



# Implementation Completion Memorandum

---

Project Number: JFPR – 36020  
January 2007

PHI: Strategic Private Sector Partnerships for Urban  
Poverty Reduction in Metro Manila (STEP UP)  
(Financed by the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction)

**JAPAN FUND FOR POVERTY REDUCTION (JFPR)**  
**IMPLEMENTATION COMPLETION MEMORANDUM (ICM)<sup>1</sup>**

<b>I. BASIC INFORMATION</b>			
<b>1. JFPR Number and Name of Grant:</b> <b>36020 – Strategic Private Sector Partnerships for Urban Poverty Reduction in Metro Manila (STEP UP)</b>			
<b>2. Country (DMC):</b> Philippines		<b>3. Approved JFPR Grant Amount:</b> \$ 3,600,000.00	
<b>4. Grant Type:</b> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Project / <input type="radio"/> Capacity Building		<b>5-A. Undisbursed Amount</b>	<b>5-B. Utilized Amount</b> \$ 3,600,000.00
<b>6. Contributions from other sources</b> (Exchange rate used: Php 51 = \$1)			
<b>Source of Contribution:</b>	<b>Committed Amount</b>	<b>Actual Contributions:</b>	<b>Remark - Notes:</b>
<b>DMC Government</b>	\$ 454,069.00	\$ 288,833	Counterpart from Local Government Units
<b>Other Donors</b> (please name)	\$ 0.00	\$ 0	
<b>Private Sector</b>	\$ 2,441,833.00	\$ 2,280,892	Composed of the following: Business Sector (\$1,409,579) Civil Society (\$ 719,890) PBSP (\$ 151,423)
<b>Community/Beneficiaries</b>	\$ 433,020.00	\$ 1,027,873	
	\$ 3,328,922.00	\$ 3,597,598	
<b>7-A. GOJ Approval Date:</b> 30 July 2002		<b>7-B. ADB Approval Date:</b> 24 September 2002	
<b>7-C. Date the LOA was signed (Grant Effectiveness Date):</b> 08 November 2002			
<b>8-A. Original Grant Closing Date:</b> 07 November 2005		<b>8-B. Actual Grant Closing Date:</b> 07 November 2006	
<b>8-C. Account Closing Date:</b> 30 October 2006			
<b>9. Name and Number of Counterpart ADB (Loan) Project:</b> Metro Manila Urban Services for Poor Project (MMUSP)			
<b>10. The Grant Recipient(s):</b>  Hon. Margarito Teves (LOA signed by former Sec. Jose Isidro Camacho, back in 2002) Secretary, Department of Finance 6th flr., Executive Tower Bldg., BSP complex, Manila 1004, Philippines  Hon. Noli L. de Castro (LOA signed by former Sec. Michael T. Defensor, back in 2002) Chairman, Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council 6F Atrium Bldg., Makati Avenue, Makati City, Philippines  Mr. Manuel V. Pangilinan Chairman, Philippine Business for Social Progress PSDC Building, Magallanes cor. Real Sts. 1002, Intramuros, Manila, Philippines			

<sup>1</sup> The ICM has to be prepared under responsibility of the ADB Project Officer with contributions from the Recipient, EA/IAs, and the grant project manager/coordinator at the PIU.

## 11. Executing and Implementing Agencies:

### Executing Agency: HUDCC

Ms. Lucille P. Ortile  
Deputy Secretary General  
Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC)  
6F Atrium Bldg., Makati Avenue, Makati City, Philippines  
E-mail: [lportile@pacific.net.ph](mailto:lportile@pacific.net.ph)  
Tel (+632) 811 4167/ 811 4116  
Fax (+632) 811 4159

### Implementing Agency: PBSP

Mr. Gil T. Salazar  
Executive Director  
Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP)  
PSDC Building, Magallanes cor. Real Sts.  
1002, Intramuros, Manila, Philippines  
Email: [GTSalazar@pbsp.org.ph](mailto:GTSalazar@pbsp.org.ph)  
Tel (+632) 527 7741 to 49  
Fax (+632) 527 3743

## II. GRANT PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

### 12. Description (Background rationale):

Urban poverty in the Philippines, especially in Metro Manila, has increased in the past 3 years from 17.9 to 20.4%. Metro Manila outpaces all other regions of the Philippines in terms of rise in the number of families living below the poverty line. The increase in the incidence of income poverty was pegged at more than 50%, the highest in the country.

With continued migration to the cities and particularly to Metro Manila, and exacerbated by faltering public funds, the number of poor are increasing and living standards in the crowded slums worsening. About 40% of Metro Manila's population is estimated to live in slum areas, and the majority is poor.

Government alone, working with NGOs and affected communities, cannot effectively address the scope and scale of the problem. The need to broaden private sector involvement and participation is urgently required, and an effective framework if needed to rationalize corporate social responsibility for urban poverty reduction.

### 13. Grant Development Objective and Scope:

**Goal:** The goal of the JFPR Project is to reduce poverty among urban poor of selected communities in Metro Manila through public-private sector partnerships. The purpose of the project is to pilot and achieve a strategic role for private sector/corporate involvement in urban poverty reduction efforts in Metro Manila.

**Scope:** The JFPR Project will target 23 poor communities in Metro Manila. The project will (i) promote demonstrable strategic business sector involvement in integrated urban poverty reduction programs through a focused, strategic framework; (ii) create a strong multisectoral coalition capable of advocating urban poverty programs and policies in a sustainable manner; (iii) improve living conditions of 5,823 households, comprising an estimated 35,000 individuals; and (iv) undertake an integrated urban poverty reduction program, including a risk reduction and management component.

