of the subproject design and Program of Works should be funded as part of the subproject financing.

**Annex 1: Estimated Population of Indigenous Peoples in the Philippines (2007)**

**ESTIMATED POPULATION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES  
ETHNIC GROUP, BY PROVINCE AND REGION  
Source: NCIP Central Office**

Note:

- Regional Estimated Population – computed based on the Population Growth Rate (2007) by Region reported by the National Statistics Office (NSO)
- IP Ethnic Group Population by Province - computed using ratio and proportion method

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
<b>CAR = 1,470,977</b>					
	<b>Abra</b>			<b>229,543</b>	
		Itneg/Tingguian	124,416		
		Adasen	11,174		
		Banac	7,070		
		Masadiit	13,440		
		Maeng	39,591		
		Mabaca	2,607		
		Balatoc	1,627		
		Binongan	1,128		
		Gubang	1,201		
		Inlaud	24,290		
		Danao	123		
		Aeta	143		
		Applai	279		
		Bago	559		
		Bontok	304		
		Gaddang	148		
		Ibaloi	126		
		Ibanag	168		
		Igorot	277		
		Ifugao	318		
	Itawes	222			
	Kalinga	220			
	Kankanaey	66			
	Yogad	46			
	<b>Benguet</b>				<b>634,777</b>
		Aeta	32		
		Applai/Bontok	153,158		
		Bago	1,466		
		Balangao	405		
		Baliwen	163		
		Barlig	182		
		Gaddang	100		
Ibaloi	205,517				

		Ibanag	486	
		Ifugao	9,397	
		Ikalahan/Kalanguya	25,874	
		Ilongot/Bugkalot	169	
		Isinai	101	
		Isneg/Apayao	232	
		Itneg/Tinguian	357	
		Kalinga	4,353	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
CAR		Kankanaey	229,524		
		Karao	3,137		
		Mabaka	22		
		Maeng	28		
		Zambal	74		
		<b>Kalinga-Apayao</b>			<b>278,333</b>
			Isneg/Apayao	72,652	
			Ifugao	372	
			Bontok	8,401	
			Tinguian/Itneg	2,376	
			Ibanag	3,403	
			Bago	7,353	
			Aeta	750	
			Ibaloi	1,140	
			Kalinga	162,255	
			Kankanaey	1,951	
			Malaueg	2,757	
			Itawes	2,924	
			Gaddang	2,500	
			Applai	8,955	
			Balangao	460	
			Zambal	19	
			Yogad	13	
		Isinai	47		
		Ivatan	5		
		<b>Mt. Province</b>			<b>152,832</b>
			Balangao	18,868	
			Bontok	38,812	
			Applai	37,088	
			Kalinga	175	
			Kankanaey	48,601	
			Ifugao	518	
			Ibaloi	218	
		Bago	1,775		
		Gaddang	7		
		Itneg/Tinguian	54		
		Isneg/Apayao	14		
		Barlig	545		
		Aeta	7		

		Ikaluna	8	
		Kalanguya	5	
		Baliwen	6,137	
	<b>Ifugao</b>			<b>175,492</b>
	Ifugao	119,497		
	Hanglulo	6		
	Tuwali	20,015		
	Bago	2,309		

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION	
			IP Group	Province
CAR		Balangao	18	
		Bontok	592	
		Gaddang	943	
		Ibaloi	204	
		Ibanag	850	
		Isneg/Apayao	108	
		Itawes	481	
		Itneg/Tinguian	120	
		Kalanguya	29,985	
		Kalinga	48	
		Kankanaey	126	
		Yogad	190	

**Region I =1,206,798**

	<b>Ilocos Norte</b>			<b>314,147</b>	
		Bago	219,213		
		Isneg/Apayao	52,571		
		Kankanaey	8,095		
		Kalinga	2,892		
		Tinguian/Itneg	31,376		
	<b>Ilocos Sur</b>				<b>335,091</b>
		Bontok	212		
		Bago	197,393		
		Ibaloi	290		
		Ifugao	441		
		Ibanag	1,823		
		Kankanaey	110,787		
		Applai	5,020		
		Kalinga	242		
	Tinguian/Itneg	18,883			
	<b>Pangasinan</b>				<b>75,008</b>
		Agta/Aeta	197		
		Bontok	326		
		Bago	58,834		
		Gaddang	525		
Ibaloi		3,810			
Isneg/Apayao		538			
Ifugao		304			
Ibanag	642				

