DRAFT

PN-ABB-952

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

USAID - Sponsored Upland Hilly Development Workshop

November 18-20, 1980

Manila Garden Hotel, Manila, Philippines

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
MISSION TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
MANILA, PHILIPPINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T

The USAID Mission to the Republic of the Philippines wishes to acknowledge and thank all the participants and their institutions for their support which made possible the Upland/ Hilly Development Workshop.

Our appreciation also goes to Mrs. Betty V. Hobgood, for her skillful and most effective administrative support.

S U M M A R Y

In an effort to understand better rainfed/upland farmers and farming systems and to identify more clearly assistance options, USAID/Manila sponsored an Upland/Hilly Development Workshop.

One of the workshop objectives was to arrive at a working definition for upland/hilly farmers and farming systems. Little agreement was reached on a definition. However, the uplands can be negatively defined as excluding irrigated, rainfed, and coastal lands under 600 m. elevation and with a slope of less than 3%.

The four sub-groups of upland farmers identified, namely: (a) indigenous slash/burn, (b) slash/burn immigrants, (c) settled rice/corn/rootcrop farmers, and (d) settled coconut/mixed farmers are interdependent and cannot be realistically singled out for priority attention. The given location considered for assistance will have to determine the target group.

The workshop identified some fundamental principles which should guide all efforts in upland development. Any approaches for the uplands must conserve and protect soil/water resources and be locally variable, participatory, and self-sustaining, both economically and socially.

The lack of tenure security is an overriding constraint. Under current tenure patterns, there is little incentive for uplanders to make responsible and sustainable use of the resource base. This implies national policy changes on land tenure and control of the resources.

Other common constraints seem to be bureaucratic and/or institutional; low productivity of land; inadequate or inappropriate access to technology, extension and training programs; lack of credit accessibility; lack of effective locally based community organization and leadership; limited alternative employment; increased population pressures; and many others.

The need to plan starting with the people becomes a basic tenet of upland development. The pilot demonstration approach is called for, relying on local, trustworthy catalysts over a sustained period of time. Any assistance program must be flexible enough to allow for significant amounts of differential testing with action-oriented activities dictated by local circumstances.

I. PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORKSHOP

USAID's FY 82 Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) for the Philippines outlines a rural employment strategy. One of its program elements calls for diversification and intensification of rainfed agriculture. In an effort to understand better rainfed/upland farmers and farming systems and to identify more clearly assistance options, USAID/Manila sponsored the Upland/Hilly Development Workshop. The workshop brought together a selected group of 27 Filipino and other academic, private and government experts (see Annex 1 for a complete list of participants).

The workshop lasted three days. The first morning was a general session devoted to arriving at a useful working definition for the uplands. That afternoon and the following day the workshop broke into four small sub-groups which explored in detail what the different types of upland farmers do with the resources available to them and what impact this has on their livelihood and on environment. The four target groups discussed were:

A. Indigenous slash/burn
B. Slash/burn immigrants
C. Settled rice/corn/rootcrop farmers
D. Settled coconut/mixed farmers

Each small group was chaired by a USAID officer responsible for moderating the group discussion against a common agenda. At the end of the second day each small group presented a 15-minute summary of their conclusions to the general group.

On the final day, the group as whole attempted to synthesize the findings of the small groups. Common issues, major differences in target group resources/constraints, and guidelines for assistance were debated. (Annex 2 provides complete agenda.)

The workshop closed with a sence of accomplishment and a general commitment to upland development in the '80s.

II. WORKING DEFINITION

It is instructive that after spending the better part of the morning very little agreement was reached on what constitute the uplands. In fact, some frustration was voiced by some of the agriculturalists who thought they had a clear idea before attending the workshop. This reflected the complexity of variables and the variety of conditions present in the uplands of the Philippines. It was possible to agree that irrigated lands where levee is present and which are suitable for continuous paddy production should be excluded from any definition of uplands. This left us with an all-inclusive definition spanning the watershed from the edge of the irrigated paddy to the top of the mountain ridge, including forest lands. The workshop proceeded with this loose definition.

.... 1

N.B. For USAID strategy purposes we need to push this working definition a little further and relate it to elevation and slope. Borrowing from the proceedings of An International Symposium on Hill Lands held at West Virginia University, October 3-9, 1976, uplands can be defined as starting at 600 m.[1/] above sea level and/or as having slope of 3% or more. With this added dimension, USAID's definition of uplands includes,hilly and mountainous agricultural lands along with forest lands. It excludes irrigated, rainfed, and coastal lands under 600m. elevation and with a slope of less than 3%.

As the workshop pointed up, definitions of upland are dependent upon the perspective or disciplines that are brought to bear on the issue. USAID's perspective is clearly systemic and our focus is on human use of the resource base on a sustainable fashion as a means of livelihood and overall development. This argues for a broad and loose definition that will encompass upland farmers and forest occupants.

