

# Official Development Assistance and Indigenous Peoples

RAYMUNDO D. ROVILLOS

University of the Philippines Baguio

## ABSTRACT

The past decade (1999-2010) saw an increase in Official Development Assistance (ODA) toward programs and projects that aim to reduce poverty in indigenous peoples' communities. Asset reform has been the centerpiece of ODA, along with the crafting of the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP). A discourse analysis of documents pertinent to these programs and projects reveals that overall, ODA aims to integrate or mainstream indigenous peoples into the neo-liberal development framework. This situation has led to state, capital, and elite capture of the indigenous peoples movement's agenda of empowerment. As an illustrative example, the notion of individual and collective land rights has inevitably pushed indigenous peoples in a game where the more powerful players end up the winners. It is true that elements of indigenous peoples' agenda for development, such as customary law, indigenous knowledge, traditional livelihoods and schools of living tradition are now given more attention. However, these articulations of a "good life" by and for indigenous peoples are still tackled within modernist discourse, which domesticates alternative social imaginaries to growth-oriented development discourse.

*Keywords:* post-development, discourse analysis, indigenous peoples' development, development and identity, modernism/modernity, alternatives to modernism/modernity, politics of identity.

## Introduction

This paper explores the connection between Official Development Assistance (ODA) and Indigenous Peoples, particularly in the implementation of the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA). This linkage is worth studying in light of the increasing presence of ODA in the indigenous peoples' development over the past decade.

Economists define Official Development Assistance or “foreign aid” as:

All grants and concessional loans, in currency or in kind, that are broadly aimed at transferring resources from developed to less developed nations (and, more recently, from OPEC to other Third World countries) on development and/or income distributional grounds. Unfortunately, there often is a thin line separating purely “developmental” grants and loans from those ultimately motivated by security and/or commercial grounds. (Todaro 1989, 482)

Official Development Assistance comes in various forms, the two basic categories being bilateral (e.g., grants and loans) and contributions to multilateral institutions (e.g., grants, capital subscription payments, and concessional loans). Bilateral ODA loans may be further classified into: 1) project loans, 2) commodity loans, 3) engineering service loans, 4) financial intermediary (two-step) loans, 5) structural adjustment loans, and 6) sector loans and sector program loans (Padilla 2001, 14). Most developing countries like the Philippines solicit or accept foreign aid due to the so-called foreign-exchange gap. This means that “these countries have excess productive resources (mostly labor) and all available foreign exchange is being used for imports” (Todaro 1989, 487). Foreign aid can, therefore, play a critical role in overcoming the foreign-exchange constraint and raising the real rate of economic growth.

Much has been said and written about the nature and actual impact of ODA on developing countries. There are two sides to the ongoing debate. On the one hand, there are those who argue that ODA contributes to the overall economic development/growth and structural transformation of Third World countries (cf. Chenery and Carter 1973, cited in Todaro 1989). On the other hand, there are those who posit that foreign aid may in fact retard growth by “substituting for, rather than supplementing, domestic savings and investment and by exacerbating LDC balance of payments deficits as a result of rising debt repayment obligations and the linking of aid to donor country exports” (Todaro 1989, 491). Critical studies also demonstrate that ODA usually benefits the donor country more than the recipient country through payments of technical assistance (honoraria), equipment and supplies, and other materials that have to be imported from the donor countries (Japan Center for Sustainable Development and Society 1996, 10). Several ODA projects like those in the Philippines have also reportedly resulted in the displacement of rural communities and indigenous peoples from their ancestral domain, restriction and weakening of traditional livelihoods, and destruction of the environment, especially in the case of mining operations (CPA

and IBON Foundation 2002; Tujan 2001) and introduction of gender inequalities in IP communities (Rovillos 1996).

Over the past decade, ODA for indigenous peoples' development has been increasing. This phenomenon may be attributed to the growing international and national attention given to the plight of indigenous peoples, who have historically been marginalized in the national development agenda. The impetus for increased ODA for indigenous communities has been further fuelled by global processes such as the declaration of the UN Decade for Indigenous Peoples and the UN General Assembly's adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Right of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). At the same time, several development institutions such as international financial institutions (e.g., World Bank and Asian Development Bank), and UN multilateral agencies (e.g., UNDP, IFAD, ILO) have instituted their respective policies on indigenous peoples. In the Philippines, the landmark Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA) was enacted in 1997. It must be noted that the UNDP and ADB also rendered technical and financial assistance in the crafting of IPRA. These institutional frameworks legitimized the necessity of a transfer of resources (funds and technical assistance) in support of indigenous peoples' development.

This essay explores the connection between ODA and indigenous peoples. It seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the ODA "presence" in indigenous peoples' communities in the Philippines?
2. What are the priority projects of ODA and why?
3. What are the results/outcomes of ODA programs and projects for indigenous peoples?
4. How did the NCIP manage the ODA projects under its jurisdiction?

This study attempts to answer these questions mainly through a close scrutiny of documents relating to the ODA-IP nexus, e.g., evaluation reports, annual reports, end of program or project reports. The conceptual and methodological approach employed is discourse analysis in the context of development, or what is known in social theory as "post-development." Discourse analysis is used here in a Foucauldian sense. For Foucault, "a discourse is a strongly bounded area of social knowledge, a system of statements within which the world can be known. The key feature of this is that the world is not simply 'there' to be talked about, rather, it is through discourse itself that the world is brought into being" (cited in Aschroft et al. 1998, 70-71). According to Arturo Escobar (1995), in order to understand development as discourse, "one must look not at the elements

themselves but at the system of relations established among them. The system of relations establishes a discursive practice that sets the rules of the game: who can speak, from what points of view, with what authority, and what criteria of expertise; it sets the rules that must be followed for this or that problem, theory, or object to emerge and be named, analyzed, and eventually transformed into a policy or plan" (Escobar 1995, 9).

### **Financing indigenous peoples' development**

A cursory survey of foreign-assisted programs and projects that deal with indigenous peoples' development from 1994 to 2011 (see Appendix A: foreign-assisted projects) reveals that there are several development actors involved which can be classified as: 1) International Financial Institutions (IFIs) such as the Asian Development Bank, World Bank, and Japan Bank International Cooperation (JBIC); 2) Multilateral institutions such as the UNDP, UNFPA, ILO, IFAD, EU; 3) "Bilateral" agencies such as the Australian Agency for International Development (Aus-aid), Canadian Agency for International Development (CIDA), Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZ-aid), Spain's Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional (AECI), and United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Among the list of ODA projects (see Appendix A), only a few went directly into the coffers of the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP). These are: the three (3) ILO-assisted projects— "Tribal Communities through Cooperatives and other Self-Help Organizations" (INDISCO), the "Indigenous Peoples Development Program" (IDP) in Lake Sebu and Caraga Region; NZ-Aid and UNDP's "Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains" (IP-EIPSDADS) and UNDP's "Human Rights Community Development Project"; and UNDP's "Strengthening Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Development" (SIPRD). The rest of the list consists of ODA-projects that went to the coffers of other government agencies. These projects are generally aimed at reducing poverty in areas or regions that are inhabited largely by indigenous peoples. As such, most of these projects tackle "indigenous peoples" as the object or "target" of development, although these projects may be couched or "packaged" in development parlance in themes like education and literacy, peace-building and conflict resolution or transformation, livelihood and food security, resource-management, participatory governance, and asset redistribution or land reform.

Indeed, the “mainstreaming” of indigenous peoples into development discourse has resulted in what Arturo Escobar (1995) calls the process of institutionalization and professionalization of the “IP problem” by development technocrats, consultants and academics. But has this process indeed changed the ethos and logic of development? Or are they (development technocrats, consultants and academics) still guilty of creating a developmental “Other,” or “abnormalities like the so-called illiterates, malnourished, subsistence farmers and small farmers, needing to be ‘saved’ by a top-down, ethnocentric and technocratic approach, which treats people and cultures as abstract concepts, statistical figures to be moved up and down in the charts of ‘progress’” (Escobar 1995)?

### **Property, state and capital**

A close examination of the substantive elements (content) of the ODA projects draws one’s attention to the apparent priority given by foreign aid to ancestral domain/land delineation and titling and its requisite, the crafting of the Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Plan (ADSDPP). This may be gleaned from the scale and resources devoted to this component (cf. CHARM 1 and 2, LAMP 1 and 2, INDISCO, IP-EIPSDADS). Reports about these projects (cf. ADB 2002; Caballero 2004; Malanes 2002; Arquiza 2005) show that the goal of entitling the ancestral domains has, in the main, been relatively successful (also see Calde’s report on titling in this volume).

