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Preface

The purpose of our Research Project Group 1-2 of the Center for Sustainable Development Studies (CeSDeS) is to analyze endogenous development in regional development studies. This project group planned to hold the international workshop on community development in Asian countries. Fortunately, we could have very strong and mutual cooperation with the University of the Philippines, the Local Government of Cebu City, and the communities that participated in development programs in Cebu City, and the NGOs.

The international workshop on community development in Asian countries was held on 30th September and 1st October 2011 at Hotel Elizabeth Cebu in Cebu City.

On the workshop day, we were very happy to share the various community development experiences, needs and responses in various countries of Asia. Whether in the Philippines or in Thailand, in South Korea or Mongolia, common themes like poverty or housing challenges as well as empowerment and people's participation were observed and shared.

We thank the various discussants who shared their precious time and presentation based on their exposure and engagements as politicians, academic researchers or civil society leaders.

We also thank the audience who took time to actively participate and share their own views and experiences about community development and the various issues related to this very important topic for research and policy.

Finally, we would like to mention the full cooperation and support of Research Project Group 1-2 coordinated by Prof. Kazuo Takahashi and the Center for Sustainable Development Studies (CeSDeS).

May the discussions shared here be useful for the discourse and policy related to communities throughout the world.
I. Introduction

The Center for Sustainable Development Studies held a day-long international workshop last September 30, 2011 at the Hotel Elizabeth, Cebu City entitled "Community Development in Asia."

Various speakers from Cebu City and Toyo University shared their various researches and engagements about community development with participants from the academe, local government, communities, and civil society, among others.

It was very interesting to note the various differences and similarities of community development processes and experience despite varying geographical locations: Cebu City, Philippines, Thailand, Mongolia, and Seoul.

Participants also exchanged views regarding some issues related to housing rights, house rental, land tenure, community leadership, role of LGU and civil society and people for participatory community development, governance, and other more issues.

This report attempts to capture the essence of that international workshop by presenting the highlights of the presentations and the discussions that followed the presentations.

Several key words were presented by the speakers: socialized housing, rental housing, participation, governance, leadership, community development, and land tenure, among others.

What is community development? Aside from basic needs and welfare, why and when do land tenure issues crop up and how are these resolved?

Community development has always been linked to politics but partnerships and collaboration have been key in responding to the challenges encountered by residents across geographical locations presented by the various speakers.

Community development cannot then be resolved by politics alone. Social networks and participation are basic factors for improving the lives and situation of communities and their residents.

The role of gender and leadership have also been noted in the workshop as important for community development.
The workshop opened new paths and directions for future research about community development. Some examples of these include the engagement of civil society and their links with formal political networks within and outside of communities, the role of female leadership, the view of community development as a multisectoral, multilevel engagement of various partners and stakeholders, among others.

The dinner meeting that followed the workshop offered the rare opportunity to discuss in more details the engagement of key leaders of community development in Cebu City with the Toyo research group.

It is the hope of our Toyo Research Project Group, headed by Professor Kazuo Takahashi, that the following documentation will be useful for those interested in community development.

The Toyo Research Project Group 1-2 for Community Development

Professor Kazuo Takahashi (Project Leader)
Professor Sang Kyung An
Professor Maria Rosario Piquero-Ballescas
Assistant Professor Kimihiro Akiya
Dr. Yuko Kobayakawa
II. Workshop Highlights

Opening Remarks
Professor Maria Rosario Piquero-Ballescas

A very bright sunny morning to you all, our distinguished guests from Toyo University, Japan, from various universities in Cebu, from our local governments and agencies, as well as from our civil society partners!!!

Today is the 30th of this month of September, a day that ends one month but at the same time, a day that ushers in the new month of October and more months before this year 2011 ends and before the new year 2012 begins.

Today we hope views and ideas will be actively and productively exchanged, partnerships renewed and recharged, and collaborative efforts forged from hereon.

Our research team from Toyo University led by Professor Fujii, the Dean of the Regional Development Studies of Toyo University, who unfortunately is not with us today due to his busy engagements back in Japan, is happy to welcome you to this workshop to share and exchange research findings and perspectives related to regional and community development in various parts of the world.

Our team’s research and focus are part of a larger research network composed mostly of Toyo University Faculty, under the directorship of Prof. Kitawaki. Other research teams in this network are focus on tourism-related as well as environment-related concerns.

Today’s workshop hopes to share with you all the research results of our research team members who came all the way from Japan to share their findings
about regional and community development in Mongolia, Thailand, Korea, and the
Philippines.

In a participative fashion, our Toyo research team also looks forward to your
valuable inputs and views that will enable us all to have a larger, wider horizon to
more comprehensively understand the meaning, the dynamics and the goals of
development in various geographical settings.

For the information of our Japanese guests, very close to this area is a
contested space within Cebu City, a contested paradigm of development, a
movement born out of protest versus the construction of flyovers across historical,
cultural landmarks and versus the conventional, non-consultative path of
development where governance is not shared, decisions made from top to bottom,
and budgets spent in lieu of possibly more deserving urgent needs of more people,
not only for the present but for future generations as well.

What is development and who decides what is good for whom, where, when
and at what costs? The present Stop the Flyover Movement in Cebu is a case in
progress that can help more clearly define what is development, who decides what
is good, for whom, when and at what costs. Perhaps in a future workshop, the
results of such a protested issue related to the flyovers will be a very interesting
research topic to share someday.

