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This journal article examines the security and regional development integration framework of the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) and providing recommendations for its enhancement. The article emphasizes insurgency and secessionism in ARMM and other regions as a crucial problem hindering regional development. In its analysis of NEDA’s regional development frameworks, the article sets forth that NEDA has already mainstreamed Gender and Development (GAD) and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in regional development planning. To present an enhanced regional development planning framework, the article forwards that mainstreaming the security dimensions identified by the United Nations—economic, food, health, environmental, personal, and political security—can essentially complement the existing frameworks of NEDA. The article concludes by providing specific recommendations for the improved incorporation of security issues and concerns in the regional development planning framework of NEDA.

National Security: Development of Concepts

Philippine Concepts of National Security

The concept of national security in the Philippines has evolved over the decades. In the early years, it was almost synonymous with national defense and basically referred to the protection of people and national territory/territories from external physical assault or threats (Talisayon, 1992.) Eventually, the concept of national security expanded from being just narrowly limited to national defense to include the protection of vital economic and political interests. National Security became the concern not only of the military but also of other departments and agencies as well, considering that threats to national security emanate from outside and inside (Ibid.).
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When Secretary Jose Almonte served as the National Security Adviser of President Fidel Ramos (1992-1998) the National Security Council officially defined national security “as a state or condition wherein the people’s way of life and institutions, their territorial integrity and sovereignty, and their welfare and well-being are protected and enhanced” (Almonte, 1992). This definition was expanded in 2010, under the new Aquino Administration to become “a state or condition wherein the country’s interests, its sovereignty, territorial integrity and democratic institutions, and the people’s way of life, cherished values, welfare and well-being are preserved.” (NSC, 2010) A recurring basic framework that was initiated for discussion by former Secretary Almonte’s close staff, notably former Deputy Director-General Serafin Talisayon and Assistant Director-General Francisco Mier, establishes that a Nation/State should be concerned with three basic agenda: (1) development; (2) defense and security; and, (3) governance.

He defines national security as “the creation of physical and policy environment where the national vision of having a Philippines where ‘freedom, dignity and prosperity’ is attained and the ‘nation’s core values, way of life and institutions; capacity to create and share wealth; living standards; sovereignty/territorial integrity; and strategic relationships’ are protected and enhanced.” (Private Interview with Sec. Almonte, Nov. 2010)

Related to this, the government has prioritized several strategic objectives which need to be met if the Philippines is to be secure. These are: (1) moral consensus, (2) cultural cohesiveness, (3) ecological balance, (4) economic strength, (5) socio-political stability, (6) territorial integrity, (7) international harmony, (8) global competitiveness, (9) people empowerment, and (10) solid infrastructure. These fundamental conditions contribute towards a stable and secure nation and are very important concerns and goals for development planning and public administration.

The National Defense College of the Philippines has established several fundamental dimensions of national security in its Graduate Program “Master in National Security Administration (MNSA)”: Economic, Socio-Cultural, Political, Military, Environmental, and Techno-Scientific (NDCP: NSA 209 - National Security Management Textbook, 2005). These dimensions appear to be consistent with and congruent to priority areas of interest of overall development planning.

In a PowerPoint presentation (produced in May 2005) to the NDCP Regular Class 41 in September 2005, Director Lorenzo A. Clavejo, DPA, of the Information Management Office of the National Security Council, provided explanations to the widely recognized ideal conditions of national security:
**Territorial Integrity and Sovereignty** – The territory of the country is intact and under the effective sovereign control of the Government.

**Ecological Balance** – The environment is able to support sustainable development strategies and activities for the benefit of the nation and the people who depend on it for existence.

**Socio-Political Stability** – There is peace and harmony among different groups of the people in the country, and mutual cooperation and support exists between the government and the people.

**Economic Solidarity** – The country’s economy is strong, capable of supporting national endeavors and providing its citizens with opportunities to earn and live decently, deriving its strength from the people who have an organic stake in it.

**Cultural Cohesiveness and National Harmony** – The citizens share the values and beliefs handed down by their ancestors and possess a strong sense of attachment to national community and harmony despite their religious, ethnic and linguistic differences.

**Moral-Spiritual Consensus** – There is moral and spiritual consensus on the wisdom and righteousness of the national vision and they are inspired by their patriotism and national pride to participate vigorously in the pursuit of the nation’s goals and objectives.

**External Peace and Harmonious Internal Relations** – The nation and the people enjoy cordial relations with their neighbors and they are free from any control, interference or threat of aggression from any of them.
Figure 1. Illustrative Paradigm for Philippine National Security, 1992
Source: National Security Management Handout, NDCP, 1992

Figure 2. Updated Paradigm for Philippine National Security, 2010
Source: Powerpoint Presentation of NSC Dir. Cyril Cusi to AFPCGSC Class 54, Nov. 2010
In a presentation in November 2005 to the Strategic Studies Group (SSG) of the National Defense College of the Philippine, SSG Fellow, Dr. Aileen Baviera of the University of the Philippines Asian Center, iterated that “Philippine (national) security must be conceptualized in accordance with the fundamental character of the country as a developing economy which is strategically located and has an archipelagic configuration.” Hence, expanding on some concepts from the document Human Security Now (Commission on Human Security, 2003), she asserts that “Philippine archipelagic security consists both of state security and human security interests….State security cannot be advanced without giving due attention to human security needs” (Baviera, 2005).

