

Appendix

6. Agenda and Photos of 2nd Public Meetings, July 2011

**INFORMATION DISSEMINATION FOR PASIG-MARIKINA
RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PHASE III)**

*JULY 15, 2011
2:35PM, Barangay 894, Punta Sta Ana Manila*

PROGRAM

14:35pm-14:40am	Brgy. Captain Natividad.	Opening remarks
14:40pm-14:45am	Ms. Estrella Songco, consultant to DPWH	Recognition of the Participants
14:45pm-15:15pm	Engr. LYDIA C. AGUILAR, DPWH	Overview of the Project
15:15pm-15:30pm	Ms. Lourdes Canon, Ms. Marilyn Musa, Environmentalist , CTI Engineering International Co., Ltd.,	Environmental Impacts and ECC validation
15:30pm-15:45pm	Engr. LYDIA C. AGUILAR, DPWH	DPWH Resettlement Plan
15:45pm-16:00pm	Sam Castillo, PRRC	PRRC Resettlement Update
16:00pm-16:30pm	Sam Castillo, PRRC	OPEN FORUM
16:30pm-16:35pm	Brgy. Captain Natividad.	Closing Remarks

The Preparatory Study for Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project
PUBLIC INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ON PMRCIP-III
 Barangay 894, Punta Sta. Ana, Manila City
 July 15, 2011; 14:35 pm

ATTENDANCE

ATTENDEES:

Ms. Lydia C. Aguilar	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I
Ms. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I
Ms. Estrella B. Songco	Community Organizer, CTI Engineering International Co.,Ltd.
Ms. Ma. Lourdes Canon	Environmentalist, CTI Engineering International Co.,Ltd.
Ms. Marilyn Musa	Environmentalist, CTI Engineering International Co.,Ltd.
Mr. Norman Gamboa	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I
Mr. Francisco Macapagal	Site Inspector, CTI Engineering International Co.,Ltd.
Mr. Sam Castillo	Representative from PRRC

PAF's:

1.	Ms. Essie Edwards	Kagawad 897
2.	Ms. Leri Galang	Kagawad 897
3.	Mr. Rodolfo dela Peña	Brgy. 894
4.	Mr. Donato dela Pe Peña	Brgy. 894
5.	Mr. Emerson Joseph Cabrera	Brgy. 894
6.	Mr. Fred Cantor	Brgy. 897
7.	Mr. Nick Abenoja	Brgy. 894
8.	Mr. R. Ravalo	Brgy. 894
9.	Mr. Tony Peñaranda	D.S.O.P (Dikeside organization of Punta)
10.	Mr. Hermie R. Sabino	D.S.O.P (Dikeside organization of Punta)
11.	Mr. Danilo M. Gonzaga Sr.	D.S.O.P (Dikeside organization of Punta)
12.	Ms. Myra Celones Diaz	Brgy. 894
13.	Ms. Eliza C. Sacramento	Brgy. 894
14.	Ms. Aleah Jayme	Brgy. 894
15.	Mr. Jaymie C. Celones	Brgy. 894
16.	Mr. Ricris Peñaranda	Brgy. 894
17.	Ms. Josefina Mines	Brgy. 894
18.	Mr. Rommel Pasia	Brgy. 894
19.	Mr. Danilo Galang	Brgy. 897
20.	Mr. Ed Natividad	Brgy. 894
21.	Ms. Teresita Peñaranda	Brgy. 894
22.	Ms. Melinda Estacio	Brgy. 905
23.	Mr. Renato Raz	Brgy. 894
24.	Mr. Danny Abas	Brgy. 894
25.	Ms. Virginia C. Pancho	Brgy. 894
26.	Mr. Ernie Ryan Pancho	Brgy. 894
27.	Ms. Charlotte K. Rillo	Brgy. 894
28.	Ms. Remedios Rueda	Brgy. 894
29.	Ms. Helen Zalarar	Brgy. 894
30.	Mr. Adriano Asturias	Brgy. 896
31.	Mr. Eduardo Garcia	Brgy. Treas, 896
32.	Ms. Crispina Peñarande	Brgy. 894
33.	Ms. Josie R. Dumalasa	Brgy. 894
34.	Ms. Aniceta B. Aruta	Brgy. 894
35.	Ms. Editha C. Allora	Brgy. 894

36.	Mr. Crisente Calma	Brgy. 894
37.	Ms. Jessica Hallqvist	Brgy. 894
38.	Mr. Cyry m. Vergara	Brgy. 894
39.	Mr. Reynan A. Malto	Brgy. 894
40.	Ms. Yolanda C. Duran	Brgy. 894
41.	Mr. Renato Ravalo	Brgy. 894
42.	Mr. Joseph Ravalo	Brgy. 894
43.	Mr. John Michael Camposano	Brgy. 894
44.	Mr. Merlo Cator	Brgy. 894
45.	Mr. Genir Merllas	Brgy. 894
46.	Mr. Welmer Cator	Brgy. 894
47.	Ms. Ma. Luisa Riño	Brgy. 894
48.	Ms. Charmie K. Rillo	Brgy. 894
49.	Ms. Flora A. Riño	Brgy. 894
50.	Mr. Roman A. Riño, Jr.	Brgy. 894
51.	Mr. Wilfredo Clapando	Brgy. 894
52.	Ms. Marianne Peñarande	Brgy. 894
53.	Ms. Zorayda Cordova	Brgy. 894
54.	Ms. Rochelle Ayas	Brgy. 894
55.	Mr. Vicente A. Pineda	Brgy. 894
56.	Mr. Adalia O. Estacio	Brgy. 894
57.	Ms. Marlyn Laudit	Brgy. 894
58.	Ms. Adelina Celli	Brgy. 894
59.	Mr. Josefino Trinidad Sr.	Brgy. 894
60.	Mr. Edwin Labanda	Brgy. 894
61.	Ms. Mary Jane Cator	Brgy. 894
62.	Mr. Reland P. Corpuz	Brgy. 894
63.	Mr. Elinio C. Ortega, Jr.	Brgy. 894
64.	Mr. Raymundo O. Acebo	Brgy. 894
65.	Mr. Angelito Sacramento	Brgy. 894
66.	Ms. Bebot Corpuz	Brgy. 900
67.	Mr. Jose Delgado	Brgy 897







INFORMATION DISSEMINATION FOR PASIG-MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PHASE III)

JULY 20, 2011

10:00AM, WEST REMBO MAKATI CITY

PROGRAM

10:00-10:15am	Acknowledgement of Attendees	Ms. Estrella B. Songco
10:15-10:35am	Overview of the Project	Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar
10:35-10:55am	Presentation of EIS and ECC	Ms. Ma. Lourdes C. Canon
10:55-11:40am	Open Forum	Ms. Estrella B. Songco
11:45	Closing Remarks	Ms. Estrella B. Songco

ATTENDANCE

Name	Office	Contact Details
Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar	DPWH-PMO-MFCP (I)	
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP (I)	
Ms. Estrella B. Songco	DPWH-PMRCIP	
Ms. Ma. Lourdes Canon	Environmentalism, WCI-PMRCIP	
Ms. Maribel M. Lumang	Makati Social Welfare Department	
Mr. Roland G. Ocsan	Makati Department of Engineering and Public Works	
Kagawad Jeff Aragon	Brgy. West Rembo	
Kagawad Manuel Coliong	Brgy. West Rembo	
Mr. Pete Caudilla	Staff, Brgy. West Rembo	





Appendix

7. Minutes of 2nd Public Meetings, July 2011

MINUTES OF THE 2nd PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

1. **Manila City:** July 15, 2011 at 2:35 pm, Barangay 894 Barangay Hall

MINUTES OF DISCUSSION:

1. Opening remarks and introduction made by Brgy. Captain Natividad.
2. Recognition of the speakers of the meeting was acknowledged by Ms. Estrella Songco.
3. Purpose of the meeting and the presentation was briefly introduced by Engr. Lydia Aguilar.
4. Presentation of the overview of the project was discussed by Engr. Aguilar as summarized below:
 - The whole PMRCIP are divided into four (4) phases, namely, Phase I which covers the detailed engineering design and was completed in 2002, Phases II, III, and IV involve the construction/civil works stages for river improvement works along the Pasig, Lower and Marikina Rivers, respectively.
 - Implementation of the Phase II project involved river improvement works on the identified priority sections along Pasig River is currently ongoing and scheduled to be completed in 2012.
 - Currently, a preparatory study is being undertaken by the DPWH through technical assistance from the Japan International Cooperation (JICA) for the implementation of the proposed Phase III project.
 - The main scope of the proposed Phase III will consist among others, improvement of river channel along the Lower Marikina River such as an approximate of 5.4 km stretch dredging works, construction of dikes/river wall and provision of boundary banks and improvement of identified critical sections along the Pasig River area which were not covered under the ongoing Phase II project.
 - The main objective of the project is to mitigate flood damages in Metro Manila caused by the channel overflow of the Pasig-Marikina River.
5. Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of the Project was presented by Ms. Lourdes Canon, Environmentalist , CTI Engineering International Co., Ltd., and highlighted the following important information:
 - The issued Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) for the PMRCIP including the proposed Phase III project is still valid; its conditions were then presented to the stakeholders.
 - Assessment of the project impacts in compliance with the JICA new requirements was also discussed.
6. Ms. Marilyn Musa continued with the discussion of the EIS, ECC, and all relevant studies concerning Phase III.
7. After the presentation of the environmental concerns, Engr. Aguilar then discussed the social concerns particularly the resettlement packages.
8. Representative from PRRC discussed the overview of the PRRC's project, status on affected informal settlers, the status on which areas that were covered and structures that have been removed to date, status of their census concerning informal settlers, and

the status of their own coordination meetings with individual baranggays, and clarification on the easement distance of the PRRC.

