

PD-ABS-665

1989

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT FUND  
PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

June 30, 1991

A

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT FUND  
PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT                  | 1           |
| A. Background                                  |             |
| B. Project Purpose and Description             |             |
| C. Implementation Arrangement                  |             |
| II. CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT              | 5           |
| A. Physical                                    |             |
| B. Financial                                   |             |
| III. SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS                  | 6           |
| A. Planned Inputs                              |             |
| B. Actual Inputs                               |             |
| IV. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS                    | 7           |
| A. Planned Outputs                             |             |
| B. Actual Outputs                              |             |
| V. POST-PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES               | 9           |
| VI. REVIEW OF PROJECT EVALUATIONS              | 10          |
| VII. LESSONS LEARNED/RECOMMENDATIONS           | 13          |
| VIII. ANNEXES                                  |             |
| A. List of Participating Cities/Municipalities |             |
| B. Pre-Approved List of Subproject Types       |             |
| C. List of Completed Subprojects               |             |

- 1 -

MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT FUND  
PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

A. Background

The 1979 Amendment to the 1947 Military Bases Agreement resulted in a pledge by the U.S. Government to provide, on a "best efforts" basis, \$200 million in Economic Support Fund (ESF) during the fiscal years 1980-1984. From these funds, the Municipal Development Fund (MDF) Project was authorized in July 17, 1981 at a planned life-of-project cost of Seventy Million United States Dollar (\$70,000.00). The Project was designed to address development needs arising from the presence of U.S. Military facilities in the country.

The U.S. Government had a number of facilities in Regions I and III, including Clark Air Base in Pampanga province and Subic Naval Base in Zambales province. The chartered cities and municipalities around these facilities were deemed to be affected in various ways by the existence of these facilities. While the bases provided employment and generally contributed to the economic life of the municipalities, they were perceived to strain marginal and inadequate public services which were generally financed, operated and maintained by the national and local government levels.

In general, the national and local governments believed that some form of assistance from the U.S. Government was justified to help the more affected municipalities improve their social and economic well-being. This feeling was magnified by the sharp contrast between the conditions at the bases and those in the neighboring municipalities.

Thus, with the signing of the Bases Agreement Amendment in 1979 and the USG Executive Branch's "best efforts" to provide ESF, both the USG and the GOP considered assistance from these funds for the affected municipalities to be of a high priority.

## B. Project Purpose and Description

### 1. Purpose

The purpose of the MDF was to provide ESF funds to enhance the capabilities of selected municipalities to manage resources in carrying out development activities responsive to locally established priorities. The MDF primarily addressed the economic and social needs of municipalities around the U.S. military facilities. In addressing these needs, the MDF would help develop the capacity of the selected municipalities to mobilize and manage resources.

The MDF provided funding for both technical and capital assistance for development projects responsive to locally established priorities. The Project was intended to enhance long-term capacities of the municipalities through their involvement in the planning, design, implementation and operation of actual development projects funded from the MDF.

### 2. Project Participants

Of the 1,500 or so municipalities in the Philippines, twenty-three cities and municipalities in Regions I and III were found eligible for MDF assistance and participated in the Project. These cities/municipalities were selected based on: (a) their geographic proximity to the facilities; and (b) the degree of impact of the facilities on the economic and social conditions and public services of the cities/municipalities. A list of the 23 cities/municipalities which participated in the Project is provided as Annex A.

### 3. Project Components and Subprojects

The project description provided in the Project Paper noted that MDF subprojects would fall into three general categories: (a) institutional development; (b) infrastructure development; and (c) public enterprises.

Subprojects proposed by the participating government entities for financing under the MDF were subjected to a preliminary screening and approval by the Secretariat, based on the Secretariat's "Project Development System" manual, similar to AID Handbook 3. USAID approvals were obtained on a selective

basis. This system was intended to ensure that the subprojects would contribute to the overall objectives of the MDF and were compatible and consistent with the development strategy of the municipality concerned. It also insured conformity with the GOP development plan.