*Foreign Concepts of National Security*

The term “national security” became acceptable and widely used after World War II, especially among the Western Allies, led by the United States. (McLaurin, 1988) It was always a consideration in the context of threats to security, mostly from external sources arising from the many rising territorial and politico-ideological conflicts of the Cold War. Hence, it became very synonymous to the concept of (national) defense, which was predominantly focused on military responses and actions. Interestingly, US President Harry S. Truman, during his 1947 State of the Union Address, reminded the American people that “National security does not consist only of an army, a navy, and an air force….It depends on a sound economy…on civil liberties and human freedoms.” (Ibid., 1988)

Edward E. Azar and Chung-In Moon delineated four distinctive values directly associated with national security concerns in the Third World, namely: political and territorial survival, preservation of economic well-being and prosperity, organic survival of the national population, and communal harmony. (Azar and Chung-In, 1988)

The United Nations Centre for Regional Development (UNCRD) in Nagoya, Japan started to focus on human security and development (specially in the context of sub-national or regional development) since the turn of the century and millennium (2001) as a principal area of interest. Several volumes of its regular journal “Regional Development Dialogue” have featured recently the theme topic “Human Security”. Volume 22, Number 2, Autumn 2001 discusses “Human Security and National Development”, taking into account case studies of the Bicol Region in the Philippines, the Northeastern Region of Thailand, and the Yogyagarta Special Province in Indonesia. Conceptually, human security “comprises the prerequisites for economic security, food security, health security, personal security,
community security, and political security.” (Lanzona, 2001) This concept takes the welfare of human beings and their communities, rather than of the state as a whole, as the relevant measure of security. Volume 24, Number 2, Autumn 2003 highlights “Reflections on Human Security Now”, with a discussion on “Targeting Human Security and Ethical Governance in the Philippines” by Josefina S. Edralin and Cristino M. Collado. The authors cite former Philippine President Fidel Ramos’ concept of “comprehensive national security”, which was understood primarily in terms of both “defense against the armed challenges to the government and defense against the social, political, and economic threats that worked in insidious ways to undermine the security of the citizens and the nation as a whole.” (Edralin and Collado, 2003) They regarded the most significant threats to human security to include: hunger and food insecurity, crime and corruption. Volume 26, Number 1, Spring 2005 looks at “Human Security and Conflict Resolution”, featuring cases of modern conflicts that have threatened human security, including some in Africa, Central Asia, Israel-Palestine, and in Mexico. For human security to exist and thrive in a state, it must have achieved peace with its neighbors and peace among its various population groups. Hence, conflict-resolution must be actively undertaken, either through selected warfare to end the conflict, negotiated settlement including peace talks, and peace agreements that are implemented and monitored.

As far as the role of the State in national security is concerned SECURITY is considered a “public good”, i.e. a valuable collective or common good. (Loader and Walker, 2006) Being a “public good”, security has an instrumental dimension, where it serves as a “prerequisite to the effective liberty of individuals, which in turn is seen as a prerequisite to the good life, however conceived.” (Ibid.) It also has a social dimension, in that it is applicable to all members of society in the state. Finally, security has a constitutive dimension, since it is essential to the very concept or nature of “public or social good”. (Loader and Walker, Ibid.)

Development and Security

Frances Stewart of the Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity (CRISE), Queen Elizabeth House, Oxford University wrote “Development and Security” in April 2004, where she discussed the relationship between development and security, which she considers human security. The three hypothetical connections are: (1) “since human security comprises much of people’s or human wellbeing, it is logically an objective for development”; (2) “lack of human security has adverse consequences on growth and poverty and thereby on development” (Stewart 2004); and, (3) “lack of development, or imbalanced development that involves (creates) sharp horizontal inequalities, is an important
cause of conflict.” (Ibid.) Her research led to some conclusive observations that lack of development can stimulate conflict and social disorder, thereby increasing internal security threats, which in turn adversely affect the desired pace and levels of development. Therefore, in the planning for development it is only appropriate that considerations for advancing human security are taken into account and provided for.

The International Peace Academy published a report in May 2004 for its New York Seminar 2004 entitled “The Security-Development Nexus: Conflict, Peace and Development in the 21st Century”. It observes in its introductory discussions that “conflicts not only rupture a country’s development; they are often the consequence of a country’s developmental efforts.” (International Peace Academy, 2004) “Strengthening state institutions and enhancing their capacity to provide security and development based on principles of good governance”(Ibid.) contribute to successful conflict resolution and management. Likewise, “an effective, credible and accountable security sector” strengthens a stable and secure state environment for development to take place and advance, ensuring economic activities and healthy political dynamics.