9. After the presentation by the PRRC representative, the open forum (Q & A) followed.

<p>Q-1 asked by Tony Peñaranda, Dikeside organization of Punta Can those who have previously accepted the resettlement package for the PRRC project avail of the compensation that will be offered by DPWH for the Phase III?</p>
<p>A-1 answered by: Engr. Dorie Dayco: the option for compensation from the DWPH is for Phase III and just compensation will only be done once the Phase III project is on its implementation stage. Ms. Estrella Songco: there are two different options: one from DPWH phase III and one for the PRRC project. However compensation may only be availed once, and that once relocated, compensation offered by the DPWH will only be those to be affected on the areas covered by Phase III. Only one option can be chosen. Engr. Dorie Dayco added that if a certain area will be been covered by the Phase III; however if was compensated previously, will not be entitled for a new compensation.</p>
<p>Q-2 asked by Ms. Bebot Corpuz from Brgy. 900: What is the compensation for private property?</p>
<p>A-2 answered by:Engr. Aguilar: Compensation have a different calculation for private property and will be subject for assessment and verification of supporting documents.</p>
<p>Q-3 asked by Adriano Asturias from Brgy. 896: Regarding the just compensation, is there a process to be undertaken for private owners? Will there be proper expropriation?</p>
<p>A-3 answered by Engr. Aguilar: Yes, with regards to private property, DPWH-IROW office will ask the owner to submit legal documents like tax declaration and title.</p>
<p>Q-4 asked by asked by Tony Peñaranda from Dikeside organization of Punta How come other private areas like those owned by big companies are not experiencing the same removal as us informal settlers with regards to the 10 meter easement from PRRC? Is there a law justifying this?</p>
<p>A-4 answered by Sam Castillo of PRRC: There is a provision on an executive order that justifies the 10 meter easement. We will provide you exact information on this at a later time. Engr. Aguilar: DPWH project implementation covers 3m, and DPWH concern is different from the 10 meter easement width of PRRC.</p>
<p>Q-5 asked by asked by Jose Delgado from Brgy 897 I have a tag number, but when I looked at the PRRC master list, I am not listed, why is it so?</p>
<p>A-5 answered by Ms. Songco: You may clarify your tag number with PRRC offices why you have a tag number but not on the master list. Sam Castillo: We will discuss your inquiry once we get a schedule on your barangay. We will have to verify it with our office's census.</p>
<p>Q-6 asked by Tony Peñaranda from Dikeside organization of Punta Where will the phase III dredging be situated?</p>
<p>A-6 answered by Ma. Lourdes Canon:</p>

Dredging will only be at the Marikina area.
Q-7 asked by Mr. Eduardo Garcia from brgy 896 Which IRR will be used? For Phase III, is it the same for PRRC? With the compensation which will be used?
A-7 answered by Engr. Dorie Dayco: IRR is different from he DPWH and PRRC. For the compensation option, it is your choice whether you will choose the DPWH or PRRC. However, you can only chose one of the two options.
Q-7 asked by Mr. Eduardo Garcia from brgy 896 Where do you measure the 3 meter easement?
A-7 answered by Norman Gamboa, DPWH: From the edge of the river bank.
Q8 - asked by Mr. Jose Delgado from Brgy 897 With regards to the garbage that is dumped in the river, not only the informal settlers are the cause of it. How about those big industries that plying the Pasig river?
A-8 answered by Engr. Aguilar: As I have mentioned before there is a Mandamus from the Supreme court to clear obstructions that is polluting the river. Other government agencies like the PPA, Coast guard, DENR, and other local government units are involved in implementing this mandamus, including educational activities for big industries.
Q9 - asked by Ms. Melinda Estacio of Brgy. 905 Once the program of or PRRC is finished, who will be managing the resettlement site especially those in Jaime Cardinal Sin Village?
A-9 answered by Sam Castillo: PRRC will hand over the management of the resettlement site to NHA (National Housing Authority) once the PRRC resettlement program is complete.

10. After answering the last question, the discussion was adjourned at 4:35 pm. Engr. Aguilar expressed her thanks to the participants of the gathering, and requested for the support of the project from the attendees of the various baranggays in the Sta. Ana area.

2. **Makati City:** July 20, 2011 at 10:00 am, Barangay West Rembo Conference Room

Ms. Estrella B. Songco, PMRCIP presided the meeting by introducing the team to Brgy. West Rembo officials and Staff and to the families present during the consultation.

Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar, DPWH-PMO-MFCP (I) discussed the reason of the consultation meeting as enumerated below:

- (1) Different Construction Stages
- (2) Scope of Works
- (3) Future plans/preparatory studies
- (4) Overview of the design for Phase III and Phase IV

Engr. Aguilar presented an illustration/map to show the construction area of the proposed PMRCIP (Phase III) Project. She also gave a quick overview on the on-going project which is the PMRCIP (Phase II).

Ms. Ma. Lourdes C. Canon, Environmentalist, gave a quick overview on the monitoring activities of the Project, objectives of the Environmental Impact Statement and requirements for the Environmental Compliance Certificate for Phase II and Phase III Project.

Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar, DPWH-PMO-MFCP (I) discussed the following IS requirements:

- (1) Maximum of 3-meter legal easement from the riverbanks.
- (2) DPWH Compensation Scheme/option which regards to resettlement of ISF.
 - DPWH will compensate the affected structures (by measuring every structures affected)

She added that for the LGU-Makati will give 3-days food assistance and trucking.

Ms. Maribel M. Lumang, MSWD further clarifies that City of Calauan issued a Resolution that no ISF will be relocated to Makati Resettlement Site. She therefore stated that no option for relocation to Calauan but she added that LGU-Makati will provide 3-day food assistance and trucking.

OPEN FORUM:

Q1- Mr. Leonard Marquez

- No objection on the 3-meter easement.
- He sent letter to PRRC copy furnished MMDA, DPWH, LGU and Pasig ferry regarding on the problem along pasig river and until now there was no reply from the said agencies.
- He stated that he is also involved in the environmental protection through the Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (DrRMC).
- He said that on the part of his area of jurisdiction they also show concerns on environmental aspect and suggested that they should be given an authority to prevent the people throwing garbage in the river.
- He suggested to include the beautification on Pasig River.

A1.1-Ms. Maribel M. Lumang, MSWD

- She commented on Mr. Marquez suggestion that there is no need to seek an authority/permit to prevent people throwing garbage in the river because we should be responsible for our surroundings. We should have social responsibility on areas of concern.

A1.2-Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar, DPWH-PMO- MFCP (I)

- Engr. Aguilar was thankful on the information given by Mr. Marquez that they don't have any

<p>objection on the 3-meter legal easement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She seeks the assistance of families living within the riverbanks for the smooth implementation of the Project.
<p>Q2-Mr. Leonardo Marquez</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - He suggested that a vacant/idled lot near C5 that can be identified as relocation site.
<p>A2.1- Ms. Maribel M. Lumang</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The LGU must have plans/programs on the idled lands that is why the LGU buy a land in Caluan, Laguna as resettlement site to all affected ISF in Makati.
<p>Q2.2-Mr. Leonardo Marquez</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - He sited an area which is the former target range area was now occupied by two big buildings.
<p>A2.2- Ms. Maribel M. Lumang</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She answered that it is a disputed area between Makati and Taguig.
<p>Q3- Kagawad . Manuel Coliong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thus the Project only requires 3-meter easement?
<p>A3- Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As for the PMRCIP (Phase III) Project, a 3-meter legal easement is required.
<p>Q4- Kagawad Manuel Coliong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the 3-meter easement safe?
<p>A4.1- Ms. Marible M. Coliong</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She further explained that the supreme court Mandamus Resolution that LGU and Barangay Officials are mandated to clean the waterways. There is an order that when it pertains to main river easement requires 10-meter and for tributaries 3-meter easement. <p>A4.2-Engr. Lydia C. Aguilar, DPWH-PMO-MFCP (I)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Series of coordination will be conducted and to prevent influx of ISF. <p>A4.3- Ms. Estrella B. Songco, PMRCIP Consultant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the implementation of the Project re-validation of ISF will be conducted. - If there are new returnees the barangay should coordinate with LGU for necessary action.
<p>Q5- Ms. Janelle Calimlim</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is really the exact total easement needed by the Project?
<p>A5- Engr. Dorie Dayco</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - She clarified that for the PMRCIP (Phase III) Project; only 3-meter easement is needed. ISF who are affected by the Project will be entitled for the DPWH Compensation.

