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ABSTRACT

The Government of the Philippines, through the leadership of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) implemented a Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program dubbed as Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program. Aside from providing income support to extremely poor households that would encourage them to increase investments in their children’s human capital, 4Ps will serve as the lead vehicle through which the many cross-cutting issues (e.g. targeting, monitoring and evaluation) will be addressed (4Ps Concept Paper, 2009). The effectiveness of the program lies on its impact toward its target clientele. Using the Technical-Economic-Political-Administrative (TEPA) format, this study sought to examine the premise that whether or not the 4Ps has successfully delivered its intended purpose in poverty alleviation. A focused group discussion (FGD) among the different stakeholders involved with the policy was conducted to assure the appropriate distribution of weights in all the criteria involved. Since policy analysis determines which of the various alternative policies will most achieve a given set of goals based upon the probable impact of each, 3 alternative options were considered in the study to wit: Option 1- 4Ps, Option 2- India’s poverty alleviation scheme, and Option 3 is the combination of PantawidPamilya and India model. There are myriad possibilities for the persistence of poverty even in the midst of economic growth. Policy makers and analysts should be sensitive to geographical, political and cultural conditions that each play a role. Poverty alleviation must go hand in hand with measures to increase national income. More than the Conditional Cash Transfer that provides short term assistance, enhancement of skill to strengthen labor market and employment guarantee should also be a prime strategy to reduce poverty.
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INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM DEFINITION

“Hunger, disease, and the waste of lives that extreme poverty are an affront to all of us. It is a difficult but solvable solution. An equation that crosses human with financial capital, the strategic goals of the rich world with a new planning in the poor world...the end of poverty: Is a challenge that’s hard to ignore” Bono (as cited by Sachs, 2005).
More than 8 million people around the world die each year because they are too poor to stay alive (Sachs, 2005). World Bank (1997, as cited by Morduch, 1999) described that in the world today, about 1 billion people live on less than $1 per day, and about 2-3 billion live on less than $2 per day. This scenario triggered a growing concentration of world poverty particularly in slow-growth areas of South Asia and Africa. A generation ago, approaches to poverty alleviation were also considerably different. While there had been an active macroeconomic agenda on — redistribution with growth, ll much of its approaches through the 1970's and mid-1980's tended to focus on poverty alleviation as a static problem (Murdoch 1999).

It has been noted that economic growth would play an important role in poverty alleviation. Unfortunately, such advancement appeared dim in poor countries. Sachs (2005) identified 8 reasons why countries fail to achieve economic growth: that poverty itself is the cause of economic stagnation, physical geography, fiscal trap, governance failures, cultural barriers, geopolitics, lack of innovation and demographic trap. The key problem for the poorest countries is that poverty itself can be a trap. When poverty is very extreme, the poor do not have the ability by themselves to get out of the mess. Our generation’s challenge is to help the poorest of the poor to escape the misery of extreme poverty so that they may begin their own ascent up the ladder of economic development.

In the Philippines, a wide range of social protection programs is in place. However, the 1997 Asian financial crisis exposed weaknesses in coverage, targeting methodologies and techniques, and operational constraints. These result in significant leakages; resources go unduly to the non-poor and the near-poor amid lack of reliable poverty measures as well as overlaps and redundancies in sectoral or geographical beneficiaries (ADB, 2008 as cited 4Ps Concept Paper, 2009). Inadequate human capabilities and limited access to social services are often key factors underlying poverty and inequality in the country. While the Philippines had achieved nearly universal primary education, enrolment in secondary education, at about 73%, leaves much room for improvement. In 2004, the average enrolment rate for the bottom 10% of the population was less than 55% compared to about 75% got the top 10%. Attendance in secondary education is below the national average in the poorer regions. In terms of health services, disparities in access to such services among income groups are even more pronounced. The average access to health services was a little over 30% for the bottom 20% of the population while it was close to 45% for the top 20%. Confronted with these findings, the Government of the Philippines, through the leadership of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) implemented a Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) Program dubbed as Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program. Aside from providing income support to extremely poor households that would encourage them to increase investments in their children’s human capital, 4Ps will serve as the lead vehicle through which the many cross-cutting issues (e.g. targeting, monitoring and evaluation) will be addressed (4Ps Concept Paper, 2009).
The focus is on building human capital in the poorest families (through investments in their health/nutrition and education) as low schooling and poor health are strongly linked with the poverty cycle in the Philippines. It provides social assistance through health and education conditional cash grants which are transferred upon the compliance of beneficiaries with the program conditions. Aside from this, 4Ps also helps fulfill the country’s commitment to meet the Millennium Development Goals, namely: *(a) Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger, (b) Achieve Universal Primary Education, (c) Reduce Child Mortality, (d) Improve Maternal Health, and (e) Promote Gender Equality.* Furthermore, the program is also aligned with the DSWD's goal of poverty reduction and empowering the poor and vulnerable groups of society. Likewise, it is also a part of the Department’s Reform Agenda under the National Sector Support for Social Welfare and Development Project.

