

**Forest Peoples Programme
Bank Information Center**

A Discussion Document

Workshop on Indigenous Peoples, Forests and the World Bank:
Policies and Practice

Washington D.C., 9-10 May 2000
Delegate Room, Embassy Suites Hotel,
1250 22nd Street NW, Washington D.C., USA

*The World Bank Policy on Indigenous Peoples:
Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project (CPPAP),
Bataan, Philippines*

Case study prepared by R Rovillos, A Cadiogan and W Alangui,
Tebtebba Foundation, Baguio City

Workshop sponsored by:

Forest Peoples Programme
Bank Information Center
C S Mott Foundation
International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs
Environmental Defense Fund
Rainforest Foundation UK and USA
Swedish Society for Nature Conservation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The study aims to assess the implementation of the World Bank (WB) policy on indigenous peoples in development projects (OD 4.20) funded by the Bank, specifically on the Aetas and the Bataan Natural Park in the Philippines, one of the ten project sites of the WB-funded “Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project,” referred to here as the project or CPPAP which started in 1995 and will end in 2001.

Based on the findings of the study, the project has not delivered substantial benefits to the Aetas and it has even stopped their sustainable traditional forest resource management practices and extraction techniques without any alternative source of livelihood.

From the perspective of the indigenous peoples, the most glaring weakness of the program is the lack of internalization and understanding of the IP issues and concerns on the part of the NGOs and GOs involved in the project, and their non-participation in the planning of the project. The project has not been able to successfully implement its policy on IPs due to the following reasons: 1) the project was suddenly imposed on the Aetas “from the top” and they were not adequately prepared for the project. They were not part of the process of conceptualization but were involved only in the implementation phase; and 2) the Aetas were dislocated from their forest-based livelihood activities without any viable alternative livelihood activity. In addition, the constraints imposed by the broader political system in the Philippines has greatly hampered any meaningful changes in the lives of the marginalized sectors, including the indigenous peoples.

The CPPAP has attempted to implement the key elements of the World Bank’s policy on indigenous peoples (OD 4.20). It seeks the full and prior informed consent of the indigenous peoples through community meetings, consultations, and workshops, such that although the program’s design and concept did not originate from them, the IPs fully supported it (and “owned” it) in the process. The IPs are also represented in the management of the protected area through the PAMB. In principle, the program endeavors to bring tangible benefits to the indigenous peoples through livelihood projects but these benefits have been hampered by organizational and institutional problems. The program also tries to address the problem of tenure over the ancestral lands of the IPs in the protected areas, but although the national legal framework for the realization of this is in place, its implementation is hindered by a legal protest (vs. the supposed constitutionality of the IPRA), and a divisive power struggle within the ranks of the indigenous peoples themselves.

Based on the above conclusion, the indigenous people in the project area recommend that any development project for them should ensure their participation and involvement as early as the conceptualization and planning phase until the monitoring phase. The funding agencies of development projects channeled through the Philippine government, like the World Bank, should fully monitor the implementation of the project to know exactly how project funds were utilized by the project implementors. Project guidelines involving the IPs (e.g. loan guidelines) should be culture-sensitive to ensure its smooth implementation.

INTRODUCTION

Thanks to the militant struggles of indigenous peoples worldwide, there is now an attempt among international institutions like the World Bank (WB) to address their issues and concerns. In September 1991, the WB issued an operational directive (O.D. 4.20), which provides policy guidance to: a) ensure that indigenous people benefit from development projects, and b) avoid or mitigate potentially adverse effects on indigenous peoples caused by Bank-assisted activities.¹

Has this policy on indigenous peoples been implemented on the ground? This is the question that this study tries to grapple with. The study takes a close look at the case of the Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project (CPPAP), a US\$ 20 M project funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The CPPAP is a GO-NGO interface “experiment” involving the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and the NGO’s for Integrated Protected Areas (NIPA), Inc.

The CPPAP aims to empower local communities, including the indigenous peoples, to manage the protected areas in sustainable manner. One of the ten protected areas covered by the CPPAP is the Bataan Natural Park (BNP). The locus of the case study is Barangay Bangkal, which is an Aeta resettlement area and serves as one of the “buffer zones” to the protected area. The Aetas are one of the many ethnolinguistic groups in the Philippines.

Through key informant interviews, focused group discussions and study of primary and secondary documents, the study hopes to capture the perceptions of the Aetas with regard to the project, as well as the intentions and effects/impacts of the project on the Aetas.

When we started this study, we hoped to break away from the usual sad stories told by indigenous peoples as they encounter grandiose development interventions. We hoped to be able to write a case of “good practice,” this time. Towards the end of study, our optimism declined. Let the Aetas speak for themselves.

The Park, The Community and The Aetas: A Situationer

The Bataan Natural Park (BNP) is one of the ten protected areas in the country, which is part of the Conservation of Priority Protected Areas Project (CPPAP). It was chosen as a project site due to the highly varied forms of flora and fauna located in the area. Some of the endemic animals located at the BNP are the endangered birds such as the Luzon bleeding-heart pigeon, green-faced parrot finch, and the Philippine hawk eagle; the endangered lizard locally called bayakan; the dwindling wild pig (*Sus. philippinensis*) and the deer (*Cervus marianus*); and a local frog called *pasinga* which is found only in Luzon. Among the endemic plants found in the area are forest palm; mossy trees; bamboo (*Bambusa sp.*); and the dwindling rattan.

The BNP contains an area of 31,400 hectares of public domain located in the municipalities of Hermosa, Orani, Samal, Abucay, Balanga, Pilar, Bagac, and Morong all in the province of Bataan, and the municipality of Subic in the province of Zambales. This paper covers the barangay of Bangkal in the municipality of Abucay, which is part of the BNP.

Bangkal is one of the nine barangays of the municipality of Abucay in the western part of the province of Bataan, which is about 119 kilometers from Manila. It is second to the biggest in

terms of land area but has the smallest population. It is an upland village located in the northwest part of the municipality of Abucay.² It is located 14 kilometers west of Calaguiman, a lowland barangay of Samal municipality, where public transport to Bangkal and the nearby barrio of Palili are stationed,³ and 15 kilometers east of the Abucay town plaza.⁴

Bangkal is bounded on the north by Brgy. Palali of Samal municipality; on the south by Brgy. Mabatang; on the east by Brgys. Palili and Mabatang; and on the west by the municipalities of Bagac and Morong.⁵

Demographic Profile:

Bangkal has an 18-20 degrees sloping land area of 1,598.6 hectares.⁶ The total land area consists of watershed areas of 100 hectares, 80 hectares are allocated for residential lots, 50 hectares to the Bataan National Agricultural School (BNAS), while the remaining area of 1,368.6 hectares is devoted to the forest area and to the agricultural production of fruits, vegetables, and rice. Passing along the barangay are the numerous tributaries of the Yamot, Abo-abo and Pagsawan rivers which provide natural irrigation and food.⁷

The total population of Bangkal is 342 distributed among 111 families as of May 1999. The population consists of 58 percent female and 42 percent male, and is basically a young population with 77 percent belonging to the 0-24 years age group.⁸ Only 10 percent of the total population are non-Aetas or lowlanders mostly residing within the premises of the BNAS.⁹