1/ D.J. Plucknett, "Hill Land Agriculture in the Humid Tropics" presented at the above-cited symposium.

.... 2

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF UPLAND GROUPS

Each one of the four already identified sub-groups examined their respective target-groups in the light of a common set of variables. The following matrix summarizes how each sub-group stands on the given number of variables. A more detailed and comprehensive discussion follows the matrix.

SUMMARY
MATRIX
UPLAND GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

VARIABLES	GROUP A INDIGENOUS SLASH/BURN	GROUP B SLASH/BURN IMMIGRANTS	GROUP C SETTLED RICE/CORN/ROOTCROP FARMERS	GROUP D SETTLED COCONUT/MIXED FARMERS
Land Tenure	Tenure Security is precarious.	Tenure claim is very unsecure.	Tenure patterns vary widely from owners, to leasee and tenants.	Tenure patterns vary. Owner/operators and caretakers are most numerous.
Current Resources available	Human: - Indegenous leadership does exist or can be developed. Physical: - Soils are often depleted. - Forest and mineral resources also available.	Human: - Primarily family labor. - Little formal education. Physical: Typical landhold of 3 to 5 has. Credit: Thru informal loans (occasional)	Human: Highly seasonal labor. Physical: - Typical landhold of 1 to 3 has. - Water utilization and management is a major problem. Credit: - Inadequate; misused.	Human: - Low skill levels. - Minimal labor needed, although relatively continuous. Physical: - Abundant land currently plant with slow but steady soil depletion. Credit: - Almost unavailable.
Land Use Technology/ Farming Systems	- Annual cropping is practiced on shifting basis. - Root crops and mixed farming.	- Regional diversity of mixed and monocropping in shifting cultivation.	- Annual crops. - Minimal crop diversification or rotation with emphasis on traditional rice and corn varieties.	- Underutilization of ground level (coconuts). - Continuous harvesting and maintenance.
Destructiveness/ Sustainability	Destructive, not sustainable.	- Not sustainable.	- Highly destructive.	Permanent tree and mixed farmi seems more ecologically sustainable.
Motivation for current resource utilization.	Land cleared represents an asset to which ownership can be claimed.	- Lack of secure tenure. - Lack of upland technical know-how leads to depletion of soils and abandonment plot.	- Food security	- Minimum effort/investment required to achieve basic survival plus relatively job security.

SUMMARY
MATRIX
UPLAND GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

Variables	GROUP A INDIGENOUS SLASH/BURN	GROUP B SLASH/BURN IMMIGRANTS	GROUP C SETTLED RICE/CORN/ROOTCROP FARMERS	GROUP D SETTLED COCONUT/MIXED FARMERS
Sources of Income	In addition to food income, gathering of minor forest products and seasonal harvesting in lowlands	In addition to produce for consumption, migration to the lowland for work.	Farm products, off-farm labor, fishing, seasonal harvesting, and government projects.	- Home gardening; pilferage. - Off-farm for non-coconut farmers.
Institutional Jurisdiction	Mostly Bureau of Forest Development (BFD).	Mostly BFD.	Ministry of Agriculture (MA); Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR); Farm Systems Development Corporation and many others.	MA, MNR, Philippine Coconut Authority (PCA) and many others.
Degree of Competition for Resources	Non-indegenous slash/burn farmers.	Between indegenous and immigrants.	National Government, private corporations and people.	Population pressures on land.

GROUP A: INDIGENOUS SLASH AND BURN

Land Tenure

The tenure situation is precarious. In most instances the National Government considers forest occupancy illegal. However, laws have been passed (PD 705, as amended) that theoretically make it possible for an illegal occupant to apply for and secure approval of long term lease permits. This law and the intent behind it, are commendable, but the implementing procedures are onerous. Complicated application forms, project study requirements and recently a provision requiring applicants to show proof of sufficient capital to develop the land (₱1,000/ha.), effectively cancel out the possibility of an indigenous slash and burn farmer securing approval of a long term permit to legalize tenure.

Present laws and policies that would legalize occupancy are not applicable to groups of shifting cultivators.

Current Resources Available

A. Human Resources:

The human resource is made up of approximately 2.5 million people out of a nationwide cultural minority population of 4 millions. Indigenous leadership can be identified and developed within the population. This group possesses many useful skills, both inherited and acquired.

B. Physical Resources:

Accessibility to physical resources like land is fairly easy. However, soils are generally depleted and low in fertility owing to increasingly short fallow periods. These denuded lands remain a resource in view of their potentials for improvement and rehabilitation.

Mineral resources, primarily gold, are available and are being exploited.

Minor forest products are usually available in sufficient quantity to qualify as a major source of income.

Land Use Technology/Farming Systems

Most indigenous groups practice annual cropping. Cropping pattern starts with slash-and-burn farming for grain production, moving in sequence to root crops and mixed farming, and eventually into long fallow periods.