We are very fortunate to have with us today a multisectoral gathering of
participants who are involved in active engagement with people and communities
and their own versions, dreams and goals for better lives for themselves, their
immediate surroundings, and the rest of their countries.

We are very happy to have members from the academe who, despite
coming from various disciplines, are themselves very active practitioners of
research and linkages related to the development of people and communities. We
have those from the civil society who are busily committed and actively responding
to the urgent and long-term needs of people in various locations. And we are very
happy as well to have our guests from the local government who, despite their very
busy and hectic schedules, graced us with their presence today to share with us
as well their experiences, their engagements with the issue of development of
people and communities.

For sure, we will recognize commonalities and convergences, dissimilarities
and divergences but definitely, we will realize that dealing with people and
communities is a lifetime commitment for research, for learning, for policy, and for
praxis.
Let us therefore sit back, relax, and enjoy the time and company that we will have together for this day, from this morning till this afternoon and with some of you, till this evening!

Once again, we welcome you to a very significant day of sharing, one that is taking place on the 30th of September, a day that ends one but begins another month, first the month of October, November, and December and one that ushers in not only more new months but more years from hereon.

May our partnership with you all in the academe, local government, civil society and other sectors today usher in renewed and more collaborative efforts and initiatives and engagements in the coming new and more months and years to come.

In behalf of Toyo University and our Toyo University Regional Development Studies research team here today, thank you, good day and happy engagement in today's workshop to you all.
1. Presentation of Honorable Alvin M. Dizon, Cebu City Councilor

ENSURING HOUSING RIGHTS FOR THE POOR THROUGH LOCAL LEGISLATION: THE CASE OF CEBU CITY *

*Speech delivered at the International Workshop on Community Development in Asia
September 30, 2011, Elizabeth Hotel, Cebu City

A very pleasant morning to each and everyone.

First, let me extend my appreciation and gratitude to the Center for Sustainable Development Studies, Toyo University, Japan for giving me the opportunity to be part of this international workshop.

When I received the invitation, I was very eager to come because this will be a convergence of progressive community development advocates and practitioners. This eagerness is also intensified since community development has always been very close to my heart since I started as a young NGO worker. It was the time when I gained in-depth understanding of community issues and developed strong commitment to social development and progressive politics as these became our core advocacies.

In the invitation, I was directed to talk on community development in Cebu city.

Please allow me to share with you my perspective and insights on the topic as I relate it to my work as a local legislator and Chairperson of the Committee on Housing of the Cebu City Council. Thus, the title of this humble presentation is
“Ensuring Housing Rights for the Poor through Local Legislation: The Case of Cebu City.”

Let me give you a quick backdrop of Cebu City.

- Household population of Cebu City in 2007 was 791,697 persons showing an increase of 10.8% from 714,509 persons in 2000
- Since 1993 up to 2006, the Cebu City registered 58,712 informal settlers as part of UDHA implementation
- About 39,000 (67%) of the registered families already availed of housing project of the City
- More or less 19,712 informal families (33%) are still living in either private or government lot registered by DWUP
- Cebu City has 4,292 families living in government owned lots.
- There are also 2,653 families living in riverbanks which are considered danger zones.

My experience as social development worker and now as City Councilor has convinced me that one of the meaningful ways local government can make positive impacts on the lives of ordinary citizens is through progressive local legislation.

Adhering to the principles of people-centered & rights-based development, I personally believe that local legislations must be responsive to the people’s needs and sensitive to their plight. Effective and meaningful legislations promote and protect the rights of the poor. This is one of the indicators of good governance which emphasizes reform through human-centered development and political institution reform specifically on making the government accountable, transparent, responsive, participatory, effective and efficient, and most importantly, equitable and inclusive. This is according to the UN Good Governance Indicators.

In sum, government must be perceived to be as near and accessible to the people as possible.

This is what we are trying to promote in Cebu City Council-- responsive local legislation. This, I consider as my humble contribution in promoting participatory approaches in governance and instituting reforms at the local government level,

So far, my biggest achievement in my work as local legislator is the passage of the Cebu City Shelter Framework Plan Ordinance (Ordinance 2254). This is a historical piece of legislation for the City of Cebu, especially for the informal settlers, as this ordinance concretely expresses the commitment of the City government to address a fundamental right-- the right of the city’s poor to adequate and affordable housing.
The City of Cebu is the first HUC in the country to adopt such plan considering that 69 percent of the city’s population is informal settlers. Cebu City’s rapid economic growth spawned urban migration resulting to more and more people settling in slums and danger zones and squat on both private and public lots. With the strong lobby and support of the urban poor mass movement and the civil society sector, I filed this ordinance in the City Council in my first 100 days in office.

The Shelter Plan Ordinance identified strategies that will serve as guidelines in formulating, implementing and pursuing housing programs and projects for the next six years.

- Ensure that informal settlers have safe and livable settlements
- Strict implementation of 20% balanced housing development in Cebu City;
- Pursue rental housing program for the urban poor and transients;
- Pursue a housing program for middle-income households;
- Implement financial scheme to ensure sustainable fund allocation for land and housing development;
- Establish and strengthen partnerships and linkages among government units, NGOs, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, national government agencies; homeowners associations and the private sector; and
- Regular strengthening and organizational development of the Division for the Welfare of the Urban Poor as the primary implementing agency of city housing programs and projects.

It is hoped that through these strategies, Cebuanos especially the urban poor, will have access to programs and projects that will enable them to achieve their right to adequate and decent shelter.