The first wave of Aeta migrants arrived in Bangkal in the late 1960s and it was easy for them to adapt to the place with its lush vegetation, water supply from the nearby springs, and forest cover to protect them from the lowlanders or the *unats* (meaning, straight haired people; as contrasted to the Aetas who are *kulots*, or curly-haired people) or Tagalogs, as the Aetas call them. The barangay was officially designated as a resettlement site by the government in 1972, although eventually, non-Aeta lowlanders migrated to the place. Bangkal's name came from the Tagalog word "bangka" (meaning boat) since fisherfolk from the coastal communities of Abucay got their logs used for building their boats from the forests of Bangkal.¹⁰

The Aeta Resource Management Practices: Continuity and Change

The Aetas in Bataan are among the scattered groups of Aetas found in the mountains of Bataan and Zambales. In Bataan, there are small Aeta settlements in almost all of the municipalities: in Dinalupihan, Hermosa, Orani, Samal, Abucay, Balanga, Orin, Limay, Mariveles, Bagac, and Morong. Most of these Aeta settlements are located around the area of the BNP. Aside from the Aetas in Dinalupihan and Hermosa, who are related to the Aetas of Zambales and using the Sambal dialect, the mother dialect of the Aetas in Bataan is the Magbeken dialect. But they also use Tagalog to communicate to outsiders and lowlanders.

Like most indigenous peoples, the Aetas of Bangkal have a strong affinity with the forest. They believe that the forest not only provide them food or shelter, but these have become their refuge in times of sickness and in times of war. The forest is the main source of all the medicinal plants that they use in healing common ailments such as headache, stomachache, malaria, and diarrhea. The Aeta elders also recalled how the forests of Bataan spared them from the atrocities

of the Japanese forces during the Second World War. Having been born and reared in the forest, they were agile and able to outrun the Japanese forces by climbing even the highest mountain. They also depended on the various rootcrops in the forest for food during the war. Even in recent times, the Aeta elders depended largely on the forest for their food supply which included plants and animals.

While the Aetas claim that the forest is still a big part of their life, most of them have shifted to sedentary farming. Since the American Colonial period up to the present, the Aetas have been persuaded to abandon swiddening or *Gahak* because they (state authorities) said that this practice was not sustainable.¹¹ Reed's description of *gahak* farming among the negritos (Aetas) in Zambales could have been practiced by the Aetas in Bataan:

*The small trees and underbrush are cut away and burned and the large trees are killed, for the Negrito has learned the two important things in primitive farming— first, that the crops will not thrive in the shade, and second, that a tree too large to cut may be killed by a ring around it to prevent the flow of sap. The clearings are never large.*¹²

There was no rigid division of labor in the *gahak*. Men, women, and children worked in the clearings. Men, being more adept with the bolo (a long, heavy single-edged big knife used to cut vegetation and as a weapon), did whatever cutting needed to be done. Once planted, the weeding and care of the crops fell largely on the women and children, while the men hunted and caught fish.

Before the restrictions on hunting, hunting was a significant activity of the Aetas. As Reed commented, "the Negrito (the Aetas) is by instinct, habits, and of necessity, a hunter." The traditional methods of hunting was to a large extent, sustainable, as can be gleaned from the following examples.

In hunting the deer, the Aetas used the deadly *belatic*, a long arrow or spear. Wild chickens and birds were captured with simple spring traps. Smaller animals and birds were caught with variously shaped iron heads without barbs. In catching fishes in large streams, the Aetas employed the bamboo weir through which the water can pass but the fish can not. In smaller streams, the Aetas built dams of stones which they covered with banana leaves. Usually, the entire course of the creek will be changed. A dam is first made below in order at some point above the creek in such a way as to change the current.¹³ Since the Aetas gathered only what they needed from nature, there was therefore no massive abuse of the environment.

The magico-religious beliefs of the Aetas reinforced the sustainable use and protection of their biological and physical resources. For example, they conceptualized disease as a form of punishment for wrongdoing, the more serious diseases coming from the supreme anito (spirit), the lesser ones from the lesser anitos. If a small pox visited a village, it was because someone has cut down a tree or killed an animal belonging to a spirit which has invoked the aid of the supreme spirit in inflicting a more severe punishment than it can be done. The Aetas also believed that an illness was caused by cutting bamboos, the spirits that owned the bamboo having been offended.¹⁴

To a large extent, these traditional beliefs are still practiced by the Aetas (particularly the old ones) up until today, amidst the proliferation of various religious groups in the area.¹⁵ This aspect

of Aeta culture (in Bangkal and elsewhere) has been noted by several anthropologists like Shimizu, 1992; Barrato and Benaning, 1978.¹⁶

Shimizu found that in the culture of Aetas, there is a feature that always states that allows them to return to other ways of living than the present one. Shimizu states that in the Aeta society, a new innovation of how to supply food, does not necessarily mean that the previous systems are abandoned. Instead another alternative is merely added.¹⁷ For example, while the Aetas have adapted to a sedentary way of life, they still continue to roam the forests in search of food especially in times of scarcity. While they have been introduced to other viands which they can buy in the town market, they still relish the old favorites, like camote and other root crops which they gather from the forest.

Aeta culture has adapted to new conditions, and assimilated new ones. The Aetas' indigenous animal dance has been replaced by western modern dances. But when asked to dance, they can easily "perform." Their own cultural songs and poetry are almost forgotten that even among the elders, only a few remember their songs, mainly due to strong lowland influences.

The traditional forms of healing, use of native costumes and other indigenous beliefs have been greatly affected by the intrusion of modern medicine, popular culture and institutional religions. Common among all Aetas in the village, both young and old, is their unshakeable faith to God. They explain occurrences in life and death, sadness and joy, pain and relief, and wealth and poverty to the "will of God" ("kaloob ng Dios", "tadhana ng Maykapal").¹⁸ At the same time, old beliefs persist, such as taboos on calling one's in-law's name, farting in public, not offending the spirits that dwell in nature, to name only a few.

Barrato and Benaning explained the adaptive and dynamic character of the Aeta culture thus:

*New ideas are redefined within the framework of traditional beliefs and practices, strengthening not only the basis of the latter but also creating the former as an integral part of it.*¹⁹

In Bataan, this dynamism manifests in the way the Aetas have negotiated (i.e., defined and redefined) their identity. They have learned to accept and reclaim the categories or labels created for them by the outsiders. Hence, they appropriated terms like negritos (Spanish and American Colonial Period), to minorities or "minority" (PANAMIN of the Marcos years), to indigenous peoples (IPs). They use these various terms or identities depending on the situation. Since now, the current trend is IPs, they have started identifying themselves IPs as well. At the same time, most of them also say that they are Filipinos.

