

## **Annex 7**

### **Summary of consultations and stakeholder engagement plan**

#### **“Adapting Philippine Agriculture to Climate Change”**

# 1 Table of Contents

|          |  |                  |
|----------|--|------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b><i>Introduction.....</i></b>  | <b><i>4</i></b>  |
| <b>2</b> | <b><i>Stakeholder consultation process.....</i></b>                          | <b><i>4</i></b>  |
| 2.1      | Stakeholder Identification .....   | 5                |
| 2.2      | Request from Philippine government & Project Ideas Generation.....           | 6                |
| 2.3      | Proposal Preparation Activities.....   | 9                |
| 2.4      | Main Project Appraisal Missions & Field Consultations.....                   | 11               |
| 2.5      | Writing and Revision Phases .....  | 16               |
| 2.6      | High Level Briefings and Institutional Coordination .....                    | 16               |
| 2.7      | Formal Transmittal to and Review Process by Philippines Government.....      | 17               |
| 2.8      | FAO Submission to the Green Climate Fund Secretariat.....                    | 18               |
| <b>3</b> | <b><i>Stakeholder Engagement Plan During Project Implementation.....</i></b> | <b><i>21</i></b> |
| 3.1      | Planning and basic project processes .....                                   | 21               |
| 3.2      | National-level consultations. ....   | 21               |
| 3.3      | Provincial-level consultations .....   | 22               |
| 3.4      | Monitoring.....  | 23               |
| 3.5      | Disclosure .....   | 23               |
| 3.6      | Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM).....                                       | 24               |

## List of Acronyms

|         |  |
|---------|--|
| AE      | Accredited Entity  |
| AWPB    | Annual Work Plan and Budget  |
| BH      | Budget Holder  |
| CCC     | Climate Change Commission  |
| CRA     | Climate Resilient Agriculture  |
| CSO     | Civil Society Organization(s)  |
| DA      | Philippine Department of Agriculture   |
| DA-SWCO | Department of Agriculture Systems Wide Climate Change Office                 |
| EE      | Executing Entity   |
| ESA     | Environmental and Social Analysis  |
| ESMF    | Environmental and Social Management Framework                                |
| ESMP    | Environmental and Social Management Plan                                     |
| ESS     | Environmental and Social Safeguards  |
| FAO     | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations                      |
| GCF     | Green Climate Fund   |
| GEF     | Global Environment Facility  |
| IP      | Indigenous Peoples   |
| IPCC    | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change                                    |
| LACRIS  | Local Agromet and Climate Resilience Information Services Centres            |
| M&E     | Monitoring and Evaluation  |
| MIADP   | Mindanao Inclusive Agriculture Development Project                           |
| MIS     | Management Information Systems   |
| NAP     | National Adaptation Plan   |
| NAFMIP  | National Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization and Industrialization Plan  |
| NCCAP   | National Climate Change Action Plan  |
| NEDA    | National Economic Development Authority                                      |
| NDA     | National Designated Authority  |
| NDC     | Nationally Determined Contribution   |
| NGO     | Non-governmental Organization  |
| OECD    | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development                        |
| PAFES   | Provincial-led Agriculture and Fisheries Extension System                    |
| PAGASA  | Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration |
| PCIP    | Provincial Commodity Investment Plan   |
| PDP     | Philippine Development Plan  |
| PMO     | Project Management Office  |
| PSA     | Philippines Statistics Authority   |
| PRDP    | Philippines Rural Development Project  |
| SAAD    | Special Areas for Agriculture Development                                    |
| UN      | United Nations   |
| UNFCCC  | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change                        |

# 1 Introduction

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity*

- 1 The Philippines is one of the world's most vulnerable countries to the impacts of climate change. Ranked 4th on the Long-Term Climate Risk Index (1999 to 2018), the country is continuously exposed to often catastrophic extreme weather events, such as devastating tropical cyclones. Compared with the other, mostly smaller countries in the top ten index, the Philippines is, on average, exposed to 33 percent more climate-related disasters due to its geographical location. Most areas of the country and over 70 percent of the population are at risk and vulnerable to climate disasters (GFDRR, 2012). High levels of disaster risk are associated with more intense tropical storms, including heavy rainfall and floods, as well as El Niño-related droughts, which have a negative impact on the country's complex agroecological zones. Consequently, rural and agricultural systems are becoming increasingly exposed to climate risks as well as ensuing losses and damages associated with extreme weather events.
- 2 It is recognized that the involvement of all actors engaged in activities is necessary for the preparation of proposals that are effective on the fight against climate change and its impacts. For that reason, the BRCCJ was prepared with the involvement of stakeholders, through different consultation processes undertaken in the country. Stakeholders include:
  - Key decision makers and institutional "leaders"
  - Parties who are affected by the decision or the action
  - Parties responsible for the implementation
  - Parties who might oppose the decision or action; and
  - Parties who might facilitate or accelerate the process or its outcomes; experts.
- 3 Dialoguing with stakeholders and capturing their visions, concerns and priorities allowed the Project to consider a broader range of perspectives, address a range of issues, and develop proposals which are better aligned with country priorities and the reality of people at the local level.
- 4 This document summarizes consultations taken with stakeholders that have been engaged during the design and formulation of this proposal, and presents a plan to ensure that all project stakeholders are identified and will properly and effectively participate in Project execution.
- 5 The summary of consultations is available in Appendix 1.
- 6 The Documentation of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and IP support organizations are available in Appendix 2

## 2 Stakeholder consultation process

## 2.1 Stakeholder Identification

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity.*

- 7 Stakeholders were initially identified through discussions between the Nationally Designated Authority (NDA) and FAO, during the design of the preliminary project concept. These discussions identified the ministries, departments, and line agencies that would likely be involved.
- 8 This project was also subject to a broad consultation process from its inception, from the top management levels to local communities. Among the tasks of the consultation process was the mapping of entities and other stakeholders for project implementation, including management and technical leadership. The figure below is a diagram showing the project's organizational structure, which includes all identified project stakeholders.
- 9 Stakeholder were also identified for the implementation of project components. Below is a table outlining the key stakeholders and their roles/responsibilities within the project.

**Table 1:** Key stakeholders and roles/responsibilities.

| KEY STAKEHOLDERS                                  | ROLES/RESPONSIBILITIES   |
|---|--|
| Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) | Accredited Entity (AE) and Executing Entity (EE)   |
| FAO Philippines                                   | Project Budget Holder (BH) and responsible for project delivery and reporting of activities and sub-activities under FAO as EE responsibility.   |
| Climate Change Commission (CCC)                   | National Designated Authority (NDA)  |
| Department of Agriculture                         | Hosts Project Management Office (PMO) and Regional Project Offices (RPO)<br><u>Component One:</u><br>- Will provide leadership in reviews and workshops with stakeholders at different levels, with regards to the direction and planning, and implementation and M&E, of the project.<br>- Together with PAGASA, see below, will lead on the technical working group (TWG) on agromet data generation and sharing aspects.<br><u>Component Two:</u><br>- Will provide guidance and regional leadership with regards to planning, and financing strategies for CRA at the LGU level, and building local capacity for extension and dissemination.<br>- Will provide regional leadership and support with regards to CRA enterprise/AMIA Village establishment, their investment planning and implementation.<br><u>Component Three:</u><br>- Will lead the CRA awareness raising and working with Government agencies and LGUs for mainstreaming CRA |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | - Will provide guidance to LGUs on implementation and rollout, and M&E of CRA enterprise development, support extension and intervention support to farmers.  |
| Philippine Atmospheric Geophysical and Atmospheric Services Administration (PAGASA) | <p><u>Component One:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will correlate with the DADA on the technical working group on aggregate data generation and sharing.</li> <li>- Will be responsible for the upgrading and operational maintenance of weather stations.</li> <li>- Will provide capacity building for the processing and utilisation of weather and climate data.</li> <li>- Will support the establishment and implementation of CIS Platform and CIS Centres.</li> </ul> <p><u>Component Two:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will support the roll out of localized CIS in support of CRA enterprise development</li> </ul> <p><u>Component Three:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will support the CRA awareness raising and integration of CIS in mainstreaming CRA</li> </ul> |
| Local communities   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will engage in reviews, planning at regional and local level, and in design of weather advisory products, as well as capacity building.</li> <li>- Will be primary beneficiaries and so play a key role in all aspects of monitoring and providing feedback on project implementation at local level.</li> </ul>   |
| Private Sector & Service Providers  | - At national, regional and local level they will be involved in reviews and capacity building to make the best use of weather and CRA  |
| NGOs, Civil Society Organizations   | - At national, regional and local level they will be involved in reviews and capacity building to make the best use of weather and CRA. They will also provide support and bridge to ensure participatory process, and strengthening of community institutions.   |
| TA and specialists  | Will be responsible for deliver and monitor high quality technical inputs and process under the project, and ensure participatory processes – and ensure accessibility and utility to all stakeholders.   |

## 2.2 Request from Philippine government & Project Ideas Generation

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity.*

- 10** On 14 October 2016, the Philippines' Department of Agriculture (DA) through its Systems Wide Climate Change Office (DA-SWCCO) officially requested FAO through its Representation Office for technical assistance in packaging a full proposal for GCF access aligned with the Department's Adaptation and Mitigation Agriculture – Project 2 (AMIA-2) program. Initial discussions with DA-SWCCO on possible projects to be proposed.
- 11** On 2 December 2016, the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) officially conveyed their intention to work with FAO to pursue the project then entitled "Climate Change Adaptation in Vulnerable Agrarian Reform Communities".

- 12** In response to the requests, FAO organized an ideas workshop for “Developing Practical Integrated and Transformative Actions to Address Climate Change in the Agriculture Sectors” on 14 December 2016 at Dolce Latte, Quezon City. The workshop aimed to raise the awareness of participants to the GCF mechanisms and priorities, as well as to generate and discuss project ideas for GCF. A total of 21 participants from the DA, DAR, National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), Philippine Crop Insurance Corporation (PCIC), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) attended.
- 13** The workshop yielded several proposal ideas from the agencies including: (i) Integrated Solutions Approach to Promote Climate Resilience among Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs), (ii) Implementation of Enhanced Climate Field School (e-CFS), (iii) Implementation of Innovative Irrigation Systems, (iv) Development of a Community-Based Crop Insurance with Islamic Financing Features in ARMM and other qualified communities, (v) Sustainable Philippine Agricultural Insurance Program for Poor Farmers and Fisherfolk Vulnerable to the Negative Effects of Climate Change, (vi) Mangrove Reforestation as a Climate Adaptation and Mitigation Strategy for Coastal Areas in the Philippines, and (vii) Agroforestry Development as a CCA and CCM strategy in the Philippines’ Uplands. Further, the participants agreed to examine the template for the GCF and provide the information needed based on the guidelines.
- 14** On 14 December 2016, FAO Philippine Representative met with Commissioner of the Climate Change Commission (CCC) for a comprehensive briefing of the Commission’s priorities and importance attached to agriculture and land sectors in the Philippines’ response to climate change.
- 15** In a letter dated 6 January 2017, FAO formally communicated its commitment to facilitate GCF Access for Philippine Agriculture sectors to CCC. In this communication, FAO offered various technical areas of support as well as an update on the GCF proposal development process initiated.
- 16** Building from the results of the December 2016 meeting, another workshop was held on 16 January 2017 at Dolcelatte, Quezon City to validate the project ideas generated and identify further ideas that are not captured in the previous workshop. The workshop also aimed at gathering information to ensure that project ideas are aligned with the GCF investment criteria, the National Framework Strategy on Climate Change (NFSCC), the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), and the country’s Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDC). A total of 25 representatives from the DA, Bureau of Soils and Water Management (BSWM), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), DAR, PCIC, NEDA, UNDP, University of the Philippines Los Baños (UPLB), UPLB Foundation, Inc (UPLBFI), and the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT) participated.
- 17** In summary, four proposal ideas were identified, namely, (1) Building Climate-Resilient Agrarian Communities & Institutions; (2) Climate Resilient Integrated Development Project in ARC Clusters; (3) Small-scale Renewable Energy Sources-Irrigation Systems in Climate Change Affected Areas; and (4) Upscaling AMIA.
- 18** Following the workshops, technical consultations with involved agencies were conducted by FAO to trim down project objectives and to identify desired long-term goals.
- 19** By mid-2017, two early draft concept notes from DA and DAR had been prepared with FAO support, both with same aim of increasing farmer capacity to use climate information systems (CIS) to increase their resilience to climate change and disasters. Both concepts hinged on using CIS with farmer level climate field schools for testing and adoption of adaptation options, enabling investments by farmers in such options, helping to increase coverage of and capacity for risk transfer, and enhancing capacity of DA, local government units (LGUs) and other agencies to implement support to farmer and fishers.

