

**AIRGRAM**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE.**

492 0233 (3)  
PD-AAD-499-C1

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION | INFO

DATE REC'D.

TO - WASHINGTON TOAD A- 469 X

Reference Center  
7 Room 1656 NS

FROM - MANILA

AIR  
C & A - DR

DATE SENT

8/25/70

SUBJECT - Water Resources Development

REFERENCE -

**NONCAPITAL PROJECT PAPER (PROP)**

Country Philippines Project No. 492-11-120-233

Submission Date August 11, 1970 Original \_\_\_\_\_ Revision No. 2

Project Title **WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**

U.S. Obligation Span: FY 1969 through FY 1973

Physical Implementation Span: FY 1969 through FY 1974

Gross Life-of-Project Financial Requirements: (\$000)

U.S. Dollars ----- \$ 671

U.S.-Owned Local Currency ----- 7,700

Cooperating Country Cash Contribution ----- 38,523

Other Donor(s) ----- 30,763

**TOTALS ----- 85,657**

PAGE 1 OF 15 PAGES

DRAFTED BY <b>Staff</b>	OFFICE <b>Program</b>	PHONE NO. <b>456</b>	DATE <b>8/11/70</b>	APPROVED BY: <i>[Signature]</i> <b>Thomas C. Niblock, Director</b>
----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	--

AID AND OTHER CLEARANCES

CC

**UNCLASSIFIED**  
CLASSIFICATION

DISTRIBUTION  
ACTION  
INFO.  
EAB  
About  
ITAD  
OLAB  
bppo  
IS  
PRR  
OA  
Exec  
  
State  
INT  
Ag  
CIA  
com

14p.

7

## I. Summary Description

Development of the Philippines' latent water resources into viable infrastructure would significantly advance the country's economic and social development. However, a proliferation of competing government water agencies, a dearth of necessary basic data, and various other constraints presently impede deliberate planning and optimal development of the nation's water.

AID and other donors, finding water resources to be an inviting target for external assistance, have unwittingly contributed to the present unfavorable circumstances by variously concentrating on limited discrete project packages (generally irrigation oriented) that are largely unrelated or uncoordinated in any context of a national water resources development plan. A critical review of past donor assistance efforts in this sector indicates that new approaches are needed.

USAID recognizes the essentiality of centralizing and consolidating water resources planning and development in the Philippines. The proposed Consultative Group for the Philippines affords an additional and multi-lateral context for discussion of the need for basic institutional changes. In the division of interests and resulting specialization as between donor agencies which we have to emerge from the Consultative Group, the USAID believes it is well qualified to act catalytically in promoting and selling the consolidated comprehensive water resources philosophy to the Philippine Government as well as to other external assistance donors. This promotional task will be helped by using AID Feasibility Study Loan funds to do useful and productive work in this sector, while highlighting and demonstrating successful and desirable water resources concepts and philosophies. Also, high level short term observation tours to the United States, or to other Asian countries that have success stories in water to tell, will be used to import beneficial water philosophy to the Philippines.

USAID proposes a modest technical assistance input of \$150,000 per year for FY 1971 through FY 1973 to conduct a water resources development program, as outlined in detail in the following discussions, aimed at evolving a fresh and viable comprehensive national consolidated Philippine government approach to water resources development.

## II. Setting or Environment

The Philippines is blessed with land and water resources which, if appropriately developed, could contribute significantly to economic and social growth. Because methodical investigation and inventory has not been pursued, knowledge of the country's water resources is not detailed or reliable enough to determine the most logical and prudent investment of its limited resources in water development so as to secure maximum permanent benefits. In the face of mounting pressures from population expansion, rural unemployment and food shortages, "crash" programs have

been resorted to, primarily for irrigation expansion, which seldom result in the lasting utility essential to avoid future adverse consequences.

Present GOP water resources development efforts are severely fragmented and divided among relatively independent, and sometimes competitive, government institutions. For example, irrigation planning, development and management is vested in the National Irrigation Administration (NIA), the Irrigation Service Unit (ISU), the Presidential Arm on Community Development (PACD), the Bureau of Public Works (BPW), the Agricultural Productivity Commission (APC), and others. Hydroelectric power generation is the responsibility of the National Power Corporation (NPC); domestic, municipal and industrial water supplies are under control of the National Waterworks & Sewerage Authority (NWSA) and/or provincial or municipal administrations; flood control works are performed by the BPW. Other public and private organizations are also involved in various aspects of water resources exploitation. By and large, coordination and cooperation among these entities is practically non-existent.