Social Services:

1. Health and Nutrition

Bangkal has one existing health center located near BNAS which is about two kilometers away from the resettlement site (apparently for the convenience of the Barrio Health Worker (BHW) who is a non-Aeta and a resident of BNAS) making it inaccessible to the people. The health center is hardly used with visits from the BHW occurring only once a month. The Local Department of Health (DOH) office offer immunizations, dental and optical check-ups conducts occasional medical missions.²⁰

The Aetas' seeming openness to health intervention was not fully maximized by the local health agency. Health skills were not taught to the villagers to enable them to practice preventive medicine. Instead, this served to heighten their dependence on professional health care offered by the public hospital in Balanga and the private clinics in Abucay. Commercial or drugstore medicines introduced in the area through the Rural Health Unit (RHU) and the medical missions eventually replaced the herbal concoctions prepared by the elder Aetas. The community found out that commercial medicines are easier to obtain and needed no preparation. In addition, there is a misconception that commercial medicines are more effective than herbal preparations.²¹

The Aetas eventually realized that getting sick drained their finances due to the high prices of commercial medicines and their expenses in transportation to the hospital, and food expenses while they are there. In spite of the free health services (mainly the hospital room and medical services of the doctors and nurses) rendered to the indigenous people by the public hospitals, money as far as the Aetas are concerned, should spell good service for them. But their experiences in the public hospitals have proven that be it in Bataan or in Manila, their being Aetas have discriminated them for getting timely and good service from the hospital, and have even raised doubts on their ability to pay for their health services.²²

The piecemeal health measures of the RHU and the poor environment sanitation and personal hygiene of the residents had worsened their health conditions. In 1999, about 50 percent of the families in the area do not have their own toilet facilities.²³ The existing toilet facilities are not fully utilized due to water problems while some are defective or set up in the wrong place. The Aetas were not taught personal hygiene such as taking a bath regularly. Although pipes were set up for spring water, the pipes seldom had water during the dry months.

Despite the Aetas' increased awareness with regard to professional health care, still births and high mortality still remain a problem. In terms of causes of morbidity, malaria, diarrhea, and acute respiratory infections were the most common afflictions in the area.

Out of the total population, 24 percent consisting of children below 6 years old suffer from first-degree malnutrition while 3 percent from the same age group are second degree malnourished.²⁴ It is possible that malnutrition was not bad as in the olden days since the elder Aetas' staple of carbohydrate-heavy camote and other root crops were balanced by their intake of fruits and vegetables, and protein from wild boars and fowl.

At present, the migration of non-Aetas to Bangkal's upland areas have not only contributed to the scarcity of food in the forest, but gave rise as well to the pollution of the Aetas' water resources . According to one doctor who served in the area, the scarcity of food, the absence of

potable water, and their inability to provide immediate cure have placed the younger generation in a more distressed situation than their elders.²⁵

2. Education and Literacy:

Elementary, secondary, and tertiary education are offered in nearby Bataan National Agricultural School (BNAS), and a day-care center exists in the resettlement site. As of 1999, there are 35 children attending the day-care center while 94 children are in the elementary and only 11 male students are in the secondary level. There were only 20 young people who did not attend school in 1999. Out of the children who are in school, 80 students or 57 percent are males and 60 students or 43 percent are females. In addition to formal education, there are 40 adults (30 females and 10 males) who attend functional literacy classes or the adult education program being offered by BNAS since 1994.²⁶

Economic Profile:

The major occupation of the Aetas is mainly in agriculture engaged by about 81 families or 73 percent of the total families residing in the area while 27 percent engage in non-agricultural activities. In addition, they also go to the lowlands and town centers for manual labor to supplement their income. As shown in their income distribution, about one-half of the population have a monthly income below P2,000.00 (US\$ 1.00= Ph 40.00) and only about one fourth earn above P5,000.00 per month. Based on their income, 54 percent of the household population earn below P2,000.00 per month while only 24 percent earn an income of above P5,000.00 per month. In addition, 14.5 percent have a monthly income of P3,000-P3,999 and 4.5 percent earn between P4,000 and P4,999 per month.²⁷

The Aetas upon settling in Bangkal were taught to till their lands within the Aeta resettlement area and not in the forest area. While some have been undertaking swidden farming (“kaingin”), most of them were “buhu” (a local kind of bamboo) gatherers. Extension workers from the Department of Agriculture introduced chemical-based agriculture by initially providing the farmers with free chemical fertilizers and pesticides. Later their traditional organic farming was replaced since the new technology resulted to higher productivity.²⁸

Eventually, the Aeta farmers were faced with the problems of increasing costs of chemical inputs. Added to their woes, the lowland traders who bought their products offered farmgate prices, taking advantage of the inability of the Aetas to bring their produce to the center due to the absence of farm-to-market roads.²⁹

According to one community organizer of PRRM, the intrusion of small-time logging in the forests of Bangkal had made it more economically difficult for the Aetas. The change in the biodiversity of the area had resulted to the loss of prime wildlife which was a rich source of sustenance and livelihood for the people. The depletion of the forest cover resulted to soil erosion which has affected the farmlands of the Aetas.³⁰

Political Profile:

The role and participation of Aetas in local (barangay) politics is significant. In the ‘70’s, the “traditional or indigenous political” structure was created by the state by appointing a tribal

chieftain and forming the tribal council composed of elders in the village. The function of the tribal chieftain and council is limited only to Aeta concerns such as peace and order, relationships, and justice within and among the Aetas. The chieftain usually represents the whole Aeta tribe in political affairs and political decisions are arrived at with the tribal council. Political decisions concerning non-Aetas are the concern of the barangay captain and council, including issues not decided on in the tribal council. At present, Barangay Bangkal is led by Barangay Captain who is an Aeta.

Mainly through the initiatives of GO's and NGOs, a number of social organizations have emerged in Bangkal. The organization, named Apo Lakay, for instance was set up in 1992 upon the encouragement of the local Department of Agrarian Reform office.

In addition to Apo Lakay, there are 3 other organizations, namely, the Barrio Health Committee (an association of mothers), the Rural Improvement club, and the Samahan ng mga Katutubo sa Bangkal. A multi-purpose cooperative was also established with members coming from Bangkal and the nearby barrio of Palili. There are three non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working in the area, namely, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM), CBFP, and the Bataan NGO Coalition (BNC).

Development Work and Problems:

Barangay Bangkal is considered to be the most depressed community in the whole municipality of Abucay. From the 1970s until the early 1990s, there had been sporadic interventions introduced by local government line agencies with each one wanting to do its share in easing Bangkal's poverty.³¹

The first decade of intervention in the resettlement site created a dole-out mentality among the Aetas. Rice, food supplies, and medicines, even housing materials were donated. But these eventually came in trickles until it stopped altogether and the Aetas had to fend for themselves again.³²

The PRRM entered Bangkal in 1991 faced with a situation of high fertility rate, deteriorating health conditions, decreasing food security, incomes way below the poverty threshold, and extremely low self-esteem. The task to introduce alternative development was a long and tedious process for the NGO.

They started the preliminary village social analyses to know the real situation of the area. Relief programs, agricultural knowledge and skills such as the regenerative agricultural technologies (RAT) of Low External Input Rice Production (LEIRP) were first introduced. These were followed with primary health care activities such as preventive medicine, nutrition, and herbal medicine.