The following general criteria was used for evaluating subprojects proposed for MDF funding:

- Subprojects proposed by cities and municipalities should be consistent and compatible with city/municipal development plans.
- Economic and institutional linkages to other municipal activities should be demonstrated by the subproject.
- The subproject should be technically sound.
- The subproject should demonstrate economically acceptable solution(s) to the problem(s) involved.
- The subproject should provide for a large proportion of benefits channelled directly to the poor sectors of the target areas.
- The subproject should insure that adequate arrangements are made for the provision of resources to cover operating and maintenance costs.
- The resulting costs of operation, maintenance, debt service, etc. should be within the absorptive capacity of the local government unit or, if appropriate, other operating entity.
- Revenue generating subprojects should be self-sustaining in terms of operation and maintenance. Such subprojects should demonstrate a high cost recovery rate, recovering a large proportion of the initial investment as well as all operating costs.

Additionally, priority consideration was to be given to subprojects which were: short gestation, quick disbursing and rapid implementing; contain a contribution by the municipality in cash and/or kind, and have a positive employment and income generating impact.

A pre-approved list of subproject types was earlier established, to facilitate subproject selection. USAID approval was required only for those which exceeded \$1 Million in estimated cost, which were outside of the pre-approved list or outside the 23 participating cities/municipalities, or which involved financing of imported equipment and materials. The pre-approved list of subproject types is provided as Annex B.

C. Implementation Arrangements

The ESF Secretariat (ESFS) was the Government of the Philippines (GOP) Office responsible for implementing the MDF Project, which it managed in concert with the city and municipal governments and, as appropriate, military and civilian entities; the private sector; national, regional and provincial governments; and USAID. The ESFS supervised the identification, development and implementation of MDF subprojects to ensure that these were responsive to local initiatives, were technically, socially and economically sound, conform to the purposes for which MDF funds were provided, and are properly documented for funding.

The local governments contracted local firms for the civil works, while the ESFS contracted local construction management services firms to supervise the work in the field.

USAID played an active role in subproject approval, design review, construction, monitoring and processing of payments under the Project. Payments to the contractors and consultants were made by ESFS from the GOP General Fund, and then a GOP Special Account was reimbursed by USAID based on a review of the billings. Later in the Project life, however, USAID decided to limit its monitoring role and its review of payments in order to help streamline the procedures. USAID continues to be involved in the system on an oversight role.

## II. CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROJECT

The Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) for the Project was originally set as December 30, 1988. The PACD was extended to December 31, 1990 through Project Implementation Letter (PIL) No. 58 dated September 14, 1988, to allow the completion of several ongoing subprojects. As a result of the PACD extension, the MDF's life-of-project was extended from seven years and five months to nine years and five months.

### A. Physical

As of the PACD, 49 subprojects have been completed, consisting of 20 schoolbuildings, 14 markets, five roads, five drainage/flood control system, two slaughterhouses and two solid waste management systems. Three subprojects which were started earlier in the project were not completed by the PACD due to the need for design revisions and additional work. It was agreed long before the PACD that these subprojects would be completed either from ESF interest earnings or the Regional Development Fund Project. These three subprojects include the San Fernando Slaughterhouse, Floridablanca Slaughterhouse and the Tarlac Livestock Auction Market. A listing of the completed subprojects is provided as Annex C. Of the 49 subprojects, 18 are categorized as public enterprises (markets, slaughterhouses and solid waste management system) and 31 as infrastructure development (schoolbuildings, roads and drainage/flood control).

### B. Financial

The MDF Project Agreement was signed on August 8, 1981 with initial grant funding of \$22 million. The Agreement was subsequently amended on August 31, 1982 and June 24, 1983 providing additional grant funds of \$13 million and \$20 million respectively. In mid-1986, the new GOP administration requested funds for budget support and as a result, \$19 million of uncommitted funds was deobligated from the Project under Project Agreement Amendment No. 3 dated June 19, 1986. Another \$2.4 million was deobligated from the Project under Project Agreement Amendment No. 4 dated August 31, 1990, based on the ESFS and USAID's assessment of funding requirements up to the PACD of December 31, 1990. The current obligation under the Project is \$33.6 million.