Because no national water policy or plan exists, the prudent conservation, use, and control of water is not centrally directed or regulated. The involved individual entities operate as relatively free agents. This results in overlapping and duplication of effort as well as a waste of scarce financial resources and technical manpower and, in some cases, unhealthy competition for the limited funds and water available.

Compounding the problems of divided responsibility and dissipation of resources are the following further impediments to sound water resources development:

- (1) a lack of adequate and reliable hydrologic basic data, such as rainfall, streamflow, and groundwater information on which to base sound development planning and subsequent project management;
- (2) inadequate comprehensive long-range planning to assure permanent optimally beneficial developments; and insufficient attention to physical, social, and economic factors that determine the success or failure of water developments (too frequently projects of this nature are used for political expediency);
- (3) a lack of adequate enabling and regulatory legislation relating to water; and a lack of forceful application and enforcement of existing legislation;
- (4) inadequate attention to and insistence on sustained effective management, operation and maintenance of water infrastructure after construction so as to extract the maximum projected benefits.

AID has always been responsive to specific Philippine requests for help in water resources. In the past, assistance has been generally predicated on the AID recognition of the basic need in the Philippines for comprehensive and methodical water resources planning and development. Apparently it has been assumed that the Philippines has also recognized the same need and therefore would support such comprehensive efforts. Results of six or seven years of USAID assistance in technical manpower, funding, commodities and participant training have indicated that such is not necessarily the case. While some progress has been made, and some GOP awareness of the need is evident, a significant increase in GOP interest and support in this vital area has not been demonstrated.

From 1955 to 1962, AID assistance in this sector was in the area of basic data collection, analysis, and publication. This was followed in 1963 by the USAID/Bureau of Reclamation Water Resources Survey Project which, in late 1966, produced: (1) a feasibility study of the Upper Pampanga River Project; (2) a comprehensive reconnaissance report on the Central Luzon Basin (Agno and Pampanga Rivers), identifying 11 potential multipurpose water storage developments; and (3) program reports on five other major river basins in the Philippines, which pointed out the need for additional basic data in those basins before reconnaissance grade work could be accomplished. Upon the departure of the BuRec team in late 1966, USAID grant-funded a two-man team (also BuRec) to follow up, monitor, and assist the BFW Water Resources Survey Division in continuing the work started by the earlier BuRec Team. This effort was further reduced to one man during all of 1969, and then increased to a four-man effort in 1970 when the GOP offered to dollar loan-finance two BuRec technicians for two years. Disappointingly, there has been little identifiable basic additional accomplishment in terms of completed water resources planning, strengthened GOP water resource institutions or organizations, or enhanced local skills or capability in water resources planning or development. Rather, there has seemed to be a gradual deterioration in the interest and support for comprehensive water resources development programs within the Bureau of Public Works. With the assignment by the GOP of the National Irrigation Administration as the implementing agency for the Upper Pampanga River Project (\$34 million IERD loan), that agency has come to the fore with an increased interest and evidently some assigned responsibilities for comprehensive water resources planning and development, even though it is basically a government irrigation agency.

The lack of solid comprehensive approach to water development is manifested in the GOP's absorption of external assistance. AID and other bilateral or multilateral organizations, addressing the Philippines' water resources problems, have responded with limited, well-defined ad hoc project assistance packages. For example: IERD's \$34 million loan for

the Upper Pampanga River Project; the ADB's \$2.5 million loan for three irrigation projects in South Cotabato; the UNDP/FAO's recent Water Resources Task Force study which has resulted in a \$2.0 million UNDP/SF grant-funded groundwater development project in Central Luzon; and USAID's PL 480 local currency support of irrigation system rehabilitation and completion. All of these are essentially unrelated and heavily irrigation-oriented assistance efforts not directed towards the sequential or complementary accomplishment of an orderly priority-based comprehensive national water resources development plan for the Philippines. In and of themselves these projects contribute little toward encouraging or precipitating a comprehensive national water resources development viewpoint.