What follows are some examples of CADTs that were delineated and titled through the active intervention of ODA and the donor agencies themselves.

- On March 25, 2004 a CADT of 4,355.9310 hectares, which represents almost 45% of the land area of the Subic Freeport Zone was awarded to the Aytas of Pastolan. This was made possible by the World Bank’s project implementation plan which “directed the SBMA IPDP implementation consultants to pursue permanent land tenure solutions for Pastolan Aytas” (Caballero 2004, 3). World Bank has an existing policy on indigenous peoples which stipulates, among others, that all projects it is supporting should develop an Indigenous Peoples’ Development Plan (IPDP).
- The Cordillera Highland Agricultural Program 1 (CHARMP1) that was/is assisted by the Asian Development Bank and later the IFAD (CHARMP2) has facilitated the ancestral domain delineation and titling in the Cordillera



region. With CHARMP2, it aims to do same for more areas in the region.

- The ILO-INDISCO project helped prepare the groundwork for the full and effective implementation of IPRA by “developing empirical evidence of key issues relevant to the indigenous peoples of the Philippines” (Wirth, in Arquiza 2005, foreword). The project also supported and facilitated the delineation, titling and crafting of the ADSPPs of selected (pilot) areas (Malanes 2002).

These success stories may be attributed largely to the substantial financial support and technical expertise provided by consultants and other external actors, and less to the internal capacity of the NCIP itself (cf. Final Project Review Report, IP-EIPSDADS 2010).

The development aim of securing property ownership is not surprising, considering that the project funds come from World Bank, Asian Development Bank, the UN bodies, and leading capitalist countries like Japan, Canada, USA, New Zealand, Australia. We know for a fact that the notion of “property” and its privatization has always been a crucial “factor of production,” along with labor, technology and capital. There are two perspectives on the issue of titling ancestral land/domain. On one hand, there is the neo-liberal logic that every individual person has a right to own, alienate, and dispose of his/her property. This basic right may of course be extended to indigenous peoples. But has the process of titling indeed promoted and protected the rights of indigenous peoples to their ancestral land/domain? What usually happens after the title has been awarded to IPs? Has it actually resulted in their empowerment and economic development? Answers to these questions would require further field investigation.

Scholars on identity politics (e.g., Hale 2005; Gatmaitan 2000; Sawyer and Gomez 2008, 2012; Rovillos 2010) posit that the struggles for indigenous rights may in actuality—counter to intentions—further a neoliberal agenda, by unwittingly domesticating opposition or being co-opted by a neoliberal politics. The bureaucratization of the indigenous peoples’ rights to land and resources has had the effect of redirecting some indigenous peoples’ organizational strategies, “from protest to proposal” (Hale 2005). Instead of resisting the forces of neo-liberalism squarely on their own territories, they are entangled in a game whose rules are crafted by the sure winners. To illustrate this point: the award of Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT) requires communities to come up with an Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development Plan and Protection (ADSDPP). The implementing rules and regulations of IPRA stipulate that the plan should emanate from the IP organizations who are the legal holders of the title. In practice, the process of planning ADSDPP and its

implementation had been influenced to a large extent by multilateral agencies, international financial institutions, state (through the National Power Corporation and some Local Government Units), and the private sector (including big business and religious congregations). This assertion is supported by the table on “sources of funds for the ADSDPPs” (Appendix B). In other cases the plan is not supported and even derailed and undermined by local government units who claim that it is their prerogative to carry out development programs and projects within their jurisdiction.

Multinational corporations have used the legal instruments of the state (e.g., Mining Act of 1995), including the IPRA of 1997, to penetrate IP territories and exploit their mineral resources (cf. Colchester et al. 2003; Sawyer and Gomez 2008, 2012). This observation is echoed and confirmed by this study’s findings (see the report on FPIC and ADSDPP). This phenomenon of state, capital and elite capture of both initiative and momentum runs counter to the agenda of the democratic IP movement, which is to resist the inroads of neo-liberalism into IP communities and livelihoods. But in most cases, the MNCs succeed precisely because IPRA has given them enough legal space to maneuver, using the language of “collective rights.” From the perspective of State and neo-liberal institutions:

Collective rights to land work just as well (as individual rights), as long as they meet two basic conditions: The first is they cannot contradict the principal tenets of the long-term economic model. The second condition is that they cannot cross a certain line in the gathering of political clout, which would threaten established power holders and destabilize the regime. As long as these conditions are met, collective land rights actually help advance the neoliberal model by rationalizing land tenure, reducing the potential for chaos and conflict, and locking the community into a mindset that makes it more difficult for expansive political alternatives to emerge. (Hale 2005, 18)

Again, this kind of economic philosophy is unsurprising, considering that, historically, from the era of high-modernity during the 19th century to the present, the concept of property rights became more pronounced alongside the consolidation of state and capital (Scott 1998). Throughout history, as the stakes became higher, the nation-state had always turned from being arbiter between capital and the community to being partner of capital (Scott, 1998; Martinussen, 1997; Engels, 1972). In the Philippines, in particular, the partnership between state and capital had also taken place, often resulting in the marginalization of indigenous peoples (De los Reyes and De los Reyes 1986; Rodil, 1994).

In short, the notions of individual and collective rights are not anathema to state and capital. On the contrary, state-building, capital consolidation and expansion, and property rights are supportive of, and intimately imbricated with, each other.

### **Participation or assimilation?**

Reports on the implementation of some ODA projects such as the Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Program (CHARMP1)-ADB, San Roque Multi-purpose Dam Project (JBIC), Laiban Dam-ADB, Conservation of Priority Protected Areas Project, and Bataan National Park-WB reveal that there has been inadequate participation of indigenous peoples in decision-making and a lack of free prior informed consent by the affected communities (Cariño 2010; ADB 2002; Tauli-Corpuz and Alcantara 2002). These criticisms bear out the post-development critique that development projects are largely conceptualized from the top and that the “problems” of indigenous peoples are to be solved mainly through technical intervention, rather than as a cultural process (Escobar 1995).

Over the past decade, the imperative to increase indigenous peoples’ participation in development initiatives and local governance has been recognized by ODA projects as may be gleaned from the project documents of, for example, CHARMP2, ILO-INDISCO, IP-EIPSDADS, Eco-governance (USAID), and others. An interesting question arises: Precisely under what development paradigm are the indigenous communities being made to fully participate? Are they being “managed” toward their full integration into a market-oriented economy? What is the impact of these processes on their indigenous or traditional livelihoods? Are they being made to “imagine” alternative notions of a good life? What is the extent and nature of their participation in development? Again, a more in-depth ethnographic case study can best capture the implications of these otherwise commonplace assumptions of the ODA projects.

A discursive analysis of the ODA project documents (see list in Appendix A) would reveal that most, if not all projects, lean toward a modernization theory of development (for a full discussion of modernization theory, see Martinussen 1997). These projects essentially aim to transform indigenous communities from a state of ‘tradition’ into a state of ‘modernity’. Traditional societies are generally characterized as subsistence (non-cash/market-oriented) economies, with low human capital as evidenced by low literary rates, high malnourishment, mortality and morbidity rates, etc. The modernizing and growth-oriented goals of ODA projects may be clearly deduced from the following excerpts:



- The intended impact of the (ADB's) Bukidnon Integrated Area Development Program (BIADP) was to improve the socioeconomic status of poor rural communities in Bukidnon Province through increased, sustained production of high-value vegetables and improved delivery of basic social services. The project aimed to strengthen LGUs and communities to initiate and manage development activities and to collaborate with private investors to produce high-value crops.
- The Project (ADB's Agrarian Reform Communities Project) will support the Government's Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) 2005-2010. It will pursue a holistic approach to poverty reduction by promoting an agribusiness approach to rural development in approximately 152 selected ARCs and ARC Clusters in 19 provinces in southern Philippines. The Project will support the following outputs: (i) strong participation of local communities in the development process, (ii) agricultural enterprise development, (iii) improved access to rural infrastructure, designed to provide a boost to improved production and productivity, and (iv) improved project management.
- Aus-Aids' STRIVE 1 and 2 develops, supports and strengthens education management and learning support systems in the Visayas for improved access to quality basic education, within the national Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda.
- The ILO (INDISCO) is working with the indigenous peoples of Caraga and collaborating partners to support community initiatives. This project seeks to develop their ancestral domains in the context of implementation of the IPRA and the Master Plan for the Development of IPs (MTPDP-IPs).
- The UNDP's IP-EIPSDADS program supports the implementation of the IPRA. It has 3 major components: (1) formulation of Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPPs); (2) strengthening of indigenous peoples' governance, particularly on community organizing, paralegal competency, and project management and implementation; and (3) pilot implementation of ADSDPPs.

