



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF USAID/PHILIPPINES GROWTH WITH EQUITY IN MINDANAO III (GEM-3) PROGRAM

ANNEXES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEX 1: GEM-3 CONTRACTUAL REVISED TARGETS AND COMPLETED TARGETS..	1
ANNEX 2: SCOPE OF WORK.....	2
ANNEX 3: EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....	12
ANNEX 4: EVALUATION WORK PLAN	13
ANNEX 5: EVALUATION TIMETABLE.....	20
ANNEX 6: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES	22
ANNEX 7: FIELD SITES FOR SURVEY AND FIELD VISITS	46
ANNEX 8: FIELD WORK SCHEDULES FOR EVALUATION TEAM	48
ANNEX 9: PEOPLE CONTACTED	54
ANNEX 10: REVENUE ENHANCEMENT AND PEACE (REAP).....	62
ANNEX 11: REFERENCES CITED	63
ANNEX 12: ECONOMIC RATE OF RETURN CALCULATIONS	65

ANNEX I: GEM-3 CONTRACTUAL REVISED TARGETS AND COMPLETED TARGETS¹

	Project	Total Budget \$98,950,113	Contractual Revised Targets	Completed Targets Sept 2012
INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT COMP		\$65,724,739		
1	Barangay Infrastructure Projects (# of BIPs)		760	720 (est)
2	Regional Impact Projects (# of RIPS)		12	12
WORKFORCE PREPARATION COMPONENT		\$13,087,485		
3	Computer Literacy & Internet Connection (CLIC) (# schools)			
	- 153 Standard; 18 internet; 34 computers; 60 teachers		265	265
4	Education Matching Grant (EMGP) (# of grants)		800	802
5	Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP) (# of colleges/universities)		26	26
6	Business Internships (PRIDE) (# of interns)		100	91
7	Scholarships (INVESTS) (# of scholarships)		185	275
GOVERNANCE IMPROVEMENT COMPONENT		\$5,133,487		
8	Congressional Internship Program for Young Mindanao Leaders (CIPYML) (# of interns)		200	149
9	Revenue Enhancement and Peace (REAP) (# of LGUs)		12	17
BUSINESS GROWTH COMPONENT		\$13,250,085		
10	Identify new Chambers in CAAM for Institutional Support (# of chambers)		6	6
11	Chambers of Commerce in CAAM assisted to advocate improved LGU performance in tax revenue collection (# of chambers)		6	6
12	Producers Associations assisted to improve the competitiveness of their products (# of associations)		20	20
13	Help BSOs plan and implement specific events (# of BSOs helped)		25	25
14	Key growth sector BSOs established (# of BSOs established)		5	5
15	Triple value from 2007 \$30 million baseline		\$82 million	\$77
16	Triple volume from 207 33T MT baseline		90T MT	60-70T MT
17	Bring about a sizeable expansion of warehousing, cold storage and VHT facilities (# of expansions)		1	2
18	Tourist resort in CAAM (# of resorts)		terminated	
19	BPO Facility in CAAM (# of facilities)		4	4
20	Outreach and community projects by major international mining firms (# of communities)		4	4
FORMER COMBATANT REINTEGRATION COMP (part of BG above)				
21	MNLF Former Combatant coops/communities provided with pre-post harvest facilities (# of facilities)		50	50
22	MNLF Former Combatant groups/communities assisted to produce high value commodities-Sulu (# of groups/communities)		50	50
23	MNLF Former Combatant groups/communities assisted to produce high value commodities-Central Mindanao (# of groups/communities)		75	75
COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS SUPPORT SERVICES		\$1,754,317		

¹ From GEM-3 Davao Office, Louis-Berger Group Inc, September 2012.

ANNEX 2: SCOPE OF WORK

SECTION C . DESCRIPTION/SPECIFICATIONS/STATEMENT OF WORK EVALUATION OF THE GROWTH WITH EQUITY IN MINDANAO (GEM-3) PROJECT (SOL-492-12-0000)

C.1 INTRODUCTION

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in the Philippines seeks to conduct an evaluation that will assess the performance of the third phase of its Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM-3) project in meeting its overarching objectives: 1) to accelerate economic growth in Mindanao; 2) to help assure that as many people as possible participate in and benefit from the growth; and 3) to help bring about and consolidate peace in Mindanao. To accomplish these objectives the GEM-3 Program conducted a wide range of projects and activities throughout Mindanao with program components ranging from: infrastructure development; workforce preparation; business growth; governance improvement; and former combatant reintegration. Beyond these main programmatic areas, the GEM-3 program also conducted a series of support services in communications and public relations and logistical and operational support to facilitate the implementation of several program activities throughout the life of the program. The evaluation will investigate each of these program components to determine what contribution each made to achievement of the aforementioned overarching objectives, provide lessons learned and make recommendations as to where USAID programs may have a comparative advantage its current assistance provision.

C.2 BACKGROUND

Economic progress in Mindanao has been limited, due to the continuing unrest, armed clashes, kidnappings, and incidents of terrorism in western and central regions of the island, the eastern coastal area, and the Sulu Archipelago. The vulnerability of people and businesses in those areas to criminal gangs, episodic loss of life and property, and armed conflict, has resulted in the expansion of only a small number of firms with a rare establishment of sizable new businesses.

To address the situation in Mindanao, the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GPH) has been pursuing a two-pronged approach. Using military and other security resources, it is trying to contain and eliminate the violence where it is still prevalent. To eliminate the future resurfacing of violence, the GPH is attempting to expand economic opportunity for all the people of Mindanao, and to improve the general well-being of local populations. USAID has been working closely and extensively with the GPH in its attempts to expand economic opportunity and improve the well-being Mindanao residents. USAID coordinates its efforts in Mindanao with other U.S. Embassy Manila agencies in conflict-affected areas of Mindanao to improve peace and stability. These agencies include the State Department's Public Affairs, Economics and Political Sections, Justice Department, and the Department of Defense, especially the Joint Special Operations Task Force– Philippines (JSOTF-P).

USAID has been implementing major assistance efforts in Mindanao for almost two decades. For the first few years, the assistance was focused on the SOCSARGEN (South Cotabato and Sarangani Provinces, and General Santos City) area in south-central Mindanao. In 1995, USAID expanded its assistance efforts to cover all of Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago. After the signing of the Peace Agreement between the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GPH) in 1996, USAID intensified assistance efforts in the conflict-affected areas of Mindanao – both the areas affected by the Muslim separatist conflict, and the areas affected by the New People's Army (NPA) insurgency and criminality.

At this point, USAID is implementing a very sizable assistance effort that includes projects and activities in a wide range of technical areas, including: infrastructure development, agricultural development, education improvement, democracy promotion, governance improvement, health services, environmental management improvement, expansion of microfinance services, and reintegration of former combatants. The activities are carried out across Mindanao, but tend to be concentrated in the five provinces that make up the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), its neighboring conflict-affected provinces, and the areas affected by the NPA.

I. The GEM-3 Program and its Objectives

The largest and most diverse program being carried out in Mindanao by USAID is its Growth with Equity in Mindanao III (GEM-3) Program. The \$98 million² GEM-3 Program continues and expands work carried out under GEM-1 (1995-2002) and GEM-2 (2002-2007) budgeted at \$22.3 million and \$82 million respectively. GEM-3 began in January 1, 2008 and is expected to have a five-year life, ending on December 31, 2012.

GEM-3 operates throughout Mindanao, but had a special focus on the ARMM and other conflict-affected areas of the region. GEM-3 has three related principal objectives:

1. To accelerate economic growth in Mindanao;
2. To help assure that as many people as possible participate in and benefit from the growth; and
3. To help bring about and consolidate peace in Mindanao.

GEM-3 works with a wide range of public and private organizations and institutions in its efforts to attain its objectives. These include: producer associations and cooperatives; the Mindanao Development Authority – (MinDA) (which is the GPH agency formally charged with oversight responsibility for GEM-3); the Mindanao Business Council; the ARMM Business Council; provincial, municipal, and barangay governments; bilateral and multilateral donor agencies; private firms; chambers of commerce; national government agencies; and Non-Government Organizations (NGOs).

GEM-3 is an umbrella-type activity, under which USAID is implementing a wide range of projects and activities throughout Mindanao. The different components of the GEM-3 Program are: a) infrastructure development; b) workforce preparation; c) business growth; d) governance improvement; and e) former combatant reintegration. Projects are carried out under each of these major GEM-3 components. Performance targets, expected results, and standard indicators for the GEM-3 projects can be found in Annex 1.

In addition to the various peace and development activities, GEM-3 also provides a range of general support services for USAID in Mindanao. The most important of these is their continuing information and communication effort aimed at promoting a balanced view of Mindanao through media; i.e., attempting to make people aware that Mindanao is more than just conflict, that it also can be an excellent place to do business. Other services include transporting and arranging security for visiting United States Government (USG) officials, and arranging public diplomacy-related events.

Additional information about the GEM-3 Program, including activity descriptions, activity results, and significant accomplishments, can also be found on the program's website at www.mindanao.org. No results framework was constructed or baseline data gathered during the formulation of the GEM-3 Program.

2. Other USAID Activities in Mindanao

USAID directs 60 percent of its total assistance towards Mindanao to improve the business climate, stimulate economic growth, reintegrate former combatants into the economy, strengthen basic education, improve health services and support transparency in local governance. In the environment and energy sectors, USAID is partnering with local governments and community-based organizations in Mindanao to help them effectively manage their natural resources, improve urban environmental management, and improve access to affordable and renewable energy sources supplied through public-private alliances.

To support the health sector, USAID is working with the private sector and local governments to improve the delivery of family health services, including maternal and child health, voluntary family planning, and control of tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, and emerging pandemic threats. In its democracy and governance portfolio, USAID is supporting local officials to combat corruption by focusing on transparency and accountability in public administration processes. Finally, in education, USAID is increasing access to quality education and livelihood skills in areas most affected by conflict and poverty and improving the quality of instruction—particularly in math, science, and English. Between 1996 and 2009, through all its programs, USAID provided nearly \$500 million to reinforce Philippine Government efforts to secure a lasting peace and build a better life for the people of Mindanao.

USAID's development programming works in conjunction with the efforts of the U.S. Military colleagues in Mindanao. USAID and the Joint Special Operations Task Force – Philippines (JSOTF-P) work closely together

² In 2011, the contract was renegotiated from its original amount of \$125 million to \$98 million

in several conflict areas of Mindanao to support the Philippine development objectives. The U.S. Embassy's Mindanao Working Group plays a key role in the coordination of all U.S. Government (USG) assistance to Mindanao. One aspect of the USG effort is the prevention of a backsliding effect that would allow terrorist elements to reestablish the safe haven that previously existed in the Philippines.

C.3 SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess GEM-3's performance in achieving its objectives and meeting its performance targets as defined in the GEM-3 contract.³ The evaluation will inform USAID/Philippines on the success and failures of the GEM-3 program in developing and stabilizing conflict-affected areas of Mindanao. The evaluation's findings, conclusions, and recommendations will provide the Mission with valuable information and insight into its work in Mindanao and its ability to combat transnational-terrorism.

The product of this evaluation will be a final report that evaluates the successes, shortcomings, and lessons learned of GEM-3 activities. The report should include recommendations for improving USAID's assistance delivery in Mindanao and highlight comparative advantages in areas not addressed by other initiatives.

C.4 DETAILED WORK REQUIREMENTS

To evaluate the GEM-3 Program performance, the Offeror will address the following eight areas: impact, relevance and selectivity, effectiveness, efficiency, gender, sustainability, lessons learned, and the process for gathering data to complete the assessment. In the proceeding text, the eight areas are listed with questions for consideration by USAID/Philippines. For each of the eight areas, the Offeror must provide questions in their proposal that will be addressed and answered during the evaluation.

I. IMPACT:

- a) Overall, what are the key results and outcomes of the program? Have the specific targets established for the various activities and projects implemented under the GEM-3 Program been attained?
- b) What has been the impact of the activities? Have the various projects and activities carried out under the GEM-3 Program played an appreciable role in bringing about improved situations with respect to peace and development?
- c) Impact of specific GEM-3 Components:
 - (1) Infrastructure Development – How did the infrastructure development component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? Did the differing scopes and scales of the infrastructure projects have a significantly different level of impact on meeting the program's targets and objectives? (E.g. Barangay Infrastructure Projects (BIPs) vs. the Regional Infrastructure Projects (RIPs)). Out of the different types of infrastructure projects supported (solar dyers, box culverts, irrigation canals, boat landings, etc.), were there specific types that were more effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives? Have the quality and functionality of infrastructure projects been maintained by local partners?⁴
 - (2) Workforce Preparation – How did the Workforce Preparation component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? Which of the different Workforce Preparation activities (Computer Literacy and Internet Connection (CLIC)⁵, Education Matching Grant Project (EMGP), Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP), Productive Internships In Dynamic Enterprises (PRIDE), Investments in Vocational, Elementary, Secondary and Tertiary Studies (INVESTS), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives and why? Did the combination of Workforce Preparation activities result in synergies that magnified the effect of any one specific activity?

³ GEM-3 performance targets can be found in Annex I.

⁴ Note that GEM-3 is currently undertaking an internal analysis of the economic impact of GEM-3 Infrastructure projects. The Evaluation Team should make use of the report generated from this analysis in their work.

⁵ Note that GEM-3 is currently undertaking an internal analysis of the impact of the Computer Literacy and Internet Connection (CLIC) program. The Evaluation Team should make use of the report generated from this analysis in their work.

- (3) Governance Improvement – How did the Governance Improvement component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? Did the technical assistance activities conducted under this component effectively improve the capacity of the Government of the ARMM and its constituent Local Government Units (LGUs) to address their key administrative and management problems? Which of the different Governance Improvement activities (Revenue Enhancement And Progress (REAP), Congressional Internship Program for Young Mindanao Leaders (CIPYML), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives? Did these programs address the most pressing needs of the ARMM LGUs? Did packaging —incentives|| (e.g. additional infrastructure projects) with governance improvements lead toward successful attainment of LGU targets? Which —incentives|| seemed to be the most effective?
- (4) Business Growth – How did the Business Growth component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? Did the activities lead to a significant increase in private investment in the targeted sectors? Which of the different Business Growth activities (Business Support Organization (BSO) Development, Targeted Commodity Expansion Project - (TCEP), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives and why? How effective were the different activities at facilitating the services required by local businesses to grow and generate employment? How effective has the Business Growth component of GEM-3 been in improving Mindanao producers' access to markets? How effective was GEM-3's business policy agenda in improving competitiveness of Mindanao businesses?
- (5) Former Combatant Reintegration (FCR) – How did the FCR component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? What effect did FCR programming have on recidivism rates of former combatants towards violence? Did the activities effectively support former MNLF combatants develop the production of agricultural products to generate sustainable economic opportunities? Which of the specific elements of the Livelihood Enhancement and Peace (LEAP) program were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) meeting targets and programmatic objectives?
- (6) Communications and Public Relations (CPR) – How did the CPR component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? Have public relations efforts been effective in changing the impression that all of Mindanao is a battleground? If yes, has this led to an increase in business activities and investment in the region? Has the CPR component generated public awareness, understanding and support of the Government of the Philippines and USAID activities in Mindanao? If so, to what extent? What have been the impacts of GEM-3 branding efforts? What is the GEM brand worth? Do different Mindanao stakeholders properly associate the GEM-3 Program with USG/USAID development assistance? Does the GEM brand have a synergistic effect on other USG/USAID activities in Mindanao? Should the GEM brand be used for future programs in the region? What are the implications of continuing to use the GEM brand? Which of the CPR activities (Pamphlets, radio, videos, CD-ROMs, etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in supporting GEM-3/USG branding/outreach efforts?
- (7) Cross Cutting GEM-3 Support Services – How did the Support Services component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II? How has the range of support services provided by the GEM-3 program impacted other USG/USAID programming in the region? Which of the Support Services activities (security services, transportation, arranging Very Important Person (VIP) visits, etc.), were most effective? Are the Support Services a necessary component to achieve success in conflict-affected areas of Mindanao?

2. RELEVANCE AND SELECTIVITY:

Did the program address relevant and priority areas in Mindanao that are consistent with the Philippine government peace and development strategies? Which of the GEM-3 Program activities were the most relevant to meeting its peace and economic development objectives? For which activities did USAID have the best comparative advantage? Is it possible to link GEM-3's socio-economic activities with the objectives

of bringing about peace and stability in Mindanao? What evidence was found to support or dismiss these linkages?

3. EFFECTIVENESS:

Did the GEM-3 Program accomplish its objectives and achieve its targets? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? Did the umbrella-type assistance approach work? Have technical assistance, training, and partnerships been targeted at the appropriate beneficiaries to ensure the greatest impact in advancing peace, stability, and economic growth? How effective are the public and private partnerships that GEM-3 developed? How effective was the financial resource leveraging or buy-in of GEM-3 activities? Where have synergies been achieved with other USAID/USG-funded activities in Mindanao, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food for Progress program and the activities of the Joint Special Operations Task Force – Philippines (JSOTF-P)? What additional opportunities exist for greater collaboration, with JSOTF-P and other USG organizations?

4. EFFICIENCY:

Were the program management structure and implementing tools efficient in achieving results? Have the various activities and projects carried out through the GEM-3 Program been appropriately managed? Have staffing levels been appropriate? Were management and oversight costs suitable given the number and scope of activities carried out? How efficient was the USAID oversight and management of GEM-3? How could it be improved? Has the —umbrella-type project design for GEM-3 been an efficient method of using program resources and finding synergies amongst the different program components? How cost effective were the results of each program area compared with alternative approaches of accomplishing the same objectives?

5. GENDER:

To what extent has the GEM-3 Gender Action Plan been implemented? Have gender concerns been mainstreamed into GEM-3 activities? To what degree have gender issues been addressed? What was lacking in the project design and/or implementation that would have improved gender considerations?

6. SUSTAINABILITY:

Are the results and impacts of GEM-3 activities sustainable? What evidence exists of the host country and local government units (LGUs) taking ownership of the GEM-3 program, including promoting the networks and best practices developed and disseminated under GEM-3?

7. LESSONS LEARNED:

What lessons have been learned from the design and implementation of GEM-3? How can socio-economic development programs be designed to have the greatest impact on fostering peace and stability? Are there activities that are more effective in promoting peace, relative to other activities? If so, which activities are these? Please also include a list of key lessons learned for each of the seven GEM-3 components.

8. DATA COLLECTION:

The Offeror will suggest specific variables to be collected to meet the GEM-3 performance evaluation requirements during Stage 2 (Refinement of Review Methods described below) of the evaluation. Variables should be selected based on availability of data as well as the feasibility and cost of collection.

C.5 METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation will determine the performance and impact of the most sizable, most visible, most varied USAID/Philippines assistance effort in Mindanao. The evaluation will be both quantitative and qualitative and will be implemented over the course of 60 workdays. The evaluation will provide answers to address each of the eight areas outlined in Section IV.

Given the lack of viable baseline information and other severe data limitations, the evaluation will rely mainly on qualitative methods including, but not limited to, semi-structured interviews, direct observation at project sites, focus groups of stakeholders and project beneficiaries, and documentation reviews. The

evaluation should also strive to collect data from areas where GEM-3 was not implemented to provide a with- and without-project comparison. Where feasible and appropriate, efforts should incorporate quantitative methods to measure program performance and impact including household surveys. Quantitative data collected will be vetted to the Mindanao Development Authority for consistency with qualitative findings.

Through participatory methods a multi-disciplinary team composed of an external consultant (team leader), key technical specialists, Government of the Philippines officials, including the Mindanao Development Authority (MindDA), and USAID/Philippines staff will examine GEM-3 program results. A visit to a series of project sites will allow field staff and beneficiaries to provide their inputs to the review process. Because of the broad area covered by the GEM-3 Program, USAID/Philippines suggests having two teams working to conduct research and collect data simultaneously. The final evaluation will be conducted in four stages:

Stage 1: Review of Existing Documentation - Time Frame: 1 week

The review team will conduct a thorough literature review of existing data and analyze relevant documentation such as studies, reports, and assessments produced by public and private sources. In addition, the Evaluation Team may decide to consult additional documentation from the USAID/Philippines, GEM-3 Headquarters office, or other sources as deemed necessary. The team will also familiarize themselves with non-GEM-3 USAID/Philippines activities in Mindanao to differentiate between GEM-3 and non-GEM-3 impacts. The Mission will seek to gather all available project documents and make them available at the USAID/Philippines office. The results of Stage 1 (Document Review) will inform the final evaluation methodology and implementation of field visits. Finally, at the conclusion of this phase, the Evaluation Team will outline preliminary field visit plans to view the various types of projects and activities that USAID has undertaken in Mindanao under the GEM-3 Program.

Stage 2: Refinement of Review Methods - Time Frame: 1 week

GEM-3 program activities are quite broad and diverse as they attempt to achieve the outlined peace and security and economic development objectives in Mindanao. The USAID GEM-3 Team and GEM-3 Staff will provide briefings to the Evaluation Team. To determine whether the collection of program activities had an appreciable impact on its targeted beneficiaries, the team will combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection. Rather than stating the exact mix in this scope of work, the Evaluation Team will be instrumental in the method selection process. For some selected performance indicators, valid quantitative data should be collected. For other indicators, qualitative methods will be a better way to gather information. At a minimum, the following data collection methods are encouraged: focus group interviews, key informant interviews, review of secondary data, document review, observation, random spot checks (visits to field offices and target population homes/fields), and household surveys.

In addition, decisions will be made on choosing a sample of project staff and target beneficiaries to be interviewed or surveyed. Thus, during this stage, the Evaluation Team will decide on final selection of the methods and instruments to be used during the field visit and prepare for the data collection exercise in the field. The strategy including chosen methods, instruments, and target beneficiaries will be presented to USAID for approval prior to the commencement of data collection.

Stage 3: Field Data Collection - Time Frame: 5 weeks

Stage 3 is the core of the evaluation process, will consider and integrate the findings of Stage 1 and Stage 2, and will involve prime contractor fieldwork, key informant interviews, validation of findings and report preparation. This will involve site visits and key informant interviews with USAID stakeholders at the local and national levels, including project contractors, grantees, MinDA officials, implementing partners in government, civil society and the private sector, beneficiary groups, local leaders, USAID officers and staff, US Embassy officers, and other donors and organizations working in Mindanao. This stage will be preceded by the completion of Stages 1 and 2. Stage 3 will be an in-depth assessment that will further analyze, synthesize and validate the findings under the earlier stages. It will seek to fill the gaps in knowledge and information from the earlier stages, in response to the evaluation questions predetermined by the Offeror.

The team leader and technical staff will plan and coordinate all the necessary logistics for the qualitative and quantitative collection of data at the field level.⁶ The USAID/Philippines and MinDA evaluation team

⁶ All raw quantitative data collected by one of the Agency's contractors or grantees for the purposes of the evaluation

members will also assist the team leader as requested in this stage. While USAID/Philippines does not propose a specific number of field visits, the total number should be sufficient to view a sizable, representative sample of all the key components of the GEM-3 Program. To the greatest extent possible, each type of project under each of the five main GEM-3 components should be visited at the field level.

Stage 4: Write and Present Evaluation Report - Time Frame: 3 weeks

Upon completion of the field data collection, the Evaluation Team will draft the evaluation report with conclusions and recommendations.⁷ The team will analyze and synthesize review findings and field data in order to describe, quantify and assess the impacts of the GEM-3 program on target beneficiaries. It will assess the effectiveness and efficiency of USAID approaches and implementing mechanisms while considering the impact indicators and targets outlined in GEM-3 program design documents. The team leader and technical staff will hold a meeting with USAID/Philippines staff and MinDA officials to present findings, lessons learned, and recommendations. Following the incorporation of feedback from USAID staff and MinDA officials, the team leader and technical staff will present the findings of the report to the entire USAID/Philippines Mission as well as USAID's Philippine Government Partners at MinDA and other interested agencies. The final report will be submitted to USAID/Philippines/Program Resources Office no later than 15 days following the conclusion of the 60-day work period. The Offeror will submit the final report to the Agency's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) within the same timeframe.⁸

C.6 DELIVERABLES AND DELIVERABLES SCHEDULE

The detailed deliverables and deliverables schedule for this contract are as follows:

The Contractor shall deliver the following items to the USAID Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR):

- a) **Detailed Work Plan and Final Report Outline:** Due to the COTR within the first 10 days of engagement. The work plan is to include any suggestions for revisions in the statement of work and the evaluation strategy describing the design and methodologies. The work plan shall reflect the Evaluation Team's schedule for interview, data collection, field visits, report writing, and periodic interim briefings for USAID. The Offeror will also submit an outline of the evaluation report during this time. A checklist for assessing the expected quality of the final report is included in Annex 2. The outline of the final evaluation report and work plan shall be approved by the COTR within five days of reception.
- b) **Draft Report:** A draft report shall be submitted to COTR on or before the 49th work day of the engagement. Comments on the report will be provided by the COTR within five days of reception.
- c) **Presentation of Evaluation Results to USAID:** Prior to the submission of the final evaluation report, the Evaluation Team shall present the results of the evaluation to USAID and MinDA. This session shall also be used to solicit comments and clarify issues. The Offeror will coordinate with the COTR to schedule these sessions between Day 49 and Day 51.
- d) **Final Report:** The final evaluation report shall be submitted to USAID by the Team Leader no later than 15 working days after the completion of the 60 work days of engagement. The final report should contain an Executive Summary of not more than five (5) pages and should clearly identify the team's findings, conclusions and recommendations. Appendices should at a minimum, list the people and organizations interviewed, the Evaluation SOW, evaluation framework and instruments used, success stories, reports from Stages 1, 2, and 3, and references cited. The final report should be single spaced, using Times New Roman font size 12, with each page numbered consecutively. Items such as graphs,

must be provided to USAID/Philippines to be uploaded and stored in a central database. The data should be organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation. USAID Evaluation Policy, January 2011, p. 12.

⁷ For specific guidance on preparing the final report, refer to the new USAID Policy on Monitoring and Evaluation at <http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation/USAID-EVALUATIONPOLICY.pdf>. Where applicable this evaluation will follow guidance outlined in this policy.

⁸ Completed evaluations must be submitted to the agency's *Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC)* and a cover sheet attached indicating the type of evaluation conducted and design. Each completed evaluation must include a 3- to 5-page summary of the purpose, background of the project, main evaluation questions, methods, findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the evaluation. USAID Evaluation Policy, January 2011, p. 11.

charts, should be included in a maximum of 60 pages (excluding appendices).

C.7 QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL

The contractor will field an experienced evaluation team with extensive experience in the fields of monitoring and evaluation of large development projects, institutional development, education, peace and security, agriculture, governance, energy/environment, and impact assessment. The evaluation team should be highly experienced in statistical sampling, surveys, and data analysis. Additional requirements of the team members include previous work experience in Asia, excellent data analysis and computer skills (word processing and spreadsheets), and sufficient language skills to conduct field research in Mindanao. To the extent possible, evaluation specialists with appropriate expertise from the Philippines, but not involved in project implementation, will lead and/or be included in evaluation teams.⁹ Additional logistical support, if necessary, will be drawn from the Office of Economic Development and Governance at USAID/Philippines.

The Offeror must take into consideration the existing security concerns present in some regions of Mindanao. American citizens under the Chief of Mission authority must receive clearance by the Regional Security Office of the U.S. Embassy before traveling to Mindanao. This concern may restrict movement of American citizens. Non-Americans should be aware of any restrictions placed on them by their respective embassies and plan accordingly. Considering these restrictions, appropriate actions must be taken to assure all necessary data can be gathered for a complete evaluation. USAID/Philippines suggests including a proper mix of Filipinos willing and able to enter conflict-prone areas to complete necessary tasks.

The Offeror must verify the availability of any personnel working on the evaluation for more than 20 days. Please include letters of availability for all applicable personnel when submitting the proposal. Submissions not including letters of availability will not be considered for the award.

USAID/Philippines suggests having two teams comprised of approximately six members each with a similar mix of technical specialties. The two teams will work simultaneously to conduct research and compile data in order to achieve the broadest coverage of geographic regions and different GEM-3 components. The teams' activities will be coordinated and managed by the Team Leader. *The following is a list of suggested specialists that should make up each evaluation team, though the Offeror may also suggest a different mix of personnel if deemed more appropriate to conduct this evaluation.*

The following experts should be considered:

The Evaluation Team Leader must have:

- a) An advanced degree in Economics, Business Administration, Regional Planning, Economic Development, or a related field
- b) At least 15 years professional experience in project performance and impact evaluation
- c) Demonstrated ability in designing and implementing development programs on a nation-wide or region-wide basis
- d) Strong skills in designing quantitative and qualitative research instruments and methodologies
- e) Proven ability to analyze data collected as part of program implementation and to prepare reports, including program recommendations
- f) Proven writing and leadership skills
- g) Familiarity with USAID project planning, implementation, and evaluation processes
- h) In-depth knowledge of development issues in conflict-areas of is an advantage

Team Members:

Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

- a) Post-Graduate degree in Project Monitoring and Evaluation/Project Planning and Management or an advanced degree in relevant social sciences.
- b) Should have a degree in Economics, Socio-Sciences, Statistics, Development Studies or related field
- c) Minimum of 10 years of prior experience in monitoring and evaluation, field-based data collection and analysis experience, and knowledge sharing
- d) Experience in sampling methodologies, in using spreadsheet and data analysis software (e.g. STATA, SPSS), and an acquaintance with other database software

⁹ USAID Evaluation Policy, January 2011, p. 9.

- e) Strong writing skills in a variety of contexts
- f) Previous experience in the development sector in Southeast Asia
- g) Familiarity with USAID project implementation and evaluation processes
- h) In-depth knowledge of development issues in conflict areas in Mindanao is an advantage

Rural Development Specialist:

- a) Advanced degree in economics related to rural development
- b) Minimum of 8 years of prior technical experience with a focus on agricultural business development, agroindustry and/or small enterprise development, export market products, and value chain analysis
- c) Ability to design, manage, and implement quantitative and qualitative field-based evaluations related to economic growth
- d) Strong writing skills in a variety of contexts
- e) Previous experience in the development sector in Southeast Asia
- f) Familiarity with USAID project planning, implementation, and evaluation processes
- g) In-depth knowledge of development issues in Mindanao is an advantage

Institutional Development Specialist:

- a) An advanced degree in Institutional Development, Urban Planning, Business Management;
- b) Minimum of 8 years of prior technical experience with a focus on local governance, institutional development, and the infrastructure sector
- c) Ability to design, manage, and implement quantitative and qualitative field-based evaluations related to economic growth
- d) Strong writing skills in a variety of contexts
- e) Previous experience in the development sector in Southeast Asia
- f) Familiarity with USAID project planning, implementation, and evaluation processes
- g) In-depth knowledge of development issues in conflict-affected areas of Mindanao is an advantage

Peace and Security Specialist:

- a) Advanced degree in a discipline related to international peace, security, conflict management and mitigation and/or governance
- b) Minimum of 8 years of prior technical experience with a focus on conflict mitigation, counter terrorism or counter extremism
- c) Ability to design, manage, and implement quantitative and qualitative field-based evaluations that links peace and security to economic growth
- d) Strong writing skills in a variety of contexts
- e) Previous experience in the development sector in Southeast Asia
- f) Familiarity with USAID project planning, implementation, and evaluation processes
- g) In-depth knowledge of development issues in conflict-affected areas of Mindanao is an advantage

Technical Assistants:

- a) Bachelor's degree in Economics, Business Administration, Agriculture, Education, etc., or a technical field related to one of the principal areas of GEM-3 involvement
- b) At least 3 years of work experience providing technical and administrative support to a team of professionals
- c) Experience in data collection and data quality assurance
- d) Ability to synthesize input from various sources
- e) Experience using of spreadsheet and other database software
- f) Must have a good knowledge of key actors and stakeholders in Mindanao

C.8 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The evaluation is expected to be completed within 60 working days. Following is a suggest timeline for conducting the requested activities. The Offeror may suggest variations to schedule, but the total timeframe cannot exceed 60 working days and the final report must be submitted within 15 days after completion.

Activity	Work Days	
	Review and analysis of basic GEM-3 Program documents and studies	1-5
Briefings from USAID GEM-3 Team and GEM-3 Program management team	6-8	3 days
Refine evaluation methodology, prepare work plan, report outline, and schedule of field visits; review of additional documents	9-13	5 days
Data collection and field visits	14-43	30 days
Preparation of draft report	44-48	5 days
Submission of draft report to USAID's Program Resources Office; briefing and discussions with USAID/	49-51	3 days
Revise report	52-55	4 days
Presentation of final draft report to USAID.	56-57	2 days
Finalize report	58-60	3 days
Submission of final report to USAID - 15 working days after completion of management		

Activity	Month 1			Month 2			Month 3			
	W1	W2	W3	W4	W5	W6	W7	W8	W9	W10
Review and analysis of basic GEM-3 Program documents and studies										
Briefings from USAID GEM-3 Team and GEM-3 Program management team										
Refine evaluation methodology, prepare work plan, report outline, and schedule of field visits; review of additional documents										
Data collection and field visits										
Preparation of draft report										
Submission of draft report; briefing and discussions with USAID; solicit comments of the draft report. Briefing with MinDA on the findings of the evaluation.										
Revise report										
Presentation of draft final report to USAID										
Finalize report										
Submission of report to USAID	15 working days after completion of engagement									

[END OF SECTION C]

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Based on the evaluation expectations presented in the GEM-3 RFP and subsequently discussed with the GEM-3 Contracting Officer's Representative, the evaluation will address the following critical issues across GEM-3 component areas with respect to the achievements of GEM-3 during Fiscal Years 2007-2012.¹⁰ The key evaluation questions as listed in the RFP are as follows:¹¹

Impact: What were the key results and outcomes of this component? Did the GEM-3 projects contribute to economic growth and development in the different intervention regions? How? What kinds of partnerships were generated as part of the GEM-3 process with various stakeholders? In what way did these activities contribute to peace or the reduction of violent conflict in the region? How?

Relevance: Did the component address relevant needs in priority areas in Mindanao as articulated by community members? How were infrastructure needs determined and by what organizations? Who were the primary decision-makers for where and what level of resources would be allocated to a given project?

Effectiveness: What percent of GEM-3 components achieved their targets? Which ones did not meet their targets? Were these targets achieved on schedule? What kinds of problems or issues were identified for contributing to GEM-3 not achieving its targets?

Efficiency: How cost-effective were the projects in achieving its targets? What type of projects were the most cost-effective in terms of time, money and results? What are the comparative rates of return on different types of GEM-3 projects?

Gender: Does the project have sex-disaggregated data? If yes, were gender gaps identified in the data analysis? How were these gender gaps addressed? Was there participation of women in decision-making for the type of projects selected? What have been the contributions of and benefits derived by women and men in this project? To what extent did GEM-3 implement its Gender Action Plan for this component?

Sustainability: What plans are in place to sustain the projects once GEM-3 is finished? By whom? What types of community organizations emerged to maintain a particular project—how was ownership resolved for various types of projects? For RIPs and BIPs, how is maintenance handled? What types of income generation efforts are in evidence to maintain these infrastructure projects?

Lessons Learned: What worked best in designing and implementing the projects? What activities did not work as anticipated? Did the differing scopes and scales of the projects have a significantly different level of impact on meeting the program's targets and objectives? Provide action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations based on evaluation findings for this component. What lessons were learned in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of GEM-3 activities?

¹⁰ USAID/Philippines COR for the evaluation is Ms. Fatima Verzosa of the Program Resources Management Office (PMR)

¹¹ RFP No. SOL-492-12-000008, pp. 10-12.