Preliminary positive FAO reviews and informal GCF feedback indicated strong core concepts in these notes.

- 20** On 17 April 2017, DA officially informed DENR, then National Designated Authority (NDA) for the GCF, that the DA is pursuing the programme proposal for “Scaling Up Adaptation and Mitigation Initiative in Agriculture” in partnership with FAO and UNDP. Thus DA is requesting the full support in facilitating the program development and submission to the GCF.

Upon further deliberation of the strong similarities of the concepts, FAO decided to prioritize resources for the Philippines for further refinement of a single strategic concept note, and possible full proposal preparation. The DA project concept was thus taken forward with the condition from DAR that Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs) should be included when they are present in the proposed project areas.

On 19 April 2017, DAR submitted the concept note for the project proposal “Climate Resilient Integrated Development Project in Agrarian Reform Communities and Agrarian Reform Community Clusters” to the DENR.

- 21** On 21 April 2017, DENR responded to DA stating that their GCF-Facilitation and Access Support Team (GCF-FAST), through the GCF-FAST Program Manager, would be more than willing to receive the DA’s proposal.
- 22** In response to the DENR advice, the DA wrote a letter on 24 April 2017 to the GCF-FAST Program Manager to formally submit the concept note and request for a meeting to discuss the salient points of the proposal. Copy furnished in this letter are the offices of Senator and then Commissioner of the Climate Change Commission (CCC).
- 23** On 22 May 2017, DA formally wrote to FAO to be the GCF implementing entity to develop the proposal “Scaling Up Adaptation and Mitigation Initiative in Agriculture” and thus assist DA in the preparation of the concept note and organization of necessary processes to develop a full proposal in addressing priority climate change adaptation and mitigation actions.
- 24** On 24 May 2017, DENR formally acknowledged the designation of FAO as the implementing entity to develop the Concept Note and Funding Proposal for the DA.



## 2.3 Proposal Preparation Activities

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity.*

- 25 In June- July 2017 FAO Philippines and Regional office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) requested the FAO Investment Centre (FAO CFI) to assist in the preparation of the concept note and full GCF funding proposal, and coordinating the technical studies to be done by DA and FAO's science partner, CIAT.
- 26 On August 18, 2017, FAO participated in the GCF Orientation and Screening and Prioritization Tool Inception Workshop conducted by the GCF Readiness Program.
- 27 On 22 August - 6 September 2017, a FAO technical mission was conducted to further refine and clarify the concept note ideas, drawing on internal FAO reviewer comments and informal GCF feedback as well as extensive discussion from the mission. A consultation meeting with wide range of stakeholders was conducted on 30 August 2017 at DA. Agencies and organizations consulted included the DA Central Office divisions and bureaus (Field Operations Service, Planning and Monitoring Service, Agricultural Training Institute or ATI, SWCCO, BFAR, BSWM,,), DENR, CCC, DAR, PCIC, ACPC, Landbank, non-government organizations (NGOs), science agencies, UNDP and other UN agencies, as well as other international financing institutions such as the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), Asian Development Bank (ADB), and the World Bank. Based on the meetings with these agencies and a well-attended multi-stakeholder consultation, broad agreements on scope of concept and partnerships for the proposed project were reached.
- 28 The FAO mission team met with OIC-Director of the DENR/GCF NDA on 4 September 2017 and with CCC Commissioner on 5 September 2017 to discuss the progress of the GCF proposal, including strategy, scope and project modalities, potential partnerships, and ways forward.
- 29 Further dialogues were then conducted through the mission in November-December 2017 where the draft concept note was presented to various stakeholders especially the DA Central Office units, in particular the new head of the SWCCO, DA Operations unit head, and also including UNDP in their planned GCF project to ensure complementarity.

A meeting with National Coordinator of the GCF Readiness Coordinator of the DENR was also held on 1 December 2017. Discussions were held with LandBank on 5 December identifying the capacity limitations at local level branches to assess the feasibility of loans for CRA, but also noting the possibility of developing new products.

The team also met with representatives from ACPC on 4 December , discussed the various credit instruments and observed the usefulness of the proposed concept to facilitate stronger utilization of potential loan instruments. Also discussed with other local finance agencies Meeting with Grameen Foundation and approaches to fisheries with BFAR, especially focusing on a few key aquaculture systems such as tilapia and bangus, where the climate risks and change responses have been analyzed, together with support from FAO. The team also met with the team at IRRI Los Baños on work done by IRRI on climate adaptation and mitigation in rice systems.

- 30 In December 2017, FAO commissioned work with CIAT to support the development of the full proposal for the GCF through the development of synthesis reports on (i) climate change projections

and their impacts on different agriculture and fisheries systems; (ii) technical and financial available and tested adaptation practices and technologies on farming systems; (iii) financial review of CRA practices; and (iv) key climate change risks and responses along the value chains, and provision of on-going advisory and support throughout the GCF project development.

- 31** On 25 January 2018, FAO met with the heads and officers of DA SWCCO, Field Operations Service (FOS), and Planning and Monitoring Service (PMS), to deliberate the key points and issues on the concept note draft for which they gave their feedback later duly considered in the revision of the concept note draft.
- 32** Through a related FAO project (Integrating Agriculture in National Adaptation Plans or NAP-Ag), the Philippine Atmospheric Geophysical and Atmospheric Services Administration (PAGASA) was commissioned starting around February 2018 to deliver, among others: (i) inventory of existing climate and weather stations, and other surface-based sensors and (ii) assessment report on the ICT requirements for a national climate and weather information system, and (iii) reports on assessment of upgrading and expansion requirements to increase forecast coverage to all vulnerable area. The inventory and reports later helped inform a major component of the proposal.
- 33** On 26 February 2018, the Mindanao Development Authority (MinDA) wrote to FAO expressing the intention to partner with FAO in accessing the GCF for the implementation of a project focusing on agriculture and fishery interventions in the Food Basket Cluster of the South Central Mindanao Development Corridor (Annex 10). FAO responded to MinDA with appreciation of the recognition of FAO as a key development partner and inviting them for further discussions and exchange of ideas
- 34** On 4 May 2018, the concept note was submitted via email by FAO Director of the Climate and Environment Division (CBC, now the Office of Climate Change, Biodiversity and Environment (OCB)) to the GCF Secretariat.
- 35** FAO shared the Concept Note with the DENR on 8 May 2018, and later on 22 May 2018 with Senator Loren Legarda, CCC Commissioner Rachel Anne Herrera, and DAR
- 36** A project preparation mission took place on 21 May - 15 June 2018 to assess progress and assist preparation team members and agencies in ensuring that all work for feasibility studies and other key required GCF documentation contributing to the full proposal, are underway or being planned accordingly. Moreover, the mission aimed to gather available data and gather the project preparation team was to obtain necessary information for the (i) selection of the project target areas; and (ii) formulation of Environmental and Social Management Framework (which includes Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework), Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan – all documents to be annexed to the Funding Proposal and submitted to the GCF. Information was also gathered on climate resilient agriculture practices and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), which is a legally required for project implementation.

The FAO CFI mission team, joined by the FAO Philippines Country Office, participated in the Climate Risk Profile workshops in La Trinidad, Davao and Cebu, each representing one of the three regions of the country. The profiles were prepared as part of the GCF project design process. The workshops were organized by CIAT, together with Benguet State University (BSU), University of the Philippines (UP) Mindanao, and Visayas State University (VSU), respectively, in the three locations,

and delivered after extensive background research. Participants included various actors from producer, to private sector marketing, along the value chains of major cash crops: cabbage, potato, cacao, coffee, white and yellow corn, rice and coconut. The profile preparation work included extensive consultations with a large number of DA, local governments, and other agriculture support actors in over 6 strategic provinces and regions to be potentially targeted under the project.

Other agencies consulted during the two-week mission are the following: Philippine Commission on Women, DA (SWCCO, Office of the Undersecretary for Special Concerns, and BFAR), BSWM, PAGASA, World Bank, United Nations Population Fund Philippines (UNFPA).

A joint meeting with DA, BSWM, and PAGASA was conducted to discuss the state of the agrometeorological system and component instruments and weather stations/facilities.

- 37** On 22 June 2018, FAO participated in a meeting attended by CCC, including CCC focal person for GCF, and staff from Foreign-Assisted Program Management Systems (FAPMS) and Climate Finance System & Services (CFSS), Climate and Agromet Division staff of PAGASA, DA Planning and Monitoring Service, CCC senior technical advisers.
- 38** A more in-depth meeting with the FAPMS and CFSS was held on 5 July 2018 to discuss in detail the full proposal and on-going project preparation activities. CCC informed FAO that it was currently reviewing legal mechanisms in order to provide the no objection letter to AEs while still waiting for the completion of its national climate investment program. Further CCC was to apprise FAO of the TWG that will be reviewing GCF proposals. CCC committed to convene a stakeholder consultation, with the participation of FAO, to ensure that the GCF proposal being prepared by the World Food Programme (WFP) in partnership with PAGASA will not overlap other on-going GCF project development. FAO, on the other hand, committed to share with the CCC reports from studies conducted in support of the project preparation.
- 39** In August 2018, FAO was informed of a GCF proposal by the World Food Programme (WFP) in partnership with PAGASA. Potential overlaps in the concept were considered.
- 40** On 25 August 2018, FAO received a letter from CCC acknowledging submission of the Concept Note.
- 41** In August 2018, FAO met with the Senator to present the concept note, highlights and outcomes of our consultations with government agencies, no-objection process, and ways forward. Project briefers were provided to the office of the Senator upon request.
- 42** On 11 September 2018, FAO participated in CCC/NDA organized “Development Partners and CSO Consultation on the Enhancement of Focus Areas for the Green Climate Fund Country Programme” at Luxent Hotel, Timog Avenue, Quezon City.

## **2.4 Main Project Appraisal Missions & Field Consultations**

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity.*

- 43** On 26 September - 10 October 2018, a pre-appraisal mission was held focusing on getting key decisions with DA and other key partners on project site and scope as well as deepening the

component details. Specifically, the mission aimed to reach agreement on the full climate rational with key partners, finalize technical support documents with government and science partners (mainly CIAT, PAGASA, and DA). The mission also aimed to gather information with partners on priority options for project areas and detailed component activities, and identify priority implementation arrangements options with DA, PAGASA, and FAO Philippines.

- 44** FAO conducted a consultation meeting with the Philippine Council on Agriculture and Fisheries (PCAF) secretariat on 28 September on concept, proposed area targeting and key recommendations. PCAF noted with appreciate that the FAO proposal was the first foreign funded project that has requested such consultation from them and recommended to proceed with local consultations in identified key priority regions and provinces.

Moreover, a two-day field mission in Central Luzon was also conducted where the mission team met with DA Regional Field officers, municipal agricultural offices (Municipalities of Gerona, Tarlac and Hagonoy, Bulacan), and visited rice and corn farming communities, as well as aquaculture farms in the area. The purpose of the consultation meetings and field visits was to solicit the views of the LGUs and sample farming communities on their experience of the impacts of climate change in the areas as well as their perceptions of the climate adaptation activities and projects introduced by the DA and NGOs in their localities.

- 45** In October 2018, PAGASA convened a meeting with CCC, UNDP, WFP, and FAO to ensure complementation between the agencies working with them for various GCF proposals. Upon due deliberation, it was noted that there are no direct overlaps.