Appendix

8. Minutes and Photos of Public Meetings, August 2011

**PUBLIC INFORMATION DISSEMINATION/CONSULTATIONS ON PASIG-MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PMRCIP), PHASE III**

MINUTES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS ALONG LOWER MARIKINA RIVER

DATE	August 12, 2011
VENUE	Barangay Maybunga, Pasig city
TIME	10:00am

ATTENDANCE:

NAME	OFFICE	CONTACT NO.
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I	(632) 304-3815
Ms. Estrella B. Songco	CTII/WCI	(632) 525-0767

ATTENDEES:

NAME	CONTACT NO.
1. Marites Perillo	09206533855
2. Aurora T. Valdezco	09154962557
3. Alfred M. Lalu	09472016267
4. Raymundo A. Viray	09106273487
5. Raffy V. De Guzman	09296443316
6. Eleonor Dela Rosa	09232239536
7. Francisco Mabutot	09294959600
8. Annabelle O. Cabailo	09126423402
9. Isabel B. Babatio	09091407010
10. Ma. Gerlie D. Jaurique	09493037842
11. Solidad Ausa	09238797947
12. Roberto Juli	09393795076
13. Fernando Juan	0910520937
14. Nancy G. Agualin	09493382686
15. Oscar M. Gamingan	
16. Nestor Camacho	09204311439
17. Antonio E. Abailo Jr.	09077560854
18. Domingo P. Umoso Jr.	09165266924
19. Raquel C. Eugenio	
20. Benita C. Tabuloc	
21. Medardo L. Debulos	
22. Marlyn J. Viray	
23. Merna Mendoza	09204255890
24. Fausta J. Viray	

The Public Information Dissemination/Consultation meeting for the proposed Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project (PMRCIP), Phase III was conducted to the PAFs with improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence, crops, vegetables, trees along the Lower Marikina River areas where the proposed dikes and other related flood control structures will be constructed.

The highlights of the said undertaking are as follows:

1. Recognition of the participants was acknowledged by Ms. Estrella B. Songco.

2. The purpose of the aforementioned public information dissemination/consultation was briefly explained by Engr. Dorie Dayco and subsequently presented the overview of the project which include among others, **(a) coverage of the whole PMRCIP** including its four (4) sub-components, namely, PMRCIP, Phase I (Detailed Engineering Design for the whole project, completed in 2002), PMRCIP, Phase II (1st Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, on-going), PMRCIP, Phase III (2nd Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, currently proposed for implementation) and PMRCIP, Phase IV (3rd Stage of Construction/Civil Works component, to be proposed for future funding) and **(b) objective/importance and impact/implication of the project as a whole**, to the communities who will be directly benefited and/or protected from the implementation of the project.
3. Engr. Dayco mentioned that currently the next stage of construction phase which is **PMRCIP (Phase III)** is being proposed for implementation, thus, it is now on the preparatory/preparation stage wherein one of the activities being undertaken is the said public information/consultation, to promote public awareness and/or participation especially those who will be affected by the project.
4. Engr. Dayco also discussed information relative to the construction of dike/revetment being one of the components being proposed under the PMRCIP (Phase III), mainly for flood control purposes and to be constructed within the identified riverbank section/area along the lower Marikina River (*as shown in the illustration materials*), hence, might affect the existing improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence etc. and/or crops, vegetables, trees situated thereat.
5. Engr. Dayco explained however, that those owners of said improvements including crops/vegetables/trees that will be identified to be affected by the implementation of the project particularly the construction of said proposed dike/revetment will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value (*as shown in the entitlement matrix under the DPWH resettlement plan/program for the PMRCIP III*) which are subject for validation during the implementation of resettlement activities.
6. After the above presentation/explanation about the project, open forum (Q & A) was then followed.

OPEN FORUM

	QUESTION	ANSWER
<u>Q1</u> Raymundo Viray/Roberto Juli	What is the affected area by the Project?	The affected area of the Project is within the river area and it is also within the limits of 3meter easement of the river.
<u>Q2</u> Medardo Debulos	Is the measurement of the 3meters will start from the river bank to landside? How about the crops/trees affected by the Project?	-Yes, the measurement of the said 3 meters will start from the riverbank towards the landside. -The crops/trees/vegetables planted will be compensated at current market price at the time of taking, except to those crops which are ready/good for harvest, which will also

		revalidated during the resettlement process.
Q3 Medardo Debulos	Is there any compensation/ payments to the affected improvements like crops/trees/vegetables?	-Yes, all improvements affected by the project will have a corresponding compensation, as mentioned earlier, except to those crops which are ready for harvest.
Q4 Nestor Camacho	How about if houses are affected outside the 3m easement?	- There is no houses identified to be affected by the construction of the said dike/ revetments, since, it is proposed to be constructed within the limits of the river park at landside area. On the other hand, because of the Supreme Court Decision /Mandamus to clean up the Manila Bay, all LGUs are mandated to clear areas along the 10meter easement for major rivers including Pasig-Marikina River and 3 meter for tributary (small) rivers in Metro Manila and NCR. Hence, the ISF along the Lower Marikina River which is within the said 10m will be relocated by LGUs in coordination with NHA and MMDA.

7. With no more questions/concerns raised, Engr. Dayco expressed thanks to all participants on said gathering and solicited their support and cooperation to the smooth implementation of the project.
8. The participants expressed positive response and also gave thanks for imparting the concept of the project as well as its purpose.
9. The discussion was adjourned at 10:45 pm.







**PUBLIC INFORMATION DISSEMINATION/CONSULTATIONS ON PASIG-MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PMRCIP), PHASE III**

MINUTES OF PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS ALONG LOWER MARIKINA RIVER

DATE	August 12, 2011
VENUE	Barangay Ugong, Pasig City
TIME	11:00am

ATTENDANCE:

NAME	OFFICE	CONTACT NO.
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I	(632) 304-3815
Ms.EStrella B. Songco	CTII/WCI	(632) 525-0767

ATTENDEES:

NAME	CONTACT NO.
1.Nino W. Cawelan	09393940870
2.Rodelfo Dimla	
3.Delsa Ginara	
4.Gemma M. Casi	
5.Julieto L. Ga	
6.Onofre Cemanes	
7.Rufina Sta Ana	
8.Domingo Reyes	
9.Ernesto Santos	
10. Romeo Sta Ana	5713455
11.Dario Ronelo	
12.Angeles Loba	
13.Ranelo Ravena	
14.Mariano Bernardo	
15.Herman Sarmiento	
16.Felicidad Ardenci	5712860
17.Acar, Alexander T.	09094690316
18.Teodolfo Albacete	7982024
19.Amelia R. Velarde	09208053843
20.Beni C. Ahun	
21.Rosemarie Namias	
22.Mitzi Namias	
23.Severina Antonio	
24.Mary Ann Sevillan	
25.Lucile Tilan	
26.Emelia Alcazar	
27.Lilibeth A. Garcia	

The Public Information Dissemination/Consultation meeting for the proposed Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project (PMRCIP), Phase III was conducted to the PAFs with improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence, crops, vegetables, trees along the Lower Marikina River areas where the proposed dikes and other related flood control structures will be constructed.

The highlights of the said undertaking are as follows:

1. Recognition of the participants was acknowledged by Ms. Estrella B. Songco.
2. The purpose of the aforementioned public information dissemination/consultation was briefly explained by Engr. Dorie Dayco and subsequently presented the overview of the project which include among others, **(a) coverage of the whole PMRCIP** including its four (4) sub-components, namely, PMRCIP, Phase I (Detailed Engineering Design for the whole project, completed in 2002), PMRCIP, Phase II (1st Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, on-going), PMRCIP, Phase III (2nd Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, currently proposed for implementation) and PMRCIP, Phase IV (3rd Stage of Construction/Civil Works component, to be proposed for future funding) and **(b) objective/importance and impact/implication of the project as a whole**, to the communities who will be directly benefited and/or protected from the implementation of the project.
3. Engr. Dayco mentioned that currently the next stage of construction phase which is **PMRCIP (Phase III)** is being proposed for implementation, thus, it is now on the preparatory/preparation stage wherein one of the activities being undertaken is the said public information/consultation, to promote public awareness and/or participation especially those who will be affected by the project.
4. Engr. Dayco also discussed information relative to the construction of dike/revetment being one of the components being proposed under the PMRCIP (Phase III), mainly for flood control purposes and to be constructed within the identified riverbank section/area along the lower Marikina River (*as shown in the illustration materials*), hence, might affect the existing improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence etc. and/or crops, vegetables, trees situated thereat.
5. Engr. Dayco explained however, that those owners of said improvements including crops/vegetables/trees that will be identified to be affected by the implementation of the project particularly the construction of said proposed dike/revetment will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value (*as shown in the entitlement matrix under the DPWH resettlement plan/program for the PMRCIP III*) which are subject for validation during the resettlement process/activity.
6. After the above presentation/explanation about the project, open forum (Q & A) was then followed.