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION WORK PLAN

FINAL WORK PLAN

August 06, 2012

This revised work plan was produced by Social Impact for review and approval by USAID/Philippines under Contract No. SOL-492-12-000008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. PROJECT OVERVIEW 15
 - Introduction 15
 - Evaluation Purpose 15
 - Evaluation Background 15
 - Operational Issues to be Addressed by the Evaluation 15
- 2. PROJECT WORKPLAN TASKS 16
 - Task 1: Orientation Briefing with USAID/Philippines 16
 - Task 2: Review of Key GEM-3 Documents 17
 - Task 3: Prepare Detailed Evaluation Work Plan 17
 - Task 4: Conduct a Mini-Survey of BIP Projects 17
 - Task 4a: Develop and Pre-Test Data Collection Instruments 17
 - Task 4b: Provide Training to Field Staff on Data Collection Procedures 18
 - Task 4c: Analyze Survey Data and Conduct a Briefing on Mini-Survey Findings 18
 - Task 5: Collect Field Data 18
 - Task 6: Data Analysis 18
 - Task 7: Evaluation Briefing and Preparation of the Evaluation Report 19
 - Task 8: Submission of the Final Evaluation Report 19
 - Task 9: Produce 20-Minute Video on Evaluation Process 19

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Introduction

The United States Agency for International Development Mission in the Philippines (USAID/Philippines), through its contractor Social Impact (SI), is conducting an evaluation to assess the performance of the third phase of its Growth with Equity in Mindanao 3 (GEM-3) project in meeting its overarching goals to:

1. accelerate economic growth in Mindanao;
2. help assure that as many people as possible participate in and benefit from the growth; and
3. help bring about and consolidate peace in Mindanao.

To accomplish these objectives, GEM-3 conducted a wide range of projects and activities throughout Mindanao with program components ranging from: infrastructure development; workforce preparation; business growth; governance improvement; and former combatant reintegration. Beyond these main programmatic areas, GEM-3 also conducted a series of support services in communications and public relations and logistical and operational support to facilitate the implementation of several program activities throughout the life of the program. The evaluation will investigate each of these program components to determine what contribution each has made towards achieving the aforementioned overarching objectives therein providing lessons-learned and recommendations for future USAID programs.

Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the GEM-3 evaluation is to assess the overall impact of GEM-3's complex and extensive set of interventions in achieving the overarching goals mentioned in the overview. This effort will essentially be a "performance evaluation" focusing on descriptive and normative elements that GEM-3 *has or has not achieved*, supported by the collection of quantitative data to document the various aspects of the program and qualitative data to capture the more subtle expressive features of the GEM-3 interventions.

Evaluation Background

Opportunities for economic growth and development in Mindanao exist, but economic growth and institutional development have been stymied by three decades of internal conflict, the lack of infrastructure and institutional development. Social conflict along with the lack of basic social services provided by the national government has resulted in the lack of trust among people at the local level and between citizens and government authorities.

Foreign assistance to Mindanao through donor-funded projects has sought to bridge this gap and, in particular, USAID has been implementing major assistance efforts in the region for almost two decades. Initially, this assistance was focused on South Cotabato, Sarangani Provinces, and General Santos City areas in south-central Mindanao. In 1995 through 2002, USAID expanded its assistance efforts to cover all of Mindanao and the Sulu Archipelago under the auspices of GEM-1 (\$22.3million). Given the continuing need to promote development assistance, USAID funded GEM 2 (\$82 million) for the years 2002-2007. USAID's largest and most diverse program in Mindanao is GEM-3. This \$98 million program has continued and expanded earlier work carried out under GEM programs 1 and 2.

GEM-3 represents a sizable assistance effort that complements projects and activities in a wide range of technical areas including (but not limited to): infrastructure development, agricultural development, education improvement, democracy promotion, governance improvement, environmental management improvement, and reintegration of former combatants. These activities are being carried out across Mindanao, but tend to be concentrated in the five provinces that make up the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) along with neighboring conflict-affected provinces. The GEM-3 program has provided technical and financial intervention assistance to achieve its objectives through the program five components: 1) infrastructure development, 2) workforce preparation, 3) business growth 4) governance improvement, and 5) former combatant reintegration. GEM-3 also provides cross-cutting activities including: a) providing information and communication aimed at promoting a balanced view of Mindanao through mass media efforts, and b) supporting transportation and security for visiting United States Government (USG) officials, and arranging public diplomacy-related events.

Operational Issues to be Addressed by the Evaluation

Based on the evaluation expectations presented in the GEM-3 RFP and subsequently discussed with the GEM-3 Contracting Officer's Representative, the evaluation will address the following critical issues across GEM-3 component areas with respect to the achievements of GEM-3 during Fiscal Years 2007-2012.

Table 1: Project Performance Elements

Impact	
1.	What were the key results (outputs and outcomes) of this component?
2.	Did the GEM-3 projects contribute to economic growth and development in the different intervention regions? How?
3.	What kinds of partnerships were generated as part of the GEM-3 process with various stakeholders?
4.	In what way did these activities contribute to peace or the reduction of violent conflict in the region? How?
Relevance	
1.	Did the component address relevant needs in priority areas in Mindanao as articulated by community members?
2.	How were infrastructure needs determined and by what organizations?
3.	Who were the primary decision-makers for where and what level of resources would be allocated to a given project?
Effectiveness	
1.	What percent of GEM-3 components achieved their targets? Which ones did not meet their targets?
2.	Were these targets achieved on schedule?
3.	What kinds of problems or issues were identified for contributing to GEM-3 not achieving its targets?
Efficiency	
1.	How cost-effective were the projects in achieving its targets?
2.	What type of projects were the most cost-effective in terms of time, money and results?
3.	What are the comparative rates of return on different types of GEM-3 projects?
Gender	
1.	Does the project have sex-disaggregated data? If yes, were gender gaps identified in the data analysis? How were these gender gaps addressed?
2.	Was there participation of women in decision-making for the type of projects selected?
3.	What have been the contributions of and benefits derived by women and men in this project?
4.	To what extent did GEM-3 implement its Gender Action Plan for this component?
Sustainability	
1.	What plans are in place to sustain the projects once GEM-3 is finished? By whom?
2.	What types of community organizations emerged to maintain a particular project—how was ownership resolved for various types of projects?
3.	For RIPs and BIPs, how is maintenance handled? What types of income generation efforts are in evidence to maintain these infrastructure projects?
Lessons Learned	
1.	What worked best in designing and implementing the projects?
2.	What activities did not work as anticipated?
3.	Did the differing scopes and scales of the projects have a significantly different level of impact on meeting the program's targets and objectives?
4.	Provide action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations based on evaluation findings for this component.
5.	What lessons were learned in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of GEM-3 activities?

The original RFP outlined numerous additional questions that the evaluation team has tried to combine and focus in the selection above. However, given that certain component-specific questions are of key interest to the Mission, the evaluation team will ask these questions in their component specific interview protocols.

2. PROJECT WORKPLAN TASKS

Nine major tasks will be carried out to evaluate the GEM-3 program. These tasks are discussed below.

STAGE ONE

Task 1: Orientation Briefing with USAID/Philippines

During the first and second week of the evaluation (July 23-August 6, 2012), the Evaluation Team (consisting of the Team Leader and Sub-Team Leader 1) will meet with USAID/Philippines GEM-3 Evaluation Managers to discuss the scope of work (SOW) of the evaluation, any changes since the contract award, and what areas of particular

sensitivity the Team should be concerned with for carrying out the evaluation (including program objectives, sub-contractor sampling design, and other general observations for carrying-out the evaluation of the GEM-3 program.

Task 2: Review of Key GEM-3 Documents

During Weeks 1 and 2, the entire Evaluation Team will begin reviewing key GEM-3 documents and begin establishing a schedule for meeting with knowledgeable persons regarding the GEM-3 program. The document review and interview findings will provide a critical nexus for determining what activities must be included in the Evaluation Work Plan and what topics and concerns should be addressed within the survey questionnaire and other key informant and focus group protocols. All material and documents will be made available to other members of the evaluation team who are due to arrive during Week 2 of the evaluation.

Key documents: In order to familiarize themselves with GEM-3's mission, its objectives, and programmatic evolution, evaluators will review (among others) the following documents: GEM-3 Quarterly Reports, the GEM-2 Completion Report, recent reports from the USAID Regional Inspector General, along with internal self-assessment reports conducted by the GEM-3 contractor—Louis Berger, Inc. (LBI).

Key Interviews: The Team Leader and Sub-Team Leader 1 will meet with the USAID/Philippines Mission Director to capture her views on the Mission's expectations of the GEM-3 evaluation and other views relevant to conducting the evaluation. Interviews will also be arranged with Mission Specialists familiar with USAID program. Subsequently, interviews will be conducted with other Government of the Philippines (GPH) agencies and international development organizations working in Mindanao. For example, members of the Evaluation Team will meet with representatives of the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), the Office of the Presidential Advisor on the Peace Process (OPAPP), the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) Regional Government, and the World Bank (WB). Other interviews will also be arranged with additional organizations, time permitting.

STAGE TWO

Task 3: Prepare Detailed Evaluation Work Plan

During Week 2 (July 30-August 4, 2012), the entire Evaluation Team will participate in preparing a work plan for carrying-out the evaluation of the GEM-3 program. The Evaluation Team will be divided into two sub-teams with respective responsibilities. The work plan will include; a detailed overall evaluation timetable, an expanded fieldwork schedule, a list of the GEM-3 sites to be visited by the Evaluation Team, and the provinces to be covered by Teams 1 and 2 over a five-week period.

Task 4: Conduct a Mini-Survey of BIP Projects

Infrastructure projects accounted for approximately 67 percent of the resources allocated to promote economic growth throughout Mindanao. These projects were conceived as serving relatively large numbers of persons in rural barangays with assumption that by improving the rural infrastructure for these populations would ultimately assist in bringing about peace in Mindanao. These infrastructure projects consisted of Regional Infrastructure Projects (RIPs—projects costing in excess of \$50,000) and Barangay Infrastructure Projects (BIPs—costing less than \$50,000). As part of its proposal, SI proposed using a sub-contractor to conduct a mini-survey of BIP projects. This effort is briefly described below:

Task 4a: Develop and Pre-Test Data Collection Instruments

During Week 2, the Evaluation Team working with its sub-contractor, the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture (RIMCU) will commence on the development of Survey Questionnaire focusing on the results achieved by the GEM-3 BIPs. This questionnaire will be conducted in 36 barangays (30 barangays with GEM-3 projects and six barangays with no GEM-3 projects) and administered to 900 respondents. Twenty-five respondents will be surveyed in each GEM-3 site for a total of 750 persons with the same number of respondents reviewed in the non-GEM-3 sites (6 x 25) for a total of 150. In each BIP site, key leaders, including community leaders, local religious heads or imams, women's group leaders, among others) will also be interviewed to collect their views on the actual benefits they perceive to have been achieved by their respective GEM-3 project. Once the draft questionnaire is developed and reviewed by the Evaluation Team Leader, suggested changes will be incorporated and then sent to the RIMCU field staff for initial translation and preparation for pre-testing the instruments. The development of a GEM-3 mini-survey field questionnaire will involve the following five principles:

First, the questionnaire content should reflect the central questions and issues initially detailed in the Evaluation Statement of Work and subsequently addressed in SI's winning proposal.

Second, the questionnaire items should only seek to collect information that is relevant to answering the aforementioned central question—each item should be justified as part of an integrated analytic plan.

Third, the instrument items should be as clear and simple as possible—the items should be carefully screened for overly complicated sentences and for unnecessary jargon (especially since the questionnaire will need to be translated into Tagalog).

Fourth, the respondent burden should be carefully considered—close-ended items should be used to the extent possible in order to lessen the response burden and to facilitate analysis.

Fifth, the questionnaire must be field-tested under realistic condition—as now envisioned, the survey instrument will consist of approximately 40 questions. No more than 30-40 minutes should be required to complete the survey questionnaire.

By the end of Week 2 (August 4), RIMCU will complete a pre-test of the BIP field questionnaire in a GEM-3 field site to insure that the survey questions make sense, are clear, and are appropriately translated for capturing the desired information on the GEM-3 program. Once the initial pretest is completed, changes to the instrument will be incorporated and then the questionnaire will be administered to an additional GEM-3 group to assess their comment on the revised instrument including the actual questions, the length of the instrument, and how much time was needed to complete the questionnaire.

Task 4b: Provide Training to Field Staff on Data Collection Procedures

By the middle of Week 3 (August 8), basic techniques for conducting the survey will be developed including a basic sample frame from which to draw survey participants (especially with the full preparation of the data base from the SI Evaluation Team Leader). In conducting the survey, the main implementation issues are those of consistency (administering the survey in the same way each time), completion of all survey items, and striving for a reliable response rate during from each participant cohort population.

Task 4c: Analyze Survey Data and Conduct a Briefing on Mini-Survey Findings

RIMCU plans on analyzing their survey data on an ongoing basis as data are collected, cleaned, and entered into a Microsoft Excel document and subsequently a SPSS/PC database. On August 30, towards the end of Week 6, RIMCU will present a briefing on their initial survey findings to the GEM-3 Evaluation Team and representatives from the GEM-3 staff, USAID and other invited parties.

STAGE THREE

Task 5: Collect Field Data

The SI Evaluation Team (divided into two sub teams) will conduct site visits to 36 to 40 GEM-3-assisted barangays; Team 1 (consisting of five persons) will visit approximately 20 barangays with Team 2 (consisting also of five persons) will visit about the same number of barangays. Both teams will conduct their site visits during the Weeks 3 to 5 (August 7-August 25). Teams 1 and 2 will conduct their site visits independent of the mini-survey being conducted by RIMCU. Total sites visited by both the teams and RIMCU will be about 72 to 76 barangays.

Upon arriving in Davao City on August 7, the Evaluation Teams will meet with MinDA officials. The teams will visit the GEM-3 staff the following day to obtain documents and to discuss various aspects of the GEM-3 components. To complement the more quantitative mini-survey data collection procedures of RIMCU, the GEM-3 evaluation teams will design and develop during Week 2 the Guide Questions for Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) for collecting extensive qualitative data during their visits to component barangays.

Unlike the more focused and structured mini-survey questionnaire, these protocols are essentially open-ended sets of questions designed to probe the attitudes and knowledge of local persons about the results and benefits of the projects that were awarded to their respective barangays by the GEM-3 program. Nevertheless, these protocols have been structured to achieve complementarity between the teams such that they will collect similar types of project performance data across the respective GEM-3 program components.

FGDs (between 6 to 8 persons each) and KIIs will require more time—between 50-60 minutes—with focus group sessions limited to an hour and a half sessions. Despite the additional time burden, the expectation is that a rich body of information will be collected to complement the quantitative data collection effort. While all of the team members have experience in conducting interviews, the Team Leader will conduct a short session on how to conduct focus groups prior to the Evaluation Teams' deployment to the field.

Task 6: Data Analysis

During Week 6 and into Week 7 (circa August 29-September 6) the Evaluation Team will return to Davao City to begin analyzing their data and preparing brief 10 page component reports describing the results of their site visits. These qualitative summaries by component area will be augmented by a briefing provided by RIMCU summarizing the major themes identified in the survey data. Part of a week has been set aside to ensure that component team members will provide a written report summarizing their FGDs and KIIs. As noted above, survey data will be entered into a data file for quantitative analysis using SPSS/PC. RIMCU is expected to conduct a brief review of the survey findings on/about August 30.

STAGE FOUR

Task 7: Evaluation Briefing and Preparation of the Evaluation Report

The GEM-3 Evaluation Team will depart from Davao City returning to Manila on September 6. The Team Leader and Sub-Team Leaders will be responsible for producing a Draft GEM-3 Evaluation Report for submission to USAID/Philippines on September 17.¹²

This draft evaluation report on GEM-3 shall be compiled from field data collected from four data sources: quantitative data results from the mini-survey findings analyzed using SPSS/PC, qualitative data summaries and themes generated from extensive key informant interviews and focus groups conducted in approximately 40 barangays, and a mix of quantitative/qualitative data obtained from a thorough review of secondary data sources. The GEM-3 Draft Evaluation Report will be organized as follows: the report will present a succinct analysis for answering how well each component was implemented vis-à-vis the project performance elements—ranging from impact to lessons-learned. Subsequently, based on the specific findings and themes identified in each individual component, a summary chapter will present an analysis of the major findings and crosscutting themes for the GEM-3 program—resulting in a summative performance evaluation with conclusion and recommendations as called for in the GEM-3 RFP. Prior to submission to USAID/Philippines, the Team Leader will submit the draft report for quality review by SI headquarters in Arlington, Virginia.

Once USAID/Philippines and MinDA personnel have reviewed and commented on the draft report (September 20), appropriate revisions will be made by the Evaluation Team. The COR will then arrange for an initial presentation of the Evaluation Team's findings, conclusions, and recommendations on/about September 21 to PRM staff. Based on the feedback from this initial presentation, the COR will arrange a presentation for the entire Mission as well as relevant GPH agencies on/about September 24.

Task 8: Submission of the Final Evaluation Report

A final draft report will be submitted to SI HQ, prior to the departure of the remaining GEM-3 Evaluation team members on September 25, along with evaluation data files, the mini-survey database, and other documents collected by evaluation team members during the fieldwork phase of the evaluation.

Home office personnel from SI in Arlington, Virginia will be responsible for producing the final evaluation document for submission to USAID/Philippines by October 16, 2012.

Task 9: Produce 20-Minute Video on Evaluation Process

As agreed with USAID/PPL/LER and USAID/Philippines (and stipulated in an official contract modification), SI, working with its subcontractor Quimera, will produce a short video (around 20 minutes long) that documents the evaluation process, as outlined in the USAID Evaluation Policy, using the evaluation of GEM-3 as an example. The video will include a short introduction of GEM-3; a section on how the evaluation purpose, questions, and methodology were derived; a section on the data collection process, including recordings of FGDs and KIIs; a section on how the evaluation team will analyze and synthesize its findings, conclusions, and recommendations; and a final section on how the evaluation will be used by USAID/Philippines and USAID/Washington to inform future program design. The intended audience will be USAID staff within the Mission and across the agency.

¹² SI requested and USAID COR agreed to a change in submission date of the Draft Final Report from September 13 to September 17 (email from USAID/Philippines to SI on August 1, 2012).

ANNEX 5: EVALUATION TIMETABLE

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
July 2012	22	Manila 23	Manila 24	Manila 25	Manila 26	Manila 27	Manila 28
		STAGE 1 Meetings w/ USAID 8.30am- 3.30pm Desk Review	STAGE 1 Meetings w/ RMICU Desk Review	STAGE 1 Meeting with USAID Mission Dir Meeting w/ ARMM	STAGE 1 Meetings w/ USAID OEDG & Key Partners Desk Review	STAGE 1 Meetings w/ OPAPP, NEDA & Key Partners	STAGE 1 Desk Review
	29	Manila 30	Manila 31	Manila 1	Manila 2	Manila 3	Manila 4
		STAGE 1 Team Briefings Eval Team Planning Meeting	STAGE 1 Desk Review & Update Eval Methods	STAGE 2 Desk Review & Update Eval Methods	STAGE 2 Submission of Final Work Plan & Final Report Outline to USAID	STAGE 2 Meetings w/ Key Partners (cont.) USAID gives written approval	STAGE 2 Update final work plan, if needed
August 2012	5	Manila 6	TRAVEL 7	Mindanao 8	Mindanao 9	Mindanao 10	Mindanao 11
		STAGE 2 Preparation for field work Team Meeting on work & logistics	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Team to <u>Davao</u> Meet MinDA	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Meet GEM-3 staff	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1*-travel to Surigao del Sur T2*-travel to Compostela Valley	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-Surigao del Sur T2-C Valley	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-Surigao del Sur T2-C Valley
	12	Mindanao 13	Mindanao 14	Mindanao 15	Mindanao 16	Mindanao 17	Mindanao 18
	Video Team travels to N Cbo on Aug 14	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-Surigao del Sur T2-C Valley	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-to N. Cotabato T2-to S. Cotabato	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-North Cotabato T2-South Cotabato	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-North Cotabato T2-South Cotabato	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-North Cotabato T2-South Cotabato	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1-North Cotabato T2-South Cotabato
	19	Mindanao 20	Mindanao 21	Mindanao 22	Mindanao 23	Mindanao 24	Mindanao 25
T2 travels to Davao for flt to ZC	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK [Eidl Fitri hol] T1- Maguindanao T2-Travel to Tawi-Tawi	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK [nat'l hol] T1- Maguindanao T2-Tawi-Tawi	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1- Maguindanao T2-Tawi-Tawi	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1- Maguindanao T2-Tawi-Tawi	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1- Maguindanao & other prov T2-Depart Tawi-Tawi	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Return to Cotabato	

T1 and T2 = Team 1 and Team 2

	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	26	Mindanao 27	Mindanao 28	Mindanao 29	Mindanao 30	Mindanao 31	Mindanao 1
		STAGE 3 FIELD WORK [nat'l hol] T1 & T2 in Cotabato City	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1 & T2 in Cotabato City	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK T1 & T2 return to Davao (by vehicle)	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Davao Meet business grps, CoCs RIMCU (2- 4pm)	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Davao Meet business grps, CoCs	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Davao Meetings & Write shop
	2	Mindanao 3	Mindanao 4	Mindanao 5	TRAVEL 6	Manila 7	Manila 8
		STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Davao Meetings & Write shop	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Davao Write shop	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK All team members submit component reports	STAGE 3 FIELD WORK Return to Manila	STAGE 4 Data Analysis/ Draft Report	STAGE 4 Data Analysis/ Draft Report
	9	Manila 10	Manila 11	Manila 12	Manila 13	Manila 14	Manila 15
		STAGE 4 Data Analysis/ Draft Report	STAGE 4 Data Analysis/ Draft Report	STAGE 4 Data Analysis/ Draft Report	STAGE 4 Team submits draft report to SI HQ COB for review	STAGE 4 Meetings at USAID and AusAID	STAGE 4 Team revises draft report based on SI HQ comments
	16	Manila 17	Manila 18	Manila 19	Manila 20	Manila 21	Manila 22
		STAGE 4 Submission of Draft Report to USAID	STAGE 4 Team prepares presentation for USAID I	STAGE 4 Receive comments on draft report from USAID	STAGE 4 Team revises draft report	STAGE 4 Presentation to USAID I (USAID & MinDA staff)	STAGE 4 Team prepares presentation for USAID2. Cont w/ revision of draft report.
	23	Manila 24	Manila 25	TRAVEL 26	27	28	
		STAGE 4 Presentation to USAID Mission and GPH agencies	STAGE 4 Finalize Draft Report Eval Team submits draft report to SI HQ				NOTE: Revised date: SI will submit Final Report to USAID by Nov 30

September 2012

ANNEX 6: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW GUIDES

6A. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

GROWTH WITH EQUITY IN MINDANAO (GEM-3) BARANGAY MINI-SURVEY Social Impact (SI) and Research Institute for Mindanao Culture (RIMCU) Cagayan de Oro City August 2012	IDENTIFICATION																			
	Province: _____ Municipality: _____ Barangay: _____ Name of Respondent : _____ Address (Street & House Number) _____ _____	CODES <table border="1" style="width: 100%; height: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td></tr> <tr><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 50px; height: 30px;"></td></tr> </table>																		
	Type of Barangay: <table style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">GEM 3 Area</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-GEM Area</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </table> Type of Sub-Project <table style="margin-left: 20px;"> <tr><td style="padding-right: 20px;">Road Construction/Upgrading (RCU)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">1</td></tr> <tr><td>Trading Center (TC)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">2</td></tr> <tr><td>Bridge Construction (BC)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">3</td></tr> <tr><td>Grain Solar Dryer (GSD)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">4</td></tr> <tr><td>Grain Warehouse/Solar Dryer (GWSD)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">5</td></tr> <tr><td>Footbridge (FTBR)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">6</td></tr> <tr><td>Drainage (DRNG)</td><td style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; text-align: center;">7</td></tr> </table>		GEM 3 Area	1	Non-GEM Area	2	Road Construction/Upgrading (RCU)	1	Trading Center (TC)	2	Bridge Construction (BC)	3	Grain Solar Dryer (GSD)	4	Grain Warehouse/Solar Dryer (GWSD)	5	Footbridge (FTBR)	6	Drainage (DRNG)	7
GEM 3 Area	1																			
Non-GEM Area	2																			
Road Construction/Upgrading (RCU)	1																			
Trading Center (TC)	2																			
Bridge Construction (BC)	3																			
Grain Solar Dryer (GSD)	4																			
Grain Warehouse/Solar Dryer (GWSD)	5																			
Footbridge (FTBR)	6																			
Drainage (DRNG)	7																			

Field Control

Name of Interviewer: _____ Signature: _____ Interviewer's Code

--	--

Interview Record

Date of Interview			Time Start	Time End	Interview length (IN MINUTES)
Month	Day	Year			

Interview Completed on

First contact	1
Second contact	2
Third contact	3

Name of Field Supervisor: _____ Signature: _____ Date of instrument verification: _____ Supervisor's Code

--	--

Introduction

Good morning/good afternoon. I am _____ (show ID) from the Research Institute for Mindanao Culture (RIMCU) Xavier University. Together with the Social Impact (SI), we are conducting a survey on your community.

This survey represents an effort to assess the level of satisfaction of local community participants with recently completed Barangay Infrastructure Projects. These projects known as Barangay Infrastructure Projects (BIPs) were funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) as part of the Growth with Equity (GEM3) program.

The aim of GEM was to improve the quality of life in barangays by providing resources for constructing a wide range of projects based on the perceived needs of local community members.

BE ASSURED THAT ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL; NO NAMES WILL BE USED OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS OR THE NAME OF THE BARANGAY. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION;

REMEMBER: SELECT RESPONDENT ACCORDING TO THE GUIDELINE. ASK EVERY QUESTION, RECORD. EXACT ANSWERS, REPEAT QUESTIONS WHEN NEEDED.

BLOCK A. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS (Demographics, Schooling and Employment)			
A1	How old are you on your last birthday? <i>(Pila na man ang imong edad karon basi nsa imong pinaka-ulahing birthday?)</i>	PLEASE RECORD ACTUAL AGE AS GIVEN BY THE RESPONDENT _____	
A2	Sex of respondent <i>(Ang RSP ba lalaki o babaye)</i>	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE Male Female	1 2
A3	What is your marital status? <i>(Ikaw ba ulitawo/dalaga, minyo/may ka-ipon, biyudo/biyuda, o bulag sa bana/asawa)</i>	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE Married Single Widowed Separated/Divorced	1 2 3 4
A4	How many children do you have? <i>(Pila man ang tanan nimong anak?)</i>	PLEASE RECORD ACTUAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN THAT RESPONDENT HAS. PLACE "0" IF RSP DON'T HAVE ANY. _____	
A5	What is the highest level of education you have completed? <i>(Unsa ang pinaka-taas nga grado ang imong nahuman?)</i>	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE No formal education/no grade Elementary School High School Specialized Technical Training Some College University/College degree Post-Graduate Courses Only attended a Madrasa	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
A6	What main ethnic group does your family belong to? (if mixed use other to specify) <i>(Unsa man ang inyong kagikan?)</i>	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE Ilocano Tagalog Cebuano Boholano Ilonggo Zamboangueno Maranao Maguindanao Iranun Subanen Manobo Tiduray Others (SPECIFY) _____	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13

			98 99
A6.1	Could you tell me what religion do you practice? (<i>Unsa man ang relihiyon sa panimalay?</i>)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE None Islam Christianity Other (specify) _____ Refused Don't know	1 2 3 4 98 99
A7	What is your occupational area? (<i>Unsa man ang klase sa imong trabaho?</i>)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE Unemployed (SKIP TO BLOCK B) Industry and/or mining Agriculture and/or forestry Transportation Construction Private business Commercial services Public health Public utilities Education and/or cultural activities Local or national government Housewife Other (SPECIFY) _____ Refused	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 98
A8	Do you work for someone and receive a salary? (Ikaw ba nagdawat ug suweldo niining imong trabaho?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE APPROPRIATE CODE YES NO Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
A8.1	Are you employed full time or part-time? (Ang imo bang trabaho permanente ug walay undang o ikaw ba dili permanente nga adunay trabaho?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE Full time employment Part-time employment Refused Don't know	1 2 98 99
BLOCK B. PROJECT INFORMATION (<i>This information to be completed by the questionnaire enumerator</i>)			
B1	Are you aware of any GEM project funded by USAID in your barangay? (<i>Nakahibalo ka ba kung adunay GEM project nga ang pondo gikan sa USAID dinhi sa inyong barangay?</i>)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE YES NO (SKIP TO QB3) Refused Don't Know	1 0 98 99
B1.1	IF "YES"--How did you first learn about the BIP project? (<i>Kang kinsa mo kini nahibalo-an?</i>)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY People from GEM came to the community My relatives, family friends told me about BIP Through media (newspaper, radio, TV) Other communities told me about the GEM and the BIPs being funded by USAID Refused Don't know	1 2 3 4 98 99
B2	What was/were this/these GEM project(s) in your community? (<i>Unsa man kini nga mga GEM projects nga ania dinhi sa inyong barangay?</i>) LIST ALL PROJECTS THAT ARE MENTIONED HERE) 01 _____	B2.1 What is the status of the project now? (<i>Unsa man ang nahitabo niini nga project sa pagkakaran?</i>) 1- Discontinued 2- Delayed 3 - On-going 4 -	

	02 _____	Completed		
	03 _____			
	04 _____			
B3 QUESTION IS FOR NON-GEM AREAS ONLY. FOR GEM AREAS, SKIP TO QB4 AFTER QB2				
B3	Which of these infrastructure projects were constructed in your community which is not GEM-funded? (Asa man niini nga mga infra projects ang na-patukod sa inyong lugar nga dili gikan sa GEM?) 01 Box culverts 02 Grain Solar Dryers 03 Training Center 04 Footbridges 05 Boat landing 06 Road 07 Irrigation 08 Water system 09 Drainage 10 Seaweed dryer 11 Grain Warehouse 12 Others (SPECIFY): _____	1 – YES 0 – NO	B3.I What is the source of fund for this project? (Kinsa man ang naghatag sa pondo alang niini nga project)	B3.I Was this ever completed? (Kini ba nahuman, wala, o nagpadayon pang gibuhat?) 1 – YES; 0 – NO; 2 ON-GOING
		B4	What was the main purpose of constructing the BIP project in your community? (Unsa man ang tumong o katuyu-an sa paghimo niining BIP Project dinhi sa inyong barangay o lugar?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY
		To improve transportation facilities (roads, footbridges, box culverts, boat landings) (Para sa pag-improve sa transportation o mapadali ug mapasayon ang pagbiyahe)	1	
		To improve the processing of agricultural products (solar or seaweed dryers) (Para mapalambo o ma-improve ang pag-proseso sa mga abot sa uma o panagat (pagbulad)	2	
		To provide an area for commercial trade and exchanges (trading centers) (Aron mahatagan ug lugar para sa pagpamaligya sa mga abot)	3	
		To provide structure for storing crops (grain warehouses) (Paghatag ug building/bodega aron adunay kabutangan sa mga na-ani nga palay, mais)	4	
		To improve water resources management (irrigations, drainage etc.) (Para mapalambo ug ma-ampingan nga mga tinubdan sa patubig)	5	
		Others (SPECIFY) _____	98	
		Refused	99	
		Don't know		
B5	How did your community decide what kind of project BIP should be done? (Gi-unsan sa mga tawo sa inyong barangay o lugar ang pagkab-ot sa desisyon kung unsa nga BIP project ang himoon?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE		
		Through discussion at the meetings (Gihisgutan o gidiskusyon sa mga meetings)	1	
		Local authorities decided (Ang lokal nga pamunu-ang ang nagdisisyon)	2	
		People's Organization decided (Ang mga POs ang nag-disisyon)	3	
		A few people from the community made the decision (Pipila lang ka tawo sa barangay ang nag-disisyon)	4	
		Refused	98	
		Don't know	99	
B6	How many persons made the decision on this BIP project? Pila man ang gidaghanon sa mga tawo nga mi-	PLEASE RECORD ACTUAL NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO MADE THE DECISION. ENCIRCLE "99" IF DON'T KNOW THE EXACT NUMBER OR 98 IF RSP		

	apil sa paghimo niini nga desisyon?)	REFUSED TO GIVE ACTUAL FIGURE. Refused Don't know	98 99
B7	How did your community participate in the BIP project? (Sa unsang paagi nakatabang ang mga tawo dinhi sa nyong barangay niini nga BIP project?) The community provided: (Sila ba mihatage sa:)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY It did nothing/no contribution at all (walay gitampo) Materials (materyales) Local labor (labor gikan sa mga residente sa barangay) Local knowledge and suggestions (kahibalo ug suggestions gikan sa mga residente sa barangay) Financial support (kuwarta) Technical equipment (technical nga mga gamit/equipment) Obtaining building permits and other legal documents (Pagkuha ug building permits ug uban pang mga legal nga dokumento) Technical assessment (technical nga kahibalo) Management (Pagdumala o pag-manage sa project) Refused Don't know	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 98 99
B8	Did the residents of the community/barangay actively participated in the BIP project? (Ang mga tawo ba sa inyong barangay aktibong misalmot sa paghimo niining BIP project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE YES NO (SKIP TO QB8.2) Refused Don't Know	1 0 98 99
B8.1	IF "YES" approximately, how many persons participated in your community's BIP? (Pila man ka tawo ang misalmot o mitabang sa paghimo niining Barangay Infra Project o BIP?)	PLEASE RECORD ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE BIP.. ENCIRCLE "99" IF DON'T KNOW THE EXACT NUMBER OR 98 IF RSP REFUSED TO GIVE AN ESTIMATE: Refused Don't know	98 99
B8.2	Were there female community members who participated in the community BIP? (Aduna bay mga babaye nga misalmot o mitabang sa paghimo niining BIP project sa inyong barangay?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO QB9) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
B8.3	IF "YES" approximately, how female members of the community participated in your community's BIP? (Pila man ang gidaghanon sa mga babaye nga misalmot o mitabang sa paghimo niining BIP Project dinhi sa inyong barangay?)	PLEASE RECORD ESTIMATED NUMBER OF FEMALES WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE BIP.. ENCIRCLE "99" IF DON'T KNOW THE EXACT NUMBER OR 98 IF RSP REFUSED TO GIVE AN ESTIMATE: Refused Don't know	98 99
B8.4	What did the female members do? (Unsa man particular nga gibuhad sa mga mi-apil o misalmot nga mga babaye sa BIP project sa barangay?)	Only listened (naminaw laman) Only provided snacks (naghatag ug merienda/snacks) Provided suggestions for the project (nagpa-ambit/mihatag ug mga sugyot) Provided cash for the project (mihatag ug cash para sa project) Provided inking contribution (mihatag ug gamay nga tabang) Monitored the sub-contractors (gibantayan ang mga sub-contactors) Used the completed project (gigamit ang nahuman nga project) Did more than one of the above (mihimo ug labaw sa	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

		usa sa mga nakalistang gimbuhaton sa itaas) Other (SPECIFY) _____ Refuse Don't know	9 98 99
B9	How did GEM personnel participate in your community project? (Unsa man usab ang gitabang o sa unsang paagi nakatabang ang mga taga GEM sa paghimo niini nga BIP project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY It did nothing/no contribution at all (walay gitampo) Only provided money (mihatag lamang ug kuwarta) Helped organize people in the community (mitabang sa pag-organisar sa mga tawo sa barangay) Provided equipment (naghatag ug equipment) Provided training (naghatag ug training) Paid for outside contractors (mibayad ug mga taga-gawas nga contractor) Refused Don't know	0 1 2 3 4 5 98 99
B10	Were there problems encountered during the implementation of BIP project? (Aduna bay mga problema sa dihang gihimo kining BIP project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO B11) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
B10.1	IF "YES" – what was/were this/these problems(s)? (Unas man kini nga mga problema?) [RECORD SEPARATELY IF THERE IS MORE THAN ONE PROBLEM. DO NOT LUMP]	01 _____ 02 _____ 03 _____	
B11	To what extent do community members utilize this BIP project? (Nagamit o napahimuslan ba ug maayo sa mga tawo dinhi sa inyong barangay kining maong BIP Project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONE CODE ONLY All the time (sa tanang panahon) Most of the time (kanunay) Sometimes (medyo kanunay) Seldom (panalagsa lang) Not at all (wala gayud) Refuse Don't know	5 4 3 2 1 98 99
B12	Who is responsible for the maintenance of this project? (Kinsa man ang responsable sa pag-maintain niining maong BIP project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ALL ITEMS THAT APPLY Barangay LGU Municipal LGU POs NGOs Community members Refuse Don't know	1 2 3 4 5 98 99
B13	Do you think the community is interested to have other BIP projects to improve local infrastructure? (Sa imo bang pagtu-o ang mga tawo o residente sa inyong barangay interesado pang maka-angkon ug laing BIP project aron mapalambo o ma-improve ang infrastruktura dinhi sa inyong barangay?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO B15) Not sure (dili sigurado) Not at this time (wala sa pagkakaran) No opinion (walay opinion)	1 0 2 3 4
B14	Which of the following projects do you think is needed in the community? (Puwede bang imong isulti kung asa niining mga mosunod nga projects ang	1 – Yes 0 - No	B14.1 Please rate according to preference as other types of infrastructure project that you think is needed in your community? (Palihug isulti kung asa niini nga mga projects nga imong ginganlan nga gikinahanglan sa barangay ang labing

	gikinahanglan sa inyong barangay o lugar?)		gusto, sunod nga gusto, ug dili kaayo gusto sa mga tawo) 1 - Most Preferred; 2 – Next Preferred 3 – Least Preferred
	01 Box culverts		
	02 Grain Solar Dryers		
	03 Training Center		
	04 Footbridges		
	05 Boat landing		
	06 Road		
	07 Irrigation		
	08 Water system		
	09 Drainage		
	10 Seaweed dryer		
	11 Grain Warehouse		
	12 Others (SPECIFY) _____		
B15	What benefits that you think resulted from the infrastructure project in your community? (Sa imong pagtu-o unsa man ang mga kaayuhan nga nahatag o mi-resulta tungod sa Infrastructure Project dinhi sa inyong barangay o lugar?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES	
		01 Gained skills in working with others (Naka-angkon ug kahanas/skills sa dihang nagtrabaho kauban ang mga residente sa barangay)	
		02 Gained technical skills, like financial management (Naka-angkon ug technical nga kahibalo sama sa financial management o unsaon pagpahiluna sa husto ang kuwarta)	
		03 Learned to cooperate with different community members (Nakatu-on sa pagpakig-ambit (cooperate) sa nagkalain-lain residente sa barangay)	
		04 Brought community members together to help decide what project is should be implemented (Nagkahi-usa ang mga residente sa barangay aron sa pagkab-ot sa desisyon kung unsa nga project ang angayang ipahimutang)	
		05 Contributed to improvements in my community (Nakatabang nga mapalambo o ma-improve ang among barangay o lugar)	
		06 Others (SPECIFY): _____	
B16	Has your community been assisted by other groups/ ORGANIZATIONS that provided services to your community? (Ang inyong lugar ba nakadawat ug mga hinabang o ayuda gikan sa ubang mga grupo o organisasyon?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO QB17) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
B16.1	IF "YES" what other groups/ ORGANIZATIONS have assisted your community? (Kinsa o unsa man kini nga mga grupo o organisasyon?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – No; 1- YES 98 – Refuse; 99 – Don't know	
		01 Local NGOs	
		02 International NGOs	
		03 LGUs (BLGU, MLGU, PLGU)	
		04 Philippine National government agency(ies)	
		05 International donors	
		06 Church-based organizations	
		07 private companies/corporation (business sector)	
		08 The community did not have a need for projects	