These projects clearly aim to integrate indigenous communities into the market economy and subject them to its forces, or more classically, its 'hidden hand'. The underlying assumption is that the full participation of IPs in a market economy is what holds the key

to their material emancipation. For instance, the production of high-value crops is expected to result in increased household incomes. The entry of capital, including foreign investments in support of the ADSDPPs (as in the case of IP-EIPSDSADS), would presumably stimulate local economic development. Most importantly, capacity building in entrepreneurship, project management (planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation) would prepare and enable the indigenous peoples to run micro-enterprises. Overall, these projects aim toward the full transformation of IP communities from traditional/subsistence economies to market-driven livelihood systems.

As gleaned from the evaluation reports, ODA projects in indigenous peoples' communities have, on balance, effectively achieved their identified goals, such as increased income, improved production, enhanced management of natural resources, and strengthened capacities of indigenous peoples in project management, and bolstered indigenous identity (cf. Reports from WB, ADB, ILO, UNDP, GIZ, JICA, etc). However, it would be good to do a deeper study of the meaning and implications of these development interventions. For example, what kinds of crops are being introduced or encouraged? Do they simultaneously contribute to sustainability (biodiversity) while increasing household income? We ask this because, in the case of previously completed ODA projects like the CECAP and CHARMP1 in the Cordilleras, indigenous farmers were encouraged to cultivate high value cash-crops that were heavily dependent on inorganic inputs (EED-TFIP 2004, 153). The projects may have succeeded in increasing household income in the immediate term, as reported, but have resulted in nitrogen loss and acidification of the soil, over the long haul. The expensive agricultural inputs had actually resulted in loss of income and worse, heavy indebtedness, over the long term. The increasing reliance on the market, with its price fluctuations and one's cultivation of inelastic produce, agri-business may lead to chronic food insecurity for IP communities, since their farmers then are disallowed from growing their subsistence crops. Mono-cropping which is implicit in the idea of agri-business have also resulted in loss of agro-biodiversity, as studies have shown (EED-TFIP 2004).

The ADSDPPs may already contain imaginings (or at least elements) of alternatives to modernity (growth, market-driven, consumerist, etc.) as our content-analysis of selected ADSDPPs may show (see Abansi in this issue). Hence, phrases such as "sustainable agriculture," "indigenous/traditional knowledge," "participatory approach," may considerably appear in the texts of the ADSDPPs. This suggests that indeed, with the deepening of the crisis (of a market economy), some previously excluded choices are now being considered (Escobar 1995). But do these articulations challenge the

prevailing cultural premise of development? Are indigenous peoples' aspirations translated into alternative imaginaries of modernity (Escobar 2008)? Or are they still framed within the confines of the same discursive space of a growth-oriented development paradigm? These big questions can be answered by in-depth ethnographic or case studies on indigenous peoples' development initiatives.

### **Modern bureaucracy for the indigenous peoples?**

The National Commission on Indigenous Peoples' (NCIP) is mandated to implement the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA). It is envisioned to be a modern/modernizing bureaucracy, which, in the "Weberian" sense, is supposed to articulate and aggregate the interests of indigenous peoples and thereby contribute to the stability of the nation-state. The IPRA and NCIP are deemed as catalysts for the transformation of indigenous/traditional communities toward modernity as the presumably desirable end for them. This assertion (that IPRA and NCIP are deemed by the state as a catalyst for modernization) is supported by the following key findings of the papers in this volume: 1) titling and eventual privatization of ancestral land and domain (Calde's paper); 2) transforming indigenous/local communities from subsistence to cash-economy (Abansi's paper); 3) increasing household income and savings (Abansi's paper) and 4) attracting investments in indigenous communities (Abansi's and Rovillos' papers). Overall, the implementation of the four (4) bundles of rights over the past decade point to modernization as a path towards IP development in the Philippines.

The law also envisions the NCIP to function as a rational and scientific modern bureaucracy, guided by expert knowledge and the ethos of efficiency and effectiveness. These characteristics constitute what Foucault (1991) familiarly calls "governmentality." These are precisely also the expectations of other actors/instruments of IP governance and development, such as the foreign donors. Hence, indigenous peoples who are in state bureaucracy are now to be appraised within the grid of rationality, science, and efficiency.

There appears to be a wide gap between this expectation of a modern state bureaucracy and the capacity of indigenous peoples by way of NCIP. Since its creation in 1998 until the present, the NCIP has performed below such expectations. Internal and external evaluations of NCIP from 2002 to present (cf. Garilao, PANLIPI, WB, and ILO, cited by Ciencia in this volume) have concertedly and consistently found that NCIP lacks the organizational capacity to carry out its mandate with efficacy and efficiency. Indeed, it has always relied on the expertise of consultancy groups and individuals to implement

ODA projects. This observation is magnified in the case of the IP-EIPSDADS project which, as a representative project/case, merits some critical discussion and analysis.

The Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADs) ran from January 2007 to March 2010. It received a grant from the UNDP in the amount of USD 100,000 and the NZ-Aid in the amount of USD 892,000. The final project review report (2010) noted the following accomplishments: 1) 26 ADSDPPs were formulated and presented before the LGUs; 2) 26 IP organizations were strengthened, with 19 tribal councils functioning as legal mechanism; and 3) support was given to the implementation of priority projects by five (5) IPOs in Lacub, Abra; Tinoc, Ifugao; Porac, Pampanga; Dumingag, Zamboanga del Norte; and Makilala, North Cotabato.

The report also emphasized the following strengths:

- Provided the conceptual tools for enhancing organizational knowledge in mobilizing IP communities toward ADSDPP formulation;
- Forged working relations between the NCIP field officers and local LGUs at least up to the municipal level;
- Blazed the trail in bringing the NCIP bureaucracy to the mass base of IP communities, thus laying the groundwork for its accountability to the constituents of NCIP's mandate;
- Developed the project focal persons as a core group of movers at the base of the NCIP organization.

However, the report revealed weaknesses in project management, largely pointing culpability to the NCIP:

Existing NCIP personnel were embroiled in multi-tasking and interlocking responsibilities that the NPCO was unable to function as a separate unit with defined duties and responsibilities in accordance with the NEDA and UNDP guidelines for nationally executed/implemented projects. More capacity building is needed towards this end, with the Bureau Directors and Regional Directors given a basic orientation for national project coordination by NEDA, and vice versa. Being a unique and "young" institution, the NCIP does not fit in the box of national government line agencies. At the same time, the NCIP has to learn the basic responsibilities and functions expected by NEDA and donors from a government agency executing/implementing a project. (p. 14)

"Lack of capacity" is also manifested in the area of financial management:

While liquidation rate rose and reached the required level of 70% as of February (2010), an available balance of around PhP1.2 million out of over PhP11.5 million transferred by the DAR to NCIP from 2007 to 2009 remain to be accounted for. Liquidation concerns again surfaced for the Component 1 implementation in the 2009 sites prompting the exploration of alternative courses of action to address liquidation concerns. (p. 16)

The report took the issue of liquidation as an indicator of a deeper institutional dilemma:

The concerns with respect to the liquidation of project funds that affected the pace of implementation and overall project efficiency had been viewed as essentially symptomatic of issues which are institutional in nature, as discussed in the preceding section on capacity building. The NCIP financial system must be looked into with the intervention of the Departments of Finance and Budget, as well as the Commission on Audit vis-a-vis the NCIP's limited manpower. (p. 18)

The disparity between expectations of NCIP as a modern state bureaucracy on the one hand and as an institution for and by indigenous peoples, on the other, indeed emerged as problematic. The NCIP is currently staffed largely by the people from the defunct Office for Northern Cultural Communities (ONCC) and Office for Southern Cultural Communities (OSCC). The lack of capacity of most NCIP staff may be a function of the situation that a considerable number of them were political appointees, rather than hired on the basis of merit and competencies. Some indigenous persons have questioned professional background or formal education as a criterion for hiring indigenous persons to serve in the NCIP as a Commissioner or a regular clerk/staff, a glaring paradox for indigenous peoples, given their expectations of the NCIP as an institution that is sensitive to indigenous culture, customary law, and indigenous socio-political institutions. The indigenous staff of NCIP (and the entire NCIP itself) would then have to be "trained and capacitated" to be at par with the civil servants of other government agencies so that "they are able to manage foreign-assisted projects." Otherwise, they tend to be judged as "inept" and "incompetent." What to do then with this dilemma? Should one continue to rely on non-indigenous experts and consultants just to ensure that the NCIP is able to meet the expected output and outcomes of the ODA projects? Is it possible to replace the current NCIP staff, both indigenous and non-indigenous, with more competent IP staff in the immediate future?

