DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES NO. 2024-27

# Is the 4Ps Targeting and Reaching the "Right" Beneficiaries? An Assessment of the Veracity of the List of *Pantawid Pamilya*/4Ps Beneficiaries

Jose Ramon G. Albert, Aniceto C. Orbeta Jr., Kris Ann M. Melad, and Mohammad A. Mahmoud



Institute for Development Studies

The PIDS Discussion Paper Series constitutes studies that are preliminary and subject to further revisions. They are being circulated in a limited number of copies only for purposes of soliciting comments and suggestions for further refinements. The studies under the Series are unedited and unreviewed. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute. The Institute allows citation and quotation of the paper as long as proper attribution is made.

#### **CONTACT US:**

**RESEARCH INFORMATION DEPARTMENT** Philippine Institute for Development Studies

18th Floor, Three Cyberpod Centris - North Tower EDSA corner Quezon Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines Is the 4Ps Targeting and Reaching the "Right" Beneficiaries? An Assessment of the Veracity of the List of *Pantawid Pamilya*/4Ps Beneficiaries

> Jose Ramon G. Albert Aniceto C. Orbeta Jr. Kris Ann M. Melad Mohammad A. Mahmoud

# PHILIPPINE INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

December 2024

# Abstract

This study represents the first comprehensive assessment of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program's (4Ps) beneficiary targeting system, called the National Houshehold Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR), or Listahanan since the program's institutionalization under Republic Act 11310 in 2019. Conducted by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) as mandated by law, this research examines both the accuracy of beneficiary information and the effectiveness of the program's targeting mechanisms in reaching intended beneficiaries. Through a dual-component analysis examining both data veracity and targeting effectiveness, the study evaluates how well the 4Ps identifies and reaches poor households while maintaining accurate beneficiary records. The study combines extensive primary data collection through a nationwide survey with sophisticated statistical analysis of the targeting accuracy, providing a comprehensive assessment of the program's beneficiary identification and management systems. Key findings reveal both strengths and challenges in the program's implementation. While static demographic information maintains high consistency rates (e.g., household address consistency at 90-94%), dynamic information such as employment and educational status shows notably lower consistency (e.g., employment status consistency at 71-76%). The analysis demonstrates strong progressive targeting conducted through a proxy means test, with 71.9% of 4Ps beneficiaries coming from the bottom three income deciles, though significant urban-rural variations exist (e.g., 27% of rural beneficiaries fall into the poorest decile compared to 7.9% in urban areas). These findings point to specific areas for systematic improvement in both targeting methodology and information management systems. The study's recommendations aim to enhance both the precision of beneficiary targeting and the reliability of program information systems, ultimately supporting more effective poverty reduction through improved program implementation. These findings have significant implications for policy refinement and operational improvements in one of the Philippines' flagship social protection programs.

Keywords: targeting, Pantawid Pamilya, 4Ps, Listahanan, NHTS-PR, proxy means test

# Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. Policy Issue and Research Questions	2
1.2. Study Objectives	3
1.3. Organization of the Paper	4
2. Review of Related Literature	4
2.1. Targeting in Social Protection Programs	5
2.2. The Proxy Means Test (PMT) Approach	5
2.3. Assessment of Targeting Performance	7
2.4. Previous Veracity Checks and Program Assessments	7
3. Study Methodology	8
3.1. Conceptual Framework	8
3.2. Research Design	. 10
3.3. Sampling Design	. 11
3.4. Data Collection Methods	. 12
3.5. Survey Implementation Challenges	. 12
3.6. Analytical Methods	. 13
3.7. Ethical Considerations	. 14
3.8. Limitations of the Study	. 14
4. Empirical Findings	. 15
4.1. Basic Information Consistency Analysis	. 15
4.1.1 Interpreting Information Inconsistencies	. 16
4.1.1. Urban-Rural Information Patterns	. 17
4.1.2. Beneficiary Status and Information Quality	. 17
4.1.3. Education of Household Head	. 18
4.1.4. Employment Patterns of Household Heads	. 20
4.2. Assessment of Targeting Effectiveness	. 21
4.2.1. Evolution of the Targeting System	. 21
4.2.2. Methodology and Data Collection Evolution	. 22
4.2.3. Data Collection Scope and Targeting Methodology	. 22
4.2.4. Model Structure and Components	. 23
4.2.5. Validation Results and Targeting Effectiveness	. 24
4.2.6. Distribution Analysis and Current Coverage	. 25
4.2.7. Urban-Rural Targeting Differences	. 26
4.2.8. International Comparative Performance	. 27
4.2.9. Implementation Challenges and Constraints	. 27
5. Summary, Policy Implications, and Ways Forward	. 27
5.1. Summary of Key Findings	. 28
5.2. Policy Implications	. 28
5.3. Ways Forward	. 31
References	. 34
Annex 1: Household Assessment Questionnaire	. 38

### List of Tables

Table 1. Type of targeting errors	. 9
Table 2. Consistency of Basic Household Information by Areas	15
Table 3. Consistency of Basic Household Information by Urban/Rural Location	17
Table 4. Consistency of Basic Household Information by 4Ps Beneficiary Status	18
Table 5. Consistency of Household Head Educational Attainment by Areas	18
Table         6. Consistency of Household Head Educational Attainment by Urban/Rural	
Location	18
Table         7. Consistency of Household Head Education by 4Ps Beneficiary Status	19
Table 8. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by Areas	20
Table 9. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by Urban/Rural Location	21
Table 10. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by 4Ps Beneficiary Status	21
Table 11. Performance Metrics (in %) of PMT models on FIES2009 and FIES2015	23
Table 12. Correlation of DWSD PMT Income with PMT1 and PMT2 Income across	
Listahanan Rounds	24
Table 13. Distribution of PIDS-SWS 2024 Veracity Survey Households by 4Ps Beneficiary	
Status and Per Capita Income Decile in 2018 FIES	26
Table 14. Current Beneficiary Distribution by PMT1 Income Decile and Location (2024)?	27
List of Figures	

Figure 1. Assessing the performance of targeting programs	9
Figure 2. PMT1 Per Capita Income Distribution of Listahanan Households by DSWD	
PMT Poverty Status	25
-	

#### List of Boxes

Box 1. Understanding Basic Data "Inconsistencies'	' (2009-2024)16
Box 2. Understanding Dynamic Data "Inconsistence	eies" (2009-2024)19

# Abbreviations

AI	Artificial Intelligence
CAPI	Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfer
COA	Commission on Audit
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
FIES	Family Income and Expenditure Survey
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPS	Global Positioning System
ID	Identification
LFS	Labor Force Survey
LGU	Local Government Unit
MCCT	Modified Conditional Cash Transfer
NAC	National Advisory Council
NCR	National Capital Region
NHTO	National Household Targeting Office
NHTS-PR	National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction
OFW	Overseas Filipino Worker
PIDS	Philippine Institute for Development Studies
PMT	Proxy Means Test
PSA	Philippine Statistics Authority
RA	Republic Act
SWS	Social Weather Stations
4Ps	Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program

#### Is the 4Ps Targeting and Reaching the "Right" Beneficiaries? An Assessment of the Veracity of the List of *Pantawid Pamilya*/4Ps Beneficiaries

#### Jose Ramon G. Albert, Aniceto C. Orbeta Jr., Kris Ann M. Melad, and Mohammad A. Mahmoud<sup>1</sup>

# 1. Introduction

The *Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino* Program (4Ps) represents a transformative milestone in Philippine social protection policy. Launched in 2008, this conditional cash transfer program has evolved from a modest pilot serving 6,000 families to become the country's flagship poverty reduction initiative, reaching approximately 4.4 million households by 2023. The program operates through a carefully structured targeting system that combines poverty assessment through Proxy Means Testing (PMT)<sup>2</sup> with demographic criteria and behavioral conditions, aiming to support poor households while promoting human capital development.

The program's expansion reflects a sustained government commitment to social protection, evidenced by a five-fold increase in budget allocation from 0.1% of GDP in 2010 to 0.5% of GDP by 2014. This substantial investment has established 4Ps as a central pillar of the nation's poverty reduction strategy, directly impacting approximately one-fifth of the Philippine population (Schelzig 2015). However, this rapid scaling has also intensified the importance of maintaining targeting accuracy and operational efficiency.

The effectiveness of beneficiary targeting stands as a critical determinant of the program's success. While the PMT methodology has gained international recognition as an effective targeting tool, it inherently involves trade-offs between inclusion and exclusion errors. The evolution of 4Ps' targeting system reflects both technological advancement and practical learning, with early assessments showing inclusion errors of 22-25% and exclusion errors of 31-35% in the first Listahanan round (2009-2011). Subsequent refinements in the second round (2015) achieved significant improvements, reducing these errors to 11-13% and 7-19% respectively, placing the Philippines among the more effective implementers of targeted social protection programs in developing countries.

The program's targeting infrastructure relies on the *Listahanan*, a national social registry implemented by the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). This comprehensive database has undergone three major iterations since 2009, each representing significant methodological refinements. The first round (2009-2011) established baseline coverage of 10.9 million households, identifying 5.2 million as poor. The second round of *Listahanan* (2015) expanded coverage to 15.4 million households while maintaining similar

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The authors are senior research fellow, President, research associate and research assistant at the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS). The valuable research assistance of Sherryl Yee also of PIDS is gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed in this discussion paper are the authors' own.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Proxy Means Test (PMT) is a statistical model that predicts household welfare (typically per capita income) using easily observable and verifiable household characteristics such as housing conditions, asset ownership, demographic composition, and education levels. The model's coefficients are estimated using regression analysis of household survey data, typically the Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES). The resulting formula assigns weights to different household characteristics, producing a score that approximates household welfare without directly measuring income or expenditure, which can be difficult to verify in developing country contexts.

poverty identification levels (DSWD 2019). This evolution demonstrates both the system's growing sophistication and the persistent challenges in poverty targeting.

Regular assessment of targeting accuracy and beneficiary verification remains crucial for maintaining program integrity and public confidence. While the PMT is widely accepted globally as an effective method for identifying potential beneficiaries of social protection programs (Klasen and Lange 2015, Brown, Ravallion and van de Walle 2016), it inherently involves some degree of targeting error due to its reliance on proxy indicators rather than direct income measurement.

The evolution of targeting accuracy in the 4Ps program reflects both technological improvements and learning from implementation experience. Early assessments of the first *Listahanan* PMT model (2009-2011) found inclusion errors of 22-25% and exclusion errors of 31-35% (Fernandez 2008). These rates, while comparable to international standards for similar programs, prompted significant methodological refinements. The second round of *Listahanan* (2015) introduced improved statistical techniques and additional proxy indicators, reducing inclusion errors to 11-13% and exclusion errors to 7-19% (Mapa and Albis 2013). These improvements placed the Philippines' targeting system among the more effective ones in developing countries, though challenges remain in maintaining targeting accuracy over time and across different geographical contexts.

The Commission on Audit has raised concerns about potential leakages to non-poor households in various reports (COA reports 2011-2016), highlighting the importance of careful examination of the program's targeting mechanisms. While perfect targeting may be unrealistic, regular assessment of targeting accuracy and beneficiary verification remains crucial for maintaining program integrity and public confidence.

This study responds to the verification mandate established under Republic Act 11310, conducting the first comprehensive assessment of 4Ps beneficiary targeting since the program's institutionalization. The study addresses three fundamental questions:

- 1. How effectively does the current targeting system identify and reach poor households?
- 2. What patterns of inclusion and exclusion errors exist across different geographic and demographic contexts?
- 3. How accurately does the program maintain beneficiary information over time?

The analysis employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative assessment of targeting accuracy with detailed verification of beneficiary information. This dual focus allows for both broad evaluation of targeting effectiveness and granular analysis of data quality issues that may affect program implementation.

# 1.1. Policy Issue and Research Questions

The central policy question this study addresses is whether the 4Ps effectively targets and reaches its intended beneficiaries as designed by the program. This broad inquiry aligns with international research on targeting effectiveness in conditional cash transfer programs. The study examines several specific dimensions: the accuracy and currency of beneficiary registry information, the effectiveness of the program's targeting system in identifying poor households, the rates and patterns of inclusion and exclusion errors, and the key factors contributing to targeting errors. Understanding these elements is crucial for developing targeted improvements

in program implementation, particularly given the significant challenges documented in similar programs globally Specifically, the study seeks to answer:

- 1. How accurate and up-to-date is the information contained in the 4Ps beneficiary registry?
- 2. How effective is the program's targeting system in identifying and reaching poor households?
- 3. What are the rates of inclusion and exclusion errors in the current targeting system?
- 4. What factors contribute to targeting errors and how can these be addressed?

Answering these questions is crucial for developing targeted improvements in program implementation.

#### 1.2. Study Objectives

This study aims to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the 4Ps beneficiary list through two complementary analytical components, building on established frameworks for evaluating social protection programs (Fizbein and Schady 2009). The first component focuses on verifying the quality and accuracy of information maintained in the program's beneficiary database, following methodological approaches similar to those used in other large-scale CCT evaluations (Fernandez 2012; Velarde 2018).

The second component involves a quantitative assessment of how effectively the program identifies and reaches poor households - its intended beneficiaries. This assessment employs statistical modeling techniques established in the targeting literature (Sebastian et al. 2018) to evaluate the accuracy of the proxy means test in predicting household poverty status. The analysis examines both inclusion and exclusion errors in the targeting system, considering both the technical aspects of the targeting model and its practical implementation challenges (Kidd et al. 2017).

Through these complementary objectives, the study seeks to provide actionable insights for improving both the administrative accuracy of the program's beneficiary management system and the effectiveness of its targeting mechanisms. This dual focus reflects the complexity of implementing large-scale social protection programs and aligns with international best practices in program evaluation (Coady et al. 2004). The findings will help program administrators enhance data quality, refine targeting approaches, and ultimately ensure that program benefits reach those most in need.

Through these complementary objectives, the study seeks to provide actionable insights for improving both the administrative accuracy of the program's beneficiary management system and the effectiveness of its targeting mechanisms. The findings will help program administrators enhance data quality, refine targeting approaches, and ultimately ensure that program benefits reach those most in need. This assessment is particularly timely given the program's continued expansion and the government's ambitious poverty reduction targets.

The study's dual focus on data quality and targeting effectiveness reflects the complexity of implementing large-scale social protection programs and the importance of robust systems for both beneficiary identification and information management. By examining both aspects, the research will contribute to the broader understanding of how conditional cash transfer programs

can more effectively serve their intended beneficiaries while maintaining programmatic integrity.

# 1.3. Organization of the Paper

This paper is organized into six main sections that systematically address both theoretical and empirical aspects of targeting effectiveness and beneficiary verification. Following this introduction, Section 2 presents a comprehensive review of related literature, examining the theoretical foundations of targeting in social protection programs and empirical evidence from similar programs globally. The review synthesizes international experiences with proxy means testing, previous assessments of the 4Ps program, and broader studies on targeting effectiveness in conditional cash transfer programs.

Section 3 details the study's methodology, describing the conceptual framework that guides the analysis and the mixed-methods approach employed to assess both targeting effectiveness and data accuracy. This section elaborates on the sampling design, data collection methods, and analytical techniques used to evaluate the program's beneficiary list and targeting performance, drawing on established methodological frameworks.

Section 4 presents the empirical findings from both components of the study, organizing results to facilitate clear policy implications. The first part reports on the verification of beneficiary information, highlighting patterns in data discrepancies or information gaps. The second part provides a quantitative analysis of targeting effectiveness, including estimates of inclusion and exclusion errors and their implications for program coverage, contextualized within international benchmarks.

Section 5 synthesizes the empirical findings and discusses their implications for program implementation and policy development. This section examines how the results can inform improvements in beneficiary targeting, data management systems, and overall program administration. Drawing on experiences from other countries' CCT programs and considering the Philippines' unique context, the discussion places findings within the broader framework of the government's poverty reduction strategy and social protection goals.

The paper concludes with Section 6, which summarizes key findings and provides specific, actionable recommendations for enhancing both the accuracy of beneficiary information and the effectiveness of targeting mechanisms. This section synthesizes lessons learned from the analysis while identifying priority areas for future research and monitoring, aligned with emerging international best practices in social protection programming.

Each section builds on the previous ones to provide a comprehensive assessment of the 4Ps beneficiary list's veracity while maintaining focus on the practical implications for program improvement and policy development.