OPEN FORUM

	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q1 Romeo Sta Ana	In the implementation of the Project, Is the river park will be affected?	During the implementation of the Project, the river park will temporarily be affected, since, dike/revetment is being proposed to be constructed on said river park area to protect the neighborhood communities from overflowing of water on the river specially during flood. After construction, the river park will be heightened since it will be restored on top of the said dike.

<p>Q2 Romeo Sta Ana</p>	<p>Before the implementation of the Project, is DPWH will also conduct series of consultation meetings with us?</p>	<p>Yes, prior to the implementation of the Project, DPWH will still conduct series of consultation meetings especially with the PAFs. Likewise, the DPWH is continuously coordinating with the LGU relative to the Project.</p>
<p>Q3 Romeo Sta Ana</p>	<p>- After the river park, are you going to get another 3 meter easement to the landside during the construction?</p> <p>- Well good to here that, thank you. Anyway, we will support and cooperate to the realization of the said flood control project.</p>	<p>-No, as explained earlier, the river park will only be affected temporarily. During construction works, river based operation for the project will be applied wherein the construction activities will be undertaken in the riverside.</p> <p>- We are also glad to hear your support and cooperation for the success of the project. Thank you very much.</p>
<p>Q4 Dra. Elizabeth Garcia</p>	<p>Thank you so much for giving as good information about the project, we really appreciated that. May I also tell that during Typhoon Ondoy, the river park was affected by water with sand and mud and went up to the residence area. There is no sufficient drainage outlet for water to pass through the river. I suggest to have drainage outlet.</p>	<p>We are also thankful receiving your appreciation about the project. Likewise, your suggestion is well taken, it might be reviewed during detailed design and you may also bring the said drainage outlet problem with the LGU, so that they can act immediately and appropriately on your concerned.</p>
<p>Q5 Rodello Ravena</p>	<p>The only problem is the low lying areas at the landside, there are collapsed areas even without rains or typhoon. I suggest said areas to be included in the Project.</p>	<p>Your suggestion is also noted, during detailed design which is tentatively scheduled to commence in 2012, extensive analyses/studies will be conducted to determine the actual condition of the river sections/areas especially those who need urgent protection works.</p>

7. With no more questions/concerns raised, Engr. Dayco expressed thanks to all participants on said gathering and solicited again their support and cooperation to the smooth implementation of the project.
8. On that note, the participants expressed positive response and also gave thanks for imparting the concept of the project as well as its purpose.
9. The discussion was adjourned at 12:15 pm.











PUBLIC INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ON PMRCIPIII

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC INFORMATION/CONSULTATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PASIG- MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PHASE III)

DATE	August 20, 2011
VENUE	Barangay Bagong Ilog, Pasig city
TIME	11:00am

ATTENDANCE:

NAME	OFFICE	CONTACT NO.
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I	(632) 304-3815
Ms.EStrella B. Songco	Community Organizer, CTII/WCI	(632) 525-0767

ATTENDEES:

NAME	CONTACT NO.
1. Aurora Ramirez	
2. Linda Gutfan	
3. Mercy Ambay	
4. Joan Magallan	
5. Arceli Ordas	
6. Marlyn Estologa	
7. Avelina Carandang	
8. Marlie Hamut	
9. Eddie Ramirez	
10. Jose Voces	
11. Josephine Calinao	
12. Rene Calumba	

The Public Information Dissemination/Consultation meeting for the proposed Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project (PMRCIP), Phase III was conducted to the PAFs with improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence, crops, vegetables, trees along the Lower Marikina River areas where the proposed dikes and other related flood control structures will be constructed.

The highlights of the said undertaking are as follows:

1. Recognition of the participants was acknowledged by Ms. Estrella B. Songco.
2. The purpose of the aforementioned public information dissemination/consultation was briefly explained by Engr. Dorie Dayco and subsequently presented the overview of the project which include among others, **(a) coverage of the whole PMRCIP** including its four (4) sub-components, namely, PMRCIP, Phase I (Detailed Engineering Design for the whole project, completed in 2002), PMRCIP, Phase II (1st Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, on-going), PMRCIP, Phase III (2nd Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, currently proposed for implementation) and PMRCIP, Phase IV (3rd Stage of Construction/Civil Works component, to be proposed for future funding) and **(b) objective/importance and impact/implication of the project as a whole,**

to the communities who will be directly benefited and/or protected from the implementation of the project.

3. Engr. Dayco mentioned that currently the next stage of construction phase which is **PMRCIP (Phase III)** is being proposed for implementation, thus, it is now on the preparatory/preparation stage wherein one of the activities being undertaken is the said public information/consultation, to promote public awareness and/or participation especially those who will be affected by the project.
4. Engr. Dayco also discussed information relative to the construction of dike/revetment being one of the components being proposed under the PMRCIP (Phase III), mainly for flood control purposes and to be constructed within the identified riverbank section/area along the lower Marikina River (*as shown in the illustration materials*), hence, might affect the existing improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence etc. and/or crops, vegetables, trees situated thereat.
5. Engr. Dayco explained however, that those owners of said improvements including crops/vegetables/trees that will be identified to be affected by the implementation of the project particularly the construction of said proposed dike/revetment will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value (*as shown in the entitlement matrix under the DPWH resettlement plan/program for the PMRCIP III*) which are subject for validation during the resettlement process/activity.
6. After the above presentation/explanation about the project, open forum (Q & A) was then followed.

OPEN FORUM

	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q1 Rene Calumba	Are DPWH is the one presently dredging the River? Our plants were affected and they put the dredged materials to our plants.	- The proposed PMRCIP (Phase III) is not yet started. The tentative schedule for the implementation of the project is in 2013. Right now it is still under the preparation/ preparatory stage wherein this consultation activity is included.
Q2 Eddie Ramirez	If in case our area will be affected by the this DPWH Project, we are very willing to vacate the area once the project is implemented, we will support this flood control project since we are the first that will be benefited.	Thank you for your cooperation and support to the Project.
Q3 Eddie Ramirez	Is there any compensation/ payments to the affected improvements like trees?	Yes, if there are improvements identified to be affected by the project, they will be compensated at current market value, except to those crops which are ready for harvest.

<p>Q4 Eddie Ramirez</p>	<p>Why is it in Marikina City area are flooded than areas in Pasig City?</p>	<p>- Because all the water coming from Antipolo and other areas upstream directly discharge and runs to the Upper Marikina River. The PMRCIP (Phase IV) which will be the next construction stage after the proposed PMRCIP (Phase III) will also be proposed in the future which will cover channel improvement of Upper Marikina River.</p>
<p>Q5 Eddie Ramirez</p>	<p>Is DPWH will conduct surveys on the improvements along the River?</p>	<p>Yes, actually we are now conducting the census survey of all the improvements of the PAFs along the Lower Marikina River.</p>

7. With no more questions/concerns raised, Engr. Dayco expressed thanks to all participants on said gathering and solicited their support and cooperation to the smooth implementation of the project.
8. The participants expressed positive response and also gave thanks for imparting the concept of the project as well as its purpose.
9. The discussion was adjourned at 11:45 pm.













MINUTES OF THE FOCAL GROUP DISCUSSIONS/CONSULTATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PASIG- MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PHASE III)

DATE	August 20, 2011
VENUE	Barangay Rosario, Pasig City (Left Bank/ Downstream of Rosario Bridge)
TIME	8:00am

ATTENDANCE

NAME	OFFICE	CONTACT NO.
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I	(632) 304-3815
Ms.EStrella B. Songco	CTII/WCI	(632) 525-0767

NAME	CONTACT NO.
1. Mario S. Noarin	09215166439
2. Shirley Reposo	09331908448
3. Jinkee Aromiro	09996843531
4. Roberto Rivera	
5. Francisco T. Fernandez	
6. Estelita G. Bedana	
7. Severino Galvez	9019151
8. Dionicio Galvez	
9. Pilar Bolalin	09296603465
10. Evangeline Borromeo	09491783922
11. Jerry Supiter	
12. Bernanrd Delos Santos	09396541867
13. Celistino Santos	09215460511
14. Gloria Dauag	
15. Ronelo Celo	09496797148
16. Joaquin Naragay	
17. Agustin Castro	09182583720
18. Maria Perbillo	09298345103
19. Ana Taganili	09192686455
20. MarcelinaTornea/Herminda Sarita	09192686455/9009223

Series of Focal Group Discussions/Consultations simultaneous with the census survey were conducted to the owners of improvements inside the riverbank limits (edge of the existing road) which may be affected by the implementation of the proposed Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project (PMRCIP), Phase III specifically with the construction of the proposed dike at the said areas.