PRRM has planned a comprehensive upland barrio development program for Bangkal sensitive to Aeta culture with the support of the other development agents in the province, and with the participation of the Aetas themselves.³³

In a recent study, the ten (10) identified problems are 1) poor housing (with houses not to last 5 years); 2) families with income below poverty level; 3) no potable water supply; 4) head of

family is jobless; 5) children not attending high school (13-16 years old); 8) illiteracy; 9) house not owned; and 10) no toilet facilities.³⁴

Barangay Bangkal is a priority area for the Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (CIDSS), formerly known as the Social Reform Agenda, project of the government. Through this program, a day care center has been constructed in the resettlement area. According to the Municipal Social Welfare Officer who is also in charge of the implementation of the CIDSS, the aim of this (day care) program is to help Aeta mothers in their child-rearing roles. The project is also encouraging the women Aetas to form groups of ten so that they can borrow money to finance a group livelihood activity- e.g. weaving (as in Grameen experience in Bangladesh). The project officer opines: "The Aeta woman should just be at home to take care of their family. We are introducing weaving projects to these women so that they will not have to go to the forests."³⁵

The Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System (CPPAS) is the most recent integrated development program that promises to uplift the situation of the Aetas in Bataan. Needless to say, it has raised the expectations of the target communities.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The Project

The Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project (CPPAP), the second phase of an Integrated Protected Areas System (IPAS) Program, started in 1994 and will end in 2001. This US\$ 20 million project is being financed by World Bank's GEF. The direct recipient of this project is a coalition of NGOs, the NGO's for Integrated Protected Areas, Inc. (NIPA), in partnership with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). The Philippine Government is expected to provide a counterpart fund of about 10% of the GEF money.³⁶

The project is being implemented in ten (10) priority sites which was selected during the initial phase. These sites include the following: Batanes Protected Landscape, Northern Sierra Madre Natural Park, Subic-Bataan National Park, Apo Reef Natural Park, Mt. Apo Natural Park, Turtle Island, Mt. Kitanglad, Mt. Kanlaon, Agusan Marsh Watershed, and Siargao Islands.³⁷

The CPPAP's primary objective is to provide a program support for the development, conservation and management of resources within the ten priority sites under the Government's new National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS).³⁸

During its initial stage, CPPAP identified four major components, namely: site development, resource management, socio-economic management and technical assistance, coordination and monitoring.³⁹ During a recent (November 29-December 10, 1999) joint review mission by the DENR, NIPA, World Bank and the Nordic Agency for Development and Ecology (NORDECO), the components were recasted "to enhance the focus of strategic activities," as follows:

- *Protected Area Planning and Management*: includes organizing and mobilizing a critical mass of PA residents for effective and sustained participation in PA management, strengthening PA Management Board (PAMB), and Project Implementation Unit staff for each sites, community-oriented PA management plan preparation, PA gazetting and development of a sustainable integrated protected areas fund system;
- *Biodiversity Conservation*: includes patrolling and related apprehension and prosecution work by the PA staff with the communities, operationalizing a biodiversity monitoring system (supported by the Technical Assistance for Conservation or TABC), construction and installation of basic infrastructure and equipment, information, education, communication (IEC) in support of protection work, boundary delineation and demarcation, resource assessment and rehabilitation/restoration activities;
- *Tenurial Security*: includes tenurial surveying, claims documentation and processing, issuance of tenurial instruments (TI) and IEC activities to enhance care and stewardship of the PA by TI holders;
- *Livelihood systems*: includes setting up capital savings and mobilization schemes for organized PA residents; provision of livelihood funds (grant and loan) to support the formulation and implementation of non-destructive livelihood activities (NDLAs); strengthening of recovery systems for loan funds; IEC and training to support livelihood development;

- *Project Management and Coordination*: includes activities at the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) level such as overall program coordination, monitoring and evaluation work, overall funds management, accessing and utilizing technical and other assistance from experts and from partners (including NORDECO Project), policy advocacy and lobbying and networking to promote sustainable strategic activities in the 10 protected areas.⁴⁰

The CPPAP is unique for its attempt to interface state and civil society organizations in pursuing sustainable development within the framework of a national law, the NIPAS Act.⁴¹ This WB/GEF-NGO-GO collaboration is coordinated at the national level by a Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) composed of representatives from NIPA, Inc. and the DENR's NIPAS Policy and Program Steering Committee (NPPSC) and the IPAF Governing Board.

The CPPAP at Subic-Bataan Natural Park is implemented by the Project Implementing Unit (PIU) which is composed of representatives of the Bataan NGO Coalition (BNC) and DENR (specifically, the Protected Area Superintendent—PASu). The Bataan NGO coalition is composed of five member organizations, namely: Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement-Bataan Branch, Balikatan ng Taong Bayan (Balikatan), Cooperative Foundation of the Philippines, Inc., Sagip-Kalikasan ng Bataan, and Bangkal Sagip-Gubat Association, Inc.⁴²

Aeta Perceptions of the CPPAP

When asked whether they knew about the project called CPPAP, the Aetas of Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan generally answer negatively. Not that they are unaware of the project. Rather, they are oblivious to the acronym. They can relate to the project when the term “parke” or park is used. Their awareness of the project’s goals and objectives are derived from their attendance in community meetings and consultations regularly conducted by community organizers and staff of the Bataan NGO Coalition.

At the start of the project, the Aetas had high expectations. They were convinced that their cooperation and participation in conservation initiatives will ultimately be for their own good.⁴³ However, as the project approaches its terminal phase, the Aetas are increasingly becoming impatient, if not, cynical, with the whole project. The following rendering of Aeta perceptions of and actual role in the CPPAP explains this sentiment. We will discuss their reactions in terms of their: 1) participation in the CPPAP, 2) access to benefits derived from the project, and 3) land tenure.

1. Participation:

The idea of CPPAP did not originate from the Aetas themselves. The project was conceptualized in Manila by the NIPA, Inc. as the Philippine NGO’s commitment to the “conservation of biodiversity in the support of present and future generations of local and indigenous communities.”⁴⁴ The project was conceptualized and designed *for* them, not *with* them. In fact, Bataan was not originally in the list of 10 priority areas. It was only chosen as an alternative to Mindoro, where the project was rejected by the Mangyans.⁴⁵

At the local level, Randy Dacanay, Coordinator of the Bataan NGO Coalition admits that while they identified the IPs as their target beneficiaries of and key stakeholder in the project, they were (initially) in the dark as to how they would operationalize this mandate.⁴⁶ They began by ensuring that the Aetas were directly represented in the project implementation through their

representation in the Protected Area Management Board (PAMB), and through their organizations, like the Sagip-Gubat Association. Hence, while the Aetas were not sufficiently involved in the project inception, they figured well in the implementation phase- as actual implementors of PA management.

For its functions and responsibilities the NIPAS Act and its supporting implementing rules and regulations gives the PAMB authority to:

- Decide allocation for budget;
- Approve proposals for funding;
- Decide matters relating to planning, peripheral or resource protection and general administration of the area in accordance with the General Management Plan Strategy.