Destructiveness/Sustainability

Land use practices presently employed are generally destructive and are not sustainable.

Motivation for Current Resource Utilization

Current land use practices are employed to meet immediate needs such as food for subsistence and some surplus production that can be sold or bartered for necessities not available in the uplands (subsistence type).

Land that is cleared represents an asset to which some degree of ownership can be claimed. This is not recognized by the National Government, although it is recognized by the members of the cultural minority groups.

Source of Income

Seasonal harvesting in the lowlands and gathering of minor forest and mineral products are their present source of cash income. However, very little is known about the relative percentage of total income derived from these activities.

Institutional Jurisdiction and Government Programs

The Ministry of Natural Resources, through the Bureau of Forest Development, has jurisdiction over most lands occupied by cultural minority groups.

Agencies	Programs
A. Presidential Assistance on National Minorities Commission	Legal, social and financial support
B. Ministry of Agrarian Reform	Resettlement Areas
C. Ministry of Energy	Energy-related watershed:Tiwi (Albay) Tongonan (Leyte), and Palimpinon (Negros Oriental)
D. National Irrigation Administration	Watershed affecting irrigation systems; Angat-Magat and Pantabangan
E. Clark Field Development Authority	Reforestation, agro-forestry, integrated area development program
F. Bureau of Forest Development	Kaingin Management Program (Forest Occupancy). PAGSAKA-Pilot Program, The Community Tree Farm Program, Energy Farms, Census of Forest Occupants

Agencies	Program
G. National Electrification Administration	Dendro-Thermal Program
H. Development Bank of the Philippines	Financing of Industrial Tree Farms and Tree Farm Leases

Degree of Competition for Resources

Competition does exists and is reported to be serious. Pasture, leases, immigration of non-indigenous slash-and-burn farmers and the grant of logging/mining concessions adversely affect access to the land.

Competition also exists from within the minority community groups when some members of the group take advantage of better education and outside sources of influence to gain control over a disproportionate share of the land resources.

GROUP B: SLASH AND BURN IMMIGRANTS

Land Tenure

The great majority of the lands occupied (90%) are reported to be of public domain. Most operators believe they own the land they farm, but generally feel their claims are very insecure. These immigrants first appeared from forty to fifty years ago, although there has been a considerable increase in the last ten to fifteen years.

On private lands, these immigrants have a high degree of tenancy. In many instances they have informal sharing arrangements with land owners. Both tenants and owners accomodate to each other. These relationships, however, begin to break down once new crops or land use changes are introduced.

Current Resources Available

A. Human Resources:

This resource is primarily composed of the household's labor, paid or unpaid, with little formal education. There is very little difference between this group and other rural groups.

B. Physical Resources:

The landholding usually varies from three to five hectares per household depending on land fertility and topography. Total area cultivated each season is typically 1 hectare, depending on availability of labor and animal power. Planting materials are usually their own, kept from harvest by the operators.

.... 7

Land Use Technology/Farming Systems

There is a great deal of regional diversity in technology for mixed and monocropping systems, which is typified by low-input/low output. The choice is between something or nothing.

Productivity of the land may be high at the beginning, but it diminishes rapidly. Generally, the bulk of the produce goes directly to feed the households. The peso/labor or calorie/labor ratio return is low in comparison to lowland farm operations.

Destructiveness/Sustainability

For the majority of the crops, current resource use is not sustainable. Some examples of sustainable systems are coconut, coffee, pineapple, papaya, bananas, etc. Others like palay, corn, vegetables are not so sustainable.

Motivation for Current Resource Utilization

Insecurity of tenure does not encourage responsible use of the land resource.

The lack of alternative employment opportunities, capital needed to finance improvements, planting materials and know-how were also cited as motivators for the poor utilization of the resource base.

Source of Income

This is an area that needs further study. It varies with location and season. Men may migrate to the lowlands for work, but alternatives are getting smaller.

Institutional Jurisdiction and Government Programs

Public domain lands are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Forest Development (BFD).

Agencies	Programs
A. Bureau of Forest Development	1. Forest Occupancy Management 2. The Community Tree Farm Program 3. Family Approach to Reforestation 4. Agro-Forestry Farms
B. National Electrification Administration	Dendro-Thermal

Agencies	Programs
C. National Irrigation Administration	Pantabangan and Angat-Magat
D. Local Government and others	1. Antique 2. Buhi/Laho 3. Villarica, Pantabangan 4. Kalahan 5. Palawan* 6. Bukidnon* 7. Allah Valley* 8. Bicol Irrigation*

Degree of Competition for Resources

There is indeed a lot of competition for the land resource. Although it varies with locations, competition is primarily between the indigenous groups and immigrants.

Mining claims, pasture leases, and timber operations also place competitive demand on the resource base.

GROUP C: SETTLED RICE/CORN/ROOTCROP FARMER

Land Tenure

Land tenure in the upland area is divided into alienable and disposable (A&D) land and non "A & D", or forest areas. Within "A & D" areas two sub-groups can be identified, namely titled and non-titled.