		09 No help was provided by any group					
B16.2	If you had to choose another project, would you choose it from GEM3/USAID or from another organization? <i>(Kung papili-on ka ug lain na usab nga project, pili-on mo ba ang gikan sa GEM/USAID o gikan sa laing organisasyon?)</i>	GEM3/USAID Another Organization Refuse Don't know	1 2 98 99				
B17	<p>Using a scale of 1 to 4 (1=not true; 2=somewhat true; 3=true; 4=very true), please rate your view of the benefits derived from the BIP project in your barangay. <i>(Gamit ang numerong 1 hangtud 4, kung diin ang 1 nagkahulugan nga dili tinu-od, ang 2 nagkahulugan siguro tinu-od, ang 3 nagkahulugang tinu-d ug ang 4 nagkahulugang pinaka-tinu-od sa mga kaayuhan o benepisyo nga nakukuha sa inyong lugar tunogd sa BIP. Puwede ba nga imong masulti kung asa niini nga mga numero ang ha-om sa mga mosunod:)</i></p> <p>(Encircle appropriate code of response. Place 98 if RSP refuse to give answer and 99t if answer is don't know.)</p>						
		CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH ACTIVITY					
B17.01	Accelerated economic growth in your barangay <i>(Mikusog ang paglambo sa ekonomiya sa inyong barangay)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.02	Accelerated economic growth in your province <i>(Mikusog ang paglambo sa ekonomiya sa inyong probinsya)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.03	Benefitted relatively few persons within the barangay <i>(Nakatabang sa pipila lamang ka tawo sa barangay)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.04	Benefitted the majority of the barangay's residents <i>(Nakatabang sa kadaghanan sa katawhan sa barangay)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.05	BIP project was consistent with the needs of the community <i>(Ang BIP project nakasulbad sa mga panginalanglanon sa barangay)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.06	Helped to reduce violence in the community <i>(Nakatabang nga mokunhod o mo-ubos ang kabubot sa sa barangay)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B17.07	Is helping to bring about peace in Mindanao <i>(Nakatabang sa pagkab-ot sa kalinaw sa Mindanao)</i>	1	2	3	4	98	99
B18	<p>Using a scale of 1 to 3 where 1=inefficient; 2=efficient; and 3=highly efficient, please give a rating on how efficiently resources tapped for these barangay infra projects were utilized. <i>(Gamit ang numerong 1 hangtud 3, kung diin ang 1 nagkahulugang na-usik, ang 2 nagkahulugan wala ma-usik o nagamit ug insakto , ug ang 3 nagkahulugang nagamit gyud ng maayo o walay bisan gamay nga na-usik. Puwede ba nga imong masulti kung asa nga numero ang mas ha-om niining mga mosunod:)</i></p> <p>Encircle appropriate code of response. Place 98 if RSP refused to give a rating and 99 if the answer is don't know.)</p>						
		CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH RESOURCE/CONTRIBUTION					
B18.01	Materials	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.02	donated labor from community members	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.03	Hired/paid labor	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.04	Local knowledge and suggestions	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.05	Professional/technical support	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.06	Money/Financial support	1	2	3	98	99	
B18.07	Construction equipment	1	2	3	98	99	
B19	Does your community hold public meetings to select what type of projects is needed in the community? <i>(Ang inyo bang barangay nagpatawag ug miting o panagtigum alang sa pagpili kung unsa nga project ang gikinahanglan sa inyong barangay o</i>	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM					
		YES				1	
		NO (SKIP TO QB20)				0	
		Refused				98	
		Don't know				99	

	lugar?)		
B19.1	What was the nature of these meetings? (Unsa man ang nahitabo/gihisgutan ug resulta niini nga mga miting o panagtigum?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES	
		01 The meetings were open to all members of the barangay (Walay gidid-an sa o ang tanang tawo sa barangay gi-awhag sa pagtambong sa mga miting o panagtigom)	
		02 Men and women could participate equally in these meetings (Ang mga lalaki ug mga babaye pareho nga maka-apil niini nga mga miting o panagtigom)	
		03 Few people attended these meetings (Pipila lamang ka tawo ang mo-apil o motambong niini nga mga miting)	
		04 Most people from the community attended these meetings (Kadaghanan sa mga tawo sa barangay motambong niini nga mga miting)	
		05 We had frequent meetings to arrive at a decision (Daghan nga mga miting o panagtigom ang gihimo ayha pa makahimo ug desisyon)	
		06 We only had meetings when it was necessary (Aduna lamay tigom o miting nga pagahimoon kung kini gikinahanglan)	
		07 Only the barangay and/or LGU officials attended the meetings (Ang mga opisyal lang sa barangay o sa munisipyo ang mitambong sa miting)	
		08 The project was decided on by persons outside the Barangay (Ang project gidesisyonan sa mga tawo nga wala magpuyo sa barangay)	
B20	Once a decision was reached on the selection of an infrastructure project, was it (in your Opinion) relevant to the needs of your community? (Ang napag-desisyonan ba o napili nga infrastructure project sa imong hunahuna mao ang gikinahanglan sa inyong barangay o lugar?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM THAT APPLY Very relevant to community needs (Mitukma gayud sa mga panginahanglan sa barangay) Relevant--but comparable to other community needs (Mitukma sa mga panginahanglan apan aduna saduban nga projects nga anayan himoon) Somewhat relevant—but other infrastructure needs were greater (Medyo nakukma apan adunay mas gikinahanglan nga infra project ang barangay) Irrelevant-project made little sense in terms of community needs (Walay panginahanglan ang barangay sa maong project) Have no idea whether project was relevant or irrelevant (Walay ideya kung ang barangay ba aduna o walay panginahanglan niini nga project) Refused Don't know	1 2 3 4 5 98 99
B21	What changes have you observed taking place in your community since the BIP project was completed? (Unsa man ang mga kausaban nga imong nakita sa inyong barangay o lugar sa dihang nahuman ang BIP project?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM THAT BEST APPLY Community member are interested in further projects (Ang mga residente sa barangay interesado sa uban pang mga projects) Community members are willing to work together on other projects (Ang mga residente sa barangay andam makigtambayayong sa paghimo ug lain na usab nga project) Community members are willing to work together with LGUs (Ang mga residente sa barangay andam	1 2 3

		makigtambayayong uban sa LGU) There is little interest in further projects in my community (Adunay gamay lang nga interest ang among barangay sa uban pang mga projects) People are more willing to talk together about community problems (Ang mga tawo sa barangay andam mohisgot sa mga problema sa barangay) I don't know of any changes in people's attitudes (Wala akoy nahibalo-an nga kausaban sa mga kina-iya sa mga tawo sa among barangay) Refused Don't know	4 5 6 98 99
B22	The benefits from this project in the community were mainly for: (Ang mga kaayuhan o benepisyo nga mahatag sa mga residente sa barangay para sa:)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES 01 Improving employment (pag-improve o pagpalambo sa panarbaho o mga gimbuhaton nga pagkakitaan) 02 Improving agricultural production (pag-improve o pagpalambo sa ani o abot pang-arikultura) 03 Improving water management (pag-improve sa pagdumala sa patubig) 04 Improving transportation (pag-improve o pagpalambo sa transportation) 05 Improving inter-community trade (pag-improve o pagpalambo sa lokal na negosyo sa mga kasikbit nga lugar)	
B22.1	For you, what benefits did you derive from this project? (Para kanimo unsa man ang mga kaayuhan o benepisyo tungod sa project?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE APPROPRIATE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES 01 given me economic opportunities (nakahatag kanako ug oportunidad pang-ekonomiya o molu-ag ang panginabuhì) 02 more time can be devoted to productive work (daghang oras ang magahin alang sa mga buluhaton nga adunay abot) 03 lessen work burden (moga-an ang trabaho) 04 improve social relation and community participation (nataga-an ug panahon nga maka-apil o makasalmot sa mga activities sa barangay ug adunay panahon sa pakighinabi ug pag-abi-abi sa mga silingan) 05 more quality time for children (nadugangan ang oras para sa pag-atiman sa mga anak)	
B23	Was your barangay's BIP project completed on time as promised by GEM personnel? (Ang BIP ba nahuman sigun sa petsa nga gisa-ad-ingon sa mga taga GEM?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
B24	Has the project proved effective in meeting the perceived needs of the community? (Epektibo ba ang project o nahatag ba sa project ang mga panginahanglan sa barangay o lugar?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
B25	Are you aware of what plans or procedures are in place to sustain the BIP project? (Aduna ka bay nahibalo-an nga mga plano o pama-agi aron	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO QB26) Refused	1 0 98

	ma-sustain kining BIP project?)	Don't know	99
B25.1	IF "YES" – what are you doing to maintain the BIP project, would you describe them. (Unsa man ang mga gibuhad aron ma-maintain kining BIP project? Imo bang masulti kung unsa kini?)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
QB26 AND BLOCK D IS FOR GEM AREAS ONLY (FOR NON-GEM AREAS SKIP TO BLOCK C)			
B26	Lastly, how did you benefit from the completion of the BIP project funded by the GEM program? (Sa kinatibuk-an, unsa man ang imong nakuhang kaayuhan o benepisyo sa dihang nahuman kining BIP project nga gihatag sa GEM program?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES	
		01 Improved income for my household (midako ang kita sa panimalay)	
		02 Reduced time spent accessing clean water (gamay na lang ang oras nga nagahin sa pagkuha ug limpyo nga tubig)	
		03 Increased employment (daghang ang trabaho)	
		04 Improved training by working on the project (nahatagan ug dugang nga training tungod sa pagtrabaho sa project)	
		05 Improved setting to conduct trade with other barangays (Nahatagan ug dakong kahigayunan diin ako makapang-negosyo sa uban nga mga barangay)	
		06 Transportation improvement (roads or footbridges) (pag-improve sa facilidad alang sa transportation)	
		07 Improved irrigation or drainage for managing water resources (Mi-improve ang irrigation ug drainage alang sa maayong pagdumala sa tinubdan sa tubig)	
		08 Others (SPECIFY) _____	
B27	What do you believe that the community has learned from doing the GEM project? (Unsa man sa imong pagtu-o ang nakat-unan sa mga residente sa inyong barangay sa paghimo niining GEM project?)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
B28	If your community did another GEM project, what would you propose doing differently? (Kung adunay himoon pag-usab nga GEM project, unsa man ang imong laing makasugyot nga project?)	_____ _____ _____ _____	
BLOCK C. PRESENCE AND ACTIVITIES OF EX-COMBATANTS IN THE COMMUNITY			
C1	Are you aware if there were any Ex-Combatants that returned to your barangay? (Aduna ka bay nahibalo-an nga mga kanhi miembro sa mga armadong grupo o mga kanhi rebelde dinhi sa inyong barangay?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (TERMINATE INTERVIEW) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
C1.1	IF "YES," do you have any idea how many Ex-Combatants returned/settled to your barangay? (Aduna ka bay ideya kung unsa ka daghan ang mga kanhi meimbro sa armadong grupo o mga	PLEASE RECORD ESTIMATED NUMBER OF EX-COMBATANTS.. ENCIRCLE "99" IF RSP DON'T KNOW OR 98 IF RSP REFUSED TO GIVE AN ESTIMATE. _____ Refused _____	98

	rebelde dinhi sa inyong lugar?)	Don't know	99
C2	Do you have any idea what these Ex-Combatants are doing now? Please describe. (Aduna ka bay ideya kung unsa ang mga gikalingawanng buhaton niining mga kanhi miembro sa armadong grupo o mga rebelde sa pagkakaran?)	_____	
C2.1	Did any ex combatants participate in the GEM project? (Adunay bay mga kanhi miembro sa armadong grupo o mga rebelde nga mi-apil o misalmot sa GEM Project)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (SKIP TO QC3) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
C2.2	How did the ex combatant benefit from the project? (Unsa man ang mga kaayuhan o benepisyo nga ilang nakuha sa ilang pag-apil o pagsalmot sa GEM project?)	PLEASE READ AND PLACE CODE FOR EACH ONE 0 – NO; 1- YES	
		01 Improved income for my household (midako ang kita sa panimalay)	
		02 Reduced time spent on household chores especially in accessing clean water (gamay na lang ang oras nga nagahin sa mga gimbuhaton sa panimalay ilabi na sa pagkuha ug limpyo nga tubig)	
		03 Increased employment opportunities (midaghan ang oportunidad sa pagpanarbaho)	
		04 Improved training by working on the project (nahatagan ug dugang nga training tungod sa pagtrabaho sa project)	
		05 Improved setting to conduct trade with other barangays (Nahatagan ug dakong kahigayunan diin ako makapang-negosyo sa kasikbit nga mga barangay)	
		06 Transportation improvement (roads or footbridges) (pag-improve sa facilidad alang sa transportation)	
		07 Improved irrigation or drainage for managing water resources (Mi-improve ang irrigation ug drainage alang sa maayong pagdumala sa tinubdan sa tubig)	
		08 Others (SPECIFY): _____	
C3	Are these ex-combatants engaged in gainful activities? (Kini bang mga kanhi miembro sa mga armadong grupo o kanhi rebelde nga ania sa inyong barangay adunay mga trabaho o mga pangita?)	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (TERMINATE INTERVIEW) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
C4	What events or circumstances do you think that will make these ex-combatants to resume hostilities or to fight again against the government? (Unsa man kaha sa inyong pagtu-o ang mga panghitabo nga makapaghat kanila nga mobalik sa ilang pagpakig-away sa gobierno?)	_____	
BLOCK D. FOR LOCAL OFFICIALS AND COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS (ONLY)			
D1	What is your current position/work for the barangay/community? (Unsa man imong katungdanan o posisyon sa	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM Barangay Chair Barangay Council member	1 2

	pagkakaran dinhi sa inyong barangay?)	Religious leader People's organization officer (PO officer) Health provider (midwife, nurse, etc) Community tribal leader Business leader/entrepreneur	3 4 5 6 7
D1.1	How many years of service have you rendered in this office/position? (Pila na ka-tuig nga ikaw nag-alagad dinhi sa inyong barangay?))	PLEASE RECORD NUMBER OF YES OF SERVICE ENCIRCLE "99" IF RSP DON'T KNOW OR 98 IF RSP REFUSED TO GIVE ANSWER. _____ Refused Don't know	98 99
FOR GEM AREAS ONLY (DO NOT ASK QD2 TO QD3.3 FOR NON-GEM AREAS)			
2.	Let us talk about the cost of the projects that the community acquired through GEM (Atong estoryahan ang mga projects nga nahatag o na-angkon sa inyong barangay pina-agi sa GEM.) (LIST PROJECT MENTIONED THAT ARE ACQUIRED THROUGH GEM)		
	D2.1 How much is the total cost of the project? (Pila man ang kinatibuk-ang kantidad sa project?))	D2.2. Did the community shared in the cost? (Mihatag ba ug kontribusyon ang mga tawo sa barangay? 1 – Yes 0 – No	D2.3 How much is the cost shared by the community? (Pila man ang kantidad nga gihatag sa barangay isip ilang kontribusyon?)
			D2.4. What form of contribution is this? (Unas man kini nga klase sa kuntribusyon?) 1 – labor 2 – in kind 3 – professional/ technical fees
			D2.5 IF LABOR: Can you estimate the total cost of labor contribution? (Pila man kaha ang kantidad sa labor nga nahatag alang sa project?)
			D2.6 IF IN KIND: Can you estimate the total cost of in kind contribution? (Pila man kaha ang kantidad sa nahatag nga in kind para sa project?)
3	Is the project earning or generating an income? (Mikita o aduna bay kita ang project?))	PLEASE ENCIRCLE ONLY ONE ITEM YES NO (TERMINATE INTERVIEW) Refused Don't know	1 0 98 99
D3.1	In what ways? (Sa unsang paagi mikita ang project?))	_____	
D3.2	How much income does the project generates annually? (Pila man ang kita sa matag tuig sa project? e.g. abang,bayad sa paggamit, bayad sa toll etc) (e.g. rental, usage/storage fee, toll fee, etc)	PLEASE RECORD ANNUAL INCOME DERIVED FROM THE PROJECT QOUTED BY THE RESPONDENT. RECORD 98 IF RSP REFUSE TO GIVE AMOUNT AND 99 IF RSP DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH IS THE ANNUAL INCOME	
D3.3	Aside from cash earnings, what other benefits does the community gained from the project? (Gawas sa cash nga kita unsa pa man ang mga kaayuhan o benepisyo ang na-angkon sa inyong barangay tungod sa project?))	01 _____ 02 _____ 03 _____	

(LEAVE TAKING)

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO ANSWER OUR QUESTIONS. GOOD DAY

TIME ENDED: _____

FOR INTERVIEWER'S ATTENTION: RETURN TO THE FRONT PAGE TO COMPLETE the FINAL INTERVIEW DETAILS

ANNEX 6B: INTERVIEW GUIDES

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: INFRASTRUCTURE	Project: Barangay Infrastructure Project (BIP)
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

Results

1. What were the key outputs and outcomes of the project?
2. How did this project help your barangay? Who primarily benefitted from this project?
3. Did the GEM project contribute to economic growth in your community? How?
4. In what way did these activities contribute to the peace or the reduction of violent conflict in the region? How?

Relevance

1. Did this project serve the needs of your community? The entire community or a group of families?
2. How and who decided on doing this type of project? What did your community contribute in conceptualizing, building and operating the project?

Effectiveness

1. Given the range of projects from box culverts, roads to footbridges and water systems, what types of projects do you think are most effective for your community?
2. Was the project completed on time based on your Barangay Development Plan?

Efficiency

1. What are the important benefits that your community derived from the project?
2. How many people in your community who benefitted from project? How many people outside your community who benefitted from the project?
3. What type of projects do you believe are the most cost-effective in terms of time, money and results?
4. Since the community had to provide resources, what projects required the most effort in terms of labor, money or materials?

Gender

1. Did women participate in deciding the type of project to carried-out in your community?
2. Were women consulted in the design of the infrastructure projects (e.g. multipurpose center, trading post, port landing, water systems)?
3. What community organizations participated in selecting the community project—did they contribute any labor or other support as part of the community contribution?

Sustainability

1. Are there any plans are in place to sustain the project once GEM3 has completed building your community's project? By whom?
2. Do you believe that any infrastructure activities contribute to the peace process or help in the reduction of violent conflict in the region? How?

Lessons Learned

1. What worked best in designing and implementing the projects?
2. What activities did not work as anticipated?
3. Any suggestions you would make to improve the allocation of resources for projects and how they are selected and then constructed.

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____
 If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:
 None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

Additional Comments

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: WORKFORCE PREPARATION	Project: COMPUTER LITERACY (CLIC)
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

Results

1. Is there an increase in the number of students accessing the internet? (M/F)
2. Do you perform better in your class now that you have access to computer and internet connection? Why?
3. Are the students able to comply with their school assignments/requirements faster and with substantive outputs?

Relevance

1. Are the interventions/support on CLIC relevant to your needs? Why?
2. Before CLIC was realized, where do you go for your computer needs? Do you have to pay for it? How much?

Effectiveness

1. Since computer and internet facility is available in your school, do you often visit the facility for your school requirements? If yes, did it help you? In what way? If not, why do you visit the facility?
2. Besides complying with your school requirements, do you use the computer and internet access for other purpose? If yes, what are these? If no, why?

Efficiency

1. Did you experience downtime due to power interruptions, internet service disruption? If yes, what are your alternatives?
2. If you encounter technical problem while using the computer and internet facility, who usually assist you? Are the problems resolved? If not what do you do?
3. What time does the facility opens and closes? Does this give you enough time to finish your work?

Gender

1. How many male and female teachers were trained on computer and internet technology to assist in the facility (sex-disaggregated data)
2. Is there equal access to the facility? What is the percentage of male and female students accessing the facility? If there is wide gender gap, how did the project reduce this gap?
3. Is there a separate space for female students using the computer? If none why?

Sustainability

1. Is your school allocating regular budget for maintenance and upgrading of the facilities?
2. How can the facility continue to operate even without outside assistance?

Lessons Learned

1. What are the difficulties encountered during project implementation? What are the learnings?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:

None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

Additional Comments:

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: WORKFORCE PREPARATION	Project: ENG MATCHING GRANT (EMGP)
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

Results

1. How much funds was raised by the EMGP? How many MGPs completed by LOP?
2. How much equity contribution raised/ provided by the PTCA?
3. What are the systems/facilities/improved practices in place as a result of the intervention?

Relevance

1. What are the projects funded by EMGP?
2. Are the funded projects relevant to the needs of the school? Why?
3. Are there other school needs that could have been supported by EMGP but was not given assistance? Why? What are these?

Effectiveness

1. Do you think all the approved matching grants projects benefit your school? Why?
2. How do you decide on what projects to be funded by the matching grant program? Are there criteria to be followed? If yes, what are these? If no, why?

Efficiency

1. How do you ensure that projects funded under the matching grant are handled and managed for efficient delivery of services? (e.g. libraries, science laboratories)
2. As a member of the PTCA, what is your contribution in conceptualizing projects for funding under the matching grant program.

Gender

1. Among PTCA members, how many are male and female? What is the percentage of attendance on PTCA meetings between male and female members? If there are gender gaps, how were these addressed by the project?
2. Did males and female members participate in different ways?

Sustainability

1. Does the PTCA engage LGU to tap Special Education Fund (SEF) for additional funding support?
2. What are your plans when the matching grant program by GEM is already completed?

Lessons Learned

What are the difficulties encountered during project implementation? What are the learnings?

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: WORKFORCE PREPARATION	Project INVEST
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

General:

1. How did you know the INVEST program?
2. Why did you apply in the program? Are you convinced that the program can help you? Why?

Results:

1. How many students were provided scholarship/ financial support (M/F)
2. How many students have completed the program/graduates (M/F)
3. How many graduates were employed (M/F)

Relevance:

1. What are the types support/ interventions provided (training, co-financing agreements, financial, school supplies, etc.)?
2. Are the interventions/ activities relevant to the needs of the student-beneficiaries? Why? Are they sufficient to fulfill the needs of the students?

Effectiveness:

1. Are there dropouts in the program? (M/F) What are the reasons?
2. How are you monitored by the project? Are you compliant with all the requisites of the scholarship program? Why?
3. Do you think your capability and skills is compatible with your course under the scholarship program? Why?

Efficiency:

1. How is your application for your scholarship been processed? What are the requirements? Were you able to comply with the requirements easily?

Gender:

1. What is the number of male and female students that were able to avail of the project?
2. What is the percent of male and female able to complete the program? If there are gender gaps, how were these addressed by the project?
3. What courses have the most number of males and females? Do you think male and female students were given equal opportunity to access the program?

Sustainability:

1. Do you want the program to continue beyond GEM's project life? If yes, what are your efforts to sustain the program? If no, why?
2. Are there other organizations that are willing to partner and continue the program? If yes, can you identify those organizations?

Lessons Learned:

1. What difficulties were encountered during program implementation? Are the identified difficulties given appropriate solution?
2. What lessons did you learn?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:

None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: WORKFORCE PREPARATION	Project: JEEP
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

Results

1. Among the total number of students who have attended the JEEP courses, how many are immediately employed? Please provide also percentages (M/F)
2. What is the percentage of male and female graduates under JEEP that are already employed? What are their usual jobs (e.g. maritime, travel and tourism, health and allied services)

Relevance

1. Why do you need to participate in the JEEP courses (Start and Accelerate)?
2. Are the regular courses on English Proficiency in your schools not enough to produce the same results as in JEEP courses? Is there any difference? If yes, what are these?

Effectiveness

1. Are you more confident now to respond to job interviews? Why?
2. Based on your personal assessment, did your English proficiency skill develop after the JEEP training? Why?
3. Are the JEEP teachers more marketable than their counterpart teachers that did not undergo JEEP training? Why?

Efficiency

1. Are the schools participating in the JEEP program accessible to you?
2. Don't you consider your attendance in the JEEP courses as additional 'burden' in completing your college course? Why?

Gender

1. How many male and female students are enrolled in the JEEP courses? (sex-disaggregated data). If there are gender gaps, how were they addressed?
2. How many male and female teachers are involved in the JEEP courses? (sex-disaggregated data)

Sustainability

1. Do you have to pay for any fee related to your attendance in the JEEP program? If yes, how much?
2. Is your school allocating regular budget to sustain the JEEP program?
3. How can the program continue to operate even without outside assistance?

Lessons Learned

1. What difficulties were encountered during project implementation?
2. What lessons were learned?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____
 If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:
 None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: WORKFORCE PREPARATION	Project: PRIDE
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

General:

1. How did you know the PRIDE program?
2. Why did you apply in the program? Are you convinced that the program can help you? Why?

Results:

1. How many interns were absorbed by companies or employed elsewhere (GEM 2 and GEM 3)?

Relevance:

1. What are the types support/ interventions provided (training, co-financing agreements, financial, school supplies, etc)?
2. Are the interventions/ activities relevant to the needs of the student-beneficiaries? Why? Are they sufficient to fulfill the needs of the students?
3. Is your course/ degree responsive to the skill sets required by the companies? Why?

Effectiveness:

1. How were you selected? What was the process and criteria of selection?
2. Do you think your capability and skills is compatible with your current work as an intern in _____ (corporation/company)? Why?
3. What are the in-demand skills required by the companies?
4. How did the internship program help you find a job?

Efficiency:

1. How is your application for your internship been processed? What are the requirements? Were you able to comply with the requirements easily?
2. How long did you wait before you were given your current internship in _____ company?
3. Are you currently employed? Is your work related with your course? How long did it take for you to find a job?

Gender:

1. What is the number of male and female students that were able to avail of the program (per cohort)
2. What is the percent of male and female able to complete the program? If there were gender gaps, how were they addressed?
3. Do you think, male and female students were given equal opportunity to access the program?
4. What is the percent of women and men given regular work after their internship in a certain company?

Sustainability:

1. Do you want the program to continue beyond GEM's project life? If yes, what are your efforts to sustain the program? If no, why?
2. Do you know of other organizations or government officials that are willing to partner and continue the program? If yes, can you identify those organizations?

Lessons Learned:

1. What difficulties did you encounter during program implementation? Are the identified difficulties given appropriate solution?
2. What lessons were learned?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:

3. None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: Business Growth	Project Type: Business Service Organization
Role of Person Interviewed: 1- LGU Official 2-Municipio Official 3-Barangay Official	
4-Community Member 5-Other _____ Gender: M F	

Results

1. How long have you/your organization have been a GEM 3 beneficiary? What kind of assistance did you get from GEM3?
2. What were the key results and outcome of the project?
3. Do you feel the GEM assistance has assisted in promoting economic growth in your community? How?

Relevance

1. How did the GEM project serve the needs of your organization?
2. How and who decided on doing this type of project? What did your organization contribute in conceptualizing, building and operating the project?

Effectiveness

1. Are you satisfied with the assistance provided by GEM 3? Why?
2. From the assistance provided by GEM 3, how did your organization benefit directly from the assistance?
3. How did you organization benefit indirectly?
4. How effective has the Business Growth component of GEM-3 been in improving Mindanao producers' access to markets?
5. How effective was GEM-3's business policy agenda in improving competitiveness of Mindanao businesses?

Efficiency

1. What are the specific benefits that your organization derived from the GEM assistance?
2. As a BSO, were you able to document an increase in any sector's (e/g. agriculture production, fish production, export) activities?
3. Did your BSO add value added to any particular sector in your province and/or region?

Gender

1. What is the membership of your BSO? What is the ratio of men to women?
2. How has your BSO benefited your women members?
3. Do women play a major role in your organization's decision-making?

Sustainability

1. Are there any plans in place to sustain the project once GEM3 has finished providing direct assistance to your organization?
2. Do you believe that your organization's efforts to improve business activity contribute to the peace process or help in the reduction of violent conflict in the region? How?

Lessons Learned

1. What activities on the part of your BSO worked best in promoting business?
2. What activities did not work as anticipated?
3. Any suggestions you would make to improve future assistance to other BSOs?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your province or region in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence are you aware in your municipality during this time:

None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in your municipality?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

Other Comments?

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: GOVERNANCE IMPROVEMENT	Project: CIPYML
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

General:

1. How did you know about the program on CIPYML? How were you selected to participate?
2. Why did you decided to participate in the project?

Results

1. Did you learn any new knowledge and skills? Do you use these skills today?
2. Are you better off now than you were before you joined the internship?
3. Did it help enhanced your chance to land a better job?
4. In what way did you contribute to enhance local governance processes and the peace and development agenda of the LGUs as a result of the internship program?

Relevance

1. How did the internship program help you deal with your LGU's efforts on peace and development?
2. Are the interventions relevant to you and your LGU's needs? Did the program address the most pressing needs of your LGU?
3. Do you feel that the project taught you the necessary knowledge and skills to help improve local governance and peace and development efforts of the local governments?

Effectiveness

1. Do you feel that you have benefited from your participation in the internship? What about your respective LGU?
2. Were you able to achieve the objectives and goals of the internship on time?
3. Do you feel that a different type of project would have been more useful for you?

Efficiency

1. What are the important benefits that you and your LGU derived from the internship?
2. What did you or your LGU contribute in conceptualizing, building and operating the project?
3. How many people in your community who benefited from project? How many people outside your community who benefited from the project?

Gender

1. How many men and women participate in the project? What is the ratio of men and women? If there are gender gaps, how were they addressed?
2. Were there any constraints to female participation and were they treated differently from men in the project?
3. Do you think that men and women benefited differently from the project? Why?

Sustainability

1. Are there any plans in place that will sustain the project when GEM3 phases out? Do you think this project will continue?
2. Did you manage to find a job after the internship program?
3. Will you advocate to HOR or any donor program to continue and support the same project?

Lessons Learned

1. What worked and did not work?
2. Would you make any changes to the way the projects work? What would these changes be?
3. What are the issues, problems and challenges encountered?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:

None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW

Date: _____	Municipal: _____
Interviewer: _____	Barangay: _____
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Project: <u>REAP</u>
Individual Role: Municipal Mayor	Discussion on Component: Governance

Key Results: Financial management capacity of LGUs enhanced through implementation of revenue generation plans to increase locally generated revenues that are earmarked for development priorities and improve the delivery, quality and range of public services.

Key Informant: The Local Chief Executive

General:

1. Are you aware of GEM-3 projects in your municipality? What was the extent of your participation in these projects?
2. What made you decide to participate in the REAP project?

Results:

1. Do you have a revenue generation plan that was approved by the SB/P and actually implemented? What is your involvement in the revenue generation plan of your municipality (formulation, consultation, approval, information campaign)?
2. Are you convinced that this plan will increase your revenue targets? Why?

3. In terms of the enabling environment are there related policy, structure, systems and mechanisms in place for collection, legislative measures, public consultation, information drive, computerization, etc.?
4. Are the local tax codes updated and legislated periodically as mandated by the LGC?
5. Did the delivery, quality and range of public services improved as a result of the technical assistance on REAP?

Relevance

1. Were you or your LGU staff consulted during the design of the project?
2. Have the project interventions (training/coaching support) helped (or not helped) your LGU tax collection team formulate appropriate/creative/innovative tax collection system?
3. Would you recommend the same project to your fellow LCEs for scaling up and replication?

Effectiveness

1. How did your LGU get selected? Are you aware of the selection criteria?
2. When did you start implementing your revenue generation plan? Was there an increase in revenue collection over the years? By what percent?
3. Have you encountered difficulties in implementing the revenue generation plan? What did you learn from participating in this project?

Efficiency

1. What are the important benefits that your community derived from the project?
2. What did your community contribute in conceptualizing, building and operating the project?
3. How many people in your community who benefited from project? How many people outside your community who benefited from the project?

Gender

1. What is the extent of women’s participation in the project?
2. Are women involved in the revenue generation planning, implementation and monitoring?
3. Are the trainings/ capability building and other TAs equally available to men and women?

Sustainability

1. Are there sustaining mechanisms in place to sustain the gains and to maintain a functional and proactive revenue generation system?

Lessons Learned

1. What worked and did not work?
2. What are the issues, problems and challenges encountered?

Summary of Interview:

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION

Date of Interview	Province:
Interviewer:	Municipality:
Time Start: _____ Time End: _____	Barangay:
Component: Former Combatant Reintegration	Project:
Topic of Focus Group:	
Number of Persons in attendance: _____ No. Males _____ No. Females _____	

General:

1. Were there any projects in your community that provided assistance to former combatants? Can you tell me about them?
2. How did people participate? Were they invited or did they ask to join?
3. Do you know who funded these projects?

Results:

1. Did the project teach you or your neighbors any news skills? Do you use these skills today?
2. Is your community better off now than before the project started? Are you satisfied with how things are going now?
3. How were participants viewed in your community? Did this change over the life of the project? (Probe: was there jealousy/resentment; did community feel participants were productive members again, etc.)

Relevance:

1. Do you feel that the project taught you the necessary skills to adjust to civilian life? Are there any other skills/activities you wish that the project had taught you?
2. Was the community consulted during the design of the projects? Was the project designed based on your input?

