

008 371

AID

D29.4

R44

1979

DIC

AID  
D29.4  
R44  
1979  
DIC

ME  
4/14/94

PD-ABP-949

95935

492-0304

USAID/PHILIPPINES  
DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION CENTER

Evaluation - Budget/Finance  
RURAL SERVICE CENTER PROJECT

by mila Refuma

USAID/PHILIPPINES  
DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION CENTER

## INTRODUCTION

The evaluation study focuses on critical factors that impact on the successful accomplishment of project objectives. Specifically, this study focuses on the appraisal of the financial planning and financial resource administration processes of the USAID and GOP inputs as provided for in the project agreement. Since resources flow from the national level through the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development to the city and to the Barangay, this report was structured to cover the functional aspects of budget and financial administration including processes and linkages between:

- a) MLGCD and CDAP
- b) CDAP and the RSC cities
- c) RSC cities and the Barangays

This report provides for:

1. An assessment of the internal organization and processes of budgeting and management at all levels;
2. A review of the current status of accounts or fund utilization;
3. Analyses of problems or constraints to the flow of resources; and
4. Recommendations for strengthening the various processes and improvements in the flow.

ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL ORGANIZATION AND  
PROCESSES OF BUDGETING AND MANAGEMENT

The flow of financial resources begin with the preparation of the budget proposal by CDAP. This then is submitted to PDAP whereby PDAP collates the budget proposals of the three other <sup>SPECIAL</sup> projects under its umbrella. PDAP, in turn, submits a budget proposal to the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development which collates the proposals of all agencies under it. The Budget for the Ministry is submitted to the Ministry of the Budget for Review.

One aspect of the review process by the Ministry of the budget includes looking at compliance with agreements made with international agencies and the extent to which the proposals are in consonance with those stipulated by the agreement. The reviewed budget is submitted to the IBP for approval and incorporation in the General Appropriations Act.

Based on approved appropriations, the agency is to prepare a schedule of quarterly releases requested and releases are made on the basis of such. Budget releases for the CDAP Program have been criticized as not having "been up to expectation"<sup>1</sup>. Judgments have been made on the basis of what has been released vs what has been requested or what has been released vs what has been stipulated by the Project agreement.

---

<sup>1</sup>Mayfield Evaluation

The analysis here attempts to show that the problem has not been so much as lack of funds as it is of the inability of cities to absorb immediately the financial stress implied by its participation in the Program compounded by the inability of CDAP to efficiently deliver the inputs required to effectively carry out the objectives of the Program.

The problem proceeds from a misconception of the intent of the original agreement of how much inputs the National Government is to provide the Program.

Exhibit 1 shows Budget requests and budget releases for the CDAP Program in 1978 and 1979.

On the assumption of a ₱500,000 Fixed Amount Reimbursement for social action projects for each of 5 cities in 1978, CDAP requested the amount of ₱5,116,000<sup>to</sup> be released, ₱223,000 for seed money and ₱4,348,000 for reimbursements. In 1979, the request for the same purpose was ₱5.5 million, ₱825,000 for seed money and ₱4,675,000 for reimbursements. The financial schedule attached to the Project agreement, apparently implied a one-time ₱500,000 grant to each of the cities. The amount programmed for reimbursement of social action projects for each of the years 1978 and 1979 was only ₱2,452,600. There was, therefore, no reduction of the amounts allocated for SAP in 1978 and 1979, amounts stipulated by the Project agreement were simply being complied with.

4

Exhibit 1

CDAP BUDGET REQUESTS AND RELEASES

	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u> <u>Original</u>	<u>1979</u> <u>Revised</u>
<u>Budget Requests:</u>			
Current Operating Expenses			
1. Personal Services	P 184,900	P 126,400	P 402,050
2. Project Activities (Surveys & Training)	433,000	493,000	1,841,800
3. Supplies and Materials	60,000	83,000	150,000
4. Equipment Outlay	<u>8,000</u>	<u>40,000</u>	<u>630,200</u>
Sub-Total	P <u>686,900</u>	P <u>742,400</u>	P <u>3,044,000</u>
Capital Outlay			
1. Reimbursement for SAP	P4,347,800	P4,675,000	P3,909,000
2. Seed Money	767,200	825,000	690,000
3. EPL Reimbursement	<u>3,000,000</u>	<u>3,200,000</u>	<u>P2,800,000</u>
Sub-Total	<u>P8,115,000</u>	<u>P8,700,000</u>	<u>P7,399,000</u>
Total Budget Requests	<u>P8,801,900</u>	<u>P8,700,000</u>	<u>P7,399,000</u>

5

Exhibit 1 (Con't.)

Budget Releases

Current Operating Expenses	₱ <u>686,900</u>	₱ <u>748,400</u>
% of budget request	(100.0%)	(100.0%)
Capital Outlay		
1. Reimbursement of SAP	₱ 26,019	₱1,013,273
2. Seed Money	163,818	171,246
3. EPL Reimbursement	<u>400,000</u>	<u>400,000</u>
Sub-Total	₱ <u>589,837</u>	₱ <u>2,402,519</u>
% of requests	(7.3%)	(27.6%)
Total Released	₱ <u>1,276,737</u>	₱ <u>3,144,914</u>
% of Budget Request	(14.5%)	(26.8%)

*request of for*

The release of ₱3 million in 1978 and ₱3.2 million in 1979 for equipment pool loan reimbursements was also made. The Project agreement stipulated only ₱1,278,000 for equipment pool loan reimbursements for each of these years.

Allocations for capital outlay for 1978 and 1979 had to be limited to the amounts stipulated by the contract. The requests for capital outlay in the amounts of ₱8.1 million in 1978 and ₱8.7 million in 1979 could not have been approved by the Ministry of the Budget.

The table shows that actual releases for current operating expenses were equal to the amounts requested in 1978 and in the original request for 1979. The releases for capital outlay were indeed very low compared to the requested amounts which accounts for the low proportion of total released to total requested.

But even if the requests for releases for capital outlay were limited to the stipulated amounts in the contract, releases for capital outlay had to be made on the basis of actual projects being undertaken and completed. Seed money is to be released upon presentation of authorities to proceed for proposed projects, reimbursement for social action projects and equipment pool loans are to be released only upon completion of the projects through cash disbursement ceilings.

Actual releases for capital outlay in 1978 and 1979 were low because:

1. Requests for seed money amounted to only ₱163,818 in 1978 and ₱171,246 in 1979;

2. Only 2 requests for reimbursement were forwarded totalling ₱26,019 in 1978 and 3 projects totalling ₱1 million in 1979;

3. Only one request for EPL reimbursement was made in 1978 in the amount of ₱400,000 and three in 1979 totalling ₱1,200,000

One of the problems or constraints to the flow of resources is the financial capability of cities to undertake projects of the magnitude provided by the Program.

Inasmuch as the program operates on a fixed amount reimbursement scheme, participating cities have to advance operating funds to complete the project before reimbursements can be made. Amounts to be spent, therefore, for the implementation of social action projects and for equipment pool development have to be incorporated in the cities <sup>or</sup> annual budgets. This means that an estimated amount of ₱625,000 for social action projects have to be appropriated each year and ₱400,000 for equipment pool construction once during the three-year period, if the city is to take full advantage of the reimburseable amounts provided.

Considering that increases in locally generated funds have been barely sufficient to cover for the increasing costs of government administration (including increased cost due to participation in CDAP, i.e., cost of training, additional staff requirements, organization of the poor, barangay surveys, etc.) difficulties of appropriating the amounts in the

budget ( particularly in the first year of participation) arose.