- 46** On 12 -23 November 2018, a preparation and appraisal mission consisting of FAO CFI, RAP and FAO Philippines members helped to consolidate preparation study findings and recommendations, and discuss these with implementation partners and local stakeholders, including farmer communities, and get decisions on key design details of the project. Part of the mission was the preparation of the environmental and social (including IP, and guidance on gender) safeguards documentations and consultations, and the detailing and consolidation of costing of project activities.

- 47** During the two-week mission, the FAO mission team met once again with key officers from the DA central units, SWCCO, BSWM, ATI, and special programmes such as the Special Agricultural Areas Development/SAAD), DAR, and PAGASA (with CIAT).

- 48** Intensive local field consultations were also conducted in Region 2 (Cagayan) and Region XII (SOCCSKARGEN) with DA regional staff, provincial officers, and sample farming communities. The schedule was as follows:

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>14 November 2018</b> | <u>TUGUEGARAO CITY, Cagayan</u>  |
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Meeting with the Regional Agriculture &amp; Fisheries Council (RAFC)</li> </ul>   |
| <b>15 November 2018</b> | <u>Province of Cagayan</u>   |
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with the Provincial Agriculture Office of Cagayan</li> <li>• Meeting with the Municipal Agriculture Office of Penablanca (4 ATs)</li> <li>• Meeting with Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs) of Cagayan</li> <li>• Field visit / community consultations:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Salamagues, Municipality of Iguig</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. San Isidro, Municipality of Iguig</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Sta. Barbara, Municipality of Iguig</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>16 November 2018</b> | <u>Province of Isabela</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with DA Regional Office 2 – Regional Executive Director (on 16<sup>th</sup> in Ilagan), regional technical staff dealing with rice, corn, and high value crops (HVC) and climate change</li> <li>• Meeting with the Provincial Agriculturist of Isabela</li> <li>• Meeting with the City Agriculturist of Ilagan, and RAFC members</li> <li>• Meeting with Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs) of Isabela</li> <li>• Visit to the Regional research station Ilagan, including gene bank for corn. Field visit / community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Luchan, Benito Soliven</li> <li>○ Farmers of Sta. Victoria, Ilagan City</li> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>19 November 2018</b> | <u>KORONADAL CITY, South Cotabato</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with DA Regional Office 12 – Regional Executive Director, regional technical staff dealing with rice, corn, and high value crops (HVC) and climate change</li> <li>• Meeting with the Provincial Agriculturist of North Cotabato in Kidapawan city.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>20 November 2018</b> | <u>KIDAPAWAN CITY, North Cotabato</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers' irrigation association in Brgy. Macebolig, Kidapawan</li> <li>○ ARBs of various ARCS from municipalities in North Cotabato (including Pikit, Carmen, etc).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| <b>21 November 2018</b> | <u>Province of North Cotabato</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rural Improvement Club in Kidapawan City</li> <li>○ Upland farmers in Brgy Ilomavis, Kidapawan City</li> <li>○ Corn farmers in Brgy. Manupal, Municipality of Matalam</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| <b>22 November 2018</b> | <u>Province of North Cotabato</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Muslim farmers in Brgy. Patadon East, Kidapawan, and Brgy. Patadon West, Matalam</li> <li>○ Manobo IP community in Brgy. Ginatilan, Kidapawan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |

- 49** The FAO mission team had the opportunity to present key details of the project to focal points of Climate Finance System & Services, CCC on 21 November 2018 at EDSA Shangri-La. The focal point from Climate Finance System & Services in turn advised the FAO team on the review process followed by the CCC.
- 50** On 22 November 2018, the mission team met with officers of the Environmental Program and Management Department of the Land Bank of the Philippines discuss the project concept and discuss possible areas of collaboration between the DA-FAO and the Land Bank, newly accredited GCF Direct Access Entity for the Philippines. The officers expressed interest especially on financial services such as credit and loan linkages with which the Land Bank may further explore, both through the proposed GCF project, but also how that could support future direct access by Landbank in terms of low interest loan from GCF.
- 51** The team then met the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) on 23 November 2018 to present the project concept and seek guidance on the appropriate consultation process to be conducted in areas with IPs, especially in the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR).

- 52** The closing meeting for the mission on 23 November 2018 was attended by DA representative along with key DA officers. FAO updated the DA on the remaining processes before the submission of the proposal to the GCF.
- 53** The appraisal mission in November 2018 was not able to complete the consultations with indigenous people for the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) and was not able to visit Region 5 (Bicol). Thus, another mission was conducted on 28 January to 8 February 2019 to help complete the project appraisal. During this mission, the team was joined by an Agribusiness Officer from FAO CFI who took the lead in the development of a component on community capacity development, developing, reviewing and refining proposed activities for CRFS and linkages to value chains, seed systems interventions, risk based financing options around credit and insurance, and review of the proposed activities for mainstreaming project with key government programs. In addition, a Natural Resources Management Officer focusing on Climate Change, Gender and Vulnerability also provided support to the team through the review of project activities suitable to upland and indigenous peoples areas, and guide the FAO Philippines team in finalizing the environmental and social safeguards documentation and consultations, with a focus on indigenous people, and guidance on gender, and ensure key processes and information gathering is being followed. The CFI officers were assisted by a country Gender specialist and a Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) specialist.
- 54** Agencies and key stakeholders consulted bilaterally during the two week mission in Manila were the following: DA, CIAT, ACPC, PCIC, NCIP (National), Bureau of Plant Industry (BPI), National Seed Industry Council (NSIC), Unyon ng mga Mangagawa sa Agrikultura, , Philippine Seed Industry Association, Landbank of the Philippines, Good Food Community, Asian Farmers' Association for Sustainable Rural Development, Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka, and the Philippine Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia (PhilDHRRRA).

NCIP expressed their support for the project under the condition that they are fully and explicitly integrated in the implementation arrangements. NCIP headquarters proposed that the Regional Offices collaborate with the project on the ground and that the headquarters provide other support on IP related issues when necessary.

Notably, the meetings with ACPC (29 January) and PCIC (6 February) yielded positive reception from the top officers present, who thus expressed support towards the project. Initial areas for collaboration were explored including improvements to the current credit programs offered by ACPC and (weather index based) insurance product development for additional crops and for wider coverage by the PCIC, and weather and climate information sharing arrangements between the project proponents and the agencies.

- 55** On 29 January 2019, FAO had the opportunity to meet again with Land Bank officers to provide update on the progress of the proposal development as well as to discuss the details of their current and planned programs, including the "Climate Resilient Agriculture Financing Program", which may be among the areas of collaboration between the two parties. The officers further expressed interest in any capacity building on GCF proposal development that FAO may be able to provide them.
- 56** Intensive local field consultations were conducted in Region 5 (Bicol) and CAR, where the team met with regional DA, DAR and NCIP, provincial and municipal agriculture officers, non-government

organizations, local agriculture and credit financing institutions, as well as with farmer groups, IP and women's groups.

Tebtebba, in particular, stated their willingness to provide support to the project by means of information exchange and also their wish to be informed of the project formulation process at critical junctures.

The schedule was as follows:

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>30 January 2019</b> | <u>Province of Camarines Sur</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with DA Regional Office 5 – Regional Executive Director, regional technical staff dealing with rice, corn, and high value crops (HVC)</li> <li>• Special Meeting with the Regional Agriculture &amp; Fisheries Council (RAFC)</li> <li>• Meeting with the Provincial Agriculturists of Camarines Sur and Camarines Norte, along with select Municipal Agriculturists</li> </ul>  |
| <b>31 January 2019</b> | <u>Province of Camarines Sur</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation with President of Bicolandia Seed Growers of Goa, CamSur</li> <li>• Consultation with Minalabac Coconut Nursery operator</li> <li>• Consultation with Manager Camarines Sur Multipurpose Cooperative</li> <li>• Field visit to Rice Processing Center 1</li> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Sta. Teresita, Iriga City</li> <li>○ Farmers of Gatbo, San Francisco, Municipality of Ocampo</li> <li>○ IP Farmers of Brgy. Burocbusoc, Municipality of Buhi</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Cagbunga, Municipality of Pamplona</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Veneracion, Municipality of Pamplona</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>1 February 2019</b> | <u>Province of Camarines Norte</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with Provincial Agriculturist of Camarines Norte with Municipal Agriculturists of Daet, Talisay, Vinzons</li> <li>• Store visit Camarines Vet Pro Plus (agriculture store)</li> <li>• Consultation with management of Ambos Agriculture Cooperative</li> <li>• Field visit to Rice Processing Center 2</li> <li>• Field visit to Coconut Nursery</li> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Itomong, Municipality of Talisay</li> <li>○ IP farmers of the Municipality of Jose Panganiban</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Sto. Domingo, Vinzons</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>4 February 2019</b> | <u>Cordillera Administrative Region</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with DA CAR RFO– Regional Executive Director, regional technical staff dealing with rice, corn, and high value crops (HVC), provincial coordinators, etc.</li> <li>• Consultation with NCIP CAR Regional Office</li> <li>• Consultation with Tebtebba</li> <li>• Consultation with Benguet State University – Northern Philippines Root Crops Research and Training Center</li> <li>• Site Visit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ La Trinidad Benguet Agricultural Trading Post</li> <li>○ La Trinidad Strawberry Farm</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  |
| <b>5 February 2019</b> | <u>Province of Ifugao</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with Provincial Agriculturist of Ifugao and Municipal Agriculturists of Lamut, Lagawe, and Banaue</li> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Anao, Municipality of Hingyon</li> <li>○ Farmers of Brgy. Poblacion, Municipality of Banaue</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Site visit of local stores</u></li> </ul>   |

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| 6 February 2019 | <u>Province of Kalinga</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with Provincial Agriculturist of Kalinga, and Municipal Agriculturists of Tabuk, and Tinglayan</li> <li>• Field visit and community consultations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Farmers of Municipality of Tinglayan</li> <li>○ Farmers of Municipality of Lubuagan</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Consultation with Mandiga Community Center INC. (women's org)</li> </ul> |
|-----------------|---|

The findings of the second appraisal mission were presented to Director of SWCCO during the closing meeting on 8 February 2019 at the FAO Country Office.

## 2.5 Writing and Revision Phases

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity*

- 57 On 20 January 2019, Office of CCC Commissioner Rachel Anne Herrera requested FAO Philippines to submit a summary of the engagement and consultation process for the GCF proposal preparation. On 12 February 2019, FAO Philippines transmitted its response to the aforementioned request, covering the process from October 2016 – February 2019.
- 58 On 14 March 2019, FAO Philippines transmitted a copy of the zero full draft of the GCF proposal to the DA and PAGASA via email, requesting initial comments.
- 59 Director of SWCCO received initial comments from DA units on 4 April 2019 and transmitted this to FAO Philippines.
- 60 On 3 May 2019, FAO Officer met with PAGASA to receive feedback on the earlier transmitted Zero Draft of proposal and other technical matters.

## 2.6 High Level Briefings and Institutional Coordination

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity*

- 61 On 29 April 2019, FAO Philippines presented the project design and FPIC engagement plan to the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP) En Banc. Director of SWCCO was present earlier during the meeting day but was unable to stay for the final presentation due to conflict in schedule as the presentation slot was delayed. The NCIP En Banc acknowledged the project and expressed that the Commission will continue to cooperate when FPIC processes are commenced.
- 62 On 6 May 2019, FAO Philippines requested an executive briefing on the GCF proposal for Sec. scheduled on 20 May 2019. The meeting did not transpire due to conflict in schedules.
- 63 On 21 May 2019, FAO officers met with Philippine Coconut Authority (PCA) to gather additional information for the actions related to coconut farming systems. FAO met again with Landbank for additional inputs.