From the perspective of many indigenous peoples and grassroots organizations, the problem is more fundamental. For them, NCIP has



become an alien(ating) bureaucracy unable or unwilling to engage indigenous knowledges and competencies (Rovillos and Tauli-Corpuz 2012, 143-147). Only a few traditional indigenous leaders are able to work as officers and/or staffers of NCIP, since the civil service requires a professional degree for basic entry into government employment. The recruitment of more technical experts to serve in the bureaucracy has also become imperative for reasons already stated.

State or elite capture of indigenous peoples' cultural definitions of development now seems to be the case. Customary law is acknowledged but not promoted (see Calde's paper in this volume), and if indigenous knowledge systems and practices in biodiversity/natural resource management are recognized in project documents and ADSDPPs, they are only so within the overarching neo-liberal framework of national development. Hence, mining, logging and other extractive industries are ultimately privileged over self-determined sustainable development alternatives. The institutionalization, bureaucratization, and professionalization of the "indigenous problem" has constrained, rather than expanded, imaginaries that can constitute alternatives to modernity. Escobar (2008) defines an alternative to modernity as:

An explicit cultural-political project of transformation from the perspective of modernity/coloniality/decoloniality – more specifically, an alternative construction of the world from the perspective of the colonial difference. The dimension of alternatives to modernity contributes explicitly to a weakening of the strong structures of modernity – universality, unity, totality, scientific and instrumental rationality, etc. (Vattimo 1991; Dussel 1996, 2000 cited in Escobar 2008)

Alternatives to modernity lurk in culture-based and community-based practices such as the so-called traditional production systems, biodiversity/natural resource management, local/indigenous knowledge, schools of living tradition, renewable energy projects, and alternative trading/marketing systems.

## **Conclusion**

Over the past decade, we have seen the strong presence of ODA projects in indigenous peoples' communities in the Philippines. Foreign assistance in the form of grants or loans has been present in a wide range of development projects such as literacy/education, food security/livelihood, infrastructure, and asset reform. There appears to be a special interest among donors in the latter (asset reform), as seen in the scale and magnitude of resources transferred to land titling

either in the framework of land reform (LAMP1 and 2) or ancestral land/ancestral domain delineation and titling (CHARMP1 and 2, IP-EIPSDADS and ILO-INDISCO). Asset reform has been a long-time priority of ODA, especially the IFIs (WB and ADB), because of the classic idea that private property—individual and collective—could facilitate the penetration of capital. Asset reform is, therefore, consistent with the neo-liberal model for economic growth.

ODA projects have undoubtedly been successful in accomplishing their desired outcomes of increasing household incomes, improving production, enhancing the management of natural resources, strengthening the capacities of indigenous peoples in project management and bolstering indigenous identity. But upon closer scrutiny as to the content and intent of their projects, ODA seems to reify the modernist model for development (i.e., growth-orientation, consumerism, individualism, reliance on experts, top-down management, anthropocentricity, etc). The cultural basis of this model is taken for granted. Alternative social imaginings of a “good life” by indigenous peoples, such as local/indigenous knowledge, sustainable development, and participatory development while appropriated, are ultimately subsumed within the same discursive space grid of modernity, if not totally undermined by it.

The NCIP’s performance in handling and managing the ODA projects is indicative of the deeply-seated problem besetting the organization. The case of the IP-EIPSDADS, for example, illustrates the tension between the expectation toward the NCIP as a modern (secular, professional, rational, and science-based) bureaucracy and the indigenous peoples’ struggles/social movements. This scenario seems to further marginalize the indigenous peoples working in the NCIP who could not meet the standards and expectations of the state, donors, and even civil society. Boxed within the confines of the statist version of “governmentality,” indigenous peoples in government are forced to step up and keep pace with the rest. Moreover, even the most capable, efficient and effective among the IPs in government are compelled to think like minions of the state. It is common to hear comments from IPs to the effect that “IPs in government do not necessarily think as IPs, or speak on behalf of IPs.” Some IPs in government find themselves placed in the awkward situation of walking the tightrope as state representatives and indigenous persons at the same time (Perez 2009).

Caught in this complex web of state capture, many indigenous peoples may either simply go along with the prevalent modes of governance and development or assert their alternative imaginings of what is the good life for them. Indeed, the seeds of alternatives to modernity lie in wait in the cultures and knowledge of many indigenous communities in the Philippines, still largely untapped

or taken for granted. These local constructions and practices offer compelling contestations of mainstream development and administrative paradigms.

## REFERENCES

- Arquiza, Yasmin D., ed. 2005. *A journey of hope: Implementing the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act of the Philippines*. Vol. 1, *The quest to reclaim ancestral domains*. Manila: International Labour Organization.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. 1998. *Key concepts in post-colonial studies*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Caballero, Evelyn J. 2004. *Ancestral domain delineation and recognition: CADT of Aytas of Bataan*. Quezon City: Department of Environment and Natural Resources-United States Agency for International Development's (DENR-USAID) Philippine Environmental Governance (EcoGov) Project.
- Cariño, Jacqueline K. 2010. *Country technical notes on indigenous peoples' issues. Republic of the Philippines*. Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and Asia Indigenous Peoples' Pact (AIPP).
- Colchester, Marcus, Emily Caruso, Loreto Ann Tamayo and Raymundo Rovillos, eds. 2003. *Extracting promises: Indigenous peoples, extractive industries and the World Bank*. Baguio City: Tebtebba Foundation.
- Cordillera People's Alliance and Ibon Foundation. 2004. *Resource kit: Taking control of our resources: Workshop on indigenous peoples, international financial institutions and multinational companies*. Quezon City: CPA and Ibon Foundation.
- De los Reyes, Angelo J. and Aloma M. De los Reyes. 1986. *Igorot: a people who daily touch the earth and the sky*. Vol. 2, *Cordillera history*. Baguio City: Cordillera Schools Group and Syner Aide Consultancies.
- Edelman, March and Angelique Haugerud, eds. 2005. *The anthropology of development and globalization: From classical political economy to contemporary neoliberalism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Engels, Frederick. 1972. *The origin of family, private property and the state*. Translated by Alec West. New York: International Publishers.
- EED Philippine Partners' Task Force for Indigenous Peoples Rights (EED-TFIP). 2004. *Our harvest in peril: A sourcebook on indigenous peoples' food security*. Quezon City: EEDTFIP.
- Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering development: The making and*

- unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Territories of difference: Place, movements, life, redes*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. Governmentality. In *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller, 87-104. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gatmaitan, Gus. 2000. Mapmaker: Mythmaker. In *Mapping the earth, mapping life*, ed. Ponciano L. Bennagen and Antoinette G. Royo, 64-107. Quezon City: Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center, Inc.-Kasama sa Kalikasan.
- Hale, Charles R. 2005. Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28 (1): 10-28.
- Japan Center for a Sustainable Environment and Society. 1996. *Environment and sustainable development in official development assistance since the 1992 Earth Summit*. Tokyo: JCSES.
- Malanes, Maurice. 2002. *Power from the mountains: Indigenous knowledge systems and practices in ancestral domain management: The experience of the Kankanaey-Bago people in Bakun, Benguet Province, Philippines*. INDISCO Case Study no. 8. Baguio: Toplinq.
- Martinussen, John. 1997. *Society, state and market: A guide to competing theories of development*. London: Zed Books.
- Padilla, Arnold J. 2001. Japan's ODA: Obstructing development through aid? In *Japan ODA: Development or profit?*, ed. Antonio Tujan, Jr., 11-40. Manila: Asia-Pacific Research Network.
- Perez, Padmapani. 2009. Indigenous peoples in government. *The Cordillera Review* 1 (2): 53-85.
- Rodil, B.R. 1994. *The minoritization of the indigenous communities of Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago*. Davao: Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao, Inc.
- Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Rovillos, Raymundo. 1996. The effects of the Central Cordillera Agricultural Programme (CECAP) on gender relations in Ifugao. *PURC News and Views*, Philippines Upland Resource Center, De La Salle University, December 1996, 30-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Indigenous peoples' movements. In *The bottom line or public health: Tactics corporations use to influence health and health policy, and what we can do to counter them*, ed. William H. Wiist, 469-476. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rovillos, Raymundo and Daisy Morales. 2002. *Indigenous peoples/ethnic and poverty reduction: Philippines*. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. Aeta communities and the Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project (CPPAP): Indigenous perspectives on a World Bank-financed conservation project in the Philippines. *Indigenous Perspectives* 3 (1): 56-81.
- Rovillos, Raymundo and Victoria Tauli-Corpuz. 2012. Development, power and identity politics in the Philippines. In *The politics of resource extraction: Indigenous peoples, multinational corporations, and the state*, ed. Suzana Sawyer and Edmund Terence Gomez, 129-152. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sawyer, Suzana and Terence Gomez. 2008. *Transnational governmentality and resource extraction: Indigenous peoples, multinational corporations, multinational institutions and the state*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria and Erlyn Ruth Alcantara. 2002. *Engaging the UN Special Rapporteur on Indigenous Peoples: Opportunities and challenges*. The Philippine Mission of the UN Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous Peoples. Baguio City: Tebtebba.
- Tujan, Antonio Jr., ed. 2001. *Japan ODA: Development or profit?* Manila: Asia-Pacific Research Network.
- Todaro, Michael P. 1989. *Economic development in the Third World*. 4th ed. New York: Longman.



**Appendix A-1.** Foreign assisted projects (project duration and cost).

DONOR / PROJECT TITLE	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	PROJECT DURATION		PROJECT COST	
		Start	End	Currency	Amount
ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (ADB)					
Bukidnon Integrated Area Development Project (BIADP)	ProvGovt	1997	2002	USD	2,600
Integrated Co Services Project (ICHSP)	DOH	1997	2005	USD	20,950
Agrarian Reform Communities Project (ARCP)	DAR	1999	2005	USD	93,162
Agrarian Reform Communities Project II (ARCP II)	DAR	2009	2015	USD	70,000
Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Project I	DA	1997	2004	USD	19,000
Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Project Phase II	DA	2008	2015	USD	10,000
Infrastructure for Rural Productivity Enhancement Sector Project (InFRES)	DA	2002	2011	USD	75,000
AUSTRALIAN AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AusAID)					
Integrated Community Health Services Project (ICHSP)	DOH	1997	2005	USD	18,500
PhilippinesAustralia Local Sustainability (PALS 1 and PALS II) Program		1999	2009	AUSD	31,400
Philippines-Australia Community Assistance Program (PACAP)		2005	2009	AUSD	30,000
Philippines-Australia Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM I and BEAM II)	DepEd	2002	2009	AUSD	53,400
Strengthening the Implementation of Basic Education in Selected Provinces in Visayas Projects (STRIVE I and STRIVE II)	DepEd	2005	2010	AUSD	19,200
Land Administration and Management II Project (LAMP2)	DOF/DENR	2005	2010	AUSD	34,000
Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)	UNDP/MEDC	2005	2011	USD	14,748
Support to UNICEF's 6th Country Program for Children (CPC 6) -The Child Friendly Movement	DSWD	2005	2009	AUSD	24,700

## 122 The Cordillera Review

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (CIDA)					
Poverty Alleviation Program for SRA - Support to Selected Indigenous Cultural Communities (ICCs) and Agrarian Reform Communities (ARCs) in Mindanao (PAPSRA)	DAR	1999	2001	CDN	22,500
Local Governance Support Program Phase II (LGSP II)	DILG	1999	2006	CDN	34,000
EUROPEAN UNION (EU)					
National Integrated Protected Areas System Program (-Mt. Isarog Integrated Conservation & Development Project)	DENR	1995	2002	ECU	11,000
Palawan Tropical Forest Protection Programme	OEO-PCSDS	1995	2004	ECU	17,000
Central Cordillera Agricultural Programme (CECAP), Phase II	DA	1996	2004	ECU	23,000
Economic Self-Reliance Programme - Caraballo and	DA	1997	2004	ECU	13,500
Southern Cordillera Agricultural Development (ERP-CASCADE)	DA	1999	2008	ECU	18,300
Upland Development Program in Southern Mindanao	DAR	2002	2008	EURO	18,422
Support to Agrarian Reform Communities in Central Mindanao (STAR-CM) Small Grants Program for Operations to Promote Tropical Forests (SGP-PTF)	SEARCA	2003	2006	PHP	110,011
Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)	UNDP/MEDC	2005	2011	USD	1,969
Strengthening Response to Internal Displacement in Mindanao (STRIDE-Mindanao)	UNDP/MinDA	2009	2010	EURO	3,000
GESSELLSCHAFT fur TECHNISCHE ZUSAMMERNARBEIT (GTZ)					
RP-German Community Forestry Project, Quirino	DENR	1997	2002	DM	12,000
Peace Development and Conflict Transformation - Mindanao (Phase II)	NEDA	2005	2009	-	-

## Official Development Assistance 123

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (IFAD)					
Western Mindanao Community Initiatives Project - Loan	DAR	1999	2007	USD	14,800
- Grant				USD	750
Northern Mindanao Community Initiatives and Resource Management Project (NMCIRMP)	DAR	2003	2009	USD	14,800
Rural Micro Enterprises Promotion Program (RuMEPP) - Loan	DTI	2006	2013	USD	21,200
- Grant				USD	500
Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Project (CHARMP)	DA	1997	2004	USD	9,200
Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Mgmt Project Phase II - Loan	DA	2008	2015	USD	26,600
- Grant				USD	561
Support Project for Indigenous Cultural Community in Zone in Peace Within the ARC (SPICC-ZPARC)	DAR	1998	2005	USD	750
INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION (ILO)					
Interregional Programme to Support Self-reliance of Indigenous and Tribal Communities through Cooperatives and other Self-Help Organizations (INDISCO)	NCIP	1994	1007		
The Indigenous Peoples Development Programme (IPDP): Lake Sebu, Philippines	NCIP	2006	2010		
The Indigenous Peoples Development Programme (IPDP): Caraga, Philippines	NCIP	2009	2013		
JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA)					
Community Empowerment Program (CEP)	NOGs	2004	-	PHP	16,900
JAPAN BANK INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (JBIC)					
Central Mindanao Road Project	DPWH	2008	-	YEN	3,717,000
ARMM Social Fund Project	RegGovt	2003	2009	YEN	2,470,000
Grant Assistance to Grassroots Projects		2002	2003	YEN	138,020

NEW ZEALAND AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (NZAID)					
Contribution to the Child Friendly Movement (UNICEF) in Mountain Province	DSWD	2006	2010	USD	892
Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS)	DAR/NCIP	2008	2010	NZD	980
Human Rights Community Development Project	CHRP/NCIP	2005	2011	USD	1,150
Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)	UNDP/MEDC				
SPAIN					
Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)	UNDP/MEDC	2005	2011	USD	1,022
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)					
Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme		2002	2008	USD	780
Small Grants Program for Operations to Promote Tropical Forests (SGP-PTF)	SEARCA	2003	2006		
Support to Asset Reform thru the CARP and Development of Indigenous Communities (SARDIC)	DAR	2004	2008	PHP	214,810
Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)		2005	2011		
Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples and Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS)	NCIP	2006	2010	USD	100
Strengthening Response to Internal Displacement in Mindanao (STRIDE-Mindanao)		2009	2010		
Strengthening Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Development (SIPRD)	NCIP	2010	2011		
UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND (UNFPA)					
Country Programme Action Plan (PAP)	NEDA	2005	2009	USD	26,000