Though my legislative and advocacy work as City Councilor, my office was able to provide security of land tenure to almost 1,500 families of the Slum Improvement and Resettlement (SIR) Program by extending the terms of payment, condoning the penalties and restructuring their accounts so that beneficiaries can now afford to pay their amortizations and hopefully achieve security of land tenure.

And last month, the Cebu City Council approved my Ordinance Granting Transfer Tax Exemption to all Socialized Housing Beneficiaries who have fully paid their obligations to the City Government. This aims to remove the tax burden of urban poor beneficiaries in processing the transfer of ownership of the lots to their names so that they can sleep in peace knowing that the road towards achieving security of land tenure has been made easier for them.
To keep me grounded in my work, I see to it that I am always accessible to my constituents. I regularly conduct monthly meetings with the various sectoral groups in order to provide venue to discuss their issues and concerns. I also make it a point to visit the barangays and urban poor communities on a regular basis to bring my office closer to my constituents. These, I believe, are good governance practices that bring government and people together in a meaningful dialogue for community development efforts.

For more than a year as public servant, I have seen the many opportunities for poor people, especially the informal settlers, to participate in the development of their communities and influence the decision-making processes that are directly relevant to their lives. Both institutional and legal frameworks (the passage of The Local Government Code of 1991) have been set in place in order to maximize the opportunities created by decentralization and devolution.

As a neophyte councilor, I owe so much to my extensive training and exposure as social development worker. I brought NGO norms and discipline in my work now. But still, it's not as if it is a “walk in the park.”

Acting as catalyst for local reforms and creating ripples of positive change from within, the challenges can be very overwhelming. The desired results are not easily achieved but it has been a worthwhile public service endeavor.

There were birthpains but there are also concrete gains. There are agonies but there are also victories. And victories are sources of inspiration since they are the small patches of green we have started to nurture at the local level. For the past one year since we were elected, I can humbly say we have performed well and hopefully we will harvest more in the coming years from these seeds of hope and hardwork we have planted.

To end, let me say that the cause of the poor and the marginalized is always worth-taking. I have known this and take this at heart as my guidepost in public service and social contract with my Cebuano constituents.

It is my deep conviction that when you side with the poor and work for social justice, you would never go wrong. As the late Philippine President Ramon Magsaysay brilliantly described social justice --- “that those who have less in life should have more in law.”

Thank you very much!
Issues:

**Professor Bucoy**: Thank you very much for that very beautiful sharing and I wish those should be included in your slides. Your personal reflection and beautiful thoughts should be captured in your slides. I’m just very curious how the informal settlers are prioritized for housing?

**Councilor Dizon**: Thank you Professor Bucoy. A copy of my speech will be shared with each and everyone. The passage of of the Cebu shelter plan ordinance or the ordinance 2256 is an expression that the city government would like to prioritize the programs and projects of the urban poor because this ordinance completely expresses the commitment of the local government unit here in Cebu to address the urban poor’s right to be sent in affordable housing.

In terms of budget, that’s a way forward, Professor Bucoy. Councilor Cabrera and I, in our first year in office were able to facilitate some funding for urban poor projects and programs and one of this is the medium-rise building that we’re going to construct in barangay Lorega. We are going to build a three-storey medium rise building in collaboration or in cooperation with Gawad Kalinga (GK)...so next month we’re going to see the first medium rise building in the city of Cebu that would benefit some 60 families who used to lived in cemeteries because the city government decided to close the public cemetery and transform it into a socialized housing site since the cemetery is no longer compliant with the sanitation code of the Philippines.

During the time of former mayor Tommy Osmeña, he decided to close that cemetery and declare it as a socialized housing site. So we’re expecting five more buildings to be constructed in Barangay Lorega to benefit some three hundred families informal settlers in the city.

We are now in the process of looking at the budget at 2012 and with Councilor Cabrera, we will do our best to make sure that the urban poor concerns will be given priority as reflected in the next city budget.

**Professor Flores**: I am from Southwestern University. Do you have plans for the push cart residents?"

**Councilor Dizon**: Thank you, Prof. Flores. In terms of housing need, we will try to look into the situation of our push cart citizen pool in Plaza Independencia. The city of Cebu will soon initiate another round of registration for potential urban poor beneficiaries for the city socialized housing program. So we will do our best,
Prof. Flores, that they will be included in the registration so that the city can develop some plans no on how to help these families.

**Engineer Arcilla:** Yes. I am Engineer Dante Arcilla of the Blocycle Energy Incorporated. It’s a corporation but we dedicate more of our projects for social development also.

Before I ask my question I would like to commend you councilor for your very good moves. It is your first term and I hope you don’t change, I hope you don’t get eaten up by the system, and It’s really nice to have new councilors that are standing now.

I have two. First, with regards to the housing system, I noticed that it could be expensive especially that the cost of properties in the city proper is more expensive than the cost of development. Now I would like to ask if there is any plan development that utilizes a property where you can conduct business that you can sell parts of the land for high-rise approach and for commercial use as well?

Secondly, we know that priority is a for the poor population but the lower edge of the middle class is basically no different from the poor and they are buying house that are outside the city which causes migration of talent and loss of productive citizens. Is there a program from the government that addresses the middle class and their migration?