- 64 On 10 June 2019, FAO Philippine requested for an executive briefing with Undersecretary then OIC of the Office of the Undersecretary for Policy and Planning, Project Development, Research and Development, and Regulations. The meeting was postponed by DA citing the ongoing developments in the change of management.
- 65 On 9-11 December 2019, representative from the Project Development Service of DA participated in the FAO “Learning and Sharing Workshop on Climate Finance and the Green Climate Fund” in Bangkok, Thailand. In this workshop, the intricacies of the GCF and GEF project preparation, submission, and approval processes were discussed with FAO staff and government partners.
- 66 On 13 December 2019, FAO Representative ad interim wrote to Secretary of DA recalling the discussion on the GCF proposal being prepared and requested the support of the Secretary to move the process forward.
- 67 On 16 December 2019, FAO Officer met with PAGASA to clarify and seek feedback on the complementarity of the FAO proposal with the recently approved GCF SAP project “Multi-Hazard Impact-Based Forecasting and Early Warning System for the Philippines”.
- 68 On 9 March 2020, FAO Philippines requested the audience of Secretary Secretary of DA for an executive briefing on the GCF proposal. The meeting was initially set on 3 April 2020. Unfortunately, the date fell under the Enhanced Community Quarantine period set by the Philippine government to contain the COVID-19 pandemic. Subsequent coordination with DA in 2020 were done through email exchanges.

## 2.7 Formal Transmittal to and Review Process by Philippines Government

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity*

- 69 FAO Philippines transmitted the full draft funding proposal and budget plan to the Office of Secretary of DA and officer of the DOST-PAGASA on 9 November 2020, for respective internal review and processing.
- 70 A series of meetings were conducted on 16 December 2020, 13 January, 21 January, 10 February 2021 between FAO, DA, PAGASA, CCC, and NEDA to discuss the first round of comments from their respective reviews.
- 71 FAO Philippines transmitted the full funding proposal package to DA, PAGASA, and CCC (as GCF NDA) on 8 February 2020 for the respective review processes. Between then and 19 March 2021, the agencies reverted with evaluations from concerned units, to which FAO formally responded. Revisions of the funding proposal package based on the review were consequently done.
- 72 PAGASA provided the signed co-finance letter on to FAO on 4 March 2021.

- 73** On 31 March 2021, DA informed FAO that the proposal was still not sufficient for final endorsement by the DA in the form of a co-financing commitment letter as required by the GCF. DA nevertheless confirmed their intention to continue working with FAO and the other project partners on accessing the GCF. PAGASA and CCC were informed of this postponement of submission. FAO reverts to DA on 15 April 2021,

## **2.8 Redesign Process with Philippine Government**

- 74** From April to September 2021, DA, FAO, and PAGASA underwent series of online meetings to discuss the adjustments to the project design. The most salient features in this reformulation include the following:
- Ensuring that the APA project builds upon previous and existing climate projects of the DA systems of agencies;
  - Ensuring that the APA project is responsive the strategies in the One DA Reform agenda, among others, especially in regards to:
    - Farm consolidation or clustering to maximize support from public services
    - Assisting farmers to step up from mere agricultural production to becoming agri-entrepreneurs
    - Professionalization of agricultural services
    - Climate change adaptation through increasing incomes from farm diversification and enterprise building
  - Improving the mechanisms for the climate information services
  - Clarifying the project management arrangements – with the Field Operations Service as the main implementing unit for DA
- 75** FAO submitted the revised funding proposal to GCF secretariat for informal review in November 2021. GCF secretariat returned with comments on 24 November 2021 specifically requesting that the APA project ensure linkage and complementarity with the Landbank GCF proposal PILAR project . FAO, DA, and PAGASA met with proponents of the PILAR project (Landbank as AE, with partners IRRI, ICRAF) met on 7th, 15th, and 22nd December 2021 to discuss the linkage and complementarity of the APA and PILAR projects. FAO thereafter prepared the narrative and visuals/diagrams to reflect these. FAO sent the revised funding proposal on 4 February 2022 to GCF secretariat reflecting the suggested complementarity.
- 76** In March 2022, GCF secretariat returned with additional comments on transforming the proposal into a cross-cutting (adaptation-mitigation) project. DA and FAO discussed this suggestion and confirmed that the APA project can accommodate this. Further revision to the FP package was done.
- 77** On 17 March 2022, FAO shared with DA and PAGASA the revised funding proposal package for the respective internal review process, and with request for furnishing of the Co-Finance Letters and parallel endorsement to the Department of Finance (DOF) as the new GCF NDA for issuance of NOL.
- 78** On 21 March 2022, FAO wrote to DOF requesting issuance of the NOL.

## **2.9**    **FAO Submission to the Green Climate Fund Secretariat**

**79**    **FAO submitted the Funding Proposal package to GCF Secretariat on 8 April 2022.**

**80**    **PAGASA issued its co-financing commitment letter and endorsement for NOL on 18 April 2022. DA meanwhile issued the same on 21 April 2022.**

**81**    **DOF (as GCF NDA) provided the No Objection Letter (NOL) for the project on 26 May 2022.**

### 3 Additional Consultations During Project Appraisal by GCF

- 82** The GCF inter-divisional review in May 2022 requested that additional stakeholder consultations take place before the project submission for GCF Board consideration in October 2022. The following additional consultations are planned for August-September 2022:

| Consultation | Modality | Target stakeholders  | Agenda  |
|--------------|----------|--|---|
| National     | On-line  | DA Central Offices<br>DAR<br>PAGASA<br>NEDA<br>CCC<br>NCIP<br>Landbank   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on progress on GCF review process, timelines</li> <li>Final Project Design</li> <li>Project Implementation Arrangements</li> <li>Philippine government SPA process</li> </ul> Initial discussion on the selection criteria setting for the 100 municipalities   |
| Regional     | On-line  | DA & PAGASA central offices<br>DA & PAGASA RFOs<br>Region CAR<br>Region II – Cagayan Valley<br>Region V - Bicol<br>Region X – Northern Mindanao<br>Region XII – SOCCSKSARGEN<br>9 Provincial LGUs (represented by OPA) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update on progress on GCF review process, timelines</li> <li>Final Project Design</li> <li>Project Implementation Arrangements</li> <li>Philippine government SPA process</li> <li>Initial discussion on the selection criteria setting for the 100 municipalities</li> </ul>  |
| Local        | FGD      | Representative IP communities including women representatives in <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Region CAR</li> <li>Region X – Northern Mindanao</li> <li>Region XII - SOCCSKSARGEN</li> </ul>                 | Community visit & FGD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community perspectives on the proposed project interventions vis-à-vis indigenous cosmovision of managing natural resources</li> <li>Community perspectives on indigenous CRA practices and technologies</li> <li>Community perspectives on agricultural enterprise development</li> <li>FPIC and IKSP processes</li> </ul> |

- 83** The consultations, particularly at the regional and local levels aim to address the key questions arisen during the project appraisal by GCF such as:
- Criteria for selecting target municipalities, with consideration for linking with the AMIA Village network
  - Criteria for selecting target farmer beneficiaries – for CRA enterprise development and for peer learning, leading to CRA adoption at scale
  - Targeting women-headed households, IP and youth
  - Update on barriers to farmers, especially women and IPs to accessing finance including social protection programmes

## 4 Stakeholder Engagement Plan During Project Implementation

### 4.1 Planning and Basic Project Processes

- 84** Consultation at all levels during implementation is a good practice to ensure that potential negative impacts and concerns are adequately addressed during the project implementation. Stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation throughout the duration of the entire project. More specifically, consultations with stakeholders during project implementation will take place yearly, at the time of the preparation of Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) – i.e. at the beginning of each of the seven project Fiscal Years (FY). In essence, stakeholder engagement will be ensured under the aegis of AWPB review and preparation, supported by the outcomes of local consultations. Through this process, all activities will be discussed, reviewed and validated before becoming the final AWPB.
- 85** The AWPB constitutes the main formal instrument to ensure ownership and participation of stakeholders and beneficiaries. It represents the results of the national engagement process and the main planning tool of the project. To this end the PMO, via its M&E team and partners, will secure constant dialogue with target communities and administrations and will ensure their participation in the AWPB formulation process. The AWPB will be presented by the PMO and reviewed by all stakeholders, including at the national, Governorates, Municipality, and community levels. During these stakeholder engagement consultations, the ESFM –including the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), but also the Gender Action Plan (GAP) -will be shared with stakeholders, and explained. The AWPB will be presented by the PMO and reviewed by all stakeholders, including at the national, Governorate, and community levels. During these stakeholder engagement consultations, the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESFM) –including relevant ESMPs prepared for sub-activities and the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) -but also the Gender Action Plan (GAP) -will be shared with stakeholders, and explained.

### 4.2 National-level consultations.

- 86** Formal stakeholder consultation will take place at the beginning of each Fiscal Year (FY), under the aegis of the reviews of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB). These will be held in Manila, Luzon; participants will include relevant Government Ministries, Governorates, and other concerned stakeholders. Details of the AWPB consultations for the Fiscal Years (FY) are below:

**FY1:** At the beginning of Year 1, the AWPB will be produced by the PMO in consultation with relevant Government Ministries, Governorates, and other concerned stakeholders. At this time, the ESMF will be explained and discussed; the Grievance Redress Mechanism will also be presented and explained.

**FY2-7:** From year two of the project, the AWPB will be composed of the previous year's complete report and the plan from the next coming year. At the beginning of FY2, the AWPB will be presented by the PMO and reviewed by all stakeholders, including relevant Government Ministries, Governorates, and other concerned stakeholders. The

purpose of these AWPB consultations is to review the work undertaken in the previous FY, assess if activities are on track, validate results, and identify, if necessary, any modifications that need to be made. Stakeholder feedback for this is essential – community engagement feeds into this process. The new AWPB will then be prepared. The Grievance Redress Mechanism will again be presented and explained (FY2), and validated at each consultation during FY 2-7.

**FY4 and FY7:** At the beginning of FY4 and FY7, in addition to the regular annual report and AWPB preparation/feedback/review, FY4 and FY7 will be of particular importance for the project and for communities that will be called in to participate in the Mid-Term and Terminal Review reviews.

### 4.3 Provincial-level consultations

- 87** The Regional Project Offices (RPO; see Funding Proposal section B.4) and experts will ensure annual consultations in target areas to support planning and to monitor execution of activities. In addition, these consultations will provide a space to discuss all project activities. The ESMF, Grievance Redress Mechanism and Gender Action Plan will be presented and explained (FY1); the Grievance Redress Mechanism will be validated at each consultation during FY 2-7. Provincial consultations will feed into the review and preparation of the AWPBs. For each FY, there will be two provincial-level consultations.

**FY1:** At the beginning of the first FY, the AWPB will be produced by the PMO together with the relevant provinces and other concerned stakeholders. At this time, the ESMF, Gender Action Plan and Grievance Redress Mechanism will be presented and explained. Stakeholders will also be informed of the process and consultations will feed into the preparation of AWPBs.

**FY2-7:** From year two of the project the AWPB will be composed of the previous year's complete report and the plan from the next coming year. At the beginning of FY2, the AWPB will be presented by the PMO and reviewed by all stakeholders. The purpose of these AWPB consultations is to review the work undertaken in the previous FY, assess if activities are on track, validate results, and identify, if necessary, any modifications that need to be made. The new AWPB will then be prepared. The Grievance Redress Mechanism will again be presented and explained (FY2), and validated at each consultation during FY 2-7.

**FY4 and FY7:** At the beginning of FY4 and FY7, in addition to the regular annual report and AWPB preparation/feedback/review, FY4 and FY7 will be of particular importance for the project and for stakeholders that will be called in to participate in the Mid-Term and Terminal Review reviews.

## 4.4 Monitoring

- 88** The PMO M&E Specialist will be responsible for keeping all stakeholders informed and for receiving their feedback on any issues that may arise, in particular regarding the Grievance Redress Mechanism. Together with the Gender Specialist and the Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialist, the PMO M&E Specialist will also be responsible for ensuring that the ESMF, eventual ESMPs and Gender Action Plan are carried out (further details in in respective Annexes on ESMF, GAP and M&E).