4Ps is a life-saver to those drowning in poverty, providing more immediate and widespread relief than the micro-financed aid proposed by some legislators. It is like giving the beneficiaries a hitch on the first rung of the ladder of social development thereby making them direct participants of the quest toward poverty alleviation. In the form of CCT (Conditional Cash Transfer) the beneficiaries are obligated to adhere with the conditions set forth and spearheaded by the DSWD. With the help of the Department of Education, Department of Health and LGUs the beneficiaries then agree to send their children to school, regular visits to health care facilities in the case of pregnant women, and enroll children below 6 years old to day care centers and other conditions.

This program however limits each beneficiary for up to 5 years of assistance, presumably believing that the beneficiaries have already figured out a more stable means of livelihood by the time the CCT expires(have already freed themselves from the dependency of CCT). Random beneficiaries of the 4Ps have in one way of the other seen the program to be most effective. According to them there are many programs of the government but it was only 4Ps that got immediate positive responses and yielded positive results as well because the help was literally given directly to them. One barangay in Cebu City pointed out that in Barangay Tejero alone, the malnutrition rate of children ages 0-6 years old dropped by approximately 85% from 371 identified malnourished kids in the beginning of 2009 to 55 malnourished children at the end of 2009. So much so that a DSWD nutritionist firmly believes that with 4Ps, combined with the feeding program of the government, would be possible to combat malnutrition in the place.

Another beneficiary pointed out that 4Ps helps lighten the burden of everyday needs. It helps the children in their schooling. John is a volunteer Day Care worker in Pandawan Day Care center. He estimated that most children under his care are from the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program and these children need a lot of care and
attention from a worker like him. He took his father’s role in managing their household since his parents were separated and his mother took care the rest of their everyday needs working in a farm.

This program however how noble its endeavor has not absconded itself from criticisms. The urban poor sector spoke of the program’s failure to invest in human capital, that is providing skills training to the marginalized sector to free them from dole-outs dependency. De Janvry & Sadoulet (UC Berkeley, 2004 as cited by DSWD, 2009) pointed on the other hand that CCTs that are oriented at inducing a socially optimum behavior should be seen as contracts with recipients for delivery of service, not as handout programs. The Catholic Church vehemently surmised that it could stimulate the way to a culture of mendicancy.

Finally, the effectiveness of the program lies on its impact toward its target clientele. This study sought to examine the premise that whether or not the 4Ps has successfully delivered its intended purpose in poverty alleviation; how was the program implemented; 4Ps mechanics in identifying its beneficiaries.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND DESIGN

The evaluation design that was employed in this study is the TechnicalEconomicPolitical-Administrative (TEPA) format utilizing the weighted decision criteria model. The latter was necessary in determining the weight allotted to each criteria which are considered in this particular analysis. A focused group discussion (FGD) among the different stakeholders involved with the policy was also conducted to assure the appropriate distribution of weight in all the criteria involved.

Technical feasibility pertains to the proficiency among the program implementers in Human Capital investment that includes three dimensions, namely; effectiveness, efficiency and equity. Effectiveness determines which of policy most achieved particularly in terms of Health and Nutrition, Education and Employment. Health and nutrition was determined based on the nutritional status and hunger incidence of the Philippines and India before and after implementation of their poverty reduction strategies. Education and employment on the other hand was analyzed based on the number of enrolled students, incidence of school attendance and decrease of unemployment rate. Equity on the other hand describes the justness and fairness of the 3 alternative options as to achieving its goals. Qualitative evaluation was employed to describe whether equal opportunity of provisions were given to the poor.

Economic viability pertains to the impact on the budget and funding of the national government. This includes Source and Status of Funds, Sufficiency and Sustainability of cash assistance.
Political possibility refers to the responsiveness of the relevant powerful groups such legislators, decision makers and administrators to a policy. This includes two dimensions: the legality of the adaptation of the policy and the acceptability of such among the stakeholders. Political acceptability was determined qualitatively based on testimonies of beneficiaries and stakeholders.