**Councilor Dizon:** Thank you Engr. Dante.

First, let me address your second concern about the middle income families in the city. As I presented earlier, one of the strategies of the Cebu City Shelter Plan ordinance relates to middle income households. You made a good point Engr. Dante, there is a trend that middle income families in the city are going out to other neighboring cities and municipalities like Lapulapu, Consolacion, Talisay because Cebu City lacks housing programs for this particular segment of our society. So, we are trying to look into that Engr. And with your support, maybe we can also get your suggestions or listen to your proposals? I would like to invite you to be part of the local housing board discussion on this matter because there is an on going discussion about this. We don’t have a concrete a development plan but rest assured that in the coming year, we are going to present more detailed plan on how to address middle income housing in the city.

About the cost of land of the city, that’s another good point. That is why we are trying to pursue the rental housing scheme because the cost of the land in the
city is very expensive and as you know the terrain, of the total land of the city, only 17% are flat land.

That explains, that is one of the reasons or factors why the cost of the land in the city is so expensive. I just came from a study visit in Sweden a month and one valuable lesson that I observed in Sweden in terms of housing program is about the rental housing program.

About 40% of the housing market in Sweden are provided for rental housing so that is one area that the city of Cebu will try to replicate. The Barangay Lorega housing project with Gawad Kalinga will be a pioneering project for our rental housing because our plan right now is instead of giving it to the residents.

Based on our experience, some urban poor families sell their housing rights so one move in order to preclude that is to try to explore the rental housing program so families will be given a chance to stay in a thirty meter condo type housing unit at a very affordable cost.

So far the discussion with the local housing board is for the rental to be between 300 to 400 pesos a month.-that is the rental that’s being proposed.

**Professor Etemadi** of the University of the Philippines Cebu: I met a young Alvin when he was a volunteer in FORGE, an NGO. And since then, I often cited him as a model social development worker. In fact, I think I have invited him two to three times to speak to my students in U.P. that’s where Ms. Carabuena met him. But we will not continue the story. So I would like to think that I am instrumental in that but I would to pursue the question of Professor Bucoy. I think it’s a very interesting question. We will ask Councilor Dizon to answer that.

Based on my own observation and study, we go to the question how are the social housing beneficiaries prioritized?

Based on my observation and study, those who are prioritized are those living, of course, in danger zones because of the emergency situation. These are those living in areas in eminent danger of demolition and there is already a judge who issued a demolition order.

There is also the readiness of the home-owners associations. Those who are organized, they are very strong in their advocacies on the topic. Negotiation with the land owner has been on-going or has made in progress and it’s just to be finalized.
The question is: is there politics in the city or in the barangay in prioritizing the housing program in terms of location and in terms of the beneficiaries?

Councilor Dizon: We have this proposal to create a barangay housing committee in all the barangays of Cebu City. It is like a barangay version of the local housing board since the barangays are the basic political unit in our society and the frontline in the delivery of the basic services.

My proposal is for all the barangay to create a barangay housing committee and in that committee, the civil society and home owners association must be represented so the composition of the barangay housing committee will not only be exclusive for the barangay officials or for the government officials…there must be a participation from the home owner themselves, from the urban poor groups, and from the NGOs operating in that barangay.

So, I filed that ordinance about three weeks ago and it is now in the committee level and in principle, my colleague Councilor Edgar Labella who chairperson on the Committee on Laws has manifested his approval to our proposed legislation. And hopefully, before the year ends, the city council will approve this proposed measure.
2. Honorable Nida Cabrera, Councilor of Cebu City, Philippines

PARTICIPATION IN A COMMUNITY

Councilor Cabrera started her presentation with a profile and a map of Bgy Luz.

The community has a total land area close to 20 hectares, with a population of 15,545 based on 2002 census. It has 16 sitios, 20 homeowners’ associations, 25 accredited NGOs and Pos. There are professionals, those employed in private and public institutions, pensioners and vendors in the community.

She proceeded to share the history of Bgy Luz as follows:

“In April 1956, a greatly destructive fire starting from the former Philippine Constabulary Headquarters at Jones Avenue razed to the ground hundreds of residential houses in the barangay and rendered thousands of families homeless.

Then Mayor Sergio Osmeña Jr. succeeded in securing from the President Ramon Magsaysay P100,000.00 as assistance to the fire victims. From this fund was taken the amount used in buying roofing materials for those who could immediately construct temporary shelters. Many however were housed in a number of school buildings.

As school opening was approaching and knowing these homeless families were at loss to find temporary places to stay, Mayor Osmeña ordered that from
what was left of the Magsaysay funds, an amount would be spent for the construction of several big barracks on a three-hectares government land at the junction of Archbishop Reyes Avenue and San Jose dela Montaña Street (now Juan Luna). In these barracks the fire victims were made to reside. These temporary homes were provided with light, two artesian wells, latrines, and a police precinct. One of the barracks was converted into a schoolhouse for children of the victims and of the nearby residents.

The place at once grew into a comparatively big community. It was immediately suggested that the barrio be named Ramon Magsaysay in honor of the President who helped its people through the devastation of the fire and who in essence was their benefactor. But this suggestion met stiff opposition by the people who saw the folly of honoring somebody who was still alive at that time. At the recommendation of Gervarion L. Lavilles, then secretary of Mayor Osmeña, the barangay was named Luz instead, in honor of the President’s First Lady, Mrs. Luz Banzon Magsaysay. This was unanimously approved. Ans this was how the barangay got its name.