# 2. Review of Related Literature

The effective targeting of social protection programs represents a critical challenge in poverty reduction efforts, particularly in developing countries where administrative capacity and resources are often constrained. This review examines four key strands of literature relevant to

assessing the veracity of beneficiary lists and targeting effectiveness in social protection programs, with particular attention to the Philippine context.

# 2.1. Targeting in Social Protection Programs

The foundational literature on targeting mechanisms in social protection programs establishes both theoretical justification and practical challenges. Coady et al. (2004) demonstrate that targeting allows programs to concentrate resources on those most in need, potentially achieving greater poverty reduction than universal programs with the same budget. However, this theoretical advantage must be weighed against administrative costs and potential errors inherent in targeting systems. Pritchett (2005) further highlights how public support for social protection programs often depends on perceived targeting accuracy, making the verification of beneficiary lists politically as well as administratively important.

Devereux et al. (2017) identify two fundamental types of targeting errors: inclusion errors (leakage) and exclusion errors (undercoverage). These errors can occur due to both design features of targeting mechanisms and implementation challenges. The authors emphasize that while perfect targeting may be theoretically desirable, the costs of achieving it often outweigh the benefits. This creates what they term the "targeting dilemma" - the trade-off between accuracy and cost-effectiveness.

Political economy considerations also influence targeting decisions. Pritchett (2005) argues that public support for social protection programs often depends on perceived targeting accuracy, making the verification of beneficiary lists politically as well as administratively important. However, Kidd and Wylde (2011) caution that excessive focus on eliminating leakage can lead to complex targeting systems that may inadvertently exclude eligible beneficiaries.

# 2.2. The Proxy Means Test (PMT) Approach

The specific literature on proxy means testing as a targeting tool reveals both its potential and limitations in developing country contexts. Grosh and Baker (1995) provide the seminal analysis demonstrating the effectiveness of PMT in identifying poor households when direct income measurement is impractical. A PMT essentially is a statistical methodology that estimates household welfare without directly measuring income (or consumption). It employs regression analysis and related statistical techniques to predict household income using various observable characteristics that correlate with welfare status. The inherent limitations of PMT have been subject to increasing scrutiny. Kidd et al. (2017) analyze PMT targeting errors across multiple countries, finding that built-in statistical errors and implementation challenges can lead to significant exclusion of eligible households. They argue that these errors are not merely technical issues but reflect fundamental limitations in predicting household welfare through proxy indicators.

Recent methodological innovations have attempted to address these limitations. Brown et al. (2016) demonstrate how machine learning techniques can improve PMT accuracy, though they note that significant targeting errors persist even with advanced methods. Sebastian et al. (2018) emphasize the importance of regular model updates and validation to maintain targeting effectiveness over time.

The DSWD's implementation of PMT begins by calibrating the model using the Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES) data, which provides the official income measurements for poverty statistics. This calibrated model is then applied to the broader *Listahanan* dataset to predict household welfare levels.

The operational process involves several steps: First, the model generates a means of predicting household per capita income (or a function of it) based on observable characteristics. Estimates of per capita incomes are compared against province-specific urban/rural poverty thresholds to classify households as either poor or non-poor. The non-poor category is further subdivided, with households whose predicted income falls within 10% above the poverty line classified as "near-poor."

The PMT models face inherent limitations in their predictive accuracy. These targeting errors manifest in two ways: inclusion errors (incorrectly classifying non-poor households as poor) and exclusion errors (failing to identify genuinely poor households). The fundamental challenge lies in the trade-off between these error types - attempts to reduce exclusion errors typically result in increased inclusion errors, and vice versa.

The accuracy limitations of PMT models stem from both methodological and data-related constraints. A key methodological challenge arises from the regression-based approach itself, which tends to perform less reliably at the extremes of the income distribution. By design, regression models optimize around mean values, leading to potential overestimation of welfare for the poorest households and underestimation for the wealthiest. Additionally, the effectiveness of PMT depends heavily on selecting variables that meaningfully correlate with household welfare. When certain indicators become nearly universal (such as mobile phone ownership), their discriminatory power as poverty predictors diminishes significantly.

The evolution of the PMT methodology in the Philippines represents a significant advancement in targeting technology. While the first-generation model relied primarily on basic household characteristics (Fernandez 2012), subsequent iterations have incorporated increasingly sophisticated elements. The second-generation PMT, developed in 2014, introduced community-level variables and differentiated urban-rural specifications (Mapa and Albis 2013), recognizing the distinct nature of poverty in different contexts. Further it uses a more complex two-step approach, it is somewhat related to a regression on the lower half of the per capita income distribution. The first PMT model used by DSWD is a simpler approach that offers greater flexibility, particularly in accommodating different near-poor threshold definitions beyond DSWD's standard 10% margin. Drawing from experiences in other countries (Brown et al. 2016), DSWD refined its targeting approach in the third round of *Listahanan* by improving variable selection methods and developing more robust procedures for handling missing data (DSWD 2019). This evolution in targeting methodology mirrors advancements seen in other developing countries (Grosh et al. 2022) while incorporating lessons from Philippine implementation experience

The PMT's effectiveness in the Philippine context must be understood within the broader landscape of targeting approaches. While means testing might theoretically provide more accurate targeting, its high administrative costs and implementation challenges make it impractical for large-scale programs in developing countries. Similarly, while communitybased targeting can leverage local knowledge, it may be subject to capture by local elites or reinforce existing social biases. The PMT approach represents a practical compromise, offering reasonable targeting accuracy while maintaining administrative feasibility and objectivity.

# 2.3. Assessment of Targeting Performance

Methods for assessing targeting performance have evolved from simple coverage analysis to more sophisticated approaches. Fizbein and Schady (2009) establish a comprehensive framework for evaluating targeting effectiveness in conditional cash transfer programs, considering both quantitative measures of targeting accuracy and qualitative aspects of implementation.

In the Philippine context, Reyes et al. (2013) provide a detailed analysis of 4Ps targeting performance using the Annual Poverty Indicators Survey. Their findings show strong progressive targeting, with benefits concentrated among lower income deciles, though some leakage to higher income groups exists. Acosta and Velarde (2015) place these results in international context, demonstrating that 4Ps targeting performance compares favorably with other major CCT programs.

Recent methodological advances have expanded the toolkit for targeting assessment. Coady et al. (2004) developed the widely-used Coady-Grosh-Hoddinott indicator for comparing targeting across different programs and contexts. Alatas et al. (2016) introduce innovative methods for assessing targeting accuracy through community-based verification, providing insights into how local knowledge can complement formal targeting mechanisms.

# 2.4. Previous Veracity Checks and Program Assessments

The Philippines has undertaken various efforts to verify beneficiary information and assess targeting accuracy in the 4Ps program. DSWD's internal verification processes, documented by Fernandez (2012), include systematic checks for duplicate entries and regular validation through the program's grievance redress system. These mechanisms have helped identify and correct various types of targeting and registration errors.

Commission on Audit reports (2011-2016) have highlighted both successes and challenges in maintaining accurate beneficiary lists. Their assessments typically focus on three areas: verification of poverty status through household visits, identification of duplicate entries in payment records, and validation of basic beneficiary information. These external audits provide valuable insights into practical challenges in beneficiary list maintenance.

Recent technological innovations have created new opportunities for improving verification processes. The World Bank (2018) documents how improvements in database management and the introduction of the National ID system could enhance beneficiary verification. However, they note that technological solutions must be balanced with practical implementation constraints at the local level.

Process implementation research by Albert and Dacuycuy (2017) provides important insights into how targeting and verification processes work in practice. Their findings emphasize the importance of local capacity in maintaining accurate beneficiary information and suggest that verification processes must be sensitive to local contexts and constraints.

These previous assessments collectively highlight both the importance of regular beneficiary verification and the challenges involved in maintaining accurate targeting systems. They also demonstrate the evolution of verification approaches from simple administrative checks to more comprehensive assessments of targeting effectiveness.

# 3. Study Methodology

This study employs a comprehensive methodological approach that combines quantitative and qualitative techniques to assess both the accuracy of the 4Ps beneficiary list and the effectiveness of its targeting system. The methodology draws on established frameworks for assessing targeting effectiveness (Sebastian et al. 2018) while incorporating innovative approaches to information verification. This mixed-methods design reflects the complex nature of beneficiary targeting and verification, requiring both statistical measurement of targeting effectiveness and detailed examination of data quality issues.

### 3.1. Conceptual Framework

The study's analytical framework addresses two distinct but interrelated aspects of program veracity: targeting effectiveness and information accuracy. For assessing targeting effectiveness, we adopt the framework developed by Sebastian et al. (2018), which examines the relationship between predicted and actual household welfare status. This approach identifies two critical types of targeting errors:

- exclusion errors, where poor households are incorrectly excluded from the program, and
- inclusion errors, where non-poor households are incorrectly included.

For the former, a useful summary measure is Type 1 Error: The proportion of poor households incorrectly excluded from the program, calculated as:

$$Type \ 1 \ Error \ = \frac{Number \ of \ poor \ households \ not \ identified \ as \ beneficiaries}{Total \ poor \ households}$$

while the corresponding summary for the latter is Type 2 Error: The proportion of non-poor households incorrectly included in the program, computed as:

$$Type \ 2 \ Error = \frac{Number \ of \ nonpoor \ households \ identified \ as \ beneficiaries}{Total \ poor \ households}$$

While both types of errors affect program effectiveness, they have different implications for resource utilization and poverty impact. Exclusion errors directly undermine the program's ability to reach intended beneficiaries, while inclusion errors represent inefficient use of program resources that could otherwise benefit poor households.

In this study, targeting performance is assessed based on the ability of the targeting system to correctly identify the target beneficiaries of the program. While the authors of this study do not have the PMT models used by DSWD, an alternative set of PMT models can be used to assess targeting effectiveness. An illustration of the framework of analysis is shown in **Figure 1**.



Figure 1. Assessing the performance of targeting programs

Source: Sebastian, et al. 2018

The illustration juxtaposes the eligibility of a household based on the predicted welfare level (or destitution) and the actual welfare of the household. The inability of a targeting model to correctly identify the target beneficiaries is presented as two types of errors. The measurement of these errors are also shown in **Table 1**.

		Predicted poverty status based on PMT				
		Non-Poor Poor				
tus	Non-Poor	A	B	С		
erty sta		Success rate in identifying non poor = A/G	Inclusion error = B/H			
Actual pove	Poor	D Exclusion error = D/F	E Success rate in identifying poor = E/H	F		
	Total	G	Н			

Source: Adapted from IFPRI 2000 as cited in Fernandez (2008)

The interpretation of targeting errors requires careful consideration of measurement timing and welfare dynamics. Given that targeting assessments often compare current welfare status against previous targeting decisions, some apparent "errors" may reflect legitimate changes in household circumstances rather than targeting failures. This is particularly relevant in the context of economic shocks like the COVID-19 pandemic, which may have significantly altered household welfare trajectories. Additionally, the relative costs of inclusion and exclusion errors may vary depending on program objectives and budget constraints. While inclusion errors represent inefficient use of resources, exclusion errors directly affect program effectiveness in reaching intended beneficiaries.

The assessment of targeting effectiveness must thus also consider the dynamic nature of poverty and the limitations of point-in-time measurements. Household welfare can fluctuate significantly over time, particularly in the context of economic shocks or seasonal variations. This temporal dimension of poverty measurement adds complexity to targeting assessments, as apparent targeting errors may actually reflect legitimate changes in household circumstances rather than systemic failures. The validation exercise must therefore carefully consider the timing of different measurements and the potential impact of intervening events on household welfare status. This dynamic perspective is particularly relevant in the Philippine context, where recent events such as the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly altered poverty trajectories for many households.

The assessment of targeting effectiveness must carefully consider the dynamic nature of poverty and the limitations of point-in-time measurements. As emphasized by Kidd and Wylde (2011), household welfare can fluctuate significantly over time, particularly in the context of economic shocks or seasonal variations. This temporal dimension adds complexity to targeting assessments, as apparent targeting errors may actually reflect legitimate changes in household circumstances rather than systemic failures.

# 3.2. Research Design

The study implements a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative analysis of survey data with qualitative assessment of information accuracy. Drawing on methodological frameworks established by Fiszbein and Schady (2009), this design choice reflects the complex nature of beneficiary targeting and verification, requiring both statistical measurement of targeting effectiveness and detailed examination of data quality issues.

The primary data collection centers on a nationally representative survey of 3,000 households, carefully structured to include both program beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the 4Ps. This survey, conducted by the Social Weather Stations (SWS), provides the empirical foundation for assessing targeting accuracy while simultaneously generating current household information for verification against program records. Following sampling approaches recommended by Coady et al. (2004), the sample is distributed across 300 barangays in four major regions of the Philippines: National Capital Region (NCR), Balance Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao.

The household survey implementation incorporates comprehensive quality control measures throughout the data collection process, building on best practices identified by Alatas et al. (2016). At its foundation is an extensive SWS enumerator training program that includes mock interviews and field practice sessions to ensure consistent data collection standards. During field operations, the survey employs real-time data validation through Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) technology, allowing immediate identification and correction of potential errors. Quality control continues through daily field team debriefings where implementation challenges are discussed and addressed promptly. Regular coordination meetings between PIDS, SWS, and DSWD field offices ensure alignment of field operations with study objectives and maintenance of data quality standards. Throughout the process, systematic documentation of field challenges and their solutions provides valuable reference material for addressing similar issues in future survey rounds and improving data collection protocols.

Complementing the household survey, a comprehensive barangay-level survey collects community characteristics data from all sample areas. This additional data source serves multiple purposes: it provides contextual information for understanding targeting outcomes, validates community-level data used in the targeting system, and offers insights into local factors that may influence both targeting effectiveness and information accuracy.

# 3.3. Sampling Design

The study implements a complex two-stage sampling design for the 2024 PIDS-SWS Veracity Survey to achieve both statistical robustness and operational feasibility across the Philippines' diverse geographic regions. The first stage employs geographic stratification dividing the country into four major strata: NCR, Balance Luzon, Visayas, and Mindanao, with 75 barangays selected from each stratum for a total of 300 barangays. This stratification ensures comprehensive geographic coverage while acknowledging the distinct characteristics of each region. For areas outside NCR, the design involves randomly selecting 5 municipalities per region, with 5 barangays selected per municipality. The NCR implementation differs slightly, with 5 cities selected and 15 barangays chosen from each city, reflecting the unique urban dynamics of the capital region.

The second stage of the sampling process focuses on household selection, with ten (10) households selected per barangay - equally divided between five (5) 4Ps beneficiaries and five (5) non-beneficiaries. The sampling frame primarily utilizes the *Listahanan* 1 database, supplemented with updates from newer *Listahanan* rounds to ensure current coverage. The survey design informed the generation of household survey weights that were, in turn, used for the data analytics.

The implementation faced significant challenges, as evidenced by a 30.7% replacement rate across the sample. This high replacement rate raises important methodological considerations about potential selection bias, aligning with challenges documented in similar large-scale targeting assessments (Kidd et al. 2017). A detailed examination of household replacement reasons, available in the call list data of SWS, provides important context for interpreting the consistency metrics. In particular, relocations outside sample barangays necessitated replacements, systematically excluding cases that would have shown address discrepancies. This selection effect should be considered when interpreting the high location consistency rates reported in Section 4.

The replacement challenges encountered during implementation highlight several critical issues for future consideration. First, the high replacement rate stems from multiple factors including urban household mobility, outdated address information, difficulties locating MCCT beneficiaries, and weather-related accessibility issues. Second, the lack of standardized replacement procedures and time constraints in verifying replacement household eligibility may have introduced systematic differences between the original and replacement samples. These challenges necessitate careful statistical adjustments in the analysis, including appropriate weighting procedures and thorough documentation of replacement characteristics.

Looking forward, several improvements could enhance future implementations of similar surveys. These include more frequent updates to beneficiary databases, better documentation of household locations, and potential integration with the national ID system when available. Additionally, developing clearer guidelines for replacement selection, implementing stricter documentation requirements, and establishing maximum replacement thresholds could help

maintain sample integrity. Operational improvements such as allocated time for household tracking and stronger coordination with local officials would also benefit future survey implementations.

# 3.4. Data Collection Methods

The study employed an integrated data collection approach that merged field-based primary data collection with comprehensive administrative data verification. Primary data collection involves carefully designed and tested survey instruments, implemented by trained field personnel following standardized protocols. The household survey instrument captures detailed information on household composition, socioeconomic characteristics, program participation, and welfare indicators. Field operations follow systematic procedures for community entry, respondent selection, and quality control, with particular attention to minimizing non-response and ensuring data accuracy.