Lastly, Administrative Ease pertains to the capacity of those in authority to employ a policy in the respective agencies. This includes three dimensions: the availability of funds, the mechanism of implementation of a policy and the constraint or limitation of administrative power.

**Important Weights for Criteria**

The qualitative analysis of the data will be based on the criteria formulated from the FGD and interviews following the simple linear additive evaluation model. The linear model shows how an option’s values on the many criteria can be combined into one overall value (Department for Communities and Local Government: London, 2009).

**Classification of Criteria**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the points must reach the assigned weight of 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>the points only need to reach the minimum points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Point Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>if the level of compliance is more than 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>if the level of compliance is less than 90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative Policies and Evaluation**

**PantawidPamilya Pilipino Program**

PantawidPamilya (4Ps) is a poverty reduction and social development strategy that provides conditional cash grants to extremely poor Filipino households to improve their health, nutrition and education particularly of children aged 0-14. PantawidPamilya has dual objectives namely Social Assistance (to provide cash assistance to the poor to alleviate their immediate need (short term poverty alleviation) and Social Development (to break the intergenerational poverty cycle through investments in human capital). The policy is based on the categories defined by the Geneva-based United Nations Research Institute for Social Development as a
social protection program designed to help the most vulnerable individuals, families or communities by transfer of cash.

DSWD Secretary Corazon Juliano – Dinky Soliman explained that the 4Ps is a social assistance and social development program that aims to break the intergenerational cycle of poverty by providing families with cash grants to help their health and education needs. It will help to fulfill the country’s commitment to meet the Millennium Development Goals, namely: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger, Achieve Universal Primary Education, Promote Gender Equality, Reduce Child Mortality and Improve Maternal Health.

The poorest households in the municipalities are selected through the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR) implemented by the DSWD using the Proxy Means Test. This test determines the socio-economic category of the families by looking at certain proxy variables such as ownership of assets, type of housing, education of the household head, livelihood of the family and access to water and sanitation facilities. The program aims to grant a monthly stipend of up to PhP1,400 per family who commit to keep their children in school, have them vaccinated and for mothers to have regular medical checkups. The stipend will last for not more than five years.

Presently, Pantawid Pamilya operates in 80 provinces covering 734 municipalities and 62 key cities. The program aims at short term poverty reduction but in the long run aims to eradicate poverty by enabling children of poor families to complete schooling and improve their health, which is deemed a huge investment in human capital.

The 4Ps adheres to the policy that cash grants should not be too high as to discourage work effort but should not be too low as to have no effect on poor families.

After two years of the Aquino Administration, Ibon executive director Sonny Africa insists that after our economy and our people are no better than when he took over. As a matter of fact, in many aspects it may have actually gone worse. IBON cites the continuing jobs crisis, i.e., the total number of unemployed and underemployed Filipinos increased in the last two years – from 10.9 million in 2010 to 11.7 million in April 2012 – consisting of 4.4 million unemployed and 7.3 million underemployed.

Worse, the jobs which have been created thus far is not as glowing with 43 percent of jobs in the economy consisting of part time work. That’s a full 16.2 million out of 37.8 employed. It is clear that in the most critical development indicator of all, jobs, which is even more important than credit ratings and some such advisories, the administration failed. Thus, IBON advised – while the unemployment rate over the same period fell from 11.4 percent to 10.3 percent, this was more than offset by rising.
underemployment which rose from 17.8 percent to 19.3 percent. (Africa as cited Ibon Foundation, July 20, 2012).

He added that the reported high 6.4% growth in gross domestic product (GDP) in the first quarter is welcome but unfortunately empty and appears largely due to a surge in government spending that is likely to be temporary. Government consumption grew 24% from a 15.8% contraction in the same period last year while public investment grew 62.2% from a 37.9% contraction. In contrast, household consumption only grew marginally faster to 6.6% from 5.9% last year while private investment actually shrank by 9.9% from 23% growth last year – indicating that the private sector did not seem to share the administration's optimism in the first quarter. Overall investment actually contracted 23.5% from 36.1% growth in the first quarter of last year.

Finally he said that, the perception of economic progress is just that and little more. The administration's governance reform agenda has unfortunately not included an economic reform agenda of building an economy biased for directly improving the lives of the majority of Filipinos. (Africa, Sonny: Ibon Foundation July 2012: Perception economics: two years of the Aquino administration: (http://www.ibon.org/ibon_features.php?id=242) July 20, 2012.)