**Components:** To achieve the stated goal and purpose, the program is implemented through the following major components:

1. Strategic Partnership Building
  - a. Business Consensus Group
  - b. Multisectoral Group
  - c. Homeowners' Associations
2. Funds for Housing, Livelihood and Community Infrastructure
  - a. Housing Improvement Fund
  - b. Micro Enterprise and Livelihood Fund
  - c. Community Infrastructure and Facilities Fund
3. Risk Reduction and Management

The first major component of the project was the **Strategic Partnership Building**. This component focused on building and strengthening different sectors that are critical in urban poverty reduction, particularly the business sector, the multisectoral groups and the homeowners associations. All these players are important to achieve the development agenda of the target communities. A *business consensus group* was envisioned to spearhead the formulation of the

development agenda and framework for participation of the business sector in urban poverty development. Formation of *multisectoral groups* per city as mechanisms to broaden stakeholder participation was also part of the outputs under this component. The MSG should work in pushing for urban poverty development agenda at the city level. Building relationships with the local government units also proved to be an important aspect under this component since we have to coordinate most of the interventions with the local government units for more effective program implementation. LGU counterpart in the form of technical expertise, cash and in-kind contributions for the projects as well as valuable time devoted by the government officials in planning, implementing and monitoring the projects is important to augment the resources needed for the different projects. Likewise, the LGUs are also considered the more permanent structures that will remain after the implementing agency (PBSP) has left the communities, thus, it is important that they have ownership of the development agenda in the urban poor communities.

The *Homeowners' Associations (HOA)* on the other hand, are regarded as both the beneficiary and major partner in this pilot urban poverty alleviation program. As main players, they were expected to be able to manage their community affairs particularly in the areas of organizational, project, financial and estate management. There were adjustments that were made in the STEP UP timetable because certain assumptions at the start of the project did not materialize. The first assumption is that the existing HOA officers have basic leadership and management skills. In reality, most of the HOAs are still in the early stages of development – the officers were not very active and they have minimal leadership skills as well as project and financial management skills. Initially, during the first year of STEP UP, the PBSP Program Officers directly implemented and managed the projects in the communities because of the lack of skills of the community partners. However, we are aware that this is not a sustainable way of doing things, so we shifted our focus from project implementation to capability building during the first two years of STEP UP. Time was spent in building and enhancing the capabilities of the HOA officers to enable them to manage projects on their own. This investment in time and skills building proved to be worth the effort since the HOAs were able to catch up during the last two years of STEP UP by implementing multiple projects and efficiently managing the funds given to them either as grants or as loan packages.

The second major component of STEP UP is the **provision of funds for Housing, Livelihood and Community Infrastructure**. The focus is on establishing revolving funds for housing improvement and micro-enterprise and livelihood activities. The target urban poor communities will be provided access to loans at affordable interest rates. The formal banking and financial institutions normally do not extend loans to the informal sector comprising the urban poor. This component would like to demonstrate that the poor are credit-worthy. A repayment rate of 95% or better is targeted under this component. There is also a provision for grants to construct community infrastructure such as road, drainage, multi-purpose centers, water facilities, etc. to upgrade the physical environment of the communities, and enhance the accessibility to better health and sanitation, other basic social services as well as generate business opportunities.

The third major component under STEP UP is the **Risk Reduction and Management**. Considering that the urban poor are the most highly vulnerable sector when it comes to natural and man-made disasters, a risk reduction and management program will be introduced in the target communities in Metro Manila. The program will focus on policies, education and training in risk prevention and disaster preparedness. Disaster management teams will be organized in each of the communities under STEP UP. PBSP will be working with its partners in the corporate sector, the civil society and the government in undertaking this component.

### Assessment

The program design rests heavily on multi-stakeholder partnerships in order to achieve its goal. All the relevant sectors in society are being tapped to participate in the program to ensure its success (community, government, civil society and business sector). Its strength lies in successfully mobilizing these sectors and making them own the development agenda for the urban poor.

The different components of the program aim to address the critical aspects in urban poverty development. The strategic partnership building takes care of the stakeholders by organizing them into working groups such as the BCG, MSG and HOA and ensuring that the required cooperation and collaboration can take place between and among these players. The funds provided for housing, livelihood and community infrastructure addresses the physical and economic needs in the areas. Hand in hand with improving the physical and economic environment of the urban poor communities, the loans and grants also helped them build their self-esteem and increase their self-worth. The HOAs were being entrusted with the funds for their community development projects, and they are also given access to financial assistance with the belief that they are credit-worthy. The no-collateral loans at affordable interest rates demonstrated to them that there are alternatives to loan sharks, and other intermediary financial institutions that charge very high interest rates and only lead to further degradation through mounting debts. Finally, the risk reduction and management component acknowledges the vulnerability of the urban poor and takes a pro-active approach to addressing and possibly mitigating these risks and disasters that the poor often ignore because of lack of resources.

The STEP UP experience showed that indeed, participation takes time especially if we want projects to be community-led. Capacity building takes time. Community planning and consultation takes time. It is actually easier and faster to formulate project proposals and get contractors to do the projects with no or minimal consultations with the communities. However, that would have defeated the goal of having self-reliant communities who are main actors in their own development. We want the communities to look at their situation, assess the resources they already have and offer these as counterparts and, most important of all, to own the projects and the development work that is happening in their communities. We want the communities to see that they can make things happen, albeit with a little help from the other

sectors in society such as the business sector, the civil society and the government. Likewise, we wanted these other sectors to see that the poor can be self-sufficient, and need not rely on dole-outs forever. They will need a little push and some form of assistance to launch them into self-sufficiency but they need not be solely dependent on others.

The communities have actually exceeded their target counterpart contributions. Next to the business sector, they have provided the second largest counterpart in the project. These are mainly in the form of the collective lands they have purchased and the manpower and labor they provided for the projects. The HOAs also took the lead in negotiating with the local government units to provide counterparts for the projects. The HOAs are the ones managing the projects and keeping the books and financial records for the organization. They prepare the reports and financial statements. They learned about these things slowly, through trial and error, through numerous training and coaching. But in the end, they learn. The end goal is important but they have to go through the process and although these resulted in some delays in the implementation schedule, the HOAs were at still able to show that they can learn and do things for themselves.

The initial projection of three years to complete the pilot project proved to be too short a time given the reality that the sheer number of target communities in itself would no doubt yield a highly diverse group in terms of developmental level. No two HOAs are alike and the readiness level was wide ranging. But this is part of the learning process and adjustments in the pacing and duration of the project were made to respond to this reality.

On the part of the business sector, PBSP spent some time in briefing the CEOs of the companies and selling the STEP UP program. More than the financial and in-kind contributions mobilized from the different companies, these businessmen invested their time and skills through community visits and having direct interactions with the HOAs. Executive time was also utilized in the review of project proposals and providing inputs and suggestions on the viability of the projects. All projects implemented in the STEP UP areas were reviewed and approved by the PBSP Board and Regional Executive Committees composed of CEO representatives. However, despite the active role taken by a number of business executives and channeling development projects and initiatives of some companies under STEP UP, the actual counterpart contribution mobilized from them fell short of the target. The proposed Business Sector Champion per city did not push through. Although there were identified champions in the early days of STEP UP, this was not pursued in the long term. One major difficulty is the crosscutting concerns of some companies thus it was difficult to confine their involvement in just one area or city.