Land tenure patterns are very confusing. There are share tenants in areas which are supposed to be under the agrarian reform program. There are share tenants as well as agrarian reform beneficiaries (both leaseholders and CLT** holders) on untitled lands in the uplands. A single farmer may be cultivating different plots of land with different land tenure patterns for each plot.

Most "A & D" non-sugar areas in the uplands are not titled. A farmer may have some claim to the land he farms, but there are usually counter-claims to the same land.

Most settled rice and corn farmers in the uplands are owners (claimants)/ operators. Given that there are usually other claimants to the same land area, their land tenure situation is insecure.

* Asian Development Bank and USAID loans with upland components.
** Certificates of Land Transfer (Provisional Title)

Current Resources Available

A. Human Resource

Labor is unskilled and highly seasonal. Farming skills and experiences are basic, which if re-directed could be a real benefit in improving upland areas. Many skills have been brought from the lowlands and are contributing to the degradation of the upland environment (e.g. continious tillage operations).

B. Physical Resource:

Landholding are usually from 1 to 3 has. of lower quality, marginal land which is eroded and depleted.

Water is abundantly available, but its utilization and management is a great problem. The removal of groundcover in the uplands has resulted in (a) lowering of the water table, (b) less water retention by the soil, (c) increased flooding, (d) increased subjectivity to drought, (e) increased erosion, and (f) siltation of lower areas.

C. Credit:

Capital available to upland rice and corn farmers is inadequate, misused, and requires a high interest rate for its use.

Land Use Technology/Farming Systems

Land use technology and farming systems are characterized by: (a) crops maturing in twelve months or less (annuals), (b) clean culture-type cultivation where land is stripped of everything but the crop, (c) minimal use of soil conservation practices such as contour plowing or terracing, (d) low level of modern production inputs used, (e) minimal crop diversification or crop rotation practiced, and (f) emphasis on traditional varieties of rice and corn.

Destructiveness/Sustainability

Rice and corn farming as presently practiced in the uplands is highly destructive to the soil. There are usually no forests where settled rice and corn farmers are located, so the effect on the forest is less severe. Rice and corn farming in the upland areas could be sustainable, but depends highly on (a) land tenure security, (b) education and assistance of farmers re soil conservation practices, and (c) applying or developing improved farming technology for upland areas.

Motivation for Present Resource Utilization

Motivations for present resource utilization are: (a) lack of secure tenure, (b) food security - The need for crops to feed family, (c) lack of appropriate upland technologies, (d) faster and more secure return on investment with rice and corn than with perennial crops, (e) markets for surplus rice and corn while not perfect are more assured than for perennial crops, (f) lack of capital to venture into alternative farming systems, and (g) lanc of land and increasing population pressure on resource base makes alternatives risky.

Sources of Income

Sources of income are generated from: (a) cash and non-cash farm products, (b) off-farm labor - family business (sari-sari store, handcrafts, processing agricultural products), (c) fishing, (d) seasonal harvesting/ weeding on other farms, and (e) working as laborers on government projects.

Generally, most income comes fron on-farm sources rather than from off-farm sources.

Instituttional Jurisdiction

Almost every agency in the Philippine Government has some projects or programs affecting upland rice and corn farmers. The following is a partial list:

Agencies	Program
A. Ministry og Agriculture	
1. Bureau of Soils	Soil Classification
2. Bureau of Plant Industry	Seed nurseries, improved varieties
3. Bureau of Agricultural Ext.	Maisan 77, Masagana 99, Palayan ng Bayan
4. Bureau of Animal Industry	Livestock dispersal - goats, carabao, pigs
5. National Grains Authority	Marketing, grain production
B. Ministry of Natural Resources	Tree Farming
1. Bureau of Forest Development	Forest Occupancy management program
2. Bureau of Lands	Land Surveys and Titling
3. Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources	Inland fishing (aquaculture)
C. Ministry of Agrarian Reform	CLT (Land Reform) Resettlement Land consolidation; compact farming
D. Ministry of Public Works	none given
1. National Irrigation Administation	Reforestation of watershed, irrigation

.... 11

	Agencies	Programs
2.	Farm Systems Development Council	Small scale irrigation; upland development of watershed areas (small water impounding projects)
E.	Ministry of Human Settlement	Dendro-thermal projects, BLISS Level 3 Housing, dams, dendro-thermal
F.	Ministry of Education and Culture	Ag. Schools - (bias on lowland technology)
G.	Ministry of Public Highways	Farms to market roads
H.	Agricultural Credit Administration and Rural Banks	Credit
I.	Research Institutions, Both public and private	IRRI, Private Ag. Schools, UPLB, Regional Ag. Colleges, PCARR

Degree of Competition for Resources

There is a high degree of competition for the land resource in upland areas. The following three sources of competiton were identified:

A. National Government vs. Local Government:
Often national government policies and programs override priorities and programs established at the local level. Examples of this are large infrastructure projects such as dams, industrial estate programs, geothermal projects, PHIVEDEC, and project like the Saba Basin. All these projects or programs result in the displacement of people due to the competition for land resources.