Highlights of the discussion:

1. Acknowledgement of the participant was made by Ms. Estrella B. Songco.
2. The purpose of the aforementioned the aforementioned focal group discussion was briefly explained by Engr. Dorie Dayco and subsequently presented the overview of the project which include among others, **(a) coverage of the whole PMRCIP** including its four (4) sub-components, namely, PMRCIP, Phase I (Detailed Engineering Design for the whole project, completed in 2002), PMRCIP, Phase II (1st Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, on-going), PMRCIP, Phase III (2nd Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, currently proposed for implementation) and PMRCIP, Phase IV (3rd Stage of Construction/Civil Works component, to be proposed for

future funding) and **(b) objective/importance and impact/implication of the project as a whole**, to the communities who will be directly benefited and/or protected from the implementation of the project.

3. Engr. Dayco mentioned that currently the next stage of construction phase which is **PMRCIP (Phase III)** is being proposed for implementation and it is now on the preparatory/preparation stage wherein one of the activities being undertaken is the information/discussion/consultation with the PAFs, to promote public awareness and/or participation especially those who will be affected by the project.
4. Engr. Dayco discussed information relative to the construction of dike/revetment being one of the components being proposed under the PMRCIP (Phase III), mainly for flood control purposes and to be constructed within the identified riverbank section/area along the lower Marikina River *(as shown in the illustration materials)*, hence, might affect the existing improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence etc. and/or crops, vegetables, trees situated thereat.
5. Engr. Dayco explained however, that those owners of said improvements including crops/vegetables/trees that will be identified to be affected by the implementation of the project particularly the construction of said proposed dike/revetment will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value which are subject for validation during the resettlement process/activity.
6. Engr. Dayco also added that said affected improvements from the edged of the existing road to the river channel will be surveyed after the focal discussion.
7. After the above presentation/explanation about the project, open forum (Q & A) was then followed.

OPEN FORUM

<p>Q1 Roberto Rivera</p>	<p>Are you going to compensate the improvements affected by the Project? In case the implementation of the Project started, the residents are willing to cooperate.</p>	<p>- Yes, all the improvements will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value, except to those crops ready for harvest. Thank you for supporting this project.</p>
-------------------------------------	---	---

8. After questions/concerns have been raised, Engr. Dayco continuously expressed thanks to all participants and solicited their support and cooperation to the smooth implementation of the project. Hence, the concerned participants/listeners expressed also their support and cooperation for the project.

MINUTES OF THE FOCAL GROUP DISCUSSIONS/CONSULTATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED PASIG- MARIKINA RIVER CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (PHASE III)

DATE	August 20, 2011
VENUE	Barangay Rosario, Pasig City (Left Bank/ Upstream of Rosario Bridge)
TIME	2:00pm

ATTENDANCE

NAME	OFFICE	CONTACT NO.
Engr. Dorie Dayco	DPWH-PMO-MFCP I	(632) 304-3815
Ms.EStrella B. Songco	CTII/WCI	(632) 525-0767

NAME	CONTACT NO.
1. Rachel Reyes	
2. Johnny Luar	6413097
3. Feliciano Ruiz	
4. Felino Ruiz	6423061
5. Angelita Tangonan	
6. Aida Estrella	09292503772
7. Teresita Canales	09154629649
8. Larry Damagan	09274324327
9. JocylN Argonia	09087273757
10. Lucas Peralta	
11. Crestita Jarata	
12. Jun Limpuasan	09272577763
13. Carlito Purganan	09156543700
14. Crisol Paterter	09486576844
15. Marian Rodriguez	09498298651
16. Saturnino Ibanez	09287774512
17. Rolly Bron	6414151
18. Consuelo Penaflor	6414151
19. Menchie Eguid	09193073310
20. Mercedes Dalia	
21. Eddie Arturo	09206009859
22. Alfonso Supang	

Series of Focal Group Discussions/Consultations simultaneous with the census survey were conducted to the owners of improvements inside the riverbank limits (edge of the existing road) which may be affected by the implementation of the proposed Pasig-Marikina River Channel Improvement Project (PMRCIP), Phase III specifically with the construction of the proposed dike at the said areas.

Highlights of the discussion:

1. Acknowledgement of the participant was made by Ms. Estrella B. Songco.
2. The purpose of the aforementioned the aforementioned focal group discussion was briefly explained by Engr. Dorie Dayco and subsequently presented the overview of the project which include among others, **(a) coverage of the whole PMRCIP** including its four (4) sub-components,

namely, PMRCIP, Phase I (Detailed Engineering Design for the whole project, completed in 2002), PMRCIP, Phase II (1st Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, on-going), PMRCIP, Phase III (2nd Stage of the Construction/Civil Works component, currently proposed for implementation) and PMRCIP, Phase IV (3rd Stage of Construction/Civil Works component, to be proposed for future funding) and **(b) objective/importance and impact/implication of the project as a whole**, to the communities who will be directly benefited and/or protected from the implementation of the project.

3. Engr. Dayco mentioned that currently the next stage of construction phase which is **PMRCIP (Phase III)** is being proposed for implementation and it is now on the preparatory/preparation stage wherein one of the activities being undertaken is the information/discussion/consultation with the PAFs, to promote public awareness and/or participation especially those who will be affected by the project.
4. Engr. Dayco discussed information relative to the construction of dike/revetment being one of the components being proposed under the PMRCIP (Phase III), mainly for flood control purposes and to be constructed within the identified riverbank section/area along the lower Marikina River (*as shown in the illustration materials*), hence, might affect the existing improvements like pig pen/dog house/fence etc. and/or crops, vegetables, trees situated thereat.
5. Engr. Dayco explained however, that those owners of said improvements including crops/vegetables/trees that will be identified to be affected by the implementation of the project particularly the construction of said proposed dike/revetment will be compensated based on their corresponding current (market) value which are subject for validation during the resettlement process/activity.
6. Engr. Dayco also added that said affected improvements from the edged of the existing road to the river channel will be surveyed after the focal discussion.
7. After the above presentation/explanation about the project, open forum (Q & A) was then followed.

OPEN FORUM

	QUESTION	ANSWER
Q1 Menchie Eguid	What project are you going to construct in the area. Where it will be constructed?	-As explained earlier, the major scope of the PMRCIP (Phase III) Project is dredging an approximately 5.4 km stretch of Lower Marikina River, dike/revetment, river wall are proposed to be constructed along the said area. The Projects is scheduled to commence by end month of 2013.
Q2 Larry Damagan	We will cooperate once the project started.	- Thank you for your cooperation and support to the project.

8. After questions/concerns have been raised, Engr. Dayco continuously expressed thanks to all participants and solicited their support and cooperation to the smooth implementation of the project. Hence, the concerned participants/listeners expressed also their support and cooperation for the project.





Focal Dialogue/Discussion at Downstream of Rosario Bridge







Focal Dialogue/Discussion at Upstream of Rosario Bridge





Appendix

9. Terms of Reference for Assistance of Rap Implementation and Internal Monitoring

Terms of Reference

Assistance of RAP Implementation and Internal Monitoring

1. Objective of the Assignment

An Internal Monitoring Agent (IMA) will be commissioned by the DPWH-PMO to assist DPWH activities of RAP implementation and internal monitoring.

2. Selection criteria

The IMA for the Project will be either a qualified individual or a consultancy firm with qualified and experienced staff.

Specifically, key quality criteria include:

- Experience in resettlement survey, planning, monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience in direct implementation of programs in Metro Manila and nearby regions;
- Experience in working with DPWH;
- Demonstrated experience in computerizing and managing resettlement-related database,
- Availability of trained staff capable of including PAPs into their programs;
- Competence, transparency and accountability based on neutral evaluations, internal reports, and audited accounts.

3. Timeframe for Services

The service will be contracted starting September 2012 to January 2017.

4. Scope of Work

Scope of work of IMA shall be the following tasks. Each listed task include necessary coordination and negotiations with related LGUs and other institutions, and making records of those meetings.

(1) Assistance of RAP Implementation

As an agent of DPWH PMO, the consultant shall ;

(1) Assistance of RAP Implementation

a) Assistance in the resettlement of displaced persons

- The Consultant shall attends LIAC meeting.
- The Consultant shall help communications between LIAC member institutions and groups.
- The Consultant shall work to coordinate the needs and requirements of LIAC member institutions and groups.

