

## **Threats to ICCAs and Community Responses— The Ikalahan Experience**

### **1. Background**

This report presents the results of a number of activities undertaken in collaboration with the Ikalahan community in the Philippines. These activities were part of the concerted efforts to promote better understanding of Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas and Territories (ICCAs). The term ICCA is commonly adopted to describe the natural sites, resources and species' habitats conserved in a voluntary, common and self-directed way by indigenous peoples and local communities throughout the world.

The activities were conducted under the the framework of the project "Strengthening the ICCA Consortium as an emerging local-to-global institution to conserve bio-cultural diversity, promote sustainable livelihoods and secure human and indigenous peoples' rights" financed by The Christensen Fund and/or the project "Documentation and dissemination of information on ICCAs in the context of CBD COP10 Aichi 2020 strategic targets" financed by UNDP/EEG.

The project is designed to deepen the understanding of ICCAs and contribute to enhancing their appreciation locally, nationally and internationally. The focus is on external and internal "threats" to ICCAs—i.e., phenomena that endanger their existence "as ICCAs", as well as the responses they elicit from their communities governing and managing them.

The threats, responses and the results of such responses presented in this report were examined from the perspective of the Ikalahan community. The related processes and the lessons learned were compiled in a photo-story entitled '*The Ikalahan Community of Imugan, Santa Fe, Nueva Vizcaya, Northern Luzon, Philippines: Threats and Responses.*' The photo-story forms an integral part of this report.

### **2. Methodology**

The simple methodology adopted for the purpose of this work, included the identification of a clear example of an ICCA related to a community that satisfies the three defining characteristics of an ICCA; and the conduct of grassroots discussions with the community on the threats to their ICCA and their responses to them.

### **3. The Ikalahan Community**

The Ikalahans are the indigenous people in the province of Nueva Vizcaya in the northeast of the Philippines. They belong to the Kalanguya-Ikalahan tribe, which inhabits the Ikalahan ancestral domain in the junction of the mountain ranges of the Cordillera and Caraballo. The domain comprises 58,000 hectares of montane forests and farm lands with high levels of biodiversity spread over the provinces of Nueva Vizcaya, Nueva Ecija and Pangasinan. It is located at an altitude of 900 to 1717 meters above sea level.

One third of the Ancestral Domain, 14,730 hectares, is a Forest Reserve with sanctuaries for watershed and wildlife protection. Three types of forests – Benguet pine (*Pinus insularis*, Endl.),

dipterocarp, and mossy scrub oak – provide diverse habitats for 1500 plant species of plants and animals.

The entire area is mountainous. It receives rainfall from 3,000 to 5,000 mm per year. Much of the area is forested, mostly with dipterocarp species, although the western edge is mostly pine. Some of the forests are primary, but most are secondary. Broad areas in the east are barren because of logging done by outsiders several decades ago.

The Ikalahans are known for their ‘indigenous knowledge practice systems’, which are environmentally sustainable. For generation after generation, the indigenous practices were transferred, protected and maintained. Among these practices are the *day-og* and *gengen*, which are ancient composting techniques on level and sloping land respectively to restore fertility of the soil in the period of three months. The *pang-omis* is a method of expediting the follow that was invented by one of the tribal elders while *balkah* is a contour line of deep rooted plants which trap eroded topsoil at the belt line. With these, thousands of hectares of forestlands were preserved from further land conversion (Rice 2000).

To defend their ancestral domain and protect their communities from possible eviction by land grabbers, the Ikalahan organized the Kalahan Educational Foundation (KEF) to negotiate for their rights with the Philippine government. They petitioned the government to recognize the legitimacy of their occupation of the forestland. This resulted to the signing of Memorandum of Agreement No. 1 with the Bureau of Forest Development (BFD) in 1974.

The agreement between the KEF and BFD recognizes the right of the Ikalahans to manage their ancestral land and to ‘utilize the area to the exclusion of all other parties not already “subsisting” within the area at the time of signing’. The agreement established 14,730 ha of land to be managed by the occupants through the KEF for a period of 25 years, renewable for another 25 years.

MOA No. 1 gave birth to social forestry in the Philippines which started the policy of inclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities in the management of the country’s forest resources. Social forestry allowed many indigenous peoples and other local communities to obtain tenure security over their territories and resources through the issuance of stewardship certificates (CSC/CFSA/CCFS) for a term of 25 years and renewable for another 25 years. More importantly, it provided opportunities for the actual ground delineation of the territories and their boundaries.