B. Private Corporations vs. People:
Examples of this type of competition are logging and mining corporations as well as plantation agriculture which result in the displacement of people.

C. People vs. People:
There is constant competition in upland areas between new immigrant settlers and indigenous groups as well as among settlers and indigenous groups themselves. This is largely due to increasing population pressures on a limited resource base.

GROUP D: SETTLED COCONUT/MIXED FARMERS

Land Tenure

Land tenure systems consists of (a) landowners, both individual and corporate, with holdings generally greater than 25 has., (b) leasees, either under straight lease agreements or as functional mortgagors of a plot of land with various degrees of control over the produce, (c) owner/operators that have four hectares or less; and (d) caretakers (particularly on coconut lands) that are the actual tillers on lands owned by someone else, but where the caretakers get a salary or proportional share of the harvest. This sub-group may or may not have rights to intercrop Sub-groups (c) and (d) are by far the most numerous.

Current Resources Available

A. Human Resource:

There are abundant lands currently planted to these crops, with slow but steady soil depletion associated with sugarcane and coconuts. Human labor needs for these systems is minimal on a daily basis, but relatively continuous year around, both in production and processing. Skill levels are low, as is the differentiation for the various tasks, particularly in sugar and coconut. Mixed farming has more variance.

B. Physical Resources:

The physical and material goods consist of a few livestock, some cottage or home industry, relatively abundant cooking fuel supply, and minimal amount of farm tools or implements.

C. Credit

Cash, credit, and goods exchange indicate almost no institutional credit. Coconut caretakers must obtain a certificate from the owner that he is indeed the tiller in order to obtain a loan. Given recent experience with land reform on rice and corn lands, owners generally will not sign, hence there is no formal credit possibility for this group. Consumption borrowing is generally at low levels, but is needed on a continuing basis. There is some cash/goods exchange from home gardening plots of this sector.

Land Use Technology/Farming Systems

Land use technology and farming systems in coconut and mixed farming are characterized by: (a) underutilization of ground level (coconut), (b) continuous harvesting and maintenance, (c) small amounts of ancillary crops (sugarcane), (d) availability of technical knowhow but lack of transfer mechanism, (e) low productivity of major crop, and (f) a wide differential of credit availability and husbandry knowledge among the various subsets of this sub-group.

Destructiveness/Sustainability

Environmental sustainability differs. Mixed farming seems the most ecologically sustainable.

Coconut and perennial crops are less soil depleting than annual crops, followed by root crops. Soil erosion on perennial crop land is highly dependent on degree of slope and soil.

Economic sustainability for sugar and coconuts depends on world price fluctuations, competition from other crops in other countries, and world demand which continues to cause dislocations.

Motivation for Current Resource Utilization

The groups' motivation/incentives are defined as (a) minimum effort/ investment required of coconut farmers to achieve basic survival, (b) economic determinism given low education and limited access to resources and services which lead families to adopt status quo maintenance strategy, (c) minimal involvement in management but relative job security in perennial and plantation-type crops, (d) high risk in coconut farming associated with shifting to other crops given longer term commitment to standing trees, and (e) owner restrictions on the tillers diversifying the agricultural production.

Source of Income

Sources of income are characterized as steady, low, and a mix of cash and goods. These can come from (a) mortgages (b) pilferage, (c) home gardening, (d) gathering of food and fuel, and (e) off-farm labor except for coconut lands where labor demand is low but continual, therefore preventing the worker from obtaining outside income. Income levels fluctuate widely from year to year.

Institutional Jurisdiction

The following agencies were mentioned as having institutional jurisdiction:

A. Ministry of Agriculture
B. Philippine Coconut Authority
C. Coco Fed
D. Ministry of Natural Resources
E. Philippine Council for Agricultural Resources Research (PCARR)
F. University of the Philippines at Los Baños
G. National Science Development Board
H. National Cottage Industries Development Authority (NACIDA)
I. Board of Investments

J. Banking Institutions
   1. Republic United Coconut Planters Bank
   2. Philippine National Bank
   3. Development Bank of the Philippines
   4. Veterans Bank
   5. Rural Banking Systems

No specific programs were mentioned for the above-listed agencies.

Degree of Competition for Resources

Competitive claims to these lands arise from: (a) overlapping tenure claims of corporations and individuals, (b) government jurisdictional overlap and competition, and (c) population pressures on the land.