The PAMB's regulatory functions include those that have to do with the enforcement of Laws and issuance of permits. They are to:

- Approve collection and utilization of resources, research, visitors permits in sustainable use zones;
- Control and regulate the construction, operation and maintenance of roads, trails, waterworks, sewerage, fire protection and sanitation system and other public utilities within the protected area;
- Exercise regulatory functions for the prohibited acts inside the protected area;
- Officially adopt the Management Plan and by majority vote, approve the work program and budget presented by the protected area staff
- Recommend persons for deputization by the DENR as field officers with authority to investigate and search premises and buildings and make arrests
- Approve, by majority vote, the recommendations for the establishment as NIPAS area.⁴⁷

Thus defined, the PAMB is a powerful body within the protected area. The two representatives of the indigenous cultural communities (ICCs) in PAMB are Mr. Benigno Parera of Bangkal and Ms. Winifreda Ramirez of Pag-asa. They are also in the Executive Committee of the board.

We had the opportunity to interview them in-depth last February. Both said that their participation in the PAMB has been good for the Aetas, for they now have a voice in the decision-making process in this body. Mr. Parera says: "pinakikinggan naman nila kami (we can say that the PAMB members listen to us)." They were duly endorsed by their respective communities. Before his appointment to the PAMB, Mr. Parera was a Barangay Councilor and an Officer-In-Charge (OIC) Barangay Captain in Bangkal. Ms. Ramirez, is concurrently the Tribal Chief of the Aetas in Bayan-bayanan, a resettlement area in Barangay Pag-asa, Orani, Bataan. She says that her capacity to represent the interests of the Aetas was a process:

Noong una, naiilang ako. Kasi ang mga kasama ko sa PAMB Executive Committee, ay mga Attorney, Provincial Project Development Officer, local government officials at Municipal Development Officers. Ibig sabihin, may mga pinag-aralan. Tapos masasabak ka. Hindi ko pa lubos na maunawaan ang mga pinag-uusapan. Pero sa pagdalo saka sa experience sa pakikihalubilo sa PAMB, nawala na rin 'yung hiya at insecurity.

(Initially, I felt uneasy, because in the PAMB Executive Committee, I had to deal with lawyers, Project Development Officers, local government officials and Municipal Development Officers. In other words, people who have a high level of educational attainment. You suddenly find yourself amidst all these people. I didn't fully understand what was being discussed. But later, through frequent attendance and experience in interacting with PAMB, I was able to overcome my insecurity and shame).⁴⁸

The staff of Bataan NGO Coalition (BNC) have high regard for the two. They told us that Parera and Ramirez have been very conscientious with their duties and responsibilities as ICC representatives. Both are very articulate and able. Ms. Ramirez has been chairing PAMB meetings. They have been actively involved in educating their fellow Aetas on the national laws such as NIPAS, IPRA, and PAMB regulations. They were also instrumental in mobilizing their constituents in all activities for the protection of the forest. Through these IP leaders, the Aeta participation in the PA management was ensured.

Our field interviews are corroborated by the WB mission report dated December 20, 1999:

Volunteers have been involved not only in patrolling and monitoring of illegal activities within the PAs but also in fire fighting, information and education campaign and conservation activities. The activities conducted by these volunteers have reportedly helped decrease the illegal activities in the area and raised the communities' awareness on environmental protection. The participation of IP volunteers, including the tribal council of elders, in the protection work also revived their traditional rites of protecting the resources and restored their ritual/ethnic pride.⁴⁹

But what is not emphasized in the WB report is the growing dissatisfaction of the Aetas. With the delay in the implementation of the livelihood component, the Aetas feel that the project is yet another form of broken promise. As IP representatives, Mr. Parera and Ms. Ramirez immediately get the flak from their constituents. Ms. Ramirez laments:

Kaya lang, nagtatampo ang mga katutubo. Sabi nila: "Kami, kasama ninyo sa pagprotekta pero wala naman kaming pakinabang. Sana iyong puwede naming mapakinabangan ay ikonsidera na."⁵⁰

(The problem now is, the indigenous peoples feel bad. They tell us: We are always with you in protection efforts, but we do not get any benefits. We just wish you would allow us to practice those things that would be beneficial to us.)

The Aetas have asked the PAMB to allow them to practice their traditional ways of extracting forest resources. They argue that it is the Tagalogs or unats who destroy the forest, not the Aetas. They cite several proofs to this allegation. For example, it is the unats who introduced "dynamite fishing," leading to the loss of ulang, their traditional shrimp. The unskilled unat destroy the honeycomb when they extract honey from it, unlike the kulots who practice a non-destructive technique. Yet the Aetas understand that since the law should be inclusive, even their sustainable resource management practices have been affected.

The balance between the need for food security and productivity on one hand and the need to maintain biodiversity on the other has been recognized.⁵¹ Yet, from the perspective of the Aetas, how this noble goal can be concretized remains to be seen.

2. Benefits

In the preceding discussion, we have already touched on the indigenous peoples' perceptions regarding the benefits (or lack of it) derived from the CPPAP. No less than the joint WB/DENR/NIPA/NORDECO November-December 1999 mission have identified the delayed implementation of the livelihood component as one of the key issues that needs priority action. This problem is not new. As early as 1996, the BNC has already reported that "the absence of alternative livelihood systems in the PA system has proven to be a set back in maintaining community acceptance of the project"⁵² The reason (or justification) for the delay is not also entirely new. The PASu report of 1998 states that:

*The major delays in the livelihood implementation were attributed to the difficulty in identifying a retail financial institution who would serve as a conduit for the loans, the intricate process of obtaining the loan from the Land Bank to the actual disbursement to the communities and the interest rates accompanying the loan part of the fund.*⁵³

The required process of obtaining loans is not only complicated and the interest high. It is also not culture-sensitive. For example, it is said that the indigenous peoples in Mindanao have opposed the idea of going to a bank and opening a savings account. In Bataan, the Aetas find as absurd the mere idea of going to a Bank to borrow.

To respond to the clamor of PA communities, the BNC has tried to look for possible funding outside of the CPPAP. Through their networking efforts, the BNC has implemented a number of agroforestry projects such as the rehabilitation of a mango plantation with cash crops (e.g. ginger production) component in Bangkal.⁵⁴

Throughout 1997-1999, the tone of the BNC annual reports is already one of despair or irritation. In 1997, it stated that "the BNC cannot understand the delay in the implementation of a crucial component of the CPPAP."⁵⁵ In a December, 1999 issue of *PA Monitor*, the Implementing Unit of the ten priority areas have issued a statement, accusing the World Bank guidelines of "insensitivity to varied levels of community beneficiaries in the protected area, particularly the indigenous people."⁵⁶

The joint mission has agreed to resolve the problem by instructing "the IPAF-GB to approve proposed revisions (including the approval process and thresholds) to the Livelihood Fund guidelines by end of January, 2000 and to issue the revised guidelines immediately thereafter."⁵⁷

As of February, 2000 the BNC staff were still waiting for the guideline. There is a proposal to convert the fund into an endowment fund, to be administered by the NIPAS. Current DENR Secretary Ceriles is not keen on the idea. "He'd rather turn the funds over back to the WB, than give it to the NGO," an informant commented. Secretary Ceriles' appointment as Secretary was blocked, albeit unsuccessfully, by NGO's.

