4Ps Targeting

MARIA LOURDES SAGMIT MENDOZA

Secretary

House Committee On Poverty Alleviation

TIMELY dissemination of research findings, in the context of plans to integrate all ayuda-giving programs into 4Ps

"Expanding the 4Ps will be better because the 4Ps has a data-driven list of beneficiaries; unlike other ayuda programs that are indiscriminate and are prone to duplication like TUPAD, AKAP, AICS, and MAIP," - Senator-elect Panfilo Lacson added.

(Read more:https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/946596/lacson-eyes-ayuda-integration-under-4ps/story/More stories: https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/ Follow us: https://www.facebook.com/gmanews/)

The central policy question this study addresses is whether the 4Ps effectively targets and reaches its intended beneficiaries as designed by the program.

Who are the poor?
Where are they?
What do they need?

The study presents <u>other aspects of targeting</u> which the legislators ought to know, appreciate, and be concerned of:

1) data quality - accuracy of 4Ps beneficiary information

2) inclusion and exclusion errors and

3) factors that contribute to targeting errors

Reactions to Some Findings:

1 - On Interpreting Information Inconsistencies :

The Value of Monitoring

Some related questions:

1) How often do we go back and measure?
2) Can we provide a user-friendly tool to collect data?
3) Can city/municipal links collect these data regularly?

What are the policy implications of observed CHANGES?

Example 1: rural-urban movement
Example 2: change from having secondary education to beyond
                        secondary education
Example 3: work in agriculture / industry to being unemployed
Example 4: size of family from 6 to 9
Example 5: change of household head / responsible person

What are the policy implications of observed CONSISTENCIES?

Example : heads of families have "no education" through the years –

vis-à-vis policy proposal on EXPANDED 4Ps:
- **Alternative Learning System (ALS)**
- **Skills Training**
- **Entrepreneurship Training**

2 - *Methodology and Data Collection Evolution*

- **Expanding Scope of Welfare Indicators**

- **Issue on data consistency and data comparability across time**

- **CBMS data similar to DSWD data that reflect level of well-being of beneficiaries?**

- **DSWD's SWIDI apart from CBMS?**

3 – *Data Collection Scope and Targeting Methodology*

- **traditional measures (housing characteristics, asset ownership) to more nuanced indicators of vulnerability (overseas worker status, access to utilities).**

- **CBMS provides traditional measures. But will it generate indicators of vulnerability of beneficiaries?**

3 – Data Collection Scope and Targeting Methodology

- **Trade-offs between inclusion and exclusion errors**

  - **May we confirm if our lead implementing agency of the 4Ps program really has an "institutional preference for minimizing exclusion errors"?**

  - **Is it too much to ask that we minimize both inclusion error and exclusion error?**

4 – Model Structure and Components

Three key components of PMT model: 1) demographic characteristics (including household composition and dependency ratios), 2) housing conditions (ownership, building materials, structural quality), and 3) access to basic services (electricity, water, sanitation).

What are the key components of the CBMS?
Are they comparable to the components seen in the PMT model?
What should be our mental set in the issue of targeting beneficiaries once we start using CBMS in lieu of the Listahanan?

5 - *Distribution Analysis and Current Coverage*

- The targeting mechanism is effectively identifying and reaching its intended beneficiaries.

- However, the data also reveals concerning exclusion patterns: 8.54% of non-beneficiary households are found in the poorest decile, and 25.07% in the bottom two deciles combined. These exclusion patterns persist despite fifteen years of program implementation and multiple rounds of beneficiary identification.

- Need to improve coverage among the poorest households, particularly in the bottom deciles.

Targeting and Regional Location

- **Regional analysis suggests that the targeting system may be more effective in identifying poor households in areas where poverty is more prevalent and perhaps more visible.**

Questions:
- **What will happen to geographical areas with only pockets of poverty?**
- **Is exclusion error higher in these places?**

- **How can data on beneficiaries' poverty incidence and location be correctly used in making informed decisions regarding graduating households? (Issue of LGUs being caretakers of graduating households)**

Recommendation on:
Information Management Systems

Case of Joint Programming that includes:

1) harmonizing *Listahanan* data with CBMS

2) integrating vital information from other government agencies' databases.

2.1 DOLE employment databases for tracking labor market participation
2.2 LGU constituent management systems for local-level validation
2.3 PhilHealth and other social insurance databases for comprehensive welfare assessment
2.4 DepEd data in the Alternative Learning System and in the Enhanced Basic Education Information System for education monitoring.

Perfect CBMS Listing of Poor Households: A necessary but insufficient ingredient to effective targeting of 4Ps Beneficiaries:

The Proper Use of Inclusion Criteria under RA 11310

Food for Thought:

4Ps Database should go beyond Initial targeting and identification of potential qualified beneficiaries

- 4Ps database should be evolving and dynamic

- "Progress report card" particularly in the dimensions of health and nutrition, and education.

- This report card should contain information which covers targeting – enrollment in the program – Years 1 to 7 level of well-being on both dimensions – exit condition of each family member – follow-through five (5) years after graduation.

"No access to household member names from the Listahanan": A Reaction

Section 10 of RA 11310 mandated the PIDS to "conduct an impact assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the 4Ps, the veracity of the list of household beneficiaries and the program implementation".

Non-Issue: privacy protection protocols versus PIDS' mandate under RA 11310?

Maraming Salamat po!

Some Thoughts on
4Ps Grievance Redress System

(From the Legislative Perspective)

Maria Lourdes Sagmit Mendoza
Secretary
Committee on Poverty Alleviation
House of Representatives

Reactions to Some Results of the Study

1.Payment-related Grievance:
   Most Common

2. In-person Mode:
   Most Prevalent

Reactions to Some Results of the Study

3. Justice delayed is justice denied.

4. Ignorance of the law/rules excuses no one.

On Recommendations

1 **The Silo Phenomenon**

2 **The Value of Data**

3 **Competency Level and workload of case managers**

✓ **Openness to feedback on how well we served our clients**

✓ **Use of survey results as a factor in 360 degree feedback mechanism on performance of DSWD staff**

✓ **Relating feedback results to HR action on DSWD staff (regularization, promotion, benefits)**

On Recommendations

4   **Role of 4Ps Parent Leaders**

- **in disseminating updated, complete and accurate information to household-beneficiaries**

- **in assisting city and municipal links with case management**

- **Ultimately – in monitoring and evaluation – to contribute towards the effective and successful implementation of the law/institutionalized 4Ps**

PREVENTION
is better than CURE

Targeting of household-beneficiaries –

monitoring –

Exit from the 4Ps Program

From
BENEFICIARY

to
BENEFACTOR

(GK Tony Meloto)

Maraming Salamat Po!