In the final consideration, development and security are inextricably and symbiotically connected and related and interactive, such that one cannot prosper without the other. It is only fitting that any framework for development planning should immediately include considerations of and provisions for security.

David Simon and Carole Rakodi (Simon and Rakodi, 1990) discussed the future of prospects for regional planning in the concluding chapter of Simon’s edited compendium. They see a real need for revisiting the true nature of the State and how it acts in the interest of the citizens. There is the very basic need to contextualize (sub-national or regional) space in terms of economic, social, political and environmental realities, in order to rationalize the allocation and distribution of national resources and development activities. Also, the State must be careful about justifying the sometimes extreme exploitation (and abuse) of its resources to “promote national security and development”. (Here, there is no affirmation of the value of considering national security issues when doing regional development planning.) They called for regional development planning to be institutionalized and enhanced to accommodate the realities of globalization, on the one hand, and greater participation and engagement of local governments and organizations, on the other. There is the continuing concern for rural development and poverty alleviation, which are issues usually considered in national security enhancement.
The overall conclusion from the review of the foregoing literature, published and unpublished, is that there appears to be a real logical opportunity for development and security to be integrated in plans and actual programs and projects at the national, sub-national or regional, and local levels.

There appears to be a strong logical and symbiotic relationship between development and security. National development creates national prosperity as well as conditions for the stability and security of the citizenry, and vice versa. Thus, the more developed nations are, for the most part, more stable and secure and their citizens are better off economically than the least developed ones. On the other hand, national security allows for continuous national development and prosperity because a nation becomes continuously attractive to investors and investments from both local and foreign businesses and economic development-stimulating activities, when there are no threats or adverse conditions that would deter continuous normal business and operations. In the Philippines there has not yet been any comprehensive documentary study of regional development planning in the context of and vis-à-vis national security conditions and considerations. This investigative study supports the formal institutionalization of the inter-relationship and interactive dynamics of development and security in the Philippines.

The following model shows how the fields of governance, development, and security overlap in their common goals of promoting the well-being of the people. This framework can be considered by national security officials and professionals who carry out their tasks of safeguarding and advancing national security in the context of national/regional/local development. And, it will provide professional environmental (regional and urban) planners more understanding and appreciation of the dynamics between development and security. Hopefully, this should lead to some formal and institutionalized inclusion and integration of relevant internal security considerations in the current development planning frameworks being used by both the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) national and regional offices, as well as local governments.
What integrates the development and security components together is Good Governance, that includes effective leadership, good planning and successful implementation of the plan. Good Governance of Development leads to Productivity and Sustainability. Good Governance with Security creates Peace and Public Order. And, Good Governance with Development and Security enhances Prosperity that contributes to the overall Well-Being and Quality of Life of the Nation, the Region and the Local Government Area. Hence, the rationale for this succeeding framework illustration.

In order to establish the rationale for integrating national security into national/regional development planning in the Philippines, the conceptual framework (Figure 4) is used.
The traditional frameworks for development planning that have influenced the development planning frameworks of the NEDA for national and regional development and the DILG for local (provincial and city/municipal) development have focused mostly on socio-economic cum spatial development, i.e., locating, situating and distributing desired socio-economic growth and development in limited physical space over a prescribed period. However, in view of the current considerations of development and security happening simultaneously, a more realistic and logical framework inevitably must consider security realities and concerns in the official development plan document. This was something officially done by the recent Arroyo Administration in its Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP) (Chapter 14, National Harmony: The Peace Process;
Chapter 15, National Harmony: Healing the Wounds of EDSA; and, Chapter 23, Defense Against Threats of National Security) for 2004 – 2010 and has been repeated in the Philippine Development Plan (PDP) of President Benigno S. Aquino III for 2011 – 2016 (Chapter 9, Peace and Security). What needs to be explored and proposed are practical and ready-to-undertake-processes for permanently institutionalizing security considerations and appropriate actions in the development plan and planning process.

The conceptual framework for development and security addresses the need of the military and defense establishments to end the decades-long insurgency and separatism and terrorism using the principal strategy of the current National Internal Security Plan (Bayanihan, Internal Peace and Security Plan) of WAGING PEACE.

The significance of the regional development plans is that they serve as the logical and best links of the grand national plan for the Philippines’ development to the local development plans in the provinces and cities and municipalities in the regions. They provide the regional spatial frameworks that guide and influence the growth of local governments and their areas, on the one hand, and they reflect the development aspirations of the local governments for the region and the nation, on the other.

Many of the security problems and threats are happening locally, and must be addressed at that operational level. On a collective basis, however, they cover regional or sub-regional areas and must be strategically addressed. Hence, it becomes very logical and practical to include security considerations and appropriate interventions in regional development plans for strategic reasons as well as local development plans for operational reasons.