USAID is working with ESFS on the close-out of the various MDF subproject accounts prior to the Project's September 30, 1991 Terminal Date of Disbursement (TDD). Billings for goods and/or services expended before the PACD are being reviewed for USAID's disbursement of funds prior to the TDD. The MDF had a pipeline of \$2.8 million as of the PACD, a portion of which (estimated at \$.8 million) has actually been expended but for which billings from the contractors/consultants are yet to be received and reviewed by ESFS and/or USAID. The rest of the pipeline estimated at \$2.0 million is anticipated for deobligation.

### III. SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS

#### A. Planned Inputs

The MDF Project Paper provided for a life-of-project funding of \$70 million, to be provided in the form of institutional development, infrastructure, public enterprise and others as follows:

| <u>Input</u>              | <u>Amount (\$000)</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Institutional Development | \$ 4,000              |
| Infrastructure            | 31,000                |
| Public Enterprise         | 31,000                |
| Other                     | <u>4,000</u>          |
| TOTAL -                   | <u>\$70,000</u>       |

Twenty million dollars in equivalent local government counterpart was anticipated in the Project Paper. However, no corresponding breakdown or details were provided on the nature of the local counterpart.

#### B. Actual Inputs

As of December 31, 1990, the actual project inputs (project expenditures) are as follows:

| <u>Input</u>      | <u>Amount (\$000)</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Infrastructure    | \$ 12,127             |
| Public Enterprise | <u>18,634</u>         |
| TOTAL -           | <u>\$30,761</u>       |

It should be noted that there are still some claims from contractors and consultants that are still being processed by the ESFS at this time due to the lag from the time the goods/services are delivered to the time the billings are received and processed. Thus, project funds may still be disbursed for payment of valid claims within the Project's Terminal Date of Disbursement (TDD) of September 30, 1991. Therefore, the actual input figures are still subject to adjustment.

USAID recently undertook an assessment of local government counterpart contributions under all Mission projects. It was determined that in the case of the MDF Project, such contributions are not required since it is not provided for in the Project Agreement. Therefore, the level of local government input to the Project has not been assessed and cannot be determined, although it should be noted that the local inputs were provided for many subprojects in the form of land for the project site, rights-of-way, and, in some cases, design and extra work for the facility.

#### IV. PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

##### A. Planned Outputs

The MDF Project Paper logframe lists the following planned outputs:

- completed institutional development subprojects
- completed public infrastructure subprojects
- completed public enterprise subprojects

The magnitude of outputs could not be determined in the Project Paper since most subprojects were yet to be identified at the project design stage.

##### B. Actual Outputs

As of the PACD, 49 subprojects have been completed, grouped into the planned output categories as follows:

- 31 completed public infrastructure subprojects (schoolbuildings, roads, drainage/flood control)
- 18 public enterprise subprojects (markets, slaughterhouses, solid waste managements)

Institutional development subprojects per se were not carried out under the project due to deobligation of project funds and scaling down of the project activities. Instead, institutional development was integrated into the implementation of the infrastructure and public enterprise subprojects through direct involvement of the LGUs in the design, contracting and supervision of these subprojects.

##### C. Assessment of Project Achievements

The project purpose as stated in the Project Paper and Agreement is:

"To provide ESF funds resulting from the Amended Bases Agreement of 1967 to enhance the capabilities of selected municipalities and cities, with emphasis in those most affected by the U.S. military facilities, to manage resources in carrying out development activities responsive to locally-established priorities."

This purpose was not revised in the course of the MDF Project's implementation over the years.