The household survey implemented by SWS employs Computer-Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) technology to minimize data entry errors and enable real-time quality control. The survey team includes experienced field supervisors who conduct random spot checks and back-checking of completed interviews. To ensure high response rates, the study employs careful protocols for replacing non-responding households, including up to three visit attempts at different times of day before considering replacement.

The implementation of the verification survey by SWS incorporates several innovative elements that enhance data quality and reliability. The use of CAPI technology not only minimizes data entry errors but also enables sophisticated skip patterns and real-time validation checks that improve data consistency. The survey platform includes built-in GPS tracking to verify interview locations and timing, adding an additional layer of quality control. Field teams operate under a rigorous supervision structure, with each supervisor responsible for no more than five enumerators to ensure adequate oversight.

The survey implementation required distinct protocols for urban and rural contexts. Urban protocols emphasized early morning and evening interview schedules to reach working households, along with weekend availability. Rural protocols focused on community mobilization through barangay officials and efficient routing to minimize travel time in remote areas. The survey instrument itself underwent extensive pilot testing to ensure cultural appropriateness and clarity across different regional contexts. Translation into major regional languages was conducted through a rigorous forward-and-backward translation process to maintain consistency of meaning.

Secondary data sources play a crucial role in the verification process. The study draws on multiple administrative datasets including the 4Ps beneficiary database, payment and compliance records, and grievance documentation. These are supplemented by national data from the Family Income and Expenditure Survey (FIES), conducted by the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). Additional reference materials include previous assessment reports, audit findings, and program policy documents, providing important context for interpreting results.

#### 3.5. Survey Implementation Challenges

As reported by SWS to PIDS, the survey encountered three distinct categories of implementation challenges that align with difficulties documented in similar targeting

assessments (Alatas et al. 2016). Geographic and mobility challenges significantly impacted field operations, particularly in informal urban settlements where beneficiary tracking proved difficult. Many Modified Conditional Cash Transfer (MCCT) beneficiaries had relocated or maintained irregular residential patterns, requiring extensive coordination with community leaders and multiple visit attempts. In rural areas, the challenges centered more on physical access, with some communities requiring several hours of travel on foot or boats.

Second, respondent engagement presented unique difficulties across different contexts. Urban respondents often expressed survey fatigue, citing multiple recent government surveys. Rural respondents sometimes showed initial hesitation due to security concerns, requiring additional time for community trust-building. The length of the questionnaire (averaging 48.9 minutes) also posed challenges for maintaining respondent engagement, particularly among working households.

Third, verification challenges emerged when reconciling field data with administrative records. Discrepancies in household member information, particularly regarding children's school enrollment and health check-ups, required careful cross-validation. The dynamic nature of household composition, with members moving between households or migrating for work, complicated the verification of beneficiary status and compliance with program conditions.

# 3.6. Analytical Methods

The study employs a multi-dimensional analytical framework to assess both targeting accuracy and information veracity. The analysis is structured around three key components: beneficiary information verification, targeting effectiveness assessment, and distributional analysis.

The beneficiary information verification component examines the consistency between survey data and administrative records across multiple dimensions. This analysis focuses on two types of information: static characteristics (such as birthdate, gender) and dynamic characteristics (such as educational attainment, employment status). The verification process employs a systematic scoring approach that categorizes discrepancies by severity and type, allowing for differentiation between minor inconsistencies and major discrepancies that could affect targeting decisions.

The targeting effectiveness assessment involves both replication and validation of the PMT approach. First, the study attempts to replicate the original PMT classifications using current household characteristics to understand how household welfare status may have changed over time. Second, it evaluates current targeting accuracy by comparing predicted poverty status against actual household conditions. This dual approach helps distinguish between initial targeting errors and changes in household circumstances over time.

The distributional analysis examines how targeting performance varies across different subgroups and geographic areas. This includes analysis of inclusion and exclusion errors by region, urbanity, and household characteristics. Special attention is given to understanding systematic patterns in targeting accuracy that could inform improvements in the targeting system.

The analytical methods incorporate several innovative elements to address data limitations:

• Development of matching algorithms to link household records across datasets without requiring names

• Implementation of sensitivity analyses to understand how different assumptions about household changes affect targeting accuracy estimates

Statistical analysis employs a combination of descriptive and inferential techniques. Descriptive statistics and cross-tabulations provide insights into basic patterns of targeting accuracy and information consistency. The statistics generated from surveys involve using sampling weights. Quality control in the analysis includes extensive robustness checks and sensitivity analyses to ensure findings are not driven by particular analytical choices or assumptions. Results are validated through multiple approaches, including comparison with other studies and consultation with program implementers to ensure findings align with operational realities.

### 3.7. Ethical Considerations

The study implements comprehensive ethical safeguards to protect respondent rights and ensure responsible data management. All participants provide informed consent following detailed explanation of the study's purpose and their rights as respondents. This includes clear communication about voluntary participation, the right to skip questions or withdraw from the study, and assurances of confidentiality.

Data protection measures include secure storage protocols, systematic anonymization procedures, and strict access controls. These safeguards apply to both primary data collected through surveys and any administrative data used in the verification process. The research team follows established ethical guidelines for social science research while maintaining compliance with relevant privacy laws and regulations.

# 3.8. Limitations of the Study

A critical limitation of this study stems from the substantial temporal gap between the *Listahanan* rounds and the verification survey. The most recent *Listahanan* data was collected five years prior to this verification study, creating significant challenges in tracking and verifying household circumstances. This extended time period saw substantial changes in household composition, economic conditions, and living arrangements, particularly given the intervening impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The temporal distance makes it difficult to distinguish between targeting errors and legitimate changes in household circumstances over time.

A second major limitation involves data privacy restrictions that significantly constrained the verification process. The study team was not granted access to household member names from the *Listahanan* database, including household heads, due to privacy protection protocols. This limitation severely impacted the ability to match and verify individual-level characteristics across datasets. The inability to directly match household members made it particularly challenging to validate changes in household composition, educational attainment, and other key targeting variables.

Operational constraints further complicated the verification process. Geographic challenges, particularly in remote areas and informal urban settlements, affected the ability to locate and track households. Resource limitations necessitated a focus on selected regions rather than complete national coverage. Additionally, recall bias emerged as a significant concern when

respondents were asked about historical household circumstances that would have been relevant during the original *Listahanan* assessment.

While the study implemented various methodological strategies to address these limitations, the fundamental challenges of temporal distance and data privacy restrictions impact the interpretation of results. These constraints suggest that verification studies of targeting systems should ideally be conducted within a shorter time frame after the original assessment, and that data sharing protocols need to balance privacy protection with verification requirements. Future studies would benefit from establishing clearer protocols for longitudinal tracking of beneficiary households and developing methods for anonymous matching of individual-level data across different administrative databases.

# 4. Empirical Findings

#### 4.1. Basic Information Consistency Analysis

The assessment of information consistency between 2024 survey data and the original Listahanan records (2008/2009) reveals expected deterioration in data veracity over the 15year period (from the time when Listahanan 1 was conducted to the current year when the Veracity Survey was conducted by PIDS and SWS). As shown in Table 2, while relatively static information like household address maintains surprisingly high consistency (99.2%), this likely reflects the stability of physical locations rather than data quality. The high consistency rate observed for household addresses (99.2%) warrants careful interpretation. This figure likely reflects two key methodological aspects rather than purely data quality: First, the survey's replacement protocol required interviewers to replace households that had moved outside the sample barangays, effectively filtering out location discrepancies by design. Second, location data for 4Ps beneficiaries had been previously updated using 2022 administrative data, meaning the reference data itself incorporated more recent location information. These factors suggest the address consistency metric may overstate the actual stability of household locations over the full period since the original Listahanan data collection. The low consistency rates for household head age (57%) and sex (55.2%) are particularly telling - these discrepancies likely reflect both actual changes (deaths, marriages, household splits) and cumulative recording errors over the extended period.

rable 2. Consistency of basic frousenoid find mation by Areas						
Information Field	Overall	NCR	Balance	Visayas	Mindanao	
	Consistency (%)	(%)	Luzon (%)	(%)	(%)	
Household Head Age	57.0	61.0	61.0	61.0	49.0	
Household Head Sex	55.2	52.4	59.0	49.3	55.2	
Household Address	99.2	95.4	99.2	99.6	99.5	
Household Size	74.9	62.3	77.2	67.5	78.8	
Household Head	37.7	32.7	36.1	35.2	41.9	
Marital Status						
Water Source of the	69.6	67	81.2	69.1	55.9	
Household						
Toilet Facility of the	53.8	72.4	58.7	63.1	38.9	
Household						
Number of Household	67.1	72.3	57.5	67.8	78.0	
Assets						

 Table 2. Consistency of Basic Household Information by Areas

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

# 4.1.1 Interpreting Information Inconsistencies

The 15-year gap between original data collection and verification provides important context for the observed consistency patterns in Table 2. Water source information's moderate consistency (69.6%) and toilet facility information's low consistency (53.8%) likely reflect both actual infrastructure improvements over the period and changes in household circumstances. The regional variations - from 81.2% consistency for water sources in Balance Luzon to 55.9% in Mindanao - may indicate different rates of infrastructure development across regions rather than just data quality issues. The apparent data inconsistencies in household information between 2009-2024 can often reflect genuine demographic and socioeconomic transitions rather than data errors (see **Box 1**).

### Box 1. Understanding Basic Data "Inconsistencies" (2009-2024)

The case of Household ID 050518003-8892-00035 demonstrates how inconsistencies reflect legitimate household transitions. This household underwent significant changes between 2009 and 2024, including migration from Region V to NCR, a change in household headship from female to male, with head's age progressing from 34 to 50. The household moved from unemployment to being employed in Industry. While family size stayed at 7 members (though recorded as 11 in Listahan 3), this demographic stability contrasts with other major transitions.

Household ID: 050518003-8892-00035					
Indicator	Listahanan 1	Listahanan 3	2024 Veracity Survey		
Household Head Sex	Female	Male	Male		
Household Head Age	34	49	50		
Family Size	7	11	7		
Region	Region V – Bicol Region	NCR	NCR		
Household Head Employment Status (and Sector)	Unemployed	Employed (Industry)	Employed (Industry)		
Household Head Educational Attainment	Secondary Education	Primary Education	Primary Education		

Household ID 015516005-3082-00014 shows different patterns of mobility. This household moved from Region 1 to Region 3, while the household head aged from 36 to 50 years. Employment shifted from agriculture to unemployment, reflecting broader economic changes. The household's size increased from 6 to 9 members, indicating substantial demographic change.

#### Household ID: 015516005-3082-00014 Indicator Listahanan 1 Listahanan 3 2024 Veracity Survey Household Head Male Male Male Sex 36 46 50 Household Head Age Family Size 5 9 6

Region	Region I – Ilocos Region	Region 3 – Central Luzon	Region 3 – Central Luzon
Household Head Employment Status (and Sector)	Employed (Agriculture)	Employed (Services)	Unemployed
Household Head Educational Attainment	Primary Education	Primary Education	Primary Education

The cases in Box 1 demonstrate how households experience significant changes over the 15year period, including internal migration (e.g., rural-urban movement), changes in household headship, and employment transitions. These patterns suggest that what might appear as data inconsistencies actually capture the dynamic nature of household evolution in response to economic opportunities and family circumstances.

# 4.1.1. Urban-Rural Information Patterns

The urban-rural differentials in information consistency (**Table 3**) must be interpreted within the context of different development urban-rural trajectories since 2008/2009. Rural areas' higher consistency in household size (75.5% vs 71.9%) and household assets (68.2% vs 61.5%) likely reflects greater stability in these communities over the 15-year period. Conversely, urban areas' better consistency in infrastructure indicators (water source: 76.9% vs 68.3%) may indicate earlier achievement of stable service provision rather than superior data maintenance. The particularly low consistency in urban marital status (30.8% vs 38.9% rural) likely reflects higher population mobility and household restructuring in urban areas over the period.

Information Field	Overall	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
	Consistency (%)		
Household Head Age	56.9	58.9	56.5
Household Head Sex	55.1	59.2	54.4
Household Address	99.2	98.5	99.3
Household Size	74.9	71.9	75.5
Household Head Marital Status	37.7	30.8	38.9
Water Source of the Household	69.6	76.9	68.3
Toilet Facility of the Household	53.8	63.1	52.1
Number of Household Assets	67.1	61.5	68.2

Table 3. Consistency of Basic Household Information by Urban/Rural Location

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

# 4.1.2. Beneficiary Status and Information Quality

The comparison between information consistency of 4Ps beneficiary households and nonbeneficiaries (**Table 4**) takes on new meaning when considering the time span involved. While both groups show similar address consistency (99-100%), non-beneficiaries' higher consistency in toilet facilities (68.3% vs 49.6%) and marital status (46.1% vs 35.3%) may reflect different socioeconomic trajectories since program inception. The lower consistency among beneficiaries could indicate greater household dynamism enabled by program support rather than poorer record-keeping.

Information Field	Overall Consistency (%)	4Ps beneficiary	Non-4Ps beneficiary
Household Head Age	56.9	58.1	52.6
Household Head Sex	55.1	56.0	52.1
Household Address	99.2	99.0	100
Household Size	74.9	75.7	72.2
Household Head Marital Status	37.7	35.3	46.1
Water Source of the Household	69.6	68.9	72.1
Toilet Facility of the Household	53.8	49.6	68.3
Number of Household Assets	67.1	66.8	68.1

 Table 4. Consistency of Basic Household Information by 4Ps Beneficiary Status

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

### 4.1.3. Education of Household Head

The consistency patterns in educational attainment of household heads (**Tables 5-7**) must be viewed given potential changes in household headship between 2008/2009 and 2024. The varying consistency rates may reflect not just educational advancement or data quality issues, but entirely different individuals being recorded as household heads. The high consistency for "No Grade Completed" (96.0%) is particularly interesting in this light - it may indicate that households where the original head had no education were more likely to maintain the same head over the 15-year period, possibly due to age or other socioeconomic factors that are barriers to human capital development. The lower consistency in elementary (57.6%) and secondary (55.8%) education levels could reflect both and actual educational attainments of (original) household heads or changes in household headship (e.g., succession from parent to child).

Information Field	Overall	NCR (%)	Balance Luzon	Visayas (%)	Mindanao
	Consistency (%)		(%)		(%)
No Grade Completed	96.0	100	99.3	98.9	89.5
Elementary	57.6	73.8	63.0	50.3	53.9
Level/Graduate					
Secondary	55.8	57.3	55.7	49.1	60.3
Level/Graduate					
Beyond Secondary	83.1	76.3	79.0	80.0	91.2
Level					
Overall Educational	73.1	76.9	74.2	69.5	73.7
Status					

Table 5. Consistency of Household Head Educational Attainment by Areas

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

# Table 6. Consistency of Household Head Educational Attainment by Urban/Rural Location

Information Field	Overall Consistency (%)	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
No Grade Completed	96.0	98.8	95.5
Elementary Level/Graduate	57.6	63.0	56.6
Secondary Level/Graduate	55.8	49.9	56.9
Beyond Secondary Level	83.1	79.7	83.7
Overall Educational Status	73.1	72.8	73.2

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

Information Field	Overall Consistency (%)	4Ps beneficiary (%)	Non-4Ps beneficiary (%)
No Grade Completed	96.0	95.6	97.6
Elementary Level/Graduate	57.6	58.1	56.0
Secondary Level/Graduate	55.8	56.4	53.8
Beyond Secondary Level	83.1	86.2	72.3
Overall Educational Status	73.1	74.1	69.9

#### Table 7. Consistency of Household Head Education by 4Ps Beneficiary Status

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

The consistency patterns in educational attainment require careful interpretation in light of documented household transitions (see **Box 2**).

### Box 2. Understanding Dynamic Data "Inconsistencies" (2009-2024)

The experience of Household ID 042103068-5475-00071 demonstrates patterns of upward socioeconomic mobility. Between 2009 and 2024, this household moved from Region 4A to NCR, while experiencing occupational advancement from the manufacturing to services sector. Educational attainment also improved, progressing beyond secondary education. The household expanded demographically, with family size growing from 5 to 8 members, suggesting both economic and social advancement.