This study is a forward step in establishing a regional development-cum-security plan in an integrated framework. It pursues the philosophy of the DAP’s development and security paradigm, which posits that development and security are intertwined and inter-related, i.e. melded. At the same time, it is congruent with the earlier advocacy of President Ferdinand Marcos to integrate and institutionalize development and security as a philosophical frame, through Presidential Decree 859 of December 23, 1975, wherein he revises Presidential Decree 107 of July 1973, which created NEDA, to include the Secretary of National Defense as a NEDA Board Member, to “ensure peace and order” for development. For unexplained reasons, PD 859 was never implemented. This advocacy is again reiterated by Presidential Order 852 of December 3, 1982, “Providing for More Effective Coordination between National Development and Security Operations”. Moreover,
he created Peace and Order Councils through Executive Order 727 of September 10, 1981, at the National, Regional and Local levels, to ensure that attention and action are focused on ensuring peace and order continuously for development.

**National Security Plans**

Prior to the Administration of President Gloria Arroyo, her predecessors had their own respective AFP plans to address the internal security threats of the local Communist insurgency and the Muslim separatist movement. Under President Ferdinand Marcos, AFP had OPLAN KATATAGAN. Under President Corazon Aquino it had OPLAN MAMAMAYAN and OPLAN LAMBAT BITAG I and II. Under President Fidel Ramos it had OPLAN LAMBAT BITAG III and OPLAN KAISAGANANAAN. The AFP during the short presidency of President Joseph Estrada has OPLAN MAKABAYAN and OPLAN BALANGAI. All these Counter Insurgency (COIN) plans are discussed in detail in the graduate group paper of AFP Col. Arthur Biyo, Lt.Col. Augusto Gaite, Lt.Cmdr. Juario Marayag, Col. Jose Antonio Carlos Motril, and Col. Alan Rojo at the Development Academy of the Philippines in March 2011 on “THE ARMED FORCES OF THE PHILIPPINES CLEAR – HOLD – CONSOLIDATE – DEVELOP (CH-CD) METHODOLOGY: An Analytical Revisit.”

In 2001, after the September 11 bombing of the World Trade Center Twin Towers in New York by Islamic terrorists, the Arroyo Administration developed a National Internal Security Plan (NISP) for implementation in the Philippines. It basically called for a joint strategy of defense and military-police initiatives together with development and civic action in the campaign against insurgency and terrorism. It also provided for convergence areas and programs for joint defense-security and development programs, especially in suspected insurgent communities and potential terrorist lairs. The program KALAHI-CIDDS (Kapit Bisig Laban sa Kahirapan – Comprehensive and Integrated Delivery of Social Services) of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) was mandated to provide the “real works” in a challenged setting. For some unexplained reasons, however, the NISP was never formally launched nor fully implemented. Nonetheless, it continued to be referred to, updated and interpreted by various defense and security officials.

In 2001, President Arroyo created an interim Cabinet Oversight Committee for Internal Security (COCIS), replacing what used to be known as Cabinet Cluster E during the terms of President Ramos and President Estrada. (COCIS was abolished in 2003.) During its brief existence, COCIS produced a “National Internal Security
Plan” (NISP, 2001), which advocated for the close interaction of internal security units at the regional and local levels (i.e., the Area Coordinating Centers) to link up with the regional development and local development councils where they operate. It appeared to be along the lines of the directive made by former President Marcos in 1982 (E.O. No. 852 of December 3, 2002). In the proposed NISP the NEDA Director-General was included in COCIS. COCIS was supposed to be steered by an Executive Committee, which included the Presidential Adviser for Regional Development. (NISP, 2001).

The NISP framework, which proposed a separate AREA COORDINATING CENTER, at the various levels of local government (i.e., regional, provincial, municipal/city, and barangay) was not popular among LGU officials because the approach was perceived to be strongly military, so that in a short time the plan was deactivated. Instead, the National Government opted to use the KALAHI-CIDDS framework implemented by DSWD in collaboration with local governments. In this framework, the military served a supportive role, principally to ensure peace and security.

The 2006 (second) official version of NISP circulated by the Department of National Defense (DND) advanced the BANTAY LAYA II approach to containing communist insurgency, Muslim separatism and terrorism involving a CLEAR – HOLD – CONSOLIDATE – DEVELOP strategy: CLEAR the affected areas of enemies and threats through combined military and police operations; HOLD and CONSOLIDATE the cleared areas principally through police and local government efforts; and, DEVELOP the cleared areas through the initiatives of the local governments, the various national government agencies, and the private sector and civil society.

The political offensive for resolving conflict and pursuing peace as well as the economic offensive for poverty alleviation through LGU-situated development are some of the principles and conditions of NEDA’s National Framework for Regional Development. (“Peace is a prerequisite to development.”)

To support these offensives, the National Government initiated three key programs in the e-NISP: (1) demobilization, disarmament, reintegration; (2) amnesty for rebel returnees; and, (3) human rights.

After her re-election in May 2004, President Arroyo’s re-crafted MTPDP for 2004-2010 reiterated the basic themes that were advanced in the 2001-2004 MTPDP, summarized in five major thrusts: economic growth and job creation; energy development; enhancing social justice and responding to basic needs;
improving education and enhancing youth opportunities; and, good governance and 
anti-corruption. It also specifically iterated strategies for pursuing national security 
vis-à-vis national development.