In terms of the planned Multi-Sectoral Groups per city, the establishment or formation of these bodies became dependent on whether there was already an existing and active Local Housing Board or Committee in the LGU that looks into the urban poverty situation. There were only three MSGs formed in Muntinlupa, Pasig and Malabon. The rest of the LGUs either have strong housing programs already spearheaded by the Government or were not receptive yet to the formation of multisectoral groups.

No formal Memorandum of Agreements were signed either with the HOAs or the LGUs. Although this did not greatly affect the partnership with the HOAs/communities, the same cannot be said on the part of the LGU. The reception of STEP UP by the LGUs differ across cities. This is very evident in the extent of involvement or participation by the LGU in the programs and activities of STEP UP. Some were very willing to provide needed counterpart for the projects either in the form of material donations, mostly landfill materials, or by providing technical expertise. The ability of the LGUs to provide these resources can either facilitate or delay the implementation of the community projects. There is also a direct correlation between the development of the HOAs and the LGU support and acceptance of the program.

14. Key Performance Indicators	Accomplishments Rating (HS,S,PS,U <sup>1</sup> )	Evaluation of each Indicator:
i) <b>Partnership Building</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Business sector consensus group formed with strategic plan for urban poverty reduction</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>The business sector through PBSP's Luzon Regional Executive Committee, a regular committee within the PBSP Governing Board Structure, adopted the role of the Business Consensus Group (BCG). The roles and functions of the BCG has been incorporated in the Luzon Regional Committee (Luzcom) and this is deemed a more sustainable approach compared with creating a national or city-level BCGs.</p> <p>The original target is to create just one Business Consensus Group (BCG) that will spearhead the formation of a strategic plan for urban poverty reduction. On the first year of the program, there was an attempt to create local BCG and business champions were identified for each STEP UP city.</p>

<sup>1</sup> HS=Highly Satisfactory; S=Satisfactory; PS=Partly Satisfactory; U=Unsuccessful

		<p>They were supposed to convene and make up the national level BCG for STEP UP.</p> <p>The identified champions for the cities include PLDT for Malabon, FPHC for Pasig, Nestle Phils. For Marikina, Monark Equipment for Quezon City, Pilipinas Shell for Taguig, CADP for Muntinlupa, Petron for Navotas, and IBM for Caloocan. These companies and other business sectors continued to support the different programs and projects in the STEP UP communities despite the absence of a formal city-level BCG.</p> <p>The Luzcom is an established structure as PBSP's governing body and the CEO representatives meet regularly to provide direction in the implementation of PBSP poverty alleviation and corporate citizenship programs. They also take the lead in promoting business sector involvement in PBSP programs and projects. It was difficult to confine or limit each business representative to just one adopted community or city. Most of the business sector's involvement and operations cut across the different cities. Given that the role envisioned for the BCG is already being performed by the Luzcom, there was no need to create a different body to perform the function of the business consensus group.</p> <p>The Luzcom have been actively involved in the review of all STEP UP projects and they continue to monitor the implementation of all these projects. They are also consulted regularly in the strategies and future direction of our urban poverty alleviation programs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nine multi-sectoral groups formed and strengthened to serve as a mechanism to broaden stakeholders participation</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>5 out of the 9 target MSGs were formed (66%). <b>Muntinlupa (SHOPCOM)</b>, <b>Malabon (Urban Poor Alliance)</b>, <b>Pasig</b> and the PBSP adopted site in <b>Valenzuela (LIAC)</b> have active MSGs while the <b>Taguig</b> MSG is in the process of being strengthened and revitalized. It has not been given an official mandate but performs on an as-need basis.</p> <p>The formation of a multisectoral group dealing with urban poor and housing issues is not a priority of four of the 9 areas. <b>Quezon City</b> has its own Local Housing Board working on the issues of urban poverty and housing for marginalized sectors in the city. <b>Marikina</b> already has a pro-active Marikina Settlements Office (MSO) that vigorously pursues land tenure solutions for its squatters; <b>Navotas</b> as a Municipality has other priorities and limited resources, while the Mayorality/political issues in <b>Caloocan</b> hinders its prioritization of programs for the Urban Poor.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Twenty-three HOAs with capability to manage their community affairs</li> </ul>	<b>HS</b>	<p>STEP UP worked with 34 Homeowners Associations from the original 23 target HOAs (148%). Each of these Homeowners Associations were able to establish their own organizational, project management and financial management systems, albeit at varying levels or degrees of proficiency.</p> <p>The HOAs were the main proponents for the projects implemented under STEP UP. They were able to exhibit their skills in implementing various community infrastructure projects. Majority is also implementing livelihood and housing loan assistance projects and despite some challenges, they</p>

		<p>continue to manage these projects on their own, using volunteer HOA officers' time and some assistance and coaching from PBSP.</p> <p>Some of the HOAs were also able to deal with other partners directly and to negotiate with LGUs for their resource requirements. During donor and member company visits, the HOA officers are able to explain and present the development programs in their areas.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regular involvement of corporate volunteers in various urban poor services</li> </ul>	HS	<p><b>Employee Volunteering</b></p> <p>Employee volunteering from member and non-member companies is valued at \$460,016, which accounts for almost 33% of the total business sector counterpart contribution. Likewise, some companies have institutionalized EV either through company policies or directives from their CEO (e.g., Citibank, AAI, GST)</p> <p>GST employees have volunteered in the house construction and painting in Taguig and Muntinlupa.</p> <p>Airlift Asia Inc. (A PBSP member company) has adopted the 8 STEP-UP cities donating 3,600 man-hours of corporate volunteering a year. They participated in tutorials, house painting and planting. The company has made it a policy to require all staff to render 24 hours of volunteer work a year.</p> <p>Various Member Companies participated in one-time volunteering activities during MC visits in the STEP UP communities – this took the form of providing labor for painting, house construction and planting.</p> <p>DLSU National Service Training Program students have been rendering services in selected communities of STEP UP.</p> <p><b>Educational Assistance</b></p> <p>Citigroup Foundation, Citibank NA, PLDT, Deutsche Bank AG, Boysen and Lepanto made substantial donations in the form of public school buildings in STEP UP partner cities.</p> <p>Ayala Corp., PMPMI donated school desks in Pasig and Caloocan.</p> <p>Credit Suisse provided scholarships for 20 elementary students in Pinagbuhatan, Pasig.</p> <p>Monark Foundation offered vocational scholarships to STEP UP Out of School Youths (OSYs).</p> <p>Australian and New Zealand Bank has adopted Pinagsama, Taguig Medium Rise Building and is currently implementing a Scholarship and Livelihood Assistance project Their employees volunteered in teaching bookkeeping &amp; accounting as well as offering tutorials for the children.</p> <p><b>Skills Training</b></p> <p>HOLCIM, a cement manufacturing company, upgraded masonry skills of 35 individuals.</p> <p>Boysen offered training on painting skills for the STEP UP community members.</p>