## 4.5 Disclosure

- 89** According to GCF and FAO policies on access to information, all safeguard instruments under this project, including the ESMF and Gender Action Plan must be disclosed online in the English and local language (Tagalog, in the case of the Philippines) at least 30 days prior to GCF Board meeting and approval of the project. Access to the documents must be possible for any locals (i.e. it must be disclosed locally in an accessible place) in a form and language understandable to key stakeholders. In instances where dialects, other than English or Tagalog, are used, a summary will be provided in the local dialect. Such disclosure of relevant project information helps stakeholders effectively participate. FAO is committed to disclosing information in a timely manner and in a way that is accessible and culturally appropriate, placing due attention to the specific needs of community groups which may be affected by project implementation (e.g. literacy, gender, differences in language or accessibility of technical information or connectivity).
- 90** For moderate risk projects like this one, FAO releases the applicable information as early as possible and no later than 30 days prior to project approval. The 30-day period commences only when all relevant information requested from the project has been provided and is available to the public. FAO undertakes disclosure for all moderate risk projects, using a disclosure portal to publicly disclose all of the projects' documentation related to environmental and social safeguards (e.g. Environmental and Social Management Frameworks, Gender Action Plans, Indigenous Peoples Plans, and other relevant documents, as applicable). The website is: <http://www.fao.org/environmental-social-standards/disclosure-portal/en/>.
- 91** In order to ensure the widest dissemination and disclosure of project information, including any details related to applicable environmental and social safeguards, local and accessible disclosure tools including audiovisual materials (e.g. flyers, brochures, community radio broadcasts) will be utilized in addition to the standard portal disclosure tool. Furthermore, particular attention will be paid to farmers, Indigenous peoples, illiterate or technological illiterate people, people with hearing or visual disabilities, those with limited or no access to internet and other groups with special needs. The dissemination of information among these groups will be carried out with the project counterparts and relevant local actors (e.g. municipalities, barangays, IP groups, Muslim groups, farmers associations, government, women's Rural Improvement Clubs (RICs) and others).

- 92 The ESMF and the accompanying Gender Action Plan were disclosed in English and Tagalog (national language of the Philippines) on 2020 on the websites of FAO, the DA, and GCF. Both documents will be disclosed at the village level in Tagalog, prior to project implementation. In instances where Tagalog is not the main language understood, further translation of the Executive Summary is provided in local dialects.

#### 4.6 Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

- 93 The grievance redress mechanism (GRM) is an integral project management element that intends to seek feedback from beneficiaries and resolve of complaints on project activities and performance. The mechanism is based on FAO requirements and most importantly, it is based on existing, community-specific grievance redress mechanisms preferred by the local beneficiaries.
- 94 FAO is committed to ensuring that its programs are implemented in accordance with the Organization's environmental and social obligations. In order to better achieve these goals, and to ensure that beneficiaries of FAO programs have access to an effective and timely mechanism to address their concerns about non-compliance with these obligations, the Organization, in order to supplement measures for receiving, reviewing and acting as appropriate on these concerns at the program management level, has entrusted the Office of the Inspector-General with the mandate to independently review the complaints that cannot be resolved at that level.
- 95 FAO will facilitate the resolution of concerns of beneficiaries of FAO programs regarding alleged or potential violations of FAO's social and environmental commitments. For this purpose, concerns may be communicated in accordance with the eligibility criteria of the Guidelines for Compliance Reviews Following Complaints Related to the Organization's Environmental and Social Standards<sup>38</sup>, which applies to all FAO programs and projects.
- 96 Concerns must be addressed at the closest appropriate level, i.e. at the project management/technical level, and if necessary at the Regional Office level. If a concern or grievance cannot be resolved through consultations and measures at the project management level, a complaint requesting a Compliance Review may be filed with the Office of the Inspector-General (OIG) in accordance with the Guidelines. Program and project managers will have the responsibility to address concerns brought to the attention of the focal point.
- 97 The principles to be followed during the complaint resolution process include: impartiality, respect for human rights, including those pertaining to indigenous peoples, compliance of national norms, and coherence with the norms, equality, transparency, honesty, and mutual respect.
- 98 **Project-Level GRM:** Consultations during project preparation highlighted that, with the exception of IP groups whose GRM will be more explicitly stated during the FPIC process, the potential project-affected peoples would prefer to share the same Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM). For communities like the Muslim communities in Mindanao, this view was shared insofar as the project offered a back-up to the existing government structures (i.e. the barangay council) in case there are any questions of discrimination based on religion/ethnicity. For IP communities, the GRM would depend on the given customary traditions of their respective communities, based



on the thorough FPIC process delineated in the ESMF's IP Plan. For the purposes of the project, and to streamline the process, either FAO or local community organizations acting on FAO's behalf would manage the GRM, including collection and reporting of grievances – even if the decisions are made through traditional (or community-approved) practices with the IPMRs and/or Barangay councils. Consultations also highlighted the utility of a hotline or grievance box on which/to which grievances could be made. With these recommendations in mind, this project-level GRM has been designed.

- 99** The project will establish one or more grievance mechanisms at the field level to file complaints, sensitive to the location wherein the project is being implemented. Both (i) contact information and (ii) information on the process one must follow in order to file a complaint will be disclosed in all meetings, workshops and other related events throughout the life of the project. It is also expected that all awareness raising material to be distributed under the project will include the necessary information regarding the process for filing grievances and key contacts. The project will be responsible for documenting and reporting, as part of the safeguards performance monitoring, on any grievances received and how they were addressed.
- 100** Following on preferences indicated in consultations, minor grievances will begin processing at the local level, and will sought to be resolved through traditional means of community discussion at the barangay level with the concerned parties and respected councilors, officials, and/or elder(s). In instances where an IP member is reporting a grievance with a non-IP member, both a barangay representative and the IPMR must be present.
- 101** In instances whereby the claimant would prefer to have the grievance addressed directly through FAO or a higher level of government, but does not have the ability to file a claim personally, the concerned person(s) will express the grievance (either orally or in writing) to the local implementation unit (e.g. the LGU, FAO, or a contracting community organization). The project staff at the local level who receives the complaint will be responsible for presenting/filing those complaints to the Lead Safeguards Specialist based in the central Project Management Office (PMO) in Manila. In instances where the claimant has the means to directly file a claim, he/she has the right to do so, presenting it directly to the Lead Safeguards Specialist within the PMO in Manila. The process of filing a complaint will duly consider anonymity as well as any existing traditional or ethnic dispute resolution mechanisms and it will not interfere with the community's self-governance system. Contact information will also be given for processing a grievance directly to the Lead Safeguards Specialist within the PMO by phone.
- 102** After the complainant files a complaint through one of the channels of the grievance mechanism, this complaint will be registered by the Lead Safeguards Specialist and sent to the PMO Project Coordinator to confirm that the complaint is eligible. The confidentiality of the complaint must be preserved during the process.
- 103** Eligible complaints will be addressed by the PMO or the applicable institution. The PMO Project Coordinator will be responsible for recording the grievance and how it has been addressed, if a resolution was agreed. If the situation is too complex, or the complainer does not accept the resolution, the complaint must be sent to a higher level, until a solution or acceptance is reached. For every complaint received, a written proof will be sent within ten (10) working days; afterwards, a resolution proposal will be made within thirty (30) working days. In compliance with the resolution, the person in charge of dealing with the complaint, may interact with the

complainant, or may call for interviews and meetings, to better understand the reasons. All complaints received, its response and resolutions, must be duly registered.

#### 104 Internal Process:

**Lead Safeguards Specialist.** The complaint could come in writing or orally (including over the phone) to the Lead Safeguards Specialist within the PMO. At this level, received complaints will be registered and screened by the Lead Safeguards Specialist for eligibility. Screened complaints will then be sent to the Project Coordinator in the PMO.

**Project Management Unit.** The complaint should come in writing from the Lead Safeguards Specialist within the PPIU to the Project Coordinator in the PMO directly. The Project Coordinator will provide final confirmation of eligibility and proceed to investigate and resolve the complaint.

**Project Steering Committee (PSC).** If the complaint has not been solved and could not be solved with the PMO, then the chair of the PSC must address the complaint. If this still cannot be resolved, then the complaint is sent to the next level (FAO Representative).

**FAO Representative.** The assistance of the FAO Representative is requested if a resolution was not agreed in the first two levels (PMO and PSC).

**FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.** The FAO Representative will request, if necessary, the advice of the Regional Office to resolve a grievance, or will transfer the resolution of the grievance entirely to the regional office, if the problem is highly complex.

**The FAO Regional Representative** will request – only on very specific situations or complex problems – the assistance on the FAO Inspector General, who would then pursue procedures of the Office of the Inspector General (OiG) to solve the problem.

**105 Resolution:** Upon acceptance of a resolution by the complainant, a document with the agreement should be signed, clearly indicating the terms of the resolution.

| RECIPIENT OF GREIVANCE                              | ACTIONS REQUIRED   |
|---|--|
| <b>Lead Safeguards Specialist (Central PMO)</b>     | Must register the complaint and send eligible complaints to the PMO within 2 working days.   |
| <b>Project Management Office</b>                    | Must respond within 5 working days of receipt.   |
| <b>Project Steering Committee (PSC)</b>             | Any organization may receive a complaint and must provide proof of receipt of said complaint. If the case is accepted, then the receiver must send all of the information to all of the Project Steering Committee members and call for a meeting to find a resolution. The response must be sent within 5 working days after the meeting of the Project Steering Committee. |
| <b>FAO Representative in the Philippines</b>        | Must respond within 5 working days, in consultation with PSC.<br><b>FAO Representative:</b> Kati TANNINEN<br><a href="mailto:FAO-PH@fao.org">FAO-PH@fao.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:Kati.Tanninen@fao.org">Kati.Tanninen@fao.org</a> -<br>Tel. (+63 2) 638 9886  |
| <b>FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific</b> | Must respond within 5 working days in consultation with FAO's Representation.<br><b>FAO Representative:</b> Jongjin Kim<br><a href="mailto:FAO-RAP@fao.org">FAO-RAP@fao.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:Jongjin.Kim@fao.org">Jongjin.Kim@fao.org</a><br>Tel.: (+66 2) 697 4000   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Office of the Inspector General</b> | To report possible fraud and bad behavior by fax, confidential: (+39) 06 570 55550<br>By e-mail: <a href="mailto:Investigations-hotline@fao.org">Investigations-hotline@fao.org</a><br>By confidential hotline: (+ 39) 06 570 52333 |
|--|---|

- 106** Members of IP and minority group communities can make a complaint or appeal on any and all aspects of sub-activities' design and implementation. A complaint and grievance feedback form, as well as a pamphlet explaining the mechanism, will be developed under the project and distributed to IP and minority group communities for their use. IP and minority group community members will be clearly informed of the complaint and appeal channels (as described above, or as delineated through their FPIC process) in community meetings and via other forms of communication that are convenient to them. Information and communications technology and media tools should be used to disseminate information. Opinions and suggestions related to resettlement which are provided by concerned people and/or organizations should be well documented.
- 107 Participation.** Consultations helped discern ways in which women, IP groups, and Muslim minorities could be encouraged to participate in project activities, based on activities that were/are appropriate to them in terms of culture, farming practices, and timing. Feedback from this was provided directly to the project design team and incorporated within the Full Project Funding Proposal and Feasibility Study.
- 108 Gender.** Women are involved with crop production (growing, transplanting, harvesting) and livestock, and some had kitchen/homestead gardens, though much of the work is unofficially recognized. Men work more with pest management and fertilizer application, given that those are considered "heavier" types of work with heightened health and safety risks due to the chemical compounds. Men also typically deal with irrigation of crops and agricultural land. During consultation, women were met with as part of the larger mixed-gender groups, as well as separately, to ensure that they had ample time and an open space to share their stories, concerns, and preferences. One notable issue was that of knowledge transfer and timing of trainings: women were often available for trainings, whereas their male partners were not (as they were out farming), and yet the transfer or knowledge from the women to their male partners has not always been successful. It was identified that trainings must be held at times in which male farmers can also participate. Overall feedback from women in the proposed project areas is detailed and acted upon within the Gender Action Plan.
- 109 Community Support.** Given the high potential for positive social and environmental impacts, and that the project benefits outweigh the limited adverse impacts, all participants consulted with, including Muslim minority groups and IP groups, indicated their tentative support for project implementation (with the understanding that, for IP groups, full FPIC will be conducted prior to commencement of activities).

## Appendixes:

*This portion has been redacted in accordance with the GCF Information Disclosure Policy, as the portion is confidential under the disclosure policy of the Accredited Entity.*

Appendix 1 - Summary of Consultations (see below)

Appendix 2 - Documentation of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and IP support organizations (Government and NGOs) (see Appendix 3 in folder ANNEX\_7\_STAKEHOLDER\_PLAN)

### **Appendix 1 – Summary of Consultations**

Below is the list of Summary of Consultations, in chronological order.