## Official Development Assistance 125

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID)					
Conflict Management Program	DENR	2003	2006	USD	1,300
The Philippine Environmental Governance Project - Phase 2 (EcoGov)		2004	2011	USD	19,000
Education Quality and Access for Learning and Livelihood Skills (EQuALLS2) Project)	EDC/DepEd	2006	2011	USD	59,000
Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM 3) Program	MinDA	2008	2012	-	-
WORLD BANK (WB) - INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (IBRD)					
Agrarian Reform Communities Development Project II WB - Japan Social Development Fund: Development and Testing of Innovative Approaches for Mainstreaming Indigenous People in Selected ARCs	DAR	2003	2007	2007	50,000
Land Administration and Management II Project (LAMP2)	DAR	2004	2008	2008	1,148
ARMM Social Fund Project	DOF/DENR	2005	2011	2011	19,000
	RegGovt	2003	2009	2009	33,600
		2010	2013	2013	30,000
The Mindanao Rural Development Project 1 (MRDP1) - Adaptable Program Loan (APL)	DA/DENR	2000	2004	2004	27,500
The Mindanao Rural Development Project - APL Phase 2 (MRDP2)	DA	2007	2012	2012	83,752



**Appendix A-2.** Foreign assisted projects (project description).

DONOR/ PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
<p>ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (ADB)</p> <p>Bukidnon Integrated Area Development Project (BIADP)</p> <p>Integrated Community Health Services Project (ICHSP)</p> <p>Agrarian Reform Communities Project (ARCP), Agrarian Reform Communities Project II (ARCP II)</p> <p>Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Project I, Cordillera Highland Agricultural Resource Management Project Phase II</p> <p>Infrastructure for Rural Productivity Enhancement Sector Project (INFRES)</p>	<p>The intended impact of the BIADP was to improve the socioeconomic status of poor rural communities in Bukidnon Province through increased, sustained production of high-value vegetables and improved delivery of increased, sustained basic social services. The project aimed to strengthen LGUs and communities to initiate and manage development activities and to collaborate with private investors to produce high-value crops. The project was planned to benefit 38,700 rural households, including some 500 farm families who belonged to an indigenous group, the Lumads. This project was cancelled November 2002 at the request of the Provincial Government of Bukidnon. ADB disbursed only \$2.6 million (about 13% of the intended \$20.0 million budget) after 6 years of implementation (original closing date: June 2004).</p> <p>The overall impact of the project was to improve health by reducing the incidence and severity of the main communicable diseases affecting children and the population in general through improved preventive and basic curative health services. The ICHSP was implemented in six pilot provinces: The ADB loan focused on the four provinces of Kalinga, Apayao, Guimaras, and Palawan, while the AusAID grant covered activities in South Cotabato and Surigao del Norte.</p> <p>The project supports the Government's Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) 2005-2010. It pursues a comprehensive approach to poverty reduction by promoting an agribusiness approach to rural development in approximately 152 selected ARCs and ARC Clusters in 19 provinces in southern Philippines. The project supports the following outputs: (1) strong participation of local communities in the development process, (2) agri-enterprise development, (3) improved access to rural infrastructure, designed to boost improved production and productivity, and (4) improved project management.</p> <p>The project builds on the first CHARMP, which has contributed to reducing poverty among indigenous peoples in the Cordillera highlands. The second CHARMP concentrates on areas where poverty is most severe in all six provinces of the region: Abra, Apayao, Benguet, Ifugao, Kalinga and Mountain Province. The aim is to reduce poverty and improve the livelihoods of indigenous peoples living in farming communities in the mountainous project area.</p> <p>The project seeks to address the lack or inadequacy of rural infrastructure. The provision of infrastructure in areas where there is potential for sustainable gains is projected to increase rural incomes, particularly of smallholders and the poor. Most of the rural poor are engaged in subsistence agriculture and are concentrated in the eastern-central and southern Philippines: the Bicol region, Eastern Visayas, ARMM, and Central Mindanao.</p>
<p>AUSTRALIAN AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AusAID)</p> <p>Integrated Community Health Services Project (ICHSP)</p> <p>Philippines-Australia Local Sustainability (PALS 1 and PALS II) Program</p>	<p>(see ADB)</p> <p>The program strengthens community and local government unit partnership in resource planning and management, and provides resources for sustainable community livelihoods.</p>
<p>Philippines-Australia Community Assistance Program (PACAP)</p>	<p>The program provides direct assistance to poor communities in the Philippines to empower them to pursue economic growth and achieve better standards of living.</p>
<p>Philippines-Australia Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM I and BEAM II)</p>	<p>The program contributes to improving the quality of teaching and learning in basic education and to implement strategies that will provide opportunities to access quality basic education in three regions in Mindanao - Regions XI, XII and the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao, particularly to disadvantaged children from Muslim and indigenous communities.</p>

Support Project for Indigenous Cultural Community in Zone in Peace Within the ARC (SPICC-ZPARC)	
INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION (ILO)  Interregional Programme to Support Self-reliance of Indigenous and Tribal Communities through Cooperatives and other Self-Help Organizations (INDISCO)  The Indigenous Peoples Development Programme (IPDP): Lake Sebu, Philippines	INDISCO utilizes community-driven participatory development (CPDP) approaches for the implementation programs and projects. The ILO, through INDISCO and promotion of the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989, contributed to the enactment of the IPRA (1987) and the formulation of medium-term Philippine development plans for IPs.  The indigenous peoples of the T'boli and Ubo tribes make up 55 per cent of Lake Sebu's population. The project looks to the empowerment of T'boli and Ubo women and men through understanding and protection of their rights, improved employment opportunities through traditional livelihoods, social protection, and a sustainable mechanism for participation in making decisions.
The Indigenous Peoples Development Programme (IPDP): Caraga, Philippines	The ILO is working with the indigenous peoples of Caraga and collaborating partners to support community initiatives. This project seeks to develop their ancestral domains in the context of implementation of the IPRA and the Master Plan for the Development of IPs (MTPDP-IPs).
JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) Community Empowerment Program (CEP)	The program aims to directly benefit marginalized people at the grassroots levels in Mindanao's conflict-affected areas by providing them with basic opportunities and developing skills for self-sufficiency to contribute to the socio-economic development in the region.
JAPAN BANK INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (JBIC)  Central Mindanao Road Project        ARMM Social Fund Project (ASFP)	The project aims to (a) reduce poverty and promote economic growth in Central Mindanao area by facilitating movement of goods and services between the rural communities and the alternative markets in the neighboring urban centers; and (b) provide access to the centers of agricultural, industrial, fishing, commercial and tourism activities in the area. Total road length (Awang-Upi-Lebak-Kalamansig Road) for construction/rehabilitation is 105.75 km.  (see World Bank - IBRD) JBIC provides parallel financing to expand the project to more sites.
The Indigenous Peoples Development Programme (IPDP): Caraga, Philippines	The ILO is working with the indigenous peoples of Caraga and collaborating partners to support community initiatives. This project seeks to develop their ancestral domains in the context of implementation of the IPRA and the Master Plan for the Development of IPs (MTPDP-IPs).
Grant Assistance to Grassroots Projects	Japan has implemented 14 projects totaling 138 million yen (2002-2003).
NEW ZEALAND AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (NZAID) Contribution to the Child Friendly Movement in Mountain Province (UNICEF)       Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples & Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS)	(see AusAID)       This program supports the implementation of the IPRA. It has 3 major components: (1) formulation of Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plans (ADSDPPs); (2) strengthening of indigenous peoples governance, particularly in community organizing, paralegal competency, and project management and implementation; and (3) pilot implementation of ADSDPPs.