The logical source of appropriations for these projects would have been the 20% development fund authorized by P.D. 144. Have funds been made available for the projects from these source in the first year of project implementation, cash flow difficulties would not arise, Reimbursements for the first set of projects could be used for the implementation of the next year's set of projects. But the 20% development fund has been eyed by most national government agencies as the source of funding for projects in the cities requiring local counterpart funding. These funds are almost eaten up by appropriations required for Barangay Prigades, BLISS projects of the Ministry of Human Settlements, nutrition projects of the Nutrition Council, family planning projects of the Population Commission, etc. Then there is the problem of the city that participates not only in the CDAP Program but also the other PDAP special programs--RRP, RPTA, and BWP--all requiring the cities to advance funds for projects that will be later reimbursed,

Since potential reimbursements are legitimate anticipated income for the city and may be reflected in the budget to partly offset the appropriations required to implement social action projects or equipment pool development, some cities did just that and got the required amounts appropriated in the regular annual budgets. This, however, did not

prevent cash flow difficulties from arising, since these are revenues that are not to be received until the project is completed. Whatever revenue is collected by the city, <sup>from its regular sources</sup> is first used to meet the costs of government administration, i.e., personnel and maintenance and operating costs. Releases of funds for projects not covered by appropriations from the 20% development fund are made only when commitments for personnel and necessary maintenance and operating expenses have been covered by the amount of revenue collected. The seed money concept that was precisely designed to avoid financial difficulties in getting projects started has not worked in practice since they were hardly made available at the time needed. It has also happened, in the case of funds having been appropriated in the budget that at the time funding becomes available, authorities to proceed for the projects have not come. The results have been: (1) the available funds <sup>d</sup> were diverted to other expenditures or other projects resulting in financial difficulties when the authority to proceed for a SAP project eventually ~~comes~~; or (2) projects <sup>were</sup> ~~are~~ started without the corresponding authority to proceed which is why some projects have managed to get finished on schedule and for which the authorities to proceed had to be antedated to qualify for reimbursement.

In some cases where appropriations have not been made in the regular budget, these were incorporated in supplemental budgets as funds became available. But, as the number of supplemental budgets passed in a given year somehow reflects on the planning efficiency of local governments,

treasurers are reluctant to propose the enactment of supplemental budgets. The perennial "no funds available" reason is given. There is a limit therefore to how many projects can find their way in supplemental budgets and unless reimbursements can be made available, the enactment of supplemental budgets for appropriations of social action projects are made difficult to come.

Exhibit 2 roughly indicates how much cities have been able to appropriate for social action projects and equipment pool construction either in the regular budget or in supplemental budgets during their first year of project implementation. The three cities with no projects in 1978 and 1979 were excluded in the analysis.

It will be noted that no city has been able to appropriate P625,000 for social action projects in the first year of implementation at the same time appropriate for the equipment pool development. More worthy of note is the fact that even as cities like Butuan, Puerto Princesa and Cagayan de Oro have been able to appropriate as large amounts as indicated, completion of these projects were not accomplished within the year indicated. Cash flow difficulties compounded by other difficulties relating to first-year requirements have impeded the city's capacity to implement and complete projects in the first year of participation amounting to the appropriations made.

Exhibit 2

FIRST YEAR PROJECTS AND STATUS OF COMPLETION

<u>Cities</u>	<u>Appropriated Amounts</u>		<u>Completed Projects</u>	
	<u>SAP</u>	<u>EPL</u>	<u>SAP</u>	<u>EPL</u>
1. Cagayan de Oro	₱323,650	₱400,000	₱323,650	
2. Dagupan	-	400,000		X
3. Puerto Princesa	247,060	400,000	214,000	
4. Roxas	156,080	400,000	-	
5. Naga	254,000	-	-	
6. Butuan	339,800	400,000	230,000	X
7. Calbayog	100,000	-	-	
8. Lipa	150,000	-	150,000	
9. Legazpi	125,000	-	125,000	
10. Olongapo	200,000	-	-	
11. Batangas	57,000	-	57,000	
12. Lucena	40,000	-	40,000	
13. Zamboanga	230,527	-	-	

X - completed in the same year

---

In the case of Butuan, while it has been able to complete the construction of the equipment pool, it has not been able to complete two projects with a total cost of ₱110,000. On the other hand, Puerto Princesa has been able

complete 6 projects with a total worth of ₱214,000 while Cagayan was able to complete all its 5 projects amounting to ₱323,650 at the expense presumably of delaying their EP construction. It will also be noted that Puerto Princesa appropriated only ₱164,000 for one project while Cagayan appropriated only ₱10,800 for projects the following year even with its receipt of reimbursements. Efforts were apparently put into the completion of their equipment pool construction. The other cities have lower appropriations and lower amounts of completed projects. One city, Dagupan, was not able to appropriate any amount for SAP the first year but was able to appropriate the amount for equipment pool construction and to finish the implementation of that project in the same year.

The reimbursements for first year projects have apparently helped the cities in its second year of implementation in one or several of the following ways: (1) increasing appropriations for social action projects; (2) enabling appropriations for equipment pool construction and actual implementation of such since appropriations for SAP are augmented by reimbursements; (3) facilitated the completion of uncompleted projects; and (5) facilitated the start as well as the completion of new projects.

REVIEW OF CURRENT STATUS OF ACCOUNTS  
OR FUND UTILIZATION

Per sixth amendment of June 30, 1980 of the original GOP/USA project agreement of March 1978, the Republic of the Philippines is to make available the equivalent amount in pesos of \$6,396,000 over the period 1978-1989 for the CDAP/RSC project. Of the amount, \$5,240,000 is to be allocated for loans/grants to cities, \$1,010,000 for CDAP office and support and \$146,000 as a NEDA trust fund.

This review will cover only the current status of accounts of the loans/grants to cities because of difficulties in segregating actual expenditures for CDAP office and support for the years 1978 and 1979.

of the \$5,240,000 (P39,300,000) for loans/grants to cities only P33,647,200 have been programmed to date. The data is given in exhibit 3.

Equipment Pool Loan Reimbursement

Each of the 16 cities participating in the program are qualified to avail of the P400,000 equipment pool loan reimbursement. The loan is a no-collateral contract payable in ten years, bearing a 4% interest per annum computed at the lower remaining balance and with a grace period of one year. The loan covers phase I of the Equipment pool Development plan which includes essential building and related facilities. The city selects that portion of its EPDP which

Exhibit 3

PROGRAM OF EXPENDITURES FOR LOANS/GRANTS TO CITIES

1. Equipment Pool loan Reimbursement		
16 cities at ₱400,000 @		₱ 6,400,000
2. Reimbursements for Social Action Projects		
1978 - ₱2,452,600		
1979 - 2,452,600		
1980 - 8,000,000		
1981 - <u>8,000,000</u>		20,905,200
3. Reimbursement for Social Action Training		
16 cities at ₱10,000 @		160,000
4. Reimbursement for implementation of Road Network Development Planning		
1980 - 9 cities at ₱30,000@		
1981 - 9 cities at ₱50,000@		720,000
5. Reimbursement for socio-economic survey and computerization		
1980 - 16 cities at ₱15,000@		
1981 - 16 cities at ₱50,000@		540,000
6. Augmentation Funds		
1980 - ₱2,461,000		
1981 - <u>₱2,461,000</u>		<u>4,992,000</u>
Total Amount Programmed		₱33,647,200
Unprogrammed Amount		<u>5,652,800</u>
Total for loans/grants to cities per project agreement		₱39,300,000

15

it wishes to construct with loan funds. The city obtains the loan for reimbursement of the completed project upon certification of compliance with agreed plans and specifications.