The MTPDP 2004-2010 included specifically the provision for national 
security considerations for national and regional development. Four chapters 
specifically address the promotion of national security vis-à-vis development. Chapter 14 (National Harmony: The Peace Process) addressed and sought to end 
the various decades-long conflicts with separatist and insurgent organizations in 
various regions of the Philippines, including the Moro Islamic Liberation Front 
(MILF) in Mindanao, the Communist Party of the Philippines and New People’s 
Army (CPP-NPA) nationwide, and the various Communist breakaway groups, notably the Rebolusyonaryong Partidong Manggagawa ng Pilipinas – Revolutionary People’s Army – Alex Boncayao Brigade (RPMP-RPA-ABB) in some provinces. Chapter 15 (National Harmony: Healing the Wounds of EDSA) recognized the urgent need to achieve reconciliation among the various antagonists of the past two (2) EDSA revolts, in 1986 and 2001. The unresolved and continuing political 
and social conflicts continue to divide the nation and make it even more difficult to 
advance programs for development and prosperity. Chapter 16 (Basic Need: Peace 
and Order) addressed the peace and order problems that prevent the advancement 
of economic development, notably: terrorism, criminality (e.g., kidnapping, 
robberies, rampant smuggling, illegal drug trading, and street crimes) and iterated 
strategies for how to counteract them. Chapter 23 (Defense Against Threats to 
National Security) focused on the reforms urgently needed by the Defense Sector 
to strengthen the Armed Forces of the Philippines against local insurgency and 
other national security threats, including external ones. This was the first time that 
the Philippine Government officially links “national development planning” and 
“national security” in its MTPDP.

The 2009 revised version of the NEDA 2004-2010 MTPDP expanded 
the chapters focused on promoting security and peace and order. (NEDA MTPDP 
Plan 2008-2010”. Chapter 15 focused on “Healing Divisions in Society.” Chapter 
16 covered “Peace and Order”. And, Chapter 23 was directed on “Defense Against 
Threats to National Security.” This expansion from three to five chapters is indicative 
of the value and priority importance given by NEDA to Peace and Security as key 
factors for national development.

The PHILIPPINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN for 2011-2016 of President 
Aquino devoted Chapter 09 to Peace and Security. Its strategic objectives included:
• Winning the Peace through the Internal Peace and Security Plan – BAYANIHAN that promotes PAMANA (Payapa at Masaganang Pamayanan Program);
• Ensuring National Security with a strong and capable Armed Forces of the Philippines and the Philippine National Police, one of whose goals is “to support national development programs by securing and protecting critical infrastructures and facilities, and other high value projects of the public and private sector.”

One approach that the Philippine Government has engaged to address the challenge of introducing security and development in conflict-marred communities is KALAYAAN BARANGAY. The Kalayaan Barangays Program or KALAHI para sa Kalayaan is government’s national program aiming to finally put an end to the decades old problem of communist insurgency in the country and usher in peace and development in these poverty-stricken rural barangays. It is in line with government’s goal of rehabilitation and development of conflict affected areas as contained in chapter 14 of the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan for 2004-2010 or the National Peace Plan. (OPAPP, 2006)

The program has as its ultimate goal the achievement of sustainable peace in the community following the human security framework of freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom from humiliation and exclusion. Specifically, it sought to:

a. empower the target barangays to be able to build and sustain peace and development;

b. restore and strengthen formal governance institutions and maintain peace and security in the area; and

c. fast-track the delivery of government’s commitment under signed final peace agreements.

For its part, the Armed Forces of the Philippines has developed approaches to address insurgency by balancing military campaigns with development initiatives, involving the cooperation of host local government officials. The fundamental principle for these counter-insurgency programs of the Armed Forces of the Philippines is the previously discussed strategy of CLEAR-HOLD-CONSOLIDATE-DEVELOP (CHCD) prescribed in the Enhanced National Internal Security Plan (E-NISP) of 2006. (Classified AFP Bantay Laya Review Report, 2007) The C-H-C-D principle calls first for the military to clear insurgent-controlled areas using armed combat, then hold and consolidate the affected community together in order for it to be developed by providing basic services and introducing income-generating activities for the residents, particularly by the local governments and
other development agencies of national government.

It is evident in the assessments of the AFP Counter-Insurgency (COIN) Programs that military campaign (i.e., defense-security component) must always be balanced with development activities, especially to make the affected communities eventually self-sustaining and not reliant on military presence. Interestingly, the Armed Forces of the Philippines has formally included “SUPPORT TO DEVELOPMENT” as one of its seven strategic priorities. To institutionalize this commitment, it established a NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT COMMAND (NDSC) in September 2007. The unit undertakes infrastructure projects “as directed by the national leadership in support of national development to transform conflict-affected communities into peace and development areas through accelerated barangay-focused rehabilitation and development.” This command was short-lived and de-activated on May 3, 2012, during the retirement day of its last Commander, Maj. General Carlos Holganza.