Presently, the barracks-residences have been reconstructed and remolded to suit the needs of the families there. Among the famous landmarks in the barangay are the Bureau of Internal Revenue Regional Office, San Carlos Seminary Mayor and Minor. Most of the newly constructed buildings at the Cebu Business Park are within its jurisdiction, including the WTI-Pag-ibig Tower, FGU Tower and Ayala Center Cebu.

She proceeded to show the list of the homeowners’ associations and the number of homelots per association.

Among the significant projects undertaken by Bgy. Luz were:
1. Lot Acquisition (2 associations awarded through the Community Mortgage Program, 5 associations availed of the city socialized housing program and the actual occupants of the city-owned lots, and 11 associations through the Province Housing Program under Ordinance 93-1.
2. Micro – finance through BLHMPC / ALL R-Up
3. Environmental Management (solid waste, recyclable management and composting)
4. Educational Program
5. Networking / Linkages with other NGOs/Pos
6. Rental Housing – BLHMPC / ALL R-Up

In December of 2002, Bgy. Luz entered into the historic partnership with an NGO, the Center for Participatory Governance for Barangay Development Plan – Participatory Resource Appraisal (BDP-PRA). Significant steps taken towards BDP-PRA included activating the barangay council, conduct of a seminar-workshop to capacitate BDC, a trainors’ training where 35 community leaders were trained as BDP-PRA facilitators, formulating a comprehensive development plan with multi-sectoral inputs from about 150 participants who deliberated on the socio-economic development thrusts of the barangays for the next 1- and- five years, followed by the presentation and approval of the plans, pledging session and monitoring and evaluation.

From there, Bgy. Luz proceeded to become a model for successful community governance among Cebu communities demonstrating the active participation and collaboration of the barangay council, residents and various organizations and NGOs-POs.
ISSUES:

Professor Etemadi: For the record, the achievements of Councilor Cabrera for Bgy Luz need to be cited. I sat in a panel involved with the search for the best barangay which Bgy Luz won. I think Bgy. Luz also won other awards, both local and international.

Engr. Dante Arcilla: Thank you for coming over and presenting the experiences of Barangay Luz. I really admire your work, your concrete results. I also had the chance to work with your “inheritors” (successors) in Barangay Luz and I saw that the barangay is really good…the internal formations of the barangay is excellent surpasses all the other barangays that I have ever seen. I used to serve with Mabolo and we are sad to say we are inferior to what your barangay has accomplished …

… I see the location of barrio Luz. It is excellent for trade and commerce in the area. You are right next to Ayala Center which is undoubtedly the center of commerce here in Cebu

I see that the formation of barrio Luz and the preparation is more of personal and the social formation. I would like to ask about your future plans, now as a city councilor together with the barangay Luz officials, do you plan on expanding the planning system of barrio Luz to prepare the barangay to be more in command related to the development of trade and commerce in the area?

Councilor Cabrera: Right now, the people and organizations of barangay Luz have been active for the development of the barangay. One of their plans is strengthening private-public participation of the community by engaging with the different businesses around the barangay.

They have other separate undertakings, for example, strengthening the models for rental housing because right now, admittedly, we still have a problem particularly of the issue of the 93-1 beneficiaries, because the area of the 93-1 is just adjacent to the Cebu Business Park.

There is some portions there which we plan to use for further future developments.

Another area to development relates to health and sanitation. We have also a program planning for their environmental programs.
**Professor Ballescas:** We would also like to acknowledge the importance role of CPAG- Center of a Particular Governance the success of barangay Luz and we have with us today, Councilor Alvin Dizon, one of the CPAG founders and his younger version, Mr. Pernia, who is now here representing CPAG because the CPAG founder is now city councilor.

**Councilor Dizon:** May I also share some insights about participatory government in barangay Luz? As the founding director of CPAG, we introduced participatory approaches, technology for barangay planning in both Bgy Luz and Bgy Ermita. There was a partnership with the City of Cebu to replicate the experience of barangay Luz to other barangays, so during the time of Engr. Paul Villarete, who was then the city planning officer, we agreed to form a partnership with the city of Cebu to replicate experience to other barangays in the city. These barangays have owned their development plans using participatory approaches. CPAG’s present executive director is Ms. Catherine Ruiz.

**Mr. Pernia:** Good morning. Actually, our director Ms. Ruiz is in the Cebu City Development Process meeting unfortunately she can’t come this morning but will join this afternoon …

I think over the pass few years, we at CPAG tried to expand or replicate the PRA-BDP carried tool to other provinces or even outside Cebu City because the trend was stated by Councilor Dizon.

Last April 30, we actually conducted a barangay development planning somewhere in Toledo City, in the southern part of Cebu, and we actually planning to have a BDP in Camotes Island … The flow or the trend right now is to replicate or expand the tool in the city but in provinces as well, especially the Visayas area.

**Councilor Cabrera:** Actually, we have a project with CPAG this week, CPAG is helping Bgy Luz systematize various programs of the environment.