The stark resemblances of India’s Anti-poverty program with that of the Philippines have also in turn showed resemblances on its inefficacy in fighting poverty. According to Acharya, Keya of Asia Times Online, said that, in spite of its massive public spending budget, NREGA has come under withering criticism, starting with allegations of corruption in several states.

In northern Uttar Pradesh, massive siphoning of NREGA funds by officials and local administration, including village panchayat heads, has led to the minister for rural development, Jairam Ramesh, calling for an official inquiry.

The largest of the NREGA scams in Uttar Pradesh emerged from the constituency of Sonia Gandhi, the leader of the ruling Congress party. Not surprisingly, the Congress party fared badly in provincial elections held in the state, India's largest, in March 2012.

Although according to one the beneficiary, –"We cannot do without the government's cash-for-work program," he told Inter Press Service. "We are happy with the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) which gives us an assured income, but we want more work."

The canal took 29 village individuals 14 days to build, paid for by the government under NREGA, the world's largest social welfare scheme, with a
budgetary allocation of US$15.02 billion for the 2011-2013 period. Total funding for NREGA since its inception in 2005 has crossed $29 billion.

The government says NREGA has so far provided over 10.1 million jobs to 550 million rural poor households. The scheme, set up by the ruling Congress party-led United Progressive Alliance coalition, helped return the party to power in the 2009 general elections.

NREGA mandates 100 days of paid, unskilled manual labor to one member of every poor, rural household in a year, the scheme having accompanying legal strictures on transparency, accountability and monitoring. Any eligible worker not given a job within 15 days of his or her request is entitled to unemployment allowance from the government.

Jobs include soil and water conservation-related measures such as afforestation, irrigation, conservation of ponds and activities related to agricultural productivity. Amendments to NREGA in 2012 have now included dairy and poultry-related activities.

Wages, which began at about US$2 six years ago, have been increased, with each state adjusting NREGA wages according to respective minimum wages for labor. In Karnataka state, the scheme now pays a little over $3 per day, while states like Bihar and Jharkhand pay $2.39 and economically better off states like northern Haryana pays $3.74. (Acharya, Keya April 2012. Asia Times Online: India’s job scheme under strain: http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/ND12Df01.html (July 20, 2012)

Looking into India’s Poverty Alleviation Scheme

At the beginning of the new millennium, 260 million people in India did not have incomes to access a consumption basket which defines the poverty line. Of these, 75 per cent were in the rural areas. India is home to 22 per cent of the world’s poor. Such a high incidence of poverty is a matter of concern in view of the fact that poverty eradication has been one of the major objectives of the development planning process. Reduction of poverty in India, is, therefore, vital for the attainment of international goals. Agricultural wage earners, small and marginal farmers and casual workers engaged in non-agricultural activities, constitute the bulk of the rural poor. Small land holdings and their low productivity are the cause of poverty among households dependent on land-based activities for their livelihood. Poor educational base and lack of other vocational skills also perpetuate poverty. Due to the poor physical and social capital base, a large proportion of the people are forced to seek employment in vocations with extremely low levels of productivity and wages.
The creation of employment opportunities for the unskilled workforce has been a major challenge for development planners and administrators. Wage employment programmes is an important component of the anti-poverty strategy that have sought to achieve multiple objectives. They not only provide employment opportunities during lean agricultural seasons but also in times of floods, droughts and other natural calamities. They create rural infrastructure which supports further economic activity. These programs also put an upward pressure on market wage rates by attracting people to public works programs, thereby reducing labor supply and pushing up demand for labour.

The National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programmes (RLEGP) were merged under the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY). The JRY was meant to generate meaningful employment opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed in rural areas through the creation of economic infrastructure and community and social assets.

The program is implemented through the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) of India is an Act to provide a legal guarantee of 100 days of wage employment in a financial year to every rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. He/she will get the minimum wage rate notified for agricultural labour in the State until the Central Government notifies a minimum wage rate, which in any case shall not be less than Rs. 60 per day. NREGA came into effect on February 2, 2006. All adult members of a rural household, resident in the area, willing to do unskilled manual work can apply. Even if a person is already employed/engaged in work, he/she has the right to demand employment under NREGA. Priority shall be given to women. At least one-third of the beneficiaries shall be women who have registered and requested for work under the Scheme.

**Combination of Pantawid Pamilya and NREGA (India)**

While 4Ps foci points to empower women in the households by providing select beneficiaries in both urban and rural areas with Conditional Cash Transfers provided that they follow certain conditions set forth by the government, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act epitomizes empowerment of rural poor particularly by providing a strong social safety net with fall-back employment source when other employment alternatives are scarce inherent to that of an agricultural economy – hence, a combination of these two would embody empowerment of the Filipino families identified indigent in both urban and rural communities.