Through the local government units' direct participation in the whole subproject cycle, from identification, design, implementation, monitoring, supervision and post construction operations, the capacity many of the selected municipalities and cities in the management of development activities has been enhanced. The local government units' actual experience in the process has been an effective institutional development mechanism rather than institutional development or training activities per se. Many of these MDF participants have now applied for and been granted additional funds for other local development activities largely as a result of their familiarity and experience in the subproject identification, design and implementation process.

## V. POST-PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES

USAID activities beyond the PACD involve the following:

1. Review and processing of peso payments - Because of the GOP's processing time for payments to local consultants and contractors, there will still be billings to be paid by the ESF Secretariat for work accomplished prior to the PACD. USAID will continue to review these peso payments and provide concurrence to those billings found to be in order.
2. Disbursement of Project Funds - As of PACD, expenditures under the Project was \$30,761,173. There are no active AID direct contracts under the Project, so there are no more direct payments to be made to AID contractors. The financial procedures under the Project involve dollar remittances to reimburse peso payments made by the ESF Secretariat to host country contracts. All host country contracts have been completed or terminated as of the PACD, although payments may still be due in some of them as noted in #1 above. Disbursement of project funds for valid billings prior to the TDD of September 30, 1991 is anticipated, but the amount cannot be determined yet as of this writing. (A rough estimate of \$.8 million is anticipated for additional disbursement.)
3. Deobligation of Excess Funds - After the TDD, USAID in coordination with the ESF Secretariat, will deobligate excess funds under the Project. Of the \$2.8 million pipeline as of the PACD, approximately \$2.0 million is expected for deobligation.
4. Monitoring Responsibilities - Once the MDF subprojects have been officially accepted and turned over by the ESF Secretariat to the LGUs, USAID is no longer required to monitor the operations of the subprojects. However, the USAID field engineers may visit some completed subprojects as part of their field trips to other ongoing subprojects and prepare special reports on any findings that may be relevant to ongoing/future USAID projects.

The ESF Secretariat, on the other hand, will continue to monitor operations and performance of completed subprojects, particularly those financed under a loan component. [NOTE: Some of the ESF Secretariat' loan terms on the MDF subprojects involve repayment periods of up to 25 years and the ESFS is currently re-evaluating the loan terms on many subprojects, particularly markets.] However, the ESF Secretariat is not required to submit monitoring reports to USAID after completion of the MDF Project. Also, the Project Paper states that USAID will not monitor reflows from credit-financed subprojects.

## VI. REVIEW OF PROJECT EVALUATIONS"

Two ESF program evaluations covering several ESF projects, including the MDF, were undertaken and served as the MDF Project's interim and final evaluations. These evaluations included a process evaluation in July 1989 followed by an impact evaluation in April 1991.

### A. Process Evaluation

The process evaluation looked at the effectiveness of institutions, structures and procedures used to implement the ESF projects under the ESF Secretariat. This evaluation reviewed both the functional and institutional aspects of the ESF Secretariat projects. The team studied the three major subproject activities (markets and other income producing ventures, roads, and schools), and then analyzed the institutional/managerial systems that were related to them: program, technical, and financial management. The study then assessed the institutional roles of the four major components: the Secretariat, local government units, USAID, and the Regional Development Councils. A future direction for the projects and their institutional base was recommended, and lessons learned were drawn from the evaluation for other activities. The team also considered the recent political climate in the Philippines, together with the numerous administrative changes that have resulted, and based their conclusions within the context of their profound and continuing effect on the ESF-projects and involved local institutions. Major findings of the evaluation are summarized below:

1. In general, the team found that most markets and other income generating subprojects were not developing a level of income necessary to make them financially sustainable as originally forecasted, nor were they always meeting their health and environmental objectives.
2. The institutional/managerial systems that support these subprojects have been in a state of flux because of the political and administrative changes. Leadership has been under constant change, institutional relationships unclear and changing, and adequate and timely coordination has been sporadic. If judged by a set of criteria of effectiveness based on standards, quantity, timeliness, and costs, the Secretariat must be seen over the eight year evaluation period to be marginally effective although has vastly improved in recent months.