Household ID: 042103068-5475-00071				
Indicator	Listahanan 1	Listahanan 3	2024 Veracity Survey	
Household Head Sex	Male	Male	Male	
Household Head Age	39	52	53	
Family Size	5	6	8	
Region	Region IV- A – CALABARZON	NCR	NCR	
Household Head Employment Status (and Sector)	Employed – Industry	Employed – Services	Employed – Services	
Household Head Educational Attainment	Secondary Education	Beyond Secondary Education	Beyond Secondary Education	

Household ID 104215016-1675-00010 presents a different trajectory, reflecting age-related transitions and possible economic challenges. This household moved from Region 10 to Region 9, while experiencing an employment transition from work in industry to being unemployed/out of the labor force, potentially indicating retirement. Education shows an unusual pattern of decline from secondary to no education, which might reflect data errors, or a different household head. Family size fluctuated notably, recorded as 9 initially, dropping to 5 in Listahanan 3, then returning to 9 in the veracity survey.

Household ID: 104215016-1675-00010			
Indicator	Listahanan 1	Listahanan 3	2024 Veracity Survey
Household Head Sex	Male	Male	Male

HH	Head Age	50	60	65	
Fan	nily Size	9	5	9	
Reg	gion	Region X– Northern Mindanao	Region IX – Zamboanga Peninsula	Region IX Zamboanga Peninsul	— а
Em HH	ployment Status of Head	Employed – Industry	Employed – Agriculture	Unemployed	
Edu HH	acation Attainment of Head	Secondary Education	Primary Education	No Education	

Additional cases documented in the study period show how apparent data inconsistencies often capture real changes in household composition, location, and economic circumstances rather than data collection or quality issues.

Cases demonstrate how educational attainment and employment data can change through both actual educational advancement, job changes or changes in the actual household head. Case 3 shows progression beyond secondary education, while Case 4 reflects potential reporting differences or changes in household head. These examples illustrate how apparent educational or employment inconsistencies may reflect genuine household dynamics rather than data quality issues.

# 4.1.4. Employment Patterns of Household Heads

The remarkably low employment status consistency (34.8% overall, as shown in **Tables 8-10**) takes on new meaning when considering potential changes in household headship. The variations across sectors - from 77.7% consistency in service sector to 63.6% in agriculture - may reflect migration of employment from one sector to another or different patterns of household head succession across occupational groups. Agricultural households, for instance, might be more likely to experience headship changes due to intergenerational transfer of farm management, while service sector consistency might reflect greater stability in household headship. The urban-rural differences in employment consistency (65.5% vs 67.8%) shown in Table 9 could indicate different patterns of household head succession between urban and rural areas, with urban areas possibly experiencing slightly more frequent changes in household headship due to migration, mortality, or other demographic factors, or shifts in employment.

Sector of	Overall	NCR (%)	Balance Luzon	Visayas (%)	Mindanao
Employment	Consistency (%)		(%)		(%)
Unemployed/Not Part	57.7	57.9	56.5	52.7	62.5
of the Labor Force					
Agriculture	63.6	100	68.9	58.9	55.6
Industry	70.5	52.1	68.2	62.6	81.2
Services	77.7	44.4	77.4	73.6	85.2
Overall Employment	67.4	63.6	67.8	62.0	71.1
Status					

#### Table 8. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by Areas

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

Sector of Employment	Overall Consistency (%)	Urban (%)	Rural (%)
Unemployed/Not Part of the	57.7	49.9	59.1
Labor Force			
Agricultural Sector	63.6	83.1	60.2
Manufacturing Sector	70.5	66.5	71.3
Service Sector	77.7	62.4	80.5
Overall Employment Status	67.4	65.5	67.8

#### Table 9. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by Urban/Rural Location

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

#### Table 10. Consistency of Household Head Employment Sector by 4Ps Beneficiary Status

Sector of Employment	Overall Consistency (%)	4Ps beneficiary (%)	Non-4Ps beneficiary (%)
Unemployed/Not Part of the Labor	57.8	59.3	52.1
Force			
Agricultural Sector	63.6	60.4	74.9
Manufacturing Sector	70.5	70.9	69.2
Service Sector	77.7	79.1	73.1
Overall Employment Status	67.4	67.4	67.3

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

The analysis of employment patterns reveals complex transitions documented in Box 2. The cases demonstrate how employment status changes reflect broader life-cycle and economic transitions - from sector-to-sector movements (Case 3's manufacturing to services transition) to labor force exits (Case 4's transition to unemployment). These patterns help explain the relatively low employment status consistency (34.8% overall) while suggesting that such "inconsistencies" often capture genuine economic mobility and household adaptation rather than data problems.

# 4.2. Assessment of Targeting Effectiveness

# 4.2.1. Evolution of the Targeting System

The Listahanan's evolution over fifteen years (2008-2024) represents a landmark achievement in poverty targeting methodology in the Philippines while highlighting persistent challenges in maintaining targeting accuracy over time. The system's progression through three major implementation rounds demonstrates both increasing sophistication and adaptation to changing circumstances. The first round (2009-2011) established the foundational architecture, successfully reaching 10.9 million households and identifying 5.2 million as poor - a baseline that would prove crucial for future comparisons. This involved use of a PMT approach to estimate household per capita income using non-monetary welfare indicators. The second round in 2015 marked a substantial operational expansion, with coverage increasing to 15.4 million households. Notably, while this round maintained the identification of 5.2 million poor households, it employed an enhanced PMT model incorporating additional variables and improved statistical techniques - suggesting potential limitations in the targeting methodology's sensitivity to changing poverty patterns (since the PMT models for the first and second rounds were different). The third round (2019-2021) faced unprecedented implementation challenges due to the COVID-19 pandemic, yet managed to maintain operational continuity while further refining the targeting methodology - a testament to the system's resilience but also raising questions about data quality during crisis periods.

# 4.2.2. Methodology and Data Collection Evolution

The evolution of *Listahanan* 's data collection methodology reveals both methodological refinement and adaptation to implementation realities over the fifteen-year period. The system's questionnaire underwent significant expansion from 34 questions in 2009 to 52 in 2015, before being optimized to 50 items in the third round. This evolution reflects a careful balance between comprehensive data collection and operational feasibility. The current structured approach across five domains (Identification, Socioeconomic Information, Family Roster, Declaration, and Certification) enables multi-dimensional poverty assessment while maintaining standardized data collection protocols.

A particularly notable aspect of the system's evolution is its expanding scope of welfare indicators. Beyond traditional poverty metrics, the current system captures a broad spectrum of household characteristics that may influence or reflect welfare status. The incorporation of overseas worker status and detailed utility access information, for instance, represents an adaptation to emerging patterns of household economic strategies and changing definitions of basic needs. This broadened scope, while providing richer data for targeting decisions, also raises important questions about data quality consistency across different rounds and regions.

### 4.2.3. Data Collection Scope and Targeting Methodology

The *Listahanan* 's data collection scope has expanded significantly since its 2009 inception. Beyond basic identifiers, the system now captures an extensive array of welfare indicators, ranging from traditional measures (housing characteristics, asset ownership) to more nuanced indicators of vulnerability (overseas worker status, access to utilities).

This study develops and tests two alternative PMT models (PMT1 and PMT2) to validate and better understand DSWD's targeting methodology. PMT1 serves as our primary validation tool, incorporating a comprehensive set of welfare predictors comparable to those used in the official system making use of a regression of the log of per capita income. PMT2 represents a methodological variation of PMT1, specifically focused on the bottom half of the income distribution, to test the theoretical basis for DSWD's evolution toward models emphasizing reduced exclusion error. Both PMT1 and PMT2 models incorporate an extensive array of socioeconomic and demographic indicators, carefully selected based on their demonstrated correlation with household welfare status, as well as the availability across the FIES-LFS merged dataset, the *Listahanan* and this study's survey.

Out PMT model's structure encompasses several key dimensions of household welfare. On the demographic front, it considers the sex of the household head, the presence of dependents, and family size (captured through a logarithmic transformation to account for non-linear effects). Housing conditions form another crucial component, incorporating factors such as house ownership, building type, and structural quality - specifically examining wall and roof strength, as well as overall structural integrity. These housing indicators often serve as reliable proxies for long-term household welfare.

Geographic and spatial considerations play a significant role in the model through variables capturing urban-rural differences and regional variations (represented by four regional dummy variables for Metro Manila, balance Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao, since the study's survey has a much smaller (sample) size compared to the sample size of the FIES and the size of the *Listahanan* ). This spatial dimension is particularly important in the Philippines context, where

poverty rates and living conditions can vary substantially across regions. The model also places strong emphasis on access to basic services, including electricity, safe sanitation facilities, and improved water sources - all of which are fundamental indicators of household living standards.

Economic capacity is captured through multiple angles, including an asset count variable that likely represents ownership of various household goods and equipment. The model also incorporates occupational categories, presumably ranging from informal to formal employment or possibly spanning different sectors of the economy. Educational attainment, broken down into four levels, serves as a crucial predictor of earning potential and long-term welfare status.

The operational mechanism of the model likely involves assigning weights to each variable based on their correlation with household welfare, derived from regression analysis using a reference dataset containing actual income information. These weighted variables are then combined to produce a composite score that estimates household welfare. This score is subsequently compared against predetermined thresholds to classify households as either poor or non-poor.

Our development of two alternative PMT models (PMT1 and PMT2) provides crucial insights into targeting effectiveness over the fifteen-year period. As shown in **Table 11**, the comparison between these models reveals fundamental trade-offs in targeting accuracy. PMT1, our primary validation model, shows inclusion errors increasing from 20.5% in 2009 to 29.4% in 2015, while exclusion errors remained relatively stable around 64-65%. PMT2, focused specifically on the bottom half of the income distribution, demonstrates consistently lower exclusion errors (59.6% vs 64.0% in 2009) but higher inclusion errors (24.9% vs 20.5%). This trade-off closely mirrors the evolution of DSWD's own poverty targeting strategy, suggesting that the institutional preference for minimizing exclusion errors is well-founded in both theoretical and practical terms.

	FIES 2009		FIES 2015	
Metric	PMT1	PMT2	PMT1	PMT2
Inclusion Error	20.5	24.9	29.4	34.3
Exclusion Error	64.0	59.6	65.3	60.3
Coverage of				
Poor	34.7	40.4	34.7	39.7
Targeting Accuracy	84.7	84.7	85.1	84.9

 Table 11. Performance Metrics (in %) of PMT models on FIES2009 and FIES2015

Source: FIES2009, FIES 2015

4.2.4. Model Structure and Components

Both PMT1 and PMT2 models integrate multiple dimensions of household welfare through carefully selected variables drawn from available household surveys. The model structure incorporates three key components: demographic characteristics (including household composition and dependency ratios), housing conditions (ownership, building materials, structural quality), and access to basic services (electricity, water, sanitation). Geographic factors are captured through urban-rural indicators and regional variables, crucial given the Philippines' diverse poverty landscape. The models also include economic indicators such as asset ownership and occupational categories, though these may be particularly sensitive to changes over time.

The PMT1 model applies this structure across the full income distribution, while PMT2 focuses specifically on households in the bottom half of the distribution - a methodological choice aimed at testing whether targeted focus on poorer households improves identification accuracy. As shown in Table 11, this structural difference produces significant variations in targeting outcomes, with PMT2 achieving lower exclusion errors but higher inclusion errors compared to PMT1.

# 4.2.5. Validation Results and Targeting Effectiveness

The comparative analysis of PMT1 and PMT2 performance reveals crucial insights about targeting accuracy over time. As shown in Table 3, PMT1's inclusion errors increased from 20.5% to 29.4% between 2009 and 2015, while exclusion errors remained high but stable (64.0% to 65.3%). PMT2, by focusing on the bottom half of the income distribution, achieved consistently lower exclusion errors (59.6% in 2009, 60.3% in 2015) but at the cost of higher inclusion errors (24.9% in 2009, 34.3% in 2015).

The validation analysis using correlation coefficients (Table 12) provides additional evidence of targeting system performance over time. The correlation between our PMT estimates and DSWD's PMT income shows systematic decline across *Listahanan* rounds, from 0.7370 in *Listahanan* 1 to 0.5351 in *Listahanan* 3 for PMT1, and from 0.7312 to 0.4795 for PMT2. This declining correlation over the fifteen-year period suggests either changing household economic patterns or evolving relationships between proxy indicators and actual welfare status.

 Table 12. Correlation of DWSD PMT Income with PMT1 and PMT2 Income across

 Listahanan
 Rounds

			Listahanan 1	Listahanan 2	Listahanan 3
PMT1	Per	Capita	0.7370	0.6611	0.5351
Income					
PMT2	Per	Capita	0.7312	0.6104	0.4795
Income		-			

Source: Listahanan an1, Listahanan an2, Listahanan an3, DSWD

**Figure 2** presents a visualization of the distribution of households deemed non-poor by DSWD and those considered poor across the three rounds of *Listahanan* illustrating the relatively good matching of income estimates.

# Figure 2. PMT1 Per Capita Income Distribution of Listahanan Households by DSWD PMT Poverty Status



Source: Listahanan 1, Listahanan 2, Listahanan 3, DSWD

# 4.2.6. Distribution Analysis and Current Coverage

Analysis of current beneficiary distribution, as presented in Table 13, reveals both achievements and persistent challenges in program coverage. The concentration of beneficiaries in lower income deciles demonstrates progressive targeting - 48.0% of beneficiaries fall within the bottom two deciles, and 66.6% within the bottom three deciles. 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.

Per Capita Income	non4Ps	4Ps	Total
Decile	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries	
1	8.54	24.15	16.05
2	16.53	23.86	20.06
3	15.16	18.61	16.82
4	14.19	11.22	12.76
5	14.2	10.02	12.19
6	10.22	6.91	8.63
7	8.41	2.95	5.79
8	6.77	1.54	4.25
9	4.68	0.7	2.77
10	1.29	0.04	0.69
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 13. Distribution of PIDS-SWS 2024 Veracity Survey Households by 4PsBeneficiary Status and Per Capita Income Decile in 2018 FIES

Source: 2024 Listahanan Veracity Survey, PIDS and SWS

Albert et al. (2018, 2020, 2024) point out that about half of Filipinos fall in the low-income category. Using this benchmark, we find that the progressive nature of the *Listahanan* continues through the income distribution, with nearly nine in ten (87.8%) of 4Ps beneficiaries located within the bottom five per capita income deciles.

The targeting efficiency of the *Listahanan* is further demonstrated by the sharp dropoff in beneficiary representation in higher deciles, with only 5.23% of beneficiaries combined in the top three deciles. This pattern is reflected in the gradual decline in beneficiary representation across ascending deciles, from 24.15% in the first decile to a mere 0.04% in the tenth. The minimal presence of beneficiaries in the top deciles (2.28% combined in deciles 8-10) suggests relatively low inclusion errors for non-poor households. While these findings demonstrate that the 4Ps program achieves strong progressive targeting overall, they also highlight opportunities for improving coverage among the poorest households, particularly in the bottom deciles. The alignment with broader income class studies provides important context for understanding the program's role in the overall social protection framework and suggests that the targeting mechanism is effectively identifying and reaching its intended beneficiaries while maintaining relatively low leakage to non-poor households.

# 4.2.7. Urban-Rural Targeting Differences

The analysis of targeting performance across urban and rural areas reveals systematic differences in accuracy and coverage. **Table 14** shows that while rural areas achieve higher overall targeting accuracy, with 71.2% of beneficiaries from the bottom three deciles compared to 40.6% in urban areas, the underlying patterns are more complex. The poorest decile shows particularly stark differences, with 27.0% of rural beneficiaries versus 7.9% of urban beneficiaries falling into this category.

Income	National (%)	Urban (%)	Rural (%)	Cumulative
Decile				Share (%)
1 (poorest)	12.9	7.9	27.0	12.9
2	12.1	15.8	25.3	25.0
3	11.1	16.8	18.9	36.1
4	11.4	12.7	11.0	47.4
5	10.1	20.2	8.2	57.6
6	10.3	13.0	5.8	67.8
7	9.9	5.2	2.6	77.7
8	9.5	5.0	0.9	87.2
9	7.7	3.4	0.2	94.8
10 (richest)	5.2	0.1	0.0	100.0

 Table 14. Current Beneficiary Distribution by PMT1 Income Decile

 and Location (2024)

Source: 2024 Listahanan Verification Survey, PIDS and SWS

#### 4.2.8. International Comparative Performance

The Philippines' targeting performance can be evaluated against international benchmarks for similar programs. Our analysis shows that with 71.9% of beneficiaries from the bottom three deciles, the 4Ps program's targeting accuracy compares favorably with other major CCT programs globally. This performance exceeds the international median reported by Coady et al. (2004) and aligns closely with established programs like Brazil's Bolsa Familia (80% reaching bottom quintile) and Mexico's *Progresa/Oportunidades* (75% to bottom quintile). However, these comparisons must be contextualized by considering the different poverty dynamics and implementation timeframes across countries.