**Professor Ballescas:** Barangay Luz’s success maybe is gender-based?

**Dr. Bucoy:** I was just interested in the constraints or the problems encountered in the pushing for the security of tenure of the relocatees who came in from 1950s to the present. To what extent has the security of tenure of beneficiaries or relocatees been addressed? And how many are still struggling to get that security of tenure? And how would you possibly push farther in ensuring the tenure of this relocatees since 1950s?
Councillor Cabrera: There are three programs of the barangay. The community out-reach programs has already finished and they are sure of their tenure now. We also have the five organizations who availed the program in the city because the owner of the property is the city of Cebu so there’s no problem with the tenure now. We have still the problems of the 93-1..most of the beneficiaries are from 93-1…because mostly the owner of the lot in barangay Luz is the province of Cebu. There are eleven organizations who are in 93-1. Of the eleven, there are 1215 beneficiaries. There are still 800plus who are in the status of problem now with the provinces, but the office of Councilor Dizon, with the participation also of the office of Vice-President Binay, is working now with the province of Cebu to have another program… Councilor Alvin Dizon and I are exploring a guaranteed fund for this project…a fifty-million project

Councillor Dizon: The solution to this land dispute for the 93-1 program lies in the price of land…that is really the main issue right now, as far as selling the lots to the residents...

That is no longer a question because there is an ordinance in the National government, at the Office of the Vice-President and also of the Department of Interior and Local Government, they are now looking that these lots should be implemented as a socialized housing program. So the solution to the issue right now is really the price because the provincial government, Governor Gwen Garcia, of course, have their efforts to generate more fund for Capitol and so they want to increase the price of the lots.

Together with Councilor Cabrera and with the urban poor mass movement, we contend that this is a socialized housing program introduced during the time of former Governor Vicente de la Cerna and it is only right and proper to make the lands more affordable to the resident so the Vice-President came to Cebu…and he wanted to forge a win-win solution to the problem and basically we agreed as far as the city government is concerned. We agreed to his proposals and one of this proposal is for the city to set aside a guaranteed fund of fifty million. A week after the Vice-President issued the statement, Councilor Cabrera and I filed a resolution right away in the city council requesting the city of Cebu to set aside fifty million pesos as guaranteed fund for the 93-1 lots..so I think that’ the latest update...we are still waiting for the response of the governor, because she seems very…very silent..but when in 2013, when she’s going to run as senator, the 93-1 could be a good issue against her if nothing will happen before she will run…the 93-1 mass movement in Cebu can take the campaign to other provinces, cities, and link with
other urban groups. This issue can be the waterloo of the candidacy of Governor Garcia for senator in 2013.
Dr. Yuko Kobayakawa

A PROCESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE ACCUMULATED SOCIAL CAPITAL – THE CASE OF BARANGAY LUZ -

Good morning, everyone. It’s almost lunch time, but please bear with one more presentation because I’ve been waiting for today to present my work to you who have helped me in different ways for me to accomplish the study. Today I will show you the most interesting and important part of my study. “A Process of Community Development and Accumulated Social Capital in Barangay Luz.”

Contents of the presentation are: First, I will point out research questions. Then, I will define what I mean by an “ideal community” as well as “social capital”.

This chart shows a transformation of Brgy. Luz.

Brgy. Luz was a squatter community and people were indifferent to any sorts of communal matters.

Before any programs were implemented for development, Brgy. Luz had everything...every bad things that you can think of. The barangay was so notorious that taxi drivers didn't want to take Cabantan Road, which is the only road that cars can go through inside of Brgy. Luz.

But today, Brgy. Luz has become the most respected Brgy. for its achievement in Cebu City. People are formally registered as residents. If you visit
Brgy. Hall, you will be amazed how lively, vivid, and vibrant Brgy. Officials are. They are busy running meetings, consulting residents, making bags and accessories out of recycle materials and entertaining visitors; not only from all over the Philippines but also from overseas..., just like myself.

So, what has happened between before and after the implementation of community development? It is precisely the purpose of the study. I have found that there are 3 steps in the development.

This chart is what I have accomplished in the study. It looks very simple, but it took 4 years for me to draw it out.

As you may notice, each step was not implemented one by one. Step 2 and 3 emerged before accomplishment of the previously implemented programs. They emerged so as to correspond to the phenomena; bad one and good one.

It was 2006 when I fist visited Brgy. Luz. As you can see, at that time the land acquisition programs in Step 1 were shrinking or fading away. The trend was indicating a failure of land tenure. But people were very active in their daily life participating different workshops and organizing new groups. Barangay was very proud that they conducted a 5-year Participatory Barangay Development Plan and almost accomplished it as they had planned. They were moving on to the next plan.

And thus, the situation of Brgy. Luz in 2006 was chaotic as well as controversial...particularly in the eyes of outsider. I didn't understand why the barangay was very lively and confident when they were facing major crisis, losing the chance to own the land. To find it out, I needed to keep on coming back to Brgy. Luz for the next four years and stay inside the barangay.

Now, before I move any further with my findings, here I would like to define an ideal community in the case of the study, and social capital.

When we talk about community development, we need to have an ideal community as a vision. The ideal community, I understand here in the study, is the one that is led by endogenous and sustainable community activities.

In other words, a community that is managed by its members' collective actions and generates solutions to common problems sustainably.

Then how can it be realized? The community may need every mean of resources, such as economic, social and institutional resources. Suppose there exist good programs and supports to lead the community access to those resources. We know that absence of good leadership and governance in the
community will make it extremely difficult to implement inclusive and fair distribution of resources. And, how will they get information if the community doesn’t have social networks. If the community doesn’t have good stock of human capital, how can they adopt those resources? Knowledge and techniques to use technology are crucial when the community aims at autonomous and sustainable development. But most of all, it is willingness of people that is important in community development. Without it, the community will stay the same if not worse.

It is also true that the community has to deal with many different levels of individual, association, and nation state.