		Itawes	250	
		Kankanaey	6,924	
		Applai	1,145	
		Kalinga	479	
		Tinguian/Itneg	697	
		Zambal	337	
	<b>La Union</b>			<b>482,552</b>
		Bontok	1,242	
		Bago	336,552	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION	
			IP Group	Province
Region I		Gaddang	223	
		Ibaloi	7,111	
		Isneg/Apayao	921	
		Ifugao	458	
		Ibanag	524	
		Itawes	585	
		Ilongot/Bugkalot	974	
		Isinai	151	
		Ivatan	615	
		Kankanaey	129,203	
		Applai	974	
		Kalanguya	488	
		Kalinga	758	
		Tinguian/Itneg	1,368	
	Zambal	405		
<b>Region II =1,030,179</b>				
	<b>Cagayan</b>			<b>198,246</b>
		Agta/Aeta	1,818	
		Bontok	499	
		Bago	415	
		Isneg	1,084	
		Ifugao	840	
		Ibanag	78,073	
		Itawes	102,329	
		Kankanaey	941	
		Kalinga	401	
		Malauog	10,989	
		Tinguian/Itneg	677	
		Zambal	180	
	<b>Isabela</b>			<b>623,058</b>
		Bontok	172	
		Bago	559	
		Dumagat	2,134	
		Gaddang	90,880	
		Ibaloi	813	
		Ifugao	5,365	
		Ibanag	432,202	
		Itawes	3,665	



		Ilongot/Bugkalot	246	
		Kankanaey	2,194	
		Applai	1,466	
		Kalinga	6,378	
		Kalanguya	382	
		Tinguian/Itneg	1,312	
		Palaranum	11,046	
		Yogad	64,244	
	<b>Batanes</b>			<b>14,393</b>
		Ivatan	14,393	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
Region II	Nueva Vizcaya			<b>169,686</b>	
		Bontok	613		
		Gaddang	35,411		
		Ibaloi	29,758		
		Ifugao	46,419		
		Ibanag	20,093		
		Ilongot/Bugkalot	7,807		
		Isinai	10,179		
		Kankanaey	6,581		
		Kalinga	152		
		Kalanguya	9,874		
		Ikalahan	2,517		
		Tinguian/Itneg	173		
		Yogad	109		
	Quirino				<b>24,796</b>
		Agta/Aeta	39		
		Bontoc	112		
		Bago	3,066		
		Gaddang	1,851		
		Ibaloi	1,179		
		Ifugao	10,053		
		Ibanag	1,619		
		Itawes	634		
		Ilongot/Bugkalot	445		
		Isinai	637		
		Kankanaey	3,283		
		Applai	582		
		Kalinga	331		
Tinguian	638				
Yogad	327				
<b>Region III = 236,487</b>					
	Nueva Ecija			<b>67,112</b>	
		Bontok	117		
		Bago	3,455		
		Dumagat	46,720		
		Ibaloi	3,362		
	Ifugao	966			