Meanwhile, the Aetas and other local inhabitants of the protected areas are being asked to stretch their patience furthermore. Many, like Maura Golisan, 21; Narsing, 66, and Ben Quinto, 45, are becoming angry. These are their sentiments:

Maura: *Hindi sapat ang luya. Kailangan namin ng pera para sa pagkain... marami nang pumunta rito pero hanggang simula lang sila.⁵⁸ (Ginger production would not suffice. We need cash to buy food... many have come here but they did not stay long).*

Ben Quinto has become cynical to all kinds of interventions and outsiders, including researchers like us. He says:

Ben : *Interview na naman? Sawang-sawa na kami diyan. Marami nang nagpunta dito upang mag-interview. Pero lahat sila—mapa-NGO man ‘yan o ano man, walang naibigay na tulong sa amin. Halos lahat sila, ginagamit lang kaming mga kulot upang makakuha sila ng pondo—Kaming mga kulot, kung baga sa isda, tinik na lang ang napupunta sa amin. Kumukuha lang sila ng impormasyon tungkol sa amin upang magkapera sila.⁵⁹*

(Interview again? We are sick and tired of that kind of thing. Many have come here to interview us. But all of them- whether from NGO or what not—we have not received any tangible help from them. Most of them use us kulots so they can get funding—while us, kulots, like the fish, only the bones remain for us. Researchers only get the information from us so they can get money)

Narsing: *Kaming mga Aeta, pinagkakaperahan lang yata kami ng mga iyan. Ang talagang gusto namin ay ang makuha ang lupang inagaw sa amin.⁶⁰*

(We Aytas are only used as milking cows by these people. What we want is to get back the land that was taken from us.)

3. Land

Narsing articulated a contentious and complicated, yet fundamental issue confronting the Aetas of Bangkal—the issue of land tenure. They have been dislocated first, from the vast mountains that served as their hunting grounds since time immemorial, then, from their lands in Bunga and Tanato which was declared as Aeta reservation areas by the Americans in 1927. In 1972, the Marcos government relocated the Aetas of Bunga, Mabtang and Salian to Bangkal.⁶¹

At present, the Aeta’s tenure in the resettlement area in Bangkal remains unstable since they have not been awarded any permanent tenurial instrument. Oral histories from the Aetas point to historical and socio-cultural bases for ancestral land claims. The following account of Narsing is repeated by Nana Orang, Rogelio Parera, and all the other members of the Tribal Council in Bangkal.

Noong panahon ng peace-time , bago kami lumipat dito sa resettlement, kaming mga Ayta ay may 72 ektarya ng lupa sa sitio Bunga, sa Abucay. Marami sa mga matatanda dito sa Bangkal ang ipinanganak sa Bunga. Doon namin inilibing ang aming mga yumaon. Hanggang ngayon, naroon pa rin ang may 200 puno ng mangga, langka, abokado, mangga, at iba pa na tinanim pa ng aming mga ninuno. Umaani pa rin ang mga puno ng mangga ng 150 kaing kada ani. Pero ngayon ay hindi na kami ang nakikinabang sa mga pinaghirapan namin at ng aming mga ninuno. Ang lupang iyon ay inangkin na ni Dr. Paharin, isang mayamang duktor sa Abukay. Ginawa niya ito noong 1972, noong kami ay inilipat dito sa Bangkal ng pamahalaan. Binakuran na niya ang lupain, kaya hindi na namin maani ang bunga ng mga punong kahoy. Noong 1984, sinira namin ang bakod para makaani. Pero dinemanda niya kami. Tumagal ang kaso. Noong isang taon, nang maipasa ang IPRA, hinarap namin si Paharin, kasama si Mr. Vic Mariano, community organizer ng BNC. Pero hindi na nasundan ang kaso,

*dahil nagmatigas si Dr. Paharin. Ayon naman kay Vic Mariano, hindi pa maipursige ang kaso dahil nabintin sa Korte Suprema ang IPRA.*⁶²

(During peace time, before we were resettled here in Bangkal, we Aetas tilled a 72 hectare land in Sitio Bunga, in Abucay. Many of the old folks here were borne in Bunga. We buried our dead relatives there. Up until now, the 200 fruit-bearing trees like mango, langka, avocado are still to be found there. Those trees continue to yield 150 kaings (a kind of big basket) per harvest. But we are not the ones enjoying these harvests. The land has been grabbed by Dr. Paharin, a rich physician from Abucay. He did this in 1972, after we were resettled here by the government. He fenced off the land, making it even more impossible for us to partake of the fruits of our ancestor's labor. In 1984, we tried to destroy the fence so we can harvest as usual. But Dr. Paharin filed a case against us. Just a few years ago, we were accompanied by Mr. Vic Mariano of BNC to settle the matter amicably with the Dr. But the meeting did not resolve anything as Dr. Paharin was callous. This was not followed through. According to Mr. Mariano, the case cannot be pursued due to the Supreme Court order suspending the implementation of the IPRA).

One of the objectives of the CPPAP (see Project objectives, above) is to facilitate the grant of a permanent tenurial instrument to the indigenous peoples. However, there are different proposals on the form of tenure. One proposal is to grant a Certificate of Ancestral Land/Domain Title as stipulated in the Indigenous Peoples' Rights Act (IPRA). But the IPRA is saddled with problems. A case has been filed in the Supreme Court, questioning the constitutionality of the law. The National Commission on Indigenous Peoples, the body that was designated by the IPRA to implement the law, has not been able to fully function because they have no funds. The Presidential Task Force on Indigenous Peoples (PTFIP) of the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) has allegedly hindered the full functioning of the NCIP, Rather than complimenting or helping the NCIP, the PTFIP is accused by NCIP as duplicating the latter's responsibilities.

At the local level, the Protected Area Superintendent, Mr. Juanito David does not subscribe to the idea of filing a Certificate of Ancestral Land Claim/Title. He argues that the Aetas do not have to possess any form of (collective) private ownership such as the CADC/CADT, since the reservation act itself could already serve as their tenurial instrument. "Communal ownership is still better, so that they will not be tempted to sell the land," he reasons out.⁶³

Another form of tenurial instrument being proposed is the Community Based Forest Management Agreement (CBFMA) for the Protected Areas. The DENR has already issued this year a Department Administrative Order (DAO) "Amending certain provisions of DAO 96-29 and providing specific guidelines for the Establishment and Management of Community-Based Projects within the Protected Areas." The CBFMA is an interim arrangement, pending the approval of an Act of Congress declaring the area as a PA. The Bataan Natural Park is the only site out of the 10 protected areas that has not been officially declared as such, by a law. It is common knowledge in Bataan that the landowners inside the natural park, including no less than an ex-Mayor and a Congressman, have actively lobbied against the proclamation of the Park as a protected area.

Under the provisions of the reservation act and the CBFMA, the indigenous peoples are mere stewards of the land which is actually owned by the state. This is the reason why some Aetas do not buy the idea of granting communal ownership as provided for by a government proclamation of the reservation area. "Tagilid pa rin kami sa ganitong kalagayan sa resettlement, dahil pag-aari pa rin ng gobyerno ang lupa." (Under this set-up, we still do not own the land, since

the government is the one that owns the land). Some Aetas clamor for the application of the Torrens Title (i.e., individual private ownership of land). They point out, “Why can lowlanders have individual private titles to land while we Aytas cannot? Why do you insist in providing us with communal titles? Are we no all Filipinos?”⁶⁴

The form of tenure for the Aetas remains to be seen. Certainly, whatever the form the tenurial arrangement will take will be a result of the dynamic interplay between several actors, such as the World Bank-GEF, the DENR, the NIPA, the National Commission for Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), the PTFIP and the indigenous peoples.