- The Consultant shall assist the DPWH in the resettlement of the displaced persons, including the movement of the displaced persons.

b) Assistance in Review and Strengthening of Livelihood Programs for the Displaced Persons

- The Consultant shall conduct the consultation with the displaced persons for the preparation of appropriate income restoration and improvement programs of their livelihood.
- The Consultant shall prepare the livelihood program by reflecting the actual needs and requests from the displaced persons.
- The Consultant shall formulate the task force with the concerned LGUs and prepare the appropriate income restoration and improvement plans such as assistance for the displaced persons to obtain assistance from micro-credit programs or other sources to improve income-generating activities.
- The Consultant shall conduct the appropriate livelihood program for the improvement of the income and living status of the displaced persons.

(2) Assistance of Internal Monitoring

As an agent of DPWH PMO and ESSO,

- The Consultant shall follow up the resettlement of the displaced persons such as the monitoring of the living conditions at the relocation site.
- The Consultant shall collect monitoring data of the PAFs.
- The Consultant shall prepare monitoring reports.

5. Required Staffing

The agency chosen will have to agree to the terms and conditions under the RAP.

The following staffing provision may be necessary for smooth and effective implementation of the RAP internal monitoring within the time frame:

- 1 Team leader (Resettlement Expert)
- 2 Sub-leader (Assistant to the leader) (Each assigned specific sub-section of the work as shown in the table below)
- 2 Workers (Each assigned specific sub-section of the work as shown in the table below)
- 1 Computer operator

Scope of Work and Staff Assignment

1 Team leader	
(1) Assistance of RAP Implementation Team	(2) Assistance of Internal Monitoring Team
1 Sub-leader	1 Sub-leader
1 Worker	1 Worker
1 Computer Operator	

Tasks of each staff are summarized in Table below.

Tasks of the Staff

Team Leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supervise the Study/ Project Team ▪ Ensure that all works undertaken are sufficient and responsive to the TOR ▪ Lead in the preparation of the survey instrument ▪ Identify the parameters/ indicators relevant to the study ▪ Closely coordinate with the Engineer/ Client ▪ Supervise the data-gathering and processing ▪ Ensure the quality of data ▪ Lead in the preparation of reports ▪ Submit/ present findings to DPWH as scheduled
Workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supervise the actual interview of Field Enumerators on-site ▪ Order call back where necessary
Computer operator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Produce reports, graphics, and maps.

6. Stages and Frequency of Monitoring

The stages and monitoring frequency of the contract packages by the IMA are as follows:

a. Inception report

The IMA will submit an Inception Report and Compliance Monitoring Report within one month after receipt of Notice to Proceed for the engagement, which is assumed September 2012.

b. Monthly Monitoring Report

The IMA will be required to conduct a monthly monitoring of RAP implementation activities until the completion of payments of compensation to PAFs. Completion of actual resettlement is expected to be November 2013.

The contents of the report will include both (1) Assistance of RAP Implementation and (2) Internal Monitoring.

c. Final (After-All-Resettlement) Evaluation

Final evaluation of the implementation of the LARRIP will be conducted, according to LARRIP p.44, three months after the completion of payments of compensation to PAFs. Completion of actual resettlement is expected to be November 2013.

d. Post-Resettlement Semi-Annual Monitoring and Evaluation

This activity will be undertaken every 6 months, after the completion of payments of compensation until the construction works end, to determine whether the social and economic conditions of the PAFs after the implementation of the project have improved. the construction works are expected to finish in November 2016.

When the PAF are found that their living standard worsen, or whose present means of livelihood became not-viable, DPWH, in coordination with other appropriate institutions, will provide assistances, such as skills and livelihood trainings.

e. Final Evaluation and Proposal Report

Draft Final Evaluation and Proposal Report will be submitted one month after the completion of the construction work, which is expected to be December 2016. Final report should be submitted in January 2017.

Reporting Schedule

													Number of reports
2012	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Inception Report									•				1
Monthly monitoring and reporting									•	•	•	•	4
2013	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Monthly monitoring and reporting	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		11
2014	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Final Evaluation		•											1
Semi-annual monitoring and reporting					•						•		2
2015	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Semi-annual monitoring and reporting					•						•		2
2016	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Semi-annual monitoring and reporting					•						•		2
2017	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Final evaluation and proposal report	•												1

7. Number of Copies of Report Required

The IMA is to submit necessary number of the copies of the each reports, about 20 copies, to the PMO.

Internal Monitoring Cost Break Down

<u>Item</u>	<u>RAP Implementation Phase</u>		<u>Post Resettlement Phase</u>		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Unit Cost P</u>	<u>Amount</u>
	<u>Sep.'12</u>	<u>-Feb.'13</u>	<u>Mar.13 -</u>	<u>Dec. '16</u>				
	<u>Months</u>	<u>Days/Month</u>	<u>Times</u>	<u>Days/Time</u>				
I. REMUNERATION COST								
1 Team Leader	18	2	34	2	104	days	8,500	884,000.00
2 Redord Keeper / Sub Leader 1	18	2	34	2	104	days	7,500	780,000.00
3 Redord Keeper / Sub Leader 2	18	2	34	2	104	days	7,500	780,000.00
4 Worker 1	18	5	34	5	260	days	5,000	1,300,000.00
5 Worker 2	18	5	34	5	260	days	5,000	1,300,000.00
6 Computer Operator	18	5	34	5	260	days	5,500	1,430,000.00
							Total for I	6,474,000.00
II DIRECT EXPENSES								
1 Transportation Cost	days	260	6,500	1,690,000.00	1 car, 1 driver, fuel			
2 Printing / Reproduction of Reports								
1 Inception Report	copies	8	3,500	28,000.00	Submission : PMO(2), ESSO(1), JICA(2), PRRC (1), Makati (1) Pasig (1) (1 time x 8 copies)			
2 Monthly Monitoring	copies	105	2,500	262,500.00	(15 times x 8 copies)			
3 Final RAP Evaluation Report	copies	7	4,500	36,000.00	(1 time x 8 copies)			
4 Semi Annual Summary Monitoring Report	copies	42	3,500	168,000.00	(6 time x 8 copies)			
5 Final Evaluation and Proposal Report	copies	7	4,500	36,000.00	(1 time x 8copies)			
3 Field Allowance	days	780	500	390,000.00	For workers (3pax x 260 days)			
4 Communication Cost	pcs.	165	300	49,500.00	Except for computer operator(5 pax x 52mos.)			
			Total Direct Expense	2,660,000.00				
			Total (I+II)	9,134,000.00				
			Contingency 5%	456,700.00				
			GRAND TOTAL	9,590,700.00				

Internal Monitoring Form

Form A : Summary

A-1. Preparation of Resettlement Site

No.	Explanation of the site (e.g. Area, no. of resettlement HH, etc.)	Status (Completed (date) / not complete)	Details (e.g. Site selection, identification of candidate sites, discussion with PAPs, Development of the site, etc.)	Expected Date of Completion
1				

A-2. Public consultation

No.	Date	Place	Contents of the consultation / main comments and answers
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			

A-3. Received Opinions, Grievances, Complaints, and Redress Measures Taken

No.	Date	Proponent	Received by	Contents	Date	Measures Taken	Responsible Staff
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							

A-4. Quarterly Progresses Monitoring

Resettlement Activities	Planned Total	Unit	Progress in Quantity			Progress in %		Expected Date of Completion	Responsible Organization
			During the Quarter	Till the Last Quarter	Total Progress	Till the Last Quarter	Total Progress		
Preparation of RAP									
Employment of Consultants		Man-quarter							
Implementation of Census Survey (including Socioeconomic Survey)									
Approval of RAP			Date of Approval:						
Finalization of PAPs List		No. of PAPs							
Progress of Compensation Payment		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							
Barangay 6		No. of HHs							
Barangay 7		No. of HHs							
Barangay 8		No. of HHs							
Barangay 9		No. of HHs							
Progress of Asset Replacement		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							
Barangay 6		No. of HHs							
Barangay 7		No. of HHs							
Barangay 8		No. of HHs							
Barangay 9		No. of HHs							
Progress of Relocation of People		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							

Resettlement Activities	Planned Total	Unit	Progress in Quantity			Progress in %		Expected Date of Completion	Responsible Organization
			During the Quarter	Till the Last Quarter	Total Progress	Till the Last Quarter	Total Progress		
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							
Barangay 6		No. of HHs							
Barangay 7		No. of HHs							
Barangay 8		No. of HHs							
Barangay 9		No. of HHs							

Form B : Check List

B-1. Budget and timeframe

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
B-1-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Have all land acquisition and resettlement staff been appointed and mobilized for the field and office work on schedule?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Have capacity building and training activities been completed on schedule?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Are resettlement implementation activities being achieved against the agreed implementation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Are funds for resettlement being allocated to resettlement agencies on time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-5	<input type="checkbox"/> Have resettlement offices received the scheduled funds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-6	<input type="checkbox"/> Have funds been disbursed according to the RAP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-1-7	<input type="checkbox"/> Has the social preparation phase taken place as scheduled?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6