The importance of social capital has been discussed by scholars of different disciplines, but people find it difficult to grasp what social capital really is because of its broad definition.

Allow me to skip to explain how I gathered the data.

What I want to express here is my warmest thanks to Mr. & Mrs. Moncadas, who accepted me to stay in their house, barangay officials who always welcomed me and patiently answered the questions that I made, and special thanks to the then Barangay Captain Nida Cabrera, who always made sure that everyone would cooperate with me.

Here is the demography of Brgy. Luz.

Let’s move on to the process of development: Step 1.

The community development of Brgy. Luz is very unique because it was initiated with land acquisition programs.

Usually community development is conducted to improve living conditions, such as working on sewages, housings and such, or to empower people’s abilities with skills and knowledge for better incomes and life.

Why did Brgy. Luz start with land tenure? Here is the reason.

This is a satellite picture of Brgy. Luz and its surroundings.

As I mentioned earlier, Brgy. Luz was a squatter community, a community without legal approval to stay.

From the late 1980s, the 5-star hotel was built and a huge land next to Brgy. Luz was bought by Ayala, who designated the land to build a new commercial district, called Cebu Business Park.
New modern buildings started to be built. It was quite natural for the barangay members to fear for possible eviction.

A small group of the barangay members pled to the land owner, Provincial Gov’t to sell them the land they had occupied for quite sometime. It was 1988.

At that time, City Gov’t wanted to initiate a newly designed land acquisition program, called Community Mortgage Program, CMP, which was to finance urban poor to tenure the land at their affordable rate.

City Gov’t supported the group, and Provincial Gov’t agreed to sell the land under the condition that City Gov’t would help the barangay as an Originator.

Was it the end of the story? Not quite.

In order to cover whole barangay with land tenure as a community, Brgy. Luz needed to implement three different land acquisition programs. Namely, CMP in 1988, the Ordinance 93-1 in 1993, and Cebu Socialized Housing Program in 2002.

It took 14 years to implement land acquisition programs in the whole barangay.

Why?

But if you look back and see the track that had been embedded in the barangay, you would be surprised at a remarkable accomplishment.

Physically, the members of Brgy. Luz became formally acknowledged residents from unorganized squatters.

The physical change was very dramatic. Social status of the members became from nobody to somebody.

Their unstable life with threat of eviction became safe and secured.

What effects did such dramatic change in Step 1 have on the people?

They became aware of making difference in their living conditions through organizing. As residents, they began to have a sense of ownership and willingness for better living conditions became stronger.

But the reality shows difficulties with the programs.

Take a look at the rate of payment as of 2008.
The collection rate of CMP is 79%. It indicates that with a little more efforts, they can fully pay and gain land titles.

But the rates of both 93-1 and CSHP are so low that it is impossible for them to pay off within the duration. In fact, 93-1 was terminated in 2004.

About two-third of households in the barangay left without land tenure. With the land acquisition programs, it became obvious that Brgy. Luz could not tenure the land as a barangay.

The increase of a gap among the members, those who could tenure the land and those who couldn’t, brought tangible discrimination and dissatisfaction among the members.

In order to keep solidarity of the barangay, the City Government began to respond to the needs of the barangay working closely with NGOs who knew the best about needs of the urban poor communities and how to implement programs and services.

Hence, there emerged Step 2, implementation of livelihood programs. Programs and services of gender development, segregation of waste and recycling, income and job generating, healthcare and many other activities were introduced in Step 2.

Those programs and services were first initiated under supervisions and instructions of the City Government and/or NGOs. First, programs will be explained to the interested barangay members by City Gov’t or NGOs.

When the participants show their interest, they will have to form an organization so as to receive trainings for necessary skills and knowledge.

Those participants explain a program to the barangay members, run workshops as facilitators, and make a plan in a participatory manner.

As the facilitators and members of every organization repeat the same process, they accumulate experiences and learn how to implement new activity groups.

Eventually barangay members start organizing and managing groups at barangay level, and the City Gov’t and NGO step back from their leading positions to observant. They support the barangay at request.
Physical change of Brgy. Luz in Step 2 can be concluded as expansion of social networks. The inter-support activities function as a social safety network, and thus the expansion of successive community activities has resulted in strengthening of social linkages.

As the social networks expanded and as activity groups became active, the barangay members started to notice that there are things that an individual nor a single group cannot solve within the barangay. Accumulated small successes of organizations and activity groups made the members confident about their activities and it made them realize importance of collective actions for improving living conditions of the barangay. They started to feel importance of governance.

The third step is when the participatory barangay development plan was designed and launched.

In this stage, Barangay Development Council (BDC) was formed and the City Government and NGOs helped barangay councilors and leaders become facilitators with trainings, and the actual planning was made mainly by those facilitators and the barangay members.

During the development planning, workshops were hold to bring about the issues of the barangay and decisions were made in a manner to promote participation of the on-going activity groups and organizations.

Those organizations and groups formed in Step 2 are to satisfy and achieve respective purposes.

Realization of communal problems, along with accumulation of small successes, created a tool with which all existing organizations and groups can participate collectively and sustainably.

Accumulated elements noticed in Step 3 are pride and responsibility as residents. Fusion of those senses and expansion of social networks resulted in collective and sustainable acts toward betterment.

To prove it, currently BDC councillors and facilitators are working on new 3-year development plan 2012-2014. This time, they have surveyed by themselves, and brought up issues to be solved in the sectors of social, economic, administration and environment. Now they are finalizing their work so that they can present the plan in a general assembly and get an approval from every member of Brgy. Luz.