Since then, KEF is considered a community-based organisation or a community-led organisation. It represents the legal personality of the Ikalahans as pioneers of community-based forest management in the Philippines. The KEF mission is to promote the education of the Ikalahan people and protect the environment and their ancestral domain. Among its aims is to provide sustainable forest-based livelihoods, improved watersheds and biodiversity (KEF 1993).

#### **4. The Grassroots Discussion on ICCA**

The grassroots discussion on ICCA was conducted on 23 to 24 March 2012 at the Dagwey Training Center, Imugan, Santa Fe, Nueva Vizcaya. At least 17 members of the Ikalahan community participated in the discussions.

The discussions focused on the basic description of the ICCA and its community, the threats against the ICCA, and the responses of the community to these threats.

##### **4.1 Basic Description of the ICCA and its community**

- What is the origin of your ICCA?

The ICCA includes all the areas declared by the community as conservation and protection sites. These include the whole area of Cluster 1 of the Ikalahan Ancestral Domain. It includes the wildlife sanctuary, watershed and fish sanctuary.

- When was it “established”? By whom? Why?

These areas have been protected and conserved by the Ikalahan since time immemorial. But it was officially recognized in 1974 when the Memorandum of Agreement No. 1 between the KEF and the BFD was signed.

The community elders govern and manage the ICCA as part of their cultural heritage, as well as their source of life.

- Is the ICCA clearly defined and/or demarcated? What does it include?

The signing of the MOA in 1974 facilitated the formal delineation of the boundaries of the ICCA and their demarcation on the ground. The delineation followed the traditional boundaries observed by the Ikalahan since time immemorial.

The ICCA include preservation and communal areas. The preservation areas include the sanctuaries and the watersheds. The conservation areas are comprise of the production forests, grazing lands, family lot claims, water resources, agricultural areas and reforestation areas including the carbon sequestration sites.

- How is the community related to the ICCA? Does it possess some kind of right—legal or customary? How is “the community” identified (“how do you know if someone belongs to the community or not”)?

The ICCA is an integral part of their ancestral domain that was inherited from their ancestors which they intend to protect and preserve for the future and for the benefit of the succeeding generations. Membership in the community is by birth and marriage.

- Does everyone in the community know about the ICCA? What is the name you use for it?

Everyone in the community knows about the ICCA. It is called “Kuyyanmi” which literally means ‘it is ours’ or property of the Ikalahan.

- Do others outside the community also know about your ICCA?

The Ikalahan Forest Reserve (the name used by the government to refer to the ICCA) is well-known in the Philippines and in the world. The signing of MOA No. 1 in 1974 made it popular as the first community-managed forestland recognize by the government. In many ways, it helped change the course of forest management in the Philippines.

- Who takes the main decisions about the ICCA? Is there a special community institution?

The **Panglakayan** or Council of Elders takes the main decisions about the ICCA. More recently, they are closely working with the elected local government officials in the village.

The elders are not necessarily identified by age, but prestige and wisdom.

- Are there special events or meetings when decisions are taken about management actions and rules to use the natural resources?

The major issues and decisions are presented to the whole community in a general assembly. For instance, the decisions to oppose mining and ban alcohol and tobacco in the community have been the collective agreement arrived at during one of these community assemblies.

- Are there specific rules the community members and others need to respect in dealing with the ICCA and its natural resources?

The Ikalahan community laid out its policies concerning the ICCA and its natural resources in their Ancestral Domain sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP). User rights are reserved to the Ikalahan people and subject to permits. Cultivated land must be interspersed with trees and new clearings must have permits. Cutting of trees for lumber and fuel is strictly for own consumption and only marked trees should be cut and the corresponding fees paid. These and the other policies and guidelines indicated in the ADSDPP are the collective desire and decision of the members of the Ikalahan community. Table 1 presents some of these specific rules.