3. Technological skills generally exist at local levels sufficient to carry out roads and schools projects, which are of standard specifications, but are lacking for larger, more complex construction. There has not been technology transfer from the Secretariat to local governments, which often already have this capacity. This transfer has also not taken place within the Secretariat because the in-house consultant (TAMS) lacked counterparts with appropriate technical backgrounds.
4. Current financial practices have reduced the peso pipelines but some problems remain in the financial reporting systems. Payments to contractors have been inordinately long, although recently improved.
5. The Secretariat has suffered from discontinuous leadership and a clear goal and purpose, both problems primarily stemming from recent political events.

A financial evaluation of operating ESF markets, including those financed under the MDF, was also conducted by a local ESF Secretariat consultant in late 1990. The study assessed the actual financial viability of the markets and concluded that out of 17 operating ESF markets, only two were financially viable given their current loan terms with the ESF Secretariat. Of the 15 non-viable markets, seven were MDF-financed markets. The study recommended restructuring of the loan terms for these subprojects on a case-to-case basis. As of this meeting, the ESF Secretariat is reviewing their loan policies in light of the evaluation recommendations.

#### B. Impact Evaluation

The impact evaluation which serves as the Project's final evaluation, looked at the impact of the basic types of ESF subprojects (schools, roads, markets and "others"). Relevant findings/conclusions from the evaluation are summarized below.

1. School construction was the most consistently successful portion of the ESF infrastructure program and had immediate and direct beneficial impacts on the local community.

Therefore, school construction should be a major part of any future ESF infrastructure program.

2. Majority of the ESF roads provided the benefits expected, although there were a number of poorly selected or poorly constructed roads. Nonetheless, the evaluation supports continued funding for road subprojects as part of a future ESF infrastructure program, with the selection of roads based on a stronger economic footing.
3. Future ESF programming should include funding for markets, drawing from lessons learned from the present program, especially concerning market design, management and financial arrangements and performance.
4. MDF-funded slaughterhouses and solid waste management activities have been unsuccessful, while drainage activities have been marginally successful.
5. Future ESF infrastructure programming should include funding for "other" types of subprojects that: a) meet requirements for economic and social soundness, b) play a well-defined and justifiable role in expanding essential social services commensurate with the level of development and needs of the community they serve, c) will receive adequate budget to operate public facilities effectively, or d) develop infrastructure facilities that address constraints to private business development and/or have high employment generation potential.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The lessons learned from the MDF Project can be drawn from the findings of the two evaluations discussed in the previous section. These lessons should be applied to the design of any future ESF projects, from procedures and implementation arrangements to types of subprojects.

On a broader perspective, major actions have been recommended by the impact evaluation (and endorsed by OCP) which address the ESF projects' performance under the current implementation arrangements. These recommendations, which are aimed at increasing program impact, are as follows:

- Examine alternatives to the current implementation arrangements for the program before proceeding with any follow-on activities. For example, consider the use of an external, non-governmental technical assistance team for the review of the engineering, economic, and other requirements, as well as project implementation monitoring of subprojects proposed by local governments.
- Give particular attention to mechanisms that would transfer management responsibility and funds directly to the development budgets of capable local governments for small-scale infrastructure projects at the very outset of the follow-on ESF project.
- Include the monitoring of the social and economic effects of completed subprojects in any future ESF Program's management information system.

OCP/MZonaga:ebe  
1058J:03/13/91

ANNEX A

List of Participating Cities/Municipalities

BATAAN

Hermosa  
Morong  
Dinalupihan

LA UNION

San Fernando

TARLAC

Tarlac  
Bamban  
Capas  
Concepcion

BENGUET

Baguio City  
La Trinidad

PAMPANGA

Angeles City  
Mabalacat  
Porac  
Magalang  
San Fernando  
Floridablanca  
Sta. Rita