B-2. Delivery of Compensation and Entitlements

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
B-2-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Have all PAFs received entitlements according to numbers and categories of loss set out in the entitlement matrix?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Have PAFs received payments for affected structures on time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Have all received the agreed transport costs, relocation costs, income substitution support and any resettlement allowances, according to schedule?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Have all replacement land plots or contracts been provided? Was the land developed as specified? Are measures in train to provide land titles to PAFs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-5	<input type="checkbox"/> How many PAFs resorted to expropriation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B-2-6	<input type="checkbox"/> How many PAF households have received land titles?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-7	<input type="checkbox"/> How many PAFs have received housing as per relocation options in the RAP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-8	<input type="checkbox"/> Does house quality meet the standards agreed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-9	<input type="checkbox"/> Have relocation sites been selected and developed as per agreed standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Are the PAFs occupying the new houses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-11	<input type="checkbox"/> Are assistance measures being implemented as planned for host communities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-12	<input type="checkbox"/> Is restoration proceeding for social infrastructure and services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-13	<input type="checkbox"/> Are the PAFs able to access schools, health services, cultural sites and activities at the level of accessibility prior to resettlement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-14	<input type="checkbox"/> Are income and livelihood restoration activities being implemented as set out in income restoration Plan? For example utilizing replacement land, commencement of production, numbers of PAFs trained and provided with jobs, micro-credit disbursed, number of income generating activities assisted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-2-15	<input type="checkbox"/> Have affected businesses received entitlements including transfer and payments for net losses resulting from lost business and stoppage of production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B-3. Public Participation and Consultation

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
B-3-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Have consultations taken place as scheduled including meetings, groups, and community activities? Have appropriate resettlement leaflets been prepared and distributed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-3-2	<input type="checkbox"/> How many PAFs know their entitlements? How many know if they have been received?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-3-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Have any PAFs used the grievance redress procedures? What were the outcomes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-3-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Have conflicts been resolved?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-3-5	<input type="checkbox"/> Was the social preparation phase implemented?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B-4. Benefit Monitoring

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
B-4-1	<input type="checkbox"/> What changes have occurred in patterns of occupation, production and resources use compared to the pre-project situation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-4-2	<input type="checkbox"/> What changes have occurred in income and expenditure patterns compared to pre-project situation? What have been the changes in cost of living compared to pre-project situation? Have PAFs' incomes kept pace with these changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-4-3	<input type="checkbox"/> What changes have taken place in key social and cultural parameters relating to living standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-4-4	<input type="checkbox"/> What changes have occurred for vulnerable groups?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B-5. Other Impacts

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
B-5-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B-5-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended impacts on employment or incomes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Form C : Indicators

Monitoring Indicators		Indicators	Last	Current	Goal	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
C-1. Budget and timeframe	A. Input Indicators	* Amount of funds for resettlement allocated to resettlement agencies on time, compared to the planned amount.				
	B. Output Indicators	* Number of staff appointed on schedule compared to the number planned. * Number of capacity building and training activities completed on schedule compared to the number planned.				
C-2. Delivery of Compensation Entitlements	A. Input Indicators	* Number of PAFs who started the procedure of resettlement activities, compared to the total number of PAFs. * Number of PAFs who finished the procedure of resettlement activities, compared to the total number of PAFs. * Number of PAFs who has not started the procedure of resettlement activities, compared to the total number of PAFs. * Number and type of income and livelihood restoration trainings and other activities being implemented.				
	B. Output Indicators	* Number of PAFs resorted to expropriation, among the total number of PAFs who started or finished the procedure of resettlement. * Number of PAFs that received land title, among the total number of PAFs who started or finished the procedure of relocation. * Number of PAFs occupying the new houses, among the total number of PAFs relocated to the relocation site. * Total number of PAFs who finished income and livelihood restoration trainings per training course.				
	C. Outcome Indicators	* Number of elementary school student among the PAFs, compared to the number prior to relocation. * Number and type of complaints received by RIC regarding the living conditions and accessibility to various services in the relocation site.				
C-3. Public Participation and Consultation	A. Input Indicators	* Number of open forums (public consultations) conducted, compared to the total number planned.				
	B. Output Indicators	* Number of attendants in open forums (public consultations) compared to the number of PAFs in the particular barangay where the forum was held.				
	C. Outcome	* Number of the grievance redress procedures filed.				

Monitoring Indicators		Indicators	Last	Current	Goal	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
	Indicators	* Number of the conflicts resolved, compared to the number of the grievance redress procedures filed				
C-4. Benefit Monitoring	A. Outcome Indicator	* Number of PAFs who answer that their income have increased after relocation, compared to the total number of PAFs relocated.				
	B. Impact Indicator	* Types and significance of unexpected positive and negative impacts on persons, families, and communities at the original habitation and relocation site.				
C-5. Other Impacts	A. Impact Indicator	* Types and significance of unexpected positive and negative impacts on persons, families, and communities at the original habitation and relocation site.				

Appendix

10. Terms of Reference and Check List for External Monitoring

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EXTERNAL MONITORING AGENT

1. Objective of the Assignment

An External Monitoring Agent (EMA) will be commissioned by the DPWH-PMO to undertake independent external monitoring and evaluation.

2. Selection criteria

The EMA for the Project will be either a qualified individual or a consultancy firm with qualified and experienced staff.

Specifically, key quality criteria include:

- Experience in resettlement survey, planning, monitoring and evaluation;
- Experience in direct implementation of programs in Metro Manila and nearby regions;
- Demonstrated experience in computerizing and managing resettlement-related database,
- Availability of trained staff capable of including PAPs into their programs;
- Competence, transparency and accountability based on neutral evaluations, internal reports, and audited accounts.

3. Scope of Work

The tasks of the EMA shall be the following:

- a. Verify results of internal monitoring;
- b. Verify and assess the results of the information campaign for PAFs rights and entitlements;
- c. Verify that the compensation process has been carried out with the procedures communicated with the PAFs during the consultations;
- d. Assess whether resettlement objectives have been met; specifically, whether livelihoods and living standards have been restored or enhanced;
- e. Assess efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of resettlement and RAP implementation drawing lessons as a guide to future resettlement and indigenous peoples' policy making and planning;
- f. Ascertain whether the resettlement were appropriate to meet the objectives, and whether the objectives were suited to PAF conditions;
- g. Assess whether PAFs' income and/or living quality have increased after resettlement, compared to the condition prior to relocation;
- h. Suggest modification in the implementation procedures of the RAP, if necessary, to achieve the principles and objectives of the Resettlement Policy;
- i. Advising project management institution regarding possible improvements in the implementation of the RAP.
- j. Review on how compensation rates were evaluated; and
- k. Review of the handling of compliance and grievances cases.

4. Required Staffing

The following staffing provision may be necessary for smooth and effective implementation of the RAP external monitoring within the time frame:

- 1 Team leader (Resettlement Expert)
- 1 Record keeper (Assistant to the leader)
- 3 Workers (Contact to DPWH (PMO and ESSO), to PRRC / LIAC, and to Makati / LIAC)
- 1 Computer operator

5. Monitoring Information

The information to be collected and evaluated in the external monitoring are summarized in the following table.

Monitoring Indicators	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Input and Output Indicators
1. Basic information on PAP households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Location <input type="checkbox"/> Composition and structures, ages, education and skill levels <input type="checkbox"/> Gender of household head <input type="checkbox"/> Ethnic group <input type="checkbox"/> Access to health, education, utilities and other social services <input type="checkbox"/> Housing type <input type="checkbox"/> Land use and other resource ownership patterns <input type="checkbox"/> Occupation and employment patterns <input type="checkbox"/> Income sources and levels <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural production data (for rural households) <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in neighborhood or community groups <input type="checkbox"/> Access to cultural sites and events <input type="checkbox"/> Value of all assets forming entitlements and resettlement entitlements 	—
2. Restoration of living standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Were house compensation payments made free of depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the PAF? <input type="checkbox"/> Have PAFs adopted the housing options developed? <input type="checkbox"/> Have perceptions of “community” been restored ? <input type="checkbox"/> Have PAFs achieved replacement of key social cultural elements? 	<p>A. Outcome Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number and type of complaints received by RIC regarding the living conditions and accessibility to various services in the relocation site.
3. Restoration of Livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Were compensation payments free of deduction for depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the PAF? <input type="checkbox"/> Were compensation payments sufficient to replace lost assets? <input type="checkbox"/> Did transfer and relocation payments cover these costs? <input type="checkbox"/> Did income substitution allow for re-establishment of enterprises and production? <input type="checkbox"/> Have enterprises affected received sufficient assistance to re-establish themselves? <input type="checkbox"/> Have vulnerable groups been provided income-earning opportunities? Are these effective and sustainable? <input type="checkbox"/> Do jobs provided restore pre-project income levels and living standards? 	<p>A. Input Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number and type of income and livelihood restoration trainings and other activities being implemented. <p>B. Output Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number of PAFs occupying the new houses, among the total number of PAFs relocated to the relocation site. <p>C. Outcome Indicator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number of PAFs who answer that their income have increased after relocation, compared to the total number of PAFs relocated.
4. Levels of PAP Satisfaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How much do PAFs know about resettlement procedures and entitlements? Do PAFs know their entitlements? <input type="checkbox"/> Do they know if these have been met? <input type="checkbox"/> How do PAFs assess the extent to 	<p>A. Outcome Indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Number of the grievance redress procedures filed. * Number of the conflicts resolved, compared to the number of the grievance redress procedures filed