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the CPPAP attempts to implement the key elements of World Bank's policy on indigenous peoples. It seeks the full and prior informed consent of indigenous peoples through community meetings, consultations and workshops. Hence, although the program's design and concept did not originate from them, the indigenous peoples fully supported it (and "owned" it) in the process. The indigenous peoples are also represented in the management of the protected area, through the PAMB. In principle, the program endeavors to bring tangible benefits to the indigenous peoples through livelihood projects. However, due to World Bank's restrictive and inappropriate livelihood guidelines, these promised benefits have not been delivered. The program also tries to see to it that the indigenous peoples in the protected areas will have tenure over their ancestral lands. The national legal framework for the realization of this objective is in place, but its implementation is hindered by a legal protest (vs. the supposed unconstitutionality of the IPRA), and a divisive power struggle within the Estrada Administration (i.e, between the NCIP and the PTFIP of the NAPC). Another problem is the delay in the declaration of the Bataan⁶⁵ Natural park as a protected area by Congress.

From the perspective of Aetas, they feel that they have fulfilled their share in the project. Their active participation in monitoring, patrolling and educating activities have significantly decreased the number of illegal activities in the forest. They have also given up their traditional access to and use of their forest. Many of them have stormed the halls of Congress to lobby for the proclamation of the protected area.

Yet for all their efforts, the Aetas feel that they have not been adequately compensated by CPPAP. The livelihood component came very late and has not been fully implemented. Their tenure over their land remains tenuous. The legal services offered by the program was not sustained. The program has only two more years to deliver. In the meantime indigenous peoples are getting restless each day. They are asking:

Para kanino ba ang ginagawa naming ito? Para ba talaga ito sa aming mga katutubo o para na naman sa iba?

(Is this idea of protecting the environment really for us, indigenous peoples, or is it again for the benefit of others?)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books/Monographs

- Barrato, Calixto L. Jr. and Benaning. *Pinatubo Negritos: Revisited*. Field Report Series No. 5. (Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies Museum, 1978).
- Noval-Morales, Daisy Y., and Monan, James. **A Primer On the Negritoes Of the Philippines** (Manila: Philippine Business for Social Progress, 1979).
- Shimizu, Hiromu. **Pinatubo Aytas: Continuity and Change** (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University of Press, 1992).

B. Reports

- Bataan NGO Coalition. *Proceedings of the Community Organizing (CO) and Community Development (CD) Summing-Up*. 1998.
- _____. **Annual Reports**. 1996-1998.
- _____. **The Bataan NGO Forum: A Leaflet**.
- DENR/NIPA/World Bank/NORDECO. *Joint Review Mission: Final Aide Memoire*. December 20, 1999.
- DENR-PASu. *Accomplishment Report*. 1998.
- NIPA, DENR-PAWB. **PA Monitor**. Special Issue. December 1999.

C. Unpublished Papers

- Castro Nelson, Cabalza, Chester and Gadit, Earl. *Pagsulat ng Kasaysayan ng Lipunang Walang Panulat*. A Paper read during the Local History Convention, University of the Philippines, Diliman. Quezon City. July 25, 1998.
- Dacanay, Randy N. *Learning: The Heart of Community Development*. Undated.
- Luna, Bonpin, Perez and Associates for NIPA, Inc. *Policy Briefing on the Proposed Position of NIPA, Inc. on ICCs in PAs*. October 27, 1995.
- Nielsen, Trine Schnell. *Perceptions and Practices of a Group of Aetas*. RUC. 1999.
- Protected Area Superintendent Office (PASu), *Selected Population Profile of Three Indigenous Filipino Communities: Bangkal, Kanawan and Pag-asa Aeta Reservations*. 1997.
- Reed, William Allan. *Negritoes of Zambales*. Department of the Interior Ethnological Survey Publications. Volume II, Part I. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing. 1904.

D. Policy Documents (Published)

The World Bank Operational Manual. Operational Directive. October 1991

PAWD-DENR. NIPAS Act: R.A. No. 7586 and Implementing Rules and Regulations (DAO 25, S 1992).

E. Leaflet/Factsheet/Brochure

Municipal Welfare Office (MWO) - Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (CIDSS). *Factsheet on the socio-economic profile of Barangay Bangkal*, Abucay, Bataan.

NIPAS, Inc. Brochure.

The Bataan, NGO Coalition. (a print-out)

F. Interviews

Andres, Ofelia J. . Municipal Welfare Officer. Abucay, Bataan. February 19, 2000.

Cruz, Cecilia S. Administrative Officer, Bataan NGO Coalition. Abucay, Bataan. February 18, 2000.

Dacanay, Randy. Project Coordinator, Bataan NGO Coalition. PRRM Office, Quezon City. February 17, 2000.

Dalmacio Bautista, 63. Member, Apo Lakay. Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 19, 2000.

David, Juanito. Protected Area Superintendent. PASu Office, Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 20, 2000.

Gulisan, Maura, 27.. Resident, Barangay Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 2, 2000.

Gulisan, Ramon, 42. Member, Tribal Council. Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 19, 2000.

Magtanong, Lilibeth. Community Organizer, Bataan NGO Coalition. Abucay, Bataan. February 18, 2000.

Mariano, Vic. Community Organizer, Bataan NGO Coalition. Pag-asa, Orani, Bataan. February 21, 2000.

Narsing, 66. Resident, Barangay Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 20, 2000.

Parera, Rogelio. Chieftain and Member, Protected Area Management Board (PAMB). Bangkal, Bataan. February 19, 2000.

Ramirez, Winifreda, 36. Chieftain and Member, Protected Area Management Board. (PAMB). Pag-asa, Orani, Bataan. February 21, 2000.

ANNEX : ACRONYMS USED IN THE PAPER

BHW	Barangay Health Worker
BNC	Bataan NGO Coalition
BNAS	Bataan National Agricultural School
BNP	Bataan Natural Park
CADC	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Claim
CADT	Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title
CALT	Certificate of Ancestral Land Title
CBFMA	Community Based Forest Management Agreement
CBFP	Community Based Forestry Program
CIDSS	Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services
CO / CD	Community Organizing / Community Development
CPPAP	Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System Project
CPPAS	Conservation of Priority Protected Areas System
DAO	Department Administrative Order
DENR	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GO-NGO	Government Organization - Non-government Organization
ICCs	Indigenous Cultural Communities
IEC	Information, Education, Communication
IP	Indigenous People
IPAF	Integrated Protected Area Fund
IPAF – GB	Integrated Protected Area Fund - Governing Board
IPAS	Integrated Protected Areas System
IPRA	Indigenous Peoples Rights Act
LEIRP	Low External Input Rice Production
MWO	Municipal Welfare Office
NCIP	National Commission of Indigenous Peoples
NDLA	Non-Destructive Livelihood Activities
NIPA	NGOs for Integrated Protected Areas
NIPAS	National Integrated Protected Areas System
NORDECO	Nordic Agency for Development and Ecology
NPPSC	NIPAS Policy and Program Steering Committee
ONCC	Office of Northern Cultural Communities
PA	Protected Area
PAMB	Protected Area Management Board
PANAMIN	Presidential Assistance of National Minorities
PASu	Protected Area Superintendent
PCU	Project Coordinating Unit
PIU	Project Implementing Unit
PRRM	Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement
RAT	Regenerative Agricultural Technologies
RHU	Rural Health Unit
TABC	Technical Assistance for Biodiversity Conservation
TI	Tenurial Instruments
WB	World Bank

¹ The World Bank Operational Manual, *Operational Directive*, October, 1991.