		<p>F. Salon and Spa (a new PBSP member company engaged in Spa and Salon services) financed the schooling of 100 STEP-UP beneficiaries in their 3 week training and possible absorption in their workforce. Splash Foundation also provided the training on cosmetology to our Valenzuela and Marikina beneficiaries.</p> <p>Letran College (Graduate School Division) has provided training on bookkeeping and accounting to Caloocan HOAs.</p> <p><b><i>Risk Reduction &amp; Healthy Living</i></b></p> <p>Nestle &amp; San Miguel Polo conducted free Fire Prevention &amp; First Aid Training in Marikina &amp; Caloocan, Malabon, Navotas &amp; Pasig. Their employees conducted the session for the STEP UP participants.</p> <p>Kraft Foods, Inc. has adopted Muntinlupa City STEP-UP sites with a P1.5 million donation in the form of a Healthy and Active Lifestyle Enhancement project that also benefited the other cities under STEP UP via their inter-HOA sports fest and learning sessions/mother classes.</p>
<b>ii) Housing Improvement</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Established sustainable revolving fund for housing improvements</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>A revolving Fund for Housing Improvement, including electrification, amounting to Php91,615,020 (US \$1.79 M). This includes the Php 3.5 M for electrification (US \$0.068 M). The interest rate given by PBSP to the HOA was at 2% and the HOA can pass it on to the individual borrowers up to 6%. The 4% earning was intended to cover administrative costs and for the HOA to eventually have additional revolving fund for housing. One of the earliest HOA to avail of the housing loan has earned almost Php200,000 and has started to relend it to new borrowers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Households provided with housing loan assistance</li> </ul>	<b>PS</b>	<p>1,212 HH (or 18% of the total HH served by STEP UP at 6,747) were provided with loans for house upgrading and construction, and 852 HH (13%) were given assistance for legalization of their electrical connection. This excludes Valenzuela since the assistance was not extended to them.</p> <p>This is far below the original target proposed which is 71% of the 5,823 HH. Originally, loans ranging from Php5,000 to Php70,000 will be offered but the loan ceiling was increased to Php 100,000 because of the increase in the cost of construction materials and the need of the borrowers. It will be noted however that since the housing assistance was in the form of a loan, less than 70% of the total HH per community expressed interest and are shown to be capable of amortizing for the loan even if at a lower interest rate. Part of the housing fund was allowed to for legalization of electrical connections.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acceptable repayment rate</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>Repayment rate as of January 30, 2007 is at <b>95%</b>.</p>
<b>iii) Micro-enterprise and Livelihood Fund</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop livelihood program</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>741 individuals from the STEP UP communities were trained in Building and Construction-related Skills, Food Processing,</p>



		<p>Handicrafts, Agri-Production, Health Care and Alternative Healing, Automotive and Heavy Machine Operations, Mobile Phone Repair and Dressmaking.</p> <p>Six Manpower Groups were established or assisted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Marikina Welders</li> <li>2) Navotas Welders</li> <li>3) Construction manpower cooperative in Quezon City</li> <li>4) Massage &amp; Aromatherapy Group (STEP UP-wide)</li> <li>5) Pasig Women's Sewers Group</li> <li>6) Tinig Fish Pen Operators (Muntinlupa)</li> </ol> <p>These groups were provided marketing support funds either through grants or loans. Equipment and assistance in registration were also given.</p> <p>On an individual basis, other beneficiaries are operating their own cellphone repair services, providing home servicing (manicure, pedicure, haircutting, etc.)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loan assistance</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>A revolving fund for livelihood was set up amounting to Php5,798,200 or US\$ 0.113 M. This was extended to 22 HOAs and at least 852 borrowers (11%).</p> <p>The accomplishment is below the original target of extending loans to 2,550 HH. However, instead of livelihood loans, funds were used to support skills training for higher employability of the beneficiaries.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable repayment rate</li> </ul>	<b>PS</b>	<p>The repayment rate is currently at 70%. This is below the target 95% repayment. The delinquency is mainly accounted for by 3 HOAs who have defaulted in their payment.</p> <p>To date, 7 HOAs have fully paid their loans to PBSP. One HOA's loan was restructured due to the effect of the typhoon that affected their business.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revolving fund/seed capital with guidelines/ systems/policies on application to expansion sites</li> </ul>	<b>HS</b>	<p>100% of the HOAs provided with revolving fund crafted their credit policies as part of the requirement for the release of the loan. AT least 30% of the HOA have expanded their livelihood loan assistance using their interest earnings and members' CBU. One of the HOA has extended their services to adjacent communities.</p>
<b>iv) Community Infrastructure</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities with access to improved road, drainage, multi-purpose center, water facilities, etc</li> </ul>	<b>HS</b>	<p>100% of the HOAs benefited with Infrastructure Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 Multi-Purpose Centers (MPCs) at Php 10.17 M or US\$ 0.199 M benefiting 5,907 HH</li> <li>• 34 HOAs/communities provided with roads, alleys and drainage worth Php 43.1 M or US\$0.845 M</li> <li>• 4 HOAs with water system worth Php 1.8 M</li> <li>• 7 HOAs with electrical poles worth Php 1.75 M</li> <li>• 1 HOA provided with canal fencing worth Php 1.2 M</li> <li>• 1 HOA with improved riprap worth Php 0.75 M</li> <li>• 1 HOA with retaining walls repaired at Php 1.7 M</li> </ul>
<b>v) Risk Reduction and Management</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed site-specific risk reduction management program</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>The issue of risk reduction and management has been incorporated in each of the HOAs Estate Management Plans. Re-blocking and chopping off of overhangs are also measures undertaken as part of estate and risk management in the areas.</p>