## 130 The Cordillera Review

<p>Human Rights Community Development Project</p> <p>Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)</p>	<p>The project sets a three-year program to strengthen human rights in the Philippines by focusing on three predominantly indigenous communities – the Kankan-ey, Higaonon and Sama Dilaut/Bajau. It aims to help them better monitor and report human rights violations, while advocating for the realization of their rights.</p> <p>(see AusAID)</p>
<p>SPAIN</p> <p>Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace (Government of the Philippines-UN Multi-Donor Program)</p>	<p>(see AusAID)</p>
<p>UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)</p> <p>Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme (SGP)</p> <p>Small Grants Programme for Operations to Promote Tropical Forests (SGP-PTF)</p> <p>Support to Asset Reform thru the CARP and Development of Indigenous Communities (SARDIC)</p>	<p>SGP channels financial and technical support directly to NGOs and CBOs for activities that conserve and restore the environment while enhancing people's well-being and livelihoods. The SGP pays special attention to local and indigenous communities and aims for replication and sustainability of its initiatives. The focal areas of the program are climate change abatement and adaptation, conservation of biodiversity, protection of international waters, reduction of the impact of persistent organic pollutants, and prevention of land degradation.</p> <p>Source of funding: European Union - (see EU).</p> <p>This is a poverty alleviation program within the framework of the Social Reform Agenda (SRA), with a reform platform relative to the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program. SARDIC's strategic objective is to help in reducing inequality and expanding the base for sustainable growth through ensured access and development of productive resources, and access to opportunities by the IPs in agrarian reform communities.</p>
<p>Action for Conflict Transformation (ACT) for Peace</p> <p>Integrated Programme for the Empowerment of Indigenous Peoples &amp; Sustainable Development of Ancestral Domains (IP-EIPSDADS)</p> <p>Strengthening Response to Internal Displacement in Mindanao [StRIDE-Mindanao]</p> <p>Strengthening Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Development (SIPRD)</p>	<p>Source of funding: Government of Australia, Government of New Zealand, Government of Spain, and European Union, (see AusAID).</p> <p>Source of funding: New Zealand Agency for International Development (see NZAID).</p> <p>Source of funding: European Union (see EU).</p> <p>The SIPRD program focuses on securing the rights of IPs and strengthening their stake in resource management, particularly their ancestral lands, including the sustainable use, management and protection of these lands. In effect, it supports good governance principles and promotes indigenous peace-keeping mechanisms to avoid costly and harmful armed conflicts.</p>
<p>UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND (UNFPA)</p> <p>Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)</p>	<p>The goal of the CPAP is to improve the reproductive health status of Filipinos through better population management and sustainable human development. The strategic areas of intervention will be reducing fertility; improving maternal health; promoting adolescent reproductive health; and HIV/AIDS prevention, capacity building of policy makers, program managers, and service providers; and empowering the poor and the vulnerable population at the grassroots. The program will focus its benefits on the poorest 10 provinces: Ifugao, Mt. Province, Masbate, Bohol, Eastern Samar, Sulu, Tawi-tawi, Lanao del Sur, Maguindanao, and Sultan Kudarat.</p>

<p>UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID)</p> <p>Conflict Management Program (CMP)</p> <p>The Philippine Environmental Governance Project - Phase 2 (EcoGov)</p> <p>Education Quality and Access for Learning and Livelihood Skills (EQuALLS2) Project</p> <p>Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM 3) Program</p>	<p>CMP speaks to the issues of conflict management using multiple approaches to address two distinct types of conflict affecting the Philippines: Endemic Clan Conflict and Community Conflicts over Natural Resources. Given that conflict is inherent in the process of change and development, the program's goal is not to eliminate but to transform conflicts into manageable disputes and debates.</p> <p>EcoGov 2 will build upon EcoGov 1 to further strengthen and sustain initiatives in forests and forest lands, coastal resources, wastewater and solid waste, including opportunities for local financing. It will implement activities in conflict-affected areas of the country, with a focus on biologically important eco-regions of Mindanao, Central Visayas and Northern Luzon.</p> <p>EQuALLS2 assists the Philippine government in improving education in Mindanao. The project offers a core set of interventions aimed at increasing access to quality education for elementary school children and relevant learning and livelihood skills training for out-of-school youth.</p> <p>GEM 3 continues and expands the work carried out under GEM 1 (1995-2002) and GEM 2 (2002-2007). GEM operates throughout Mindanao, with a special focus on the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) and other conflict-affected areas of Mindanao (CAAM). It is a grant for livelihood enhancement, consolidation of peace, infrastructure development and strengthened education and governance in Mindanao.</p>
<p>WORLD BANK - INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT (IBRD)</p> <p>Agrarian Reform Communities Development Project II</p> <p>WB - Japan Social Development Fund: Development and Testing of Innovative Approaches for Mainstreaming Indigenous People in Selected ARCs</p> <p>Land Administration and Management II Project (LAMP2)</p> <p>ARMM Social Fund Project (ASFP)</p> <p>The Mindanao Rural Development Project - APL (MRDP1)</p>	<p>The project sought to reduce rural poverty and improve the quality of life of people living in about 80 agrarian reform communities. It aimed to upgrade rural roads and bridges, small scale irrigation systems, water supply systems and post-harvesting facilities. It is also intended to provide strategic support services to help generate viable increases in agricultural production and diversification.</p> <p>This aims aims at developing and testing innovative approaches so Indigenous People (IP) can better benefit from agrarian reform, including developing effective targeting mechanisms and appropriate incentive systems for local government to mainstream IP concerns in development planning.</p> <p>LAMP2 wants to improve land tenure security and develop an efficient system of land titling and administration, through institutional and legal reform and a fair and uniform property valuation system. The implementation of LAMP2 fully recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples (IPs) and thus looks to secure a culturally-defined free, prior, and informed consent from the IPs/indigenous cultural communities affected by the project.</p> <p>The ASFP main objective is to reduce poverty and help build sustainable peace in conflict-affected areas in the ARMM by financing small-scale sub-projects of social and economic infrastructure with participation of local communities, and by providing technical assistance for strengthening institutional capacity. The project prioritizes groups most affected by deprivation and displacement caused by armed conflict including the poorest community members, the elderly, widowed women, internally displaced persons, indigenous people, children and out-of-school youth.</p> <p>The long-term MRD Program, designed as a poverty reduction program for the rural poor and indigenous communities of Mindanao, aimed at improving incomes and food security in the targeted rural communities in five selected provinces (North Cotabato, Sultan Kudarat, Agusan del Sur, CompostelaValley and Maguindanao) and 32 municipalities.</p>

## Appendix B. Sources of Funds for ADSDPPs.

REGION	SOURCE OF FUND	PROVINCE	Brgy/ Municipality	TRIBES	AREA Hectares)	IP POPULATION	REMARKS
CAR	CHARMP, LGU, IFAD	Abra	Bucloc	Tingguian- Masadiit	0	0	
CAR	UNDP EIPSDADs	Abra	Lacub	Tingguian	0	0	
CAR	UNDP EIPSDADs	Abra	Peñarrubia (Patok)	Tingguian- Illaud	3,918.70	3474	W/ CADT
CAR	CECAP, LGU	Abra	Tube	Tingguian- Maeng	0	0	
CAR	CECAP, LGU	Abra	Malibcong	Tingguian- Banao, Mabaca	0	0	
CAR		Abra	Sal-lapadan	Masadiit	0	0	
CAR		Abra	Luba	Maeng	0	0	
CAR	UNDP	Benguet	Brgy. Happy Hallow, Baguio	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	146.42	2900	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Atok	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	20,017.65	15634	W/ CADT
CAR	CHARMP, LGU, ILO, NCIP-IFAD	Benguet	Bakun	Bago, Kankanaey	29,444.34	17218	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Bokod	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	41,223.32	12356	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Buguias	Kalanguya & Kankanaey	17,155.00	35510	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Itogon	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	38,683.42	27229	W/ CADT
CAR	ILO, LGU, NAPOCOR	Benguet	Kabayan	Ibaloy, Kalanguya and Kankana-ey	22,880.86	11837	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Kapangan	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	17,127.09	15995	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Kibungan	Kankanaey	22,836.88	15472	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	La Trinidad	Kankana- ey, Ibaloi & Kalanguya	7,313.34	26842	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Mankayan	Kankanaey	13,290.00	24423	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Sablan	Ibaloi	11,585.98	1513	W/ CADT
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Tuba	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	0	0	
CAR	NAPOCOR	Benguet	Tublay	Kankanaey- Ibaloi	9,934.10	11065	W/ CADT
CAR	CHARMP, LGU	Ifugao	Asipulo	Kalanguya, Ayangan, Tuwali	25,816.31	14355	W/ CADT
CAR	LGU, PANCORDI, OPAPP	Ifugao	Hungduan	Tuwali	0	0	
CAR	UNDP IP	Ifugao	Tinoc	Kalanguya	21,371.22	12133	W/ CADT
CAR	CHARMP, LGU	Mt. Province	Kadaclan	Ikcharay	0	0	