**Table 1. Resource policies in the Kalahan Reserve**

Resource use	Nature of restriction	Fine or penalty
Use rights	<input type="checkbox"/> Kalahan residents only <input type="checkbox"/> Access to resources in secondary forest areas only, not primary forest, subject to resource guidelines below <input type="checkbox"/> New residents to obtain permits for resource use	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-residents reported to the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) for prosecution
Fuelwood and lumber	<input type="checkbox"/> On-reserve use only, not for outside sale <input type="checkbox"/> Harvesting restrictions - marked trees only to be cut <input type="checkbox"/> Cutting permit required <input type="checkbox"/> Registration of chainsaws with Agro-Forestry (AF) office	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 pesos per tree cut <input type="checkbox"/> Confiscation of all produce <input type="checkbox"/> 500 pesos for unregistered chainsaws and reported to DENR for prosecution
Swidden farming	<input type="checkbox"/> New clearings must have permit from AF office <input type="checkbox"/> Cultivated lands to be interspersed with forest and not on land susceptible to slides	<input type="checkbox"/> 500 pesos in dedicated watershed or sanctuary (primary forest) areas and required to cover cost of reforesting area <input type="checkbox"/> 100 pesos anywhere else
Forest fires	<input type="checkbox"/> No burning except for "proper agricultural development" (see Swidden farming) <input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines re firelines and burning times	<input type="checkbox"/> 500 pesos, plus payment for damages and reforesting area plus remuneration of people involved in putting out fire
Fishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Bona fide residents only <input type="checkbox"/> No use of chemicals or electrical current	<input type="checkbox"/> 200 pesos for fishing with chemicals or electrical current <input type="checkbox"/> Confiscation of electrical equipment for second offence by residents
Orchid collection	<input type="checkbox"/> Strict guidelines on methods for orchid collection	See below

	<input type="checkbox"/> Complete ban on collection of endangered orchid species	
Wildlife and flora	<input type="checkbox"/> In sanctuaries: no harvesting of trees, orchids, rattan, bamboo, birds or other animals <input type="checkbox"/> Outside sanctuaries: hunting of animals permitted from July to August; birds from September to October	<input type="checkbox"/> First offence: 1 000 pesos plus confiscation <input type="checkbox"/> Second offence: 2 000 pesos plus confiscation <input type="checkbox"/> Third offence: 3 000 pesos plus confiscation (3 000 pesos fine also applies for hunting wild pig and other big animals in sanctuary areas on the first offence)

Source: KEF. 1995. Development Plan: Ancestral Domain Kalahan Reserve Phase 2.

- Does the community care about the ICCA? Does it care a little or a lot? Can you give some examples that justify/ illustrate the reasons of your response?

It can be fairly said that the community cares a lot about the ICCA. A concrete manifestation of this is their full compliance with the policies and guidelines. The many cases of forest burning, in the past has been reduced to zero at present.

- What are the crucial values of the ICCA *as perceived by the community* (“why is it important?”, “what benefits does it have for you”)?

The ICCA provides direct benefits to the community in the form of balanced ecology, water and sources of livelihood. The pleasant weather in the community is another concrete manifestation of the benefits derived from the ICCA.

- In what status is the ICCA? (e.g., severely damaged; damaged; relatively all right; changing but likely to remain sustainable as ICCAs in the long run; thriving)?

The ICCA is in good shape and all indications point to it being sustained in the long run by the next generation.

- How is the community about its own sense of identity, internal solidarity and capacity to act “as a community” (e.g., very weak; weak; medium; strong; very strong)?

The sense of identity of the Ikalahan remains strong. Despite some challenges, the internal solidarity to act as a community is very strong. This is a result of a combination of factors which include the strong influence of the women in the community, the social engagement of the elders, and solidarity of the elected village officials all of whom are also members of the tribe.

#### 4.2 Threats

- Has ever your ICCA been under threat? Is it under threat now?

Since 1974, when the Philippine government has first recognized the rights of the Ikalahan to manage their forestland, the ICCA has never been threatened as in the present.

- If yes, **which** threats? Please consider **external** and **internal** threats, and describe them exhaustively. If at all possible, please “tell the story” about how the threats manifest or manifested themselves. [If there is more than one threat, try to focus on the most important one, although you should mention them all and describe whether and how they are linked]

The most serious threat to the ICCA is the proposed mining exploration and operation. The proposed exploration site is right in the middle of the ancestral domain overlaps with the ICCA. The Titan Mining Company has been granted a permit without the free, prior and informed consent of the community.