		<p>Aside from the road and drainage projects that seek to prevent or minimize flooding in the areas, other special infrastructure projects like Canal Fencing, Ripraps, and Retaining Walls were implemented as a response to the risk situation faced by the communities.</p> <p>The upgrading and legalization of electrical connections in the Caloocan and Malabon areas is a response to the risk of fire posed by illegal and dilapidated electrical connections. The people were made aware of the dangers of illegal connection and thus, they initiated the request to extend the housing improvement assistance to cover the electrification.</p> <p>Streetlights and gates also served to enhance safety and security in the communities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organized community-based disaster response team with systems and basic support</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>Each HOA formed their own safety and security committees that act as disaster management teams</p> <p>Emergency equipment has been distributed such as plastic drums, metal buckets, fire extinguishers, water pump, firemen's jacket and hat, water hose, ladders and first aid kits. Policies on the use and maintenance of the equipment were also drafted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved mitigating capability of HOAs</li> </ul>	<b>S</b>	<p>Community Disaster Management (CDM) and Standard First Aid (SFA) Trainings were conducted by the Philippine National Red Cross for the Disaster Management Teams for all the 34 HOAs</p> <p>Nestle Phils. (Cabuyao and Marikina plants) and the local Bureau of Fire Prevention and Management of the different LGUs provided Fire Drills for Marikina, Pasig, Malabon, and Navotas communities.</p> <p>San Miguel Polo Brewery also provided Emergency Management (fire fighting, first aid and risk mapping) for Caloocan, Navotas and Pasig.</p>

**15. Evaluation of Inputs** (Adequacy of formulation, terms of references, inputs and performance of the Recipient(s), EA, IA(s), NGOs and ADB, performance of consultants, other inputs, review missions):

The funds allocated for the different inputs required for the project had some major revisions. Increased allocation was sought for the revolving credit facilities (specifically for the housing improvement fund), the civil works, project management and audit/poverty impact assessment. The higher demand for housing loans necessitated the increase in the allocation for the housing revolving fund by 12%. Incorporating risk reduction and management in the community infrastructure projects account for the 61% increase in the civil works budget.

Project management costs increased due to the changes in the assumption on the personnel requirements. Initially, the manning complement consists of Community Organizers but given the demand of the program, the positions were upgraded to Program Officer levels. Likewise, the one-and-a-half year extension also required additional allocation for project management.

Major reduction (90%) in the budget allocation was made for equipment, machinery and other capital costs as well as the contingency since these were already incorporated in the project management and civil works component. The budget for supplies, training, workshops and seminars as well as technical support was reduced at around 50-60% of the original budget allocation.

Below is the table showing the original target fund allocation versus the revised target. Percentage of increase or decrease from the original target is also shown. The succeeding column shows the actual expenses and its percentage over the revised target.

Inputs	Original Target	Revised Target	% Increase/ Decrease vs. Orig.Target (+/-)	Actual Expenses	% (Actual vs. Rev. Target)
1. Revolving credit facilities	1,720,000.00	1,926,099.55	12%	1,846,816.90	96%
2. Civil works	558,824.00	898,456.20	61%	1,104,296.81	123%
3. Equipment, machinery, and other capital costs	312,863.00	19,551.02	(94%)	19,034.76	97%
4. Supplies	5,882.00	2,906.84	(51%)	3,889.31	134%
5. Training, workshops, seminars	253,725.00	127,864.80	(50%)	115,176.40	90%
6. Technical support	267,471.00	108,273.65	(60%)	107,654.42	99%
7. Project Management	285,196.00	453,382.86	59%	357,590.57	79%
8. Audit/Poverty Impact Assessment	42,549.00	48,150.67	13%	37,951.39	79%
9. Contingencies	153,490.00	15,314.41	(90%)	7,589.44	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,600,00.00</b>	<b>3,600,00.00</b>		<b>3,600,000.00</b>	<b>100%</b>

All the changes were made in response to the demands of the program and the unique situations of the different communities. ADB has been very open and flexible in adjusting to these circumstances. The donor approved changes in scheme like the expansion of the Housing Improvement Fund to cover electrification and water issues. Even the timetable was adjusted given the scope and the processes that the communities have to go through before they were deemed capable of implementing and managing the development projects and loan assistance provided under STEP UP.

The formal review mission was conducted only during the latter part of the program implementation of STEP UP. Nevertheless, there was constant communication between ADB and the IA. Major concerns about the program were referred to the STEP UP Officer in ADB. Likewise, approvals of projects worth US \$50,000 were sent to ADB for immediate approval.

There were delays however in the replenishment of the imprest account, which affected the Implementing Agency's cash flow. The fluctuating exchange rate of the dollar to peso greatly affected the program funds especially during the latter part of the extension year when the peso was getting stronger against the dollar.

Overall, the input provision has been Highly Successful (HS), major needs of the communities were responded to and the funds adequately covered all the components of the STEP UP. Except for the timeline and the need for more in-depth social preparation and mobilization in the first two years of the project, there was enough to provide for a holistic community development for the sites identified. The program spent less than \$1,000 per household in 4 years to provide capability building, community infrastructure, housing improvement, livelihood loan assistance and risk reduction interventions. The STEP UP benefited a total of 9,126 HH or at least 45,000 urban poor individuals.

#### **16. Evaluation of Outputs and Results** *(Reports generated, institution building, training, analysis of quality, comparison with terms of references, sustainability and exit strategy):*

Overall, we can say that the program was able to produce the desired results with the minimum expense but through a lot of hardwork and beyond the timeframe that was originally proposed.

The specific outputs expected from the program are the 1) formation of BCG, MSG and strengthening of HOAs; 2) establishment of revolving Fund for Housing with at least 95% repayment rate; 3) Livelihood Loan provision with at least

95% repayment rate, 4) provision of community infrastructure to all HOAs to improve access to basic services and, 5) development of site-specific risk reduction management program for each HOA.

The aspect that took the longest time was the social preparation of the HOAs and the establishment of the BCGs and MSGs. Although in terms of cost, this aspect has been one of the components with minimal budget allocation. Expenses for training, seminars and workshops as well as project management costs account for less than 13% of the total budget yet it was the key to the successful implementation of the civil works projects and establishment of revolving funds for housing and livelihood that took up more than 80% of the STEP UP budget.