On the part of assistance organizations, as well as the GOP itself, there is a need to distinguish between irrigation per se and the generalized, but more basic, needs of overall water resources development. In the past few years "irrigation" seems in practice to have become fairly synonymous with "water resources" in the Philippines. The urgency for food (primarily rice) production has exerted great stress on the need for irrigation improvement and development in the country. Except for one existing regulated year-round water supply (The Angat Reservoir) for irrigation, and a second under construction (The Upper Pampanga River Project), all other irrigation is dependent on stream or river diversion and pumping, either from surface or groundwater sources. "Run-of-the-river" diversion (or pumping) irrigation systems are, of course, subject to the vagaries of weather and rainfall, and in the dry season the effective irrigation from these sources is reduced to approximately one-third of that available during the rainy season. Development of additional water storage sites for regulated year-round water supplies would mitigate this situation and provide opportunities for other much-needed water-based benefits, such as hydroelectric power, domestic and industrial water supply, flood control, etc. Unfortunately, without a basic comprehensive national water resources plan, or adequate reliable basic data with which to compile such a plan, few storage possibilities in the Philippines have been identified, much less studied, evaluated and assigned to a priority plan for development.

The philosophy that irrigation should be viewed, and developed, as a part of and in conjunction with other water-based infrastructure is not widely held in the Philippines, nor does that philosophy guide the development of irrigation programs by the various agencies of the GOP involved. Additionally, irrigation projects have rather extensive political ramifications and implications and are frequently used to gain political advantage, without serious consideration being given to their technical or economic viability. (This phenomenon is not of course confined to the Philippines.) For this reason and further compounded by a lack of serious and attentive GOP support to the necessary management, operation and maintenance of systems when built, many irrigation investments have deteriorated to the point of being liabilities.

Government owned and operated irrigation systems suffer from a lack of routine logistic support and funding. The fund shortages arise because of difficulties in collecting irrigation fees, among the lowest in the world. The concept of irrigation associations, which has been so successful in Taiwan and Japan, is new to the Philippines, but may be the answer to many traditional irrigation problems, if carefully adapted and properly applied. A principal impediment to irrigation advancement is the unrealistic and burdensome central government responsibility for the retail sale and delivery of irrigation water. Many existing and recurrent irrigation problems will diminish significantly when the government can divest itself of this responsibility and concentrate on the development and wholesaling of irrigation water, and water users' organizations assume the retail sale and distribution responsibilities.

During the past several years, AID assistance to Philippine irrigation has consisted primarily of FY 480 Title I loans to the NIA for rehabilitation, repair, and completion of existing irrigation systems. This has amounted to approximately \$9.0 million equivalent in local currency since FY 1967. In addition, AID extended a \$4.7 million development loan to the GOP, with the NIA as implementing agency, for the procurement of irrigation operation and maintenance equipment to augment the NIA's equipment pool. With respect to irrigation assistance, USAID has embraced a general policy that encourages completion, repair, and rehabilitation of existing irrigation systems; but discourages the construction of new systems, which would add to already heavy O & M burdens.

### III. Strategy

Successful water resources development would provide much-needed basic infrastructure in flood and river control works; hydroelectric power generation facilities; domestic, municipal, and industrial water supplies; and irrigation facilities, and would contribute beneficially to rural and urban socio-economic development. With USAID's emphasis on rural development it is logical to pursue a water resources program which complements, albeit on a long-range basis, USAID's other inputs to the rural development sector.

In order to induce and assist the GOP mount an effective and meaningful water resources program, the USAID will attempt to promote and "sell", to the point of general acceptance in the Philippines, the absolute essentiality of a comprehensive national water resources philosophy and a realistic approach to translation of that philosophy into permanently beneficial physical developments. To accomplish this, it will be necessary to continually focus the attention of GOP officials and politicians, as well as the general public, on the benefits available and the national interests that will be served by the adoption of an

ordered approach to comprehensive water resources planning and development for the country. USAID would be considerably assisted, and significantly more successful in achieving positive results, if these same concepts and attitudes were espoused and encouraged by other assistance donors in this vital sector. In fact, a unified coordinated approach to water resources assistance for the Philippines by all donors would crystallize the Philippines' enthusiasm for, and acceptance of, a comprehensive and consolidated water resources philosophy.