		Ilongot/Bugkalot	336	
		Ibanag	191	
		Iwak	669	
		Kankanaey	3,004	
		Applai	220	
		Kalinga	121	
		Kalanguya	7,362	
		Ikalahan	163	
		Tinguian/Itneg	274	
		Maeng	152	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION	
			IP Group	Province
Region III	Bataan			<b>12,286</b>
		Agta/Aeta	12,286	
	Tarlac			<b>38,877</b>
		Agta/Aeta	9,898	
		Aberling/Aborlin	21,780	
		Baluga	3,675	
		Isneg/Apayao	69	
		Kankanaey	51	
		Zambal	3,404	
	Pampanga			<b>10,055</b>
		Aeta/Agta	10,055	
	Zambales			<b>66,979</b>
		Aeta/Agta	57,784	
		Abelling/Aborlin	8,183	
		Bontok	279	
		Ibaloi	187	
		Ifugao	95	
		Ibanag	27	
		Kankanaey	99	
		Kalinga	204	
Tingguin/Itneg		121		
Bulacan			<b>38,513</b>	
	Dumagat	38,513		
Aurora			<b>2,665</b>	
	Baluga	577		
	Dumagat	2,088		
<b>Region IV = 936,745</b>				
	Rizal			<b>29,936</b>
		Dumagat	23,453	
		Aeta (Remontado)	6,483	
	Quezon			<b>103,814</b>
		Dumagat	7,515	
		Aeta (Remontado)	27,183	
		Tagbanuas	69,029	
		Taut Bato	87	
	Palawan			<b>257,807</b>
		Batak	18,100	

		Coyunen	59,303	
		Palawano	11,188	
		Tagbanuas	169,005	
		Tao't Bato	211	
	<b>Oriental Mindoro</b>			<b>329,306</b>
		Alangan (Mangyan)	66,478	
		Batangan (Mangyan)	68,457	
		Buhid/Buid (Mangyan)	2,154	
		Hanunuo (Mangyan)	92,382	
		Iraya (Mangyan)	25,672	
		Tadyawan (Mangyan)	74,163	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
Region IV	Occidental Mindoro			<b>185,235</b>	
		Alangan (Mangyan)	37,394		
		Batangan (Mangyan)	38,508		
		Buhid/Buid (Mangyan)	1,211		
		Hanunuo (Mangyan)	51,965		
		Iraya (Mangyan)	14,441		
		Tadyawan (Mangyan)	41,716		
	Romblon				<b>30,647</b>
		Ati	840		
		Mangyan	2,706		
Bantoanon		23,701			
<b>Region V = 213,311</b>					
	Camarines Sur			<b>65,971</b>	
		Aeta-Abiyan	14,513		
		Agta	11,215		
		Mayon	15,833		
		Kabihug	13,854		
		Pullon	10,556		
	Camarines Norte				<b>31,364</b>
		Aeta-Abiyan	6,273		
		Isarog	19,132		
	Sorsogon				<b>61,152</b>
		Cimaron	61,152		
	Albay				<b>31,234</b>
		Itom	31,234		
	Masbate				<b>16,644</b>
		Pullon	16,644		
Catanduanes				<b>6,946</b>	
	Agta/Tabangnon	6,946			
<b>Region VI = 168,145</b>					
	Aklan			<b>4,232</b>	
		Sulod	4,232		
	Antique				<b>41,106</b>
Ati		41,106			

	<b>Iloilo</b>			<b>77,384</b>
		Ati	53,673	
		Sulod	22,394	
		Bukidnon	1,317	
	<b>Negros Occidental</b>			<b>39,163</b>
		Ati	36,617	
		Bukidnon	1,273	
	Magahat/Corolanos	1,273		

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
	<b>Guimaras</b>			<b>6,260</b>	
		Ati	3,150		
		Bukidnon	3,110		
<b>Region VII = 35,767</b>					
	<b>Bohol</b>			<b>4,174</b>	
		Eskaya	4,174		
	<b>Cebu</b>			<b>7,053</b>	
		Badjao	7,053		
	<b>Negros Oriental</b>			<b>24,540</b>	
		Ati/Ata/Magahat	15,895		
Bukidnon		8,645			
<b>Region IX = 1,203,598</b>					
	<b>Zamboanga del Norte</b>			<b>506,674</b>	
		Sama (Badjao)	31,028		
		Subanen	438,672		
		Sama (Samal)	36,974		
	<b>Zamboanga City</b>			<b>123,616</b>	
		Sama (Badjao)	441		
		Sama (Samal)	112,837		
		Kalibugan	2,672		
		Subanen	4,135		
		Yakan	3,530		
	<b>Zamboanga del Sur</b>			<b>517,594</b>	
		Sama (Badjao)	1,510		
		Subanen	352,634		
		Kalibugan	160,202		
	<b>Pagadian City</b>			<b>32,874</b>	
		Sama (Samal)	2,805		
		Subanen	30,069		
	<b>Dapitan</b>			<b>22,841</b>	
		Subanen	22,841		
	<b>Region X = 1,802,266</b>				
		<b>Bukidnon</b>			<b>984,845</b>
Higaonon			98,485		
Banwaon			88,637		
Matigsalog			275,756		
Talaandig			246,211		