In the context of the holistic approach and whole of government approach mentioned previously, the Philippine military takes charge of the clear and hold phases while civilian agencies of the national government as well as local government units and executives take care of the consolidate and develop phases, with the Armed Forces apparently performing a support role in such efforts.

Indeed, national security for the Philippines is closely linked with national development. The National Security Council notes that development involves the “creation of value and wealth and its distribution in a manner that motivates all to create more value and wealth on a sustained basis”. Consequently, national security pertains to the creation of the physical and policy environment that allows the creation and distribution of value and wealth. Wealth simply cannot be created where insecurity among the people persists or fear for one’s life dominates.

In December 2010 the DND, the AFP, and the NSC announced the revised approaches to security and development with the Internal Peace and Security Plan - Bayanihan (IPSP-Bayanihan) replacing the previous Administration’s E-NISP.

The previous E-NISP was characterized by a WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT APPROACH, towards addressing the decades’ old problem of insurgency with an inter-governmental cooperation for development by agencies at the national, regional and local levels. It emphasized the need to converge the activities of appropriate agencies in affected areas (those overcoming insurgency), usually clusters of barangays. It was an integration of all previous Lambat Bitag approaches of previous administrations into the Kalayaang Barangay paradigm.
The current IPSP (BAYANIHAN) expands the previous WHOLE OF GOVERNMENT paradigm into a WHOLE OF NATION and people-centered framework, which engages not only the government and public agencies, but also includes non-government stakeholders, such as private enterprises, non-government organizations, academia, and the community. Furthermore, the PURSUIT OF PEACE is the principal strategic objective of Bayanihan. President Aquino, in his Memorandum No.6 of 2010, “Directing the Formulation of the National Security Policy and National Security Strategy for 2010-2016”, required that it “draws information from the regions, considering regional development, strategies and local security needs.” This National Security Policy “shall provide the enabling environment conducive to development.” Its major concerns include internal and external issues.

At present the AFP is undertaking a review of the IPSP in terms of its feasible implementation, specially at the local grassroots level. Some clarificatory discussions have been quietly initiated between AFP J-3 (Deputy Staff for Operations) and the Development Academy of the Philippines. Some issues that have cropped up pertain to the “Whole of Nation approach” vs the older “Whole of Government approach” of the previous E-NISP. A particular issue has to do with the mobilization and use of resources: Who is in control? Is it the Government or its NGO partners? Also, in terms of planning programs and projects, which group takes the lead, the Government or the NGO partners? In this regard, the much advanced IPSP has yet to showcase success experiences.

The “Whole of Government” Approach basically means that there is effective inter-agency collaboration from planning to implementation of the program policy actions. The “Whole of Nation” Approach is more challenging as it requires smooth and effective collaboration both among the Government agencies and Non-Government Stakeholders and among themselves. The latest adopted approach requires efficient inter-organizational/agency inter-operability, a concept and practice that was made popular by Pres. George W. Bush after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center Twin Towers in New York City. Inter-agency inter-operability is a sophisticated systematic process of instant connectivity and quick decision-making derived from computer systems functioning. The instant connectivity through efficient computer systems network provides decision-makers and planners with needed information to make quick decisions and plans.

Still another issue of the shift from E-NISP to IPSP is the military and police long-standing strategy of pursuing elements who are hostile to the Government and seek its destruction, namely the communist insurgents and their affiliates and the
separatist Moro Islamic Liberation Front. IPSP advocates for the more expanded use of negotiations and non-armed dialogues between the Government and the elements hostile to it. There are varying degrees of reservations by the military and the police regarding “staying passive for the peace process” even as the insurgents and separatists continue their armed operations against the Government. A particular case in point is the Al Barka incident in Basilan where 19 soldiers of the Special Forces who were undergoing special training were ambushed and killed by MILF troops.

**Integrating Security to Development Planning**

In view of the conclusive need to formally integrate security considerations into regional development planning and institutionalize the practice, it is appropriate to mainstream security then into the development planning framework and process at the national, regional and local levels. This study focuses on the regional development planning level, which serves as the key link to cascade down to the local government development plans the priorities of the national development plan. Furthermore, it is the regional development plan that integrates all of the local development aspirations in its area of coverage. Hence, mainstreaming of security is proposed with the regional development plan.

The long-running insurgency and Muslim separatist activities in the Philippines have been taking place in localities of regions, making it necessary to respond to them both locally and regionally. The reality of the Communist insurgency and the Muslim separatist activities is that they operate in regional and sub-regional fronts for strategic purposes and they conduct their political and combat activities in provinces and localities. Their local and regional revolutionary activities undoubtedly are threats to the security of the regions where their presence is strong, thereby causing challenges to actual and potential development investments, actual and planned socio-economic activities, and the region’s peace and order.

Recognizing that these security conditions are present in some, if not all, of the regions of the Philippines, mainstreaming security (focusing on addressing armed insurgency and conflicts using a basic framework) is a very practical and useful outcome of this long study.