The objective of this combination attempt is to empower families of select urban and rural communities by providing CCTs and enhance skills and livelihood security in identified indigent communities in urban areas and poorest rural areas by providing guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.
Goals of the Combination

a. Strong social safety net for the vulnerable groups by providing a fall-back employment source, when other employment alternatives are scarce or inadequate;

b. Growth engine for sustainable development of both urban industrial economy and rural agricultural economy. Through the process of providing employment on works that address causes of chronic poverty such as:

   b.1. Urban Indigents
       b.I.1. termination from previous employers due to budget cuts; company closures/bankruptcies and the like;
       b.I.2. legal disputes between employees and employers;
       b.I.3. disability or death of the bread winner;

   b.2. Rural Communities
       b.II.1 drought, deforestation and soil erosion, the program seeks to strengthen the natural resource base of rural livelihood and create durable assets in rural areas. When effectively implemented, this scheme has the potential to transform the geography of poverty.

c. New ways of doing business, as a model of governance reform anchored on the principles of transparency and grass root democracy;

d. improve the health condition of children age 0-14 years old;

e. improve the maternal health of pregnant and lactating mothers;

f. raise consumption of nutrient dense foods among poor households;

g. increase enrolment/attendance of children in elementary/high school; and

h. encourage parent's participation in the growth and development of their children,

i. and their involvement in the community.

Salient Features

Other than the Conditional Cash Transfer of target beneficiaries the combination alternative policy will provide at least 100 days of guaranteed wage employment in a financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work:
1. Adult members of urban and rural households, willing to do unskilled manual work, may apply by registering in writing or personally applying to the local DSWD field office;
2. After due verification will issue a recommendation to the DSWD head office and a corresponding identification job order (JO) will be issued. Adult members of the household can avail of the JO Identification Card free of charge;
3. The JO Card should be issued within 15 days of application;
4. A JO Card holder may submit a written application for employment to the local DOLE field office, stating the time and duration for which work is sought. The minimum days of employment have to be at least 100 days;
5. The DOLE will issue a dated receipt of the written application for employment which the guarantee of providing employment within 15 days operates;
6. Work should ordinarily be provided within 5 km radius of the residence;
7. Wages are to be paid according to the Minimum Wages Act per region;
8. Wages are to be paid according to piece rate or daily rate. Disbursement of wages has to be done on weekly basis and not beyond a fortnight in any case;
9. Permissible works predominantly include water and soil conservation, forestation, land development works; community sanitation, and environmental preservation.

**TEPA Analysis Of Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps)**

**Table 1.** Weighted Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>MINIMUM POINTS</th>
<th>PantawidPamilya (Option 1)</th>
<th>Employment Guarantee (Option 2)</th>
<th>Combo 1 &amp; 2 (Option 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


## TECHNICAL

1. **EFFECTIVENESS (Human Capital)**
   - Health and Nutrition (health & nutritional status)
   - Education (enrolment rate school attendance)
   - Employment (employment rate)

1.2 **EQUITY**
   - Difference in standard of living between urban and rural barangays
   - Poverty Reduction (Poverty Index) No. of Target Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOFT</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFT</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 **EFFICIENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>SOFT</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 70% 58.3% 62.5% 91.7%

## ECONOMIC

- Source of Funds
- Sufficiency and Sustainability
- Equity of Cash Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOFT</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## POLITICAL

- Legality
- Political Acceptability (Qualitative Evaluation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOFT</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ADMINISTRATIVE EASE

- availability of funds
- Constraint / Limitation of Administrative Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SOFT</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optimal Scenarios and Policy Choice

Both option 1 and option 2 can help fulfill the country's commitment to meet the UN Millennium Development Goals. Specifically, option 1 aims to Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger, Achieve Universal Primary Education, Promote Gender Equality, Reduce Child Mortality, Improve Maternal Health. Option 1 focused on breaking intergenerational cycle of poverty through investment in human capital of
poorest families (health/nutrition and education) given the observation that low schooling, ill health and high malnutrition are strongly associated with the poverty cycle in the Philippines. Increasing human capital is thought to be one of the most critical ways for poor households to hook into growth processes. Although formal empirical work remains scant, improving health conditions is considered central to this aim: good health can enhance productivity (Strauss and Thomas 1995, as cited by Murdoch, 1999), and bad health can trigger and lengthen spells of poverty.