#### **2018 Mission**

1. Meeting minutes with Iguig – Municipality (Class 4), 15<sup>th</sup> November 2018
2. Meeting with AMIA villages in Region 2, 16<sup>th</sup> November 2018
3. Meeting minutes with DA in Socksargen, Region 12, 19<sup>th</sup> November 2018
4. Meeting minutes in North Cotabato, Region 12, 20<sup>th</sup> November 2018
5. Meeting minutes with communities in Ilomavis – Mt. Apo Foothills, 21 November 2018
6. Meeting minutes with Muslim community (Patadon EW, Matalam) and IP Obo-Manobo (Monuvu) in Region 12 (Mt. Apo), 22 November 2018

Meeting minutes with ATI, NCIP and others, 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2018

#### **2019 Mission**

7. Notes of Field Consultations in Manila, Bicol and Cordillera during 28 January – 6 February 2019. File name 'Notes Bicol, CAR'

## Appendix 2 of Annex 7

### Documentation of consultations with Indigenous Peoples and IP support organizations (Government and NGOs)

*This presents the issues, needs and perspectives identified by the IPs and their support groups ( NCIP, Provincial and Municipal Local Government Units, Dept of Agriculture, NGOs, Farmers Federations/ Union) on socio-economic situation of indigenous peoples, climate change and agriculture. It also contains relevant tenure and governance discussions and Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSP) related to farming. Eleven community consultations with 14 indigenous cultural communities were completed. At the end of this Annex is a list of these groups as well as the date and location of the consultation meetings.*

#### A. Consultation with indigenous peoples/ communities

| Stakeholder and IP community   | Description/ Highlights of the meeting  |
|--|---|
| IP farmers in Kidapawan City and Matalam in North Cotabato, SOCKSARGEN<br><br><b>IP Group: Manobos, Blaen, Tagakaolo</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Series of meeting with IP farmers who are also Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries ( ARBS), corn farmers and coconut farmers</li> <li>Recommendation from the communities is for the Indigenous Peoples Mandatory Representative ( IPMR) to be involved in the project</li> <li>Muslim farmers felt they were treated unfairly by government</li> <li>Stealing of crops ( theft or robbery ) was/is an issue</li> </ul>  |
| IP farmers, Burubusoc, Buhi, Camarines Sur, Region V-Bicol<br><br><b>IP Group: Agta, Agta-Tabangnon</b>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IPs work as land laborers and farmer, farming vegetables are main source of income sash crops: banana, coconut, corn, <i>kamote</i>, taro, Cassava and purple yam. Half of the population are land laborers. Even the farmers who own land must work for others, since the holdings are too small to support themselves.</li> <li><b>Tenure:</b> Processing of their Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title is still in progress.</li> <li><b>Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices (IKSP) related to farming :</b> Kamote planting ritual, a man has to bury his naked lower half body underground and put the plant in between his thighs for good harvest; women during menstruation should not go to the corn field because If they do, the corn will turn red; The farmer who plants the corn should have complete set of teeth so that the corn will also be complete.</li> <li><b>Observed changes:</b> Drying up of river, there is only water available in the rainy season and during typhoons; temperature is higher than before; droughts are more frequent, causing crops to dry up; Occurrence of more pests such as <i>tungro</i> disease, coco lisap</li> <li><b>Adaptation:</b> The changes in the climate are dealt with modifying the crop calendar. Since the rainy season arrives earlier than before, no fallow is possible, and hence fertilizer become necessary.</li> </ul> |
| IP farmers in Oyango Tribal Settlement, Sta. Teresita, Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Region V-Bicol                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The tribe immigrated to the present location at a lower altitude for lack of water and school, 18 years ago ( now with 64 households and 375 persons in the settlement)</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>IP Group: Agta</b></p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Farm:</b> cash crops are root crops and vegetables; there is also abaca and coconuts while Non timber forest products are gathered as food.</li> <li>• <b>Tenure:</b> ancestral domain has been titled to non-IPs. NCIP is negotiating on behalf of the tribe with private individuals who had the ancestral domain titled under their names.</li> <li>• <b>IKSP related to farming:</b> Rituals for planting <i>kamote</i> and bringing in rain ( men run around the field naked at noon or at night). The latter is no longer practiced.</li> <li>• <b>Observed changes:</b> Heavy rains (more rain, production is lower) and rainfall patterns have changed; occurrence of pests such as the corn borer and more pests on abaca; Incident of Landslides and floods which were not observed 30 years ago.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>IP farmers - Bulwak Tribo, Jose Panganiban, Camarines Norte, Region V-Bicol</p> <p><b>IP group: Agta ( Manide/ Kabihug)</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Settled some decades, Nomadic some decades ago, but now settled</li> <li>• <b>Farms:</b> root crops such as cassava, kamote; vegetables such as beans, okra, chili, tomato</li> <li>• <b>Tenure:</b> The ancestral domain consists of 22 has, they are still processing their ancestral domain title</li> <li>• <b>Observed changes:</b> Typhoons tend to arrive after a long dry season.</li> <li>• <b>Belief:</b> No animal or plant is considered sacred.</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Former NCIP Ethnographic Commissioner, Conchita Calzado, representing Rest of Luzon</p> <p><b>IP Group: Agta-Dumagat</b></p>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commissioner belongs to the Agta-Dumagat community in Quezon province and has served as ethnographic commissioner covering the “rest of luzon “ for two terms at the NCIP. “rest of Luzon” ethnographic region includes the Bicol region</li> <li>• The Agta communities in Camarines Sur and Camarines Norte have better access to government support including agriculture technology and inputs because of good coordination by the regional /provincial NCIP to other agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture</li> <li>• Farming is the main activity of the Agta for both subsistence and livelihood. Most They have settled in farm areas in the mountains or areas adjacent to the mountains</li> <li>• IP Support groups: In Camarines Sur, the Catholic church thru the bishop has provided support to the Agta tribes in many ways.</li> </ul> |
| <p>IP farmers in Brgy. Anao, Hingyon, Province of Ifugao</p> <p><b>IP Group: Ifugao- Tuwali</b></p>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IPs in the meetings are from the Tuwali tribe ( it is also the name of their language), who are all rice farmers planting heirloom rice.</li> <li>• Agriculture: Rice is the major cash crop, and vegetables cultivated in the buffer zones a secondary cash crop.</li> <li>• <b>Observed changes:</b> CC impacts are manifested thru occurrence of pests.</li> <li>• <b>FPIC-</b> To start off the process, there should be a meeting with farmers and barangay officials ( they are also IPs ), and the entire assembly votes for or against any proposal</li> <li>• <b>Tenure:</b> Their CADT is on process, the plan is to have one CADT for all Hingyon. At present land ownership is per clan. Farming and decision what to plant is also carried out by clan; Clan members know and respect the land rights of everyone, hence, less/</li> </ul>      |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>absence of land issues ; They have a single way of treating their lands, averaging 2-3 hectares</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IKSPs related to farming-</b> There is a person designated as the “<i>Tumonak</i>”, respected farmer leader, who starts the planting and everybody follows; every farming steps has a ritual system- land preparation ( chicken is offered) sowing, planting, harvesting ( udbo and badtang- free labor and cooperation system); Land preparation accompanied by <i>baki</i> (prayer); a system of bayanihan still exists, where all community help in the work and celebrate harvest after with a feast of rice wine, pigs and chicken. Affluent families would have gong ensemble as part of the celebration during harvest time, these affluent families are the <i>Kaddangyans</i>.</li> <li>• Benefit- negatively with the low price of heirloom rice at Php 120-150 per kilo, for them it should be priced at Php 200-250 /kilo’ Off-season livelihood is a challenge</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Farmers in Poblacion, Banaue, Ifugao Province</b></p> <p><b>IP group: Ifugao- Tuwali</b></p>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big group of local people- barangay officials farmers, IPs , local businesspersons. Mostly vegetable farmers( pechay, beans, to lesser extent ginger and corn) and they do rice farming for their own consumption. Livestock for family use are pigs, chickens</li> <li>• <b>Tenure:</b> Farmers owned their lands ( average size 0.5 hectares to 2.5 hectares)</li> <li>• <b>IKSP on farming:</b> Traditional practices in farming is with the Tinawon rice, not much ritual practiced nowadays, some farmers butcher kitchen; Leader farmer prepares seed first for others to follow Some has Christian ways- praying; Change in the traditional farming system from two seasons to just one season only.</li> <li>• <b>Challenges related to CRA:</b> Lack of water; abandoned rice terraces due to lack of water and lack of functioning irrigation system; farmers not interested as it is not viable; occurrence of “Kiwit” nocturnal snake in the rice fields.</li> <li>• <b>On seeds:</b> Farmers saved seeds and still practice the traditional seed exchange with fellow farmers; DA has provided seedbank that supplied the short maturing, long pinnacle grains, but limited.</li> <li>• IRRI research – No viable seeds found, there was one thought but it was highly shattering.</li> <li>• Highly interested in getting payment for ecosystem services ( water) from Cagayan and Isabela provinces as they are the one’s maintaining the forest and watershed that supplies water to these downstream provinces.</li> </ul> |
| <p>IP farmers and IP agriculture extension officers of Municipality of Tinglayan, Kalinga Province</p> <p><b>IP group: Kalinga</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All farmers in the meeting are IPs, as hundred percent of Tinglayan residents belong to the Kalinga tribe. They farm vegetables ( cabbage and beans) and most have pigs and chicken at the backyard.; 90% of rice is organic and 10% non-organic</li> <li>• There are with 7 sub-tribes of Kalinga in Tinglayan namely Botbot tribes residing in 5 barangays; Tulgao tribe in Tulga East and West Dananao Tribe in Brgy. Dananao; Basao Tribe in 1 barangay, then Sumadel, Bangad and Tongrayan tribes.</li> <li>• <b>Challenges encountered related to CRA:</b> Rice planting can be adjusted to weather. If water availability is a problem, it can be</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>planted early in November/December. If drought is expected, harvesting can be done earlier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Observed changes</b> almost all of their farms were wipe out by the past 2 typhoons (Typhoons Ompong and Rosita) and including the communal irrigation system; Lack of water; One incident of farm carabao dying of hypothermia; occurrence of thin long worms (like <i>bihon</i> noodles, they say) around 5 years ago.</li> <li>• The long thin worms bore holes in the dike and make the soil and roots go up. Many attempts had been made (putting salt into the farms and Chlorox, chemical based solution), but more come out from the ground.</li> <li>• <b>Adaptation/ Coping mechanism:</b> Pray and wait for rain; New planting calendar is adopted. In some barangays, transplanting is done February – March, and in some others January – March. It depends on the availability of the water.</li> <li>• <b>Implementation of extension programs:</b> There are 7 extension workers, assigned per banner program of the DA and one assigned to assist rural based organizations</li> <li>• <b>Practice of FPIC :</b> Consent is sought from all the community, thru meetings and there is no ritual associated with it.</li> <li>• <b>IKSP related to farming:</b> The Tulgao and Botbot tribes <b>have such practices</b> : before transplanting the rice, no visitors or outsiders are allowed in the fields and again one day before harvest; Initial transplanting of 9 seedlings. If they are still standing the next morning, transplantation is conducted at full scale.</li> <li>• There used to be synchronized farming but now, it is now individual-based and it depends on water availability.</li> <li>• The traditional rice grows 5-6 months are planted in higher elevation and in the low land are the high yield varieties, yield of both are affected by the temperature</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>IP farmers- Municipality of Lubuagan, Kalinga</b></p> <p><b>IP Group: Kalinga</b></p> | <p>Small group of women farmers, three are from the nearby town of Pasil at the MAO office.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These farmers never used pesticides or synthetic fertilizers for generations, but there are some who does use them but for business only and not for their own family consumption</li> <li>• The farmers do not know any specific program on IPs but they know that NCIP provide scholarship, for any course as long as the IP can qualify;</li> <li>• <b>Tenure:</b> Individual lands are inherited. Ancestral domain exists, but the participants did not know the location; In ancestral domains, IPs practice swidden farming</li> <li>• <b>IKSP related to farming:</b> Indigenous practices and rituals used to be strictly followed, but not anymore. There are some people who still follows practices such as: Before transplanting, gongs are played to drive rats away, setting up scarecrows and clinking plates to drive animals away. Before harvest they put a bunch of tiger grass in every corner of the paddy to indicate that people are not allowed to go in.</li> </ul>  |