ZAMBALES

Olongapo City  
Subic  
San Antonio  
San Narciso  
San Marcelino  
Castillejos

ANNEX B

Pre-Approved List of Subproject Types

Roads and Bridges  
School Buildings  
Electric Power Facilities  
Street Lighting  
Water Supply  
Drainage/Flood Control  
Erosion Control  
Reforestation  
Institutional Development  
Sanitation  
Solid Waste  
Public Markets  
Slaughterhouses  
Ice Plants and Cold Storage  
Hospital/Health Stations  
Sites & Services (Resettlement)

kk

ANNEX C

List of Completed Subprojects

| <u>Subproject</u>                      | <u>Region and Province</u> | <u>Contractor</u> | <u>Consultant</u> | <u>Date Started/<br/>Date Completed</u> |
|--|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|
| 1. Baguio City High School             | I - Benguet                | Marron            | DCCD              | 07-11-84<br>12-06-85                    |
| 2. Trinidad Spec. Market               | I - Benguet                | Multi Dev't.      | DCCD              | 01-07-84<br>02-20-89                    |
| 3. Baguio City Public Market (Phase I) | I - Benguet                | Titan             | DCCD              | 01-14-85<br>06-10-89                    |
| 4. Mamaltec Elem. Sch.                 | I - Benguet                | AGC               | DCCD              | 08-29-85<br>03-21-86                    |
| 5. San Fernando Solid Waste            | I - Benguet                | Area Builders     | DCCD              | 02-16-85<br>03-16-88                    |
| 6. Morong Mun. High School             | III - Bataan               | Unitech           | DCCD              | 11-14-83<br>02-21-85                    |
| 7. Hermosa Mun. High School            | III - Bataan               | Gabriel           | DCCD              | 11-23-83<br>03-21-86                    |
| 8. Dinalupihan Elem. School            | III - Bataan               | AJR               | AWIA              | 01-28-85<br>01-07-86                    |
| 9. Dinalupihan Public Market           | III - Bataan               | R.D. Tuazon       | Amalgamated       | 07-11-84<br>11-05-87                    |
| 10. Morong Roads/ Drainage Improvement | III - Bataan               | J.N. Constr.      | TCGI              | 05-21-84<br>02-16-88                    |
| 11. Morong-Mabayo Road                 | III - Bataan               | H. Hollero        | TCGI              | 04-09-84<br>02-21-86                    |
| 12. Dinalupihan Public Mkt. Drainage   | III - Bataan               | Orani Builders    | PMO               | 01-20-90<br>05-09-90                    |

|                                 |                |                   |             |                      |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 13. Morong Drainage             | III - Bataan   | V.P. Roque        | Phnico      | 01-18-90<br>12-31-90 |
| 14. Mabalacat (Dau) E/S         | III - Pampanga | Lugue             | Amalgamated | 08-17-83<br>05-08-84 |
| 15. Angeles City Slaughterhouse | III - Pampanga | A.L. De Castro    | Philnor     | 03-26-84<br>01-24-85 |
| 16. Magalang Public Market      | III - Pampanga | Cedar             | Avecilla    | 02-10-84<br>11-19-85 |
| 17. Sta. Rita Public Market     | III - Pampanga | Buan              | Philnor     | 10-04-84<br>03-21-85 |
| 18. Mabalacat E/S (A)           | III - Pampanga | A.V. Lugue        | UICI        | 12-02-85<br>10-08-86 |
| 19. Mabalacat E/S (B)           | III - Pampanga | Buan              | UICI        | 09-25-85<br>04-24-86 |
| 20. Magalang Elem. School       | III - Pampanga | A.V. Lugue        | UICI        | 02-06-85<br>10-02-85 |
| 21. Taug River Control          | III - Pampanga | Ferdstar          | MMDC        | 08-15-86<br>05-06-88 |
| 22. Porac Public Market         | III - Pampanga | Jehan             | Philnor     | 12-12-84<br>09-28-90 |
| 23. San Isidro-San Basilio      | III - Pampanga | Macapagal         | Allied Tech | 01-27-86<br>05-22-88 |
| 24. Concepcion Mun. H/S         | III - Tarlac   | New City Builders | Codes       | 02-04-84<br>09-26-85 |
| 25. Concepcion Public Market    | III - Tarlac   | Tuazon            | TCGI        | 02-04-84<br>06-18-86 |
| 26. Concepcion Sta. Rosa E/S    | III - Tarlac   | F.C. Dizon        | UICI        | 02-11-85<br>08-18-88 |
| 27. Capas E/S                   | III - Tarlac   | Rodel's Constr.   | UICI        | 01-13-88<br>06-21-88 |