		Umayamnon	78,787	
		Bukidnon	196,969	
	<b>Camiguin</b>			<b>76,993</b>
		Camiguin	76,993	

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION	
			IP Group	Province
Region X	Misamis Occidental			<b>338,351</b>
		Higaonon	43,986	
		Tigwayanon	20,301	
		Subanen	274,064	
	Misamis Oriental			<b>324,547</b>
		Higaonon	103,723	
		Bukidnon	220,824	
	Lanao del Norte			<b>30,498</b>
		Ilianen	17,397	
		Higaonon	9,077	
	Iligan City			<b>47,032</b>
		Higaonon	37,216	
		Ilianen	4,716	
		Subanen	4,573	
Igorot		527		

**Region XI = 2,289,268**

	Davao del Norte			<b>583,673</b>
		Langilad/Talaingod	215,959	
		Mansaka	215,959	
		Matigsalog	87,551	
		Manguangan	5,837	
		Dibabaon	58,367	
	Davao del Sur			<b>1,154,153</b>
		Matigsalog	123,449	
		B'laan	467,744	
		Tagakaolo	212,285	
		Bagobo	131,557	
		Kalagan	116,815	
		Manobo	102,303	
	Davao Oriental			<b>181,546</b>
		Mandaya	181,546	
	Davao City			<b>369,896</b>
		Bagobo-Tagabawa	131,621	
		Bagobo-Guiangan/Clata	149,701	
		Manobo-Ubo	34,035	
Ata-Matigsalog		54,539		

**Region XII = 1,856,300**

	North Cotabato			<b>549,977</b>
		Bagobo	66,824	
		B'laan	177,300	
		Ilianen	22,429	

	Manobo	142,958
	Teduray	140,466

REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
Region XII	Sultan Kudarat			<b>443,616</b>	
		Bagobo	40,957		
		B'laan	108,667		
		Ilianen	13,746		
		Manobo	87,620		
		Teduray	192,626		
	Cotabato City				<b>20,248</b>
		Teduray/Tiruray	20,108		
		Aromanen	89		
		Subanen	19		
		Igorot	32		
	Saranggani				<b>164,469</b>
		B'laan	87,991		
		T'boli	52,630		
		Manobo	11,512		
		Tagakaolo	12,336		
	South Cotabato				<b>677,990</b>
		Bagobo	78,016		
		Kalagan	69,276		
		Manobo Blit	39,702		
		T'boli	392,495		
		Tasaday	155		
		Ubo	34,578		
Mangguangan		3,100			
	Manobo	60,668			
<b>Region XIII = 1,004,750</b>					
	Agusan del Norte			<b>260,384</b>	
		Mamanua	15,623		
		Manobo	106,758		
		Tigwayanon	20,830		
		Higaonon	49,472		
		Dibabaon	26,039		
		Umayamnon	41,662		
	Agusan del Sur				<b>260,511</b>
		Mamanua	10,420		
		Manobo	59,918		
		Tigwayanon	13,025		
		Higaonon	28,656		
		Dibabaon	13,025		
		Umayamnon	23,447		
		Mandaya	112,020		
	Surigao del Norte				<b>288,670</b>
		Mamanua	14,434		
Manobo		92,374			