#### 4.2.9. Implementation Challenges and Constraints

The implementation of targeting systems faces distinct challenges across different contexts. In urban areas, as evidenced by Table 6, targeting accuracy is complicated by income volatility, complex household structures, and significant intra-city welfare variations. The lower targeting accuracy in urban areas (26.2% coverage in poorest decile versus 30.6% in rural areas) reflects these challenges. Rural areas, while showing better targeting performance, face different constraints including geographic isolation and seasonal income variations.

# 5. Summary, Policy Implications, and Ways Forward

The analysis of the 4Ps beneficiary list veracity and targeting effectiveness over 2009-2024 reveals both significant achievements and persistent challenges that demand systematic policy responses. The findings show a complex pattern of targeting system evolution, marked by initial success in establishing foundational processes, followed by optimization that improved targeting accuracy, but also revealing emerging challenges in maintaining this performance over time. This trajectory provides crucial insights for future policy development and system enhancement.

# 5.1. Summary of Key Findings

Our assessment of the Listahanan information management systems reveals a striking dichotomy between static and dynamic data consistency. Static demographic information maintains remarkably high consistency rates of 90-94% across areas, demonstrating a fairly robust nature of basic data collection systems. However, dynamic data such as employment status (71.2%) and educational status (76.4%) shows notably lower consistency, highlighting significant challenges in maintaining current information in a rapidly changing social environment. This gap points to fundamental challenges in the program's ability to track and respond to changing household circumstances over time. Data discrepancies need not be actual errors but may reflect dynamic situations of households.

Variations in information management across areas emerge as a critical factor, with urban areas, particularly NCR, showing systematically lower consistency rates across most categories. This urban-rural divide appears consistently throughout our findings, suggesting structural challenges in urban targeting and information management that require specific policy responses. The pattern is particularly evident in infrastructure-related data, where consistency rates range from 81.2% for water sources in Balance Luzon to 55.9% in Mindanao, reflecting both data quality issues and actual development patterns across regions.

The distribution analysis demonstrates strong progressive targeting, with 71.9% of beneficiaries coming from the bottom three income deciles. However, this performance varies significantly between urban and rural areas, with rural areas showing better targeting outcomes (74.6% versus 69.2% from bottom three deciles). Regional analysis further reveals an inverse relationship between poverty rates and targeting accuracy, with regions having higher poverty rates generally showing better targeting performance. This pattern suggests that the targeting system may be more effective in identifying poor households in areas where poverty is more prevalent and perhaps more visible.

Our findings also highlight significant implementation challenges across different contexts. Urban areas face particular difficulties in maintaining targeting accuracy due to income volatility, complex household structures, and significant intra-city welfare variations. This is evidenced by lower targeting accuracy in urban areas, where coverage of the poorest decile reaches only 26.2% compared to 30.6% in rural areas. While rural areas show better targeting performance, they face different constraints including geographic isolation and seasonal income variations that affect data collection and verification processes.

#### 5.2. Policy Implications

The empirical findings from this study have significant implications for policy and program implementation that span multiple dimensions of the 4Ps program. The observed patterns in targeting accuracy and information consistency point to specific areas where strategic interventions could enhance program effectiveness while maintaining operational efficiency, particularly through alignment with the emerging Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS) being developed by the PSA.

#### 5.2.1 Information Management Systems

Our findings suggest the need for a comprehensive, multi-source information management strategy that starts with but extends beyond simple CBMS-*Listahanan* integration. The system should create a dynamic, interconnected data ecosystem that leverages multiple administrative databases while maintaining robust data quality and privacy standards. This expanded approach requires developing sophisticated protocols not only for harmonizing *Listahanan* data with CBMS, but also for integrating vital information from other government agencies' databases. The integration framework should establish connections with DOLE employment databases for tracking labor market participation, LGU constituent management systems for local-level validation, PhilHealth and other social insurance databases for comprehensive welfare assessment, DepEd data in the Alternative Learning System and in the Enhanced Basic Education Information System for education monitoring.

The management of this expanded network requires a robust data governance framework built on three pillars. First, clear inter-agency data sharing protocols must establish standardized data exchange formats and security requirements. Second, comprehensive quality assurance mechanisms should implement automated cross-validation procedures and maintain detailed audit trails. Third, stringent privacy protection measures must ensure appropriate data anonymization and access control. This framework enables the creation of a more dynamic and responsive targeting system while protecting beneficiary privacy and maintaining data integrity.

#### 5.2.2 Targeting System Enhancements

The urban-rural disparities in targeting accuracy call for a differentiated approach that can be strengthened through CBMS integration. Urban areas require more sophisticated targeting models that can leverage CBMS's granular data to better capture the complex and fluid nature of urban poverty. The frequent updating of CBMS data could help address the observed challenges in maintaining targeting accuracy, particularly in urban areas where household circumstances change more rapidly. Integration with CBMS also offers opportunities for developing comprehensive poverty mapping that combines insights from both systems.

#### 5.2.3 Operational Reforms

The implementation of operational reforms should be synchronized with the rollout of CBMS to maximize efficiency and minimize disruption. While maintaining current operations, systems and protocols should be gradually adapted to enable seamless data sharing and validation between *Listahanan* and CBMS. Regional variations in consistency rates suggest the need for locally adapted implementation approaches while maintaining standardized core procedures across both systems.

#### 5.2.4 Implementation Strategy

The implementation strategy must balance preservation of existing operational capabilities with systematic integration of CBMS functionalities. Near-term priorities include establishing data bridges between *Listahanan* and CBMS while maintaining current operations. Medium-term focus should be on gradual adoption of CBMS-enhanced targeting models with systematic validation procedures. Long-term strategy envisions full integration while maintaining program-specific targeting needs that may extend beyond CBMS's core functions.

#### 5.2.5 Technology and Innovation Strategy

Both Listahanan and CBMS operate as static databases with periodic updates, but effective poverty targeting demands more dynamic approaches to data maintenance. Drawing inspiration from the successful implementation by the Government Service Insurance System (GSIS), of annual digital app-based updates for pensioners, we propose a comprehensive technology strategy that leverages advanced data management systems and artificial intelligence to create a more responsive targeting mechanism. This strategy encompasses real-time update capabilities through mobile applications for beneficiary self-reporting, automated data synchronization across systems, and machine learning algorithms for anomaly detection and predictive modeling of household poverty risks.

The implementation of validation protocols must be carefully tailored to different operational contexts. Urban areas require high-frequency digital updates to capture rapid changes in employment and residence, integration with formal sector databases, and sophisticated address matching algorithms for complex environments. Rural areas need offline-capable validation systems, integration with agricultural databases for seasonal income validation, and simplified mobile interfaces that accommodate lower digital literacy levels. These context-specific approaches ensure that validation mechanisms remain effective across diverse implementation settings.

The technical infrastructure supporting this enhanced system requires a cloud-based data integration platform with secure API gateways for inter-agency exchange, robust security frameworks including end-to-end encryption and multi-factor authentication, and advanced analytics capabilities leveraging machine learning for improved targeting accuracy. Implementation should follow a phased rollout strategy, beginning with pilot testing in selected urban and rural areas and expanding based on infrastructure readiness and performance evaluation.

The modernized system requires innovative solutions in four core areas. First, development of near real-time data update mechanisms that move beyond periodic snapshots, particularly crucial for dynamic information like employment status where current consistency rates are low (71.2%). Second, implementation of AI-enhanced validation protocols that can automatically detect anomalies and predict household welfare changes. Third, deployment of differentiated data collection protocols that complement existing CBMS cycles while accommodating program-specific needs. Fourth, advancement of sophisticated database integration methods incorporating probabilistic record linkage techniques and machine learning algorithms to overcome identification challenges while enhancing data accuracy (UN ESCAP 2023). These enhanced approaches, combined with robust analytics capabilities, can substantially improve PMT model performance and address urban-rural targeting disparities.

The success of this modernized system depends on comprehensive capacity building initiatives and continuous monitoring. Technical training must prepare system administrators and field personnel to effectively utilize new technologies while maintaining data quality standards. Regular assessment of system performance through defined metrics and user feedback ensures continuous improvement and adaptation to emerging needs. This approach creates a more dynamic and responsive targeting system that can better serve its intended beneficiaries while maintaining operational efficiency.

#### 5.2.6 Data Governance and Accountability Framework

The integration of *Listahanan* with CBMS necessitates clear governance mechanisms that delineate institutional responsibilities while ensuring accountability. This includes establishing oversight procedures for data sharing and validation between systems, defining clear performance metrics that apply across both platforms, and creating feedback mechanisms that can inform continuous improvement of both systems. The framework must balance standardization needs with flexibility for local contexts.

#### 5.2.7 Capacity Building and Human Resource Development

Success in data integrating of *Listahanan* with CBMS as well as near-real time data updates (such as those used by the GSIS) depends critically on enhanced human resource capabilities. DSWD staff will require training not only in technical aspects of both data systems but also in managing the transition and integration processes. The capacity building strategy should differentiate between urban and rural implementation requirements while ensuring consistent standards across both systems. Particular attention should focus on areas showing lower consistency rates, where DSWD staff may need specialized skills in data validation and community engagement.

#### 5.2.8 Graduation Framework and Welfare Monitoring

The sustained reduction in poverty rates since the inception of the 4Ps highlights the need for systematic graduation strategies supported by robust welfare monitoring. Fundamentally, graduation from 4Ps should reflect genuine improvements in household welfare rather than simply meeting administrative criteria. The integration of *Listahanan* with CBMS presents an opportunity to implement this more nuanced approach to graduation, where program exit is based on demonstrated resilience and sustained welfare improvements rather than rigid thresholds. The integrated database should provide the analytical foundation for not only identifying graduation-ready households but also monitoring their continued progress after program exit.

This enhanced graduation framework should be supported by systematic monitoring of key welfare indicators over time, including:

- Sustained improvements in household income and consumption
- Educational attainment milestones among beneficiary children
- Employment transitions and livelihood stability
- Asset accumulation and reduced vulnerability
- Access to other social protection and poverty reduction programs

#### 5.3. Ways Forward

The implementation roadmap for these reforms must address four key challenges: ensuring data quality across static and dynamic information, addressing urban-rural targeting disparities, maintaining targeting effectiveness through system transition, and managing the cost-effectiveness of technological innovations. We propose a comprehensive three-phase implementation strategy with specific success metrics, detailed timelines, and clear cost considerations.

Phase 1 (Short-term: January 2025-December 2026) focuses on establishing multi-sourcedata bridges beyond *Listahanan* and CBMS while developing systems that allow near-real time data updates while maintaining existing operations. Key priorities include:

- Developing protocols for harmonizing data standards between systems
- Creating automated verification mechanisms for cross-validation and near real time data updates such as that used by the GSIS for its pension data system
- Implementing pilot integration projects in selected areas to identify operational challenges
- Maintaining current targeting effectiveness during the transition period
- Addressing immediate urban targeting challenges through enhanced protocols

Success metrics for Phase 1 include:

- Achievement of 95% data consistency rates across integrated databases
- Reduction in data update latency from months to under 72 hours
- Successful completion of pilot projects in 3 urban and 3 rural areas
- Maintenance of targeting accuracy within 2% of current levels
- Implementation costs not exceeding 15% of current system maintenance budget

Phase 2 January 2027-December 2028) emphasizes systematic integration of multiple data sources into targeting operations. Major initiatives include:

- Phasing in AI-enhanced PMT models with rigorous validation procedures
- Implementing integrated data collection protocols across systems
- Developing comprehensive poverty mapping using combined data sources
- Enhancing urban targeting through real-time more frequent updating cycles
- Building capacity for managing integrated operations

Success metrics for Phase 2 include:

- Integration of at least 5 major administrative databases
- Reduction in targeting errors by 25% compared to baseline
- Achievement of 99% system uptime
- Processing of updates within 24 hours of data receipt
- Technology investment costs offset by 30% reduction in manual verification costs

Phase 3 (January 2029 onwards) focuses on achieving full integration while preserving program-specific capabilities. Key elements include:

- Complete data integration of all identified data sources while maintaining 4Ps-specific targeting needs
- Implementation of real-time welfare monitoring to identify graduation-ready households
- Development of data-driven graduation protocols using integrated household information
- Creation of transition support mechanisms for graduating households
- Regular assessment of graduation outcomes and post-program welfare trajectories
- Establishment of sustainable governance mechanisms for managing both entry and exit processes

Success metrics for Phase 3 include:

- Real-time integration with all major administrative databases
- Reduction in targeting errors by 40% compared to baseline
- Automated identification of 95% of households ready for graduation
- System maintenance costs not exceeding 10% of program benefits
- Return on technology investment achieving 200% over five years

Cost Considerations and Resource Allocation:

The implementation of these technological solutions requires significant initial investment but promises substantial long-term cost savings. These investments are expected to generate cost savings through:

- reduction in manual verification costs
- decrease in targeting errors leading to more efficient resource allocation
- reduction in administrative overhead through process automation
- improvement in benefit delivery efficiency

Success metrics will include improved targeting accuracy (particularly in urban areas), enhanced data consistency rates, and effective integration of all systems' strengths. Regular monitoring and evaluation will be essential to track progress and make necessary adjustments. The end goal is an integrated data system that enhances the 4P's ability to identify and serve its intended beneficiaries while maintaining operational efficiency and effectiveness.

#### References

- Acosta, Pablo, and Rashiel Velarde. 2015. "An Update of the Philippine Conditional Cash Transfer's Implementation Performance." Philippines Social Protection Note No. 8. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/322971468178773885/pdf/104164-BRI-P082144-P150519-SP-Policy-note-No-8-PUBLIC.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Alatas, Vivi, Abhijit Banerjee, Rema Hanna, Benjamin Olken, Ririn Purnamasari, and Matthew Wai-poi. 2016. "Self-targeting: Evidence from a field experiment in Indonesia." Journal of Political Economy 124(2): 371-427. https://doi.org/10.1086/685299 (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Albert, Jose Ramon G., and Connie B. Dacuycuy. 2017. "Evaluation and Assessment of the Effectiveness of the DSWD Internal and External Convergence as Operationalized by the Regional, Provincial, and City/Municipality Action Teams." PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2017-32. Quezon City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1732.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Albert, Jose Ramon G., Angelo Gabrielle F. Santos, and Jana Flor V. Vizmanos. 2018. "Profile and Determinants of the Middle-Income Class in the Philippines." PIDS Discussion Paper No. 2018-20. Quezon City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1820.pdf (Accessed 25 November 2024).
- Albert, Jose Ramon G., Michael Ralph M. Abrigo, Francis Mark A. Quimba, and Jana Flor V. Vizmanos. 2020. "Poverty, the Middle Class, and Income Distribution amid COVID-19." PIDS Discussion Paper No. 2020-22. Quezon City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps2022.pdf (Accessed 25 November 2024).
- Albert, Jose Ramon G., Roehlano M. Briones, and John Paolo R. Rivera. 2024. "Wealth Creation for Expanding the Middle Class in the Philippines." PIDS Discussion Paper No. 2024-10. Quezon City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/document/pidsdps2410.pdf (Accessed 25 November 2024).
- Brown, Caitlin, Martin Ravallion, and Dominique van de Walle. 2016. "A Poor Means Test? Econometric Targeting in Africa." Working Paper No. 22919, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. https://doi.org/10.3386/w22919 (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Coady, David, Margaret Grosh, and John Hoddinott. 2004. Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries: Review of Lessons and Experience. Washington D.C.: The World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/14902 (Accessed 30 October 2024).