Another threat is the proposed highway that would cut across the forest reserve. This proposal has been opposed by the community for a long time now because it will disturb the wildlife sanctuary and exposed their forest to further threats of encroachment and poaching of their resources by outsiders. Apparently, the proposal has been put on hold, but the community fears that the ongoing widening and concreting of the road leading to their domain has something to do with the proposed mining and highway.

Internally, the community is trying to address the challenges from within. Some members of the community are selling their lands to outsiders resulting to alienation and land conversion. Although the cases are very few and limited, it has to be resolved soon and effectively to stop the practice.

- Are there particular people in the community who are most knowledgeable about the threats? Who are they? Are they present at this meeting? If not, where and how can they be met?

The people most knowledgeable about the threats include the elders, the members of the KEF Board of Trustees and its officers and staff, and the village officials. Most of them were present in the grassroots discussions.

- Are there places, people or events that exemplify the threats and could be featured in the picture story we will prepare?

In the nearby community of Runruno (Quezon, Nueva Vizcaya), the ongoing mining operations has brought damages to the farmlands and rice fields. The community has become fully dependent on employment with the mining company. This is proving not enough to sustain them.

- Is anyone willing to volunteer to take pictures of such places, people or events, or to enact some scenes for the purpose of taking pictures– with or without the help of the facilitator of the grassroots discussion?

On the second day of the grassroots discussion, all the attendees participated in the taking of pictures and enactment of the scenes for the purpose of the picture story.

#### **4.3 Community responses**

- How did /does community respond to the threat to its ICCA? Please describe in some detail.

To counter the threats, the community mobilized its members by conducting intensive information campaign to help them understand fully well the adverse impacts of mining. This campaign culminated in the holding of a mining forum which was attended the members of all the affected communities. They also conducted meetings to discuss their plans and actions to prevent the mining company from getting inside their communities.

They filed petition with the government agencies (DENR and NCIP) to question the permit granted to the company. They held protest marches and rallies. They send a delegation to the Philippine Congress to plead their case. They obtained the opportunity for the Committee on Cultural Communities of the Philippine House of Representatives to conduct a Congressional Hearing on the case. This hearing resulted into the cancellation of the exploration permit granted to Titan Mining Company.

- Did the community take collective action or only some members seemed concerned and active?

With the massive information dissemination and campaign conducted by the village officials and the KEF trustees, the community took collective action to counter the threat of mining.

- If the community did take collective action, was that organized by the institution that governs the ICCA, or by other community body or authority (please explain)?

The collective action taken by the community was a direct result of the efforts of the KEF, which is also the institution that governs and manages the ICCA under the guidance of the Council of Elders. The different cluster organizations also helped, as well as the village officials.

- If the response came only from individual community members or from other actors outside the community, who were/are such individuals and/or actors? What is/was their motivation to protect the ICCA?

The community's motivation to protect the ICCA is very clear. The ICCA provides them with their daily needs.

- Did the community or individual community members ask and/or receive any form of support to counteract the threats? From whom?

The Ikalahan community, through the KEF, has established partnerships and alliances with other organizations and institutions, through the years. This partnerships and alliances came handy when they were opposing the proposed mining in their ICCA.

The community got legal support from ULAN (Upholding Law and Nature), an alternative environmental law group. PAFID has been the long time partner of the community even before MOA No. 1 in 1974.

Support also came from the Alyansa Tigil Mina, a national coalition of civil society organizations campaigning against mining in the Philippines. The congressional hearing was conducted as a result of the support from members of the Philippine House of Representatives namely Representative Ted Baguilat of Ifugao (Chair of the House Committee on National Cultural Communities), Representative Carlos Padilla of the Lone District of Nueva Vizcaya, and Representative Ted Casiño of the militant Bayan Muna Partylist.

- Are there particular people in the community who are most knowledgeable about the action taken to respond to the threat? Who are they? Are they present at this meeting? If not, where and how can they be met?

The KEF Executive Officer is the person most knowledgeable about the action taken to respond to the threat. He participated in the grassroots discussions all throughout along with the KEF Chairperson and Staff.

- Are there places, people or events that exemplify the responses to the threat and could be featured in the picture story we will prepare?

The place, people and events that exemplify the responses to the threat has been featured in the picture story. These include features of the ICCA, the actions taken and the people involved in the action.

- Is anyone willing to volunteer to take pictures of such places, people or events, or to enact some scenes for the purpose of taking pictures– with or without the help of the facilitator of the grassroots discussion?