The strategy adapted from Conditional Cash Transfer of Latin America that provides cash grants to extremely poor households to allow the members of the families to meet certain human development goals. Although criticized for the program might develop a culture of dole out and mendicancy, AUSAID Director General Peter Baxter noted that the CCT program is important because it is set to improve the lives of families. He added further that it is bound to succeed because it primarily invests on women, mothers and children which are essential in the development of a nation. He believed that education is the key to development and makes the attainment of MDGs easier (dswd.gov.ph, 2009).

This is supposed to be a long term scheme however 4P program will only be implemented until 2014. The policy also failed to made mention enhancement of skills that would generate a strong Labor Market. Option 2 on the other hand creates a social safety net for the vulnerable groups by providing a fall-back employment source, when other employment alternatives are scarce or inadequate. The program focuses on the empowerment of rural poor. Combining option 1 and option 2 (alternative option 3) will ensure a strong policy impact as the short term conditional cash transfer of Pantawid Pamilya can be sustained by providing employment opportunities particularly in rural areas. If program implementers will add impetus on rural areas, it will prevent distress migration, decongest urban areas, decrease street families and eradicate informal settlers in cities. Both option 1 and 2 on the other hand failed to mention how they will address street families particularly in urban areas.

In terms of efficiency, it has been noted that since the implementation of option 1, there was a significant drop of hunger incidence from 3.9 to 3 million families according to the Social Weather Station (2nd Quarter Accomplishment Report, 2011). Although the present administration targets 4.6 million families at the end of Pres. Aquino's term, DSWD reports as of July 19 2011 showed that Pantawid Pamilya reached and served a total of 2,212,055 household beneficiaries. The total number of registered households increased by 38.57% or 615,735 households from the 1,596,320 households registered as of the first quarter. Almost half of the total registered household beneficiaries or around 48% are from Mindanao while 30% and 22% are from Luzon and Visayas, respectively. Target beneficiaries were divided into 5 sets. As of the moment program implementation is still halfway to Set 4B.
The Ministry of Rural Development (2011) in India on the other hand reported that since NREGA was implemented, 41 million households were employed as of 2011. NREGA was introduced with an aim of improving the purchasing power of the rural people, primarily semi or un-skilled work to people living in rural India, whether or not they are below the poverty line. Around 1/3 of the stipulated work force is women. There is clear evidence to suggest that, while implementation has been very uneven across states and districts four positive impacts are visible: (i) agricultural wages have increased; (ii) distress migration has shown a decline; (iii) area cultivated in some states has increased; (iv) water conservation structures has been built and, in many cases, have been revived. While there are success stories in each state, Andhra Pradesh stands out for the systematic and transparent manner with which it has gone about implementing the NREGA. If both options will be combined (option 3), there will be a strong technical impact to reduce poverty as employment guarantee would also improve skill thereby strengthening the country's labor market.

Technical impact in option 3 is high (25%). Implementation of this alternative would not only focus on women but the whole family as well since employment of the head of household as well as maternal health and nutrition of children is ensured.

As to Economic dimension, Pantawid Pamilya (option 1) approved program budget was based on the General Appropriations Act (GAA) Republic Act No. 10147 which is PhP 21,194,117,000.00 to cover 2,318,110 households. Of this amount, 80.86% is allocated for cash grants and 19.14% is for operating cost. However, the estimated actual requirement to implement the program is PhP 23,151,097,517 with PhP 18,948,566,880 (81.85%) for cash grants and PhP 4,202,530,637 (18.15%) for operating cost or a total funding gap of PhP 1.956.980,517. Out of the total funding gap of PhP 1.956.980,517, PhP 1,810,702,547 is due to the frontloading of cash with the goal to cover as many beneficiaries in the earlier part of CY 2011 given the target of June 2011. In terms of fund utilization, a total of PhP 5,928,221,200 worth of cash grants has been released to household beneficiaries for the payment period January to June 2011. Of this amount, 59.57% was released for health grants while 40.43% was released for education grants (Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program Second Quarter Report, 2011).