To date, only the amount of ₱1.6 million has been expended for equipment pool loan reimbursements, although substantial amounts have been programmed each year by CDAP. Only four cities (Dagupan, Cagayan de Oro, Butuan and Pureto Princesa) have so far availed of the loan reimbursement. While 8 cities have submitted loan applications to CDAP, the expended amount is likely to increase to only ₱2.4 million before the end of the fiscal year with two more cities (Legazpi and Roxas) possibly being able to complete their respective projects and getting their reimbursements. One other city (Lipa) which equipment pool project is on-going expressed intent to waive its allocation. One other city, Olongapo, has its application awaiting approval. Two Cities (Batangas and Naga) which previously waived its allocation now along with five other cities have expressed intent to avail of the reimbursement allocation. Actual loan reimbursements are not likely to be made until next year tho'. The amount of ₱2.8 million for EPL reimbursements have been appropriated in the 1981 budget.

In effect, the proportion of the total allocation for EPL reimbursement is liketly to reach a maximum of only 81% since total expended amounts for this purpose is likely to reach a maximum of ₱5.2 million only.

## Social Action Projects

While existing documents relating to appropriations for social action projects almost invariably state that each city was to be provided a fund of ₱500,000 yearly from the time of entry of the city into the program for city social action projects, yet, the financial schedule for project funds attached to the signed project agreements stipulate the intent to provide each city only one ₱500,000 allocation for the whole life of the project. The original financial schedule programmed only the amount of ₱7,356,000 for the three-year life of the program and this amount was for 15 cities. A decision was later made to take in one more city. The amounts programmed in said financial schedule required the release of the amount of ₱2,452,600 for each of the years 1978 and 1979. The financial agreement was amended in 1980 and to reflect the intent to give each city the ₱500,000 allotments per year, the amount for loans/grants to cities was increased. This enabled the amount of ₱8 million to be programmed for each year of 1980 and 1981 for social action projects.

The decision to distribute the ₱2,452,600 programmed for 1978 to 10 cities instead of 5 may not have been at all unjustified. With the voluminous first-year requirements, it was not likely that any city would have been able to organize for any more projects than it had been able to.

Exhibit 4

STATUS OF FUND UTILIZATION FOR  
SOCIAL ACTION PROJECTS

<u>1978</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Projects submitted for Review	18	
Projects issued AP	18	₱1,107,050 (FAR)
Seed money Released	15	163,818
Projects completed to date	17	"
Projects Reimbursed	19	843,432
Projects Reimbursements in Process	2	58,150
Projects still on-going	1	41,650
 <u>1979</u>		
Projects submitted for Review	32	
Projects issued AP	27	₱1,886,455 (FAR)
Seed Money Released	17	171,246
Projects Completed to date	23	
Projects Reimbursed	7	213,860
Projects Reimbursement in process	16	924,899
Projects still on-going	4	576,450
 <u>1980</u>		
Projects submitted for review	106	
Projects issued AP	67	₱3,602,498 (FAR)
Seed Money Released	5	31,664
Projects completed to date	8	
Projects Reimbursed	6	153,000
Projects Reimbursements in Process	2	62,040
Projects on-going	59	3,355,794

Exhibit 4 (Con't)

1978 - 1980

Projects submitted for Review

Projects Issued AP	112	76,596,003 (FAR)
Seed Money Released	44	366,728
Projects completed	48	
Projects Reimbursed	28	1,210,292
Projects Reimbursement in Process	20	1,045,089
Projects on-going	64	3,973,894

In fact, only six cities were able to organize themselves for SAP that year and the total reimburseable amounts for the approved projects of these cities hardly reached their allocated amount of ₦245,260.

Eighteen projects with a total fixed amount reimburseable of ₦1,107,050 were submitted that year which were all issued authorities to proceed. This amount represents what the Ministry of the Budget would have been able to release for social action projects that year, and represents only 45% of the amount allocated. Of the 18 projects, only 13 projects were completed that year, two other projects were completed in 1979, and one project remains uncompleted to date.

A total of ₦1,007,250 have been released representing 91% of the amount to be released that year. A breakdown shows that ₦163,818 was released in the form of seed money and ₦843,432 in the form of subsequent reimbursements. The amount of ₦99,800 is still to be released, ₦58,150 for two projects whose reimbursements are in process and ₦41,650 for a project that is still on-going.

In 1979, only 12 out of 16 cities submitted 32 projects for review. 27 projects with a total of only ₦1,886,455 were issued authorities to proceed. This amount represents only 77% of the total amount allocated for SAP that year. This amount could have been increased to ₦2,086,455 or 85% of the amount appropriated had one project with a total FAR of ₦200,000 been approved that year. The project was approved the next year.

Of the total amount (P1,886,455) to be released, only the amount of P385,106 or 20% has so far been released (P171,246 as seed money and P213,860 as subsequent reimbursement for 7 projects). The amount of P1,509,349 remains to be released, P924,899 as subsequent reimbursements of projects completed and P576,450 for still uncompleted projects.

For 1978 and 1979, therefore, of a possible P4.9 million appropriations, only 61% could have been released, representing a total estimated amount of P3 million fixed amount reimbursements of 45 projects. Of the P3 million, an estimated total of P1.4 million has been released (P335,000 in the form of seed money and P1.08 million in the form of subsequent reimbursements). An estimated total of P1.6 million remains to be released, P1 million of which are for completed projects whose reimbursements are being processed and P.6 million for reimbursement of uncompleted projects.

In 1980, the amount of P8 million has been appropriated for social action projects for which cities are allocated P500,000 each. A total of 106 projects have been submitted of which only 67 have been issued authorities to proceed. Total fixed reimburseable amount for these 67 projects is P3,602,498 or 45% of the P8 million appropriated amount. Only P31,664, less than 1% of the total FAR of projects approved have so far been released as seed money. Subsequent reimbursements amounting to P153,000 have been made for six completed projects. Reimbursements of two other projects completed are in process amounting to P62,040.

There are still 39 projects awaiting authorities to proceed and **55%** of the ₱8 million appropriation still have to be programmed.

To date, therefore, over the three-year period, 1978-1980, a total of ₱12.9 million has been appropriated for social action projects. Only 112 projects with a total FAR of ₱6.6 million have been so far approved representing only 51.1% of the appropriated amount. Utilization of the appropriated amount could still be improved to 85.2% if the total appropriated amount of ₱8 million for 1980 is used up before the end of the fiscal year. Of the total possible release of ₱6.6 million, about 24% or ₱1.58 million have been released, ₱366,728 in the form of seed money and ₱1.2 million in the form of subsequent reimbursements for **28** completed projects. There are **20** completed projects awaiting reimbursements totalling ₱1 million representing 15.8% of the total possible release to date. A larger proportion of the amount (60.2%) or an estimated ₱4 million are for projects that are still to be completed this year.

#### Reimbursements for Social Action Training

Each of the 16 cities participating in the CDAP program are entitled to a maximum of ₱10,000 reimburseable amount for social action training. This means that ₱160,000 of the estimated ₱39.3 million programmed for loans/grants to cities are to be used for this purpose. To date, eleven of the cities have each received their ₱10,000 reimbursement. Five cities, namely Cagayan, Butuan, Dagupan, Zamboanga and

General Santos have not yet received their allocations. The amount of ₱50,000 for this purpose is therefore yet to be expended.