The participants to the grassroots discussion took picture of the places, people or events that exemplify the actions taken to counter the threat, and even enacted some scenes for the purpose of taking pictures.

#### **4.4 Results**

- Was “the response” overall effective? Did it manage to fend off/stop the threat?

In a referendum, the community members voted overwhelmingly to reject the proposed mining operation (576 no to mining and 169 in favor).

For the moment, the community was successful in fending off the threat of mining. The permit of the Titan Mining Company was cancelled. But they learned that the same company is pursuing its bid and has commenced working to have a new permit. It was also learned that the company has filed charges against the community leaders purportedly for misinformation, and plead that the result of the referendum be nullified.

- If yes, is the problem fully solved? Is it partially or temporarily solved? If only partially or temporarily solved, or not solved at all, is the community planning a more complete or different response?

The problem is temporarily solved. The struggle is not yet over for the community. For this purpose, they KEF intend to strengthen the governance of the ICCA by building the capacity of the community members. They continue to conduct information campaign and have introduced livelihood activities to lessen the temptations of mining. They have began to campaign to replace the local political figures that are pro-mining.

- Is anyone in charge of monitoring the issues and the status of the ICCA? If yes, who is?

The KEF, in cooperation with the village officials, is monitoring the status of the ICCA.  
- KEF , barangay officials, NRDP staff

- If the threat is/was not neutralised, what are the consequences for the ICCA?

The threat is not yet completely neutralized. The fight is ongoing. But the ICCA, for the meantime is safely in the control of the Ikalahan community.

- Are there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) of the action taken to respond to the threat?

The action taken by the Ikalahan community attracted support from other communities in the province, as well as other civil society organizations. The manifestation of support from these allies and support groups further strengthened the commitment and unit of the people to push onward.

- Are there lessons learned that the community would like to share with others? [For instance, if the community could start again its response from scratch, what would it do? In particular what would it do differently?]

The KEF needs further capacity building/IEC, network building with other support groups to address the problem on poverty by introducing livelihood projects.



- Are there particular people in the community who are most knowledgeable about the results of the community response to the threat? Who are they? Are they present at this meeting? If not, where and how can they be met?

The KEF Executive Officer is the person most knowledgeable about the action taken to respond to the threat. He participated in the grassroots discussions all throughout along with the KEF Chairperson and Staff.

- Are there places, people or events that exemplify the results of the community response to the threats and could be featured in the picture story we will prepare?

The place, people and events that exemplify the results of the community response to the threat has been featured in the picture story. These include features of the ICCA, the actions taken and the people involved in the action.

- Is anyone willing to volunteer to take pictures of such places, people or events, or to enact some scenes describing the results of the community action, or even simply enacting community members reflecting on the consequences of their action, for the purpose of taking pictures– with or without the help of the facilitator of the grassroots discussion?

The participants to the grassroots discussion took picture of the places, people or events that exemplify the actions taken to counter the threat, and even enacted some scenes for the purpose of taking pictures.

## 5. The Picture Story

The picture story is attached to this document as part of the report.

## 6. The Grassroots Discussion on the Resiliency and Security of the ICCA

The grassroots discussion on the Resiliency and Security of the ICCAS was held on 23 May 2012. A total of 15 members of the Ikalahan community participated in the discussion held at the Dagwey Training Center, Imugan, Santa Fe, Nueva Vizcaya.

The “ICCA Resilience and Security Tool” developed by the ICCA Consortium was used in the discussion which seeks to better understand the characteristics that contribute to ICCA resilience and security. It is hoped that this better understanding could lead to a more coordinated efforts to strengthen ICCAs.

The results of the discussion are as follows:

**6.1** The community’s **appreciation of the cultural, spiritual and other non-material values** of the ICCA is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**. These values are virtually universally known and appreciated in the community. But such appreciation is weakening, especially from the younger generations, owing to external material influences.

**6.2** The community’s **appreciation of the ICCA’s values for the conservation of biological diversity** remains **STRONG (5)**. Most people in the community are knowledgeable and active in conservation.

**6.3** The community’s **appreciation of the ICCA’s subsistence and economic values** is **MEDIUM (3)**. Only about half of the population feels they benefit from it. This is partly explained by the fact that

most households in the community earn from employment ( local or abroad). Farming has become secondary, if at all.