With the anticipated formation of the IBRD-chaired Consultative Group for the Philippines, the timing and circumstances appear most auspicious for AID to promote a policy calling for consolidation of GOP responsibilities and activities in water resources as the first step toward the effective absorption and utilization of the considerable assistance that will be available to this sector under the aegis of the Consultative Group. Assuming that it will coordinate all external assistance to maximize benefits in selected priority sectors, a comprehensive water resources development plan will undoubtedly be central to the needs to be addressed in the important infrastructure development sector. Hopefully, the Consultative Group will evaluate needs and attempt to concentrate assistance in selected priority areas within the framework of total investment capital available, including local resources, and within the Philippines' institutional and managerial capacity to effectively absorb and utilize such capital assistance.

In this context, USAID's role will be to act catalytically to solidify the orientation to, and desire for, the comprehensive water resources philosophy by the GOP and by other assistance donors functioning within the Consultative Group. In fulfilling that role USAID has an important, albeit financially modest, contribution to make in providing technical assistance.

USAID believes a new focus is required for the technical assistance being furnished through the Bureau of Reclamation water resources team. As previously stated, over the past three years the counterpart support for this effort has gradually diminished and weakened. Very candidly, this situation results from the preoccupation of the Bureau of Public Works (the counterpart agency) with other programs of greater public and political appeal and insistence, such as schoolhouse construction, ports and harbors development, and public building programs. In this setting very little attention or support is or can be given to water resources planning activities, which includes the highly important basic data gathering function. There is little doubt that better results would obtain if the technical assistance, as well as the counterpart water resources agency, would function at a higher level within the bureaucracy and with a more advantageous public exposure. Continued promotion and selling of idealistic water resources concepts at the BW Water Resources Survey Division (WRSD) level, where they

find ready acceptance, may be personally gratifying but have little or no beneficial effect on overall GOP water resources policy.

Although physically located with the BFW's WRSD, the BuRec water resources team should actively seek to make their services and expertise available to other GOP water agencies. Successful formation of a consolidated water resources policy and planning organization will require the backing of the majority of the principal water agencies and, indeed, most have already officially signified support for the concept. Some agencies, notably the NIA, have informally encouraged the idea that selected qualified personnel from the WRSD of the BFW should constitute the nucleus of the technical staff of the central body, augmented by technical personnel from the other agencies. Also, recently an agreement was reached between the NIA and the BFW to jointly undertake a major multipurpose project feasibility study (the Magat River Project) with the NIA taking the lead as the implementing agency. Indications are that USAID will be requested to finance from the existing Feasibility Study Loan the required additional technical advisory disciplines from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to augment the incumbent BuRec Team's capability to assist the GOP in making the study.

Under the circumstances, providing technical assistance now to the NIA or the BFW, or both, may appear to run counter to USAID's expressed ultimate objective -- the central consolidated water resources policy and planning body. It can be seen, however, that an undertaking of the magnitude of the Magat Feasibility Study (approximately \$650,000 over a two year period) would afford many opportunities to promote and demonstrate beneficial water resources concepts, as well as the need for consolidation and centralization. Also, the organization and training into a functioning unit of what might largely comprise the technical staff of the ultimate central body, together with the production of a bankable feasibility study, argue in favor of continuing USAID's technical assistance efforts rather than suspending all activity until the consolidated central agency has been formed.

By remaining flexible, and responding to GOP water resources needs appropriately, the USAID/BuRec team will be in a far better position to influence the expeditious formation of the consolidated policy and planning body than if there were no contacts at all at the technical working level.

A bill was introduced in the Philippine Senate last year calling for the establishment of a central Water Resources Commission. This Commission would be responsible for promulgation of national water policy and for overall planning of water resources, as well as the supervision of program and project implementation by the individual agencies. While

the legislation has not yet been enacted its introduction has precipitated much interest and also called attention to the need for a central water policy and planning entity. Knowledgeable GOP officials estimate the probable establishment of such a central body during 1971, possibly under the existing government reorganization legislation.

To solidify progress being made in developing public and official awareness of the needs of the Philippines with respect to water resources, two other strategic and highly useful tools are available. One is the AID Feasibility Study Loan which can be used to finance major comprehensive multi-purpose water project planning as discussed previously, or other studies related to water resources; for instance, irrigation association or cooperative development, organization, and management. Many opportunities are presented during the course of these studies to demonstrate, as well as to absorb, beneficial water resources concepts. And, of course, the primary benefits obtain: the production of documented bankable studies to support loan applications.