		Mandaya	181,862		
REGION	PROVINCE	IP Group	POPULATION		
			IP Group	Province	
Region XIII	Surigao del Sur			<b>195,185</b>	
		Mandaya	195,185		
<b>ARMM = 730,054</b>					
	<b>Maguindanao</b>			<b>300,476</b>	
		Teduray	300,476		
	<b>Sulu</b>				<b>136,333</b>
		Kalagan/Kalibugan/ Samal	64,271		
		Badjao	72,062		
	<b>Tawi-Tawi</b>				<b>63,621</b>
		Kalagan/Kalibugan/ Samal	29,992		
		Badjao	33,629		
	<b>Basilan</b>				<b>229,624</b>
		Sama (Badjao)	41,815		
		Kalibugan	560		
		Subanen	234		
		Yakan	187,015		
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION</b>			<b>14,184,645</b>		

## Annex 2: Indigenous People Plan (IPP) Template for Subprojects

Department of Agriculture  
Philippine Rural Development Project Scale-up

### Indigenous People Plan (IPP) Template for Subprojects

*Before filling out this Template please read the following:*

1. *This IPP template shall be used in cases where Indigenous Cultural Communities/Indigenous Peoples (IP/ICCs) (i.e. an extant, fully functioning IP/ICC community, either organized or only loosely associated but practicing common customs and traditions different from the mainstream society) are present within the Subproject's influence area **and** when they are **either**: (a) not the proponent of the subproject; **or**, (b) only a minority of the proponents.*
2. *Where IP/ICCs are the majority of the proponents of the Subproject, there is no need of this IPP but a proof that the IP/ICCs are themselves the proponent of the Subprojects must be provided such as but not limited to: (a) Letter of solicitation/intent from the IP/ICC communities to the Project Management; **or** (b) IP/ICC Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP) showing that the Subproject is included in the IP/ICC development plan; **or** (c) a Provincial Commodity Investment Plan (PCIP) showing that the Subproject was proposed by the IP/ICC themselves during a planning which involve consultation with the IP/ICC.*
3. *For subprojects whose proposed sites overlap with any IP Ancestral Domain (AD), this template shall be prepared only if: (a) the Subproject is not included (or not part of) the ADSDPP of the IP/ICC; **and** (b) the NCIP/MIPA-administered FPIC/CP process (or requirements under the NCIP AO No. 3 series of 2012 otherwise known as "The Revised Guidelines on the Exercise of Free and Prior Informed Consent (FPIC) and Related Processes") did not include an IP Development Plan, developed as a separate document or implied in the Memorandum of Agreement with the IP/ICC and the Project.*
4. *Hence, filling out of this IPP Template is required only in lieu of:*
  - (a) *ADSDPP showing the Subproject is part of the IP/ICC plan for their AD;*
  - (b) *Any IP Development Plan resulting from the FPIC/CP Process administered by NCIP/MIPA under the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA);*
  - (c) *Memorandum of Agreement resulting from the NCIP/MIPA-administered FPIC/CP Process under IPRA, between the Project and the IP/ICC indicating any IP development plan, rents and other benefits or conditionalities in their favor as conditions for issuing the FPIC;*
  - (d) *A Provincial Commodity Investment Plan (PCIP) showing that the Subproject was proposed by the IP/ICC themselves during a planning which involve consultation with the IP/ICC; and,*
  - (e) *Letter or Petition from IP/ICC to PRDP signed by majority of the members of the community, soliciting or proposing for the said Subproject;*
  - (f) *Other convincing proofs that the majority of the proponents are members of the IP/ICC.*
4. *It should be noted that the requirement to conduct meaningful consultations in accordance to this Framework must also be fulfilled. Proofs that consultations have been conducted (e.g. Dated Presentation Materials and Minutes of Meetings, Dated Photograph of the Consultation, etc.) must be submitted along with this IPP. The IPP must be signed by the IP/ICC community representatives/leaders.*
6. *Identified activities in the IP Plan should be implemented within the project duration.*



**I. Background Information**

*[These information shall be taken from the Subproject Feasibility Study/Business Plan and the PCIP, particularly the Section on Social Assessment. It is understood that the Social Assessment conducted under the FS had involved a Free and Prior Informed Consultation with the IP/ICC and proofs that these consultations had occurred shall be provided (see note #5 above) as part of the SP proposal package.]*