Reimbursements for Implementation of Road Network Development Planning

A pilot study is being presently undertaken in the City of Angeles for the implementation of Road Network development planning. The program seeks to assist nine cities in financing the preparation of a Road Network Development Plan in their respective localities. Each of nine cities are to be allocated ₱30,000 for 1980 and ₱50,000 for 1981. To date the project is being implemented in only one city and disbursements for this purpose to any of the cities have not been made.

Reimbursements for Socio-economic Survey and Computerization

To assist cities in the financing of a socio-economic survey required for the development of a comprehensive development program for the city, the Program is allocating the amount of ₱15,000 for each of the cities in 1980 and ₱50,000 in 1981 to reimburse expenses incurred for the conduct of such survey. Computerization of the data is also going to be undertaken and technical assistance is presently being provided some of the cities to speed up collation and analysis of the data.

Augmentation Funds

The amount of ₱2,461,000 has been programmed by the Ministry of the Budget in 1980 to be used to subsidize depressed cities not participating in the CDAP Program to enable them to benefit from the CDAP program giving priority in such augmentation to Regions II, VII and XII, subject to sec. 40 of P.D. 1177 and in compliance with the conditions of the USAID Agreement. Since per National Budget Memorandum No. 13, issued by the Ministry of the Budget on February 28, 1980, to implement the provision of LOI 981 directing the realignment of government resources, all agencies are to identify savings of no less than 10% of their CY 1980 budget computed on the basis of the original program of expenditures prior to the imposition of initial regular reserves, CDAP has identified the amount equal to ₱910,000 from this allocation as part of the 10% savings required. The amount therefore of ₱1,551,000 is supposed to be used in 1980 for projects in other cities. However, no such projects have been planned to date. The amount of ₱2,461,000 has also been appropriated in the 1981 budget for said purpose.

**USAID/PHILIPPINES  
DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION CENTER**

24

## ANALYSES OF PROBLEMS AND CONSTRAINTS TO THE FLOW OF RESOURCES

Apart from the inherent inability of the cities to absorb all of the inputs being made available by the Program, three other factors account for the under utilization of these resources. These factors relate to certain inefficiencies in the processes involved in the delivery of the project inputs which further inhibits their capacity to take full advantage of the inputs. These factors are:

1. Delays in the issuance of authorities to proceed for social action projects;
2. Delays in the release of the seed money; and
3. Delays in the reimbursement of projects

### The Process of Issuing Authorities to Proceed

An authority to proceed has to be issued by CDAP before the city can start any social action project that it hopes to get reimbursed for. As project proposals are submitted, these are reviewed by a CDAP technician to determine:

1. if the project is in consonance with the approved social action development plan;
2. reasonableness of the cost estimates;
3. financial and economic feasibility of the project;
4. technical soundness of the project;
5. project's desirability by the supposed beneficiaries of the project;
6. the fixed amount reimburseable

In at least half of the number of projects submitted in 1978 and 1979 for which data are available, issuance of authority to proceed took about a month or more (in some instances, more than three months). The data also show that in some cases this was accomplished in a day or two. While there is no record of any project being rejected, there were instances when the projects were not issued authorities to proceed during a given year, so that the projects had to be resubmitted the next year. There were a few projects, too, where apparently no action has been taken.

Delays in the issuance of authorities to proceed have implications in the number of projects a city may be able to complete in a given year. As schedules for project starts are not met, this may upset the scheduling of other projects that eventually may lead to the inability to complete or even start other projects. This may also mean that the projects do not get completed during the same year and difficulties in reimbursement would result. The delayed authority to proceed may also come at a time when funds are not readily available, which means the project start gets further delayed for lack of funds. A long delay in the project start may necessitate the revision of cost estimates for which change orders would have to be made and forwarded to CDAP before reimbursements can be made.

Analyses of the problem show that delays in the issuance of authorities to proceed have been due to one or several of the following factors:

1. Inadequate documentation of project proposals by cities

Projects submitted for review have sometimes to be returned on account of inadequacies in the preparation of the project justification or in the attachments required. These inadequacies, on some occasions, occurred because of frequent changes in documentation requirements. Up to about a week or two ago, cities were confused as to which of three manuals should be followed in the documentation of project proposals.

2. Lack of adequate personnel at CDAP to do project review

Presently, in the CDAP staff, there is only one person delegated to review project proposals. Said person is also in charge of reviewing EPL proposals. In almost all cases, the review of the proposals entail verification of some aspects of the project on site, i.e., technical feasibility, demand for the project, etc. The overloading of too many tasks on one person, disables the immediate review of projects and subsequent actions on these.

3. Deficiencies in the proposals are not immediately communicated to the Cities.

A problem surfaced during the course of the evaluation was that the cities never find out what the actions on the proposals are except when they get to Manila. Further

delays ensue when correction of deficiencies noted requires a trip back to the city. Then there are the delays that occur sending back of the documents to Manila.

#### 4. Inherent defects in the procedural system

A project proposal has to be reviewed by a CDAP technician. This is further reviewed by the CDAP Project Director who recommends approval of the projects. Authorities to proceed are prepared for each project and are sent to the MLGC Deputy Minister for signature. Considering the voluminous transactions The Deputy Minister has to sign each day, many of them, no doubt, requiring greater attention, the demands on his time by the many other agencies within the Ministry, it may take some time before these authorities are signed.

#### The Release of Seed Money

The seed money is a mechanism designed into the program to help the cities in financing the initial phases of implementation of social action projects. It has, however, served very little its purpose. Of 45 projects issued authorities to proceed in 1978 and 1979, seed money was released for some 34 projects only. Of these 13 came after the projects had been completed while the other cases took more than three to five months after the Authority to Proceed had been issued.

Clearly, if the seed money is to abate cash flow

difficulties, it has to come early in the stage of project implementation. A project may not get started if no city funds are released or if there is no seed money to help. This compounds the delay in the project start which has already resulted because of a delayed issuance of Authority to proceed. This long delay may result in the non-completion or even start of the project within the year.

The delay in the release of seed money proceeds from an inherent defect of the procedural requirements for the release of seed money. As authorities to proceed are issued these are batched until a substantial amount for release of seed money is reached after which the cash disbursement Ceiling is requested. Release of the CDC requires a significant amount of time and waiting for a number of projects to get reviewed and issued authorities to proceed compounds the problem even more. By the time the seed money is released, a significant amount of time has lapsed.

#### The Reimbursement Process

11 Delayed reimbursements are characteristic of all projects completed. The length of time a project gets reimbursed from the time it is completed runs from 122 days to more than a year.

The non-reimbursement of projects in a given year have resulted in:

1. Non-inclusion of appropriations for social action projects in the regular annual budget;
2. delay in the implementation of other projects requiring supplemental budgets; and
3. reluctance on the part of some city treasurers to release funds for other projects.

The main bottleneck in the reimbursement process, again, is the process of requesting for the cash disbursement ceilings. The process takes a while and any improvement in the procedures would have to be premised on the assumption that there is little that can be done about how external agencies move and the way to get around it is through a means that would enable the request of the CDC in advance.

Another reason for delayed reimbursement is delay in project completion. A project that is not completed within the year of its estimated completion date will have difficulty getting the release of the CDC. This would mean that a revalidation of the CDC would be required which in turn requires explanations, justifications and longer waiting. As mentioned earlier, delays in project completion have been partly due to delays in the release of authority to proceed and the seed money release.

There is also the problem of inadequate documentation and the subsequent delay because of non-communication of deficiencies to the cities.