The program is being funded through a $400 million loan approved last September 2010 by the Asian Development Bank. This means that foreign loan is once again acquired to implement the program which will surely increase Philippine foreign debt. This would also be an added burden on people’s taxes. International grants are also acquired for the program. AUSAID for one in 2010 shared PhP 400 million that helped 430 families. However, another 4 million pesos have been spent for training alone of program implementers which is quite expensive.
There is also a question on equity of cash grants in Pantawid Pamilya. The poorest households identified as beneficiaries with pregnant women members and children 0-14 years old (3-14 years old children who are attending day care/school) shall receive P500.00 as health and nutrition grant and P300.00 per child as education grant monthly. A maximum of three children beneficiaries shall be covered by education grant. Thus, a household with three children beneficiaries shall receive P1,400.00 as monthly grants for a period of five years for as long as they comply with the conditions of the program. According to 1 grantee from Brgy. T. Padilla, cash grants may be awarded based on the geographical location of beneficiaries. For instance, a PhP 300 per child monthly allowance may be enough for a child living in the rural municipality but will not be sufficient if the child lives in a highly urbanized locality (Labajo, et.al, 2012). Rachel Daria (DSWD Program Officer) however reiterated that the issue is an isolated case since there are many grantees residing in areas with high standard of living but the distance of the school from the child’s residence is very near. In this case, the distance from house to school is more significant than the type of locale the grantee is living. Option 3 provides a good alternative as employment and school should be provided within 5 km radius of the residence of the beneficiary.

In option 2, the Central Government of India bear the following costs: entire cost of wages for unskilled manual workers, 75 percent of the cost of material and wages for skilled and semi-skilled workers, administrative expenses as may be determined by the Central Government that includes include, inter alia, the salary and allowances of Programme Officers and their support staff and work site facilities and administrative expenses of the Central Employment Guarantee Council. The Indian State Government also bear 25 % cost of material and wages for skilled and semiskilled workers and administrative expenses of the State Employment Guarantee Council. There was no foreign technical assistance mentioned in option 2.

A National Employment Guarantee Fund has been set up by the Central Government to be managed according to the Rules made for this programs purpose. The grants to State Governments or Districts for implementation of NREGA shall be released from the said fund. Indian State Government also created a complete Financial Management System for the transfer and use of funds. This must ensure transparency, efficiency and accountability, and track the use of funds towards the final outcomes. Separate bank accounts are also opened for funds under the Scheme at the State, District and Block levels. The accounts shall be opened in public sector banks which would assure that NREGS should not be used for other purposes under any circumstances.

Options 1 and 3 got 25 % of the weighted evaluation which would imply that there is a strong political impact of the 2 alternative options. In terms of legality, option 1 and 3 is bounded by RA 8425 or an act Institutionalizing Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Program. The said law created National Anti Poverty Commission
on December 11, 1997. Pantawid Pamily was launched by the Arroyo administration in February 2008 on a pilot scale, but the present Aquino administration has decided to make the 4Ps a flagship program designed to reach 2.3 million households by the end of 2011.

The Rural Employment program of India (option 2) on the other hand is initially called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but was renamed on 2 October 2009. MNREGA was launched on February 2, 2006 from Anantapur in Andhra Pradesh and initially covered 200 "poorest" districts of the country. The Act was implemented in phased manner – 130 districts were added in 2007–08. With its spread over 625 districts across the country, the flagship program of the government has increased the purchasing power of rural poor, reduce distress migration and to create useful assets in rural India. Also, it fostered social and gender equality as 23% workers under the scheme are Scheduled Castes, 17% Scheduled Tribes and 50% women (Ministry of Rural Development, 2009).

Option 1 ensured strong (25 %) political impact based on the positive feedbacks from beneficiaries. They noted that that since they were provided with cash grants, the conditions made them become better mothers that prioritizes on health and education of their children. There were clamors of an increase on cash grants at the same time an extension of the program beyond children aged 14. One mother hoped that the program would b extended until their children finishes high school (16 years old) (Labajo, et.al. 2012).