Effectiveness:

1. Do you feel that you have benefited from your participation in these projects? What about your community?
2. Is it easier or more difficult to provide for your family since you returned?

Efficiency:

1. Would you make any changes to the way the projects work? What would these changes look like?
2. Who gets to use the project facilities? (M/F)

Gender

1. Did both men and women participate in your project?
2. Were there female former MNLF combatants who participated in the project. Were the women treated differently from men in the project?
3. Do you think that men and women benefit differently from the project?

Sustainability

1. Do you plan on continuing to participate in this project? Why or why not?
2. Are there any similar projects that have been abandoned in the past? If so, why?

Lessons Learned

1. Which aspects of the project worked particularly well? Which did not?
2. If you could design your own project, what would it look like to really meet your needs?

Peace and Security

Have you seen a decrease in violence (armed conflict) in your barangay in the last 12 months?

Yes: _____ No: _____ Not Sure _____ Don't Know _____

If yes, how many incidences of violence were there in your barangay during this time:

None 1 2 3 4 More than 5 instances

Can you describe what types of conflict are typical in this area?

1-Political **2**-Resource conflict (land, access to labor market, access to roads) **3**-Popular justice (vigilantism) **4**-Administrative conflict (corruption, procurement, donor assistance) **5**-Identity based on religion or ethnicity
Do you know of any former combatants assisted by GEM who returned to arms?

ANNEX 7: FIELD SITES FOR SURVEY AND FIELD VISITS

FIELD VISIT SITES

PROVINCE	MUNICIPALITY/CITY	BARANGAY
Northern Mindanao Section		
1. Compostela Valley	1. Maco	1. Elizalde
	2. Mawab	2. Malinawon
	3. Monkayo	3. Salvacion
	4. New Bataan	4. Batinao
2. Surigao del Norte	5. Claver	5. Hayanggabon
	6. Gigaquit	6. Ladgaron
	7. Surigao City	7. Mahanub
	8. Tagum	8. Poniente
3. Davao del Norte		9. Poblacion
		10. Poblacion
Central Mindanao Section		
4. North Cotabato	9. Carmen	11. Kitulaan
		12. Manili
	10. Pigcawayan	13. Poblacion
		15. Buluan
		16. Bulucaon
	11. Libungan	17. Poblacion
		18. Batiocan
		19. Gumaga
		20. Sinwingan
		21. Poblacion
5. South Cotabato	12. Makilala Koronadal City	
	13. Banga	22. Poblacion
		23. Benitez
		24. Brgy Punong Grande
		25. Lampari
	14. Noralla	26. Poblacion
		27. San Miguel
	15. Polomolok	28. Bentung
		29. Sumbakil
	16. Tupi	30. Poblacion
		31. Bunao
		32. Kalkam
		33. Lunen
		34. Polonulong
		35. Poblacion
6. Sarangani	17. Alabel	
7. Lanao del Sur	Marawi City	
8. Maguindanao	18. Datu Odin Sinsuat	36. Poblacion
		37. Awang
		38. Dalican
	19. Datu Paglas	39. Poblacion
		40. Baguadatu
		41. Damalusay
	20. Parang	42. Poblacion
	21. Upi	43. Poblacion
Western Mindanao Section		
9. Tawi-Tawi	23. Bongao	44. Poblacion-Bongao City
		45. Lato-Lato
		46. Sanga-sanga
		47. Sowangkowang
		48. Tongsinah
	24. Panglima Sugala	49. Balimbing
		50. Malacca

1. Cotabato City
2. Davao City
3. Kidapawan City
4. Koronandal City
5. Marawi City

SURVEY SITES – GEM 3 ASSISTED AREAS

PROVINCES	MUNICIPALITY/CITY	BARANGAYS
Zamboanga Peninsula		
1. Zamboanga del Norte	1. Salug 2. Manukan 3. Liloy	1. Caracol 2. Poblacion 3. Baybay
2. Zamboanga del Sur	4. Labangan 5. San Pablo	4. Tawagan 5. Sagasan 6. Tadubuay
3. Zamboanga Sibugay	6. Tungawan 7. Ipil	7. Tigbanuang 8. Batungan 9. Don Andres
ARMM		
4. Lanao del Sur	8. Taraka 9. Masiu	10. Dilabayan 11. GubarSawer
5. Maguindanao	10. North Upi 11. Datu Blah Sinsuat 12. Pandag	12. Nuro 13. Pinansaran 14. Kabuling 15. Barangay Pandag
CARAGA		
6. Surigao Del Norte	13. Alegria 14. Malimono	16. Budlingin 17. Cagtinae
7. Compostela Valley	15. Monkayo	18. Upper Ulip
8. Davao Oriental	16. Banaybanay	19. Maputi
Northern Mindanao		
9. Lanao Del Norte	17. Kapatagan	20. Mahayahay 21. Tiacongan
SOCCSKSARGEN		
10. North Cotabato	18. Aleosan 19. Libungan	22. Upper Mingading 23. Ulamian 24. Batiocan
11. Sarangani	20. Tulunang 21. Malapatan 22. Glan	25. Bunawan 26. Poblacion 27. Big Margus
12. Sultan Kudarat	23. Lambayong 24. President Quirino	28. Poblacion 29. Bagumbayan
13. South Cotabato	25. Polomolok	30. Rubber

SURVEY SITES – NON GEM 3 ASSISTED AREAS

PROVINCES	MUNICIPALITY/CITY	BARANGAYS
Lanao del Norte	26. Baloï	31. Sandor
Lanao del Sur	27. Masiu 28. DitsaanRamain	32. MacalumpangLumbac 33. Pangandapan
Surigao del Norte	29. Alegria	34. Ombong
Compostela Valley	30. Monkayo	35. Olaycon 36. Banlag

ANNEX 8: FIELD WORK SCHEDULES FOR EVALUATION TEAM

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM I								
Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver		BIPs	MLGU	MPDC Eva Casedo; Staff: Ms. M Entenia	0	3
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Hayanggabon	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Eva Casedo	2	2
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Daywan	BIP	BLGU	Barangay Chairman Rogelio Nazi	2	2
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Ladgaron	BIP	BLGU	Barangay Chairman Renerio B. Galinato	1	
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Hayanggabon	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Eva Casedo	0	2
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Hayanggabon	EMGP	Hayanggabon Elementary School	School Head : Beda G. Murcia	3	10
Aug 10	Surigao del Norte	Claver	Ladgaron	EMGP	Ladgaron Elementary School	Former School Head : Rosie Entoc	1	8
Aug 11	Surigao del Norte	Gigaquit	Mahanub	BIP	MLGU	MPDC Rodelio Torregosa	2	2
Aug 11	Surigao del Norte	Gigaquit	Poniente	BIP	MLGU	Restituto Mira, Municipal Engineer	1	4
Aug 11	Surigao del Norte	Gigaquit	San Isidro	BIP GEM 2	MLGU	MEO Mira	1	0
Aug 12	Surigao City			BSO	Surigao City Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Willie Gan, President	7	2
Aug 13	Surigao del Norte	Gigaquit	Poniente	EMGP	Poniente Elementary School	School Head Joselito P. Manongas	1	10
Aug 13	Surigao City			JEEP	Surigao City State College of Technology	JEEP Coordinator Iryn Cavite	1	8
Aug 15	Maguindanao	Municipality of Datu Paglas	MLGU	REAP	Municipal Government	Mayor Mohammad Paglas; MPDC Padido Usman	6	3
Aug 15	Maguindanao	Municipality of Datu Paglas	Damalusay	BIP	BLGU	Mayor Mohammad Paglas; MPDC Padido Usman; Barangay Chairman Mando Guiwan	3	0
Aug 15	Maguindanao	Municipality of Datu Paglas	Manindolo	BIP	BLGU	Mayor Mohammad Paglas; MPDC Padido Usman	2	0
Aug 15	Maguindanao	Municipality of Datu Paglas	Bunawan	BIP	BLGU	Mayor Mohammad Paglas; MPDC Padido Usman	2	0
Aug 15	Maguindanao	Municipality of Datu Paglas	Damalusay	EMGP	Baguadatu Elementary School	School Head Pahmia Abubacar		
Aug 15	North Cotabato	Kidapawan City		BSO	Metro Kidapawan Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Chamber President Dr. Ramon Floresca and Project Officer Blesilda Bayoy	1	2
Aug 16	North Cotabato	Kidapawan City		RIP	Provincial Local Government Unit	Prov Engrs Office Admin Officer Oscar Sumejo; GEM Projects In Charge Engr. Eliodoro Vergadera Jr.	2	0
Aug 16	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan		Standard CLIC	Notre Dame of Libungan	School Head Anita Ceballos	1	0
Aug 17	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan	Batiocan/ Demapaco	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Renante Ponce	5	0

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM I (cont.)

Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
Aug 17	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan	Sinawingan	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Renante Ponce	4	0
Aug 17	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan	Gumaga	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Renante Ponce	4	0
Aug 17	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan	Ulamian	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Renante Ponce	4	0
Aug 17	North Cotabato	Municipality of Libungan	Baguer	BIP	BLGU	MPDC Renante Ponce	4	0
Aug 18	North Cotabato	Pigcawayan		REAP	Municipal Government	MPDC Zaldy Balofinos	3	3
Aug 18	North Cotabato	Pigcawayan	Buluan	BIP		MPDC Zaldy Balofinos	3	0
Aug 18	North Cotabato	Pigcawayan	Bulucaon	BIP		MPDC Zaldy Balofinos	3	0
Aug 18	Cotabato City			BSO	Metro Cotabato Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Mr. Pete Marquez, Former Chamber President	1	0
Aug 21	Cotabato City			BSO	Metro Cotabato Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Dr. Danda Juanday, President; Ms. Janette Eran	1	1
Aug 22	Maguindanao	Upi		REAP	Municipal Government	MPDC Paulo	6	8
Aug 22	Cotabato City			JEEP	Cotabato City State Polytechnic College	JEEP Coordinator Arbaya Boquia	2	4
Aug 22	Cotabato City			PASS	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries ARMM	Executive Director Felix Mosne	1	0
Aug 23	Cotabato City			FCR PH	Biriruan Famers Association	Barangay Chairman Jack Mohammad	1	0
Aug 23	Cotabato City			PASS	Lucrative Fruits Growers Multi Purpose Cooperative	President Baintan Guinta	0	1
Aug 23	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat		JEEP	Mindanao State University	JEEP Coordinator Sarah Jane Diang	0	11
Aug 23	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat		EMGP	MSU Integrated Laboratory High School	School Head Lornaida Madale	1	1
Aug 23	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat		Standard CLIC	DOS Educational Foundation	IT In charge Abdul Makalilay	1	0
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang		REAP	Municipal Government	Mayor Ibrahim P. Ibay; MPDC Ma. Theresa Ubas	3	2
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang	Poblacion (Market)	BIP	Municipal Government	Municipal Administrator Usman Ibay; MPDC Ma. Theresa Ubas	2	1
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang	Poblacion	BIP	BLGU	Municipal Admin Usman Ibay; MPDC Ma. Theresa Ubas	2	1
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang		EMGP	Notre Dame of Parang	School Head Caroline Rusiana	0	1
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang		Standard CLIC	Easter Joy School Incorporated	School Head Amelita Lim	0	1
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang	Moro Point	FCR CD	Illana Bay Multi Purpose Cooperative	Barangay Chairman Jun Serasar	1	0
Aug 24	Maguindanao	Parang	Moro Point	FCR PH	Illana Bay Multi Purpose Cooperative	Barangay Chairman Jun Serasar	1	0
Aug 25	North Cotabato	Carmen	Kitulaan	FCR CD	Kababaihang Carmeniang Nagkakaisa	MPDC Engr Marilyn Garcia		

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM I (cont.)								
Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
Aug 25	North Cotabato	Carmen	Manili	FCR CD	Manili Free Farmers Association	MPDC Engr Marilyn Garcia	1	0
26 Aug	Cotabato City			BSO	Iranon Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Ex Director Monina Macarongon; Chamber President ARMM DTI Secretary	1	4
27 Aug	Cotabato City			CIPMYL		Mr. Shim Yu, CIPMYL alumni	3	1
28 Aug	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat	Awang	BIP	Municipal Government	MPDC Manan Mandaragon	1	0
28 Aug	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat	Poblacion	BIP	Municipal Government	MPDC Manan Mandaragon	1	0
28 Aug	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat		CLIC	Camp Siongco National High School	IT in charge, Analyn Ballesteros	0	4
28 Aug	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat	Poblacion	BIP	Municipal Government	MPDC Manan Mandaragon	1	0
	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat	Awang	BIP		MPDC Manan Mandaragon	1	0
	Cotabato City			BSO	ARMM Business Council	Datu Haron Bandila, Chairman	1	0
30Aug	Davao City			JEEP	Davao Merchant Maritime Academy	Jee Gica, JEEP Coordinator	3	2
				BSO	Davao City Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Mary Anne Abundo, Executive Director	0	1
				PRIDE	Casa Leticia	Liezel Apple Tungpalan, Officer In Charge	2	6
				BSO	Mindanao Trade Expo Foundation, Inc.	Ann Pamintuan, President	0	1
Aug 31	Davao City			HCAP	Southern Philippines Fresh Fruits Corporation	Christine Joyce Legaspi	0	1
				HCAP	KF Nutri Foods International	Marilou Fernandez	0	1
				PASS	Mindanao Fruits Council	Atty. Antonio B. Partoza, Jr., President	1	0
Sept 3	Davao City			BIP, FCR, BSO	GEM Staff	Marilou Sian, Executive Officer and Support Services Team Leader		
				BSO	Mindanao Business Council	Debbie Gail Laburada, Project Management Officer	1	0
				MRDP	Dept of Agric	Engr. Renato Tamos	1	

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM 2

Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
9 Aug	Compostela Valley	Mawab	Malinawon	BIP	MLGU	MPDC Roland Jose E. Escalantar	2	1
			Malinawon	BIP	BLGU	Barangay Chair Rogelio D. Galo	2	4
			Malinawon	EMGP	Malinawon Elementary School	School Head Arlyn B. Lim	2	6
10 Aug	Davao del Norte	Tagum		PASS	Dynamic Vegetable Growers Association	Ray A. Acain, President	4	1
10 Aug	Compostela Valley	Maco	Pangi	BIP	BLGU	Carlo Bangales, Barangay Secretary	2	0
			Elizalde	BIP	BLGU	BLGU	4	1
			Elizalde	BIP	BLGU	Beneficiaries	0	12
			Elizalde	EMGP	Elizalde National High School	IT In Charge Mary Jean B. Soriano	2	6
			Elizalde	CLIC	Elizalde National High School	IT In Charge Mary Jean B. Soriano	1	11
11 Aug	Compostela Valley	New Bataan	Batinao	BIP	BLGU	Barangay Chair Bonifacio M. Jaso	9	32
13 Aug	Compostela Valley	Monkayo	Salvacion		MLGU	MPDC Geronimo O. Balana	2	0
			Salvacion	CLIC	Samuag Elementary School	Perlito Operario, Master Teacher	3	9
			Union	BIP	BLGU	Barangay Chair Harvey D. Taroy	3	0
			Salvacion	BIP	BLGU	Geronimo O. Balana, MPDC	4	5
13 Aug	Davao City			BSO		Marilou N. Infante	0	1
				PASS	Central Mindanao Vegetable Industry Council	Jose Victor Santos, President	3	0
Aug 13	Davao City			PASS	Northern Mindanao Vegetable Producers Association, Inc. (NorminVeggies)	Marcelino Remotigue, President	1	0
14 Aug	South Cotabato	Polomolok	Sumbakil	FCR	Sumbakil Vegetable Producer Association	Sarodin Kakim, President	5	0
			Sumbakil	BIP	MLGU; BLGU	Eronio P. Muno, MPDC	11	0
			Bentung	EMGP	Bentung-Sulit National High School	Digna A. Hibionada, Head Teacher	3	2
			Bentung	FCR	Bangsmoro Women's Association	Husna Anjam, President	6	15
Aug 15	South Cotabato	Tupi	Bunau	BIP	Bunao Muslim Association	Renette Bergado, Municipal Admin	2	6
			Kalkam	FCR	Kalkam Aquaculture and Farmers Assoc.	Arsad Landasan, MNLF former commander	3	0
			Palian	FCR	Palian Community Workers Assoc.	Alexander Basilio, Barangay Chairman	5	1

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM 2 (cont.)

Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
Aug 15	South Cotabato	Koronadal City		BSO	South Cotabato Chamber of Commerce	LitoUy, President	1	0
				CLIC	Saravia National High School	Gil G. Subang, School Head	4	4
Aug 16	South Cotabato	Koronadal City		FCR	Lake Sebu Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Cooperative	Rudy Tomas, Chairman	1	0
				PASS	South Cotabato Banana Creations, Inc.	Benigno R. Sensano Jr., President	5	1
		Banga	Municipal government	REAP	MLGU	MPDC Virgilio S. de Leon	3	2
				CLIC	Banga Central Elementary School	Marites P. Gahaport, ICT Coordinator	8	2
Aug 16	South Cotabato	Banga		CLIC and EMGP	Punong Grande National High School	Roden E. Solatorio, ICT Coordinator	2	4
			Lampari	BIP	BLGU	Abrila N. Miskinan, Brgy. Captain	4	2
Aug 17	South Cotabato	Norallah	Municipal Government	REAP	MLGU	Victor Y. Balayon, Mayor	2	3
				EMGP	San Miguel National High School	Nemesio M. Alvero, Principal	3	0
		Tupi	Polonuling	FCR	Manisan Multi-purpose Cooperative	Mendato c. Abo	10	6
			Polonuling	BIP	BLGU	Victor Y. Balayon, Mayor	3	0
			Poblacion	BIP	BLGU	Victor Y. Balayon, Mayor	4	0
Aug 21	TawiTawi	Bongao	SangaSanga	RIP	PLGU,MLGU of Bongao	Ruby Sahali, Vice Governor; Michael Guanieso, Staff Vice Governor's office	6	0
				FCR	Botica sa Campo Brgy Womens Club	Edwina T. Jumsali, President	4	0
				BSO	TawiTawi Chamber of Commerce	Nazrullah G. Masahud Executive Vice President	0	23
Aug 22	TawiTawi	Panglima Sugala	BatoBato		MLGU	Nurbert M. Sahali, Mayor	1	0
			Malacca	BIP	BLGU	AdzharAbdulmurib, Brgy. Chairman	5	2
				EMGP	Panglimajalman Elementary School	Erlinda M. Saiyari, Teacher	1	3
Aug 22	TawiTawi	PanglimaSugala	Parangan	BIP	BLGU	MahamudAskali, Barangay Secretary	25	0
				FCR	Parangan Multi Purpose Cooperative	MadohSahiron, Chairman	9	0
			Balimbing	BIP	BLGU	Raffy Soon, Barangay Chairman	4	1

SCHEDULE FOR FIELD VISIT – TEAM 2 (cont.)								
Date	Province	Municipality	Barangay	Project	Organization	Contact Person	Respondents	
							Male	Female
Aug 23	TawiTawi	Panglima Sugala	LatoLato	FCR	Mega High-Value Multi Species Hatchery	Arlyn Carroz, Hatchery Manager	0	1
			Tongsinah	EMGP	Tongsinah Child Friendly Elementary School	Evangeline Tadás, School Head	1	12
				FCR	Tongsinah Multi Purpose Cooperative	MuhminArik, Chairman	1	0
		Bongao	SangaSanga	EMGP	SangaSanga Elementary School	Hja. Anselma A. Jamma, Principal	0	6
Aug 27	Cotabato City			FCR	Bangsamoro Women for Peace and Development	Bai Grace Maryam A. Sinsuat, Ex Director	0	2
				BSO	Metro Cotabato Chamber of Commerce	Dr. Danda N. Juanday, President	1	0
				BSO	Muslim Chamber of Kutawato	Hadji Abdunnasser D. Sema, President	1	0
Aug 28	Maguindanao	Datu Odin Sinsuat	Awang	FCR	Kadtabanga Foundation for Peace & Dev Advocates	Hadja Giobay Diocolano, Executive Director	1	1
	Cotabato City				Notre Dame University Peace Center	Mr. Essex Guiguento, Executive Director	1	
	ARMM				Regional Planning & Development Office	Engr. Baintan Ampatuan, CESO, Regional Executive Director	0	1
Sept 3	Davao City			FCR	GEM-3	Adel Oviedo		1
Sept 6	Manila			Comm/P R	GEM-3/USAID	Tina Cuyugan, Nikki Meru, Ima Vermoza		3
Sept 6	Manila			Support Services	GEM-3/USAID	Karen Smith and Enrique Gallardo, Jr	1	1

People Interviewed:

Males 305

Females 313

ANNEX 9: PEOPLE CONTACTED

CAGAYAN DE ORO CITY

Northern Mindanao Vegetable Producers Association, Inc. (NorminVeggies)
Marcelino Remotigue, President

PROVINCE OF COMPOSTELA VALLEY

Municipality of Maco

Elizalde Barangay Local Government Unit

Fidel G. Cabello, Barangay Chairman
Domingo Cabillo, Councilor
Florencio C. Bricaole, Councilor
Amelia B. Flores, Secretary,
Nicolas Maynocas, Tribal Chairman

Elizalde National High School

Mary Jean B. Soriano, Computer in Charge
Meriam R. Andrade, ICT Coordinator
Abel E. Dongono, Student
Dannah Loveila D. Loguisan, Student
Bernadeth S. Lee, Student
Jezzel Rabe, Student
Jejeen Jiani A. Sinsano, Student
Cynthia P. Caasi, Student
Crisostomo Abelleja Sr., Parents Teachers Association (PTA) President
Virginia S. Perong, PTA officer
Malina A. Degamo, PTA officer
Genelyn T. Canite, PTA officer
Emma K. Resani, PTA officer
Apolonia S. Pantaleon, PTA officer
Edillyn O. Tating, PTA Officer
Ruleth C. Tisado, PTA Officer
Roxan C. Tating, PTA Officer
Cresencia A. Socorro, PTA Officer
Ruby Dizon, PTA Officer
Remelyn T. Marmito, PTA Officer

Pangi Barangay Local Government Unit

Carlo V. Bongales, Secretary
Caprida S. Dave, Beneficiary

Municipality of Mawab

Municipal Government

Evalina Jampayas, Municipal Mayor
Abram A. Agosajes, Water system In-Charge
Roland Jose E. Escalantar, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator

Malinawon Elementary School, Mawab

Victor Paig, Parents Teachers Association President

Arlyn B. Lim, School Head
Evelyn G. Buntrostto, Master Teacher
Jeany M. Baring, Student
Arnold E. Raronable Jr., Student
Reigna Marie P. Decio, Student
Princess Claire G. Paig, Student
Cyrill Jean B. Satinigan, Student

Malinawon Barangay Local Government Unit

Rogelio D. Galo, Barangay Chairman
Josefina Flores, Secretary
Analou G. Balsa, Treasurer
Aisa Compendio, Record Keeper
Rosita Good, Nutrition Staff
Reynaldo Cayang, Councilor

Municipality of Monkayo

Municipal Government of Monkayo

Manuel B. Brillantes (Mayor, M)
Geronimo O. Balana, Municipal

Samuag Elementary School, Monkayo

Perlito Operario, Master Teacher
Norma L. Tabios, Teacher
Fe R. Ferasol, Teacher
Mercy J. Salve, LSB Teacher
Josevil A. Borres, Teacher
Jan Faye A. Baluis, Teacher
Josephine N. Dingal, LSB Teacher
Analyn P. Dingal, Teacher
Antonio D. Tobias Sr., PTA President
Helen M. Parulanang, PTA Treasurer
Jocelyn P. Mangayan, PTA Secretary
Mario P. Racia, PTA officer

Union Barangay Local Government Unit

Harvey D. Taroy, Barangay Chairman
Jonah C. Salmeo, Councilor
Billy M. Paniamogan, Councilor

Union National High School

Gaudencio M. Binalangbang Jr - principal
Ma. Charito O. Mater - computer incharge
Mechellie E Pacheco - Teacher
Uzziel P Abatayo - Student
Mae Liza M. Legatob - Student
Lyn E Taroy – Teacher
Gena S. Gonzaga - PTA Treasurer
Christine Marie D. Villa - PTA Secretary
Wilma Castino - PTA PIO
Arceli P. Layson - PTA Vice President
Renato D. Quinones - PTA President
Monaliza M. Sanchez - PTA Business Manager

Salvacion Barangay Local Government Unit

Bonifacio C. Pagador, Barangay Chairman
Nestor M. Leoparipas, Treasurer
Joeched Paculanang, Councilor
Sanra A. Golez, Beneficiary
Tata C. Mondejar, Beneficiary
Rhea A. Escorial, Beneficiary
Lucrecia M. Tulo, Barangay Health Worker
Nora D. Gumantasan, Purok Chairwoman
Daniel Miel, Purok Chairman

Municipality of New Bataan**Batinao Local Government Unit**

Bonifacio M. Jaso, Barangay Chairman
Caraciolo O. Jaso, Councilor
Dominador Sabite, Staff
Evena D. Plantes, Treasurer
Eledia Jaso, People's Organization Treasurer
Ceriaca L. Dagal, Purok Chairman
Marainito Erosedo, Purok Chairman

COTABATO CITY**Bangsamoro Women for Peace and Development**

Bai Grace Maryam A. Sinsuat, Executive Director
Anisa K. Abad, Admin and Finance officer

Biniruan Famers Association

Jack Mohammad, Association President and Barangay Chairman

Cotabato City State Polytechnic College (CCSPC)

Arbaya H. Boquia, JEEP coordinator
John Alles, Teacher
Aida Gasang, Teacher
Rica Ali, Teacher
Franklin Tizon, Teacher
Asliah Balindong, Teacher

Department of Agriculture and Fisheries ARMM

Felix Mosne, Agribusiness Chief
Jelica Mangacop, Chief of Crops Division

Growth with Equity in Mindanao Cotabato Office

Mao Baraguir, Agriculture Specialist

Kadtabanga Foundation for Peace and Development Advocates (KFPDAI)

Hadja Giobay Diocolano, KFPDAI Executive Director

Makol Musa, KFPDAI member and Chair of Mapayag Multi Purpose Cooperative

Lucrative Agri-Development Multipurpose Cooperative

Bainta Ginta, Treasurer
Mr. Ginta, member

Metro Cotabato Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Danda N. Juanday, Current President
Pete Marquez, Former President
Janette Eran, Executive Director

Muslim Kutawato Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Hadji Abdunnasser D. Sema, President

Notre Dame University, Peace Center

Mr. Essex Guiguiento, Executive Director

Regional Planning and Development Office

Engr. Baintan Ampatuan, Regional Executive Director

DAVAO CITY**Davao City Chamber of Commerce and Industry**

Mary Ann Abundo, Executive Director

Davao Merchant Maritime Academy

Jee Gica, JEEP Coordinator
Roly Oring, Teacher
Neil Exclamador, Teacher
Irish Baguio, Teacher
Jake Diacono, Teacher

Growth with Equity in Mindanao

Dan Bichanich, Chief Oo Party and Infrastructure Team Leader
Ross Wherry, Former Chief of Party
Dr. Charles E. Feibel, Vice Pres. Louis Berger Group, Inc
Marilou Sian, Executive Officer and Support Services Team Leader
Dr. Stanley N. Swerdloff, Senior Fisheries Adviser
Neil P. Cachuela, BIP Project Manager
Arnold A. Dacula, Business Growth Team
Roselle P. King, BSO Specialist
Adel Oviedo, TCEP – Former Combatant Reintegration Team Leader
Carlos Enriquez, TCEP-High Value Horticulture (Veggies/Fruits) Team Leader
Armando Succang, BSO –Governance Mgmt Specialist
Engr. Vilma Belches, Infrastructure Team
Lanie Villan, CLIC in Charge

Anna Pulido, Workforce Staff

KF Nutri Foods International, Inc

Marilou Fernandez, Marketing Officer and owner

Mindanao Business Council

Rolando Torres, Executive Director

Mindanao Development Authority (MinDA)

Janet Lopez, Executive Director

Engr. Charlita Escaño, Division

Jayrome Rala, Project Monitoring Specialist

Anelyn Binancilan

Yvette Valderia

Joan Barera

Mindanao Trade Expo Foundation, Inc.

Ann Pamituan, President

Mindanao Fruits Council

Atty. Antonio B. Partoza, Jr., President

PRIDE Interns

Carlo Jay Bagundang, We are IT Philippines

Hannah Oliveros, Italianni's Restaurant

Ramil Alfaras, Italianni's Restaurant

Gerlie Salgado

Crystal Joy Pirante

Cristy Cabino

Claire Marie Ancheta

Liezel Apple Tungpalan

Southern Philippines Fresh Fruits Corporation

Christine Joyce Legaspi, Marketing Officer

PROVINCE OF DAVAO DEL NORTE

Dynamic Vegetable Growers Association

Ray A. Acain, President

Dr. Anastacia Notarte, Asst. Provincial Agriculturist

Jesus H. Almendres, Board of Directors

C. Feuntes, Board of Directors

Alfredo P. Coita, Board of Directors

PROVINCE OF NORTH COTABATO

Provincial Local Government Unit of North Cotabato

Oscar Sumejo, Provincial Engineers Office

Administrative Officer

Engr. Eliodoro Vergadera Jr., GEM Projects In Charge

Kidapawan City Chamber of Commerce

Dr. Ramon Floresta, President

Blessilda Bayoy, Project Officer

Alma Respicio, Board of Director

Municipality of Libungan

Manuel dela Serna, Mayor

Renante Ponce, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator

Engr. Jerry Licayan, Municipal Engineer

Florante Depas, Barangay Chairman

Joseph Dante Devilleres, Barangay Chairman

Mario E. Pretesto, Barangay Chairman

Federico J. Paseoles, Barangay Chairman

Rolando E. Martin, Barangay Chairman

Beneficiaries while project visits

Notre Dame of Libungan

Anita Ceballos, School Head

Municipality of Pigcawayan

Municipal Local Government Unit

Zaldy Balofinos, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator

Jaime Akinde, Municipal Treasurer

Jocelyn Jaconob, CPA, Municipal Accountant

Rosalie Pascual, Municipal Budget Officer

Romulo delos Santos, Municipal Assessor

Armelinda Palma, Revenue Code Focal Person

Buluan Local Government Unit

Noel Marfil, Barangay Chairman

Barangay Officials

Bulacaon Local Government Unit

Wilson Untal, Barangay Chairman

Barangay Officials

Municipality of Carmen

Integrated Cultural Livelihood Assistance

Multipurpose Cooperative

HadjiYusupAmella, Chairman

Kababaihang Carmenian Nagkakaisa Cooperative

PROVINCE OF MAGUINDANAO

Municipality of Datu Paglas

Municipal Local Government Unit

Mohammad Paglas, Mayor

Padido Usman, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator

Arcadio Duruin, Municipal Budget Officer

Alfredo Macion, Municipal Assessor

Julinar Abutasil, Municipal Treasurer's Office

Hamida Adzal Abubacar, Assistant treasurer
Engr. Nemia Nando
Councilor Nando
Councilor Datang

Damalussy Local Government Unit

Mando Guiwan, Barangay chairman
I Barangay councilor

Baguadatu Elementary School

Pahmia Abubacar, School Head

Municipality of Datu Odin Sinsuat

Municipal Local Government Unit

Manan Mandaragon, Municipal Planning and
Development Officer

Camp Siongco National High School

Analyn M. Ballesteros, ICT In Charge
Helen P. Bayon, Department Head
Marfelina I. Buenafe, Department Head
Angel Joy R. Condes, IT Teacher

**Datu Odin Sinsuat Educational Development
Foundation**

Abdul Makalilay, ICT Coordinator

Mindanao State University, DOS Campus

Sarah Jane Diang, JEEP Coordinator
Fhajema Kunso, Teacher
Amie Lazado, Professor
Agnes Baay, Professor
Princess Sheryn Mamuca, Professor
Noriel Sabandal, Student
Meldred Baguio, Student
Ma. Angelica Bagayas, Student
Gay Borja, Student
Jessa Ybas, Student
Elsa Felipe, Student

**Mindanao State University- Integrated
Laboratory High School**

Lornaida Madale

Municipality of Parang

Dr. Ibrahim P. Ibay, Mayor
Usman Ibay, Municipal Administrator
Ma. Theresa Ubas, Municipal Planning and
Development Officer
Municipal Budget Officer
Revenue Collections Officer
Staff from Municipal Treasurers Office

Easter Joy School Incorporated

Amelita Lim, School Head

Notre Dame of Parang

Ms. Caroline Rusiana, School Head

**Illana Bay Fishermen Multi-purpose
Cooperative, Moro Point**

Jun Sarasar, Cooperative President and Barangay Moro
Point Chairman

Iranon Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Bai Monina Macarongon, President
Chamber Chair
Rayda Rachel Sentita, Project Officer
Gina Autida, Technical Assistant
Mr. Macarongon, Chamber member

Municipality of Upi

Municipal Government of Upi

Ramon Piang Sr., Mayor
Alexis Platon - Vice mayor
Susan Mayo - SB Member
Engr. Paulo Cagara – MPDC
Helen Faith Apostol - HRMO
Herlinda Aguilos - BPLO - In-Charge
Edna Claveria - Treasurer Representative
Christdane Sente - IT In-Charge
Jose Boglosa - SB Secretary
Cherubin Real - Engineering Staff (Sounds - In charge)
Pearl Chiong - TV In-Charge
Marni Pablo - Mun. Accountant Designate
Ma. Selda Platon - Mun Assessor Representative
Engr. Gerardo Carino - Mun. Engineer

GENERAL SANTOS CITY

Neil Cachuela, BIP Project Manager in the GEM
General Santos City Office

PROVINCE OF SOUTH COTABATO

Municipality of Banga

Municipal Government of Banga

Henry Ladot, Mayor
Virgilio S. De Leon, MPDC cum Municipal
Administrator
Lolita E. Tillan, Municipal Accountant
Delilan G. Tanag, Municipal Treasurer,
Robert V. Franilla, Municipal Engineer

Banga Central Elementary School

Melitona M. Santbayanes, School Guidance
Marites P. Gahaport, ICT Coordinator

Beatrice Joy L. Tingson, Student
Shekinah Bagaman, Student
April Jeanhien C. Castillo, Student
Brix O. Embedia, Student
Kevin Riggs A. Gacilos, Student
Lourdes D. Amparo, SPED Teacher
Beverlie O. Labordo, Teacher
Willafe B. Nicer, Teacher

Lampari Local Government Unit

Abrila N. Miskinan, Barangay Chairman
Susan U. Pineda, Treasurer
Jack M. Mame, Councilor
Mindal Pablito Councilor
Tayan Anibalgan, Councilor
Taugan Samerey, Representative, T'boli community

Punong Grande National High School

Roden E. Solatorio, ICT Coordinator
Grace P. Asturias, Student
Ma. Carah Ken Tambungalan, Student
Elidenio I. Perez, PTA Vice-President
Melinda A. Ramos, PTA Treasurer
Jocelyn G. Alacayan, Property Custodian

Koronadal City

Lake Sebu Bangsa Moro Multi-Purpose Cooperative

Rudy Tomas, Chairman

Palian Barangay Local Government Unit

Alexander Basilio, Barangay Chairman
Abbie P. Bansil, Councilor
Joel E. Basilio, Councilor

Palian Community Workers Association (PACOWA)

Ruden S. Bantu, PACOWA Chairman
Mercedes S. Espiritu, Secretary
Marcos Gabat, Auditor

Saravia National High School

Gil G. Subang, School Head
Ricky B. Romua, Student
Jetlyn G. Vargas, Teacher
Jannien O. Selomenio, Student
Kent Joseph Burgos, Student
Irish Cabarcas, Student
Apple Grace J. Arabaca, Student
Michael Rey Patricio, Teacher

South Cotabato Chamber of Commerce

Lito Uy, President

South Cotabato Banana Creations, Inc.