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In capacity building activities like FFS- the women attend more than the men but the women said they share what they know to the husband</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

**B. Consultation meetings with National Government Agencies, National farmers federation and National NGOs engaged in agriculture and climate change**

| Stakeholder  | Agreement and/or highlights of the meetings  |
|--|--|
| <p>National Commission of Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)</p> <p>Office of the Socio-Economic Services and Special Concern) (OSESSC)</p> <p>Ancestral Domains Office (ADO)</p> <p>Office of the Executive Director</p> | <p>Series of meetings with the NCIP from November 2018 to March 2019 with the offices in charge of agriculture and livelihood programs, the OSESSC and ADO, office in charge of the policy formulation and over-all FPIC implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provided guidance and endorsement to the mission team for the visits in Bicol ad CAR; GCF team provided feedback on the consultation results.</li> <li>• Upon approval of the project and before implementation, recommended to have a national memorandum of agreement (MOA) among NCIP, DA and FAO and then regional MOA between NCIP CAR and DA CAR for implementation on the ground. The MOA contains the role and responsibilities of each agency, and will facilitate the project's further engagement with the IPs (such as FPIC)</li> <li>• Requested for support under the project, not possible at this stage since it has to be done thru DA, as the main implementing agency and the FAO as technical agency.</li> <li>• Once the proposal is complete, present to the NCIP en Banc for their information and guidance, before submission to GCF.</li> <li>• In the proposed implementation arrangements, NCIP is proposed to be part of the Project Steering Committee and member of the regional project guidance body, this was welcomed.</li> <li>• Guidance on the applicable FPIC Guidelines, which was eventually determined to be 2. The project's activities will likely include documentation of indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSP) related to farming, seeds etc. by IPs, if relevant. FPIC for Research/ Capture / Documentation of IKSP and customary falls under NCIP Administrative Order 1, 2012 while generally the FPIC process for the project (FFS and Agromet in ancestral domain) falls under projects for FPIC validation of the of NCIP AO 3, 2012:</li> </ul> |
| <p>NCIP Provincial Office in Camarines Sur, Bicol Region</p> <p>Catherine J. Ibarreta,</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several Agta people were killed by Usman typhoon.</li> <li>• Upland Agta cultivate root crops, rice and bananas. Lowland Agta are fishermen.</li> <li>• Pure blood Agtas (<i>Kabihug</i>) are found in Camarines Norte.</li> <li>• Agtas are plagued by poverty and lack of education. They work mostly as hired labor. Outmigration is common. If they can, they hide their identity so as not to be discriminated against.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>Unyon ng mga Manggagawa sa</b></p>   | <p>UMA is a national progressive center of unions, federations, associations and organizations of agricultural workers in the Philippines, and affiliated with the</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Agrikultura</b> (UMA Pilipinas)</p>                                  | <p>umbrella group of Bayan, new patriotic alliance and UMA is a member of the Asian Peasant Coalition. <u>Practices agro-ecology. Especially for women and youth</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UMA works with agricultural workers where landlessness is the biggest issue for the peasants. The IPs have ancestral domain but are forced to sell their lands for plantation and mining, these are programs government pushes and supports. Hence IPs become workers or are displaced or murdered in the campaign against the companies</li> <li>• <b>Constraints of IPs: Poor</b> labor conditions of rural farmer including IPs, IPs are worse off, because of remoteness and lack of education and also because they are very trusting. In North Cotobato, IPs do not want to grow coffee anymore due to security reasons, there was a massacre incidence</li> <li>• <b>identified the following as pressing issues, affecting IPs and non-IPs:</b> 1.) Agribusiness Venture Arrangements (AVAs) which allows for the re-concentration of lands back to big landlords; 2) intrusion of giant multinational plantations into peasant communities and ancestral domain of <i>lumads</i> ( <i>non-islam IP groups in Mindanao</i> ), Oil palm business intrusion into ancestral domains agribusiness venture arrangements” with very cheap rental of lands ( 1,500/hectare per year, there is 700/hectare/year in Luzon)</li> <li>• One of their members, a Lumad farmers from Agusan del sur, part of the NAMASUR-(Nagkahiusang Mag-uuma sa Asgusan Del Sur)- KMU Caraga was shot last Nov. 2018 opposing the oil palm business</li> <li>• <b>IP agriculture:</b> Accredited community schools ( 58 schools) on IP agriculture in the uplands were closed, the schools tagged as associated with the New People’s Army, rebel soldiers.</li> <li>• Seed preservation is very active, they have established seed bank for 2,000 indigenous rice and seed banks for corn and vegetables are being experimented, this is with the technical assistance of MASIPAG. Experience of farmers in asking seeds from DA and LGU is negative since too many requirements and too bureaucratic, so we provide seeds, but our problem is still lack of seeds</li> <li>• Demo farms with the help of NAPCI , invited DA to provide help but DA gives high yielding varieties. DA has limited impact in terms of organic agriculture, few scattered farms not creating impact.</li> <li>• Upland rice and wild rice are not so common.</li> <li>• DA programs are limited in number and impacts are smaller than those of destructive activities, such as mining. They promote this but do many</li> </ul> |
| <p>Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka</p> <p><b>PAKISAMA</b></p> | <p>PAKISAMA is a national peasant confederation. It is composed of 75 farmers organizations of small farmers, fishers , rural women nationwide. A number of IP farmers groups are part of the federation. National federation member of AFA in the Philippines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They promote farmer-to-farmer extension program aimed at promoting sustainable agriculture and improving farm productivity. There is the farm planning based on agroecology and to be climate change inspired. The farm is complete with rice, farm and fish</li> <li>• socio-economic enterprises that can support the livelihood initiatives, they assist in capacitating farmers group to be cooperative so they can do business, then the Cooperatives link the farmers to markets.</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IP interventions aside</b> from farming technology support is assisting IP farmers to claim their ancestral domain, they have a partnership with PAFID on 3d mapping and GIS</li> <li>• <b>Farming coping mechanism:</b> putting windbreakers in their farms like indigenous trees and bamboo; farmer to farmer response during disasters</li> <li>• <b>Challenges on CRA-</b> lack of storage facility at the community and PO level</li> </ul>  |
| <p>Asian Farmers' Association for Sustainable Rural Development (AFA),<br/><br/>Quezon City</p>              | <p>Alliance of Asian national farmers organizations , composed of small scale women and men family farmers, fishers, indigenous peoples, forest users, herders and pastoralists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on a rights-based approach; recognition of vulnerable groups and supporting them to have rights to natural resources and technology and to organize themselves. Programs include awareness of climate change, DRR, including value addition and community-based seed system, a farmer-to-farmer learning system</li> <li>• <b>IP intervention:</b> Specific activities related to IP farmers will be that IP women farmers are provision of indigenous local seeds and exchange since seed banks are kept by the farmers themselves; Promotion of indigenous knowledge</li> <li>• <b>Constrained of IPs farmers.</b> 1- mitigation/coping up after post typhoons, linking with other agencies, there is a Philippine Crop Insurance, the process is not easy and then need to work with DENR particularly on Indigenous Peoples' concerns since DENR handles fishery and forestry;</li> <li>• Suggested that the project should have a knowledge sharing and exchange program at the ASEAN level</li> <li>• Questions: This is G to G project; how can farmers organization be part of the program. FAO PH answered that it can be thru inputs/consultation during project design such as this as well as knowledge sharing</li> <li>• Effective ways of getting information across farmers is thru community radio and transmission of information thru other channels aside from PAG-ASA,</li> <li>• CC information is crucial for farmers and government gaps are addressed by private groups. Example is the local storm tracker of Naga City in Camarines Sur, the NGO Typhoon Preparedness Center ( see <a href="https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/regions/176229/in-bicol-a-private-center-warns-gov-t-of-coming-storms/story/">https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/news/regions/176229/in-bicol-a-private-center-warns-gov-t-of-coming-storms/story/</a> ) They issue hourly updates especially those within Pagasa's six-hour interval</li> </ul> |
| <p>Philippines Development of Human Resources in Rural Asia<br/><br/><b>PHILDRA</b><br/><br/>Quezon City</p> | <p>Network of 65 NGOs involved in various development activities in rural communities across the Philippines. Their initiatives related climate change are on CC/DRR responsiveness thru community planning ( pushing for responsive Local Climate Change Adaptation Plans) and promoting social enterprise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change work mostly centered in the humanitarian/DRR/CC projects in Visayas hit by Yolanda in 2013</li> <li>• In Visayas, there is coastal management and zoning projects. Environmentally friendly livelihoods for mud crabs, seaweed, and sea</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>cucumber. In the low land, organic rice and sugarcane for vinegar are promoted as enterprises.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems related to CCA: seed banking and insurance.</li> <li>• The main issue for the IPs is land, and securing it against private companies and even government.</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>TEBTEBBA</b></p> <p>NGO Special Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations</p> <p>GCF Focal person, IP Agriculture focal point, IP women and CC team</p> | <p>The GCF project key components, scope and area, consultation process during program preparation and after implementation; FPIC engagement process were presented. Discussions followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• climate smart agriculture vs climate resilient agriculture and developmental projects vs. climate change project. These should be properly defined or very clear so not to cause problems with CSOs engaging the GCF.</li> <li>• Climate change projects vs. development project. But for IPs, one of the reasons that come out are extractive industries, oil palm affecting agri production of IP people, large commercial farming like in Benguet, we will promote agri but can pre-empt these activities</li> <li>• <b>Constraints by IPs on CRA:</b> Proliferation of chemical based farming is eroding the genetic base; Equity issue- Weather forecasting is tied to the price. farmers are at the mercy of the big business, there is no control of the government on the trading system. At the LGU level there is no participation of the IPs, even if the DA or the LGU staff are IPs themselves, IP farmers need are not reflected, so in effect they are not reflected in the LCCAPs; general lack of recognition and support for IKSP based agriculture; Issues on land tenure security and extractive industries should be considered, these greatly impact IP agriculture</li> <li>• How to ensure the women as seed bankers? Tease out from the Women breeders themselves not just the LGUs and Das</li> <li>• <b>Promote the recognition of IKSP:</b> What can be done to capacitate the LGUs- maybe a knowledge exchange between LGU/ support agencies on recognition of more sustainable IP farming knowledge systems<br/>At the level of the farmer, there can be knowledge exchange between farmers ( KSP, soil) and spell out in the project that CRA should be based on indigenous species, faming systems.</li> <li>• Mechanization will not at all time displace farmers, there is good mechanization. We are disbursing rice mill, men operate and women is freed from the hard work of pounding rice.</li> <li>• What is your specific design on engagement IP women?</li> <li>• <b>On country ownership and Involvement of more local institutions,</b> GCF is strong on country ownership , but in many instances , country ownership works against IPS. NCIP is the institution to protect the rights of IPs but in many meetings with communities, this is not the best institution for the IPs, especially at the regional / provincial.</li> <li>• Asked about the process of FPIC- how to do ensure genuine representation? The project will ensure working beyond NCIP identified leaders/ community representatives</li> <li>• <b>On the role of IPS on project implementation:</b> We want to make sure that this funding proposal has to good, this has to go down to the last IP in the remote areas, representation of IP community is</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>suggested, not the IPMR ( most cases. acts as government representative, not IP representative ).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>On the role of CSOs on project implementation:</b> Suggested CSO involvement in project board, if a CSO has big role then they can influence.</li> <li>• Suggested that the project team looked into the framework for the IPs for Climate Change, IP priorities with respect to CC, these are results of the national workshop last 2018</li> <li>• Land conflicts should be integrated in the FAO GCF project</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**C. Consultations with NCIP and DA Regional Offices, Provincial and Municipal Local Government Units and local NGOs (provincial)**