IV. CONSTRAINTS

Common To All Target Groups -

A. Insecure land tenure;
B. Bureaucratic/Institutional:
   1. Inability of upland farmers to deal with the bureaucracy to achieve tenure security and obtain government services.
   2. Bureaucracy does not fully understand how to address relevant upland issues.
   3. Poor integration and coordination of government projects and programs in the uplands.
C. Low productivity of the land due to depleted or degraded soil fertility;
D. Inadequate or inappropriate access to upland technology, extension and training programs;
E. Inadequate infrastructure such as roads, water impoundment, etc.
F. Inadequate marketing and distribution systems;
G. Lack of credit accessibility for production inputs, animals, farm tools, etc;
H. Lack of effective locally based community organization and leadership;
I. Unwillingness to take risks;
J. Limited alternative employment;
K. Increased population pressures;
L. National calamities; and
M. Nutritional problems.

Group Specific -

Group A: Indigenous Slash/Burn

. Physical constraints such as altitude, prevalent plant pests and diseases.

Group B: Slash/Burn Immigrants

. Customs and preferences.

Group C: Settled Rice/Corn/Rootcrop Farmers

. Scarcity of land.

Group D: Settled Coconut/Mixed Farmers

. Underutilization of the land resource; and
. Inefficient post harvest practices

V. TARGET GROUPS

Integral to the proceedings of the workshop was the concern for the uplander. Notwithstanding all the limitations involved in categorizing upland farmers into only four groups, the question of which group deserved most priority was aired. Out of curiosity, an attempt was made to rank the four groups against common criteria like the number of households, sustainability, potential, population growth rate, AID regional concentration and degree of poverty. The ranking was on a scale of 1 to 4, relating one group to another, and was essentially intuitive based on consensus. (Figure 1 shows the matrix and the rankings.)

The main conclusion drawn by the participants was that all four groups are so interdependent, and that as the close scores suggest, it is not realistic or practical to attempt to single out any one group for priority attention. In effect, the location considered for assistance will determine the target group.

FIGURE 1

TARGET GROUP RANKING[1/]

Group \ Criteria	No. of Households	Destructive Production Practices	Population Growth Rate	Potential for Agriculture Development	Concentration in USAID's Core Regions	Degree of Poverty	Total Score
A. Indigenous S/B	1	2	2	2	1	4	12
B. S/B Immigrant	2	3	4	1	2	3	15
C. Rice/Corn Farmer	4	4	2	3	4	2	19
D. Coconut/Mixed Farmer	3	1	3	4	3	1	15

1/ Score is based on equal weight for all 6 criteria.

1 = Lowest/Least
4 = Highest/Most

VI. SUB-GROUP INTERVENTION IDEAS

The small group discussion brought up a number of possible intervention strategies.

Group A: Indigenous Slash/Burn

Program Suggestions:

A. Replicability of programs designed for one cultural minority community would probably not be viable for another community due to the wide variations in site conditions and perhaps even cultural mores. However, this difficulty in replicating programs from one area to another should not be perceived as a negative factor. A wide range of development approaches will probably be a pre-requisite to accomplishing anything positive in the uplands.

B. Land tenure security issues must be addressed. Until some form or degree of tenure security is assured, it will be very difficult and perhaps impossible to expect any cooperation from cultural minority communities.

C. Credible and trustworthy intervenors will be needed in most instances. Cultural minority communities require some help from without since they are challenged now by outside pressures that place them at a disadvantage.

D. Organization, training, and then involvement in program design for and with community members are realistic goals. They are also essential elements of any successful intervention.

E. Local Governments will play a key role. Methods should be found to increase their participation in and management of upland development programs.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Improve the quality and increase the numbers of community development workers that will accept the commitment to live and work in communities composed of cultural minority groups on a long-term basis. Motivate CD workers;

B. Establish communication within these groups and invest the time and effort required to win their confidence before attempting any work on program design;

C. Work to design programs in partnership with the members of a community, using their concerns as a starting point.

D. Start well-documented experiments to help convince policy makers and financial institutions that it is worthwhile investing in

development initiatives with indigenous groups. Take other appropriate steps that would exert a positive influence on policy makers and bring about a re-orientation of development programs, so that more emphasis is placed on the need for upland/hilly development programs;

E. Facilitate appropriate technology transfer from outside and especially among different minority groups; and

F. Improve the time frame and methodology for development of programs and addressing upland development issues.

Group B: Slash/Burn Immigrants

Program Suggestions:

A. Begin by evaluating the elements of currently successful small scale efforts. Incorporate lessons in a pilot level AID-assisted project to get started and begin learning.

B. It is important to understand the mechanics aggravating population pressures in the uplands.

Suggested Strategies:

A. Start with the people. Know who they are, and what they are doing;

B. Adapt technologies to the resource base and to the needs of the people;

C. Work where the people are through local institutions over a sustained period of time; and

D. Seek national policy changes on land tenure and control of resources.

Group C: Settled Rice/Corn/Rootcrop Farmers

Suggested Strategies:

A. Appropriate Technological Utilization and Development:

1. Examine existing technologies which may be appropriate for upland areas.

2. Develop and validate location-specific, sustainable upland technologies by starting with what the farm families are already producing.