**6.4** While many members of the community acknowledge that the relationship between the ICCA and the community dates back to ancient times, they categorize the relationship as **MEDIUM (3)** or the **age of relationship** is less than 50 years. They reckon that the relationship of their community to the ICCA began to re-emerge in the 1970s when they feel threatened with eviction. The relationship was reinvigorated when the MOA No. 1 was signed in 1974.

**6.5** The participants assessed the **strength of relationship** between the ICCA and their community as **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**. Everybody, including the elders, youth, men, and women, is engaged in caring for the ICCA. But this is changing because of external influences. In fact, they raised a **POWER FLAG (PF)** on the proposed highway and mining. They admit that should these proposals push through, it will definitely disrupt the ICCA.

**6.6** The community's **respect and value for the ICCA decision-making** is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)** as evidenced by the strong ICCA-related institutions such as the KEF and the Panglakayan (Council of Elders) but their authorities are sometimes being undermined. They see this mainly as a result of the conflict spawned by the political differences that divide even the clans and households. The respect for the elders' authority remains strong but the political power that emanates from the prevailing system of governance alien to the traditional leadership structure is proving a hindrance.

**6.7** The **community's engagement in decision-making** remains **FAIRLY STRONG (4)** but weakening. All the major issues are only decided by consensus by a general assembly of the community. But lately, a consensus is hard to arrive at, and some decisions, including the mining issue, have been decided by a majority vote.

**6.8 Community cohesion and solidarity** is assessed as **STRONG (5)**, as evidenced by a sense of common identity, mutual help and respect. The community is proud of its identity and demonstrates in practice its own internal solidarity and aliveness. But the **POWER FLAG (PF)** is raised on the proposed mining and highway which is proving to be a divisive issue for the community members.

**6.9** The **effective enforcement of rules** concerning a variety of aspects of community life (not only on the ICCA) is categorized as **MEDIUM (3)**. The rules are generally known and the infractions are infrequent.

**6.10 Transparency and accountability** is seen as **fairly strong (4)**. There is excellent respect of agreed procedures and satisfaction of criteria as evidenced the readily available information on local decision-making, financial accounting, and regular evaluation. Any member of the community is also free and competent to discuss ICCA management issues. But the system needs further improvement.

**6.11** The **status of ecosystems in the ICCA** remains **fairly strong (4)**, as evidenced by indicators such as integrity of forest areas; status of soil; quality and quantity of freshwater in and from the ICCA; abundance and vigour of endemic biodiversity. The **POWER FLAG (PF)** is raised on the proposed mining and highway. If these proposals push through, most certainly, the forests and the biodiversity will be disrupted.

**6.12** The **status of ecosystems in the surroundings of the ICCA** is deemed as **MEDIUM (3)**. The ecological balance is uncertain.

**6.13** The **quality of livelihoods for the community governing the ICCA** is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**, the community is thriving in both aspects. This is evidenced by material indicators, e.g. food sovereignty, wealth per capita, public health, but also non-material indicators, e.g. internal solidarity and sense of satisfaction and well-being.

**6.14** The **extent of community members migrating outside the areas** is **strong (1)**, basically all the youth leaves the area to work or study and none comes back (depopulation). Several years ago, one or two comes back but in recent times it was observed that nobody comes back anymore, well at least not in the community itself, some prefer to stay in the provincial capital and the town center of Santa Fe and elsewhere.

**6.15** The **evidence of rapid cultural change** related to national assimilation policies, influences of globalization, education curricula disrespectful of customary values and institutions, changing ethnic composition because of extensive migration, among others, is **WEAK (4)**. The local mores stay strong and able to interpret and incorporate all novelties and change)

**6.16** The **evidence of rapid changes in economic lifestyles and aspirations** is categorized as **MEDIUM (3)**. The new aspirations and lifestyles appear to blend with customary ones. The **POWER FLAG (PF)** is raised on the proposed mining which could drastically alter economic lifestyles and aspirations.

**6.17** The **evidence of political/ social fragmentation**, as revealed by political and social differences well apparent within the community is assessed as **MEDIUM (3)**. Sharp socio-political differences exist but most of them are respectfully dealt with.

**6.18** The **evidence of strong internal inequities, conflicts and crimes**, including gender-related and age-related is **WEAK (5)** and unheard of.