The other is the use of carefully structured short term observation tours to neighboring Asian countries, notably Taiwan, Japan and Thailand -- or possibly the United States, if circumstances warrant -- for Administrator or managerial officials who are at a high enough level to affect policy or decision-making relative to water development. Past experience has shown that one to two week intensive observation tours of this nature have been extremely successful as a means of transferring or importing practical, workable and desirable water resources concepts, policies, procedures and approaches to the Philippines.

#### IV. Planned Targets, Results, Outputs

The primary objective of this project is to assist the Philippine Government in the ultimate attainment of a consolidated centralized responsibility for the regulation and control of an optimally beneficial exploitation of Philippine water resources. In achieving this idealistic goal, the following conditions are essential and expected to obtain, with the help of technical and other assistance provided by AID;

- (1) General Filipino acceptance of the basic philosophy that the nation's water resources must be planned and developed on a comprehensive integrated national basis;
- (2) With that philosophy as a guiding principle, the establishment of a high-level central organization, and the development of a viable capability within that organization, to
  - (a) formulate water policy in the long term national interest,
  - (b) plan major water resources projects using technical, socio-

UNCLASSIFIED

logical, and economic factors to establish priorities for implementation, and (c) supervise implementation to assure attainment of minimum standards, both during construction and subsequent operation; and

- (3) Progressive development, enhancement, organization, motivation, and training of the considerable available (but widely dissipated) in-country professional talent so that the central organization ultimately will be staffed to function entirely without, or at least with only a minimum of, external technical assistance.

Time and resources necessary to accomplish the above are difficult to project, since too many variable and non-quantifiable factors impinge. However, while providing technical assistance aimed at promoting the above goals, short-range ad hoc technical assistance will also be provided to various ongoing activities in support of the agricultural and rural development sector programs supported by USAID. During the next three years USAID will periodically critically review and evaluate results of all activities within this project and increase, decrease, or discontinue assistance based on the response and participation of the Philippine Government.

Important secondary targets which the USAID will assist in attempting to achieve are:

- (1) The evolution of an initial national water policy and the beginnings of an organized national water resources development plan.
- (2) Organization, establishment and initial operation of one or more pilot demonstration irrigation associations.
- (3) Completion of additional planning or feasibility studies of major multipurpose water storage projects to support GOP loan applications to financial institutions. (Two such possibilities presently being considered are the Balog-Balog Project in Tarlac Province, and the Magat River Multipurpose Project in Isabela Province.)
- (4) Enactment of basic enabling landmark legislation relative to surface and ground water rights; the formation and operation of water users organizations; and other water connected matters.
- (5) Completion of all equipment and spare parts deliveries under the Irrigation and Equipment Rehabilitation Project (AID Loan 492-H-024 for \$4.7 million).

## V. Course of Action and Financial Plan

To implement the strategy and achieve the results previously discussed, USAID proposes a relatively modest financial input comprised of:

### 1. Technicians

- (a) Two (2) U.S. Bureau of Reclamation technicians, with wide technical expertise in water resources investigations, studies, planning and development to (1) broadly assist the GOP and its water agencies in these activities, (2) generally promote sound water resource development philosophy and concepts, (3) guide, assist and train Filipino technicians and officials in the production of bankable project planning or feasibility studies, and to provide the leadership when appropriate in the expeditious accomplishment of specific related feasibility and planning work funded under AID's Feasibility Study Loan, and (4) to advise and assist the GOP in the organization and establishment of the necessary institutions to enhance its overall water resources posture.

FY 71	-	Two (2) BuRec/PASA technicians	---	\$ 75,000
FY 72	-	" " " "	---	75,000
FY 73	-	" " " "	---	<u>75,000</u>
Total				\$225,000

- (b) Approximately nine (9) man-months per year of additional short term expert assistance for the above two-man BuRec team on special problems that may arise during the course of project investigations, studies, or planning, or to meet critical emergency short-term needs of an as-yet-unknown nature:

FY 71	-	9 man-months TDY assistance	---	\$ 30,000
FY 72	-	" " " "	---	30,000
FY 73	-	" " " "	---	<u>30,000</u>
Total				\$ 90,000

- (c) One direct-hire AID equipment specialist to continue monitoring implementation of the AID \$4.7 million irrigation equipment loan to the NIA and to advise and assist the NIA in their equipment management operations, in compliance with loan provisions, as well as to provide advisory assistance on irrigation system operation and maintenance.