Mainstreaming has become a practical approach for national and international programs and projects to embed and institutionalize in their existing frameworks and approaches additional considerations that have become necessary
and relevant at a specific period, or on a continuing basis. In the Philippines, the more recent and popular causes to be mainstreamed into national, regional and local development plans are gender and development, disaster risk reduction, and, climate change.

The mainstreaming of security in development plans and programs is a recent activity of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security (2009). It is an ambitious attempt to include considerations and provisions for comprehensive Human Security which includes: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security, and political security.

In the Philippines, the mainstreaming of Gender and Development and Disaster Risk Reduction in development planning has been effected. NEDA and the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women published in 2004 “Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines for Project Development, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation” with the assistance of United Nations Development Programme and the Asian Development Bank. It was a sequel to their “Mainstreaming Gender in Development Planning: Framework and Guidelines” of 2002, with assistance from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Through these official guidelines, all development plans are enjoined to include Gender and Development considerations and appropriate provisions. For mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction cum Climate Change in development planning, NEDA published in 2008, with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the European Commission Humanitarian Aid, “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction in Sub-National Development Land Use/ Physical Planning in the Philippines” cognizant of the continuing disasters that plague the nation, especially brought about by climate change. In July 2009 the Congress of the Philippines enacted Republic Act No. 9729, “An Act Mainstreaming Climate Change into Government Policy Formulations, Establishing the Framework Strategy and Program on Climate Change, Creating for This Purpose the Climate Change Commission, and for Other Purposes”. Relevant to this is the ADB publication in January 2010 of Peter King’s “Mainstreaming Climate Change into National Development Planning – A Training Manual”.

Useful to understanding mainstreaming is NEDA’s framework to mainstream Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. It provides a clear process for integrating to the National and Regional Development Planning frameworks the now popular and much needed Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation.
1. Framework for Mainstreaming Peace and Security into National and Sub-National (Regional and Local) Development Planning in the Immediate Future

Since there are already existing mainstreamed programs, in varying degrees, about Food Security, Health Security, Economic Security, Personal Security, Community Security, Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change and Gender and Development in the National/Regional and Local Development Plans of the Philippine, this framework for mainstreaming Peace and Security is recommended.

The mainstreaming of Security will be an add-on to the current existing frameworks for National and Regional Development Planning, namely, NEDA’s

1. Guidelines for the Formulation of the Medium-Term Development Plan and Medium-Term Public Investment Program (Prepared as a basic framework for the Philippine Development Plan of every new administration)
2. Philippine Development Planning Matrices (Prepared as a basic framework for the Philippine Development Plan of every new administration)

The proposed strategic intervention of this paper is not to create an entirely new framework that is “imposed” on the development planning framework, but rather to introduce the mainstreaming through existing entry points where the “embedding” or formal inclusion will happen. Hence, it shall not be as complicated and sophisticated like the mainstreaming of DRR. The mainstreaming of security, focusing on addressing armed insurgency and conflicts will be more simple and easier to undertake. There is a desire that the insurgency and conflict threats will sooner than later be resolved through the Government’s peace process, which is being carried out by the Government’s Peace Panel.

As a start, the Analytical Framework of AFP J2 can be adopted to evaluate the threat situation of a region, province, city, municipality or barangay. This requires a clearance from the AFP and approval of the Secretary of National Defense.

In the Guidelines for the Formulation of the Medium-Term Development Plan and Medium-Term Public Investment Program, the incumbent NEDA Director General – Economic Planning Secretary should permanently include and require a chapter or section on PEACE AND SECURITY FOR DEVELOPMENT, that complements the PEACE AND SECURITY Chapter of the appropriate PHILIPPINE National Security and Regional Development Planning
DEVELOPMENT PLAN RESULTS MATRICES for the particular planning period, the next one being 2017 – 2022. It will be along the “GUIDELINES FOR THE FORMULATION OF THE MEDIUM-TERM PHILIPPINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND MEDIUM-TERM PUBLIC INVESTMENT PROGRAM, 2010 – 2016”, where one of the agenda shall be on PEACE AND SECURITY to advance continuing development and prosperity. It shall be concerned with three principal outcomes:

1. Permanent end to all internal armed conflicts involving Communists, Muslim separatists and other political insurgents, secessionists and terrorists that promotes and ensures peace in the regions;
2. Continuing public safety and order that has minimized criminality and political violence and other ethnic or cultural conflicts; and,
3. Harmonious external relations with other nations, especially our neighbors.

For practical reasons, the considerations for environmental security (i.e., disaster risk reduction and calamity preparedness) shall be included in a separate domain focusing principally on physical environmental security.