Benigno R. Sensano Jr., President
Eduardo Morante, Vice President
Bernadette De Jesus, Secretary
Melecio De Luna, Treasurer
Silvestre R. Caduada, Auditor
Jershon C. Malubay, Board of Director

Municipality of Noralla

Municipal Government of Noralla

Victor Y. Balayon, Mayor
Rosemarie B. Enriquez, Municipal Treasurer
Salve M. Fano, Revenue Collector II
Zenaida A. Esprella, Revenue Collector
Diogenes C. Aquilan, Market Supervisor

Manisan Multi-purpose Cooperative

Mendato C. Abol, Chairman
Analyn Cunahap, Bookkeeper
Marcelino O. Rafael, Vice Chairman
Clarita Rafael, Treasurer
Satornino Basques, Recipient
Romfo Rafael, Recipient
Elvie C. Liza, Recipient
Analea A. Phaza, Recipient
Ignazio S. Sulit Jr., Board of Director
Jaime D. Gonzales Sr. Board of Director
Aladino H. Cunahap, Recipient
Doseray Cordero, Recipient
Salome Rafael, Recipient
Romeo Rafael, Recipient
Aldo A. Dela Cruz, Councilor
Ronilo H. Juevesa, Councilor

Poblacion Local Government Unit

Morlito Apuzen, Trading Center Manager
Rodolfo E. Empig, Board of Director
Marlo Villalon, Board of Director
Jaime Jangcan, Board of Director

Polonuling Local Government Unit

Rey Balanon, Councilor
Vicente L. Trabado, Councilor
Edgar A. Barrientos, Councilor

San Miguel National High School

Nemesio M. Alvero, School Head
Elnar I. Robles Jr., ICT Coordinator
Ernie A. Tianchon, ICT Teacher

Municipality of Polomolok

Bangsamoro Women's Association

Husna Anjam, Barangay Chair

President of Bangsmoro Women's Assc.

Bentung-Sulit National High School

Digna A. Hibionada, Head Teacher
Raymund S. Arellano, Student
Florence C. Miano, IT Coordinator
Joy R. Javier, SLRC Coordinator
Nelson R. Gasmin, Teacher

Sumbakil Local Government Unit

Datu Asgar A. Mangelin, Barangay Chairman
Sarodin M. Kakim, Councilor
Ting R. Lido, Councilor
Raffy G. Solaiman, Beneficiary
Suieb K Mangelin, Councilor
Kanar M. Kakim, Beneficiary
Daven A. Mangelin, Beneficiary

Sumbakil Vegetable Producer Association

Sarodin Kakim, President,
Teng Lido, Vice President
Adjed Salik, Treasurer
Mangantong Mamdong, Auditor
Raffy Solaiman, Secretary

Municipal Government of Polomolok

Eliazar G. Jobero, Vice Mayor
Eronio P. Muno, Municipal Planning and Development
Coordinator
Ronelio J. Diaz, Municipal Engineer

Municipal Government of Tupi

Reynaldo S. Tamayo, Mayor
Renette Bergado, Administrator

Kalkam Aquaculture and Farmers Association

Arsad Landasan, Councilor and MNLF former ground
commander
Nonoy Diego, Beneficiary
Felipe Diego, Beneficiary

Lunen Local Government Unit

Roberto Liwao, Councilor
Gina Laco, Tribal Women's President
Dolores Ponan, Representative Tribal Youth
Glay Joy D. Poncardas, Beneficiary
Lilibeth Tamayo, Beneficiary
Amy O. Suarez, Beneficiary

SURIGAO CITY

Surigao City Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Willie Gan, President
Jun Piong, Executive Director

Cresol Mantong, Project Officer
Manuel R. Kong, Chamber member
Ferdinand P. Sembrano, Chamber member
Concepcion R. Paqueo, Chamber member
Julius R. Marasigan, Chamber member
Alma Rita M. Laayon, Chamber member
Leila G. Esparrago, Chamber member

Surigao City State College of Technology

Iryn Cavite, JEEP Coordinator
Eden Pungkol, Teacher
Vera Gingo, Teacher
Vanessa Velarde, Teacher
Anabelle Laig, Teacher
Myron Cubillan
Dr. Rowena Plando
Dr. Jane Jabonera
Alice Maghuyop, Former JEEP Coordinator

PROVINCE OF SURIGAO DEL NORTE

Municipality of Claver

Municipal Local Government Unit

Rosemarie Mira Gokiangkee, Mayor
Eva Casedo, Municipal Planning and Development
Coordinator
Manche Entenia, Executive Assistant to the Mayor
Renerio B. Galinato, Chairman of Barangay Ladgaron
Rogelio Nazi, Chairman of Barangay Daywan
Beneficiaries of Daywan (3)
Beneficiaries of Ladgaron (4)
Beneficiaries of Hayanggabon (2)

Hayanggabon Elementary School

Beda G. Murcia, School Head
Fely D. Malinao, Teacher
Custodia S. dela Piña
Vivian B. Goron, Teacher
Aimee Lubapis, Teacher
Dave G. Balili, Teacher
Alfredo Pantilo, Parents Teachers Association (PTA)
President
Gemma More, PTA Officer
Liza Maglinte, PTA Officer
Tres Rosendo Ebol, PTA Officer
Isabel Pardillo, PTA Officer
Salome Ruiz, PTA Officer
Rosita Cuanan, Parent

Ladgaron Elementary School

Rosie Entoc, Former School Head
Renerio Galinato, Parents Teachers Association
President
Deodlyn Solis, Teacher

Marilyn Leyros, Teacher
Meriam Sajulga, Teacher
Ma. Luz Tejano, Teacher
Adela Galagala, Teacher
Mary Ann Acedo, Teacher
Rosalinda Najial, Teacher

Municipality of Gigaquit

Municipal Government of Gigaquit

Carlos Egay, Mayor
Redelio Torregosa, Municipal Planning and
Development Coordinator
Engr. Restituto Mira, Municipal Engineer
Abundio L. Amarille, Barangay Chairman of Mahanub,
with 4 beneficiaries
Angelita L. Gesta, Barangay Chair of Poniente, with 3
Barangay councilors

Poniente Elementary School

Joselito P. Manongas, School Head
Loida Galido, Teacher
Dalicerna Yamson
Alma D. Bayang, Teacher
Herminia Montalban, Teacher
Warlita Unayon, Teacher
Dalicerna Yamson, Teacher
Angelyn Pepino, PTA President
Evelyn Payajo, PTA Vice President
Josefina Villar, PTA Officer
Rochelle F. Omandam, PTA Officer

PROVINCE OF TAWI-TAWI

Provincial Local Government Unit

Michael E. Guanieso, Vice Governor's Office, Staff
Nestor Delasas, Provincial Planning and Development
Officer

Municipality of Bongao

Municipal Local Government Unit

Jasper Que, Municipal Mayor
Manuel G. Pampora, Bongao Municipal Planning and
Development Coordinator
Moh. Nur Bahap, Bongao Municipal Engineer
Jun Q. Ibbo, Municipal Councilor

Botica sa Campo Barangay Womens Club Multi Purpose Cooperative

Edwina T. Jumsali, President
22 member-beneficiaries

Sanga Sanga Elementary School

Pepang S. Aksa, Teacher

Hja. Manis A. Sammani, PTCA Treasurer
Amina H. Lahug, Teacher
Noradina J. Abduljabul, Teacher
Sherwina A. Hajan, Teacher
Hja. Anselma A. Jamma, School Head

Tawi Tawi Chamber of Commerce

Nazrullah G. Masahud, Executive Vice President
Alvin Tan, Board of Director
Rolando E. Lim, Board of Director
Rasil S. Ibno, Executive Director

Municipality of Panglima Sugala

Nurbert M. Sahali, Mayor

Malacca Local Government Unit

Adzhar Abdumurin, Barangay Chairman
Jamaica Faizal, Councilor
Abdurajik Amag Councilor
Jum Habi Councilor
Lutian Badbaran Councilor
Mabini Usman Councilor
Madezan H. Badbaran, Project Evaluation Officer

Panglima Jalman Elementary School

Erlinda M. Saiyari, ESP-I
Dambong B. Tingkasa, Parents Teachers Association,
Public Information Officer
Mersa A. Sabuddin, Home Economics Teacher
Leonora A. Ylanan, Teacher

Parangan Local Government Unit

Mahamud Askali, Brgy. Secretary
Muhai Alhari Councilor
Saldy Alhari Councilor
Dahim Adih Councilor

Parangan Multi Purpose Cooperative

Madoh Sahiron, Chairman
Alsamer S. Hamed, Vice-Chairman
Bisar Odan, Member
Moktadil Monir, Member
Monir Ahmad, Member
Odan Osman, Member
Yayah Osman, Member
Olod Bassad, Member
Radz Bassad, Member

Balimbing Local Government Unit

Raffy Soon, Barangay Chairman
Tinding Hassan Councilor
Tating Mohammad Councilor
Abdurasa Asiri, Councilor
Zaffrullah Soon, Municipal Councilor

Tongsinah Child Friendly Elementary School

Evangeline Tadus, School Head
Apsa T. Melaham, PTCA officer
Juhura S. Abdulmonap
Shelma A. Halipa, PTCA Treasurer
Rubin Tawasil, PTCA Vice President
Ainul S. Mohammad, PTCA President
Huricha Knaick, PTCA Member
Luciana A. Akil, Teacher
Sharipa T. Sarahan, PTCA Member
Partana Y. Lssden
Al-shaima M Knaic, PTCA Officer
Elizabeth Arandilla, PTCA Officer
Narcisa Marabbam, PTCA Officer

Tongsinah Multi Purpose Cooperative

Muhmin Arik, Chairman

MANILA**Australia Agency for International Development**

Sam Chittick
Suhart Ambolodto, Mindanao Conflict Affected Areas Specialist

Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) Manila Liaison Office

Jolly Lais, Officer in Charge
Abdulhamid Alawi, Jr, Executive Assistant

Community and Family Services International (NGO)

Steven Muncy, Executive Director

European Union

Emily Mercado, Program Officer

Japan International Cooperation Agency

Mori Yusuke, Representative, Mindanao and Governance Section
Hernan Pineda, In-house Consultant, Mindanao Section

Louis Berger Group, Inc

Charles Feibel, Vice President

National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)

Roderick Planta, Director, Project Monitoring Staff
Violeta Corpus, Assistant Director, Project Monitoring Staff
Jesse David, Project Monitoring Staff
Noel Quejada, USAID Desk Officer

Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (OPAPP)

Secretary Teresita Quintos-Deles
Undersecretary Luisito Montalbo
Howard Cafugauan, Assistant Secretary for Operations
Pamela Padilla, Director III, Program Development Unit

United States Agency for International Development

Gloria Steele, Head of Mission, USAID/Philippines
Reed Aeschliman, Deputy Mission Director
Karen Smith and Enrique Gallardo, Jr for Support Services
Tina Cuyugan and Nikki Meru for Communications
William Murphy, Head, USAID Audit Office/Regional Inspector General
Daniel Miller, Head, USAID Office of Economic Development and Governance (OEDG)
Fatima Verzosa, Contracting Officer's Representative, Program Resource Management (PRM)
Gerald Britan, Ph.D., Senior Strategy & Evaluation Advisor
John Callanta, Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, PRM
Maria Teresa Robielos, Development Assistance Specialist, OEDG
Myre Emata Stokes, Office Chief, PRM
Stephanie Whittle, Captain U.S. Army/JSOTF-P

World Bank

Felizardo Virtucio, Rural Development Specialist
Matt Stephens, Sr. Social Development Specialist
Roberto Tordecilla, Operations Officer
Fermin Adriano, Social Development Consultant

Other

Robert Barnes, former USAID Program Manager for GEM
Renne Subido, former DCOP under GEM 2 and GEM 3

ANNEX 10: REVENUE ENHANCEMENT AND PEACE (REAP)

<u>Cohort</u>	<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Province</u>
1	Buug	Zamboanga Sibugay
1	Dumingag	Zamboanga del Sur
1	Molave	Zamboanga del Sur
1	Lamitan	Basilan
2	Datu Paglas	Maguidanao
2	Upi	Maguidanao
2	Alabel	Sarangani
3	Banga	South Cotabato
3	Norala	South Cotabato
3	Malapatan	Sarangani
3	Parang	Maguidanao
3	Pigcawayan	North Cotabato
4	Kiamba	Sarangani
4	Maasim	Sarangani
4	Presidente Roxas	North Cotabato
4	Aurora	Zamboanga del Sur
4	Calamba	Masamis Occidental

ANNEX II: REFERENCES CITED

- Act for Peace Programme: Action for Conflict Transformation 2005-2011 Terminal Report, Logical Framework, M&E framework, and Results and Peace Significance Matrix
- Audit of USAID/Philippines' Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM-3) Program, Manila, Philippines, Audit Report No. 5-492-12-002-P, December 1, 2011.
- "Barangay Infrastructure Project: Operation and Maintenance Policy and Implementation Guidelines of Pedestrian Bridge." Pg 10. USAID Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM) Program, no date.
- Behind the Veil of Conflict: Moving towards Economic Integration for Sustained Development and Peace in Mindanao. World Bank, May 2009.
- BIP Distribution by Province and City and Average Cost per BIP Type as of June 30, 2012, *GEM Program*.
- "Completion Report: GEM Infrastructure Program Advisory Services – November 10 – December 10, 2010." Pg. 18. USAID Growth with Equity in Mindanao Program (GEM). Davao City, Philippines
- Conflict Monitoring System (pilot period, January to April 2011), World Bank-State and Peace Building Fund project.
- Do Working Men Rebel? Insurgency and Unemployment in Iraq and the Philippines. Eli Berman, Joseph Felteer and Jacob Shapiro, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, 155547, November 2009.
- ELAP Assessment Survey Report. Mindanao State University Foundation Inc. 2000.
- Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects. Institute for Socio-Economic Development Initiatives, Ateneo de Davao, Mindanao, February 2012. Implemented by Louis Berger Group, Inc and commissioned by USAID Contract No. AID 492-C-00-08-000001-00, Sept. 15, 2011.
- "Fragile States: Securing Development". Speech given by Robert B. Zoellick, former President of The World Bank Group at The International Institute for Strategic Studies, Geneva, Switzerland, September 12, 2008.
- Forsberg, B.C, E. Sullesta, S. Pieche, and N. Lambo. "Cost of Diarrhoeal Diseases and the Savings from a Control Programme in Cebu, Philippines." *Bulletin World Health Organization*. 71(5):579-86. 1993.
- GEM-3 Development Activity Approval Document, Office of Economic Development and Governance, USAID, October 31, 2006.
- GEM 3 Quarterly Reports, FY2008 to FY2012. USAID's Growth with Equity in Mindanao Program. Louis Berger Group, Inc. Makati City, Philippines
- Gender and Conflict in Mindanao. The Asia Foundation. 2011. Pg. 10 and 15, Dwyer, Leslie and Rufa Cagoco-Guam.
- Growth with Equity in Mindanao 2 Program Completion Report: October 2002 to December 2007.
- Joint Needs Assessment for Reconstruction and Development in Conflict-Affected Areas in Mindanao. World Bank, 2005, Washington DC.
- Leaving Terrorism Behind. Eds. Tore Bjorgo and John Horgan, New York, Routledge, 2009
- Local Governance Performance Management System (LGPMs): Revenue Generation, LGU Financial Performance e-Report (<http://www.blgs.gov.ph/lgpmsv2/cmshome/index.php>).
- Medium Term Philippine Development Plan (MTPDP), by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA), 2004-2010.
- "Milkfish Production and Processing Technology in the Philippines." Yap, W., A. Villaluz, M.G. Soriano and M.N. Santos. *World Fish Center-Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research Milkfish Project Publication Series No.2, 2007*.
- Mindanao: A Gamble Worth Taking. Malcolm Cook and Kit Collier, Lowy, Institute for International Policy, 2006, New South Wales, Australia.
- "Mindanao Pioneers Commercial Peanut Farming," <http://www.newsflash.org/2001/03/be/be001577.htm>

¹ <http://discovery.iabc.com/view.php?pid=1069>.

National Objectives for Health—Philippines 2005-2010. Department of Health, Republic of the Philippines. Manila, 2005.

New Patterns of Violence in Indonesia: Preliminary Evidence from Six “High Conflict” Provinces. The World Bank, November 2010.

“Peace Frames & Tapestries: Frontliners’ Perspectives on Peacebuilding Dimensions.” 2009. Page 70, by the *ACT for Peace Programme*.

“Philippines: Looking At Mindanao.” ICAF Report January 2011, US Department of State.

Scope of Work for Social Impact. Based on RFP No: SOL-492-12-000008, Evaluation of Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM-3) Project. USAID/Philippines, January 19, 2012. Statement of Income and Expenditures (SIE), BLGF-DOF, FY 2006.

Summary Report of Beneficial Use Monitoring (BUM) Visits of Barangay Infrastructure Projects (BIP) as of 31 May 2012. GEM-3 Program.

“The Impact of USAIS’s Computer Literacy Internet Connection Program: A Summary of Major Conclusion. Ateneo University, August-Sept. 2012.

US Mission Manila’s Mindanao Strategy, May 2011.

USAID Evaluation Policy, Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning, January 2011

USAID’s Growth with Equity in Mindanao (GEM-3) Program: Gender Action Plan. 12 pp. February 29, 2008. Louis Berger Group, Inc. Makati City, Philippines.

World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development. World Bank, Washington DC.

ANNEX 12: ECONOMIC RATE OF RETURN CALCULATIONS

Baragay Infrastructure Projects	ERR
Box Culverts	
Purok 1, Sitio Bokbokon, Bgy Daywan Footbridge	74.7%
Purok 4 Barangay Bridge (Box Culvert) Construction in Ladgaron	81.5%
Sitio Day-ason Barangay Bridge (Box Culvert) Construction	76.4%
Buluang Barangay Bridge (Box Culvert)	22.6%
Trading Centers	
Hayanggabon Trading Center	53.2%
Purok 3, Mahanub Proper Trading Center (with toilet)	37.4%
Parang Trading Center (with toilet)	50.0%
Water Systems and Irrigation	
Poblacion 2 Drainage Canal Upgrading	58.6%
Malinawon Water System Upgrading (Level 2)	86.5%
Sitio Dungo-an, Buluacang Water System Upgrading (Level 2)	13.2%
Boat Landings	
Malacca Boat Landing	19.5%
Parangan Boat Landing	35.8%
FCR-Grain Dryers/Warehouses	
Batinao Grains Warehouse and Solar Dryer Construction	48.8%
Manisan Grains Solar Dryer Construction	73.3%
Moro Point Seaweed Solar Dryer (Kauyaguyag Fishing Cooperative)	13.7%
FCR-Livelihood	
Cardaba Banana Production Consolidation Facility	21.6%
Grouper and Milkfish Fishcage Farming (Illana Bay Cooperative)	7%
Buri Weaving, Nagkakaisang Carmenian Association	37.0%
Workforce Preparation	
Mindanao State University (JEEP)	-
Surigao State College and Technology (JEEP)	-
Datu Odin Sinsuat Educational and Development Foundation Inc. High School (CLIC)	-
Notre Dame of Libungan (CLIC)	-

NOTE: The Philippines Government (NEDA) uses 12 % and above ERR for economically feasible.

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Daywan

City/Municipality: Claver

Province: **Surigao del Norte**

Region: Caraga

Date visited: 10 August 2012

Basic info:

<i>Items</i>	<i>Qty</i>	<i>Unit</i>	
Size of footbridge	60	meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries	327	persons	source: field
Ave. household size	4.64	persons per household	source: census
No. of households (HH) beneficiaries	70	households	source: field
% of adults of total HH members	55.7	%	source: census
No. of adult beneficiaries	182	persons	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total HH members	27.3	%	source: census
No. of female adult beneficiaries	89	persons	source: field (validated census data)
No. of HH members attending primary school	2	person per HH	source: field
Enrolment growth rates at primary school (all levels) SY 2010-11, Caraga	4.08	%	source: DepEd-BIS
No. of HH members attending secondary school	1	person	source: field
Enrolment growth rates at secondary school (all levels) SY 2010-11, Caraga	6.50	%	source: DepEd-BIS
Population growth rate, Surigao del Norte	1.24	%	source: NSCB
No. of HH evacuees due to flooding	20	households	source: field
No. of person-evacuees due flooding	70	persons	source: field
Travel time savings by beneficiaries, normal days	5	minutes	source: field
Travel time savings by the beneficiaries, flooding season	10	minutes	source: field
Frequency of flooding	3	per month	source: field
No. of months (flooding), December to February	3	months per year	source: field
No. of days of suspended classes due to flooding	3	days per flooding	source: field
Total no. of school days in a school year (exc holidays)	180	days per school year	field, estimate
Incremental no. of visits to town center (adult females)	0.5	days per week	source: field
No. of days devoted to farming	7	days per week	source: field
Incremental no. of month-visit to farm site (adult)	9	months per year	source: field
Incremental sacks of palay harvested	20	sacks per hectare	source: field
No. of harvest in a year	2	harvest seasons per year	source: field
Average area of rice field tended by one HH	0.311	hectare	source: field (validated DA-BAS data)
Price of palay (farm-gate)	700	pesos per sack	source: field
Growth rate of volume of palay production in Surigao del Norte, 2011	3.73	%	source: DA-BAS
Fare to nearest town center, public market, secondary school and clinic	20	pesos per head (return trip)	source: field
Fare to nearest elementary school	10	pesos per head (return trip)	source: field
Travel time to nearest town center, public market, secondary school and clinic	10	minutes	source: field

Travel time to nearest primary school from pickup point near residence	5	minutes	source: field
Start date of construction	24-Feb-12		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	30-May-12		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	96	days	source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion	0	months	source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,003,571	pesos	source: GEM3 website source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	derived estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	45,161	pesos per year	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Lifespan	20	years	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	4	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage non-agriculture, Caraga	258	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	1	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict		political (communist insurgency)	source: field
Violent conflict actors		New Peoples Army, private citizens	source: field
Violent conflict form		P10,000 extortion ('tax') or death	source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
BENEFITS									
[A]	Private benefits		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	User fee		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[B]	Social benefits		957,519	922,568	827,512	742,344	665,978	597,502	536,098
	Incremental farm income of households		613,689	596,225	532,344	475,307	424,381	378,912	338,314
	Cost savings from travel time to nearest town center by adult females		325,839	308,968	279,285	252,453	228,200	206,276	186,459
	Cost savings from travel time to nearest school by students		5,391	5,428	5,084	4,822	4,573	4,338	4,115
	Cost savings from travel time to nearest safe area by evacuees during flooding		12,600	11,948	10,800	9,762	8,824	7,977	7,210
[C]	Total benefits [A]+[B]		957,519	922,568	827,512	742,344	665,978	597,502	536,098
COST									
[D]	Private costs	1,102,643	55,196	51,697	46,158	41,213	36,797	32,855	29,334
	Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)	1,003,571	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Imputed labor cost of community	99,072	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Maintenance		10,036	9,400	8,392	7,493	6,690	5,974	5,334
	Depreciation cost		45,161	42,298	37,766	33,720	30,107	26,881	24,001
[E]	Social cost		0						
	Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction		0						
	Total cost [D]+[E]	1,102,643	55,196	51,697	46,158	41,213	36,797	32,855	29,334
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(1,102,643)	902,323	870,871	781,354	701,131	629,181	564,648	506,764
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(1,102,643)	(55,196)	(51,697)	(46,158)	(41,213)	(36,797)	(32,855)	(29,334)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	7,208,279.9
BCR	5.5
FRR	-
ERR	74.7%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible. given that a footbridge is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	4,633,130.9	4.2	-	68.7%
30% discount rate	3,082,402.6	3.3	-	62.1%
10% increase in benefits	8,087,540.5	6.1	-	83.6%
10% increase in costs	7,049,847.3	5.0	-	66.7%

8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
481,034	431,651	387,363	347,641	312,014	280,057	251,391	225,675	202,606	181,909
302,066	269,702	240,805	215,005	191,968	171,400	153,036	136,639	121,999	108,928
168,546	152,353	137,716	124,486	112,526	101,716	91,944	83,111	75,126	67,909
3,904	3,705	3,516	3,337	3,168	3,007	2,855	2,712	2,575	2,446
6,518	5,891	5,325	4,814	4,351	3,933	3,555	3,214	2,905	2,626
481,034	431,651	387,363	347,641	312,014	280,057	251,391	225,675	202,606	181,909
26,191	23,385	20,880	18,643	16,645	14,862	13,269	11,848	10,578	9,445
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,762	4,252	3,796	3,390	3,026	2,702	2,413	2,154	1,923	1,717
21,429	19,133	17,083	15,253	13,619	12,160	10,857	9,694	8,655	7,728
26,191	23,385	20,880	18,643	16,645	14,862	13,269	11,848	10,578	9,445
454,842	408,266	366,483	328,999	295,369	265,195	238,121	213,828	192,028	172,464
(26,191)	(23,385)	(20,880)	(18,643)	(16,645)	(14,862)	(13,269)	(11,848)	(10,578)	(9,445)

18	19	20
0	0	0
0	0	0
163,339	146,678	131,727
97,257	86,837	77,533
61,384	55,487	50,156
2,324	2,208	2,098
2,374	2,146	1,940
163,339	146,678	131,727
8,433	7,529	6,723
0	0	0
0	0	0
1,533	1,369	1,222
6,900	6,160	5,500
8,433	7,529	6,723
154,906	139,148	125,004
(8,433)	(7,529)	(6,723)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Ladgaron

City/Municipality: Claver

Province: Surigao del Norte

Region: Caraga

Date visited: 10 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of box culvert/bridge construction	10	meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries	779	persons	source: field
Ave. household size	4.64	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	168	households	source: field
% of adults of total HH members	55.7	%	source: census
No. of adult beneficiaries	434	persons	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total HH members	49	%	source: census
No. of female adult beneficiaries	382	persons	source: field (validated census data)
No. of HH members attending elementary school	1	person per HH	source: field
No. of days of suspended classes at primary school due to flooding	2	days per flooding	source: field
% of HH population in the informal sector, Caraga	16.1	%	derived estimate: source: NSCB, census
% of self-employed w/o paid employee of total informal sector operator, Caraga	90	%	source: NSCB
Cost of raft	300	pesos per raft	estimate
No. of rafts due on flooding season	5	units	source: field
Frequency of flooding	2	per week	source: field
No. of months (flooding)	2	months per year	source: field
Incremental visits to town center (adult females)	5	days per week	source: field
Incremental visits to town center (adult, non-mothers)	2	days per week	source: field
Incremental income of HH	350	pesos per week	source: field
Fare to nearest town center	20	peso per head (return trip)	source: field
Daily traffic volume, <i>habal-habal</i> (average)	8	units per day	source: field
Daily traffic volume, 4-wheel vehicle (average)	2	units per day	source: field
Traffic volume growth rate	5	% per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, motorcycle	1.09	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, utility car	5.98	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Average time savings of vehicles	8	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Average traffic time due to delay in construction	15	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Start date of construction	9-Oct-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion	20-May-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	221	days	source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion due to cracks	4.87	months	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website

Construction cost	2,015,452	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	90,695	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	10	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage non-agriculture, Caraga	258	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	4	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict		political (communist insurgency)	source: field
Violent conflict actors		New Peoples Army, private citizens	source: field
Violent conflict form		extortion ('tax')	source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits			15,770	15,509	14,540	13,631	12,779
User fee			0	0	0	0	0
Operating cost savings of vehicles			75	74	70	65	61
Time cost savings of vehicles			15,695	15,435	14,470	13,566	12,718
[B] Social benefits			2,372,539	2,222,137	2,081,269	1,949,331	1,825,758
Incremental income of HHs			408,239	382,359	358,121	335,418	314,155
Cost savings from travel time of adult females			1,835,573	1,719,211	1,610,225	1,508,149	1,412,543
Cost savings from travel time of adult males			98,864	92,597	86,727	81,229	76,080
Cost savings from building rafts during flooding			3,000	2,810	2,632	2,465	2,309
Cost saving from travel/access by students during flooding			26,862	25,159	23,564	22,070	20,671
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			2,388,309	2,237,646	2,095,809	1,962,963	1,838,537
COST							
[D] Private costs		2,015,452	110,850	103,823	97,241	91,077	85,303
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		2,015,452					
Imputed labor cost of community		570,180					
Maintenance			20,155	18,877	17,680	16,559	15,510
Depreciation cost			90,695	84,946	79,561	74,517	69,793
[E] Social cost			14,513				
Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction			14,513				
Total cost [D]+[E]		2,585,632	125,362	103,823	97,241	91,077	85,303
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(2,585,632)	2,262,947	2,133,823	1,998,568	1,871,886	1,753,234
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(2,585,632)	(110,850)	(103,823)	(97,241)	(91,077)	(85,303)

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14

11,981	11,232	10,530	9,872	9,255	8,676	8,134	7,626	7,149
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	54	50	47	44	42	39	36	34
11,923	11,178	10,479	9,824	9,210	8,635	8,095	7,589	7,115
1,710,018	1,601,615	1,500,084	1,404,989	1,315,923	1,232,503	1,154,371	1,081,192	1,012,652
294,240	275,587	258,117	241,754	226,429	212,075	198,631	186,039	174,245
1,322,998	1,239,129	1,160,577	1,087,005	1,018,096	953,556	893,108	836,491	783,464
71,257	66,740	62,509	58,546	54,835	51,359	48,103	45,054	42,198
2,162	2,025	1,897	1,777	1,664	1,558	1,460	1,367	1,280
19,361	18,134	16,984	15,907	14,899	13,954	13,070	12,241	11,465
1,721,998	1,612,847	1,510,614	1,414,861	1,325,178	1,241,179	1,162,505	1,088,818	1,019,801

79,896	74,831	70,087	65,644	61,483	57,585	53,935	50,516	47,313
14,526	13,606	12,743	11,935	11,179	10,470	9,806	9,185	8,602
65,369	61,225	57,344	53,709	50,304	47,115	44,128	41,331	38,711
79,896	74,831	70,087	65,644	61,483	57,585	53,935	50,516	47,313
1,642,103	1,538,016	1,440,527	1,349,217	1,263,695	1,183,594	1,108,570	1,038,302	972,488
(79,896)	(74,831)	(70,087)	(65,644)	(61,483)	(57,585)	(53,935)	(50,516)	(47,313)

15	16	17	18	19	20
6,702	6,283	5,891	5,522	5,177	4,854
0	0	0	0	0	0
32	30	28	26	25	23
6,670	6,253	5,862	5,496	5,153	4,830
948,457	888,332	832,018	779,274	729,874	683,605
163,200	152,854	143,164	134,088	125,588	117,627
733,798	687,280	643,711	602,905	564,685	528,888
39,523	37,017	34,670	32,473	30,414	28,486
1,199	1,123	1,052	985	923	864
10,739	10,058	9,420	8,823	8,264	7,740
955,160	894,615	837,909	784,796	735,051	688,459

44,314	41,505	38,874	36,409	34,101	31,939
8,057	7,546	7,068	6,620	6,200	5,807
36,257	33,958	31,806	29,789	27,901	26,132
44,314	41,505	38,874	36,409	34,101	31,939
910,846	853,111	799,035	748,387	700,950	656,519
(44,314)	(41,505)	(38,874)	(36,409)	(34,101)	(31,939)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	23,640,185.5
BCR	7.1
FRR	-
ERR	81.5%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a barangay bridge/box culvert is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	14,275,499.2	5.2	-	75.2%
30% discount rate	9,037,380.5	3.9	-	68.5%
10% increase in benefits	26,962,070.9	9.2	-	118.1%
10% increase in costs	23,252,498.6	6.5	-	73.1%

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Poniente

City/Municipality: Gigaquit

Province: Surigao del Norte

Region: Caraga

Date visited: 10 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of box culvert/bridge construction	10	meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries (Bgy Poniente and Bgy Camboayon)	2,198	persons	source: field and census
Ave. household size, Surigao del Norte	4.64	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	474	households	source: field
% of adults of total HH members, Caraga	55.7	%	source: census
No. of adult beneficiaries	1,224	persons	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total HH members, Caraga	49	%	source: census
No. of adult female beneficiaries	1079	persons	source: field (validated census data)
Population growth rate, Caraga	1.25	%	source: NSCB
Land area for palay production	60	hectares	source: field
Volume of palay production	60	sacks per hectare	source: field
Frequency of harvest	2	times per year	source: field
Growth rate of volume of palay production in Surigao del Norte, 2011	3.73	%	source: DA-BAS
Handling fee to transport palay produce to town on a motorcycle (with bridge)	5	pesos per sack	source: field
Carrying capacity of motorcycle	6	sacks per trip	source: field
Handling fee to transport palay produce to town on carabao cart (without bridge)	50	pesos per sack	source: field
Carrying capacity of carabao cart	10	sacks per trip	source: field
Average traffic time of handling palay produce to cross creek - carabao cart	20	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Average traffic time of handling palay produce to cross creek - motorcycle	1	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Average traffic time saving of handling agri produce to cross the creek	19	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Incremental visits to town center (adult females)	2	days per week	source: field
Fare to nearest town center	20	peso per head (return trip)	source: field
Start date of construction	4-Nov-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	7-Aug-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	282	days	source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion due to cracks*	207	months	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,830,484	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	82,372	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	10	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage non-agriculture, Caraga	258	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC

*no reported additional cost due to delay in

construction			
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			source: field
Violent conflict actors			source: field
Violent conflict form			source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits			144,000	139,902	129,572	120,004	111,143
User fee			0	0	0	0	0
Operating cost savings of vehicle to transport palay produce			30,000	29,146	26,994	25,001	23,155
Time cost savings of vehicles to transport palay produce			114,000	110,756	102,578	95,003	87,988
[B] Social benefits			2,071,677	1,940,347	1,817,343	1,702,136	1,594,233
Cost savings from travel time by adult females			2,071,677	1,940,347	1,817,343	1,702,136	1,594,233
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			2,215,677	2,080,249	1,946,915	1,822,141	1,705,376
COST							
[D] Private costs		1,830,484	100,677	94,294	88,317	82,718	77,474
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		1,830,484					
Imputed labor cost of community							
Maintenance			18,305	17,144	16,058	15,040	14,086
Depreciation cost			82,372	77,150	72,259	67,679	63,388
Total cost [D]		2,558,044	100,677	94,294	88,317	82,718	77,474
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(2,558,044)	2,115,000	1,985,955	1,858,598	1,739,423	1,627,902
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(1,830,484)	43,323	45,608	41,255	37,286	33,669

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	21,740,679.1
BCR	6.8
FRR	-
ERR	76.4%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a barangay bridge/box culvert is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	13,088,551.4	5.0	-	70.2%
30% discount rate	8,242,772.2	3.7	-	63.4%
10% increase in benefits	25,014,066.7	9.4	-	121.4%
10% increase in costs	1,170,786.6	2.0	-	-

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
102,937	95,336	88,296	81,777	75,738	70,146	64,966	60,169	55,726
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21,445	19,862	18,395	17,037	15,779	14,614	13,535	12,535	11,610
81,491	75,474	69,901	64,740	59,959	55,532	51,432	47,634	44,117
1,493,170	1,398,514	1,309,858	1,226,822	1,149,051	1,076,209	1,007,985	944,086	884,238
1,493,170	1,398,514	1,309,858	1,226,822	1,149,051	1,076,209	1,007,985	944,086	884,238
1,596,107	1,493,850	1,398,154	1,308,599	1,224,789	1,146,355	1,072,951	1,004,255	939,964
72,563	67,963	63,655	59,620	55,840	52,300	48,985	45,879	42,971
13,193	12,357	11,574	10,840	10,153	9,509	8,906	8,342	7,813
59,370	55,606	52,081	48,780	45,687	42,791	40,078	37,538	35,158
72,563	67,963	63,655	59,620	55,840	52,300	48,985	45,879	42,971
1,523,544	1,425,886	1,334,500	1,248,979	1,168,949	1,094,055	1,023,967	958,376	896,993
30,373	27,373	24,642	22,157	19,898	17,846	15,982	14,290	12,755
15	16	17	18	19	20			
51,612	47,801	44,271	41,002	37,975	35,171			
0	0	0	0	0	0			
10,752	9,958	9,223	8,542	7,911	7,327			
40,859	37,842	35,048	32,460	30,063	27,843			
828,183	775,682	726,510	680,454	637,318	596,917			
828,183	775,682	726,510	680,454	637,318	596,917			
879,795	823,483	770,781	721,456	675,293	632,087			
40,247	37,696	35,306	33,068	30,972	29,008			
7,318	6,854	6,419	6,012	5,631	5,274			
32,929	30,842	28,887	27,055	25,340	23,734			
40,247	37,696	35,306	33,068	30,972	29,008			
839,548	785,787	735,475	688,388	644,321	603,079			
11,365	10,105	8,965	7,934	7,003	6,162			