There is also the delay, on the side of CDAP, in performing the final inspection and the certification of compliance with project plans and specifications.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The first set of measures are here being recommended to ensure more effective and efficient utilization of the resources being made available by the Program to the cities. They represent immediate action that may be undertaken by CDAP to facilitate the flow of resources for social action projects this year.

1. For the year, 1980, some 67 projects with a total FAR of ₱3.6 million have been issued authorities to proceed. Of this amount, only ₱31,664 have been released representing the 15% seed money of 5 projects. Some ₱500,000 representing 15% of the total FAR of 54 projects may be released this third quarter. Since authorities to proceed have been issued these projects, the request for cash disbursement ceiling in the estimated amount of ₱500,000 should not be difficult.

2. CDAP has very recently made a decision to have an all-out effort to encourage the cities to exhaust their ₱500,000 allocation for social action projects. While the move is laudable, a more pressing need, it seems, is to act on the 39 proposals submitted and are pending review. A Conservative estimate of the total FAR of these unapproved projects has been figured at ₱2.6 million. If all these proposals are approved, eight or nine cities would have reached their respective quotas and efforts would be limited to seven or eight cities. Since three of these seven or eight cities have new city coordinators, it would do well for

CDAP to give attention to providing more technical assistance to these cities.

These proposals, if approved, would also be eligible for seed money release amounting to about ₦390,000, immediate action on which will be necessary in line with the objective of improving the flow of resources and the effective utilization of this.

3. The records show that some 21 claims for reimbursement for social action projects amounting to about ₦1.1 million are in process and pending release. The necessary actions to speed up the processing of these should be taken, i.e., immediate communication to the cities of documentation deficiencies, final inspections, requests for cash disbursement ceilings, etc. Efforts should be made to have the release of said reimbursements this quarter. Similarly, the ₦10,000 reimbursement for social action training of the five cities should be attended to.

4. The rate at which allocations for equipment pool loan reimbursements are being utilized leaves much to be desired. To date only 25% of the total allocation has been disbursed with the likelihood of this proportion increasing to 31% only before the end of the year. With the intentions to avail of the loan reimbursement indicated by most of the cities, perhaps what is needed is some assistance on aspects like preparation of the Equipment Pool Development Plan, selection of portions of the plan to be constructed with loan funds, preparation of

the necessary plans, specifications, cost estimates and quality control plan covering the portion of the EPDP that will be implemented under loan financing, accomplishment of cost summary sheets, planned repayment schedule, etc. Equipment Pool Specialist from PDAP should be used for this purpose to augment present CDAP staff capability.

The second set of measures relate to proposals for strengthening various processes involved in the flow of resources. The processes in consideration are (1) issuance of authority to proceed; (2) release of seed money; and (3) release of reimbursements.

A. Issuance of Authority to Proceed

Much could be achieved in terms of ensuring a more speedy process of issuing authorities to proceed by the following measures:

1. Clarification of the procedures to be followed and forms to be filled out.

A significant step has been taken along this line by the pronouncement made by the CDAP project director during a consultative conference held in August that guidelines set by the CDAP SPS-PIP Manual shall be the one followed. Since not all city coordinators were present during that conference, adequate measures should be taken to inform all CPDS directors and staff of this.

2. Area specialists should be utilized to check on the adequacy of documentation requirements. They should also be made responsible for looking into the appropriateness and adequacy of the project selection process, following up on the status of review in Manila, and ascertaining that the deficiencies are referred back immediately to the cities, corrected and submitted back to the CDAP office for immediate action. The task should not be difficult since each area specialist takes charge of only four cities each. These specialists, who will now be visiting the cities at least once in six weeks should, themselves, be familiar with the procedures.

3. Delegation of the responsibility of reviewing project proposals to one other specialist may greatly reduce the waiting time created by the volume of proposals awaiting review. This means that there is an immediate need to assign a specialist to work with the one person now responsible for project review. Initially, smaller projects involving relatively smaller amounts or those that will not entail verification of the technical feasibility may be assigned him/her.

4. Lastly, the Authority to proceed should not require the signature of the Deputy Minister. Since the Authority to Proceed does not involve any releases of funds, such a task should be delegated the CDAP project Director.

## B. Release of Seed Money

The timely release of the seed money will greatly ease the cash flow difficulties being experienced by some cities and will, to a large extent, ensure that the project is started as scheduled.

Representations will have to be made with the Ministry of the Budget to allow the use of the Annual Implementation Plans as support documents for requesting release of the cash disbursement ceilings for seed money. Since the Annual Implementation plans contain the number of projects and estimated amounts of projects to be implemented per quarter, agreement is likely to be achieved.

At the start of each quarter, cash disbursement ceilings are requested in the amount equal to 15% of the fixed amount reimburseable indicated by the projects to be implemented in that quarter. Once released, the processing of the seed money requests should not take long. This would allow the treasury warrants for seed money to be released to the cities along with the Authority to Proceed. The Authority to Proceed may be made a requirement for the release of the treasury warrant to the city, or even for the signature of the Deputy Minister or the Counter signature of the Auditor.

## C. Release of Reimbursements

Experience of other special projects under the PDAP umbrella indicate that requests for cash disbursement

35

ceilings may be made upon certification that a project is 80% completed. The reimbursements, however, are not released until all the requirements are completed. The immediate request for cash disbursement ceilings will allow reimbursements to be made within one month after the filing of reimbursement claims.

Area specialists are to monitor project progress closely particularly as each project nears its estimated completion date. Project status reports prepared by the City periodically may also help identify such projects. For each quarter, cash disbursement ceilings will be requested for projects certified as 80% completed and to be completed that quarter. This would greatly facilitate the processing of reimbursement claims when filed.

Area specialists should also be responsible for ascertaining compliance with the documentation requirements for reimbursement, that requests for project inspection are immediately communicated and acted upon, submission of reimbursement claims to CDAP office, communication of deficiencies to the cities and follow up of compliance measures.

NAC STATUS OF PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES  
AS OF APRIL 24, 1980

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	MAP	W/O SP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	PAID	SELD. MONEY	SEI	REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED	REIMBURSEMENT FOR	STATUS	
1978	Public Faucet	OICE-78-01	X			16,950	8,358	1,695	0,897		Reimbursed	✓
	House of Magdalene	OICE-78-03	X			58,400	8,700	5,840	43,300		-do-	✓
	Training Center	OICE-78-04	X			122,000	18,300	11,200	91,500		-do-	✓
	Palangan Waterworks	OICE-78-05	X			37,000	3,600	3,700	30,700		-do-	✓
	Sub-total ...					234,350	39,018	25,435	177,897			
1979	Palus Waterworks	OICE-79-01	X		35,400.00	20,310	3,046		20,304		REIMBURSEMENT IN PROGRESS	✓
	Lasandig Waterworks	OICE-79-02	X			31,000	4,710		15,000			✓
	Sub-total ...								740,950			
	Equipment Pool Project	EPL-78-01				400,000			P400,000			
1980	Bayanga Waterworks	OICE-80-01	X		49,500	46,659.75	6,000		39,000		25.7%	✓
	Mohon Waterworks	OICE-80-02	X		37,800	33,220.00			30,000		20.7%	✓
	Sampar (Fishing Boat)	OICE-80-03	X		22,600	20,100.00			20,100			✓
	Indahag Waterworks	OICE-80-04	X		32,100	28,114.00			28,114			✓
	Public Faucet	OICE-80-05	X		24,736	19,752.00			19,752			✓
	Gusa Concrete	OICE-80-06	X		43,700	27,862.00			27,862			✓
	Sub-total ...					175,707.75			1108,700			✓
	SNI Training					10,000			10,000			
	TOTAL ...					P871,767.75	P53,773	P25,435	P571,897	P232,650		