| Stakeholder  | Description and/or highlights of the meetings  |
|--|--|
| <p>NCIP Cordillera Administrative Region</p> <p>Regional Office ( Regional Director and Regional attorney)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Operations and staff complement :</b> In the region, there are 187 NCIP employees, average of 25 in the NCIP Provincial Offices and around total 5-7 in the Community Service Centers</li> <li>• <b>Example/s of IKSPs related to farming that has been recognized by government:</b> NCIP- DENR policy on recognition of Sustainable Traditional and Indigenous Forest Resources Management Systems and Practices (STIFRMSP, <a href="http://server2.denr.gov.ph/files/jointao-denr-ncip-2008-01_634.pdf">http://server2.denr.gov.ph/files/jointao-denr-ncip-2008-01_634.pdf</a> ). One practice <i>muyong</i> (agroforestry, rice farming is a portion ) as practiced in Benguet and Ifugao provinces is documented and recognized by DENR and NCIP</li> <li>• <b>Constraints by IP farmers:</b> The problem is not the sustainability ( there is both family-based system and community system) but the link to markets, Vegetables produced are discarded, feed to livestock because of low prices. Studies on value chain is needed.</li> <li>• <b>Regional coordination with other agencies:</b> NCIP has good working relationship with DA. In the Regional Development Council( RDC), CAR has Committee on IP Concerns, and NCIP sits as the chair. NCIP is also regular member of the RDC en banc.</li> <li>• <b>FPIC Guidelines:</b> Establishment of PAGASA/DA/LGU agro-met station needs to go through a FPIC process, as an LGU project under NCIP AO 3, Series of 2012- Section 40 &amp; 43 .In the past, such structures were installed without consent, and some were burned by the residents.</li> <li>• For documenting IP knowledge, FPIC process required will IKSP Guidelines. FPIC Classification of the project will be possible when details are known, can be LGU project with DA and PAGASA collaboration or as a community solicited project with DA and PAGASA collaboration.</li> <li>• <b>FPIC practice:</b> Acceptance of government projects will be decided by elders only. While large scale projects such as mining and hydro projects will be discussed and approved/disapproved by all.</li> <li>• DA project on heirloom rice in Ifugao, Kalinga and Mountain Provinces undertook FPIC under AO 1, 2012</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure enough resources for the consultation meetings for FPIC and for project implementation with IPS.</li> <li>• Delivery of information for IPs is not problem, there is radio; social media, and IPS has access to mobile phones and internets ( thru family)</li> <li>• NCIP confirms support to the project and can provide necessary information and support for project implementation.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>DA CAR Regional Officials and key staff members.</p> <p>Baguio City</p>   | <p>DA CAR characterized the region to have different ecosystems from others, terrain and crops varied. Benguet: high value products and then the Lowlands are the banner programs ( rice, corn, cassava etc.) and then the Uplands: much less supported by regular programs. Many people are vulnerable to extreme weather, and extreme weather has always existed. In the same manner IPs in region come in extremes--many shades from the very modern to "untouched."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DA CAR is sensitive and supportive of IP issues and likely the most compliant on FPIC.</li> <li>• Important considerations - Landholding is small, especially in the highlands; the risks of adopting new technology are very high, since their livelihood will be at stake. Insurance will be needed. Demonstration and scientific proof are needed to affect a behavioral change/ shift from regular farming to CRA</li> <li>• DA and NCIP has the good working relationship . NCIP capacity should also be strengthened.</li> </ul>   |
| <p>Provincial Agriculture Environment and Natural Resources Office ( PAENRO)</p> <p>Ifugao and the Municipal Agriculture officer of Lagawe, Ifugao</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PAENRO Office is staffed by 80% IPs, from the different tribes in Ifugao- the four main tribes are: Ifugao, Kalanguya, Tuwali, Ayangan.</li> <li>• <b>Farming:</b> Rice and cassava are planted. Uplands are rice only. Heirloom rice is included in the list of high value crop. Rice farming is Lagawe alone is done by 2,000 households. Men are the ones registered but the woman is sent to trainings. Heirloom Cultivated by women, but men participate in land preparation such as fixing the pilapil/ rice paddy and transport of heavy items.</li> <li>• <b>Observed Changes:</b> Extreme temperatures have been observed, very hot and very cold but varies across municipalities;</li> <li>• <b>Adaptation/Coping mechanism:</b> for drought are water impounding. and use of deep and shallow tube wells; Planting of drought resistant rice variety, which is locally available</li> <li>• <b>IKSP on farming : Examples are the following:</b> when a <i>Bakako</i> bird shouts , villages would know its time of for planting; When a particularly bird shouts, it signals that the typhoons has passed and it's safe. The bird is not seen anymore' Planting first by the tomonak, leader farmer, he plants first and performs the ritual.</li> <li>• <b>Other projects:</b> GEF 5 project on heirloom rice aims at conservation of traditional agricultural systems (rice based farming) and fostering entrepreneurship. Support groups include the Ifugao Cultural Heritage Office and Ifugao School of the Arts , the latter for ritual related to rice farming.</li> </ul> |
| <p>Provincial Agriculturist Officer (PAO) and Assistant PAO, Kalinga,</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Observed changes :</b> Number of typhoons has decreased, but intensity has gone up. The typhoon now enters the PH through the south - Mindanao, which has been beneficial to CAR in the north of</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>City and Municipal Agriculturists of Tabuk City, Tinglayan, Rizal and Lubuagan, all of Kalinga Province</p>     | <p>PH. Typhoons destroyed the irrigation dams; Communal Irrigation System along the river does not have any water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IP agriculture:</b> DA program on community seed banking was not successful as farmers prefer to store their seeds individually. Planting cycle has to be changed; In summer time, coffee beans are so small ( like mongo beans) because of the heat and the lack of rains</li> <li>• <b>Farming;</b> rice and corn ( major conversation of from coffee to corn). Corn is used for feeds and can be planted 2x a year as compared with coffee which is once a year. Sugarcane for bioethanol and there is a bioethanol processing factory nearby Cagayan.</li> <li>• <b>On FPIC :</b> For special projects, such as ones by the World Bank, we apply for FPIC and then FPIC process is conducted. For regular programs, FPIC is unnecessary, since all involved are IPs; Constraints in FPIC is the time and process is affected by NCIP personalities such as the Commissioners who signs it. in one case, it took one year for approval. While if the Commissioner is friendly to us, it was fast.</li> <li>• <b>IKSP on farming:</b> Rituals are extinct but there is one municipality ( Rizal?) in the uplands who still practices some rituals. Examples are: Before rice planting, rice cakes used to be placed on the sides of rice fields; At the time of planting, a particular prayer is said and offerings were given to different gods; Bird or bees flying over a full granary is considered a bad omen; pig or chicken is sacrificed and another particular prayer is said.</li> <li>• Suggested to connect with the Regional Development Council I and projects of the NAPCI (National Anti -Poverty Commission)</li> </ul>       |
| <p><b>NGO -Mandiga Community Center</b></p> <p>Fr. George Manisem, Executive Director</p> <p>IP group: Kalinga</p> | <p>Mandiga ( means <i>Elegant women</i> in Kalinga dialect ) is a women led local NGO operating within the Kalinga Province. It is supporting its members- women POs. Membership consists of 15 organizations- 4 lowland people's organizations and 11 Kalinga indigenous people's organizations (IPOs) with some 300 active members. They are members of Phildra and CODE-NGO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities include giving micro grant ( Php. 25,0000) to the POs to start a business, one successful business is the rice milling . Benefit sharing of the proceeds is equal to all members and they can discount for the milling services.</li> <li>• <b>Priority Interventions for IPs-a.)</b> livelihood to lessen forest utilization in Tinglayan b.)production of tiger grass c.)weaving and c.) developing eco-tourism in Mt. Taungan, but should prevent another Sagada. ( famous eco-tourism -cave area). The rules under the Bodong system ( dispute resolution of Kalinga)can be used to govern the resources. This is oral but can be written down. d.) Communal Irrigation System was identified but MCC has no capacity to provide so it helped thru linking the concerned members with NIA.</li> <li>• <b>Tenure and Disputes:</b> Conflicts arising from land boundaries cannot be easily resolved, unlike murders and robbery. If disputes among sub-tribes are not resolved, it will be a sub-tribal war, which is based on eye-for-an-eye philosophy. The people still use the traditional mechanism- the <i>Bodong</i>, Kalinga's traditional mediation mechanism, where the negotiators are the elders from other tribes. Settlement / peace offering is a spear. In case of continuous tribal war, there is ceasefire which gives time for negotiation.</li> </ul> |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IKSPs related to farming.</b> Imong system is a conservation system with a landscape approach, which defines no-go zone, rice paddies, and settlement area, it is similar to the concept of Indigenous Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) that is why Tinglayan was recognized by Biodiversity Management Bureau, DENR</li> <li>• <b>FPIC and its implementation-</b> This has been problematic because of NCIP, the process requires money from the communities, similar treatment done with mining companies. NCIP will facilitate government projects, however, community solicited projects – enterprise and conservation projects will be very hard to get FPIC.</li> <li>• <b>IP Constraints to CRA:</b> DA programs reached the “rich farmers” or the farmers connected with the LGUs and DA. There is a need to improve the monitoring and evaluation of projects and have on the ground monitoring This should be ideally by a third party and regular (quarterly).</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**Annex 10-A\_ List of Indigenous Peoples- Farmers , NCIP and IP led organizations consulted during program preparation**

| Stakeholder and IP group  | Date              | Location (Brgy, Municipality, Province, Region)                 | Number |      |
|---|-------------------|---|--------|------|
|   |                   |   | Female | Male |
| Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries/ IP farmers (Manobo, B’Laan, Tagakaulo) | November 20, 2018 | Kidapawan, North Cotabato, SOCCSKSARGEN                         | 7      | 14   |
| Coconut Farmers/ IP farmers (Obo Manobo)                              | November 21, 2018 | Ilomavis. Kidapawan, North Cotabato, SOCCSKSARGEN               | 16     | 5    |
| Muslim corn farmers and IP farmers                                    | November 22, 2018 | Patadon West Matalam, North Cotabato, SOCCSKSARGEN              | 11     | 73   |
| IP farmers – Manobo   | November 22, 2018 | Ginatilan, Matalam, North Cotabato, SOCCSKSARGEN                | 21     | 4    |
| IP farmers (Agta, Agta-Tabangnon)                                     | January 31, 2019  | Burubusoc, Buhi, Camarines Sur, Region V-Bicol                  | 13     | 7    |
| IP farmers (Oyango Tribal Settlement)                                 | January 31, 2019  | Sta. Teresita, Iriga City, Camarines Sur, Region V-Bicol        | 19     | 2    |
| farmers (Aeta) – Bulwak Tribo   | February 1, 2019  | Jose Panganiban, Camarines Norte, Region V-Bicol                | 10     | 8    |
| IP farmers ( Ifugao- Tuwali)  | February 5, 2019  | Poblacion, Banaue, Ifugao, Cordillera Administrative Region     | 15     | 5    |
| IP farmers (Ifugao-Tuwali)  | February 5, 2019  | Anao, Hingyon, Ifugao, Cordillera Administrative Region         | 6      | 3    |
| IP farmers ( Kalinga)   | February 6, 2019  | Poblacion, Tinglayan, Kalinga, Cordillera Administrative Region | 10     | 1    |
| IP farmers ( Kalinga)   | February 6, 2019  | Poblacion, Lubuagan, Kalinga, Cordillera Administrative Region  | 7      | 0    |
| Government- National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)          | 2018-Macrh 2019   | Quezon City, National Capital Region                            | 0      | 5    |
| Government-National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP)- CAR      | February 4, 2019  | Baguio City, Benguet  | 0      | 2    |



|  |                  |                       |   |   |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|---|---|
| Government-Catherine J. Ibarreta, NCIP   | 30 January 2019  | Pili, Camarines Sur   | 1 | 0 |
| NGO-Tebtebba   | February 4, 2019 | Baguio City , Benguet | 3 | 1 |
| NGO -Mandiga Community Center,<br>Fr. George Manisem, Executive Director , Kalinga | February 6, 2019 | Tabuk City, Kalinga   | 0 | 1 |