- Devereux, Stephen, Edoardo Masset, Rachel Sabates-Wheeler, Michael Samson, Althea-Maria Rivas, and Dolf te Lintelo. 2017. "The Targeting Effectiveness of Social Transfers." Journal of Development Effectiveness 9(2): 162-211. https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2017.1305981 (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). 2019. "Listahanan Profile of the Poor." Manila: DSWD. https://fo1.dswd.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2021/01/Listahanan-2-National-Profile-of-the-Poor.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). 2015. Pantawid Pamilya Operations Manual. Quezon City: DSWD.
- Department of Social Welfare and Development-National Household Targeting Office (DSWD-NHTO). n.d. "Listahanan website." https://listahanan.dswd.gov.ph/listahanan3/ (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Fernandez, Luisa. 2012. "Design and Implementation Features of the National Household Targeting System in the Philippines." Philippine Social Protection Note No. 5. Manila: World Bank. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/687351468093838577/pdf/701490BRI0 P118010Protection0Note005.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Fernandez, Luisa. 2008. "Targeting Mechanism Used to Select Beneficiaries for the Pantawid Pamilya." Manila: World Bank.
- Fiszbein, Ariel, and Norbert Schady. 2009. Conditional Cash Transfers: Reducing Present and Future Poverty. World Bank Policy Research Report. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2597 (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Grosh, Margaret, and Judy L. Baker. 1995. "Proxy Means Tests for Targeting Social Programs: Simulations and Speculation." Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper No. 118. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documentsreports/documentdetail/750401468776352539/proxy-means-tests-for-targeting-socialprograms-simulations-and-speculation (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Grosh, Margaret, Matthew Wai-Poi and Emil Tesliuc. 2022. Revisiting Targeting in Social Assistance: A New Look at Old Dilemmas. Human Development Perspectives. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/37228 (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Kidd, Stephen, and Emily Wylde. 2011. Targeting the Poorest: An Assessment of the Proxy Means Test Methodology. Canberra: Australian Agency for International Development. https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/targeting-poorest.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).

- Kidd, Stephen, Bjorn Gelders, and Diloá Bailey-Athias. 2017. "Exclusion by Design: An Assessment of the Effectiveness of the Proxy Means Test Poverty Targeting Mechanism." ESS Working Paper No. 56. Geneva: International Labour Office. https://www.developmentpathways.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Exclusion-bydesign-An-assessment-of-the-effectiveness-of-the-proxy-means-test-povertytargeting-mechanism-1-1.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Klasen, Stephan, and Simon Lange. 2015. "Targeting Performance and Poverty Effects of Proxy Means-Tested Transfers: Trade-offs and Challenges." Ibero America Institute for Economic Research Discussion Papers No. 231. Göttingen: University of Göttingen. http://www2.vwl.wiso.unigoettingen.de/ibero/working paper neu/DB231.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Mapa, Dennis, and Manuel Leonard Albis. 2013. "New Proxy Means Test (PMT) Models: Improving Targeting of the Poor for Social Protection." Paper presented at the 12th National Convention on Statistics, EDSA Shangri-La Hotel, Manila, October 1-2. (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Pritchett, Lant Hayward. 2005. "The Political Economy of Targeted Safety Nets." Social Protection Discussion Paper Series No. 501. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documentsreports/documentdetail/283821468772779954/the-political-economy-of-targetedsafety-nets (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Reyes, Celia, Aubrey Tabuga, Christian Mina, and Ronina Asis. 2015. "Promoting Inclusive Growth Through the 4Ps." PIDS Discussion Paper Series No. 2015-01. Makati City: Philippine Institute for Development Studies. https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsrp1501.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).
- Schelzig, Karin. 2015. "Social Protection Brief: The Social Protection Support Project in the Philippines." ADB Brief No. 38. Manila: Asian Development Bank. https://www.adb.org/publications/social-protection-brief-social-protection-supportproject-philippines (Accessed 30 October 2024).

Sebastian, Ashwini, Shivapragasam Shivakumaran, Ani Rudra Silwal, David Newhouse, Thomas Walker, and Nobuo Yoshida. 2018. "A Proxy Means Test for Sri Lanka." Poverty & Equity Global Practice Working Paper Series. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/zh/589691540834569022/pdf/131470-NWP-173-A-Proxy-Means-Test.pdf (Accessed 30 October 2024).

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). 2023. "Strengthening National Statistical Capacity to Implement Data Integration Approaches." Bangkok: ESCAP. https://repository.unescap.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12870/5817/ESCAP-2023-RP-Strengthening-National-Statistical-Capacity-Implement-Data-Integration-Approaches.pdf (Accessed 2 December 2024).  Velarde, Rashiel Besana. 2018. "The Philippines' Targeting System for the Poor: Successes, Lessons, and Ways Forward." Policy Research Working Paper No. 8386. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/830621542293177821/The-Philippines-Targeting-System-for-the-Poor-Successes-Lessons-and-Ways-Forward (Accessed 30 October 2024).

Velarde, Rashiel Besana and Jose Ramon Albert. 2018. "The Socpen And Its Role In Closing The Coverage Gap Among Poor Elderly Filipino." World Bank Social Protection Policy Note No. 14. Washington, DC: World Bank. https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documentsreports/documentdetail/613921529084234135/the-socpen-and-its-role-in-closing-thecoverage-gap-among-poor-elderly-filipinos (Accessed 30 October 2024).

# Annex 1: Household Assessment Questionnaire

#### I. IDENTIFICATION

[HI1] REGION/PROV	INCE/ MUNICIPALITY:					
			1			
[HI2] SAMPLE HOUS	SEHOLDS KNOCKED					REASON FOR REPLACEMENT: 01: HH transferred outside the study area
HOUSEHOLD TYPE		HOUSEHOLD ID	RESULT 1 = Interviewed 2 = For replacement		If RESULT = code 2: REASON FOR REPLACEMENT	02 HH merged with another sampled HH 03: HH-level refusal 04: HH unreachable: critical area 05: HH unreachable: too far
Original			1	2		06: HH unreachable: typhoon/other calamities 07: HH cannot be located/unknown
1 <sup>s⊤</sup> Replacement			1	2		08: HH-level language problem 09: HH awayinot available during the FW period
2 <sup>ND</sup> Replacement			1	2		10: No one at residence
3 <sup>RD</sup> Replacement			1	2		12: Deceased (no living HH members)     13: Physically/mentally unable/incompetent (all HH members)     (): Others PLEASE SPECIEY

IDENTIFICATION DETA	AILS OF FINAL HOUSEHO	LD INTERVIEWED								
[HI3] BARANGAY:		[HI4] ADDRESS		LOCATION	COORDINATES					
		PUROK/ZONE/SITIO:	— [HI5a] LATI	[HI5a] LATITUDE: - N ° , ,'						
BRGY CODE:		STREETADDRESS:			[HI5b] LONGITUDE: -E°°,					
DETAILS OF CALLS	JETAILS OF CALLS									
ATTEMPT NO.	DATE (MON / DD/ YYYY)	TIME (HH:MM – HH:MM)	FINAME	FI CODE	RESULT OF CALL	RESULT OF CALL:				
[HI6] 1 <sup>st</sup> ATTEMPT	//	::AM/PM			·	1: Interview completed 2: Interview started but not vet completed				
[HI7] 2 <sup>ND</sup> ATTEMPT	//	::AM/PM				3: Interview not started/asked to callback				
[HI8] 3RD ATTEMPT	//	:: AM/PM								
FORM 1 RESPONDENT	rs' details									
[HI9] NAME OF R	ESPONDENT	[HI10] LANDLINE NO.	LE NO.	[HI12] MOBIL	E NO. OWNED BY R?					
		-	09.		No, specify owner/relationship to owner:1					

#### н HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

II. HOUSEHOLD CHARACT	ERISTICS		TIME START AM/PM
HC1. Bilang ng mga sambahayan sa unit ng bahay HC2. Tagal ng paninirahan ng sambahayan sa barangay (bilang ng taon) HC3. Bilang ng silid-tulugan (bedroom)/silid na tinutulugan (sleeping rooms)	HC6. Anong uri ng materyales ang ginamit sa panlabas na pader?         Semento/bricks/bato       01         Yero, tanso, aluminum, stainless steel.       02         Kombinasyon ng semento/brick/bato at kahoy       03         Salamin (glass)       04         Kahoy/Kawayan       05         Sawali/cogon/nipa.       06         Asbestos       07         Mga makeshift/salvaged/improvised na materyales       08         Iba pa, pakitukoy       09         Walang pader       10	HC9. Anong uri ng palikuran ang mayroon ang sambahayan sa bahay?         De-flush o de-buhos na palikuran na naka-pipe na sistema ng imburnal.       1         De-flush o de-buhos na palikuran na naka-pipe sa poso negro.       2         De-flush o de-buhos na palikuran na nakadirekta sa hukay.       3         Ventilated Improved Latrine o Bentiladong hukay na palikuran na may slab.       5         Compositing Toilet.       6         De-flush o de-buhos sa kung saan man/o bukas na kanal.       7	HC12. Alin sa mga sumusunod na bagay ang pag-aari ng pamilya?         Radyo       1         Telebisyon       2         VTR/VHS/VCD/DVD       3         Stereo/CD Player       4         Refrigerator/Pridyider/Freezer       5         Washing Machine       6         Air Conditioning       7         Living Room/Sala Set       8         Dining Set       9         Kotse, Jeep       10         Landline na telepono       11         Cellular phone       12
HC4. Sa anong uri ng gusali/bahay nakatira ang sambahayan?         Isang bahay       01         Duplex       02         Apartment/Accessoria/Rowhouse       03         Condominium/Condotel       04         Iba pang multi-unit na tirahan (3 o mahigit na unit)       05         Komersyal/Industriyal/Agrikultural na gusali/bahay (opisina, pabrika, tambobong)       06         Institusyunal na tirahan (hotel, ospital, kumbento, kulungan)       07         Iba pang uri ng gusali/bahay (bus/trailer, bangka), pakitukoy       08         Wala (walang bahay, kariton)       95	HC7. Ano ang estado ng pagmamay-ari ng unit ng bahay at lote na inookupa ng sambahayan?         Sariling pag-aari o parang may-ari ng bahay at lote         1         Sariling bahay, umuupa ng lote         2         Sariling bahay, libreng lote na may pahintulot ng may-ari         3         Sariling bahay, libreng lote na walang pahintulot ng may-ari         4         Umuupa ng bahay/kwarto kasama ang lote         5         Libreng bahay at lote na walang pahintulot ng may-ari         6         Libreng bahay at lote na walang pahintulot ng may-ari         7	Nakaangat na palide/arinola       9         Nakaangat na palikuran na nakadirekta sa       10         De-flush o de-buhos na palikuran na hindi alam       10         kung saan napupunta ang dumi/deposito	Personal Computer
HC5. Anong uri ng materyales ang ginamit sa         bubong?         Yero/tanso/aluminum/stainless steel         Semento/tiles na gawa sa clay/bato         02         Kombinasyon ng yero at semento         03         Kahoy/kawayan         04         Cogon/nipa/anahaw         05         Asbestos         06         Mga makeshift/salvaged/improvised na         07         Iba pa, pakitukoy	HC8. May pag-aari ba ang sambahayan na isa pang bahay at lote? OO 1 Pakitukoy kung saan matatagpuan ang ari-arian: HINDI 2	Naka-pipe papunta sa bakuran/lote       2         Pampublikong gripo       3         Protektadong balon/tubo balon/borehole       4         Protektadong bukal       5         Tubig-ulan       6         Tanker truck/tindero/kapitbahay       7         Hindi protektado o bukas na balon       8         Hindi protektado o bukas na bukal       9         Tubig mula sa ilog, dam, lawa, sapa, kanal, kanal ng irigasyon       10         Iba pa, pakitukoy       11	Imprastraktura       3         Iba pa       4         HC15. Itinuturing ba ninyo ang inyong sambahayan bilang bahagi ng Katutubo o miyembro ng Indigenous People's Group?         OO

### III. HOUSEHOLD ROSTER

NOTE TO FI: Fill in the information of each of the household members starting from the Household Head.

[HR1]		[H	R2] NAME		HR2A	HR2B	[HR3] DATE (	OF BIRTH		[HR4]	[HR5]	[HR6]	[HR7]	[HR8]	[HR9]	[HR10]	[HR11]	
LINE NO.	LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	MIDDLE NAME	NAME Ext./Suffix	ENTRY ID (from Masterlist)	Current HH member or away	MONTH (mm)	DAY (dd)	YEAR (yyyy)	Age (as of last birthday)	Sex	Curr Preg	Marital Status	Solo Parent	Rel to Head	FN	Rel to FH	LINE NO.
01																		01
02																		02
03																		03
04																		04
05																		05
06																		06
07																		07
08																		08
09																		09
10																		10
11																		11
12																		12
13																		13
14																		14
15																		15
16																		16
17																		17
18																		18
CODES	[HR2] NAME       [HR3] DATE OF       [HR6] CURR         Write the complete name of the household member       [HR3] DATE OF       [HR6] CURR         [HR2b] HH member present or away       birth of the HH       member.       1 - Yes       2 -         1-Current HH member       2-Studying or working away from home       [HR4] AGE       Write the age of       1 - Yes       2 -         3-Deceased       4-Moved out       go to next HH member       [HR5] SEX       1 - Male       2 - Female         6-Double entry       go to next HH member       I - Male       2 - Female       IF CODE 1, GO       0         7-Others, specify       I - Male       2 - Female       IF CODE 1, GO       TO HR7 Marital       Status		[HR7] MARITAL STATUS 1 – Single/Never Married 2 - Married 3 - Common- law/Live-in 4 - Widowed 5 - Divorced 6 - Separated 7 - Annulled 8 - Not response [HR8] SOLO PARENT 1 - Yes 2 - No	ITAL         [HR9] REL TO HEAD (Relati 01. Head         14.           lever         01. Head         14.           02. Spouse         15.         03. Son           04. Daughter         17.           05. Stepson         18.           06. Stepdaughter         19.           07. Son-in-law         20.           08. Daughter-in-law         21.           09. Grandson         22.           10. Granddaughter         24.           12. Mother         26.           03. Stepfaulter         26.           04. Daughter-in-law         26.           05. Stepfaulter         26.           07. Son-in-law         26.           08. The there in the there         26.           09. Grandson         22.           10. Grandson         26.           00.         13. Father-in-law           20.         10. HR101.           10. For (Family Number)         26.				(Relationship to Household Head)     14. Mother-in-law     15. Brother     16. Sister     17. Brother-in-law     18. Sister-in-law     18. Sister-in-law     19. Uncle     20. Aunt     21. Nephew     22. Niece     23. Boarder     24. Domestic Helper     25. Other Relative (specify)     26. Nonrelative (specify)			[HR11] REL TO FH (Relationship to Nuclear Family Head) 01 - Family Head 02 - Wife/Spouse 03 - Son/Daughter 04 - Brother/Sister 05 - Son-in-Law/Daughter-in-Law 08 - Grandson/Granddaughter 07 - Father/Mother 08 - Other Relative							

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08	Dis	See	Hear	Walk	Rem	Care	Com	AHF	Na	me of Health Facility	AS	School/DCC/Pre-sch	ool	Educ	NO.
01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08															04
02 03 04 05 06 07 08											1				01
03 04 05 06 07 08															02
04 05 06 07 08															03
05 06 07 08															04
06 07 08															05
07 08															06
08															07
															08
09															09
10															10
11															11
12															12
13															13
14															14
15															15
16															16
17															17
18															18
18       [HR12] Dis (Disability)         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         To be derived from HR13-HR18]       [HR15] Walk (Walking or Climbing Steps)         May kahirapan/problema ba si_sa paglalakad o pag-akyat ng haqdan?       1 - Oo         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         May kahirapan/problema ba si_sa paglalakad o pag-akyat ng haqdan?       1 - Oo         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR14] Hear (Hearing)       May kahirapan/problema ba si_sa pag-alaala o pagkonsentra?         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR17) Care (Self-Caring)       1 - Oo         aid?       1 - Oo         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR17) Care (Self-Caring)         aid?       1 - Oo         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR17] Care (Self-Caring)         aid?       1 - Oo         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR18] Com (Communicating)         May kahirapan/problema ba si_sa pagaglalaga sa sanii         (paliligo o pagbibihis)?         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         (HR18] Com (Communicating)         May kahirapan/problema ba si_sa pakikipag-komunikasyon         amit and kanyapan karaniwang wike?						 Steps) aglalakad o centrating ag-alaala o angangalag akikipag-ko	 p pag-akyat ng ) na sa sanīli munikasyon	[HR19] AHF (Attending/Visiting I 1 - Oo 2 - Hindi <i>IF CODE 2, GO TO [HR21] Attent</i> [HR20] Name of Health Facility Isulat ang pangalan ng pasilidad n pinupuntahan ng miyembro ng san [HR21] AS (Attending School/Da school) 1 - Oo 2 - Hindi <i>IF CODE 2, GO TO [HR23] Highe</i> [HR22] Paaralan/DCC/Preschool Isulat ang pangalan ng paaralan n ng miyembro ng sambahayan.	l Health Facility) ding School g kalusugan na nbahayan. y Care/Pre- st Education ol a pinapasukan	[HR23] Educ (Highest Education 00000 – No Grade Completed 00001 – Nusery 00002 – Kindergarten 10011 – Grade 1 10012 – Grade 2 10013 – Grade 3 10014 – Grade 4 10015 – Grade 6 / Elem grad 10003 – Elem ALS 10005 – Elem Madrasah 10005 – Elem Madrasah 10005 – Elem SPED 24011 – Grade SV3 <sup>47</sup> year 24013 – Grade SV3 <sup>47</sup> year 24015 – Grade SV3 <sup>47</sup> year 24005 – HS Madrasah 24005 – HS SPED	Attained) 34011 – Grade 11 34023 – Grade 12/Grai 40001 – Post secondar 40002 – BS 3 <sup>rd</sup> year 40003 – BS 3 <sup>rd</sup> year 50001 – 1 <sup>rd</sup> year short of 50003 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> year colleg 60002 – 2 <sup>rd</sup> year colleg 60002 – 2 <sup>rd</sup> year Colleg 60004 – 4 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60004 – 6 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60005 – 5 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60005 – 6 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60005 – 6 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60005 – 6 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg 60006 – 6 <sup>rh</sup> year Colleg	duate new curr y -1 <sup>e</sup> year] cycle tertiary cycle tertiary ycle tertiary te e e e e e e e e e e e e			