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CITY: BUTUAN

LIST OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES  
 OF SUBJECT 19, 1980

NO.	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	W/AP	L/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	RESPONSIBLE TO CIPR	REMARKS
78	Cut-Off Channel I	04BY-78-01	/		230,000	179,000	26,850	17,900	4,250	✓
	Artesian Well I	04BY-78-02	/		45,000	39,000	5,850		30,150	CHARGE 1980
	Artesian Well II	04BY-78-03	/		64,000	49,000	7,350		41,650	CHARGE 1980
	Sub-total ...				<u>339,000</u>	<u>267,000</u>	<u>40,050</u>		<u>74,050</u>	
79	Cut-Off Channel II	04BY-79-01	/		342,500	285,000			285,000	FOR REVALIDATION OF CDC
	Compact Farming		/		49,500					
	Rattan and Wood Furniture		/		235,072					
	Sub-total ...				<u>627,072</u>				<u>285,000</u>	
	Equipment Pool Project	EPL-78-01	/			400,000			<u>400,000</u>	REVALIDATION
	Goat Dispersal Project	04BY-80-01	/		20,000	18,800			<u>18,800</u>	CHARGE
	SAT Training					10,000			<u>10,000</u>	Charging Dec.
	TOTAL ...					<u>900,800</u>	<u>240,050</u>	<u>17,900</u>	<u>754,750</u>	<u>754,750</u>

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

As of August 29, 1980

CITY: PUERTO PRINCESA

Year	Project Title	Project Title	W/ AP	W/C AP	Total Project Cost	FAR	Seed Money	SUA	Reimbursable Reimbursed	For Reimbursement	Status
1978	Lighting Facilities	05AQ-78-01	/		13,170.	10,920.			10,920.		Reimb.
	Waterworks Project	05AQ-78-02	/		18,870.	15,100			15,099.93		Reimb.
	Watersealed Toilet	05AQ-78-03	/		43,000.	33,000.	4,950.	3,300.	24,850.00		Reimb.
	Drainage System	05AQ-78-04	/		5,000.	4,000.	600.	400.	3,000.00		Reimb.
	Lighting Facilities II	05AQ-78-05	/		14,000.	12,000.	1,800.	1,200.	9,000.00		Reimb.
	Cattle Dispersal	05AQ-78-06	/		120,000.	120,000.	18,000.	12,000.	90,000.00		Reimb.
	Drainage Project II	05AQ-78-07	/		33,000.	25,000.					
Sub-Total					247,040.	220,020.			142,868.93		
1979	Integrated Trng. Center	05AQ-79-01	/		164,000.	153,500.				153,500.00	
	Equipment Pool Proj.	EPL-78-01	/			400,000.			400,000.00		Reimb.
	SAT Training					10,000.			10,000.00		Reimb.
1980	Skills Training	05AQ-80-01	/		65,000.	54,625.				54,625.00	
	Work Animal w/Farm Improvement	05AQ-80-03	/		215,680.	152,400.				152,400.00	
	Cattle Dispersal II	05AQ-80-05	/		160,000.	117,980.				117,980.	
	Taga-ud Agro Forest Development	05AQ-80-04	/		178,800.	85,450.				85,450.00	
Sub-Total					619,540.	420,455				420,455.00	
Total:					1,030,580.00	1,203,975.	25,350.00	16,900.00	552,868.98	573,955.00	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

62

RSR STATUS OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES  
AS OF August 29, 1980

ITY: OLONGAPO

EAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	W/AP	W/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAH	SEED MONEY	SDA	REIMBURSABLE		STATUS
									Reimbursed	For Reimb.	
978	Training Center	07AJ-78-01	/		P 50,000	P 39,000	P 5,850 ✓	P 3,900	P 29,250		Reimbur
	Fishermen Banca Station	07AJ-78-02	/		150,000	127,000	19,050 ✓	12,700	95,250		-do-
	Sub-total ...				<u>P200,000</u>	<u>P166,000</u>	<u>P 24,900</u>	<u>P16,600</u>	<u>P124,500</u>		
979	Equipment Pool Project	EPL		/		<u>P400,000</u>					Implement
980	Training Center <sup>Bgy.</sup> Kalaklan	07AJ-80-01		/	P105,000						Implement
	Training Center Bgy. Sta. Ritu	07AJ-80-02		/	105,000						-do-
	SAT Training					<u>P 10,000</u>			<u>710,000</u>		Implement
	Sub-total ...				<u>P210,000</u>						
	TOTAL ...				<u>P410,000</u>	<u>P376,000</u>	<u>P 24,900</u>	<u>P16,600</u>	<u>P134,500</u>		

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BSO STATISTICAL REPORT AND ACTIVITIES  
 [1980-1981, 1980]

CITY: DALAYOG

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	W/AP	W/C AT	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	PREMIUMS/BOR		REMARKS
									Reimbursed	For Reimb.	
1979	Communal Piggery Bgy. Basud	08BR-79-01	/			P12,500	P 1,410			P 11,090	FOR REVALIDATION OF CDC
	Communal Piggery] Bgy. Dagum	08BR-79-02	/			12,500	1,400			11,100	-do-
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Hijaga	08BR-79-03	/			12,500	1,400			11,090	-do-
	Health Center Bgy. Gadgarat	08BR-79-05	/			37,280				37,280	-do-
	Sub-total ...					<u>P74,780</u>	<u>P 4,218</u>			<u>P 70,560</u>	
	SAT Training					<u>P10,000</u>			<u>P10,000</u>		Reimburse
1980	Concrete Foot Wall:	08BR-80-01A	/		P72,730.60	P54,528				P 54,528	100%
	Communal Piggery Panlayahar	08BR-80-01	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	START AUG. 29 '80
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Mabang	08BR-80-02	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	-do-
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Cagbilauang	08BR-80-03	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	-do-
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Naga	08BR-80-04	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	-do-
	Deep-Sea Fishing Project	08BR-80-05	/		124,314.40	93,235				93,235	-do-
	Deep-Sea Fishing Project	08BR-80-06	/		67,736.26	65,927				65,927	-do-
	Multi-Purpose Center	08BR-80-07	/		77,656.30	54,500				54,500	-do-
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Bontay	08BR-80-08	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	-do-
	Deep-Sea Fishing Project	08BR-80-09	/		124,314.40	93,235				93,235	-do-
	Multi-Purpose Center	08BR-80-14	/		77,656.30	54,500				54,500	-do-
	Communal Piggery Bgy. Sinidman Oriental	08BR-80-15	/		36,116	27,867				27,867	-do-
	Deep-Sea Fishing	08BR-80-18	/		124,314.40	93,235				93,235	-do-
	Sub-total...				<u>P605,416.00</u>	<u>P676,362</u>				<u>P676,362</u>	
	TOTAL ...				<u>P605,416</u>	<u>P761,142</u>	<u>P4,218</u>		<u>P10,000</u>	<u>P740,362</u>	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