3. Set-up and administrate small, pilot demonstration projects for (1) and (2) above.

B. Develop projects or programs to assist small upland farmers to obtain secure and continuing access to land resources.

1. This activity is considered an absolute precondition for other options or interventions discussed.

2. The activity would include land mapping and titling, land classification, and land use planning.

C. Develop marketing and distribution programs and realistic credit programs for upland farmers.

D. Farmer Organizations.

1. Assist upland farmers to identify existing suitable organizations to help them gain access to existing government and private resources.

2. Where such organizations do not exist help them to develop such organizations. Where they do exist, help them to become more effective.

E. Undertake projects to provide resources necessary for infrastructure development such as roads, dams, water impoundments, electricity, etc. which are identified as requirements through farmers organizations discussed in option "D" above.

F. Assist in creating off-farm employment opportunities. Included under this option would be:

1. Developing vocational training programs to give farmers skills needed for employment.

2. Attempt to process agricultural products locally.

Group D: Settled Coconut/Mixed Farmers

Suggested Strategies:

A. Intercropping, integrated farming systems;
B. Increase monoculture yields;
C. Retard soil degradation;
D. Evolve suitable off-farm employment;
E. By-product utilization, production enhancement;
F. Policy reform; and
G. Small producer organizations

VII. PREMISES/PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS

After a healthy exchange of ideas, the workshop identified some fundamental principles which should guide all effort at upland development.

Any approaches proposed for the uplands must: (a) be sustainable economically (productive) and environmentally (protective); (b) allow for local variation and recognize complexity of relationships which requires a systemic perspective; (c) benefit people, which means building upon indigenous systems and fostering self-reliance; (d) ensure local involvement which will require trained full-time catalysts to provide interface between people and technology disseminators; (e) recognize that security of land tenure is a precondition; and (f) minimize dependence on petroleum based energy.

VIII. RECOMMENDED APPROACH

As the participants reviewed the possible points of intervention for AID, it became clear that a new, radically different approach was needed. A traditional package that is universally applicable is simply not relevant to the problems facing the uplands. What is called for is a pilot demonstration approach. Moreover, the nature of any specific intervention in pilot areas cannot be identified in advance. The components of any intervention at this juncture, given our knowledge base, will per force be locally determined. That implies differential testing of hypothesis and approaches as dictated by local conditions, in effect to position ourselves, so that in time we may in fact be able to identify a strategy or a package of approaches that is more widely applicable. AID needs to consider a program that is flexible and responsive enough to permit a significant amount of differential testing by making resources available for various pilots, with action oriented activities as dictated by local circumstances. Such activities would include training aspects broadly defined and locally specific; research and evaluation within the pilot areas or pilot projects, as well as across them, so that the overall experience can be assessed from the lessons generated from the total set of pilots. To work in this domain the most appropriate intervention point as far as an institution may be the Municipal Development Council. NEDA, particularly at the regional level thru the RDC mechanism might serve as an overall umbrella agency to coordinate the total program. But any decision in this regard will clearly have to be worked out as a project concept takes shape.

IX. CONCLUSION

Development of the uplands will not be quick or easy. Innovation, risk taking, trial and error are all necessary ingredients.

The success of the programs in the 80's will determine not only the quality of life of upland people, but the environmental quality of the Philippines in the year 2000. The uplands can no longer be ignored without serious long-term consequences for the Philippines as a whole.

ANNEX 1

UPLAND/HILLY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

List of Attendees
November 18-20, 1980

Name	Institution/Agency
	- Academia -
1. Dr. Percy Sajise	UPLB/Institute of Human Ecology
2. Dr. Miguel Palao	Palawan National Agricultural College
3. Mr. Celso P. Diaz	UPLB/Forest Research Institute
4. Prof. Carol Brady de Raedt	UPLB/Baguio
5. Fr. Francis C. Madigan	Xavier University
6. Dr. Art Gomez	UPLB/Agronomy
7. Dr. Michael Costello	Xavier University
	- Philippine Government -
8. Dr. Jesus D. Valerio	Ministry of Natural Resources
9. Dr. Ed Quisumbing	National Food and Agriculture Council
10. Mr. Vicente Magno	Bureau of Forestry Development Extension
11. Ms. Eufresina Boado	Bureau of Forestry Development/Project Management Staff
12. Mr. Edwin Payuan	Bureau of Forest Development
13. Mr. Lindy Morrell	National Economic & Development Authority
14. Ms. Macra Cruz	Farm Systems Development Corporation
15. Ms. Annabelle Adriano	National Electrification Administration
16. Dr. Carlos Fernandez	Development Academy of the Philippines
17. Mr. Jose Gapas	Bureau of Forest Development/Cebu
18. Mr. Arsenio Pagaduan	National Irrigation Administration
	- Private Sector -
19. Dr. Christopher Gibbs	Ford Foundation
20. Mr. Delbert Rice	Kalahan Foundation
21. Mr. Mario Chanco	Journalist
22. Dr. Ramon Binamira	Environmental Protection Council
23. Mr. Teofilo Fran	Farmer/Leyte
24. Dr. Arcadio Matela	Paper Industries Corporation of the Philippines
25. Mr. Edward Litton	Litton Agro-Marine, Inc.
26. Mr. Barry White	Observer
27. Dr. Edward Reed	International Institute for Rural Reconstruction
	- AID -
28. Dr. R. J. Edwards	34. Mr. L. J. Ervin, OD/E
29. Mr. P. C. Dugan	35. Mr. P. F. Novick
30. Mr. D. A. Heesen	36. Mr. S. S. Roco, OD/P
31. Mr. T. D. Hobgood	37. Mr. G. Carner, OD/P
32. Mr. K. F. Jensen	38. Mr. T. L. Rishoi, OCD
33. Mr. J. Correa-Montalvo	