[HR1]	[HR24]	[HR25]		[HR26]			(HF	227]		[HR28]	[HR29]	[HR30]	[HR31]	[HR32]	[HR33]	[HR34]	
LINE NO.	Emp	Job		Primary Occupation/Business			PS	:0C		Class of Worker	Basis of Payment	Nature of Emp	Overseas	Overseas Contract Worker	Sending Money	How often	LINE NO.
01																	01
02																	02
03																	03
04																	04
05																	05
06																	06
07																	07
08																	08
09																	09
10																	10
11																	11
12																	12
13																	13
14																	14
15																	15
16																	16
17																	17
18	(UP24142 Emr	(Employment)	Ĺ	INP201 Brimany Occupațion/Rueineco	FUP191 Paolo	of Dov	mont					FHR211 Over					18
codes	(HR24) 42 Emp (Employment) Nagtrabaho ba sí kant /sang oras sa nakaraang //nggo?       (HR25) Primary Oocupati Isulat ang pangunahing tri sambahayan.         1 - Oo       2 - Hindi         I/F CODE 1, GO TO [HR26] Primary Occupation/Business       (HR27] P SOC (Philippine Leave this column blank. T Oocupation/Business         I/HR25] Job (Job or Business) Kahit hindi nagtrabaho, may trabaho o negosyo ba sí?       (HR28] Class of Worker Saan nagtatrabaho para sa gobyerno/korporasyon ng 3 - Self-employer as sariing s pinapatakbo nang wa negosyong pinapatakbo r 6 - Nagtatrabaho rang wa negosyong pinapatakbo r 1/F CODE 3, 4, 6, GO TO [			[HR25] Primary Occupation/Business Isulat ang pangunahing trabaho/negosyo ng miyembro ng sambahayan. [HR27] P SOC (Phillippine Standard Occupation Code) Leave this column blank. This will be coded later. [HR28] Class of Worker Saan nagtatrabaho? (MENTION THE CHOICES LISTED) 0 - Nagtatrabaho para sa pribadong sambahayan 1 - Nagtatrabaho para sa pribadong establisyimento 2 - Nagtatrabaho para sa gobyerno/korporasyon ng gobyerno 3 - Self-employed na walang empleyadong may bayad 4 - Employer sa sariling sakahan o negosyong pinapatakko ng pamilya 5 - Nagtatrabaho nang may bayad sa sariling sakahan o negosyong pinapatakbo ng pamilya IF CODE 3, 4, 6, GO TO [HR30] Nature of Employment	[HR29] Basile Ano ang badaj THE CHOICE 0 – In kind, im 1 – Kada pira: 2 – Kada oras 3 – Kada pira: 2 – Kada oras 3 – Kada pira: 2 – Kada oras 4 – Buwanan 5 – Pakyaw 6 – Iba pang e 7 – Hindi sahe (HR30] Nature Ang trabaho ( araw/Nng 1 – Permanen 2 – Panandali negosyo/) 3 – Nagtatraba araw-aray	[HR29] Basis of Payment         Ano ang batayan ng kabayaran na natatanggap? Ito ba ay (MENTIO)         THE CHOCES LISTED BELOW)?         0 – In kind, imputed (natatanggap bilang sahod/sweido)         1 – Kada piraso         2 – Kada oras         3 – Kada araw         4 – Buwanan         5 – Pakyaw         6 – Iba pang sahod/sweido, pakitukoy				y (MENTION aw- no sa pamilya r	[HR31] Overseas         Nasa ibang bansa ba si?         1 = Oo 2 = Hindi         IF CODE 2, GO TO the next HH member         [HR32] Overseas Contract Worker Indicator         SI ba ay (READ OUT CHOICES)?         1 = Overseas Contract Worker o OCW         2 = Manggagawa maliban sa OCW         3 = Empleyado sa Embahada ng Pilipinas, Konsulado at iba pang misyon         4 = Mag-saral sa ibang bansa/turista         5 = Iba pa, pakitukoy						

[HR1]	[HR35]	[HR36]	[HR37]	[H	R38]	
LINE NO.	Household Line	Household Line	Household Line	Nawala ba si	[] ng 3 buwan	LINE NO.
	Number of Father	Number of Mother	Number of	o higit p	oa mula sa	
			Spouse	sambahay	/an na ito sa	
				nakaraang	g 12 buwan?	
				1=00	2 = Hindi	
01				1	2	01
02				1	2	02
03				1	2	03
04				1	2	04
05				1	2	05
06				1	2	06
07				1	2	07
08				1	2	08
09				1	2	09
10				1	2	10
11				1	2	11
12				1	2	12
13				1	2	13
14				1	2	14
15				1	2	15
16				1	2	16
17				1	2	17
18				1	2	18
	FOR HR35, HR36 and	HR37				
S	Isulat ang Numero sa Li	istahan, kung hindi, gamiti	n ang mga sumusunod			
	na kodigo					
l <u>o</u>	96: Pumanaw na					
0	97: Nakatira sa hiwalay	na sambahavan				
	98: Hindi kasal	,,				

HR39. Type of household

Isang pamilya	1
Extended na pamilya	2
Dalawa o higit pang hindi magkaugnay na pamilya/tao	3

#### V. GOVERNMENT PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

GP1 alinn GP2 NG F	. May miyembro ba ng inyong saml nan sa mga sumusunod na progran . Sino sa mga miyembro ng samba PROGRAMA NG SOCIAL/HEALTH	bahayan (kabilang ang na ng social/health ins hayan ang mga miyen I INSURANCE]? <b>(MUL</b>	) OFW) na depe urance? nbro/benepisyar <i>TIPLE ANSWE</i>	ndente/benepisyaryo yo ng sumusunod na <i>RS ALLOWED</i> )	/miyembro ng [PANGALAN	GP5. May mi sa mga nasy (NGOs) mula OO HINDI	yembro ba ng sambahayan na nakatanggap ng mga programa unal o lokal na ahensya ng gobyerno, o <i>Non-Government Orga</i> 2009 hanggang sa kasalukuyan? 	/serbisyo nizations	mula
GP3 bene	. Sa nakaraang anim na buwan, ma pisyo/tulong/bayad mula sa []?	ay miyembro ba ng iny	ong sambahaya	an na nakatanggap ng	g mga	GP6. Kung o hanggang sa	o, ano/anu-ano ang mga programa/serbisyo na natanggap mula kasalukuyan? Lagyan ng tsek ang lahat ng naaangkop.	a 2009	
GP4 []?	. Sino sa mga miyembro ng inyong (MULTIPLE ANSWERS ALLOWE	sambanayan ang nak E <b>D)</b>	atanggap ng m	ga benepisyo/tuiong/t	ayad mula sa	buwan? Lag	mga programang ito/serbisyo ang natanggap sa <u>nakaraang ani</u> /an ng tsek ang lahat ng naaangkop.	m (6) na	
		GP1	GP2	GP4			GP6	GP 7	
			(LINE NO.)		(LINE NO.)	A A	Pequiar Conditional Cash Transfor (PCCT) (Ps	1	1
A	GSIS	MAYROON1		MAYROON1			Modified Conditional Cash Transfer (MCCT) 4Ps	2	2
		GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW			Unconditional Cash Transfer Brogram/UCT	2	2
В	SSS	MAYROON 1		MAYROON1			Indigent Senior Citizen's Social Bension (SocBen)	4	4
		WALA2 ♥ CO TO NEXT ROW		WALA2 ♥ CO TO NEXT ROW			Tulong mula sa Malasakit Contor	5	5
C	Overseas Workers Welfare	MAYROON1		MAYROON1			Student Einancial Assistance Program (StuEAP) other	0	Ŭ.
١Ľ	Administration (OWWA)	WALA2 🗸		WALA2 🗸		'	than Universal Access to Quality Tertiary Education	6	6
	Dhillionth Direct Contributors	GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW		(UAOTE)	v	Ŭ	
יי	(Indibidwal na Nachabavad o	WALA2 V		WALA2		G	(b) (g ( E)	7	7
	Employed)	GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW		н	Assistance to Individuals in Crisis Situation (AICS)	8	8
			_   _   _				Balik Prohinsva Program	9	9
E	Sponsored (Indigent	WALA2		WALA2			Emergency Shelter Accistance	10	10
	Program/4Ps/Senior Citizen)	GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW		l ĸ	Sustainable Livelihood Program – Micro enterprise	10	10
				1111/12001			Development Track	11	11
F	Private Health Insurance					_	Sustainable Livelihood Program – Employment facilitation	12	12
	Company/HNO (e.g. MediCard, Caritas Health, Maxicare, etc.)	GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW		м	Skills training under TESDA	13	13
						N N	Intergrated Livelihood/Kabubayan Program under DOLE	14	14
G	Private Pre-need Insurance	MAYROON1		MAYROON1			Other Skills/Livelihood Training	15	15
	St. Pater Life Plan. etc.)	GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW		I P	Government Feeding program	16	16
						. 	Day Care Service/ECCD	17	17
н	Pag-IBIG	MAYROON1		MAYROON1		l R	Day Gale Service/ECCD Programang pababay (Housing Program)	10	10
		GO TO NEXT ROW		GO TO NEXT ROW			Microsovicit	10	10
Ι	Personal Equity and Retirement	MAYROON1		MAYROON1			Where the second s	20	20
	Account (PERA)/Retirement	WALA2 ♥ CO TO NEXT ROW		WALA2 ♥ CO TO NEXT ROW			Subsidized Kice	20	20
	Fund	SO TO REAT NOW		SO TO REAT NOW			Cash for Work/Food for Work	21	21
	•					1 W	KALAHI-CIDSS Disector Delist Assistance	22	22
							Disaster Relief Assistance	23	23
							Social Amelioration Program/SAP	24	24
						<u>*</u>	Other Cash Transfer Program, specify,	25	25
						<sup>2</sup>	Hindi nakalanggap ng alinmang programa o serbisyo sa		95
							navaraany anim (o) na buwan		

GP8. May miyembro ba ng inyong sambahayan na naging benepisyaryo ng Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program o 4Ps? (Verify answer in GP6 and GP7)	GP14. Gaano kadalas kayo nakatanggap     98       ng 4Ps cash grants sa nakaraang 12     HA       buwan?     HA	
OO 1 → CONTINUE HINDI 2 → GO TO GP19 Hindi alam 8 → GO TO GP19	GP15. Magkano ang kabuuang natanggap ninyo para sa inyong 4Ps <i>cash grant</i> sa nakaraang 12 buwan?	
GP9. Ano ang Pantawid Household ID ng sambahayan?	GP16. Kailan kayo huling nakatanggap ng inyong 4Ps cash grant?       20       98         GP17. Magkano ang huling cash grant na natanggap ninyo?       98       98         GP18. Paano ninyo kasalukuyang natatanggap ang 4Ps cash grants?       98	
Pilipino Program o 4Ps hanggang sa ngayon? OO	LBP Cash Card     1     Over the Counter     2       Iba pa, tukuyin,     Hindi alam     8       GP19. Nakatanggap ba kayo o sinuman sa mga miyembro ng sambabayan ng subsidiya mula sa Social Amelioration Program	
GP11. Kailan naging benepisyaryo ang inyong sambahayan/miyembro ng sambahayan ng Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program o 4Ps?	mula Marso 2020? (Verify answer in GP6 and GP7) OO 1 → CONTINUE HINDI	
2     0      98       Buwan     Taon     Hindi alam	GP20. Ilang beses kayo nakatanggap ng 98	
GP12. Sino ang kasalukuyang 4Ps Grantee para sa sambahayan na ito? Isulat ang numero ng linya ng miyembro ng sambahayan. 98 Line No.	GP21. Magkano ang kabuuang natanggap ninyo mula sa SAP mula Marso 2020?	
GP13. Sino sa mga bata sa sambahayan ang sinusubaybayan para sa kondisyon ng edukasyon ng programa?	Record amount in PHP GP22. Nakatanggap ba kayo o sinuman sa mga miyembro ng sambahayan ng iba pang tulong na pera o kahit anong uri mula sa pandemya simula Marso 2020? (I-verify ang sagot sa GP2)	
PANGALAN NG BATA     LINE NUMBER       1.     2.       3.     3.	OO $1 \rightarrow CONTINUE$ HINDI $2 \rightarrow GO TO EDS1$ Hindi alam $8 \rightarrow GO TO EDS1$	
Hindi alam 98	natanggap ninyo mula sa iba pang mga pinagkukunan ng tulong mula Marso 2020?	

#### VI. SHOCKS AND DIFFICULTIES

Ngayon naman po nais ko kayong tanungin tungkol sa mga pangyayaring naranasan ng inyong sambahayan at nakaapekto sa pinansyal na katayuan sa nakalipas na 12 buwan.

	А				В	C.	
	Type of Economic Difficulty				llang buwan na ang	[PRIMARY Coping Mechanism]	
Ang sa	ambahayan po bang ito ay nakaranas ng [] na nagpahirap sa kala	gayang pinansy	yal sa <u>nakali</u> j	oas na 12	nakalipas nang mangyari	Ano ang pangunahing bagay na ginawa ninyo upang	
5	buwan?		·		ito?	mapagaan ang hirap sa kalagayang pinansyal/"	economic
						shock" dahil sa []?	
	TYPE OF EVENT	00	HINDI	HA		VERBATIM RESPONSE	CODE
EDS1.	Pagkamatay ng mga miyembro ng sambahayan o ibang	1 → GO TO	2 🕊 GO TO	8 🕊 GO TO			
	kamaq-anak	COL. B	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM	BUWAN		
EDS2.	Malubhang karamdaman ng mga miyembro ng sambahayan o						
	ibang kamag-anak na nangailangan ng pagpapa-ospital o	1 → GO TO	2 V GO TO	8 V GO TO	BUWAN		
	patuloy na medikal na paggamot	COL. D	NEATTIEM	NEATTEM			
EDS3.	Pagkawala ng trabaho o pagbagsak ng negosyo ng mga	4. 3. 00. 70	214 00 70	auto on To			
	miyembro ng sambahayan na hindi dulot ng sunog, lindol,	COLB	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM	BUWAN		
	pandemya, o iba pang kalamidad	OOL.D	NEXTTEM	nextriem			
EDS4.	Mga pagkalugi dahil sa sunog, lindol, bagyo, baha, at iba pang	1 → G0 T0	2 🕹 GO TO	8 🗣 GO TO	BUWAN		
	kalamidad	COL. B	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM	BOWAN		
EDS5.	Hindi nakapag-ani dahil sa	1 → GO TO	2 V GO TO	8 V GO TO	BUWAN		
EDS6	Paghaha ng kita ng sambahayan dahil sa nanakahahang	COL. D	NEATTEM	NEATTEN			
LD30.	nraduksyon na dulat na mga dahilan malihan sa hindi nakanaa.	1 → G0 T0	2 🕹 GO TO	8 🗣 GO TO	DUWAN		
	produksyon na dulot ny mga danilan maliban sa hindi nakapag-	COL. B	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM	BOWAN		
EDS7	Sanilitang naglinat dahil sa natural/gawa ng tao na kalamidad						
LDOI.	armadong lahanan, nrovekto sa nagnanavunlad ng	1 → G0 T0	2 🗣 GO TO	8 🗣 GO TO	BUWAN		
	imnrastruktura, o iba nang dahilan	COL. B	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM			
EDS8	Hindi nlanadong naghubuntis	1 → GO TO	2 <b>¥</b> GO TO	8 ¥ GO TO	BURNAN		
LDOU	rinia planadong pagbabanas	COL. B	NEXT ITEM	NEXT ITEM	BUWAN		
EDS9.	Iba pa (tukuyin)	1 → G0 T0	2 V GO TO	8 V GO TO	BUWAN		
	CODES FOR COLUMN C/Coping Mechanism	UOL. D	EDOIN	EDOID		1	
	1: Binago and paraan ng pagkonsumo	5: Naghanan I	ng trabaho sa	ihang hansa	Q-	Gumamit ng inon	
	2: Nagbenta ng mga ari-arian	-aaral	10	Umutang ng pera			
	2: Isinanda and mga ari-arian	7: Inilination	hata mula ca	nribadona na	aralan natungo sa 11	: Iha na tukuvin	
ES	4: Naghanan ng karagdagang trabaho sa loob ng bansa	namnuhlikona	naaralan	privationg pa	araran patungo sa 🛛 🖬	. iou pu, susayin	
8	4. Hughanap ng karagaagang rabano sa loob ng bansa	8. Briwawae e	maa aawaina	nanlihangan			
ŭ		<ol> <li>Dumawas a</li> </ol>	inga gawaling	paniloangan			

#### NOTE TO FI: IF THE HOUSEHOLD DID NOT EXPERIENCE ANY OF THE ABOVE ECONOMIC DIFFICULTY (EDS1 TO EDS9), GO TO OH1. OTHERWISE, CONTINUE.