RSC STATUS OF MANAGED AND ACTIVITIES  
AS OF AUGUST 31, 1980

FOKAS

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	Y/P	N/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	PAR	DEB. BAL.	CDR	REVENUE	TO DATE	REMARKS
1979	Water Tank (8)	03AY-79-02	/			164,000	20,000			143,700	FOR REQUALIFICATION OF CDC
	Commodity Assistance	03AY-79-01	/			45,000	6,750		38,750		REVENUE
	Deep Wells (10)	03AY-79-03	/			53,000	7,350			45,650	FOR REQUALIFICATION OF CDC
	Mobile School			/	14,000						
	Cottage Industry			/	10,000						
	Sub-total ...				24,000				233,750	218,750	
	Equipment Pool Project	EPL-79-01	/			400,000				220,000	On-going
	SAT Training		/		10,000	10,000			110,000		
1980	Slipper Making and Embroidery	03AY-80-02	/		32,106.30	31,200	4,000			270,000	
	Chorizo and Garmert Making	03AY-80-03	/		35,254	34,230	5,100			20,100	
	Hand Tractor	03AY-80-04	/		44,571	43,225				47,000	
	Corantay Fishing Boat	03AY-80-05	/		42,990	40,770	6,116			24,054	
	Fry Hatchery	03AY-80-07	/		60,000	58,000	8,730			49,001	
	Tabodluck (Fishing Boat)	03AY-80-14	/		48,018	42,961				41,901	
	Garment Making	03AY-80-15	/		34,791	34,791				34,791	
	Duckery	03AY-80-17	/		30,135	20,115				30,115	
	TOTAL ...				2328,423.70	2315,552	259,665		241,700	2879,637	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ITY: ROXAS

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	W/AP	1/0 AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	PRIORITIZATION		DEPENDENCY TO PROJ. DOCUMENTATION
									Reimbursed	Not Reimb.	
1980	Mobile School Training	03AY-80-01		/	740,000						
	Banana Crackers	03AY-80-02		/	39,180						-do-
	Rice Mill	03AY-80-08		/	37,326.99						-do-
	Shell Craft	03AY-80-09		/	24,854						-do-
	Gasoline Pumping Station	03AY-80-10		/	32,110						-do-
	Bakery	03AY-80-11		/	68,667						-do-
	Rice Mill	03AY-80-12		/	43,956						-do-
	Fish Dealership	03AY-80-13		/	45,773						-do-
	Poultry Raising	03AY-80-14		/	36,424						-do-
	Poultry Raising	03AY-80-15		/	36,424						-do-
	Pig Dispersal	03AY-80-16		/	72,648						-do-
	TOTAL				1440,370.99						-do-

NOTE: THIS PROJECT WILL BE PRIORITIZED BY THE CITY SO AS NOT TO EXCEED ALLOCATION

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

43

REG STATUS OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES  
AS OF August 31, 1980

CITY: DAGUPAN

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJECT NO.	W/AP	W/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDM	REVENUE AND SERVICES		STATUS
									Maintained	Per Month	
1979	Guibang Foot Bridge	02AD-79-01	/			6,000				6,000	FOR REVALIDATION OF CDC
	Foot Walk Herrero	02AD-79-02	/			34,000	5,100			28,900	CASE- PENDING EXPROPRIATION
	Sub-Total ...									734,000	
	Equipment Pool Program	EPL-02AD-78-01	/			400,000				400,000	Completed
	SAT Training					10,000				110,000	Completed
1980	Pantal Rivetment	02AD-80-01	/		200,000	200,000				200,000	STARTED JUNE 20, 1980 ON- GOING
	Calmay Norte Rivetment	02AD-80-02	/		200,000	200,000				200,000	- do -
	Sabang Artesian Well	02AD-80-03	/		8,900	8,900				8,900	- do -
	Cantores-Camaangan Artesian Well	02AD-80-04	/		10,000	8,800				8,800	- do -
	Guibang Artesian Well	02AD-80-05	/		10,000	8,800				8,800	- do -
	Pantal Waiting Shed	02AD-80-06	/		10,000	9,341				9,341	- do -
	Poblacion Oeste Mini Park	02AD-80-07	/		25,000	25,000				25,000	- do -
	Cottage Industry Training	02AD-80-08	/		22,000	22,000				22,000	- do -
	Sub-total ...					482,941				482,941	
	T O T A L ...					1,032,841	5,100		200,000	527,741	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

44

CITY OF ZAMBOANGA

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJ. NO.	W/AP	W/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	REIMBURSABLE		STATUS
									REIMB.	FOR REIMB.	
1979											
	SKILLS TRAINING CENTER	16BX-79-01	/		₱74,300	₱2,645			₱74,655		FOR REVALIDATION OF CDC
	DRAINAGE PROJECT	16BX-79-02	/		86,000	12,900			73,100		FOR REVALIDATION OF CDC
SUB-TOTAL					₱160,300	22,545			₱137,755		
	SAT				10,000				₱10,000		
1980											
	SKILLS TRAINING PROJECT	16BX-80-01	/		₱50,000	₱44,566					
	KALIBO FISHING PROJECT	16BX-80-04	/		90,000	78,310					
	GARMENT MAKING	16B-80-07	/		15,000						
SUB-TOTAL					₱155,000	122,876					
TOTAL					₱155,000	223,176	₱22,545		₱110,000	₱137,755	

→ 9500.000

45

CITY ANGELES

YEAR	Project Title	Project No.	W/AP	W/O AP	Total	Seed	REIMBURSABLE	STATUS
					Proj. Cost	F A R	Money S D A	Reimbursed For Reimbursement
1979	SAT Training				10,000		10,000	Reimbursed
1980	Doll Making	11AI-80-01	/		27,740	27,740	27,740	Reimbursement in Process
	Skill Training on Tailoring & Dressmaking	11AI-80-02	/		47,744	34,300	34,300	Reimbursement in Process
	Skills Training on Dressmaking & Tailoring	11AI-80-03	/		39,459	32,654	32,654	ON-GOING
SUB-TOTAL					\$114,943	\$94,694	\$94,694	
	Baby/Children Garments	11AI-80-4	/		138,000			In Planning
TOTAL					\$252,943	\$94,694	\$10,000 \$94,694	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4/9

CITY OF LEGASPI

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJ. NO:	W/AP:	W/O AP:	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	REIMBURSABLE		STATUS	
									REIMB.	FOR REIMB.		
1978	SANITARY TOILET	09AL-78-01	/		125,000	100,000		15,000	75,000		Reimbursed	
B-TOTAL					125,000	100,000		15,000	75,000			
979	SANITARY TOILET	09AL-79-01	/		137,000	114,000	14,350	11,400	89,950		Reimbursed	
	SEWING & NEEDLE CRAFT	09AL-79-02	/			16,900	2,540	1,385	12,675		-do-	
	CASSAVA PRODUCT	09AL-79-03	/			5,000	900	600	4,500		-do-	
B-TOTAL					187,000	136,900	18,290	13,385	104,925			
	EQPT. POOL PROJ.	EPL-79-01	/			400,000			400,000		On-Going	
	SAT TRAINING					10,000			10,000		Reimbursed	
1980	NEEDLECRAFT PROJ. PHASE II	09AV-80-01	/		52,000	39,000			39,000		Reimbursed	
	NEEDLECRAFT PROJ. PHASE I	09AV-80-02	/		34,000	26,000			26,000		-do-	
	NEEDLECRAFT PROJ. PHASE I	09AV-80-03	/		34,000	26,000			26,000		-do-	
	NEEDLECRAFT PROJ. PHASE I	09AV-80-04	/		34,000	26,000			26,000		-do-	
	NEEDLECRAFT PROJ. PHASE I	09AV-80-05	/		34,000	26,000			26,000		-do-	
	REPACKING PROJ.	09AV-80-06	/		45,752	42,824			42,824			
	BATTERY MAKING TRAINING II	09AV-80-09	/		27,500	20,935			20,935			
	SARAODAN PROJECT	80-13	/		20,400	15,300			15,300			
	BATTERY MAKING	80-15	/		27,500	20,935			20,935			
TOTAL					1,312,552	1,024,552	12,290	128,385	1,143,000	99,994		