In very specific aspects per component, Partnership Building with LGUs had not been very efficient. We can only claim a success rate of roughly 50% of all the participating cities who were engaged actively in STEP UP. Considering the effort invested in meeting and dealing with the LGU, particularly the Chief Executives or the Mayor, we didn't have much success in that area. No formal MOA has been executed and no firm commitment from the LGUs for the program was obtained. We were mostly working with them on a per project basis. The fact that STEP UP is actually a program implemented in partnership with HUDCC and DOF was not highlighted and thus, was not used to leverage higher LGU participation.

For the business sector, we were able to mobilize resources from more than 70 companies for STEP UP. The reach is not that wide yet considering the available or potential pool of companies operating in Metro Manila. In the four years of STEP UP, there were companies who constantly provided support and project funds for the program. There were also those who participated in one-time giving or project involvement. PBSP is still working on harnessing other companies' support for STEP UP.

In the area of HOA capability building, a lot of time was spent in strengthening the organizational, financial and project management skills of the officers. Numerous training on leadership, management, teambuilding and planning as well as estate management, para-legal and collection efficiency, to name a few, have been conducted for the HOAs. Coaching and learning sessions were also scheduled per HOA to monitor and follow through the skills building exercises in the classroom. In the four years of STEP UP, the HOAs were gradually moved from the formation (level 1) to consolidation stage (level 2).

Originally, the community infrastructure projects were designed to be implemented on the first year of the program. However, given the existing capacity of the HOAs, there was a need to focus more on the capability building. Initially, some projects were directly implemented by PBSP but since the communities are expected to take the lead in project implementation, investment in the building of capacities was prioritized and project implementation was deferred. Towards the latter part of the program, the HOAs were able to make up for the lost time by implementing multiple projects through the functioning committees created. There were more officers who are working with PBSP in developing, implementing and monitoring the projects in infrastructure, housing and livelihood. More youth are also now involved and are being trained to become second-line leaders for the associations.

Some components were also combined or integrated during the project implementation stage. The risk reduction and management component was integrated in the design and conceptualization of the community infrastructure and housing projects. This resulted to being able to address two or more pressing concerns or situations with one project.

There was a significant increase in the number of target HOAs served by the program. From 23 communities in 9 cities PBSP was able to implement STEP UP in 34 communities in 8 cities in Metro Manila. Total number of households reached also increased from 5,823 to 9,126 (56% increase).

The revolving fund for housing improvement was increased by 44% from the original target of \$1,200,000. The actual housing loan fund stands at US\$1,727,715. However, the beneficiary reach was significantly lower than 70% of the target urban poor households, which was set at 4,130 HH out of the 5,823 HH. In reality, the housing improvement loan was extended to 1,212 HH which is 16% of the actual 7,410 HH in the 8 cities where STEP UP was implemented. The 7,410 HH does not include the HH beneficiaries in Valenzuela since the housing loan assistance was not extended to them. This is roughly 30% only of the original target. The increased loan ceiling and the actual number of beneficiaries interested and capable of obtaining a loan account for the marked increase in the number of HH provided with housing loan assistance. Repayment stands at 95% from HOA to PBSP.

The revolving fund for livelihood was reduced from US\$500,000 to US\$113,690 with the corresponding reduction in the original target beneficiary reach from 2,550 HH (out of 5,823) to just 852 HH. The repayment rate from livelihood is also significantly lower than the target. Current collection efficiency is at 70% compared with the 95% target. Economic crises and natural calamities affect the income of the communities, especially those that are daily wage earners. There were also issues of integrity that affected collection in some HOAs. Although these are being addressed, the effect on overall repayment rate is not easily overcome.

PBSP has committed to continue to support the different Homeowners Associations until they are ready to graduate or phase out of the program. To date, at least 50% of the HOAs are projected for phase out by June 2007. A review will be

conducted on the existing constitution and by laws of the HOAs, as well as estate management plans, policies on housing, livelihood, and donated materials to the HOA to ensure these are updated and revised accordingly if needed. As early as the third year, the HOAs were already being prepared for the eventual exit of PBSP. That is the reason why all their systems are installed and the necessary capability building to enhance their management skills and increase their confidence in managing their affairs are provided. All projects implemented were audited and the results are discussed with the HOA. They were expected to respond to the audit findings. Some technical assistance was provided but the HOAs take the lead in resolving the major problems surfaced during the audit. All these are being done with the end view of enabling the HOA to be able to manage their organizational affairs.

PBSP continue to look for and sustain education-related and jobs-generating opportunity for the members of the homeowners associations. Since education is also one of the primary expressed needs in the urban poor areas, efforts are being extended to address this through scholarships while matching up the employable skills in the HOAs with the businesses are also being done to address economic needs. The manpower groups that were formed are also still in the formation or start-up phase and will need some form of assistance until they can embark on their own ventures.

Aside from the investment and preparations in terms of human resource, there are also programs in place to respond to financial sustainability of the HOAs. The interest earned from the housing and livelihood loan assistance projects managed by the HOA should enable them to extend credit to more beneficiaries. For the housing loan, the HOA earns 4% while for Livelihood Loans, the HOAs can earn up to 12% from the loans extended. This could cover both administrative expenses and provide additional funds to loan out to more beneficiaries. The concept of Capital Build Up (CBU) for the members were also incorporated in the loan policies so that they also get to save and support the operations of their HOA by infusing capital through their individual shares invested in the projects.

Since the loan exposures ranged from 5 to 7 years, PBSP's presence should still be felt in the communities to ensure repayment, and to see to it that the HOA are able to re-lend the interest earning from the housing and livelihood funds to new borrowers either in the same community or in nearby/adjacent areas. Likewise, given the development stage of some of the HOAs, PBSP will need to continue to monitor the HOAs.

## **17. Overall Assessment and Rating (HS,S,PS,U):**

Overall assessment for STEP UP is **Successful (S)**. The main purpose of the program has been achieved and although there were some changes in the actual outputs compared with the plans, there were valid reasons for these deviations. The program was able to demonstrate different modes by which the business sector can participate in urban poverty alleviation. Likewise, it also showed that the Homeowners Associations have the capability to rise above their current condition with support from other sectors. The most significant accomplishment is in showing the credit worthiness of the urban poor. These people from the informal sector managed to implement their own housing loan programs and register high repayment rates at 95%. This could open up other opportunities for them to access other credit facilities beyond the loan sharks in the communities if they continue to demonstrate their credit-worthiness.