Monitoring Indicators	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Input and Output Indicators
	<p>which their own living standards and livelihood been restored?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How much do PAFs know about grievance procedures and conflict resolution procedures? How satisfied are those who have used said mechanisms.</p>	
5. Effectiveness of Resettlement Planning	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Were the PAFs and their assets correctly enumerated?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Was the time frame and budget sufficient to meet objectives?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Were entitlements too generous?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Were vulnerable groups identified and assisted?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How did resettlement implementers deal with unforeseen problems?</p>	<p>A. Output Indicators</p> <p>* The difference / delay of resettlement activities compared to the original time frame.</p> <p>* The difference of cost of resettlement activities per PAFs compared to the original budget.</p>
6. Other Impacts	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended environmental impacts?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended impacts on employment or incomes?</p>	<p>A. Impact Indicator</p> <p>* Types and significance of unexpected positive and negative impacts on persons, families, and communities at the original habitation and relocation site.</p>

6. Stages and Frequency of Monitoring

The stages and monitoring frequency of the contract packages by the EMA are as follows:

Inception Report

This is the first activity that EMA shall undertake to determine whether or not the RAP was carried out as planned and according to this Policy.

The EMA will submit an Inception Report and Compliance Report within one month after receipt of Notice to Proceed for the engagement, which is assumed September 2012.

Semi-Annual Monitoring Report

The EMA will be required to conduct semi-annual monitoring of RAP implementation activities. Results of the monitoring will be summarized and reported twice a year as the Semi-Annual Monitoring Report.

Final Evaluation and Proposal Report

Final Evaluation and Proposal Report will be submitted one month after the completion of the construction work.

Monitoring and Reporting Schedule

2012	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Inception report									●			
Semi-annual report									●			
2013	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Semi-annual report			●						●			
2014	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Semi-annual report			●						●			
2015	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Semi-annual report			●						●			
2016	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Semi-annual report			●						●			
2017	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Final report	●											

7. Reporting

The EMA is to submit necessary number of the copies of the each reports, 7 copies, to the PMO.

8. Timeframe for Services

The EMA will be contracted starting September 2012, or from the day of contract commencement, to January 2017.

External Monitoring Cost Break Down

<u>Item</u>	<u>Monitoring and Reporting</u>		<u>Qty</u>	<u>Unit</u>	<u>Unit Cost P</u>	<u>Amount</u>
	<u>Times</u>	<u>Days/Time</u>				
I. REMUNERATION COST						
1.1 Team Leader	10	5	50	days	8,500	425,000.00
1.2 Redord Keeper / Sub Leader	10	5	50	days	7,500	375,000.00
1.3 Worker 1	10	5	50	days	5,000	250,000.00
1.4 Worker 2	10	5	50	days	5,000	250,000.00
1.5 Worker 3	10	5	50	days	5,000	250,000.00
1.6 Computer Operator	10	5	50	days	5,500	275,000.00
					Total for I	1,825,000.00
II. DIRECT EXPENSES						
1. Transportation Cost	days	50	6,500	325,000.00	1 car, 1 driver, fuel	
2. Printing / Reproduction of Reports						
1 Inception Report	copies	8	3,500	28,000.00	Submission : PMO(2), ESSO(1), JICA(2), PRRC (1), Makati (1), Pasig (1) (9 time x 8 copies)	
2 Semi Annual Monitoring Report	copies	72	3,500	252,000.00		
3 Post Resettlement Monitoring and Evaluation Report	copies	8	4,500	36,000.00		
3. Field Allowance (3pax x 50 days)	days	150	500	75,000.00	For workers	
4. Communication Cost (5 pax x 10mos.)	pcs.	50	300	15,000.00	Except for computer operator	
				Total Direct Expense	731,000.00	
				Total (I+II)	2,556,000.00	
				Contingency 5%	127,800.00	
GRAND TOTAL PhP					2,683,800.00	

External Monitoring Form

Form A : Summary

1. Public consultation

No.	Date	Place	Contents of the consultation / main comments and answers
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

2. Received Opinions, Grievances, Complaints, and Redress Measures Taken

No.	Date	Proponent	Received by	Contents	Date	Measures Taken	Responsible Staff
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							

3. Monthly Progresses

Resettlement Activities	Planned Total	Unit	Progress in Quantity			Progress in %		Expected Date of Completion	Responsible Organisation
			During the Month	Till the Last Month	Up to the Month	Till the Last Month	Up to the Month		
Preparation of RAP									
Employment of Consultants		Man-month							
Implementation of Census Survey (including Socioeconomic Survey)									
Approval of RAP			Date of Approval:						
Finalization of PAPs List		No. of PAPs							
Progress of Compensation Payment		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							

Resettlement Activities	Planned Total	Unit	Progress in Quantity			Progress in %		Expected Date of Completion	Responsible Organisation
			During the Month	Till the Last Month	Up to the Month	Till the Last Month	Up to the Month		
Progress of Asset Replacement		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							
Progress of Relocation of People		No. of HHs							
Barangay 1		No. of HHs							
Barangay 2		No. of HHs							
Barangay 3		No. of HHs							
Barangay 4		No. of HHs							
Barangay 5		No. of HHs							

Form B : Check List

1. Restoration of Living Standards

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-1-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Were house compensation payments made free of depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the PAF?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-1-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Have PAFs adopted the housing options developed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-1-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Have perceptions of “community” been restored ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-1-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Have PAFs achieved replacement of key social cultural elements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Restoration of Livelihoods

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-2-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Were compensation payments free of deduction for depreciation, fees or transfer costs to the PAF?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Were compensation payments sufficient to replace lost assets?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Did transfer and relocation payments cover these costs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Did income substitution allow for re-establishment of enterprises and production?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-5	<input type="checkbox"/> Have enterprises affected received sufficient assistance to re-establish themselves?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-6	<input type="checkbox"/> Have vulnerable groups been provided income-earning opportunities? Are these effective and sustainable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-2-7	<input type="checkbox"/> Do jobs provided restore pre-project income levels and living standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Levels of PAP Satisfaction

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-3-1	<input type="checkbox"/> How much do PAFs know about resettlement procedures and entitlements? Do PAFs know their entitlements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-3-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Do they know if these have been met?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-3-3	<input type="checkbox"/> How do PAFs assess the extent to which their own living standards and livelihood been restored?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-3-4	<input type="checkbox"/> How much do PAFs know about grievance procedures and conflict resolution procedures? How satisfied are those who have used said mechanisms.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Effectiveness of Resettlement Planning

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-4-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Were the PAFs and their assets correctly enumerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-4-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Was the time frame and budget sufficient to meet objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-4-3	<input type="checkbox"/> Were entitlements too generous?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-4-4	<input type="checkbox"/> Were vulnerable groups identified and assisted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/> How did resettlement implementers deal with unforeseen problems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Other Impacts

	Basis for Indicators / Check List	Monitoring Results	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
2-5-1	<input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended environmental impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2-5-2	<input type="checkbox"/> Were there unintended impacts on employment or incomes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Form C : Indicators

			Last	Current	Goal	Issues to be Discussed in RIC
1. Restoration of living standards	A. Outcome Indicator	* Number and type of complaints received by RIC regarding the living conditions and accessibility to various services in the relocation site.				
2. Restoration of Livelihoods	A. Input Indicators	* Number and type of income and livelihood restoration trainings and other activities being implemented.				
	B. Output Indicators	* Number of PAFs occupying the new houses, among the total number of PAFs relocated to the relocation site.				
	C. Outcome Indicator	* Number of PAFs who answer that their income have increased after relocation, compared to the total number of PAFs relocated.				
3. Levels of PAP Satisfaction	A. Outcome Indicators	* Number of the grievance redress procedures filed.				
		* Number of the conflicts resolved, compared to the number of the grievance redress procedures filed				
4. Effectiveness of Resettlement Planning	A. Output Indicators	* The difference / delay of resettlement activities compared to the original time frame.				
		* The difference of cost of resettlement activities per PAFs compared to the original budget.				
5. Other Impacts	A. Impact Indicator	* Types and significance of unexpected positive and negative impacts on persons, families, and communities at the original habitation and relocation site.				