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4

LEGAZPI

ar	Project Title	Project No.:	W/AP	W/O AP	T P C	: FAR	Seed	Reimboursable		Status
							: Money	: S A D	: Reimb.:	
980	Individual Sanitary Toilet I	:09AV-80-07	:	/	:72,900	:	:	:	:	:
	Individual Sanitary Toilet II	:09AV-80-08	:	/	:72,900	:	:	:	:	:
	Deep Sea Fishing Project	:09AV-80-10	:	/	:194,774	:	:	:	:	:
	Bagoong Processing Construction I	:09AV-80-11	:	/	:132,088	:	:	:	:	:
	Bagoong Processing Construction II	:09AV-80-12	:	/	:190,449	:	:	:	:	:

VAL

¥33,111

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SP

CITY OF GENERAL SANTOS

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJ. NO.	N/A/P	H/O/A/P	TFC	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	REQUIS	FOR ESTIMATED	1980
1980	Cattle Rattening	15CH 80-01	/		100,000	100,000		10,000	90,000		10,000
	Poultry/Broiler Raising	15CH 80-02	/		173,419	173,419				173,419	
	Duckery Balut/Salted Egg	15CH 80-03	/		95,000	82,900				82,900	
	Leadership & Mgmt. Trai.	15CH 80-09	/		15,000	15,000				15,000	
SUB-TOTAL					383,419	371,319				371,319	
	Rice Cake Making,		/		31,018						
	Commercial Ring Net Project		/		173,419						
	Deep Sea Fishing		/								
SUB-TOTAL					353,652						
	SAT Training				10,000						
TOTAL					747,070	371,319			90,000	371,319	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RSC STATUS OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES  
AS OF JUNE 29, 1990

CITY IRIGA

YEAR	PROJ. Title	Project No.	M/P	W/O AP	Total	Cost	F A R:Money	BDA	Reimbursed	For Reimbursement	STATUS
1990	Cat Walk		:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	
	Project	13AW-80-01	:	:	10,000	10,000	:	:	10,000	:	<del>Reimbursed</del> CLAIMS NOT SUBMITTED
SUB-TOTAL					10,000	10,000	:	:	10,000	:	
	SAT Training		:	:		10,000	:	10,000		:	Reimbursed
TOTAL					10,000	20,000	:	10,000	10,000	:	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## CITY OF BATANGAS

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJ. NO.	W/AP	W/O AP	TPC	FAR	SEED MONEY	SDA	Reimbursable REMB FOR REMB	STATUS
1979	Sewing & Needle Craft	12AK- 79-01	/		31,000	31,000		3,100	27,900	Comp.
	Sewing & Needle Craft	12AK- 79-02	/		26,000	26,000		2,600	23,400	Comp.
SUB-TOTAL					57,000	57,000		5,700	51,300	
	SAT Training					10,000			10,000	Comp.
1980	Ferry Boat	12AK- 80-01	/		15,100	6,100				
	Sewing & Needlecraft	12AK- 80-03	/		21,400	21,400				Buy. Simlong Clara
	Sewing & Needlecraft	12AK- 80-04	/		49,500	26,800				Buy. Malibago
	Sewing & Needlecraft	12 AK 80-05	/		30,400	22,800				Buy. Simlong
	Sewing & Needlecraft	12AK- 80-06	/		58,200	52,000				Buy. Simlong
	Cattle fattening	12AK 80-07	/		69,000	64,600				Buy. Tabangoo
	Fishing Project	12AK 80-08	/		227,300	170,300				
SUB-TOTAL					470,900	364,000				
	Health & Sanitation	12AK- 80-02			105,317					
	Individual Toilet	12AK- 80-08			99,920					
SUB-TOTAL					205,237					
TOTAL					907,437	431,000		5,700	61,000	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

5

RSC Status of Project & Activities  
as of Aug. 21, 1980

CITY LIPA

YEAR	Project Title	Project No.	W/AP	W/O AP	Total	REIMBURSABLE			STATUS	
						Project Cost	F A R	Seed Money		S D A
1978	Sewing & Needle-craft I	10AL-78-01	/		119,680.98	19,500		11,968	88,211.20	Reimbursed
Sub-Total :					119,680.98	19,500		11,968	88,211.20	
1979	Trng. Center	10AL-79-01	/		266,000	24,000			242,000	NOT STARTED
	Artesian Well	10AL-79-02	/		172,000	19,950			152,050	NOT STARTED
Sub-Total :					438,000	43,950			394,050	
	Equipment Pool	EPL-10AL-79-01			400,000				400,000	On-going
	S A T Trng.				10,000			10,000		Reimbursed
1980	Sewing & Needle-craft		/		300,000					DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED @ THE CITY.
	Carpentry/Mason		/		33,000					- do -
	Artesian Well		/		237,000					- do -
	Social Action Mobile Service Center		/		182,438					
	Skills Trng.		/		14,000					
	Livestock Raising		/		18,000					DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED @ THE CITY
	Improvement of Livestick Practices		/		34,250					
	Advanced Trng.		/		13,200					
Sub-Total :					831,888	63,450		11,968	98,211.20	794,050

REG. SLIP OF PROJECT AND ACTIVITIES  
As of August 21, 1980

YF#R	Project Title	Project No.	W/ AP	W/O AP	Total Project Cost	REIMBURSABLE			REMARKS	
						F.I.R.	Seed Money	S.D.A.		
1979	Manager Skill Training	06IX-79-01	/		60,000	37,000	5,550		31,450	Association
	Sewing & Needle-craft	06IX-79-02	/		50,000	37,000	5,550		31,450	-de-
	Health & Nutrition Center	06IX-79-03	/		107,000	71,400	10,710		60,690	-de-
	Livestock Chain Disposal	06IX-79-04	/		47,000	47,000	7,050		39,950	-de-
SUB-TOTAL					<u>264,000</u>	<u>192,400</u>	<u>28,860</u>		<u>163,540</u>	
	SIT					10,000			10,000	
TOTAL					<u>264,000</u>	<u>202,400</u>	<u>28,860</u>		<u>173,540</u>	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CITY OF LUENA

YEAR	PROJECT TITLE	PROJ. NO. W/AP:W/O AP	TOTAL PROJ. COST	FAR	SEED MONEY	%	REIMBURSABLES		STATUS
							REIMP.	FOR ADINA.	
1979	DRAINAGE PROJECT	14AR-79-01 /		274,065	5,625	3,486.5	231,578.5		Reimbursed
	NAT TRAINING			10,000			10,000		-dc-
1980	MANPOWER SKILLS TRAINING CENTER	14AR-80-01 /	520,000	298,904.00					
	COTTAGE INDUSTRY	14AR-80-01-II /	200,000	122,162					
	PATHWAY PROJ. II	14AR-80-02 /		33,032					
	DRAINAGE PROJ. II	14AR-80-07 /							
	PATH WAY PROJ.	14AR-80-08 /							
	DRAINAGE PROJ.	14AR-80-09 /							
SUB	TOTAL			4454,090	75,625	23,415	241,378.5		
	TOTAL			4,498,960	75,625	23,486.5	241,378.5		

DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION CENTER  
 231/8102

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

57