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Buluan

City/Municipality: Pigcawayan

Province: **North Cotabato**

Region: Soccsksargen

Date visited: 18 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of bridge	10	meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries, (population of barangay)	1070	persons	source: census
Average household size, Pigcawayan	4.7	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	228	households	source: field (validated census data)
% of HH members aged 5 years and above, Pigcawayan	88.35	%	source: census
No. of beneficiary HH members aged 5 years and above	945	persons	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total HH members	28.26	%	source: census
No. of female adult beneficiaries	302	persons	source: field (validated census data)
% of HH population in the informal sector, North Cotabato	16.3	%	derived estimate: source: NSCB and census
% of self-employed w/o paid employee of total informal sector operator, North Cotabato	77.81	%	source: NSCB
Population growth, North Cotabato	2.19	%	source: NSCB
Duration of days of flooding	2	days per flood	source: field
Frequency of flooding	3	per week	source: field
No. of months (flooding)	2	months per year	source: field
Incremental visits to town center (adult females)	1	days per week	source: field
Incremental visits to town center (adult, non-mothers)	1	days per week	source: field
Incremental income of HH	0	pesos per week	source: field
Fare to nearest town center	16	peso per head (return trip)	source: field
Daily traffic volume, habal-habal (average), daily	20	units per day	source: field
Daily traffic volume, truck (average), during harvest season	1	unit per day	source: field
Traffic volume growth rate	5	% per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, motorcycle	1.09	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, truck	5.98	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Average time savings of vehicles	10	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Incremental distance saved by vehicles from residence to town center	3	kilometers per trip	source: field
Incremental length of time pedestrians can cross the bridge due to construction delays	3	minutes	source: field
Note: before GEM3, wooden bridge impassable to vehicles			
Harvest season	3	seasons per year	source: field
Start date of construction	27-May-10		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	17-Sep-11		source: GEM3 website

No. of days of construction	475	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion due to flood	400	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,940,319	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	87,314	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	14	persons	source: field
No. of days devoted by unpaid local laborers to construction before they quit	5	days	source: field
Minimum daily wage, Soccsksargen	270	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	4	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict		communist insurgency	
Violent conflict actors		New Peoples Army, private citizens	
Violent conflict form		extortion ('tax')	
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits			67,054	65,755	61,645	57,793	54,181
User fee			0	0	0	0	0
Operating cost savings of vehicles			25,486	24,992	23,430	21,965	20,593
Time cost savings of vehicles			41,569	40,763	38,216	35,827	33,588
[B] Social benefits			726,025	678,055	633,255	591,415	552,340
Incremental income of HHs			0	0	0	0	0
Cost savings from travel time of adult females			232,229	216,886	202,556	189,173	176,674
Cost savings from travel time of adult males			493,796	461,170	430,700	402,243	375,666
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			793,079	743,811	694,901	649,208	606,520
COST							
[D] Private costs		1,940,319	106,718	99,667	93,081	86,931	81,188
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		1,940,319					
Imputed labor cost of community		18,900					
Maintenance			19,403	18,121	16,924	15,806	14,761
Depreciation cost			87,314	81,545	76,158	71,126	66,426
[E] Social cost			477,090				
Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction			477,090				
Total cost [D]+[E]		1,959,219	583,808	99,667	93,081	86,931	81,188
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(1,959,219)	209,272	644,144	601,819	562,276	525,332
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(1,940,319)	(19,403)	(18,121)	(16,924)	(15,806)	(14,761)

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
50,794	47,620	44,643	41,853	39,237	36,785	34,486	32,331	30,310	28,416
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
19,306	18,099	16,968	15,907	14,913	13,981	13,107	12,288	11,520	10,800
31,489	29,521	27,676	25,946	24,324	22,804	21,379	20,043	18,790	17,616
515,846	481,763	449,932	420,205	392,441	366,512	342,296	319,680	298,558	278,832
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
165,001	154,099	143,917	134,408	125,528	117,234	109,488	102,254	95,498	89,188
350,845	327,664	306,015	285,796	266,913	249,278	232,808	217,426	203,060	189,644
566,640	529,383	494,576	462,058	431,679	403,297	376,782	352,011	328,868	307,248

75,824	70,814	66,135	61,765	57,684	53,873	50,314	46,989	43,885	40,985
13,786	12,875	12,025	11,230	10,488	9,795	9,148	8,544	7,979	7,452
62,037	57,939	54,110	50,535	47,196	44,078	41,166	38,446	35,906	33,533

75,824	70,814	66,135	61,765	57,684	53,873	50,314	46,989	43,885	40,985
---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

490,817	458,569	428,441	400,292	373,994	349,424	326,468	305,021	284,984	266,263
(13,786)	(12,875)	(12,025)	(11,230)	(10,488)	(9,795)	(9,148)	(8,544)	(7,979)	(7,452)

16	17	18	19	20
26,640	24,975	23,414	21,950	20,578
0	0	0	0	0
10,125	9,492	8,899	8,343	7,821
16,515	15,482	14,515	13,608	12,757
260,409	243,204	227,135	212,128	198,112
0	0	0	0	0
83,296	77,792	72,652	67,852	63,369
177,114	165,412	154,483	144,276	134,743
287,049	268,178	250,549	234,078	218,691

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	5,358,729.4
BCR	2.5
FRR	-
ERR	22.6%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a barangay bridge/ box culvert is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	2,599,216.2	1.8	-	16.2%
30% discount rate	1,048,920.4	1.4	-	9.2%
10% increase in benefits	6,277,489.8	2.7	-	26.5%
10% increase in costs	5,190,663.9	2.4	-	21.6%

38,277	35,748	33,386	31,180	29,120
6,960	6,500	6,070	5,669	5,295
31,318	29,249	27,316	25,511	23,826

38,277	35,748	33,386	31,180	29,120
---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

248,772	232,430	217,162	202,898	189,570
(6,960)	(6,500)	(6,070)	(5,669)	(5,295)

Project Name: Hayanggabon Trading Center	BIP
Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project	

Barangay: Hayanggabon
City/Municipality: Claver
Province: **Surigao del Norte**
Region: Caraga
Date visited: 10 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
Size of trading center	84	square meters	source: field, GEM3
Population of barangay	880	persons	source: census
HH size of town	4.85	persons per household	source: census
Population (HH) of barangay	181	households	source: field
Population growth rate, Caraga	1.25	%	source: census
No. beneficiaries (vendors) - 1st year	24	persons	source: field
No. beneficiaries (vendors) - 2nd year	5	persons	source: field
No. beneficiaries (buyers)	50	persons per day	source: field (MPDC)
Peak days (weekend)	2	days per week	source: field
Trough days (weekdays)	5	days per week	source: field
Days open	365	days	source: field
Incremental total volume of fish sold per day	2	<i>bandehada</i> of fish	source: field
incremental total volume of fish sold per day by dropout-vendors during the 1st year	0.25	<i>bandehada</i> of fish	field estimate
Kilogram equivalent of 1 <i>bandehada</i> of fish	8	kilograms	source: field
Price of fish (peak)	20	pesos per kilo	source: field
Price of fish (trough)	20	pesos per kilo	source: field
Growth rate of sales	5	% per year	assumption
Cost of goods sold by farmers	50	% of sales	field estimate
Rental fee - for 1st year (with total 24 vendors)	60	pesos per stall-per week	source: field
Rental fee - for 2nd year*	288	pesos per stall-per week	source: field
Subsidy (working capital) given by mining company for vendors	5,000	pesos per person, lump-sum, 1st year	source: field
* with total 5 vendors who now bear the fees of 19 dropout-vendors			
Rental fee of stalls at the nearest alternative trading center/public market	50	pesos per week	source: field (MPDC)
Average travel time to nearest alternative trading center/public market	5	minutes	source: field
% of residents who ride public transport to nearest trading center/public market	0	%	source: field
**reason: within walking distance			
Start date of construction	30-Mar-09		source: GEM 3 website
Completion/turn-over date	24-Jun-09		source: GEM 3 website
No. of days of construction	84	days	source: GEM 3 website derived estimate, source: GEM 3 website
Delays in completion	24	years	source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,617,762	pesos	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	derived estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	72,799	pesos per year	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Lifespan	20	years	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: GEM3 website

Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	0	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage, Caraga	258	pesos per person-day	source:DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incident	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A]	Private benefits		69,120	64,738	60,634	56,791	53,190
	User fee (rental fee of stalls)		69,120	64,738	60,634	56,791	53,190
[B]	Social benefits		950,484	1,029,384	964,600	903,894	847,008
	Incremental retail net earnings		415,908	528,696	495,653	464,674	435,632
	Cost savings from travel time to nearest alternative trading center/public market		534,576	500,688	468,948	439,220	411,376
[C]	Total benefits [A]+[B]		1,019,604	1,094,122	1,025,235	960,685	900,199
COST							
[D]	Private costs	1,617,762	88,977	83,336	78,053	73,105	68,471
	Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)	1,617,762					
	Maintenance		16,178	15,152	14,192	13,292	12,449
	Depreciation cost		72,799	68,184	63,862	59,814	56,022
[E]	Subsidy and Opportunity cost		131,520	10,790	10,106	9,465	8,865
	Incremental user fee cost		11,520	10,790	10,106	9,465	8,865
	Subsidy		120,000				
	Total cost [D]+[E]	1,617,762	220,497	94,126	88,159	82,571	77,336
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(1,617,762)	799,107	999,996	937,075	878,114	822,863
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(1,617,762)	(19,857)	(18,598)	(17,419)	(16,315)	(15,281)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	10,451,048.1
BCR	4.6
FRR	-
ERR	53.2%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible. given that a trading center is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	6,040,900.5	3.4	-	46.7%
30% discount rate	3,576,274.5	2.6	-	39.7%
10% increase in benefits	11,785,677.4	5.1	-	59.7%
10% increase in costs	10,161,523.6	4.2	-	47.4%

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

49,819	46,660	43,702	40,932	38,337	35,907	33,631	31,499	29,502	27,632
49,819	46,660	43,702	40,932	38,337	35,907	33,631	31,499	29,502	27,632
793,703	743,753	696,946	653,085	611,985	573,471	537,381	503,562	471,872	442,176
408,405	382,880	358,950	336,515	315,483	295,765	277,280	259,950	243,703	228,472
385,298	360,873	337,996	316,570	296,501	277,705	260,101	243,612	228,169	213,705
843,522	790,413	740,648	694,017	650,322	609,378	571,012	535,061	501,374	469,808

64,131	60,065	56,257	52,691	49,351	46,222	43,292	40,548	37,977	35,570
11,660	10,921	10,229	9,580	8,973	8,404	7,871	7,372	6,905	6,467
52,470	49,144	46,029	43,111	40,378	37,818	35,421	33,175	31,072	29,103
8,303	7,777	7,284	6,822	6,390	5,984	5,605	5,250	4,917	4,605
8,303	7,777	7,284	6,822	6,390	5,984	5,605	5,250	4,917	4,605
72,434	67,842	63,541	59,513	55,740	52,207	48,897	45,798	42,894	40,175

771,088	722,571	677,107	634,504	594,581	557,171	522,114	489,264	458,480	429,633
(14,312)	(13,405)	(12,555)	(11,759)	(11,014)	(10,315)	(9,661)	(9,049)	(8,475)	(7,938)

16	17	18	19	20
25,880	24,239	22,703	21,264	19,916
25,880	24,239	22,703	21,264	19,916
414,350	388,274	363,840	340,943	319,487
214,192	200,805	188,255	176,489	165,458
200,157	187,469	175,585	164,454	154,029
440,230	412,514	386,542	362,206	339,403
33,315	31,203	29,225	27,372	25,637
6,057	5,673	5,314	4,977	4,661
27,258	25,530	23,911	22,396	20,976
4,313	4,040	3,784	3,544	3,319
4,313	4,040	3,784	3,544	3,319
37,628	35,243	33,009	30,916	28,956
402,601	377,271	353,534	331,290	310,446
(7,435)	(6,964)	(6,522)	(6,109)	(5,721)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Mahanub

City/Municipality: Gigaquit

Province: Surigao del Norte

Region: Caraga

Date visited: 11 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of trading center	84	square meters	source: field
Population of barangay	2,050	persons	source: census
Ave. HH size	4.95	persons per household	source: census
No. of HHs	414	households	source: field
Population growth rate, Caraga	1.25	%	source: census
No. beneficiaries (vendors)	8	persons	source: field
No. beneficiaries (buyers) - peak	200	persons per day	source: field
No. beneficiaries (buyers) - trough	70	persons per day	source: field
Peak days (weekend)	2	days per week	source: field
Trough days (weekdays)	5	days per week	source: field
Days open	365	days	source: field
Monthly electricity bill	500	pesos per month	source: field
Incremental total volume of sales (peak)	750	pesos per seller-day	source: field
Incremental total volume of sales (trough)	70	pesos per seller-day	source: field
Growth rate of sales	5	% per year	assumption
Cost of goods sold by farmers	50	% of sales	field estimate
User fee for toilet	1	peso per head	source: field
% of vendors and sellers who use the toilet	20	%	assumption
Rental fee - peak	100	pesos per stall-day	source: field
Rental fee - trough	50	pesos per stall-day	source: field
Fare from residence to nearest alternative trading center/public market	14	pesos per head (return trip)	source: field
Fare from residence to nearest alternative trading center/public market-chartered	56	pesos per return trip	source: field
Rental fee of stalls at the nearest alternative trading center/public market	20	pesos per day	source: field
% of residents who ride public transport to nearest trading center/public market	10	%	source: field
Start date of construction	26-Oct-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	11-Jan-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	75	days	source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion*	15	months	source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	969,958	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	43,648	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects

Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	0	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage non-agriculture, Caraga * no reported additional cost due to delay in construction	258	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A]	Private benefits		28,601	26,788	25,090	23,499	22,009
	User fee (rental fee from stalls)		27,375	25,640	24,014	22,492	21,066
	User fee (for use of toilet)		1,226	1,148	1,075	1,007	943
[B]	Social benefits		492,893	461,980	417,411	377,305	341,203
	Incremental retail net earnings		372,605	349,317	311,890	278,473	248,637
	Cost savings from travel time to nearest alternative trading center/public market		120,288	112,663	105,521	98,831	92,566
[C]	Total benefits [A]+[B]		521,494	488,767	442,500	400,804	363,212
COST							
[D]	Private costs	969,958	53,348	49,966	46,798	43,832	41,053
	Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)	969,958					
	Maintenance		9,700	9,085	8,509	7,969	7,464
	Depreciation cost		43,648	40,881	38,290	35,862	33,589
[E]	Opportunity cost		21,120	19,781	18,527	17,353	16,253
	Incremental user fee cost		21,120	19,781	18,527	17,353	16,253
	Total cost [D]+[E]	969,958	74,468	69,747	65,326	61,184	57,306
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(969,958)	447,026	419,020	377,175	339,619	305,907
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(969,958)	(24,747)	(23,178)	(21,709)	(20,333)	(19,044)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	3,141,549.0
BCR	2.7
FRR	-
ERR	37.4%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a trading center is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	1,848,858.8	2.2	-	31.3%
30% discount rate	1,078,011.3	1.8	-	24.8%
10% increase in benefits	3,638,468.5	3.0	-	42.9%
10% increase in costs	2,958,784.3	2.5	-	32.4%

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
20,614	19,307	18,083	16,937	15,863	14,858	13,916	13,034	12,207	11,434
19,731	18,480	17,308	16,211	15,183	14,221	13,319	12,475	11,684	10,944
883	827	775	726	680	637	596	559	523	490
308,695	279,414	253,029	229,246	207,801	188,455	170,997	155,237	141,003	128,141
221,997	198,212	176,975	158,013	141,083	125,967	112,471	100,420	89,661	80,054
86,698	81,202	76,054	71,233	66,717	62,488	58,527	54,817	51,342	48,087
329,310	298,721	271,113	246,183	223,664	203,313	184,913	168,271	153,210	139,575

38,451	36,013	33,730	31,592	29,589	27,713	25,957	24,311	22,770	21,327
6,991	6,548	6,133	5,744	5,380	5,039	4,719	4,420	4,140	3,878
31,460	29,465	27,597	25,848	24,209	22,675	21,237	19,891	18,630	17,449
15,222	14,257	13,354	12,507	11,714	10,972	10,276	9,625	9,014	8,443
15,222	14,257	13,354	12,507	11,714	10,972	10,276	9,625	9,014	8,443
53,673	50,270	47,084	44,099	41,303	38,685	36,233	33,936	31,784	29,770

275,637	248,451	224,029	202,085	182,361	164,628	148,681	134,335	121,426	109,805
(17,836)	(16,706)	(15,647)	(14,655)	(13,726)	(12,856)	(12,041)	(11,277)	(10,563)	(9,893)

16	17	18	19	20
10,709	10,030	9,394	8,799	8,241
10,250	9,600	8,991	8,421	7,888
459	430	403	377	353
116,516	106,002	96,490	87,881	80,084
71,477	63,819	56,981	50,876	45,425
45,039	42,183	39,509	37,005	34,659
127,224	116,032	105,885	96,679	88,325

19,975	18,708	17,522	16,412	15,371
3,632	3,402	3,186	2,984	2,795
16,343	15,307	14,336	13,428	12,576
7,908	7,407	6,937	6,497	6,085
7,908	7,407	6,937	6,497	6,085
27,882	26,115	24,459	22,909	21,457

99,342	89,917	81,425	73,771	66,868
(9,266)	(8,678)	(8,128)	(7,613)	(7,130)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Poblacion 2

City/Municipality: Parang

Province: **Maguindanao**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 24 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of trading center	84	square meters	source: field
Population of barangay	8916	persons	source: census
Ave. HH size	5.15	persons per household	source: census
No. of HHs	1731	households	derived estimate, (validated census data)
Population growth rate, Maguindanao	6.60	%	source: census
No. beneficiaries (vendors)	16	persons	source: field
No. beneficiaries (buyers) - peak	200	persons per day	source: field
No. beneficiaries (buyers) - trough	160	persons per day	source: field
Peak days (Saturday)	1	day per week	source: field
Trough days (weekdays)	5	days per week	source: field
Days open	317	days	source: field
Salary of watchmen	2,000	pesos per head	source: field
No. watchmen	4	persons	source: field
Start date of installing watchmen	2011	year	source: field
Average losses incurred by each vendor before start date of employing watchmen	200	pesos per vendor-day	source: field
Incremental total volume of sales (peak)	230	pesos per seller-day	source: field
Incremental total volume of sales (trough)	200	pesos per seller-day	source: field
Growth rate of sales	5	% per year	assumption
Cost of goods sold by farmers	50	% of sales	field estimate
User fee for toilet	2	peso per head	source: field
% of vendors and sellers who use the toilet	20	%	assumption
Rental fee - peak	7	pesos per stall-day	source: field
Rental fee - trough	7	pesos per stall-day	source: field
Fare from residence to nearest alternative trading place--street	14	pesos per head (return trip)	source: field
Fare from residence to nearest alternative trading place--street	50	pesos per return trip	source: field
Rental fee of stalls at the nearest alternative trading place--street	2	pesos per day	source: field
% of residents who ride public transport to nearest trading place--street	10	%	source: field
Start date of construction	6-Aug-08		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	15-Sep-09		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	409	days	derived estimate, GEM3 website
Delays in completion*	349	months	derived estimate, GEM3 website
Construction cost	832,235	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	37,451	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from	0	persons	source: field

the community				
Minimum daily wage (non-) agriculture, ARMM *no reported additional cost due to delay in construction	232	pesos per person-day		source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	1	incident		source: field
Type of violent conflict	rido			
Violent conflict actors	families			
Violent conflict form				
Discount rate	12	%		assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%		source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits			7,333	6,953	6,592	6,250	5,926
User fee (rental fee of stalls)			4,438	4,208	3,990	3,783	3,586
User fee (for use of toilet)			2,895	2,745	2,603	2,468	2,340
[B] Social benefits			660,917	621,303	563,085	510,672	463,464
Incremental retail net earnings			501,557	470,209	419,830	374,848	334,686
Cost savings from travel time to nearest alternative trading center/public market			159,360	151,093	143,255	135,824	128,778
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			668,250	628,255	569,677	516,922	469,390
COST							
[D] Private costs		832,235	141,773	134,418	127,445	120,834	114,566
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		832,235					
Imputed labor cost of community		0	96,000	91,020	86,298	81,822	77,577
Maintenance			8,322	7,891	7,481	7,093	6,725
Depreciation cost			37,451	35,508	33,666	31,919	30,264
[E] Opportunity cost		-	35,280	33,450	31,715	30,069	28,510
Incremental user fee cost			35,280	33,450	31,715	30,069	28,510
Total cost [D]+[E]		832,235	177,053	167,868	159,160	150,904	143,076
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(832,235)	491,197	460,387	410,517	366,018	326,314
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(832,235)	(134,440)	(127,466)	(120,853)	(114,584)	(108,640)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	3,417,507.3
BCR	2.1
FRR	-
ERR	50.0%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a trading center is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	2,137,860.1	2.0	-	44.0%
30% discount rate	1,357,189.1	1.8	-	37.5%
10% increase in benefits	4,066,174.8	2.3	-	58.3%
10% increase in costs	2,593,299.7	0.2	-	-

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

5,619	5,327	5,051	4,789	4,540	4,305	4,081	3,870	3,669	3,479
3,400	3,224	3,057	2,898	2,748	2,605	2,470	2,342	2,220	2,105
2,218	2,103	1,994	1,891	1,793	1,699	1,611	1,528	1,449	1,373
420,924	382,573	347,981	316,764	288,576	263,110	240,090	219,268	200,423	183,356
298,827	266,809	238,223	212,699	189,910	169,562	151,395	135,174	120,691	107,760
122,098	115,764	109,759	104,065	98,666	93,548	88,695	84,094	79,732	75,596
426,543	387,900	353,032	321,552	293,116	267,415	244,172	223,138	204,092	186,834
108,623	102,988	97,646	92,580	87,778	83,224	78,907	74,814	70,933	67,253
73,553	69,737	66,120	62,690	59,438	56,354	53,431	50,659	48,031	45,540
6,376	6,046	5,732	5,435	5,153	4,885	4,632	4,392	4,164	3,948
28,694	27,205	25,794	24,456	23,187	21,984	20,844	19,763	18,737	17,765
27,031	25,628	24,299	23,038	21,843	20,710	19,636	18,617	17,651	16,736
27,031	25,628	24,299	23,038	21,843	20,710	19,636	18,617	17,651	16,736
135,654	128,616	121,945	115,619	109,621	103,934	98,543	93,431	88,584	83,989
290,889	259,284	231,088	205,934	183,496	163,481	145,629	129,707	115,508	102,846
(103,004)	(97,661)	(92,595)	(87,791)	(83,237)	(78,919)	(74,825)	(70,944)	(67,264)	(63,774)

16	17	18	19	20
3,298	3,127	2,965	2,811	2,665
1,996	1,893	1,794	1,701	1,613
1,302	1,235	1,171	1,110	1,052
167,888	153,862	141,132	129,572	119,065
96,214	85,905	76,701	68,483	61,146
71,674	67,956	64,431	61,089	57,920
171,187	156,989	144,097	132,383	121,731

63,764	60,456	57,320	54,347	51,528
43,177	40,937	38,814	36,800	34,891
3,743	3,549	3,365	3,190	3,025
16,844	15,970	15,142	14,356	13,611
15,868	15,045	14,264	13,524	12,823
15,868	15,045	14,264	13,524	12,823
79,632	75,501	71,584	67,871	64,350
91,555	81,488	72,513	64,512	57,381
(60,466)	(57,329)	(54,355)	(51,536)	(48,862)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project
 Barangay: Poblacion 2
 City/Municipality: Parang
 Province: **Maguindanao**
 Region: ARMM
 Date visited: 23 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
Size of canal drainage	200	meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries, (population of barangay)	1958	persons	source: census
Average household size, Parang	5.15	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	380	households	source: field (validated census data)
Population growth, Maguindanao	6.6	%	source: NSCB
Duration of days of flooding	2	days per flood	source: field
Frequency of flooding	3	per week	source: field
No. of months (flooding)	1	months per year	source: field
Daily traffic volume, habal-habal	30	units per day	source: field
Daily traffic volume, utility vehicles	25	unit per day	source: field
Daily traffic volume, trucks	15	units per day	
Traffic volume growth rate	5	% per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, motorcycle	1.09	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, utility vehicles	5.98	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Operating cost savings of vehicle, trucks	6.14	pesos per km	source: DPWH, Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Average time savings of vehicles	20	minutes per vehicle	source: field
Incremental distance saved by vehicles from residence to poblacion	3	kilometers per trip	source: field
No of shops affected during flooding	14	shops (wholesalers)	source: field
Volume of losses during flooding	3	sacks of corn	source: field
Wholesale price of corn (white)	20.15	pesos per kilogram	source: BAS
Kilogram equivalent of 1 sack	50	kilograms per sack	source: field
Start date of construction	8-Aug-08		source: GEM3 website
Completion/date	20-Jan-09		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	162	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion due to flood	102	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	494,988	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	22,274	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Laborers employed during construction,	5	persons	source: field

from the LGU			
Minimum daily wage agriculture and non-agriculture, ARMM	232	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	4	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict		political (communist insurgency)	source: field
Violent conflict actors		New Peoples Army, private citizens	source: field
Violent conflict form		extortion ('tax')	source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits			547,342	544,896	510,840	478,912	448,980
User fee			0	0	0	0	0
Operating cost savings of vehicles			300,359	299,016	280,328	262,807	246,382
Time cost savings of vehicles			246,983	245,880	230,512	216,105	202,599
[B] Social benefits			126,945	120,360	114,116	108,196	102,584
Incremental loss prevention from flooding			126,945	120,360	114,116	108,196	102,584
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			674,287	665,256	624,956	587,109	551,564
COST							
[D] Private costs		494,988	27,224	25,812	24,473	23,204	22,000
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		494,988					
Imputed labor cost of community		187,920					
Maintenance			4,950	4,693	4,450	4,219	4,000
Depreciation cost			22,274	21,119	20,023	18,985	18,000
[E] Social cost			552,160				
Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction			552,160				
Total cost [D]+[E]		682,908	579,384	25,812	24,473	23,204	22,000
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(682,908)	94,903	639,444	600,483	563,905	529,564
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(494,988)	(4,950)	(4,693)	(4,450)	(4,219)	(4,000)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	6,732,581.7
BCR	5.3
FRR	-
ERR	58.6%

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	3,850,402.2	3.7	-	51.3%
30% discount rate	2,246,153.6	2.6	-	43.3%
10% increase in benefits	7,751,662.5	6.6	-	86.6%
10% increase in costs	6,642,969.7	5.0	-	55.9%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a drainage canal is an impure public good.

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
420,919	394,612	369,948	346,827	325,150	304,828	285,776	267,915	251,171	235,472	220,755

0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
230,983	216,547	203,012	190,324	178,429	167,277	156,822	147,021	137,832	129,218	121,141
189,936	178,065	166,936	156,503	146,721	137,551	128,954	120,895	113,339	106,255	99,614
97,262	92,217	87,433	82,897	78,597	74,520	70,654	66,989	63,514	60,219	57,095
97,262	92,217	87,433	82,897	78,597	74,520	70,654	66,989	63,514	60,219	57,095
518,181	486,828	457,381	429,724	403,747	379,348	356,430	334,904	314,684	295,692	277,851

20,859 19,777 18,751 17,778 16,856 15,981 15,152 14,366 13,621 12,914 12,244

3,792 3,596 3,409 3,232 3,065 2,906 2,755 2,612 2,477 2,348 2,226
17,066 16,181 15,341 14,546 13,791 13,076 12,397 11,754 11,144 10,566 10,018

20,859 19,777 18,751 17,778 16,856 15,981 15,152 14,366 13,621 12,914 12,244

497,323 467,052 438,631 411,946 386,891 363,367 341,278 320,538 301,063 282,777 265,606

(3,792) (3,596) (3,409) (3,232) (3,065) (2,906) (2,755) (2,612) (2,477) (2,348) (2,226)

17 18 19 20

206,958 194,023 181,897 170,528

0 0 0 0

113,570 106,472 99,817 93,579

93,388 87,551 82,079 76,949

54,133 51,325 48,663 46,138

54,133 51,325 48,663 46,138

261,092 245,349 230,560 216,667

11,609 11,007 10,436 9,895

2,111 2,001 1,897 1,799

9,499 9,006 8,539 8,096

11,609 11,007 10,436 9,895

249,482 234,341 220,124 206,772

(2,111) (2,001) (1,897) (1,799)

Project Name: Malinawon Water System Upgrading (Level 2)

BIP

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Malinawon
City/Municipality: Mawab
Province: **Compostela Valley**
Region: Davao
Date visited: 9 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
Size of water system			
Population of barangay	3,048	persons	source: field (validated census)
Ave. HH size	4.70	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) in the barangay	649	households	source: field
% infant population (< 1 year old) of total, Compostela Valley	2.2	%	source: census
% child population (1-9 year old) of total, Compostela Valley	21.7	%	source: census
Population growth rate, Compostela Valley	1.30	%	source: census
No. of neighborhoods serviced by the project	8	puroks	source: field
No. beneficiaries (HH)	298	households	source: field
User fee (proportional rate)	60	pesos per cubic meter	source: field
Average HH water consumption per month	7	cubic meters per month	source: field
No. of minutes to nearest alternative source of water (deep well) from residence	5	minute-walk	source: field
Infant mortality (< 1 year old) rates due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	0.7	per 1,000 persons	source: DOH- National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010 source: DOH- National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Child mortality (1-4 year old) rate due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	16.14	per 100,000 persons	source: DOH- National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Child mortality (5-9 year old) rate due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	2.19	per 100,000 persons	source: DOH- National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Cost of treating diarrhea, inflation adjusted 2012	3,044.5	pesos per month	source: Forsberg, Sullesta, Pieche and Lambo (1993)
Start date of construction	28-Jun-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion	10-Nov-09		source: GEM3 website derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	132	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion*	42	days	source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,291,093	pesos	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects derived estimate
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	84,244	pesos per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Lifespan	20	years	
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	
Counterpart contribution, cost overrun from 25% to 45% (inc labor payments)	580,992	pesos	source: field
Minimum daily wage, agriculture Davao	281	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
*no reported additional cost due to delay in construction			

No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Davao	4.5	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A]	Private benefits		1,569,506	1,419,562	1,283,944	1,161,281	1,050,337
	User fee		1,569,506	1,419,562	1,283,944	1,161,281	1,050,337
[B]	Social benefits		321,220	303,606	274,601	248,367	224,639
	Cost savings from travel to nearest alternative water source (deep well)		318,379	300,921	272,172	246,170	222,652
	Health cost savings from contracting water-borne diseases due to improved water source		2,841	2,686	2,429	2,197	1,987
[C]	Total benefits [A]+[B]		1,890,727	1,723,169	1,558,545	1,409,648	1,274,976
COST							
[D]	Private costs	1,872,085	97,155	90,649	84,579	78,915	73,630
	Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)	1,872,085					
	Maintenance		12,911	12,046	11,240	10,487	9,785
	Depreciation cost		84,244	78,602	73,339	68,428	63,846
	Total cost [D]+[E]	1,872,085	97,155	90,649	84,579	78,915	73,630
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(1,872,085)	1,793,572	1,632,520	1,473,966	1,330,733	1,201,346
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(1,872,085)	1,472,352	1,328,914	1,199,365	1,082,366	976,707

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	14,290,740.1
BCR	5.8
FRR	68.9%
ERR	86.5%

Hence, the project is economically and financially feasible given that a level 2 -water system is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	9,221,480.2	4.6	62.9%	80.4%
30% discount rate	6,195,397.2	3.6	56.4%	73.9%
10% increase in benefits	16,015,833.8	6.4	77.3%	96.6%
10% increase in costs	1,228,208.3	1.1	2.2%	75.1%

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
949,993	859,234	777,147	702,902	635,749	575,013	520,078	470,392	425,453	384,807

949,993	859,234	777,147	702,902	635,749	575,013	520,078	470,392	425,453	384,807
203,178	183,767	166,211	150,332	135,970	122,980	111,231	100,604	90,993	82,300
201,381	182,142	164,741	149,002	134,767	121,892	110,247	99,714	90,188	81,572
1,797	1,626	1,470	1,330	1,203	1,088	984	890	805	728
1,153,170	1,043,001	943,358	853,233	771,719	697,992	631,309	570,997	516,446	467,107

68,700	64,099	59,807	55,802	52,065	48,579	45,326	42,291	39,459	36,816
9,130	8,518	7,948	7,416	6,919	6,456	6,023	5,620	5,244	4,893
59,570	55,581	51,859	48,386	45,146	42,123	39,302	36,671	34,215	31,924
68,700	64,099	59,807	55,802	52,065	48,579	45,326	42,291	39,459	36,816

1,084,471	978,902	883,551	797,431	719,654	649,413	585,983	528,706	476,987	430,291
881,293	795,135	717,340	647,099	583,684	526,434	474,753	428,102	385,994	347,991

16	17	18	19	20
348,044	314,794	284,720	257,519	232,916
348,044	314,794	284,720	257,519	232,916
74,437	67,326	60,894	55,076	49,815
73,779	66,730	60,355	54,589	49,374
658	596	539	487	441
422,482	382,119	345,613	312,595	282,731

34,351	32,051	29,904	27,902	26,033
4,565	4,259	3,974	3,708	3,460
29,786	27,791	25,930	24,194	22,574
34,351	32,051	29,904	27,902	26,033

388,131	350,069	315,709	284,693	256,698
313,693	282,743	254,815	229,617	206,883

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Bulucaon

City/Municipality: Pigcawayan

Province: **North Cotabato**

Region: Soccsksargen

Date visited: 18 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of water system	-		
Population of barangay	3,048	persons	source: field (validated census)
Ave. HH size	4.70	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) in the barangay	649	households	source: field
% infant population (< 1 year old) of total, North Cotabato	2.3	%	source: census
% child population (1-9 year old) of total, North Cotabato	22.4	%	source: census
Population growth rate, Soccsksargen	2.41	%	source: census
No. of puroks serviced by the project	3	puroks	
No. beneficiaries (HH) - normal days	60	households	source: field
No. beneficiaries (HH) not paying the user fee for the last two years	50	households	source: field
Additional no. beneficiaries, evacuees, (population) - flooding season	292	persons	source: field
No. of months -flooding season	2	months per year	source: field
User fee (flat rate - for the first 10 cubic meters)	80	pesos per 10 cubic meters	source: field
User fee (proportional rate - in excess of 10 cubic meters)	7	pesos per cubic meter	source: field
Average HH water consumption per month	10	cubic meters per month	source: field
No. of minutes to nearest alternative source of water (deep well) from residence	12	minute-walk	source: field
Infant mortality (< 1 year old) rates due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	0.7	per 1,000 persons	source: DOH-National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Child mortality (1-4 year old) rate due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	16.14	per 100,000 persons	source: DOH-National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Child mortality (5-9 year old) rate due to diarrhea and gastroenteritis	2.19	per 100,000 persons	source: DOH-National Objectives for Health, Philippines 2005-2010
Cost of treating diarrhea	3,112.25	pesos per month	source: Forsberg, Sullesta, Pieche and Lambo (1993)
Start date of construction	13-Jan-10		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	8-May-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	115	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion*	40	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	1,200,981	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	54,044	pesos per year	derived estimate

Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	0	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage, Soccsksargen *no reported additional cost due to delay in construction	270	pesos per person-day	source:DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits			32,991	18,689	17,089	15,626	14,288
User fee			32,991	18,689	17,089	15,626	14,288
[B] Social benefits			314,733	287,784	263,143	240,611	220,009
Cost savings from travel to nearest alternative water source (deep well)			314,733	287,784	263,143	240,611	220,009
Health cost savings from getting water-borne diseases due to improved water source			145	138	127	116	106
[C] Total benefits [A]+ [B]			347,724	306,473	280,231	256,237	234,296
COST							
[D] Private costs		1,200,981	66,054	61,690	57,614	53,807	50,252
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		1,200,981					
Maintenance			12,010	11,216	10,475	9,783	9,137
Depreciation cost			54,044	50,473	47,139	44,024	41,115
[E] Social costs			0				
Imputed labor cost of community due to delay			0				
Total cost [D]+ [E]		1,200,981	66,054	61,690	57,614	53,807	50,252
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(1,200,981)	281,670	244,784	222,618	202,429	184,044
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(1,200,981)	(33,063)	(43,001)	(40,525)	(38,181)	(35,964)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	1,327,669.98
BCR	1.7
FRR	-
ERR	13.2%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a level 2-water system is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	521,387.4	1.3	-	7.3%
30% discount rate	44,476.4	1.0	-	0.8%
10% increase in benefits	1,656,644.5	1.9	-	16.2%
10% increase in costs	-7,669,332.7	0.3	-	-

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
13,064	11,946	10,923	9,988	9,132	8,350	7,635	6,982	6,384	5,837
13,064	11,946	10,923	9,988	9,132	8,350	7,635	6,982	6,384	5,837
201,170	183,945	168,195	153,793	140,625	128,584	117,574	107,506	98,301	89,884
201,170	183,945	168,195	153,793	140,625	128,584	117,574	107,506	98,301	89,884
97	89	81	74	68	62	57	52	47	43
214,235	195,891	179,118	163,781	149,757	136,934	125,209	114,488	104,685	95,721
46,932	43,831	40,935	38,230	35,704	33,345	31,142	29,085	27,163	25,368
8,533	7,969	7,443	6,951	6,492	6,063	5,662	5,288	4,939	4,612
38,399	35,862	33,492	31,279	29,213	27,283	25,480	23,796	22,224	20,756
46,932	43,831	40,935	38,230	35,704	33,345	31,142	29,085	27,163	25,368
167,303	152,060	138,183	125,550	114,053	103,589	94,067	85,404	77,522	70,353
(33,867)	(31,885)	(30,012)	(28,243)	(26,572)	(24,995)	(23,507)	(22,103)	(20,779)	(19,531)

16	17	18	19	20
5,337	4,880	4,463	4,080	3,731
5,337	4,880	4,463	4,080	3,731
82,188	75,150	68,716	62,832	57,452
82,188	75,150	68,716	62,832	57,452
40	36	33	30	28
87,525	80,031	73,178	66,912	61,183
23,692	22,127	20,665	19,299	18,024
4,308	4,023	3,757	3,509	3,277
19,384	18,104	16,908	15,790	14,747
23,692	22,127	20,665	19,299	18,024
63,833	57,904	52,513	47,613	43,159
(18,355)	(17,246)	(16,202)	(15,219)	(14,293)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Malacca

City/Municipality: Panglima Sugala

Province: **Tawi-Tawi**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 22 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of boat landing	-		
No. beneficiaries	2385	persons	source: census
Average household size	6.63	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	360	households	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total population	25.07	%	source: census
No. of female adult beneficiaries	598	persons	derived estimate, source: census
Population growth, Tawi-tawi	4.7	%	source: NSCB
Daily traffic volume (persons)	314	persons per day	derived estimate, source: field and Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
No. of days in a year	365	days	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Traffic volume growth rate	5	% per year	
Incremental visit of women in town proper	0.5	day per week	
Average time savings of passengers	4.9	minutes per person	derived estimate, source: field and Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Start date of construction	26-Jul-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	19-Jan-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	193	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion	103	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost	2,193,948	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	98,728	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Counterpart laborers employed during construction, from the community	3	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage agriculture and non-agriculture, ARMM	232	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			source: field
Violent conflict actors			source: field
Violent conflict form			source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits			272,710	271,491	254,523	238,616	223,702
User fee			0	0	0	0	0
Time savings of passengers			272,710	271,491	254,523	238,616	223,702
[B] Social benefits			438,312	436,353	409,081	383,514	359,544
Shadow value of time reallocation of adult women from doing household chores			438,312	436,353	409,081	383,514	359,544
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]			711,022	707,845	663,604	622,129	583,246

COST

[D] Private costs		2,193,948	120,667	114,408	108,473	102,846	97,511
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)		2,193,948					
Imputed labor cost of community		134,328					
Maintenance			21,939	20,801	19,722	18,699	17,729
Depreciation cost			98,728	93,606	88,750	84,146	79,781
[E] Social cost			76,957				
Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction			76,957				
Total cost [D]+[E]		2,328,276	197,624	114,408	108,473	102,846	97,511

NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted

	(2,328,276)	513,398	593,437	555,132	519,283	485,735
--	-------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted

	(2,328,276)	(120,667)	(114,408)	(108,473)	(102,846)	(97,511)
--	-------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	----------

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	4,783,901.5
BCR	2.2
FRR	-
ERR	19.5%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a boat landing is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	2,215,382.3	1.7	-	13.2%
30% discount rate	774,813.6	1.3	-	6.5%
10% increase in benefits	5,789,597.0	2.5	-	24.4%
10% increase in costs	4,623,751.7	2.1	-	18.8%

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
209,721	196,613	184,325	172,805	162,004	151,879	142,387	133,487	125,144	117,323
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
209,721	196,613	184,325	172,805	162,004	151,879	142,387	133,487	125,144	117,323
337,072	316,005	296,255	277,739	260,380	244,107	228,850	214,547	201,138	188,567
337,072	316,005	296,255	277,739	260,380	244,107	228,850	214,547	201,138	188,567
546,793	512,619	480,580	450,544	422,385	395,986	371,237	348,034	326,282	305,889

92,452 87,656 83,109 78,798 74,710 70,835 67,160 63,676 60,373 57,241

16,809 15,937 15,111 14,327 13,584 12,879 12,211 11,577 10,977 10,407
75,643 71,719 67,998 64,471 61,126 57,956 54,949 52,099 49,396 46,834

92,452 87,656 83,109 78,798 74,710 70,835 67,160 63,676 60,373 57,241

454,341 424,962 397,471 371,746 347,675 325,151 304,077 284,358 265,909 248,648

(92,452) (87,656) (83,109) (78,798) (74,710) (70,835) (67,160) (63,676) (60,373) (57,241)

16	17	18	19	20
109,990	103,116	96,671	90,629	84,965
0	0	0	0	0
109,990	103,116	96,671	90,629	84,965
176,781	165,732	155,374	145,663	136,559
176,781	165,732	155,374	145,663	136,559
286,771	268,848	252,045	236,292	221,524

54,272 51,456 48,787 46,256 43,857

9,868 9,356 8,870 8,410 7,974
44,404 42,101 39,917 37,846 35,883

54,272 51,456 48,787 46,256 43,857

232,500 217,392 203,258 190,036 177,667

(54,272) (51,456) (48,787) (46,256) (43,857)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Parangan

City/Municipality: Panglima Sugala

Province: **Tawi-Tawi**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 22 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of boat landing	-		
No. beneficiaries	2026	persons	source: field (validated census)
Average household size	6.63	persons per household	source: census
No. of household (HH) beneficiaries	306	households	source: field (validated census data)
% of adult females of total population	25.07	%	source: census
No. of female adult beneficiaries	508	persons	derived estimate, source: census
Population growth, Tawi-tawi	4.7	%	source: NSCB
Daily traffic volume (persons)	267	persons per day	derived estimate, source: field and Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
No. of days in a year	365	days	
Traffic volume growth rate	5	% per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Incremental visit of women in town proper	0.5	day per week	source: field
Average time savings of passengers	4.9	minutes per person	derived estimate, source: field and Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Start date of construction	9-Aug-11		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	20-Oct-11		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	73	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion	0	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Construction cost (inc labor from community paid by the contractor)	1,319,857	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	59,394	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: GEM3 Infra interview
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Minimum daily wage agriculture and non-agriculture, ARMM	232	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			source: field
Violent conflict actors			source: field
Violent conflict form			source: field
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits		231,890	230,854	216,426	202,899	190,218
User fee		0	0	0	0	0
Time savings of passengers		231,890	230,854	216,426	202,899	190,218
[B] Social benefits		372,705	371,039	347,849	326,109	305,727
Shadow value of time reallocation of adult women from doing household chores		372,705	371,039	347,849	326,109	305,727
[C] Total benefits [A]+[B]		604,595	601,893	564,275	529,008	495,945

COST

[D] Private costs	1,319,857	72,592	68,826	65,256	61,871	58,661
Capital outlay (inc. contractor labor input)	1,319,857					
Maintenance		13,199	12,514	11,865	11,249	10,666
Depreciation cost		59,394	56,313	53,391	50,622	47,996
[E] Social cost		0				
Imputed traffic cost due to delay in construction		0				
Total cost [D]+[E]	1,319,857	72,592	68,826	65,256	61,871	58,661

NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted

	(1,319,857)	532,003	533,067	499,019	467,137	437,284
--	-------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted

	(1,319,857)	(72,592)	(68,826)	(65,256)	(61,871)	(58,661)
--	-------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	5,172,393.3
BCR	3.3
FRR	-
ERR	35.8%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that a boat landing is an impure public good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	2,847,321.4	2.5	-	29.6%
30% discount rate	1,545,198.5	1.9	-	22.8%
10% increase in benefits	5,913,333.2	3.6	-	40.6%
10% increase in costs	5,080,678.5	3.2	-	35.3%

6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
178,329	167,184	156,735	146,939	137,755	129,146	121,074	113,507	106,413	99,762
0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
178,329	167,184	156,735	146,939	137,755	129,146	121,074	113,507	106,413	99,762
286,619	268,705	251,911	236,167	221,406	207,568	194,595	182,433	171,031	160,342
286,619	268,705	251,911	236,167	221,406	207,568	194,595	182,433	171,031	160,342
464,948	435,889	408,646	383,106	359,161	336,714	315,669	295,940	277,444	260,103
55,618	52,733	49,998	47,404	44,945	42,613	40,403	38,307	36,320	34,436
10,112	9,588	9,090	8,619	8,172	7,748	7,346	6,965	6,604	6,261
45,506	43,145	40,907	38,785	36,773	34,865	33,057	31,342	29,716	28,175
55,618	52,733	49,998	47,404	44,945	42,613	40,403	38,307	36,320	34,436
409,330	383,156	358,648	335,702	314,217	294,101	275,267	257,633	241,124	225,668
(55,618)	(52,733)	(49,998)	(47,404)	(44,945)	(42,613)	(40,403)	(38,307)	(36,320)	(34,436)

16	17	18	19	20
93,527	87,681	82,201	77,064	72,247
0	0	0	0	0
93,527	87,681	82,201	77,064	72,247
150,320	140,925	132,117	123,860	116,119
150,320	140,925	132,117	123,860	116,119
243,847	228,607	214,319	200,924	188,366
32,649	30,956	29,350	27,827	26,384
5,936	5,628	5,336	5,060	4,797
26,713	25,327	24,013	22,768	21,587
32,649	30,956	29,350	27,827	26,384
211,198	197,651	184,969	173,096	161,982
(32,649)	(30,956)	(29,350)	(27,827)	(26,384)

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Batinao

City/Municipality: New Bataan

Province: **Compostela Valley**

Region: Davao

Date visited: 11 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of solar dryer	240	square meters	source: field
Size of warehouse	36	square meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries (within and neighboring barangays)	260	households	source: field
Population of barangay	1085	persons	source: census
Average household (HH) size, New Bataan	5.14	persons per household	source: census
No. HH of barangay	211	households	source: census
Population growth rate, Compostela Valley	1.3	%	source: census
Volume of palay - harvested	85	sacks per hectare	source: field
Kilogram equivalent of 1 sack of palay	50	kilograms per sack	source: field
% of post harvest losses, without GEM3 solar dryer	8	% per harvest season	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Production capacity	60	% per harvest	
Ratio of dry yield palay harvest to wet yield palay harvest, Davao	0.9795		source: DA-BAS
Frequency of harvest in one year	2	times per year	source: field
Farmgate price of palay (wet)	15.04	pesos per kilogram	source: DA-BAS
Farmgate price of palay (dry)	15.3	pesos per kilogram	source: DA-BAS
Land area for palay production	40	hectares	source: field
User fee (goes to association)	1.75	pesos per kg	source: field
User fee (goes to barangay council for social responsibility activities, e.g. feeding program)	2	pesos per sack of palay	source: field
Distance from residence to nearest alternative solar dryer (in another barangay)	1	km	source: field
Fare from site to nearest alternative solar dryer	16	pesos (return trip) per head	source: field
Start date of construction	12-Jul-11		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	27-Sep-11		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	75	days	source: GEM3 website derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion*	15	days	website
Project cost	1,092,699	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	assumption
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	35,671	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: field
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	assumption
Counterpart contribution by the provincial govt (inc labor)	300,000	pesos	source: field
Palay worker daily wage rate, Phil	236.14	pesos per person-day	source: BAS

*no reported additional cost due to delay in construction			
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Davao	4.5	%	source: NSO

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits		365,160	326,036	291,103	259,914	232,066	207,202
User fee		365,160	326,036	291,103	259,914	232,066	207,202
[B] Social benefits		309,874	289,123	269,762	251,698	234,843	219,117
Incremental gross earnings (quantity and price effects)		309,874	289,123	269,762	251,698	234,843	219,117
[C] Total benefits [A] + [B]		675,034	615,159	560,866	511,612	466,909	426,319
COST							
[D] Private costs	1,092,699	46,598	41,606	37,148	33,168	29,614	26,441
Capital outlay	1,092,699						
Maintenance		10,927	9,756	8,711	7,778	6,944	6,200
Depreciation cost		35,671	31,850	28,437	25,390	22,670	20,241
Total cost [D]	1,092,699	46,598	41,606	37,148	33,168	29,614	26,441
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(1,092,699)	628,435	573,553	523,718	478,444	437,295	399,877
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(1,092,699)	318,562	284,430	253,955	226,746	202,452	180,760

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	5,042,834.5
BCR	4.4
FRR	18.3%
ERR	48.8%

Hence, the project is economically and financially feasible given that a grain solar dryer with warehouse is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	3,016,920.7	3.2	12.4%	42.8%
30% discount rate	1,840,172.6	2.4	6.0%	36.2%
10% increase in benefits	5,695,371.0	4.8	21.7%	55.0%
10% increase in costs	4,894,581.3	4.0	15.2%	43.2%

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
185,001	165,180	147,482	131,680	117,572	104,975	93,727	83,685	74,719	66,713
185,001	165,180	147,482	131,680	117,572	104,975	93,727	83,685	74,719	66,713
204,444	190,754	177,980	166,062	154,941	144,566	134,885	125,853	117,425	109,562
204,444	190,754	177,980	166,062	154,941	144,566	134,885	125,853	117,425	109,562
389,445	355,933	325,462	297,742	272,513	249,541	228,613	209,538	192,144	176,275
<hr/>									
23,608	21,079	18,820	16,804	15,003	13,396	11,961	10,679	9,535	8,513
5,536	4,943	4,413	3,940	3,518	3,141	2,805	2,504	2,236	1,996
18,072	16,136	14,407	12,863	11,485	10,255	9,156	8,175	7,299	6,517
23,608	21,079	18,820	16,804	15,003	13,396	11,961	10,679	9,535	8,513
<hr/>									
365,837	334,855	306,642	280,938	257,510	236,145	216,652	198,859	182,609	167,762
161,393	144,101	128,662	114,876	102,568	91,579	81,767	73,006	65,184	58,200

17	18	19	20
59,566	53,183	47,485	42,398
59,566	53,183	47,485	42,398
102,225	95,380	88,993	83,033
102,225	95,380	88,993	83,033
161,790	148,563	136,478	125,431
<hr/>			
7,601	6,787	6,060	5,410
1,782	1,591	1,421	1,269
5,819	5,195	4,639	4,142
7,601	6,787	6,060	5,410
<hr/>			
154,189	141,776	130,418	120,020
51,964	46,397	41,426	36,987

Component: Barangay Infrastructure Project

Barangay: Polonuling

City/Municipality: Tupi

Province: South Cotabato

Region: Soccsksargen

Date visited: 17 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of solar dryer	360	square meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries (members of the producers association)	50	households	source: field
Population of barangay	6261	persons	source: census
Average household (HH) size, Tupi	4.66	persons per household	source: census
No. HH of barangay	1344	households	source: census
Population growth rate, South Cotabato	1.46	%	source: census
Volume of palay - harvested	55	sacks per hectare	source: field
Kilogram equivalent of 1 sack of palay	45	kilograms per sack	source: field
% of post harvest losses, without GEM3 solar dryer	8	% per harvest season	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Production capacity	60	% per harvest	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Ratio of dry yield palay harvest to wet yield palay harvest, Soccsksargen	0.8713		source: DA-BAS
Frequency of harvest in one year	2	times per year	source: field
Farmgate price of palay (wet)	15.04	pesos per kilogram	source: DA-BAS
Farmgate price of palay (dry)	15.3	pesos per kilogram	source: DA-BAS
Land area for palay production	31	hectares	source: field
User fee	2	pesos per kg	source: field
Start date of construction	27-Oct-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	28-Nov-09		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	31	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Delays in completion	0	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Project cost	239,150	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	assumption
Depreciation cost (linear approach): cement foundation	8,071	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan	20	years	source: field
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	assumption
Counterpart contribution by the provincial govt (inc labor)	59,788	pesos	source: field
Palay worker daily wage rate, Phil	236.14	pesos per person-day	source: DA-BAS
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSO

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS							
[A]	Private benefits		148,500	138,688	129,525	120,967	112,975
	User fee		148,500	138,688	129,525	120,967	112,975
[B]	Social benefits		100,426	93,791	87,594	81,806	76,401
	Incremental gross earnings (quantity and price effects)		100,426	93,791	87,594	81,806	76,401
[C]	Total benefits [A] + [B]		248,926	232,479	217,119	202,774	189,376
COST							
[D]	Private costs	298,938	10,463	9,342	8,341	7,447	6,649
	Capital outlay	298,938					
	Maintenance		2,392	2,135	1,906	1,702	1,520
	Depreciation cost		8,071	7,207	6,434	5,745	5,129
	Total cost [D]	298,938	10,463	9,342	8,341	7,447	6,649
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(298,938)	238,463	223,137	208,778	195,326	182,727
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(298,938)	138,037	129,347	121,184	113,520	106,325

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	2,420,933.8
BCR	7.3
FRR	39.8%
ERR	73.3%

Hence, the project is economically and financially feasible given that a grains solar dryer with warehouse is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	1,455,230.5	5.0	33.6%	67.1%
30% discount rate	913,514.1	3.7	26.9%	60.4%
10% increase in benefits	2,701,673.9	8.0	44.8%	81.6%
10% increase in costs	2,382,287.1	6.6	35.3%	65.8%

105,510	98,539	92,028	85,948	80,269	74,966	70,013	65,387	61,067	57,032
105,510	98,539	92,028	85,948	80,269	74,966	70,013	65,387	61,067	57,032
71,353	66,639	62,236	58,124	54,284	50,697	47,348	44,219	41,298	38,569
71,353	66,639	62,236	58,124	54,284	50,697	47,348	44,219	41,298	38,569
176,864	165,178	154,265	144,072	134,553	125,663	117,360	109,606	102,364	95,601
5,937	5,301	4,733	4,226	3,773	3,369	3,008	2,686	2,398	2,141
1,357	1,212	1,082	966	862	770	687	614	548	489
4,580	4,089	3,651	3,260	2,911	2,599	2,320	2,072	1,850	1,652
5,937	5,301	4,733	4,226	3,773	3,369	3,008	2,686	2,398	2,141
170,927	159,877	149,532	139,846	130,780	122,294	114,352	106,920	99,966	93,460
99,573	93,238	87,296	81,722	76,496	71,597	67,005	62,701	58,669	54,891

16	17	18	19	20
53,264	49,744	46,458	43,388	40,522
53,264	49,744	46,458	43,388	40,522
36,021	33,641	31,418	29,342	27,404
36,021	33,641	31,418	29,342	27,404
89,284	83,385	77,876	72,730	67,925

1,912	1,707	1,524	1,361	1,215
437	390	348	311	278
1,475	1,317	1,176	1,050	937
1,912	1,707	1,524	1,361	1,215
87,373	81,679	76,352	71,370	66,710
51,352	48,038	44,934	42,028	39,307

Component: Former Combatant Reintegration

Barangay: Moro Point

City/Municipality: Parang

Province: **Maguindanao**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 24 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of solar dryer (120 sq m x 2 levels)	240	square meters	source: field
No. beneficiaries	50	farmers	source: field
No. members of cooperative who are former MNLF combatants	35	persons	source: field
Population of barangay	533	persons	source: census
Average household (HH) size, Parang	5.15	persons per household	source: census
No. HH of barangay	103	households	source: census
% HH with former MNLF combatants	50	%	source: field
Volume of seaweed - harvested (wet seaweed)	1,000	kilograms per harvest-farmer operator	source: field
Capacity of GEM3 solar dryer	1,000	kilograms	source: field
Conversion rate of wet to dried seaweed	40	%	source: field
% of post harvest losses due to high tide season, without GEM3 solar dryer	8	% per harvest season	source: Evaluation of the Economic Impact of Infrastructure Projects
Frequency of harvest in one year	8.1	times per year, i.e. every 45 days	source: field
Duration of sun drying process	3	days per harvest	source: field
Farmgate price of dried seaweed	30	pesos per kilogram	source: field
Farmgate price of wet seaweed	25	pesos per kilogram	source: field
High tide season	50	% (or half of the time)	assumption
Seaweed seedlings	10	kilograms per grow out	source: field
User fee	0	pesos	source: field
Fare from site to the wharf in Poblacion 1, Bacolod	20	pesos (return trip) per head	source: field
Fare from site to the wharf in Poblacion 1, Bacolod	300	pesos (return trip), chartered	source: field
Farmers employed	3	persons	source: field
Salary of employed farmers	1,500	pesos per person-month	source: field
Fish farming permit fee for the municipal government	0		source: field
Profit tax for the barangay	0		source: field
Start date of construction	24-Aug-09		source: GEM3 website
Completion date	8-Mar-10		source: GEM3 website
No. of days of construction	194	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
No. of days to replace bamboo slats	3	days	source: field
Delays in completion	134	days	derived estimate, source: GEM3 website
Project cost	661,146	pesos	source: GEM3 website
Cost of replacement of bamboo slats	10,000	pesos	source: field
Unpaid loan made by the barangay chief to the contractor for construction	8,000	pesos	source: field
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	Source: field estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach): cement foundation	29,302	pesos per year	derived estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach): bamboo cage	970	pesos per year	source: field

Lifespan (cement structure)	20	years	source: field estimate
Lifespan (bamboo slats)	3	years	source: field estimate
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	assumption
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	6	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage, agriculture, ARMM	232	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS						
[A] Private benefits		209,548	187,097	167,051	149,152	133,172
User fee						
Incremental gross earnings		209,548	187,097	167,051	149,152	133,172
[B] Total benefits [A]		209,548	187,097	167,051	149,152	133,172
COST						
[C] Private costs	661,146	39,336	35,121	31,358	36,083	24,999
Capital outlay	661,146	0	0	0	0	0
Imputed value of labor cost (replacement of bamboo slats) by the community	0	0	0	0	526	0
Operating cost (excluding labor)		170	152	135	121	108
Maintenance (including replacement of bamboo cages every after 5 years)		7,021	6,268	5,597	12,556	4,462
Depreciation cost		32,145	28,701	25,626	22,880	20,429
[D] Social costs		29,778				
Foregone earnings due to disruption of production		29,778				
Total cost [C] + [D]	661,146	69,114	35,121	31,358	36,083	24,999
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(661,146)	140,434	151,975	135,692	113,069	108,173
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(661,146)	170,212	151,975	135,692	113,069	108,173

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	723,014.4
BCR	1.7
FRR	14.7%
ERR	13.7%

Hence, the project is economically and financially feasible given that a seaweed solar dryer is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	298,254.6	1.3	8.8%	7.8%
30% discount rate	39,181.3	1.0	2.5%	1.4%
10% increase in benefits	899,757.3	1.9	17.9%	16.8%
10% increase in costs	621,095.3	1.5	11.7%	10.8%

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

118,903	106,164	94,789	95,212	75,565	67,469	60,240	53,786	48,023	42,878	38,284
118,903	106,164	94,789	95,212	75,565	67,469	60,240	53,786	48,023	42,878	38,284
118,903	106,164	94,789	95,212	75,565	67,469	60,240	53,786	48,023	42,878	38,284

22,320	25,683	17,794	15,896	18,281	12,665	11,308	13,012	9,015	8,049	9,262
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	374	0	0	267	0	0	190	0	0	135
96	86	77	77	61	55	49	44	39	35	31
3,984	8,937	3,176	2,836	6,361	2,260	2,018	4,528	1,609	1,437	3,223
18,240	16,286	14,541	12,983	11,592	10,350	9,241	8,251	7,367	6,578	5,873

22,320	25,683	17,794	15,896	18,281	12,665	11,308	13,012	9,015	8,049	9,262
96,583	80,480	76,995	79,316	57,284	54,804	48,932	40,774	39,008	34,829	29,022
96,583	80,480	76,995	79,316	57,284	54,804	48,932	40,774	39,008	34,829	29,022

17	18	19	20
34,182	34,334	27,250	24,330
34,182	34,334	27,250	24,330
34,182	34,334	27,250	24,330

6,417	5,732	6,592	4,567
0	0	0	0
0	0	96	0
28	28	22	20
1,145	1,023	2,294	815
5,244	4,682	4,180	3,732

6,417	5,732	6,592	4,567
27,765	28,602	20,657	19,763
27,765	28,602	20,657	19,763

Component: Former Combatant Reintegration

Barangay: Manili

City/Municipality: Carmen

Province: North Cotabato

Region: Soccsksargen

Date visited: 25 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of consolidation facility	288	square meters	source: field
Capacity of consolidation facility	1,000	clusters of bananas	source: field
Population of barangay	2,594	persons	source: census
Average household (HH) size, Carmen	4.57	persons per household	source: census
No. HH of barangay	568	households	source: census
% HH with former MNLF combatants	50	%	source: field
Members of the cooperative	100	persons	source: field
% of cooperative members who are former MNLF combatants	100%	%	source: field
Volume of cardaba bananas harvested	500	kilograms per hectare	source: field
Farmland area for cardaba banana production, 2012	200	hectares	source: field
Farmland area for cardaba banana production, 2012	7	hectares per farmer	source: field
Farmland area for cardaba banana production, 2006	2	hectares per farmer	source: field
Average expansion rate of land devoted to banana production*	0.83	hectares per year	derived estimate
Frequency of harvest in one year	12	times per year	source: field
Farmgate price of cardaba bananas (before PRC ban on Phil banana export in 2012)	7	pesos per kilogram	source: field
Farmgate price of cardaba bananas (after PRC ban on Phil banana export in 2012)	4	pesos per kilogram	source: field
Product substitution: Volume of <i>lacatan</i> bananas harvested (due to PRC ban 2012)	500	kilograms per hectare	source: field
Land substitution: Farmland area for <i>lacatan</i> banana production (due to PRC ban)	1	hectare	source: field
Farmgate price of <i>lacatan</i> bananas	15	pesos per kilogram	source: field
<i>*assume farmland expansion will be devoted to lacatan banana production starting 2012</i>			source: field
<i>(note: farmers stopped using fertilizers/pesticides)</i>			
Transportation fare from site to market (jeepney)	2,000	pesos (return trip, chartered trip)	source: field
Cargo capacity of jeepney	4,000	kilograms per trip	source: field
Farmers employed	3	persons per hectare	source: field
User fee: harvest fee for the association	5	% of sales per harvest	source: field
<i>(note: farmers do not use fertilizers or pesticides)</i>			
Start date of construction	2009		source: field
Completion date			source: field
No. of days of construction	10	days	source: field
Delays in completion	0	months	source: field
Project cost (consolidation facility)	1,000,000	pesos	source: field
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	assumption
Depreciation cost (linear approach):	80,000	pesos per year	derived estimate
Lifespan (net, security post)	10	years	source: field
Lifespan (cage - bamboo)	5	years	source: field
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	assumption

Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	3	persons	source: field
Minimum daily wage, agriculture (plantation), ARMM	232	pesos per person	source: DOLE-NWPC
Minimum daily wage, agriculture (non-plantation), ARMM	232	pesos per person	source: DOLE-NWPC
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSO

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
BENEFITS						
[A] Private benefits		8,676,570	7,779,625	6,975,279	4,463,907	5,560,650
Incremental gross sales		8,676,570	7,779,625	6,975,279	4,463,907	5,560,650
User fees		433,829	388,981	348,764	223,195	278,032
[B] Total benefits [A]+[B]		8,676,570	7,779,625	6,975,279	4,463,907	5,560,650
COST						
[C] Private costs	1,006,960	8,067,620	7,230,867	6,480,806	5,718,960	5,203,472
Capital outlay	1,000,000					
Imputed value of labor cost (construction and operation)	6960	6,901,592	6,188,136	5,548,336	4,974,599	4,460,113
Operating cost (excluding labor)		627,600	560,357	500,319	446,713	398,851
Maintenance		10,460	9,339	8,339	7,445	6,648
User fees		433,829	388,981	348,764	223,195	278,032
Depreciation cost		94,140	84,054	75,048	67,007	59,828
Total cost [D]+[E]	1,006,960	8,067,620	7,230,867	6,480,806	5,718,960	5,203,472
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(1,006,960)	608,950	548,758	494,473	(1,255,053)	357,178
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(1,006,960)	608,950	548,758	494,473	(1,255,053)	357,178

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	1,426,238.7
BCR	1.0
FRR	21.6%
ERR	21.6%

Hence, the project is economically and financially feasible given that a consolidation facility is a club good.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	744,136.1	1.0	16.7%	16.7%
30% discount rate	351,637.0	1.0	11.4%	11.4%
10% increase in benefits	8,559,124.9	1.1	126.6%	126.6%
10% increase in costs	-5,564,023.7	0.9	-	-

4,964,866	4,432,916	3,957,961	3,533,893	3,155,262	2,817,198	2,515,356	2,245,853	2,005,226	1,790,380
4,964,866	4,432,916	3,957,961	3,533,893	3,155,262	2,817,198	2,515,356	2,245,853	2,005,226	1,790,380
248,243	221,646	197,898	176,695	157,763	140,860	125,768	112,293	100,261	89,519
4,964,866	4,432,916	3,957,961	3,533,893	3,155,262	2,817,198	2,515,356	2,245,853	2,005,226	1,790,380

4,662,481	4,177,683	3,743,247	3,353,946	3,005,096	2,692,497	2,412,387	2,161,391	1,936,487	1,734,965
3,998,768	3,585,082	3,214,138	2,881,528	2,583,294	2,315,888	2,076,129	1,861,161	1,668,425	1,495,624
356,117	317,962	283,894	253,477	226,319	202,070	180,420	161,089	143,830	128,419
5,935	5,299	4,732	4,225	3,772	3,368	3,007	2,685	2,397	2,140
248,243	221,646	197,898	176,695	157,763	140,860	125,768	112,293	100,261	89,519
53,418	47,694	42,584	38,022	33,948	30,311	27,063	24,163	21,574	19,263
4,662,481	4,177,683	3,743,247	3,353,946	3,005,096	2,692,497	2,412,387	2,161,391	1,936,487	1,734,965
302,385	255,233	214,714	179,948	150,166	124,701	102,969	84,462	68,739	55,415
302,385	255,233	214,714	179,948	150,166	124,701	102,969	84,462	68,739	55,415

16	17	18	19	20
1,598,554	1,427,280	1,274,357	1,137,819	1,015,910
1,598,554	1,427,280	1,274,357	1,137,819	1,015,910
79,928	71,364	63,718	56,891	50,795
1,598,554	1,427,280	1,274,357	1,137,819	1,015,910

1,554,396	1,392,604	1,247,638	1,117,749	1,001,371
1,340,698	1,201,802	1,077,279	965,643	865,563
114,660	102,375	91,406	81,613	72,869
1,911	1,706	1,523	1,360	1,214
79,928	71,364	63,718	56,891	50,795
17,199	15,356	13,711	12,242	10,930
1,554,396	1,392,604	1,247,638	1,117,749	1,001,371
44,158	34,676	26,720	20,070	14,539
44,158	34,676	26,720	20,070	14,539

Component: Former Combatant Reintegration

Barangay: Moro Point

City/Municipality: Parang

Province: **Maguindanao**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 24 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
Size of fish cage - milkfish	36	square meters	source: field
No. fish cage - milkfish	2	pieces	source: field
Size of fish cage - grouper	16	square meters	source: field
No. fish cage - grouper	4	pieces	source: field
No. beneficiaries (members of the cooperative)	25	persons	source: field
No. members of cooperative who are former MNLF combatants	19	persons	source: field
Population of barangay	533	persons	source: census
Average household (HH) size, Parang	5.15	persons per household	source: census
No. HH of barangay	103	households	source: census
% HH with former MNLF combatants	50	%	source: field
Volume of milkfish harvested	1,000	kilograms per cage-harvest	source: field
Volume of grouper harvested	180	kilograms per cage-harvest times per year, i.e. every 4 months	source: field
Frequency of harvest in one year - milkfish	3	months	source: field
Frequency of harvest in one year - grouper	1	i.e. every 8 months	source: field
Farmgate price of milkfish	85	pesos per kilogram	source: field
Farmgate price of grouper	450	pesos per kilogram	source: field
Volume of fingerlings per grow out - milkfish	3,500	pieces per growout	source: field
Volume of fingerlings per grow out - grouper	1,200	pieces per growout	source: field
Buying price of fingerlings - milkfish	3.5	pesos per piece	source: field
Buying price of fingerlings - grouper	48	pesos per piece	source: field
Fare from site to Cotabato for purchase of the fingerlings	1,300	pesos (return trip, chartered trip)	source: field
Farmers employed	3	persons	source: field
Salary of employed farmers	1,500	pesos per person-month	source: field
Volume of feeds - milkfish	65	sacks per cultivation cycle	source: field
Volume of feeds - grouper	20	sacks per cultivation cycle	source: field
Buying price of feeds - milkfish or grouper	650	pesos per sack	source: field
Hatchery soon to open within the site within 2012 (construction on-going)			source: field
Fish farming permit fee for the municipal government	800	pesos per operator-year	source: field
Profit tax for the barangay	5	% of total profits	source: field
Technology adoption externality: no. households/operators	2	operators	source: field
Technology adoption externality: size of fishcage - milkfish	36	square meters	source: field
Technology adoption externality: no. fishcage - milkfish	1	piece per operator	source: field
Technology adoption externality: length of months of adoption	4	years	source: field
Growth of technology adoption	2	operators every four years	field estimate
Scale		constant returns to scale	assumption
Recommended stocking of fish (pen culture: milkfish, Philippines)	12	fingerlings per square meter	source: Yap, et al (2007)
Average mortality rate of milkfish (for recommended stocking)	10	%	source: Yap, et al (2007)
Start date of construction	2008		source: field