134 The Cordillera Review

CAR		Mt.Province	Sabangan	Kankana-ey	0	0	
CAR	NCIP, CECAP	Mt.Province	Sadanga		0	0	
CAR	NCIP-KADIPO	Mt.Province	Upper Bauko, Bauko	Kabatangan	9,746.53	14287	1st Edition
Region 1	NCIP	Ilocos Norte	Carasi	Bago-Kankanaey	15,737.85	0	
Region 1	UNDP EIPSDADs	Ilocos Sur	Sugpon	Bago, Kankanaey	6,339.42	3300	W/CADT
Region 1	UNDP EIPSDADs	Ilocos Sur	Alilem	Bago-Kankanaey	8,341.15	5717	W/ CADT
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Basco	Ivatans	0	0	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Itbayat	Ichbayat-Ivatans	89,163.42	3911	W/CADT-arc
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Ivana	Ivatans	1,811.84	1856	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Mahatao	Ivatans	0	0	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Sabtang	Ivatans	4,059.79	1781	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Batanes	Uyugan	Ivatans	0	0	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Isabela	Brgy. La Suerte IP/ Anggadanan	Agta, Ibanag, Kalinga, Gaddang, Yogad	3,380.20	2035	
Region 2	JSDF-IP	Isabela	San Pablo	Agta, Ibanag, Ifugao	2,752.74	4457	
Region 2	UNDP EIPSDADs	Nueva Vizcaya	Sta. Fe, Aritao & Kayapa	Kalanguya-Ikalahan	30,758.58	10442	
Region 2	Ecogov, LGU	Quirino Province	Nagtipunan	Bugkalot & Ilongot	139,691.87	15374	W/ CADT
Region 3	UNDP EIPSDADs	AngelesCity & Pampanga	Brgy. Sapangbato & Porac	Ayta	18,659.73	3507	
Region 3	JSDF-IP	Bataan	Bagac	Aytas	0	0	
Region 3	JSDF-IP	Bataan	Morong		0	0	
Region 3	JSDF-IP	Bataan	Orion		0	0	
Region 3	Biodiversity (Ateneo) NCIP	Bataan	Pastolan, Hermosa	Aeta	4,284.13	759	W/CADT
Region 3	UNDP EIPSDADs	Bulacan	Karahume, San Jose del Monte	Dumagats	1,817.15	726	
Region 3	NCIP	Pampanga	Florida Blanca, Nabuclod, Mawacat	Aytas	5,457.71	3580	
Region 3	Holy Spirit	Tarlac	Labayko		0	0	
Region 3	JSDF-IP	Zambales	Castillejos	Aytas	0	0	
Region 3	JSDF-IP	Zambales	Palauig	Aytas & Igorots	0	0	



Region 3	UNDP EIPSDADs	Zambales	Botolan	Ayta	8,218.66	4370	
Region 4	NCIP, Bulalacao Service Center, LGI, PENRO, ERPR & EU	Oriental Mindoro	Bansud	Mangyans Buhid & Bangon	98,624.83	14252	
Region 4	UNDP EIPSDADs	Oriental Mindoro	Puerto Galera	Iraya-Mangyan	5,700.87	2888	
Region 4	UNDP EIPSDADs	Rizal	Tanay	Dumagat/Remontado	21,883.88	6294	
Region 5	JSDF-IP/ UNDP IP-EIPSDADs	Albay & Camarines Sur	Tiwi & Buhi	Agtas (Tabangon/ Cimanon)	1,453.85	639	W/CADT
Region 5	CARE	Camarines Sur	Ocampo	Agta-Cimarron & Agta Tabangnon	5,099.34	5622	W/ CADT
Region 5	UNDP EIPSDADs	Sorsogon	Donsol	Agta-Tabangnon Agta-Marog	12,654.82	5861	
Region 6	UNDP EIPSDADs	Antique	San Agustin, Valderama	Iraynon-Bukidnon	6,426.72	1090	W/CADT-registered & awarded
Region 6	UNDP EIPSDADs	Negros Occidental	Kabankalan	Bukidnon-Karulanos	3,981.25	4140	
Region 9	JSDF-IP	Zamboanga del Norte	Jose Dalman	Subanen	0	0	
Region 9	JSDF-IP	Zamboanga del Norte	Manukan	Subanen	0	0	
Region 9	UNDP EIPSDADs	Zamboanga del Norte	Siayan	Subanen	48,241.82	8035	
Region 9	UNDP EIPSDADs	Zamboanga del Sur	Dumingag	Subanen	20,097.93	6985	Ready for marketing
Region 10	UNDP EIPSDADs	Bukidnon	Kitaotao, San Fernando Quezon, Kibabwe all of Bukidnon	Matigsalug-Manobo	102,324.82	24405	Completed in Kitaotao side only
Region 10	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP, LGU	Bukidnon	Hagpa, Impasug-ong	Higaonon	14,313.75	1484	
Region 10	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP, LGU	Bukidnon	Poblacion, Impasug-ong	Higaonon	0	237	
Region 10	UNDP EIPSDADs	Bukidnon/Malaybalay City	Brgy. Kalasungay, Patpat and Sumpung	Bukidnon	4,536.05	1154	
Region 10	JSDF-IP	Misamis Occidental	Jimenes	Higaonon	0	0	
Region 10	JSDF-IP	Misamis Occidental	Plaridel	Higaonon	0	0	
Region 10	JSDF-IP	Oroquieta City/ Misamis Occidental	Brgys. Toliyok, Clarin Settlement, Mialen, Sebucal & Bunga	Subanen	6,979.58	2360	W/CADT

## 136 The Cordillera Review

Region 11	JSDF-IP	Compostela Valley	Compostela Mangayon Cluster	Mandaya	0	0	
Region 11	UNDP EIPSDADs	Compostela Valley	Laak	Dibabawon	60,967.49	4705	W/ CADT
Region 11	JSDF-IP	Compostela Valley	Monkayo	Mandaya, Manobo, Mangguangan & Dibabawon	81,009.33	36765	W/ CADT
Region 11	UNDP EIPSDADs	Compostela Valley	Mabini, Compostela Valley	Mansaka	141,773.30	14076	
Region 11	JSDF-IP	Davao del Norte	Asuncion	Mandaya, Mangguangan & Dibabawon	81,054.82	33977	
Region 11	JSDF-IP	Davao del Norte	Panabo	Lumads	0	0	
Region 11	JSDF-IP	Davao del Norte	Samal	Sama	0	0	
Region 11	UNDP IP-EIPSDADs	Davao Oriental	Bonston	Mandaya	19,151.44	3259	W/ CADT
Region 11	UNDP IP-EIPSDADs	Digos City/ Davao del Sur	Brgys. Kapatagan, Binaton, Goma, Balagbag/ Bansalan, & Sta. Cruz, Makilala	Bagobo-Tagabawa	40,733.38	19281	W/ CADT
Region 12	UNDP IP-EIPSDADs	North Cotabato	Llomavis, Makilala	Bagobo	43,706.49	19814	ADSDPP submitted to OPR, CO
Region 12	UNDP IP-EIPSDADs	North Cotabato	Bentangen, Carmen	Bagobo-Tagabawa	5,680.63	715	ADSDPP submitted to OPR, CO
Region 13	NMCIREMP	Agusan del Sur	Esparanza	Higa-onon	74,827.00	6000	for final draft
Region 13		Agusan del Sur	Las Nieves		0	0	
Region 13	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP, LGU	Agusan del Sur	Loreto	Manobo	5,020.01	3800	for NCIP concurrence/ completed
Region 13	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP, KRDFIL, GU, NCIP	Agusan del Sur	Binicalan, San Luis	Banwaon, Manobo, Talaandig (TagBaMaTaAd)	25,895.05	2689	
Region 13	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP,	Agusan del Sur	Rosario	Manobo	22,554.85	3690	completed for NCIP concurrence/ completed
Region 13	DAR	Agusan del Sur	Veruela	Manobo	30,453.77	5304	completed
Region 13	DAR/IFAD-NMCIREMP, LGU	Surigao del Sur	Brgy. Mampi, Lanuza	Manobo & Mamanwa, Mandaya	18,186.00	1728	

Source: NCIP Ancestral Domain Database Information System.