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Manila, Philippines

Ramon Magsaysay Center
1680 Roxas Boulevard

Telephone: 59-80-11

UPLAND/HILLY DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

I. AGENDA

1. Welcome: Dr. R. J. Edwards

2. Brief Administrative Orientation: Mrs. B. Hobgood

3. General Session: Mr. P. C. Dugan

   - CDSS Background

   - Workshop Objectives:

     a. Arrive at some useful working definitions re upland/hilly farmers and farming systems.

     b. Identify alternative development approaches with particular attention to optimal role for USAID.

A. Definition of Uplands/Hilly Lands (to be proposed and get group to focus):

   1. What are relevant distinctions?

   2. What parameters should be considered?
      (e.g. slope, inhabitants, potential use)

      - Where are the areas
      - Characteristics of upland areas
      - Land use
      - Profile of users (target groups)

B. Definition of Relevant Upland Groups

Proposed categorisation for small group discussion

1. Indigenous Slash/Burn
2. Slash and Burn Immigrants
3. Settled Farmers - Rice/Corn/Rootcrops
4. Settled Farmers - Coconut/Mixed/Landless

4. Small Group Discussions on Alternative Strategies/Approaches for Assistance to Individual Target Group

A. Suggested Working Groups

Group A	Group B
Miguel Palao	Percy Sajise
Bert Pollisco	Annabelle Adriano
Carlos Fernandez	J. Antonio Aguenza
Delbert Rice	Eufresina Boado
Jesus Valerio	Christopher Gibbs
Jose Gapas	Edward Litton
Pat Dugan - Moderator	Ramon Binamira
	Dave Heesen - Moderator

Group C	Group D
F. Madigan	C. Brady de Raedt
Art Gomez	Vicente Magno
Macra Cruz	Ed Quisumbing
Antonio Principe	Mario Chanco
Lindy Morell	Arcadio Matela
Teofilo Fran	Santiago Frexias
Tom Hobgood - Moderator	Karl Jensen - Moderator

B. Small Group Discussion Format

1. Further refine definition of target group on basis of:

- Resources (quantity/quality) available to group: current and potential use
- How is group managing resources?

- Group characteristic problems/constraints
- What does each group need to overcome its problems?
- What part of the upland do they occupy?
- Relationship to other groups

2. What broad program strategies does this suggest?

3. Implementation capacities and responsibilities for each strategy option.

4. Priorities and sequencing of interventions within strategy options.

5. Small Group Presentations (two pages summaries) in General Session

   20 minutes - Presentation
   30 minutes - Questions and Answers

6. Summary of Previous Day Presentation: 5 minutes/working group

7. Synthesis

   A. Common elements of group strategies
   B. Conflicts/Contradictions
   C. General Principals (do's and don'ts for intervening in uplands)
   D. Summary of Conclusions

II. WORKING SCHEDULE

November 18, 1980

0800-0830	Welcome/Orientation
0830-1030	Definitions and General Discussion
1030-1050	"Merienda"
1050-1230	Definitions and General Discussion
1230-1330	Lunch
1330-1500	Group Discussion (A, B, C, and D)
1500-1530	"Merienda"
1530-1700	Group Discussion (A, B, C, and D)

November 19, 1980

0830-1030	Group Discussion (A, B, C, and D)
1030-1050	"Merienda"
1050-1230	Group Discussion (A, B, C, and D)
1230-1330	Lunch
1330-1500	Group Presentation
1500-1530	"Merienda"
1530-1700	Group Presentation

November 20, 1980

0800-0830	Administrative Matters
0830-0900	Summaries of Previous Day Presentation (A, B, C and D)
0900-1030	General Discussion
1030-1050	"Merienda"
1050-1230	General Discussion
1230-1330	Lunch
1330-1500	Synthesis
1500-1530	"Merienda"
1530-1700	Synthesis