**6.19** The **respect and recognition of the ICCA by the neighboring communities** is seen as **WEAK (2)**. This lack of respect is evidenced by the continuing attempts by the people from these communities, especially on the side of the province of Pangasinan to encroach into the territory and do illegal activities.

**6.20** The recognition of the civil society in general and national/international NGOs on the **collective territorial, land, water and natural resource rights (ownership and/or use)** is **STRONG (5)**. Specific campaigns and support action have been provided to support the community in the governance and management of their ICCA.

**6.21** The recognition by the state agencies of the **collective territorial, land, water and natural resource rights (ownership and/or use)** is **STRONG (5)**. Government officials respect and acknowledge these rights and coordinate management activities with the community. In fact, for a long time, management of the ICCA has been left to the KEF without any support from the government.

**6.22** The status of the **formal recognition of the ICCA in state law and policy** is **STRONG (5)**. The Philippine government formally recognises the ICCA under the common property of the relevant community first in 1974, and reaffirmed and expanded it in 2008 with the granting of a Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title (CADT). But with the proposed mining, the community raised the **POWER FLAG (PF)**. The entry of mining with the permit of the government and without the consent of the community undermines such recognition and support.

**6.23** The **political support from outsiders** is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**. Outside actors support the advocacy of the rights of the community. But the community chooses only the groups they work with and whose support they desire, and more often, they get the support they desire..

**6.24** The **economic support from outsiders**, in terms of financial resources and/or in kind support provided to the community for a variety of initiatives is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**.

**6.25** The **technical support from outsiders** is **STRONG (5)**. The community gets a lot of assistance for biodiversity inventories and legal advice, among others. Most of the technical advice they get from PAFID. ULAN provides them with legal support.

**6.27** The **cultural recognition** is **FAIRLY STRONG (4)**. The understanding and respect of the cultural and identity values motivating the community, such as local language & other cultural expressions are openly valued & included in school curricula, are used in government meetings, and are well recognised by society in general. The KEF operates schools whose curriculum integrates culture and traditions, and these are recognized and supported by the Philippine government.

**6.28** The **major economic forces coveting the ICCA** is considered **fairly weak (4)**, none exists at the moment. But these could change anytime because like the mining company and the highway proposal, these forces are trying to work out an arrangement with the respective government agencies to gain a foothold on the ICCA.

**6.29** The **settlers, migrants and refugees coveting the ICCA's land and resources** are considered as **WEAK (5)**. The Ikalahan community is able to regulate strongly the entry and exit of people.

**6.30** The **major environmental threats** to the ICCA, such as pollution, widespread invasive species or current/ expected severe effects of climate change is considered as **WEAK (5)** but the **POWER FLAG (PF)** is raised on the proposed mining which is seen as the major environmental threat.

**6.31** The **threats to the ICCA related to war, violent conflicts and crime**, such as because of guerrilla and a counterinsurgency operation in the area is **WEAK (5)**. There are no insurgents in the area and there are no reason counterinsurgency operations.

#### ■ **Estimate of the ICCA Resilience and Security "Index"**

For purposes of comparison, the participants decided to compute the numerical index, assuming no power flags were raised. The result is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Resilience and Security Index} &= \text{Total score}/150 \\ \text{Resilience and Security Index} &= 119/150 \\ \text{Resilience and Security Index} &= 0.79\end{aligned}$$

From this result, which is larger than **0.75**, the Ikalahan ICCA could be considered as *relatively* resilient and secure. But because the power flags were raised on the proposed mining and highway, the ICCA may need attention and help.

Before closing the meeting, the participants were asked the following questions:

**What did you learn from the discussion of all the issues that you have scored?**

The index and tool may not be foolproof but as a tool for analysis, it is very helpful.

**What are, in your view, the key elements of strength of your ICCA?**

The key elements of strength of the Ikalahan ICCA are the guidance provided by the Council of Elders and the cooperation of each member of the community.

**What are the key weaknesses?**

There are still those in the midst of us that have a different perspective and plans, mostly these are based on selfish motives.

**What could you do to build upon the elements of strength?**

Keep the course steady, take advantage of the wisdom and guidance provided by the elders.

**What could you do to remedy or counteract the weaknesses?**

Continue the dissemination of information and dialogues to mend relationships and strengthen cooperation and unity.

Prepared by:

**SAMSON B. PEDRAGOSA**

Date: 31 July 2012