The program also showcased the transformation of the urban poor communities in varying degrees, depending on their initial situation. Some communities had dramatic and remarkable physical improvement while others seemed to have minimal changes from the perspectives of outsiders but given the original blighted conditions, the beneficiaries would swear that there had been marked improvement in their already. Both on-site and off-site development projects were implemented and these were all community-led and managed.

The grant activities contributed to the success of the program. The pilot stage provided insights on areas where there should be changes or modification in order to effect real and felt changes in the urban poor communities.

All in all, STEP-UP is a success because it meets a real and urgent need. It is a need felt by the communities themselves, the donors, the corporations, the local governments, and all those who believe that urban poverty can be alleviated or at least reduced. It has shown a way by which assistance can be maximized through a focused and targeted intervention implemented within a framework of believing and trusting in what people can do and providing them the means to fulfill their dreams.

## **18. Major Lessons Learned:**

- 1) "Start from where the people are." This is a cardinal dictum in community development that is often forgotten in the rush to get things done or to meet targets. But it is the starting point for trust and developing a sense of ownership. Thus it must be repeated again and again. The program has demonstrated how STEP-UP first went to the communities, listened to what they wanted, what they could do, how much they could put in or pay; and built its plans from there. This calls for consultation and participation.

- 2) Develop and strengthen partnerships between the communities, business, the LGUs, and others who have a stake in well-planned and functional communities. In the STEP-UP communities, partnerships are strong—vertically or horizontally. And these are legitimized and institutionalized through written policies, ordinances and memoranda of agreement.
- 3) Provide avenues to promote synergy in the partnerships, such as the ShopCom and the Multisectoral Groups. It is in these structures that donors, government and the homeowners associations come together to assess their progress and jointly plan their next steps.
- 4) Develop a framework for strategic and targeted focus of assistance. The donors not only were willing to help; they also wanted to know how they would be most effective and how their contribution would contribute to the viability of the project. This was made possible through an institution-building framework that plots out the stages of group development and details the roles and tasks of the groups, PBSP and other NGOs, the corporations and the government.
- 5) Promote the concept of community as an estate — well-planned, self-sufficient, self-reliant with its rules and regulations, basic amenities and facilities to cope with disasters.
- 6) Maximize volunteerism from the private sector. In the project, the corporations not only gave funds but also volunteered their time and talents as extra pairs of hands, mentors, or technical advisors. This has forged camaraderie and has educated both the givers and the receivers on the uniqueness and limitations of each other.
- 7) Align corporations' contributions with their main line of business or Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) preferences to make their participation more meaningful and enhance their motivation. The contributions of Meralco, Phelps Dodge, PLDT, Holcim, Monark are examples of aligning contributions with core business; those of Citibank are examples of alignment with CSR interests.
- 8) Promote community participation in identifying and carrying out projects, for this results in a feeling of accomplishment, self-confidence and, ultimately, ownership of the project. There is another oft-repeated dictum in development, which states that projects succeed only to the extent that the end-users own them. In the STEP-UP communities, the livelihood projects thrive and infrastructure projects are completed because, owning them, the homeowners exert every effort to make them succeed.
- 9) Institutionalize good practices, such as rules, regulations and systems through the by-laws of the homeowners associations, estate management policies and ordinances from the LGUs. Capability-building workshops, meetings, joint planning sessions and the creation of structures like the ShopCom are essential activities to ensure such institutionalization.
- 10) Provide economic opportunities to increase the incomes of the homeowners, thereby enabling them to pay their loans and to have sustained access to health and other social services. In the STEP-UP communities, the variety of income-generating activities includes not only enterprises but also skills training for either employment or contracting, such as dressmaking, food processing, carpentry and masonry.
- 11) Formulate cost-recovery schemes from the housing and enterprise projects to ensure the availability of funds, ultimately, the sustainability of the project. Loans are given at market rates, proving that communities can afford, and are willing to pay for, quality services. This also develops the people's sense of responsibility—they must pay their loans so that others, too, can be helped. Moreover, this promotes the beneficiaries' self-worth and dignity, knowing that their houses or enterprises were "earned", not doled out.
- 12) Identify, develop and support project champions — in the corporations and in government. STEP-UP has demonstrated that financial contributions, government assistance, and volunteerism increased because of the advocacy and infectious enthusiasm of believers in the project. As shown by the project, champions from the highest executive levels are the most effective. Support was given through PBSP's Corporate Citizenship Committee, Luzon Regional Committee and the Business Consensus Groups.
- 13) Leverage to increase funds and thereby upscale the project. It must be remembered that STEP-UP came to be because of the desire of PBSP to reach out to more areas in the metropolis, which it would not have accomplished with its own limited funds.
- 14) Find ways to help donors and financiers tailor their programs to the situation of the community. The employment of an NGO in this case PBSP, as anchor for the project, avoided the limitations brought about by their mandates of traditional sources of funds such as the government housing agencies and the banks. It has been aid that it is the NGOs that have the patience and passion to work with communities and STEP-UP is once more a proof of this. This passion and patience is important, for the work requires understanding the needs and appreciating the uniqueness and capabilities of the urban poor.

- 15) Trust the community. Despite difficulties from entrenched practices, beliefs, attitudes, worldviews, pessimism and apathy of the communities, the donors gave because they saw that behind the tough, if not resigned, suspicious stance was the desire and determination for a better life—with a little help from friends, as one community puts it. Once they were given the means, the homeowners largely took it upon themselves to create order, to build the needed infrastructure, to acquire skills and to do the tasks they need to improve themselves and their communities.