FY 71	-	Direct-hire equipment specialist	---	\$ 25,000
FY 72	-	" " "	---	25,000
FY 73	-	May change to Irrigation Systems O&M Engineer	---	<u>30,000</u>
Total				\$ 80,000

## 2. Commodities

Miscellaneous commodities to support general water resources activities including investigations, studies, planning, demonstrations, promotional work, etc. such as, for example, field transportation, survey instruments and equipment, laboratory equipment, special measuring or metering devices, etc.

FY 71	-	Miscellaneous Commodities	---	\$ 15,000
FY 72	-	" "	---	15,000
FY 73	-	" "	---	<u>10,000</u>
Total				\$ 40,000

## 3. Participant Training

No participants per se are proposed. Rather, observation tours sponsored by USAID on invitational travel orders as outlined under Strategy (Section III) are preferred to accomplish a more expeditious introduction of acceptable concepts into the Philippines at a more responsive and effective official level.

FY 71	-	Short term observation tours	---	\$ 5,000
FY 72	-	" " " "	---	5,000
FY 73	-	" " " "	---	<u>5,000</u>
Total				\$15,000

**4. Local Currency**

In addition to the dollar (\$) inputs described above, it is anticipated that approximately \$1.0 million equivalent local currency (P) per year from PL 480 loan sources will be needed for the next three years to assist in meeting purely local cost financial needs of the following types:

- (a) Initial set-up, investment, and possible partial initial operating costs of centralized water resources entity (Commission, Bureau, Agency, etc.)
- (b) Partial local currency costs for pilot or demonstration irrigation association (district, or cooperative)
- (c) Partial local currency support costs for dollar-financed studies under the AID Feasibility Study Loan.

		\$000
FY 71	- PL 480 Title I Funds (P equivalent)	-- \$ 1,000
FY 72	- " " "	-- 1,000
FY 73	- " " "	-- <u>1,000</u>
	Total	\$ 3,000

**5. Other Assistance**

As indicated in the attached tables, other donors have contributed both grant and loan assistance, as follows:

- (a) Asian Development Bank \$000
  - 1. Water Management Tech. Asst. Team - Grant, FY69 \$ 105
  - 2. " " " " " FY70 102
  - 3. 3 Irrig. Projects, South Cotabato - Loan, FY70 2,500

(b) IBRD (World Bank)

Upper Pampanga (Pantabangan) River

Multi-purpose Project - Loan, FY70 \$34,000

(c) UNDP/SF (with FAO as implementing agency)

Central Luzon Groundwater Development

Project, Nueva Ecija - Grant, FY70 \$1,996.2

All the above projects have been, or will be, implemented with or through the National Irrigation Administration.

**NONCAPITAL PROJECT FUNDING**  
(OBLIGATIONS IN \$000)

PROP DATE: 8/1/70  
Original #:           
Rev. No. :   2  

Country: PHILIPPINES

Project Title: WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT  
Project No. 492-11-120-233

Fiscal Years	AP	L/G	Total	Cont	Personnel Serv.		Participants		Commodities		Other Cost	
					AID	FASA	CONT	U.S. Ag	CONT	US Ag	CONT	US Ag
Prior through Actual FY 1968	DL	L	(130)*	-	(130)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FY 1969	TC	G	197	28	153	-	1	-	15	-	-	-
FY 1970	TC	G	24	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
FY 1971	TC	G	150	25	105	-	5	-	15	-	-	-
FY 1972	TC	G	150	25	105	-	5	-	15	-	-	-
FY 1973	TC	G	130	30	105	-	5	-	10	-	-	-
All Sub.												
Total Life	TC	G	671	132	468	-	16	-	55	-	-	-

\* Non-Add. - 2 BuRec Technicians funded from proceeds of Feasibility Study Loan No. 492-N-023.

UNCLASSIFIED

TOAID A-469

MANILA

UNCLASSIFIED