² PASU Office, *Fact Sheet*, 1999, p. 1.

³ Randy N. Dacanay, *Learning: The Heart of Community Development*, Undated, p. 1.

⁴ PASU Office, *Fact Sheet*, p. 1.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Dacanay, Ibid.

⁸ Municipal Welfare Office (MWO)- Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services (CIDSS), *Factsheet on the Socio-economic profile of Barangay Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan*, 1999, pp.2-3.

⁹ Dacanay, Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ The Secretary of Interior, Annual Report, *Philippine Islands*, (1911), p. 70.

¹² William Allan Reed, *Negritoes of Zambales*, Department of the Interior Ethnological Survey Publications, Vol. II, Part I, (Manila: Bureau of Public Printing, 1904), p. 42. N.B.: Although Reed's study was conducted among the Aetas in Zambales, his description of the *Gahak* and other resource management practices in this province also applies to those of the Aetas in Bataan-- perhaps due to proximity and common ecological niche. For materials that specifically discuss the Aetas of Bataan, one may refer to Colonial records. Cf:

Philippine Commission, *Annual Report*, 1911; Secretary of the Interior, Annual Report, *Philippine Islands*, 1908, 1910, 1911, and 1912.

¹³ Reed, *Negritoes of Zambales*, pp. 44-48.

¹⁴ Ibid, pp. 65-66. Our field interviews show that these indigenous beliefs and practices were also observed by the elder Aetas in Bataan. However, the younger generation have been largely assimilated and acculturated into the mainstream culture.

¹⁵ Cf. Trine Schnell Nielsen, *Perceptions and Practices of a Group of Aetas*. Unpublished MA Thesis, RUC, 1999.

¹⁶ It should be noted that these authors conducted their studies among the Aetas in Zambales. Since there is, up to now, no published work on the Aetas in Bataan, we are referring to these author for their good insights on culture change among the Aetas—some of which, like the ones cited in this paper, are also true in the case of Bataan.

¹⁷ Hiromu Shimizu, *Pinatubo Aytas: Continuity and Change* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1992, p. 4.

¹⁸ Dacanay, p. 5.

¹⁹ Calixto L. Barrato and Benaning, *Pinatubo Negritos: Revisited*. Field Series No. 5 (Quezon City: Philippine Center for Advanced Studies Museum, 1978), p. 1.

²⁰ Dacanay, p. 5.

²¹ ibid.

²² ibid, p. 6.

²³ PASu, *Fact Sheet*, 1999.

²⁴ Municipal Welfare Office (MWO)-CIDSS data-RHU, 1999.

²⁵ Dacanay, p. 7

²⁶ MWO-CIDSS data-RHU, 1999.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Dacanay, p. 8.

²⁹ ibid.

³⁰ ibid.

³¹ Dacanay, p. 9.

³² Ibid., p. 11.

³³ Ibid., p. 12.

³⁴ PASu, Fact Sheet, 1999.

³⁵ Ofelia J. Andres, Municipal Welfare Office, Bataan. Interview conducted on February 19, 2000 at Bangkal, Bataan.

³⁶ CPPAP, Briefing Packet, 1994, p. 10

³⁷ NIPA, Brochure, undated, p. 1

³⁸ DENR/NIPA/World Bank/NORDECO, *Joint Mission: Final Aide Memoire*, (December 20, 1999), p. 1.

³⁹ CPPAP, Briefing Packet, undated.

⁴⁰ WB, et. al., *Aide Memoire*, pp. 1-2.

⁴¹ Randy Dacanay, Project Coordinator, Bataan NGO Coalition, Interview held at the PRRM Office, Quezon City, February 17, 2000.

⁴² Bataan NGO Consortium, undated, p. 1

⁴³ Neilsen, *Perceptions*, 1996, p. 12.

-
- ⁴⁴ NIPA Brochure.
- ⁴⁵ Mr. Flores, Forester IV, PASu, Bataan. Telephone interview conducted on March , 2000.
- ⁴⁶ Also see: BNC CO-CD *Summing Up Proceedings*, 1998.
- ⁴⁷ Section 18, Chapter 8 of the NIPAS Act or R.A. No. 7586 and Implementing Rules and Regulations, DAO 25, S 1992.
- ⁴⁸ Winifreda Ramirez, 36, Chieftain and Member, Protected Area Management Board (PAMB). Interviewed in Pag-asa, Orani, Bataan, Febuary 21, 2000.
- ⁴⁹ WB, et.al. *Aide Memoire*, 1999, p. 9.
- ⁵⁰ Ramirez, interview.
- ⁵¹ PASu, *Accomplishment Report*, 1998.
- ⁵² BNC, *Progress Report*, 1996:1.
- ⁵³ PASU, 1998.
- ⁵⁴ BNC *Annual Report*, 1996.
- ⁵⁵ BNC *Annual Report*, 1997.
- ⁵⁶ CPPAP, *PA Monitor*, December, 1999, p. 5
- ⁵⁷ WB, et. al. *Aide Memoire*, 1999.
- ⁵⁸ Maura Gulisan, 27. Resident, Barangay Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. Interviewed on February 2, 2000.
- ⁵⁹ Ben Quinto, Resident. Barangay Pag-asa, Orani, Bataan, Febraury 21, 2000.
- ⁶⁰ Narsing, 66. Resident, Barangay Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. Interviewed on February 20, 2000.
- ⁶¹ Nestor Castro, Chester Cabalza, and Earl Gadit, *Pagsulat ng Kasaysayan ng Lipunang Walang Panulat*, a paper read during the Local History Convention, University of the Philippines, Diliman. Quezon City. July 25, 1998, p. 12.
- ⁶² This story is a reconstruction of separate accounts by the following Aetas: Narsing, 66; Rogelio Parera, Chieftain and member, PAMB; and Nana Orang. The Interviews were conducted in February 20, 2000.
- ⁶³ Juanito David, Protected Area Superintendent. PASu office, Bangkal, Abucay, Bataan. February 20,2000.
- ⁶⁴ Quoted by Nestor Castro, Comments On Tebtebba Foundations' "The World Bank Policy On Indigenous Peoples: The Conservation of Priority Protected Areas Project (CPPAP) In Bataain, Philippines," from the e-mail: tom@forestpeoples.org. July 17, 2000.
- ⁶⁵ Rogelio Parera, Chieftain and Member, Protected Area Management Board. Bankal, Bataan. February 19, 2000.