## **19. Recommendations and Follow-up Actions:**

Based on PBSP's experience in implementing the pilot stage of the STEP UP, some changes and enhancements on the overall program concept are necessary. The holistic and multisectoral approach to the different components shall be retained but specific strategies implemented may need revision. In light of the four-year experience during the pilot stage of STEP UP, the following are recommended:

### **Partnership Building**

- Pursue a formal Memorandum of Agreement between all partners (LGU, community and even the business sector) clarifying rules of engagement, roles and expectations, including counterpart contributions and commitment to the program. This will also be helpful when pushing for the urban poor development agenda at the local levels.
- Refine the Transformational Framework for HOA with the corresponding curriculum to achieve Institution Building Agenda for the target HOA. The major aspects being looked at right not are the organizational, project, finance and estate management capabilities of the HOA. The advocacy aspect should also be strengthened. More specific and realistic performance indicators should be drawn up based on the 4-years experience in dealing with the urban poor homeowners associations.
- Stronger tie-up with the other programs dealing with the urban poor and the housing situation in the Philippines should also be explored to avoid duplication of efforts and to have a wider reach in terms of beneficiaries. Strategically mapping where and what other organizations are already doing would also help the program achieve greater impact.
- Introduce and institutionalize the conduct of community surveys such as the MBN, CBPIMS or a similar tool that the communities can administer and interpret themselves to enable them to track their own baseline information and anchor their plans based on the results of the survey.

### **Community Infrastructure and Facilities**

- Prioritize crafting a long-term (3-5 years) community development master plan before any infrastructure projects and housing/livelihood interventions are introduced. The plan should also provide for the timeline for the incremental development with the corresponding budget allocation and sources of funds.
- Risk mapping should be done prior to the community development planning so that risks mitigating measures can be integrated in the proposed site development projects.
- Consider how the site development projects in the target communities would also affect nearby or adjacent communities (e.g., drainage outflow, elevation of the road, ingress/egress, social issues/dynamics between associations)
- Environmental and health/sanitation and other basic services concerns must be given equal attention in the community development plan and not just the infrastructures like road, drainage and MPCs.
- STEP UP should set a ceiling or maximum budget per household as rough guide in setting the community development fund. Based on experience, road & drainage projects costs around Php12,000 per household or Php1,200 per linear meter, including the counterpart, while multi-purpose centers can be built at Php300,000 to Php 500,000/building. This way, the community would also have a guide in planning their site upgrading projects.

### **Housing Improvement**

- There should be stricter implementation of the criteria on land security/ownership to avoid problems in land disputes that could affect any post-land acquisition programs, especially given the heavy investment on infrastructure. Complete documents and clearance must be secured/submitted by the HOAs. The community mortgage should be taken out and good repayment is maintained for the past six months (at least 85% CER).
- Estate management planning should be done at the start of the program, and this should be cascaded to the members and regularly revisited with the entire community, to check whether these are complied with.
- Technical assistance on house design and construction is a requirement. The condition of the borrower's house and lot (whether for new construction or house improvement, amount of landfill needed, etc.) must be assessed along with the capacity to pay. A design with the corresponding bill of materials must be prepared prior to release of any loan. Experience has shown that a number of borrowers embarked on building or upgrading their housing structure without any concrete plans thus, some were left unfinished when funds ran out especially when they under-estimated the amount needed for the construction.
- A forced savings scheme shall be imposed upon those who are interested to avail of the housing loan. A period

of at least 6 months is needed to ensure the borrowers can come up with the required counterpart or equity aside from developing the habit of setting aside money even before they start the amortization for the housing loan. This is also a good way to show level of commitment.

- Another option that can be explored is the provision of Incremental Loan Availment scheme. Rather than immediately applying for the maximum loan amount, borrowers will initially be given a smaller amount payable in a shorter period of time. They can avail of the higher amount after they have shown a good track record in paying their initial loan. This should encourage good repayment by having the option to renew their loan as an incentive. This will also lessen the risk, and the interest being paid by the borrower as well as increase the turn around of the funds given the shorter loan term. Right now, the maximum affordable amortization rate that the HOA members can pay for is at Php1,800 a month for 7 years (around \$35/month).
- An alternative scheme for the poorest members of the community should also be explored. At least 20% of the urban poor communities have members who are really in dire need to upgrade their housing structure but are not in a position to avail of the regular loan. Some schemes that can be explored are: extended loan duration, (10 years instead of 7 years), lower interest (4% instead of 6%), providing partial loan and grant, etc. Very clear criteria should be drawn up and the selection procedure for the “poorest of the poor” who could avail of the special housing loan assistance should be participated in by the entire community to avoid conflict and issues.

#### **Microenterprise and Livelihood Assistance**

- If the target
- Arrangements for the livelihood loan assistance can take several forms – if the HOA has been assessed as having the capability, HOA-managed livelihood project is still the preference; otherwise, if this is not really feasible, working with a cooperative or linking them with a micro-finance institution can be explored.
- Business advising and technical assistance in managing their enterprise should be offered. Most of the problems encountered in the repayment of the livelihood loan stems from unsuccessful ventures that did not increase the income of the borrower but instead mired them into debt.
- Continue with the skills training component but stronger tie-up with employers or companies should be looked at to ensure employment or ready market for the skilled workers.
- There is a big population of out-of-school youth in the urban poor communities and there should be specific intervention for them to enhance their employability or earning capacity if formal tertiary education is not an option. Investing in vocational training for the youth can be seriously considered since these OSYs are more available to attend skills upgrading compared with their parents who are already working

#### **Risk Reduction and Management**

- As mentioned earlier, risk mapping must be done in the early part of the community development planning stage to ensure that these are integrated in any proposed infrastructure projects
- Each community should have a stronger tie-up with the concerned local agencies such as the Disaster Coordinating Councils, DSWD or the Bureau of Fire Protection and Management, especially for those that are still within or near danger zones or are disaster-prone areas.

#### **20. Additional Remarks, Comments and Suggestions:**

### **III. PREPARATION AND APPROVAL**

<b>Prepared by:</b>	<b>Name of Person and designation / Name of Institution / Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
<b>1. Representative from the Recipient:</b>	<b>Gil T. Salazar Executive Director Philippine Business for Social Progress</b>	<b>April 30, 2007</b>
<b>2. Manager, JFPR-GIU<sup>2</sup>:</b>		
<b>3. Project Officer, ADB:</b>		

<sup>2</sup> GIU=grant implementation unit (formerly called PIU=project implementation unit)



---

Approved	Name of Person and designation / Name of Institution / Signature	Date
1. Director General, Department, ADB:		
2. Division/Country Director, ADB:		
3. Head of the Recipient:		
4. Head of the Executing Agency:		
5. Head of Implementing Agency:	Gil T. Salazar <i>Executive Director</i> Philippine Business for Social Progress	April 30, 2007