Completion date	-		
No. of days of construction	15	days	source: field
Delays in completion	0	months	source: field
Project cost (GEM3 assistance: net, security post, etc)	86,950	pesos	source: field
Operating cost (GEM3 assistance: fingerlings and feeds) - first year	363,050	pesos	source: field
Cost of bamboo cage replacement - community counterpart	20,000	pesos	source: field
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	assumption
Depreciation cost (linear approach): net, security post, etc	7,826	pesos per year	derived estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach): bamboo cage	1,900	pesos per year	source: field
Lifespan (net, security post)	10	years	source: field
Lifespan (cage - bamboo)	5	years	source: field
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	assumption
Unpaid laborers employed during construction, from the community	6	persons	source: field
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
2011 91-day T-bill rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	0	1	2	3	4	5			
BENEFITS										
[A]	Private benefits		885,625	1,097,929	706,015	875,262	562,830			
	Incremental gross sales		885,625	1,097,929	706,015	875,262	562,830			
[B]	Social benefits					239,756	256,896			
	Positive externality due to technology adoption by neighboring farmers					239,756	256,896			
[C]	Total benefits [A]+[B]		885,625	1,097,929	706,015	1,115,018	819,726			
COST										
[D]	Private costs	89,200	794,171	736,151	633,109	586,855	504,710			
	Capital outlay	86,950	0	0	0	0	0			
	Labor cost (construction and operation)	2250	57,343	51,199	45,713	40,815	36,442			
	Operating cost (excluding labor)		719,915	655,107	573,912	522,247	457,519			
	Maintenance (including replacement of bamboo cages every after 5 years)		923	824	736	657	587			
	Fee for the municipal permit		850	759	677	605	540			
	Profit tax		4,813	19,041	3,837	15,179	3,059			
	Depreciation cost		10,328	9,221	8,233	7,351	6,563			
[E]	Social cost		337,846	444,762	286,001	510,715	367,421			
	Environmental damage		337,846	444,762	286,001	510,715	367,421			
	Total cost [D]+[E]	89,200	1,132,018	1,180,912	919,109	1,097,570	872,131			
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted	(89,200)	(246,393)	(82,984)	(213,095)	17,448	(52,405)			
	NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted	(89,200)	91,453	361,778	72,906	288,407	58,120			
6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16

697,754	448,685	556,245	357,689	443,435	285,147	353,504	227,318	281,811	181,216	224,658
697,754	448,685	556,245	357,689	443,435	285,147	353,504	227,318	281,811	181,216	224,658
229,371	379,436	365,707	322,210	415,845	390,455	345,549	399,746	368,109	328,669	356,431
229,371	379,436	365,707	322,210	415,845	390,455	345,549	399,746	368,109	328,669	356,431
927,125	828,121	921,952	679,899	859,280	675,602	699,053	627,064	649,920	509,885	581,089

479,285	402,352	372,957	320,753	328,950	262,198	237,021	203,844	188,952	162,503	154,317
0	0	0	0	33296	0	0	0	0	0	0
32,538	29,052	25,939	23,160	20,678	18,463	16,485	14,718	13,141	11,733	10,476
416,332	364,731	331,898	290,762	264,587	231,793	210,927	184,784	168,150	147,309	134,048
12,575	468	418	373	333	7,135	265	237	212	189	4,049
482	430	384	343	306	274	244	218	195	174	155
11,498	2,439	9,647	1,944	6,026	1,208	6,131	1,235	4,887	985	3,702
5,860	5,232	4,672	4,171	3,724	3,325	2,969	2,651	2,367	2,113	1,887
407,139	404,053	423,808	322,109	416,969	327,419	332,405	317,327	315,269	252,971	291,411
407,139	404,053	423,808	322,109	416,969	327,419	332,405	317,327	315,269	252,971	291,411
886,425	806,405	796,764	642,861	745,919	589,617	569,426	521,171	504,220	415,475	445,728

40,700	21,716	125,188	37,038	113,360	85,985	129,627	105,892	145,700	94,411	135,361
218,468	46,333	183,288	36,936	114,485	22,949	116,483	23,474	92,859	18,713	70,341

17	18	19	20
144,465	179,096	115,166	142,774
144,465	179,096	115,166	142,774
327,952	292,814	306,267	280,363
327,952	292,814	306,267	280,363
472,416	471,910	421,433	423,138

129,547	120,082	103,274	105,913
0	0	0	10,720
9,354	8,352	7,457	6,658
117,434	106,862	93,617	85,190
151	134	120	107
139	124	110	99
785	3,106	626	1,940
1,685	1,504	1,343	1,199
237,454	232,311	217,825	210,669
237,454	232,311	217,825	210,669
367,000	352,393	321,099	316,582

105,416	119,517	100,334	106,555
14,918	59,014	11,893	36,861

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	800,170.8
BCR	1.1
FRR	177%
ERR	7%

Hence, the project is financially feasible given that fish cage farming is a private good. It is not economically feasible due to the environmental impact of the project.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	3,847.0	1.0	172.9%	0.1%
30% discount rate	-325,770.6	0.9	163.6%	-
10% increase in benefits	2,237,390.7	1.2	267.4%	24.1%
10% increase in costs	-557,032.0	1.0	99.3%	-

Component: Former Combatant Reintegration
 Barangay: Kitulaan
 City/Municipality: Carmen
 Province: **North Cotabato**
 Region: Soccsksargen
 Date visited: 21 August 2012

Basic info:	Qty	Units	
Volume of <i>Buri</i> mat produced	10	mats per month	source: field
Selling price of <i>Buri</i> mat	250	pesos per mat	source: field
cost of goods (paint, shipping, packaging, but exc labor)	65	% of price	source: field
Labor	1	person per mat	source: field
Work day	3	days per mat	source: field
Minimum daily wage, agriculture, Soccsksargen	270	pesos per person	source: DOLE-NWPC
Cost of training	30,000	pesos	source: field estimate
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSCB

Present value, inflation adjusted

Year	0	1	2	3	4	5
[A] Private benefits		30,000	28,018	25,016	22,336	19,943
Sales		30,000	28,018	25,016	22,336	19,943
[B] Social benefits		97,200	90,778	81,052	72,368	64,614
Shadow value of freed-up time of adult women from household chores		97,200	90,778	81,052	72,368	64,614
Total benefits [A] + [B]		127,200	118,796	106,068	94,703	84,556
[C] Private costs	30,000	116,700	104,196	93,033	83,065	74,165
Cost of goods		19,500	17,411	15,545	13,880	12,393
Labor		97,200	86,786	77,487	69,185	61,772
Training cost	30,000	0	0	0	0	0
Total cost [C]	30,000	116,700	104,196	93,033	83,065	74,165
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation-adjusted	(30,000)	10,500	14,599	13,035	11,638	10,391
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation-adjusted	(30,000)	(86,700)	(76,179)	(68,017)	(60,729)	(54,222)

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

17,806	15,898	14,195	12,674	11,316	10,104	9,021	8,054	7,191	6,421
17,806	15,898	14,195	12,674	11,316	10,104	9,021	8,054	7,191	6,421
57,691	51,510	45,991	41,063	36,664	32,735	29,228	26,096	23,300	20,804
57,691	51,510	45,991	41,063	36,664	32,735	29,228	26,096	23,300	20,804
75,497	67,408	60,186	53,737	47,980	42,839	38,249	34,151	30,492	27,225
66,219	59,124	52,789	47,133	42,083	37,574	33,548	29,954	26,745	23,879
11,065	9,879	8,821	7,876	7,032	6,278	5,606	5,005	4,469	3,990
55,154	49,245	43,968	39,257	35,051	31,296	27,943	24,949	22,276	19,889
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
66,219	59,124	52,789	47,133	42,083	37,574	33,548	29,954	26,745	23,879
9,278	8,284	7,396	6,604	5,896	5,265	4,701	4,197	3,747	3,346
(48,413)	(43,226)	(38,594)	(34,459)	(30,767)	(27,471)	(24,527)	(21,900)	(19,553)	(17,458)

16	17	18	19	20
5,733	5,119	4,570	4,081	3,643
5,733	5,119	4,570	4,081	3,643
18,575	16,585	14,808	13,221	11,805
18,575	16,585	14,808	13,221	11,805
24,308	21,704	19,378	17,302	15,448
21,321	19,036	16,997	15,176	13,550
3,563	3,181	2,840	2,536	2,264
17,758	15,855	14,157	12,640	11,286
0	0	0	0	0
21,321	19,036	16,997	15,176	13,550
0	0	0	0	0
2,987	2,667	2,381	2,126	1,898
(15,588)	(13,918)	(12,426)	(11,095)	(9,906)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	100,939
BCR	1.1
FRR	-
ERR	37.0%

Hence, the project is economically (but not financially) feasible given that *Buri* weaving is a private good. Reason: not enough volume sold.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	59,697.0	1.1	-	30.8%
30% discount rate	16,329.4	1.0	-	15.3%
10% increase in benefits	211,661.8	1.2	-	77.5%
10% increase in costs	3,310.7	1.0	-	1.3%

Component: Workforce Preparation- Job Enabling English Proficiency Project,

Barangay: Poblacion

City/Municipality: Datu Odin Sinsuat

Province: **Maguindanao**

Region: ARMM

Date visited: 23 August 2012

Basic info:

	Qty	Unit	
No. units of computers used by students - JEEP Start	31	units	source: field
No. units of computers used by students - JEEP Accelerate, given on 2nd year	10	units	source: field
No. units of computers used by the teacher - JEEP Start	1	unit	source: field
No. beneficiaries (JEEP Start - students), 1st school year	450	students per semester	source: field
No. beneficiaries (JEEP Start - students), 2nd school year	570	students per semester	source: field
No. beneficiaries (JEEP Accelerate - students), 2nd school year	330	students per semester	source: field
No. of student dropouts per JEEP class	1	student per class-semester	
No. teachers (part-time), 1st school year onwards	8	persons	source: field
Additional teachers (full-time), 2nd school year	2	persons	source: field
No. teaching assistants	2	persons	source: field
No. IT personnel	1	person	source: field
College enrollment growth rate, ARMM	2.22	% per year	source: CHED
No. classes per day	9	classes	source: field
No. hours per class session - normal days	1	hour	source: field
No. hours per class session - Ramadan or imposition of curfew due to violent conflict	0.45	hour	source: field
No. times sessions per week for a class	3	sessions per class-week	source: field
No. semesters in a school year	2	semesters per school year	source: field
No. months per semester	5	months per semester	source: field
Attendance rate of a teaching assistant per week	3	days per week	source: field
Attendance rate of IT personnel for JEEP in a week	1	day per week	source: field
Required no. of hours devoted by teaching assistants	2	hours per day	source: field
Required no. of hours devoted by IT personnel (on-call)	1	hour per day	source: field
Electricity bill (based on university allotment of expenditures)	10,400	per month	source: field
Annual license fee of software (for JEEP start computer units only)	10,000	pesos per computer unit-year	source: field
Monthly teacher salary inc. taxes and other dues (entry level)	19,000	pesos per teacher-month	source: field
Teacher's incentive provided by GEM3 for the first year	14,250	pesos per teacher-semester	source: field
Teacher's incentive provided by MSU-JEEP for the 2nd year onwards	8,000	pesos per teacher-year	
Average number of headphone set replaced per year	6	units	source: field
Replacement cost of headphone set	1,500	pesos per unit	source: field
User fee - JEEP Start	1,000	pesos per student-semester	source: field
User fee - JEEP Accelerate	600	pesos per student-semester	source: field
Teaching assistant salary	600	pesos per person-month	source: field
Start of GEM3 JEEP training of teachers			source: field
Start date of JEEP Start	Jun-10		source: field
Start date of JEEP Accelerate	Jun-11		source: field
Project cost (hardware)	22,000	pesos per unit	source: field estimate
Project cost (software, given free by GEM3 for the first year)	10,000	pesos per unit	source: field

Project cost (training*)	168,000	persons	source field
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: field estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	4,950	pesos per computer unit-year	derived estimate
Lifespan of computers	4	years	source: field estimate
Maintenance cost (excluding replacement of damaged headphone set)	1	% of total cost per year	source: field
Minimum daily wage rate, non-agriculture, ARMM	232	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC
Minimum hourly wage rate non-agriculture, ARMM	29	pesos per person-hour	
* note: this refers to per diem only			
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	1	incident	source: field
Type of violent conflict		secessionism	
Violent conflict actors		BIFF and AFP	
Violent conflict form		firefight	
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits		900,000	1,488,650	1,411,427	1,338,209	1,268,789	1,202,971
User fee of students		900,000	1,488,650	1,411,427	1,338,209	1,268,789	1,202,971
[B] Total benefits [A]		900,000	1,488,650	1,411,427	1,338,209	1,268,789	1,202,971
COST							
[C] Private costs		3,138,000	2,626,022	2,292,030	2,173,131	2,629,299	2,122,075
Capital outlay (hardware)		704,000	208,588	0	0	568,899	168,559
Training cost		168,000					
License fee for the software		320,000	303,400	287,661	272,739	258,590	245,176
Maintenance (including replacement of damaged headphone set)		16,040	17,294	16,397	15,546	14,740	13,975
Salary		1,533,160	1,813,915	1,719,818	1,630,602	1,546,015	1,465,815
Teacher incentive		228,000	75,850	71,915	68,185	64,648	61,294
Electricity bill		10,400	9,861	9,349	8,864	8,404	7,968
Depreciation cost		158,400	197,115	186,890	177,195	168,003	159,288
Total cost [C]		3,138,000	2,626,022	2,292,030	2,173,131	2,629,299	2,122,075
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(2,238,000)	(1,137,372)	(880,603)	(834,922)	(1,360,509)	(919,104)
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(2,238,000)	(1,137,372)	(880,603)	(834,922)	(1,360,509)	(919,104)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	(16,047,647.0)
BCR	0.5
FRR	-
ERR	-

Hence, the project is not economically and financially feasible, given that the JEEP project, which is a private good, is implemented by a public school.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	-10,450,434.2	0.5	-	-
30% discount rate	-7,374,358.5	0.5	-	-
10% increase in benefits	-14,130,951.6	0.6	-	-
10% increase in costs	-30,483,631.9	0.2	-	-

7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

1,140,567	1,081,400	1,025,302	972,115	921,686	873,874	828,542	785,561	744,810
1,140,567	1,081,400	1,025,302	972,115	921,686	873,874	828,542	785,561	744,810
1,140,567	1,081,400	1,025,302	972,115	921,686	873,874	828,542	785,561	744,810

1,852,178	1,756,096	2,124,723	1,714,838	1,496,736	1,419,092	1,716,978	1,385,752	1,209,504
0	0	459,724	136,211	0	0	371,501	110,072	0
232,458	220,399	208,966	198,125	187,848	178,103	168,864	160,104	151,799
13,250	12,563	11,911	11,293	10,707	10,152	9,625	9,126	8,653
1,389,776	1,317,682	1,249,327	1,184,518	1,123,071	1,064,812	1,009,575	957,203	907,548
58,114	55,100	52,241	49,531	46,962	44,526	42,216	40,026	37,950
7,555	7,163	6,791	6,439	6,105	5,788	5,488	5,203	4,933
151,025	143,190	135,762	128,720	122,042	115,711	109,709	104,018	98,622
1,852,178	1,756,096	2,124,723	1,714,838	1,496,736	1,419,092	1,716,978	1,385,752	1,209,504

(711,611)	(674,696)	(1,099,421)	(742,723)	(575,049)	(545,219)	(888,436)	(600,191)	(464,694)
(711,611)	(674,696)	(1,099,421)	(742,723)	(575,049)	(545,219)	(888,436)	(600,191)	(464,694)

16	17	18	19	20
706,173	669,540	634,808	601,877	570,655
706,173	669,540	634,808	601,877	570,655
706,173	669,540	634,808	601,877	570,655

1,146,761	1,387,481	1,119,819	977,394	926,692
0	300,208	88,948	0	0
143,924	136,458	129,379	122,668	116,304
8,204	7,778	7,375	6,992	6,629
860,469	815,832	773,511	733,385	695,341
35,981	34,115	32,345	30,667	29,076
4,678	4,435	4,205	3,987	3,780
93,506	88,655	84,056	79,696	75,562
1,146,761	1,387,481	1,119,819	977,394	926,692

(440,588)	(717,941)	(485,011)	(375,517)	(356,037)
(440,588)	(717,941)	(485,011)	(375,517)	(356,037)

Project Name: Surigao State College and Technology (JEEP)	WORKFORCE
Component: Workforce Preparation- Job Enabling English Proficiency Project	

Barangay: Poblacion
 City/Municipality: Surigao City
 Province: **Surigao del Norte**
 Region: Caraga
 Date visited: 13 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
No. units of computers used by students - JEEP Start	42	units	source: field
No. units of computers used by students - JEEP Accelerate	5	units	source: field
No. units of computers used by the teacher - JEEP Start	1	unit	source: filed
No. beneficiaries (JEEP Start - students)	631	students per semester	source: field
No. beneficiaries (JEEP Accelerate - students)	252	students per semester	source: field
No. teachers (1st year of project onwards)	6	persons	source: field
Additional no. teachers (starting 2nd year of project due to JEEP Accelerate)	2	persons	source: field
No. teaching assistants	3	persons	source: field
No. IT personnel	1	person	source: field
College enrollment growth rate, Caraga	2.21	% per year	source: CHED
No. classes per day	8	classes	source: field
No. hours per class session	1	hour	source: field
No. times sessions per week for a class	3	sessions per class-week	source: field
No. semesters in a school year	2	semesters per school year	source: field
No. months per semester	5	months per semester	source: field
Attendance rate of teaching assistants per week	3	days per week	source: field
Attendance rate of IT personnel for JEEP in a week	1	day per week	source: field
Required no. of hours devoted by teaching assistants	8	hours per day	source: field
Required no. of hours devoted by IT personnel	8	hour per day	source: field
Electricity bill (based on university allotment of expenditures)	36,000	per year	source: field
Annual license fee of software (for JEEP start computer units only)	10,000	pesos per computer unit-year	source: field
Monthly teacher salary inc. taxes and other dues (entry level)	20,000	pesos per month-teacher	source: field
Teacher's incentive provided by GEM3 for the first year	12,000	pesos per semester-teacher	source: field
Average number of headphone set replaced per year	10	units	source: field
Replacement cost of headphone set	2,500	pesos per unit	source: field
User fee (subject fee and laboratory fee)	950	pesos per semester-student	source: field
User fee of nearest alternative JEEP (Butuan City)	2,000	pesos per semester-student	source: field
Start of GEM3 JEEP training of teachers	Apr-11		source: field
Start date of JEEP Start	Jun-11		source: field
Start date of JEEP Accelerate	May-12		source: field
Project cost (hardware)	22,000	pesos per unit	source: field estimate
Project cost (software, given free by GEM3 for the first year)	10,000	pesos per unit	source: field
Project cost (training of 15 teachers over 2 weeks*)	168,000	pesos	source field
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: field estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	4,950	pesos per computer unit-year	derived estimate
Lifespan of computers	4	years	source: field estimate
Maintenance cost (excluding replacement of damaged headphone set)	1	% of total cost per year	source: field
Minimum daily wage non-agriculture, Caraga	258	pesos per person-day	source: DOLE-NWPC

*note: this refers to per diem only			
No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Caraga	4.9	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits		1,198,900	1,606,800	1,504,940	1,409,538	1,320,183	1,236,493
User fee of students		1,198,900	1,606,800	1,504,940	1,409,538	1,320,183	1,236,493
[B] Total benefits [A]		1,198,900	1,606,800	1,504,940	1,409,538	1,320,183	1,236,493
COST							
[C] Private costs		4,131,660	2,964,137	2,776,232	2,600,238	3,163,385	2,360,298
Project cost (hardware)		1,056,000	0	0	0	727,983	79,283
Training cost		168,000					
License fee for the software		430,000	402,741	377,210	353,298	330,901	309,924
Maintenance (including replacement of damaged headphone set)		34,460	33,306	31,194	29,217	27,365	25,630
Salary		2,025,600	2,271,834	2,127,816	1,992,928	1,866,590	1,748,262
Teacher incentive		144,000					
Electricity bill		36,000	33,718	31,580	29,578	27,703	25,947
Depreciation cost		237,600	222,538	208,431	195,218	182,842	171,251
Total cost [C]		4,131,660	2,964,137	2,776,232	2,600,238	3,163,385	2,360,298
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(2,932,760)	(1,357,337)	(1,271,291)	(1,190,700)	(1,843,201)	(1,123,805)
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(2,932,760)	(1,357,337)	(1,271,291)	(1,190,700)	(1,843,201)	(1,123,805)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	(20,449,342.8)
BCR	0.5
FRR	-
ERR	-

Hence, the project is not economically and financially feasible given that the JEEP project, which is a private good, is implemented by a public school.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	-13,511,051.6	0.5	-	-
30% discount rate	-9,623,570.6	0.5	-	-
10% increase in benefits	-18,525,102.6	0.5	-	-
10% increase in costs	-24,418,517.4	0.4	-	-

7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

1,158,108	1,084,693	1,015,931	951,528	891,208	834,712	781,797	732,237	685,818
1,158,108	1,084,693	1,015,931	951,528	891,208	834,712	781,797	732,237	685,818
1,158,108	1,084,693	1,015,931	951,528	891,208	834,712	781,797	732,237	685,818

2,136,415	2,000,981	2,434,343	1,816,338	1,644,052	1,539,830	1,873,319	1,397,740	1,265,160
0	0	560,210	61,011	0	0	431,103	46,950	0
290,277	271,876	254,641	238,498	223,379	209,219	195,956	183,534	171,899
24,005	22,484	21,058	19,723	18,473	17,302	16,205	15,178	14,216
1,637,435	1,533,633	1,436,412	1,345,353	1,260,068	1,180,188	1,105,373	1,035,300	969,669
24,302	22,762	21,319	19,967	18,702	17,516	16,406	15,366	14,392
160,395	150,227	140,704	131,784	123,430	115,606	108,277	101,413	94,984
2,136,415	2,000,981	2,434,343	1,816,338	1,644,052	1,539,830	1,873,319	1,397,740	1,265,160

(978,306)	(916,289)	(1,418,413)	(864,810)	(752,844)	(705,119)	(1,091,522)	(665,504)	(579,342)
(978,306)	(916,289)	(1,418,413)	(864,810)	(752,844)	(705,119)	(1,091,522)	(665,504)	(579,342)

16	17	18	19	20
642,342	601,622	563,484	527,763	494,306
642,342	601,622	563,484	527,763	494,306
642,342	601,622	563,484	527,763	494,306

1,184,957	1,441,589	1,075,614	973,588	911,869
0	331,750	36,130	0	0
161,002	150,795	141,236	132,283	123,897
13,314	12,470	11,680	10,939	10,246
908,199	850,626	796,702	746,197	698,894
13,479	12,625	11,824	11,075	10,373
88,963	83,323	78,041	73,094	68,460
1,184,957	1,441,589	1,075,614	973,588	911,869
(542,615)	(839,967)	(512,130)	(445,825)	(417,563)
(542,615)	(839,967)	(512,130)	(445,825)	(417,563)

Project Name: Datu Odin Sinsuat Educational & Dev Fdn Inc. High School (CLIC) WORKFORCE
Component: Workforce Preparation- Computer Literacy and Internet Connection

Barangay: Poblacion
 City/Municipality: Datu Odin Sinsuat
 Province: **Maguindanao**
 Region: ARMM
 Date visited: 23 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
No of computer units	6	units	source: field
No. beneficiaries (3rd and 4th year high school students) - primary users	248	per school year	source: field
No. beneficiaries (5th and 6th grade elementary school students) - secondary users	160	per school year	source: field
No. teachers (2008)	1	person	source: field
No. teachers (post 2008)	2	person	source: field
No. IT personnel	0		source: field
Elementary school (5th-6th grade) enrolment growth rate, Soccsksargen	2.04	% per year	source: DepEd-BIS
Secondary school (3rd-4th year) enrolment growth rate, Soccsksargen	5.50	% per year	source: DepEd-BIS
No. of classes per day (3rd and 4th year high school)	4	classes per day	source: field
No. of classes per day (5th and 6th grade elementary school)	4	classes per day	source: field
No. hours per class session	1	hour	source: field
Hands-on learning time per student, actual	10	minutes	source: field
No. hours per student, ideal	1	hour	source: field
No. times sessions per week for a class	3	sessions per class-week	source: field
No. months in a school year	9	school year	source: field
user fee: computer laboratory fee	50	pesos per student-month	source: field
Electricity bill	1,000	per month	source: field
Internet service fee*	3,600	pesos per quarter	source: field
Monthly teacher salary inc. taxes and other dues (entry level)	6,000	pesos per month-teacher	source: field
<i>*2010: disconnection of internet service</i>			
User fee of nearest alternative internet café shops, Cotabato City - 2008-10	15	pesos per hour	source: field
Frequency of study visit to Cotabato City	1	time a month	source: field
Hands-on learning time per student per 1 class session	60	minutes	source: field
Transportation fare to Cotabato	30	pesos per head (round trip)	source: field
User fee of nearest alternative internet café shops, (within campus)-2010 onwards	15	pesos per hour	source: field
Start date	2008		source: field
Project cost (computer hardware, software and internet connection)	22,000	pesos per unit	source: field estimate
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: field estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	6,600	pesos per computer unit-year	derived estimate
Lifespan of computers**	3	years	source: field estimate
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	source: field estimate
<i>note: **lifespan is reduced from 4 to 3 years given</i>			

intense use of computers by # students

No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, ARMM	6.19	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits		3,610	3,357	3,122	2,905	2,703	2,516
User fee of students		3,610	3,357	3,122	2,905	2,703	2,516
[B] Social benefits		165,240	165,285	155,692	166,527	156,862	147,758
Cost savings from access		165,240	165,285	155,692	166,527	156,862	147,758
[C] Total benefits [A] + [B]		168,850	168,642	158,815	169,432	159,565	150,275
COST							
[D] Private costs		250,320	163,458	142,034	247,171	127,680	121,057
Capital outlay		132,000	0	0	112,505	0	0
Maintenance		1,320	1,329	1,260	1,195	1,133	1,074
Salary		54,000	102,398	97,086	92,049	87,274	82,747
Internet connection service fee		14,400	13,653				
Electricity bill		9,000	8,533	8,090	7,671	7,273	6,896
Depreciation cost		39,600	37,546	35,598	33,751	32,001	30,341
[E] Social Cost		137,700	137,737	129,744	138,772	130,718	123,132
Cost due to reduced learning hour relative to alternative		137,700	137,737	129,744	138,772	130,718	123,132
Total cost [D] + [E]		250,320	163,458	142,034	247,171	127,680	121,057
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(81,470)	5,184	16,781	(77,739)	31,885	29,218
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(246,710)	(160,101)	(138,912)	(244,266)	(124,977)	(118,541)

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	(214,950.2)
BCR	0.9
FRR	-
ERR	-

Hence, the project is not economically and financially feasible given that the CLIC project, which is a private good, is implemented by a small private NGO-school.

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	-1,356,318.1	0.5	-	-
30% discount rate	-925,648.2	0.5	-	-
10% increase in benefits	-1,910,230.5	0.6	-	-
10% increase in costs	-2,596,224.1	0.5	-	-

2,343	2,182	2,032	1,894	1,765	1,645	1,534	1,431	1,335
2,343	2,182	2,032	1,894	1,765	1,645	1,534	1,431	1,335
139,183	131,106	123,497	116,330	109,578	103,219	97,228	91,586	86,270
139,183	131,106	123,497	116,330	109,578	103,219	97,228	91,586	86,270
141,526	133,287	125,529	118,223	111,343	104,864	98,762	93,016	87,605

210,666	108,823	103,178	179,552	92,751	87,939	153,034	79,052	74,951
95,889	0	0	81,727	0	0	69,656	0	0
1,018	965	915	868	823	780	740	701	665
78,454	74,385	70,526	66,867	63,399	60,110	56,992	54,035	51,232
6,538	6,199	5,877	5,572	5,283	5,009	4,749	4,503	4,269
28,767	27,274	25,859	24,518	23,246	22,040	20,897	19,813	18,785
115,986	109,255	102,914	96,941	91,315	86,016	81,024	76,321	71,892
115,986	109,255	102,914	96,941	91,315	86,016	81,024	76,321	71,892
210,666	108,823	103,178	179,552	92,751	87,939	153,034	79,052	74,951

(69,140)	24,464	22,351	(61,329)	18,592	16,925	(54,271)	13,964	12,654
(208,323)	(106,641)	(101,145)	(177,659)	(90,986)	(86,294)	(151,500)	(77,622)	(73,617)

16	17	18	19	20
1,245	1,162	1,085	1,013	946
1,245	1,162	1,085	1,013	946
81,264	76,548	72,105	67,920	63,979
81,264	76,548	72,105	67,920	63,979
82,509	77,710	73,190	68,933	64,925

130,432	67,377	63,882	111,168	57,426
59,369	0	0	50,600	0
630	598	567	537	509
48,574	46,055	43,666	41,400	39,253
4,048	3,838	3,639	3,450	3,271
17,811	16,887	16,011	15,180	14,393
67,720	63,790	60,088	56,600	53,315
67,720	63,790	60,088	56,600	53,315
130,432	67,377	63,882	111,168	57,426
(47,923)	10,333	9,308	(42,235)	7,499
(129,187)	(66,215)	(62,797)	(110,155)	(56,480)

Project Name: Notre Dame of Libungan (CLIC)	Workforce
Component: Workforce Preparation-Computer Literacy and Internet Connection	

Barangay: -
City/Municipality: Libungan
Province: **North Cotabato**
Region: Soccsksargen
Date visited: 16 August 2012

Basic info:			
	Qty	Unit	
No of computer units (GEM3)	5	units	source: field
No of computer units (school counterpart)	5	units	source: field
No. beneficiaries (3rd and 4th year high school students)	273	per school year	source: field
No. teachers	3	person	source: field
No. IT personnel	1	person	source: field
Secondary school (3rd-4th year) enrolment growth rate, Soccsksargen	5.50	% per year	source: DepEd-BIS
No. of classes per day (3rd and 4th year high school)	7	classes per day	source: field
No. hours per class session	60	minutes	source: field
Hands-on learning time per student, actual (with GEM3)	15.38	minutes per session	derived estimate, source: field
Hands-on learning time per student, actual (before GEM3)	7.69	minutes per session	derived estimate, source: field
No. hours per student, ideal	1	hour	source: field
No. times sessions per week for a class	3	sessions per class-week	source: field
No. months in a school year	9	school year	source: field
Student-computer ratio per class (with GEM3)	3.9	students per computer-class	derived estimate, source: field
Student-computer ratio per class (without GEM3)	7.8	students per computer-class	derived estimate, source: field
user fee: computer laboratory fee	100	pesos per student-month	source: field
Electricity bill	2,900	pesos per month	source: field
Internet service fee (from W.I.T., 2009-2011)*	3,600	pesos per quarter	source: field
Monthly salary of computer technician	3,000	pesos per month	source: field
Monthly teacher salary inc. taxes and other dues	7,000	pesos per month-teacher	source: field
*2011: disconnection of internet service, school subscribed to PLDT starting 2012	2,300	pesos per month	
User fee of nearest alternative internet café shops, poblacion	10	pesos per hour	source: field
Hands-on user time	60	minutes	assumption
Average frequency of visits by students to alternative internet café shops per week	2	time a week	source: field
Transportation fare to Poblacion	14	pesos per head (round trip)	source: field
% of students without access to computer at home	90	%	source: field
Start date	2009		source: field
Project cost (computer hardware, software and internet connection)	22,000	pesos per unit	source: field estimate
Salvage value	10	% of total cost	source: field estimate
Depreciation cost (linear approach)	6,600	pesos per computer unit-year	derived estimate
Lifespan of computers**	3	years	source: field estimate
Maintenance cost	1	% of total cost per year	estimate
<i>note: **lifespan is reduced from 4 to 3 years given intense use of computers by # students</i>			source: field

No. of violent conflict (last 12 months)	0	incidents	source: field
Type of violent conflict			
Violent conflict actors			
Violent conflict form			
Discount rate	12	%	assumption
2011 inflation rate, Soccsksargen	4.6	%	source: NSCB

PRESENT VALUE, inflation-adjusted

	Year	1	2	3	4	5	6
BENEFITS							
[A] Private benefits		257,002	242,087	228,037	214,803	202,337	190,594
User fee of students		257,002	242,087	228,037	214,803	202,337	190,594
[B] Social benefits		88,452	87,151	82,093	77,329	72,841	68,614
Cost savings from access		88,452	87,151	82,093	77,329	72,841	68,614
[C] Total benefits [A] + [B]		345,454	329,238	310,131	292,132	275,178	259,208
COST							
[D] Private costs		400,600	271,447	265,025	337,120	231,161	215,888
Project cost		110,000	0	0	89,605	0	0
Maintenance		1,100	1,075	1,004	937	875	818
Salary		216,000	201,729	188,400	175,952	164,327	153,469
Internet connection service fee		14,400	13,449	24,073	22,483	20,997	19,610
Electricity bill		26,100	24,376	22,765	21,261	19,856	18,544
Depreciation cost		33,000	30,820	28,783	26,882	25,105	23,447
[E] Social Cost		54,432	53,632	50,519	47,587	44,825	42,224
Cost due to reduced learning hour relative to alternative		54,432	53,632	50,519	47,587	44,825	42,224
Total cost [D] + [E]		455,032	325,078	315,544	384,707	275,986	258,112
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - economic, inflation adjusted		(109,578)	4,160	(5,414)	(92,575)	(809)	1,096
NET PRESENT BENEFITS - financial, inflation adjusted		(143,598)	(29,360)	(36,988)	(122,317)	(28,824)	(25,294)

x

Conclusion, at 12% discount rate

NPV	(338,336.9)
BCR	0.9
FRR	-
ERR	-

Hence, the project is not economically and financially feasible given that the CLIC project, which is a private good, is implemented by a small private school that still relies on government transfer (i.e. 90% of students receive state scholarship).

Sensitivity Analysis

Scenarios	NPV	BCR	FRR	ERR
20% discount rate	-263,052.6	0.9	-	-
30% discount rate	-211,264.0	0.9	-	-
10% increase in benefits	81,344.5	1.0	-	7.8%
10% increase in costs	-791,851.9	0.8	-	-

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
179,533	169,113	159,299	150,054	141,345	133,142	125,415	118,137	111,280

179,533	169,113	159,299	150,054	141,345	133,142	125,415	118,137	111,280
64,632	60,881	57,348	54,019	50,884	47,931	45,149	42,529	40,061
64,632	60,881	57,348	54,019	50,884	47,931	45,149	42,529	40,061
244,164	229,994	216,646	204,073	192,230	181,073	170,565	160,666	151,341

274,616	188,302	175,861	223,700	153,390	143,255	182,225	124,950	116,695
72,992	0	0	59,459	0	0	48,435	0	0
763	713	666	622	581	542	507	473	442
143,330	133,860	125,015	116,755	109,041	101,837	95,108	88,824	82,955
18,314	17,104	15,974	14,919	13,933	13,012	12,153	11,350	10,600
17,319	16,175	15,106	14,108	13,176	12,305	11,492	10,733	10,024
21,898	20,451	19,100	17,838	16,659	15,558	14,530	13,570	12,674
39,773	37,465	35,291	33,243	31,313	29,496	27,784	26,172	24,653
39,773	37,465	35,291	33,243	31,313	29,496	27,784	26,172	24,653
314,389	225,767	211,152	256,943	184,703	172,751	210,009	151,122	141,348

(70,225)	4,227	5,495	(52,870)	7,526	8,322	(39,444)	9,544	9,994
(95,083)	(19,189)	(16,562)	(73,647)	(12,045)	(10,113)	(56,810)	(6,814)	(5,414)

16	17	18	19	20
104,822	98,739	93,008	87,611	82,526
104,822	98,739	93,008	87,611	82,526
37,736	35,546	33,483	31,540	29,709
37,736	35,546	33,483	31,540	29,709
142,558	134,285	126,491	119,150	112,235

148,439	101,784	95,059	120,918	82,912
39,455	0	0	32,139	0
413	385	360	336	314
77,474	72,356	67,575	63,110	58,940
9,900	9,245	8,635	8,064	7,531
9,361	8,743	8,165	7,626	7,122
11,836	11,054	10,324	9,642	9,005
23,222	21,874	20,605	19,409	18,283
23,222	21,874	20,605	19,409	18,283
171,661	123,658	115,664	140,327	101,195

(29,103)	10,627	10,828	(21,176)	11,040
(43,617)	(3,045)	(2,050)	(33,307)	(386)

For more information, please visit
<http://www.socialimpact.com>

Social Impact, Inc.
2300 Clarendon Boulevard
Suite 300
Tel: (703) 465-1884
Fax: (703) 465-1888
www.socialimpact.com