Name of Subproject: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of Subproject (I-Build/I-REAP): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Estimated Total Subproject Cost: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name/s of the IP Group or Groups: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of Municipality: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Names of Barangays/Villages: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Population (Number of Families): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Distance of the Community/Village from the Subproject Site: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Main livelihood sources of the Community: \_\_\_\_\_

Benefits accruing to the Community from the proposed Subproject (describe/enumerate if there are any):

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Adverse Impact of the Subproject to the Community or Members of the Community (describe if there are any):

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Expressed Development Needs of the IP/ICC that are related to the proposed Subproject (describe, if there are any and indicate their respective priorities):

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Identification and Prioritization of Additional SP Component/Activity for the IP Community**

**A. Identification of possible additional SP activities**

*[Choose at least three priority development needs by the IP/ICC from Section I. For each development need, identify any activity/ies that might be funded as part of the Subproject. Fill in the rest of the table. Note that more than one activity may be identified for each development need.]*

Expressed development need of the IP/ICC (from Background Info)	Additional Subproject Component/Activity that may address this development need	Priority Rank to the IP/ICC (1 is top priority)	How is this Component/Activity related to the Subproject’s benefits or impacts? (Check one)
			<input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits and mitigates impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits to the IP/ICC

			<input type="checkbox"/> mitigates SP's impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> not related to the SP
			<input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits and mitigates impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> mitigates SP's impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> not related to the SP
			<input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits and mitigates impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> mitigates SP's impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> not related to the SP
			<input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits and mitigates impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> enhances SP benefits to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> mitigates SP's impacts to the IP/ICC <input type="checkbox"/> not related to the SP

**B. Ranking of Possible Additional Activities**

*[Assign scores to each of the possible additional activities as follows]*

Additional Subproject Component/Activity that may address this development need	Priority to the IP/ICC Score = (total number of activities considered minus (-) priority rank of that activity)	Relations to the SP Score = (3 for activities that mitigate impact and at the same time also enhance benefits; 2 for activities that enhance benefits; 2 for activities that mitigate impacts; and, 1-not related to the SP)	Total Score

**III. Agreed Additional SP Activities/Components to be Funded**

**A. Determining Priorities and Costs**

[Based on II-B, list down activities the from highest to lowest scores and indicate their cost estimates].

Score (highest to lowest)	Additional Subproject Component/Activity that may address this development need	Estimated Cost (C)	Cost borne by the IP/ICC (D)	Cost to LGU and other sources (C-D)	Cumulative Cost to LGU and other sources

**B. Final List of Additional Activities to be funded**

The following are the Additional Activities to be Funded under the Subproject [Using the above, list down the first set of activities whose total cost to PRDP does not exceed 20% of the original SP cost (refer to the Section I for the estimated original cost of the SP. Fill in the additional):

Additional Component/Activity to be Funded	Cost to LGU and other sources	IP/ICC contribution if any	How would this additional activity/component be implemented? (Through a modification of SP design; Through additional item in the Project of Works of SP; Through a separate construction/service contract by contractor; Through supply of materials and separate service contract by IP/ICC themselves; Through a separate I-REAP subproject for the IP/ICC; others please specify.)
Total Cost ≤20% of original SP cost			

**IV. Signatories**

The preparation of this IPP was facilitated by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
P/M/CPMIU Head

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

In behalf of the IP/ICC Community, we hereby concur with the above plan and certify that the final list of additional activities was arrived at by consensus among the members of the IP/ICC whose signatures and thumb marks are hereby attached:

\_\_\_\_\_  
IP/ICC Leader/Representative      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
NCIP/MIPA or LGU Representative      Date

*(Please attach sheets containing the signatures of the IP/ICC members present during the final consultation. The sheet containing the signature must also have a heading containing the title of the Subproject, the Name of the IP/ICC Group, the Date and the Location of the final consultation conducted.)*