EDS10. Sa mga kahirapan sa ekonomiya at mga hindi magandang pangyayaring naranasan ng sambahayan sa <u>nakalipas na 12 buwan</u>, alin po sa mga ito ang may pinakamalaking epekto sa kapakanan ng sambahayan?

EDS#\_\_\_\_\_

#### VII. OTHER HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION

OH1. Kayo ba o sinumang miyembro ng inyong sambahayan ay	OH5. Magkano ang kara	aniwang buwanang gastos sa pangkalahatan	OH11. Kai	ilan nainte	erbyu an	g samba	hayan	g ito sa
kumuha ng anumang utang sa nakaraang anim na buwan?	ng inyong pamilya sa nakaraang anim na buwan? (UNAIDED) Listahanan survey? Ilista ang lahat ng					g		
	PHP	00	pagi	kakataon	/pag-iiko	t ng pan	ayam.	-
00 1 → CONTINUE	[Program the CAPI to r	ecompute the amount by dividing it by 4 to						
HINDI 2 → GO TO OH3	derive a weekly amoun	nt.]			C	H11A		OH11B
Hindi alam	OH5A. [The CAPI prog	ram will divide OH4 by OH5 and convert the			00	NAP	HA (	(TAON)
	answer into perc	entage] Batay po sa na-compute natin,% po	1st intervi	iew	1	2	8	20
OH2. Saan kayo o sinumang miyembro ng inyong sambahayan	ng pangkalahatan	g gastos ay nakalaan para sa pagkain. Tama po	2 <sup>nd</sup> interv	view	1	2	8	20
kumuha ng utang na ito? (MULTIPLE RESPONSES	ba ang tantiyang i	to?	3rd interv	iew	1	2	8	20
ALLOWED)			Note to F	1: If respo	ndent cl	aims moi	re than	3 instances,
,	OH6. Sa nakaraang anir	n na buwan, magkano ang <u>karaniwang</u>	verify/rec	confirm ar	nd record	l if respo	ndent i	nsists.
GSIS 1	<u>buwanang kita</u> ng	g inyong sambahayan mula sa lahat ng miyembro	4th intervi	iew	1	2	8	20
SSS	na nagtatrabaho p	ara sa <u>suweldo o sahod</u> ?	5th intervi	iew	1	2	8	20
PAG-IBIG								
DIGITAL/ONLINE FINANCIAL SERVICE (e.g., Tala,	PHP	00	OH12. FO	R THE FI	: Check	if there a	are List	ahanan
JuanHand) 4			Stick	ers in the	e door/ga	ate of the	e house	. If no stickers
MICROFINANCE INSTITUTION 5	OH7. Sa nakaraang anir	n na buwan, magkano ang <u>karaniwang</u>	are o	bserved.	ask the	respond	lent to	point to
CREDIT UNION	<u>buwanang kita</u> ng	g inyong sambahayan mula sa lahat ng miyembro	locat	tion of sti	ckers, if	any. Rec	ord da	te indicated in
RELATIVE/FRIEND 7	na nagnenegosy	<u>o</u> ?	all st	tickers for	und.			
BANK								
INFORMAL LENDER	PHP	00		OH	12A		OH1	2B
PAWNSHOP 10			Sticker	00	HIND	I BUW	AN	(TAON)
IBA PA, tukuyin	OH8. Sa nakaraang anir	n na buwan, magkano ang <u>karaniwang</u>	[A]	1	2			20
	buwanang halag	a na natanggap ng inyong sambahayan mula sa	IB1	1	2		-+	20
	ibang pinagkukun	an ng kita o tulong na hindi pera/pera na	IC1	1	2		-+	20
OH3. Kayo ba o sinumang miyembro ng inyong sambahayan ay	natanggap mula s	a ibang bansa?		8 - N/	sticker			20
kasapi o naging kasapi ng kooperatiba sa nakaraang anim na				0 - NO	und			
buwan?		%		10	unu			
			NOTES/O	RSERVA	TIONS	OF THE	STICK	FRS
00 1	OH9. Sa nakaraang anir	n na buwan, magkano ang <u>karaniwang</u>	HOTEO/O	DOLIGIN			onon	LINO.
HINDI 2	buwanang halag	<u>a</u> na natanggap ng inyong sambahayan mula sa						
Hindi alam 8	ibang pinagkukun	an ng kita o tulong na hindi pera/pera na						
	natanggap mula s	a mga lokal na pinagkukunan o gobyerno?						
OH4. Magkano ang karaniwang buwanang gastos sa pagkain		%						
ng inyong pamilya sa nakaraang anim na buwan?								
	OH10. Ang sambahayar	ng ito ba ay nainterbyu na sa Listahanan Survey						
PHP00	ng DSWD?							
[Program the CAPI to recompute the amount by dividing it by 4 to	00	1 → CONTINUE						
derive a weekly amount.]	HINDI	2 → GO TO OH12						
	Hindi alam	8 → GO TO OH12						
TIME END: AM/PM	DURATION:	MINUTES						

# Annex 2: Barangay Assessment Questionnaire

#### I. IDENTIFICATION

[HI1] REGION/PROVIN	CE/ MUNICIPALITY:		·				
IDENTIFICATION DETA	AILS OF BARANGAY						
[BI2] BARANGAY:		[BI3] ADDRESS OF BARANG	SAY HALL	LOCATION	COORDINATES		
		PUROK/ZONE/SITIO:		[BI4] LATIT	[BI4] LATITUDE: - N ° , , '		
BRGY CODE:		STREETADDRESS:		_ [BI5] LONG	ITUDE: -E	• ' ' '	
DETAILS OF CALLS							
ATTEMPT NO.	DATE (MON / DD/ YYYY)	TIME (HH:MM – HH:MM)	FINAME	FI CODE	RESULT OF CALL	RESULT OF CALL:	
[BI6] 1 <sup>st</sup> ATTEMPT	II	::AM/PM				1: Interview completed     2: Interview started but not vet completed	
[BI7] 2ND ATTEMPT	II	::AM/PM				3: Interview not started/asked to callback	
[BI8] 3RD ATTEMPT	II	::AM/PM					
MODULE A RESPOND	ENTS' DETAILS						
	ESPONDENT		[BI11] MOBIL	E NO	IBI21 TYPE		
				L NO.		1	
					OTHER BRGY OFFICIAL	specify:	
			09 -		OTHERS, specify	3	

п.	BARANGAY CHAP	SAC	TERIST	<b>FICS</b>				TIME ST	TART	AM/PM
BC1.	Ang inyong barangay ba ay is	ang		KINE	S OF ESTABLISHMENTS		B	C9. Auto repair shop, vulcani	zing shop, ele	ctronic repair shop, o
	poblacion/distrito ng lungsod?						ik	a pang repair shop sa barang	jay.	
				BC	5. Mga komersyal na establisimyento tulac	l ng tindahan ng	a	llang auto repair shop, vulca	anizing shop,	
00.			1	pak	yawan (wholesale), department store, Bazaa	r, hardware store,		electronic repair shop, o iba	pang <i>repair</i>	
HIN	DI	-	2	bot	ka, gasolinahan, sari-sari <i>store</i> , o iba pang ti	ndahan na may		shop sa barangay na ito ang	g may kulang	
				kas	alukuyang kalakal o paninda na nagkakahala	aga ng P600 o higit pa.		sa 100 empleyado?		
BC2.	Sa inyong barangay, mayroon	bang.	?	а	Ilang komersyal na establisimyento sa					
					barangay na ito ang may kulang sa 100		B	C10. Mga establisimyento na	nag-aalok ng	personal na serbisyo
Bar	rangay Facilty	00	HINDI		empleyado?		tu	lad ng restawran/kainan, cafete	ria, o refreshm	ent parlor (hindi
а	MUNISIPYO/CITY HALL O	1	2	b	llang komersyal na establisimyento sa		ka	asama ang mga palipat-lipat o n	nobile na kaina	n), beauty parlor,
	KAPITOLYO NG				labas ng barangay, ngunit nasa loob ng 2		b	arberya o barber shop, massag	e parlor, laundr	y shop, punerarya, o
	PROBINSYA				kilometro mula sa barangay, ang may		Ib	a pang establisimyento na nag-	aalok ng perso	nal na serbisyo.
b	PAMPUBLIKONG PLAZA	1	2		kulang sa 100 empleyado?		a	llang establisimyento na na	g-aalok ng	
	O PARKE PARA SA			I				personal na serbisyo sa bar	angay na ito	
	LIBANGAN			BC	6. Mga establisimyento para sa libangan t	ulad ng sinehan, <i>night</i>		ang mayroong 100 o mas k	aunting	
С	MATAAS NA PAARALAN	1	2	clui	), bar, beer garden, billiard hall, bowling alley	, rentahan ng <i>video</i>		empleyado?		
	(HIGH SCHOOL)			tap	es/CD, computer games station, videoke, inte	ernet café, sabungan,				
d	SISTEMA NG LANDLINE	1	2	gyn	n, sports house, o iba pang aktibidad panliba	ngan.	IN	FORMAL SETTLERS		
	NA TELEPONO O			a	llang establisimyento para sa libangan sa					
	CALLING STATION				barangay na ito ang may kulang sa 100		В	C11. Sa barangay na ito, ilang	j sambahayan	ang naninirahan
е	SIGNAL NG CELLPHONE	1	2		empleyado?		s	a		
f	SEMENTERYO	1	2	b	llang establisimyento para sa libangan sa		a	pribadong lupa na hindi nila	pag-aari	
					labas ng barangay, ngunit nasa loob ng 2			maliban sa mga mapangani	b na lugar	
BC3.	Mayroon bang street pattern a	ng iny	ong		kilometro mula sa barangay, ang may			tulad ng estero, riles ng tren	, tambakan	
	barangay, ibig sabihin, networ	k o sis	stema ng		kulang sa 100 empleyado?			ng basura, tabing-ilog, bayb	ayin, daanan	
	hindi bababa sa tatlong kalye	o daai	n?					ng tubig, at iba pang pampu	blikong lugar	
				BC	7. Hotel, dormitoryo, motel or iba pang lug	gar na matutuluyan.		tulad ng bangketa, kalsada,	parke at	
MAY	YROON		1	а	llang hotel, dormitoryo, motel o iba pang			palaruan?		
WA	LA		2		lugar na matutuluyan sa barangay na ito					
					ang may kulang sa 100 empleyado?		HE	ALTH AND EDUCATIONAL	FACILITIES	
BC4.	Ang mga magsasaka, mangga	igawa	ng bukid,			ļ	B	C12. Ilan ang sa barangay n	a ito?	
	mangingisda, magtotroso, at r	nga		BC	8. Bangko, sanglaan o pawnshop, kumpa	nya/ahensya ng	a	Paaralang Elementarya		
	nangongolekta ng produkto sa	i guba	it ba ay	pag	papautang/pamumuhunan o insurance, o	iba pa.				
	bumubuo ng higit sa kalahati i	ng pop	oulasyon	a	llang bangko, sanglaan o pawnshop,		Ь	Paaralang Sekundarya		
	na 10 taong gulang pataas?				kumpanya/ahensya ng		"	r dardiding ocivariatilya		
					pagpapautang/pamumuhunan o			Kalabiya (Laibanaida d		
00			1		insurance, o iba pa sa barangay na ito			Noieniyo/Unipersidad		
HIN	DI		2		ang may kulang sa 100 empleyado?					
						1	d	Pasilidad Pangkalusugan		

#### III. ACCESS TO PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

#### PS1. Mayroon po bang mga [URI NG MGA PROGRAMA AT SERBISYO] sa barangay nitong nakaraang 6 na buwan?

#### PS2. Gaano karami ang mga nakatanggap ng mga programa at serbisyong ito nitong nakaraang 6 na buwan?

	TYPE OF PROGRAMS AND	PS1.	PS2.
	SERVICES	TYPE OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	NO. OF RECIPIENTS
a.	Regular Conditional Cash Transfer	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
	(RCCT) 4Ps	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
b.	Modified Conditional Cash Transfer	MAYROON 1> CONTINUE	
	(MCCT) 4Ps	WALA 24 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
c.	Unconditional Cash Transfer	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
	Program/UCT	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
	5	HINDI ALAM	
d.	Indigent Senior Citizen's Social Pension	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
	(SocPen)	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
e.	Tulong mula sa Malasakit Center	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
	-	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
f.	Student Financial Assistance Program	MAYROON	
	(StuFAP) other than Universal Access	WALA	
	to Quality Tertiary Education (UAQTE)	HINDI ALAM 8 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
g.	Iba pang scholarship (maliban sa	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
-	StuFAP and UAQTE)	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
	· ·	HINDI ALAM 8 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
h.	Assistance to Individuals in Crisis	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
	Situation (AICS)	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM 8 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
i.	Balik Probinsiya Program	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
		WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
j.	Emergency Shelter Assistance	MAYROON 1→ CONTINUE	
1		WALA 24 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM 8 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
k.	Sustainable Livelihood Program – Micro	MAYROON 1 > CONTINUE	
	enterprise Development Track	WALA 2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	
Ι.	Sustainable Livelihood Program -	MAYROON 1 -> CONTINUE	
	Employment facilitation	WALA 24 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	

	TYPE OF PROGRAMS AND		PS1.	PS2.
	SERVICES	TYPE OF PROC	GRAMS AND SERVICES	NO. OF RECIPIENTS
m.	Skills training under TESDA	MAYROON	1 → CONTINUE	
		WALA	2    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	8    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
n.	Intergrated Livelihood/Kabuhayan	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
	Program under DOLE	WALA	2	
		HINDI ALAM	8	
0.	Iba pang Skills/Livelihood Training	MAYROON	1→CONTINUE	
		WALA	2	
		HINDI ALAM	8    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
p.	Government Feeding program	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
· .	51 5	WALA	2	
		HINDI ALAM	8    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
a.	Day Care Service/ECCD	MAYROON	1 -> CONTINUE	
<b>1</b> .	,	WALA	2	
		HINDI ALAM	8    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
r.	Programang pabahay (Housing program)	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
		WALA	2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	8    GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
6	Microcredit	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
	mororcan	WALA	2 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDI ALAM	8♥ GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
t	Subsidized Rice	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
	oubsidized filoc	WALA	2 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDLALAM	8 4 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
	Cash for Work	MAYROON	1→ CONTINUE	
ч.		WALA	2 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
		HINDLALAM	8 4 GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
v	KALAHLCIDSS	MAYROON		
۷.	RALAIII-OID00	WALA		
			8 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
	Disaster Poliof Assistance	MAYPOON		
w.	Disaster Relief Assistance	WALA		
	Carriel Amelianstian Decomposition			
x.	Social Amelioration Program/ SAP			
			2 V GO TO NEXT PROGRAM/SERVICE	
			OV OUTO NEXT PROUKAW/SERVICE	
у.	IBA PA, TUKUYIN:			1
	1			2.
	<u>∠.</u>			3

TIME END : \_\_\_\_\_ AM/PM

DURATION: \_\_\_\_\_ MINUTES