In this regard, a general framework is proposed that will permanently and continuously embed the integration/mainstreaming of security into national and regional development planning processes. Hopefully, this will also cascade down to the local development planning of local governments.
In January 1995 NEDA issued GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE REGIONAL PHYSICAL FRAMEWORK PLAN, that provides, what former NEDA Secretary Cielito Habito describes as “a ready, handy reference for…regional planners.” (Ibid.) Specific interventions to mainstream Peace and Security recommended are as follows:

1. In Chapter 3.0, RPFP: Plan Formulation Process, an eleventh item, Peace and Security Situation, should be added into Section 3.2 Detailed Surveys and Planning Studies (Page 15). To be researched and shown on standard regional development planning maps are summarized fundings:
   a. Ideological conflicts and insurgency (size, location, events, etc.)
   b. Public Order and Safety (criminality, dispensation of justice, police services, etc.)
   c. Political, Cultural and/or Ethnic Violence
   d. Peace and Order Council effectiveness

   The original existing topics are: (1) Regional/sub-regional physical characteristics, (2) Population size and distribution, (3) Urbanization and settlement patterns, (4) Regional/sub-regional economy and employment distribution, (5) Land use patterns and changes, (6) Transportation systems, (7) Infrastructure facilities and social services, (8) Environmental management, (9) Physical, economic and policy constraints, and, (10) Development administration capability.

2. In its Annex B. REGIONAL PHYSICAL FRAMEWORK PLAN ANNOTATED OUTLINE, Section II. BASES OF THE PLAN (Pages 39 – 44) shall include a new Item, L. PEACE AND SECURITY SITUATION, which includes statistics and maps of the elements presented previously. A sample of the peace and security map is the map produced at J2-IRAD about the security situation in the regions.

3. In Annex C-1.1. Worksheet 1.1. CHECKLIST OF AVAILABLE REGIONAL DATA (Pages 59 – 60), replace the current Item 5 (which will become Item 6) with a new topic REGIONAL PEACE, SECURITY AND PUBLIC ORDER, featuring
   a. Ideological conflicts and insurgency-influenced LGUs, including size of insurgency forces;
   b. Criminality and disposition of justice per LGU, including crime levels and handling of criminality by the Philippine National Police and the Department of Justice systems;
   c. Political, cultural and/or ethnic violence per LGU;
   d. General activities of the Regional and Local Peace and Order
Councils, whether active and effective, inactive and ineffective

4. In Annex C-5.1. Worksheet 5.1. A SIMPLE GOALS-ACHIEVEMENT MATRIX EVALUATION TECHNIQUE’s Attachment 5.1.a. SUGGESTED GAM EVALUATION CRITERIA and Table 5.1.a. SAMPLE EVALUATION MATRIX Item 6 should focus on PEACE, SECURITY AND PUBLIC ORDER (Pages 127 – 131), posing these questions:
   a. What ideological and other conflicts should be addressed and ended peacefully and what insurgent-influenced municipalities of the region should be weaned and how?
   b. What widespread existing and/or continuing crimes should be addressed and solved and how? What problems of disposition of justice should be addressed and how? In what municipalities of the region?
   c. What continuing organized violence (political, cultural and/or ethnic) should be addressed and solved and how in what municipalities?

An overall outcome of this new review is that the PEACE AND SECURITY goals of the region shall be logically inter-related with the other goals that correspond to other components of the UN Human Security framework. PEACE AND SECURITY shall correspond to the STATE SECURITY aspects of the Human Security Framework.

2. Institutional Changes for Mainstreaming Peace and Security in Development Planning

   A. The NEDA Board should be expanded to include the Secretary of National Defense as a bona fide member, congruent to the rationale of President Marcos’ PD 859 of 1975 and to ensure that security and defense matters affecting and contributing to development are continuously considered by the planners at the national and regional and local levels.

   B. At the regions, the close interaction of the Regional Development Council and the Regional Peace and Order Council should be permanently institutionalized to ensure the enhancement of development and security there. For this reason, it is appropriate that the NEDA Regional Director, who serves permanently as the Regional Development Council Vice Chair, be a permanent member of the Regional Peace and Order Council. In turn, the sitting RPOC Chairman shall be a permanent member of the
Regional Development Council.

C. At the local levels, the Executive Officer/Director or Administrator of the Local Development Council shall immediately sit as a permanent member of the Local Peace and Order Council. At the same time, the Local POC Head shall sit as a permanent member of the Local Development Council

3. Conceptual Framework for Mainstreaming Security in Development

Taking into account the mainstreaming frameworks and processes prescribed in NEDA’s new frameworks to mainstream Gender and Development and Disaster Risk Reduction in development planning and development plans, the following conceptual framework is offered for consideration and adoption, the details of which for implementation will be the focus and function of a future study.

![Proposed Conceptual Framework for Integrated and Comprehensive Development and Security Plan (National, Regional, Local)](image)

**Figure 5.** Proposed Conceptual Framework for Integrated and Comprehensive Development and Security Plan (National, Regional, Local)
The methods for integrating and mainstreaming can be derived from the current NEDA Guidelines for mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. In addition, the analytical framework of the UN Trust Fund for Human Security and the AFP Analytical Framework for Assessment of Area Security Threats are very useful to determine priority problems and consequent solutions.
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