There was moderate (12.50 %) political acceptability of India's rural employment programme (option 2). A study conducted in Ajmer, Udaipur, Pali and Jaisalmer in Rajasthan for the period 1995-2001 observed that, Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS), Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) and Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) funds were utilized mainly to create school buildings, health infrastructure or economic infrastructure such as roads shops etc. The facilities created in the villages contributed to increased economic activities. School buildings have helped in human capital formation especially for girls. Soil and moisture conservation works had an impact on the availability of work as they increased the irrigation potential and land productivity in the village. While the villagers expressed satisfaction on the construction of such works and their usefulness, it was felt that these schemes have not addressed some basic needs like availability of drinking water. Employment opportunities generated under wage employment programmes were limited, with only five to six persons in the village getting employment for around 30 days. The area development programmes viz, the Desert Development Programme (DDP) and the Border Area Development Programme (BADP) in Pali and Jaisalmer districts have helped in meeting some of the basic needs like water. However, different works have been undertaken by different departments ignoring the advantages of complementarity of works. In Uttar
Pradesh a study was conducted in 20 villages in 10 districts viz., Bareilly, Aligarh, Meerut/Baghpat, Deoria, Jaunpur, Allahabad/Kaushambi, Fatehpur, Unnao, Hamirpur and Pithoragarh. The study revealed that during 1999-2000, some work was found to have been done in each of the villages under the employment generation programmes although the quantum varied. The most common work undertaken was earth work or *kharanja* (brick path) within the village or the construction of link roads. Panchayat buildings were constructed in some villages. Other works included installing of hand pumps, repairing of old wells for drinking water and school buildings and construction of drains. While the improvement in infrastructure enhances the development potential of the region, a very small percentage of casual laborers had benefited from the programmes. The average number of the days of employment available to the sample beneficiaries was 14.7 days only (Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur and Anti-Poverty Programmes in Uttar Pradesh: An Evaluation – Institute of Human Development, New Delhi).

All 3 alternative options got a weighted evaluation of 16.7% in terms of Administrative Impact. There are administrative issues raised in option 1 like faulty selection process as the poorest households are selected through the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR) implemented by the DSWD using the Proxy Means Test. This test determines the socio-economic category of the families by looking at certain proxy variables such as ownership of assets, type of housing, education of the household head, livelihood of the family and access to water and sanitation facilities. However there are complaints that even a well off family with an OCW father wondered why they are included in the grant. There dubious issues of local government officials intervening in the selection process for political reasons. A heavy criticism of the program is the fact that it is perceived by the opposition as a program meant to buy votes of poor people. DSWD however point to the use of citizen’s cards which helps dissociate receipt of money from individual politicians and political parties. There are also fears that since a poor child can only receive cash grant until the age 14, there is a possibility that the child cannot finish schooling anymore after age 14. CCT has been criticized further — Because the people needs land, work and basic social services, not dole outs.‖ says Anakpawis Rep. Rafael Mariano (Bulatlat.com, 2010). The Catholic Church, through its National Conference of Bishops maintains that the program is addictive and leads its beneficiaries to — a culture of mendicancy.‖

A good thing in the program is that 4P has a Grievance Redress System, a mechanism to address and resolve issues and complaints. As of 18 July 2011, 72,476 complaints were received through the GRS. Out of the total grievances filed, 38.29% (27,752) have already been resolved. Meanwhile, a total of 155,944 households have been delisted from the program as of 27 July 2011. Of the total number of delisted households, about 96% (150,443) were delisted due to beneficiaries’ non-attendance
to community assemblies (CAs), verified and delisted by the DSWD Field Offices, and duplicates.

Option 2 on the other hand ensures strong monitoring and vigilance of the program through transparency and public accountability. But at the same time, there is equally clear evidence that the original objectives of NREGA have yet to be achieved on a large scale and its true potential as an instrument of rural transformation is yet to be fully realized. Quite apart from the issue of fraud, misuse of funds and corruption, structural issue have emerged-like, for instance, delayed payment to workers, inadequate attention to quality of assets being created, etc. the programme has not evolved into a demand-driven and right-based programme (Ministry of Rural Development, India, 2009).

From among the 3 alternative options, a combination of Pantawid Pamilya and India’s NREGA program (option 3) has the highest evaluation rating of 91.7 %. This implies that conditional cash transfer is deemed not enough to alleviate poverty in the Philippines. A study published by the Poverty Reduction, Equity and Growth Network (PEGNet), titled Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes and their Impact on Poverty Reduction: Lessons from Mexico and El Salvador, reveals that the CCT alone could not result in poverty reduction CCT programmes are not a panacea against poverty and social exclusion and its limitations should be addressed by creating other strategies which focus on more comprehensive policy reforms such as the creation of productive options, temporary employment programmes, access to micro-credit and micro-entrepreneurial opportunities, among others. No matter how much the Aquini administration spends on the CCT, reducing poverty in the country still boils down to adequate social services and jobs creation and more importantly, a national development strategy.

CONCLUSION

There are myriad possibilities for the persistence of poverty even in the midst of economic growth. Only a close diagnosis of particular circumstances will allow an accurate understanding. Policy makers and analysts should be sensitive to geographical, political and cultural conditions that each play a role. Poverty alleviation must go hand in hand with measures to increase national income. More than the Conditional Cash Transfer that provides short term assistance, a policy to enhance skills in order to strengthen labor market and employment guarantee should also be established as a prime strategy to reduce poverty.
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