M

|  |                |                             |                     |                      |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| 28. Capas<br>Concepcion<br>Road                | III - Tarlac   | Master Iron<br>Works        | DCCD                | 12-02-85<br>09-27-88 |
| 29. Bamban E/S                                 | III - Tarlac   | J.C. Anthony                | UICI                | 12-09-85<br>06-27-89 |
| 30. Capas<br>Public Market                     | III - Tarlac   | ADC                         | Codes               | 07-23-83<br>04-30-87 |
| 31. Tarlac Mun.<br>Drainage                    | III - Tarlac   | Dyna                        | Phinco              | 03-14-85<br>01-29-87 |
| 32. Pitabunan<br>Corazon De<br>Jesus E/S       | III - Tarlac   | R.C. Sunga                  | UICI                | 12-13-85<br>11-17-89 |
| 33. Concepcion<br>Sta. Rita<br>Elem. School    | III - Tarlac   | On Soon                     | UICI                | 09-25-85<br>11-17-89 |
| 34. Concepcion<br>South Central<br>Minane E/S  | III - Tarlac   | Eastern Visayas             | UICI                | 09-11-85<br>12-21-89 |
| 35. Concepcion<br>North Central<br>E/S         | III - Tarlac   | Eastern Visayas             | UICI                | 09-11-85<br>12-21-89 |
| 36. Concepcion<br>Culatingan E/S               | III - Tarlac   | Eastern Viasyas             | UICI                | 09-25-85<br>12-31-90 |
| 37. Bamban Public<br>Market                    | III - Tarlac   | Panday Pira/<br>R.D. Tuazon | DCCD/<br>Trans-Asia | 02-07-84<br>11-09-90 |
| 38. San Narciso<br>Public Market               | III - Zambales | Abesco                      | Amalgamated         | 10-10-83<br>08-30-85 |
| 39. Subic Public<br>Market                     | III - Zambales | A.L. De Castro              | DCCD                | 01-09-84<br>01-31-86 |
| 40. San Marcelino<br>Livestock<br>Auction Mkt. | III - Zambales | E.L. Cervantes              | Amalgamated         | 03-26-85<br>01-22-87 |

|  |                |                |             |                      |
|--|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------------|
| 41. Subic Cent. School                   | III - Zambales | Unitech        | DCCD        | 01-07-85<br>03-26-87 |
| 42. San Antonio Slaughterhouse           | III - Zambales | SSD Lopez      | Amalgamated | 01-16-85<br>03-04-86 |
| 43. San Marcelino CS                     | III - Zambales | E.L. Cervantes | Amalgamated | 03-26-85<br>11-26-88 |
| 44. San Narciso Drainage & Outfall       | III - Zambales | Abesco         | Amalgamated | 01-14-86<br>01-12-89 |
| 45. San Marcelino Public Market          | III - Zambales | Jehan          | Codes       | 07-05-83<br>06-25-87 |
| 46. Castillejos Road Improv. Package B   | III - Zambales | Rocky Mountain | Philnor     | 02-12-85<br>04-24-86 |
| 47. Olongapo Solid Waste                 | III - Zambales | NSD            | Total       | 02-23-84<br>08-04-88 |
| 48. San Antonio Public Market            | III - Zambales | Raymundo       | Amalgamated | 02-10-84<br>10-19-89 |
| 49. Castillejos Road Improv. (Package A) | III - Zambales | NSD Constr.    | Philnor     | 05-28-87<br>11-17-89 |