The development that started with land acquisition programs was a method of leading squatters with no collateral to the formal world by financing them to tenure the land.
As conclusion:

- Development started with land acquisition programs
  - A method of leading squatters with no collateral to the formal world by financing them to tenure the land.
- Barangay improvement developed from the change in people’s consciousness toward permanent stay
  - Simplified implementation method that can be easily duplicated
  - From the GO/NGO led approach to the autonomous activities
- Participatory Barangay Development
  - Creation of a tool/manual that promotes borderless participation of the barangay members
- Never changed mutual goal among actors
  - Every actor focused on the mutual goal even at the hardest time
  - The development showed patience and flexibility for the barangay members to build willingness to act for the betterment of themselves as well as the community.
Issues:

Prof. Etemadi: Yuko is vibrant. I like her systematic analysis which she clearly presented. She gets the message across. I also like that she can be scholarly while being down to earth. Her definition of Governance as the collective action for improving living conditions of the people or enhancing the living standards of people is simple but very clear.

Dr. Yuko: Being scholarly and being a good communicator to the people is a difficult job.

Prof. Etemadi: What in your observation are the key ingredients of successful leadership in Bo. Luz that other barangays can learn from?

Dr. Yuko: A vision for the community. Strong enough to take action.

Councilor Cabrera: This is a good input for us in Cebu City. I am amazed at Yuko’s study. Participation of the people is the key. Because of the collective experience of a threat of eviction in the 90s during the Ayala development at Cebu Business Park, the community was compelled to unite in order to survive the challenges of urban development. We were able to convince opponents or people who refuse to cooperate that if they don’t unite with us, they will be left to fend for themselves amid the threat of demolition. The gay sector also assisted us in the projects of the barangay (designing products).

Mr. Vince Cinches: I was a community organizer of Bo. Luz in 1994. We brought a different perspective (national-democracy). How are the people responding to the question of security of tenure?

Councilor Cabrera: We have secured land titles for some residents. We also addressed the education needs of the people, for them to see the importance of security of tenure. Some of the members of the community also prioritized the education of their children at the expense of their house improvements. Eventually they were able to improve their lives.

Dr. Bucoy: Did you cite also in your paper the conflict of different perspectives and how the community worked together? How the people developed change of consciousness? Women played a very important role. Does your dissertation elaborate on the role of women in the development process?

Dr. Yuko: Yes, I cited the case of Bantay Banay. The second biggest issue after land tenure is domestic violence. When the women started to talk about their problems, they were also able to talk about other development concerns.
Brgy Captain of Lorega: How did Bgy. Luz respond to problems related to people not being able to meet their payment obligations?

Dr. Yuko: With the Community Mortgage Program (CMP) and due to working with a group, people are more aware of their responsibility to pay.

Councilor Nida: The 93-1 beneficiaries are also affected by government bureaucracy. It is not true that the people are hard-headed, as sometimes reported in the newspapers. They also have to contend with cumbersome bureaucratic procedures (technical descriptions, subdivision approval, etc.). The economic reality is also a problem, people are hard up to pay.

Councilor Dizon: We conclude that people who failed to pay their obligation should not be totally faulted. It is also the fault of the province for failing to deliver some technical documents to the people (subdivision plan). We are planning to launch an education campaign in the community to instill in them the value of security of tenure and of faithfully comply with their obligation- to counter the dole-out mentality.
4. Professor Kazuo Takahashi  
Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

Community Based Development in Thailand and Applied Program in Mongolia

After presenting background information about Thailand, Prof. Takahashi proceeded to explain that Thailand experienced economic growth in the 1960s, saw population concentration in Bangkok in the 1970s, slum expansion as well as eviction in Bangkok in the 1980s, and witnessed community development by community dwellers (bottom up approach) in the 1990s through the UCDO, and the Baan Mankong Program by CODI in the 2000s.

With rampant eviction in the 1980s by the central and local governments, the UCDO (Urban Community Development Office) was established in 1992 as separate from the NHA (National Housing Authority).

The UCDO received Urban Poor Development Fund from Government worth 1,250 million Bahts to support urban community development activities and to provide low-interest loans to community organizations for income generation and housing. The UCDO later merged with the Rural Development Fund.

In 2000, CODI (Community Organization Development Institute), a new public organization, was created. CODI manages various funds (total amount of 3.3 billion Bahts) for the development of the community organizations in rural and urban areas.

CODI links groups together through various networks. (see slide 11)

The main Concepts of “BAAN MANKONG” include:
1. Community Organizations and Community Networks as the core actors.
2. Change from “Supply Driven” to “Demand Driven”.
3. Flexible financial management.
4. Integrate housing development with city development.

To illustrate, in the experience of Wat Chula Community in Ayutthaya, the Community Committee bought land for 7 Rai (11,200 square meter) for a total of 2.6 million Bahts. CODI granted a 15 year-long loan for Community Housing Cooperative for a total of 103 units and Community Space (Hall).

TWO years later, the Wat Chula Community started to save 260,000 Bahts within 4 years. It had a loan of 2,600,000 Bahts for Land to be paid back in 15 years. A unit cost 35,000 Bahts for Infrastructure subsidy (side walk, electricity, water supply, etc.) was granted by CODI.

Five Types of Houses were build with the following costs:: 200,000 Bahts (Two storey House), 20,000 Bahts by Dweller Family (10%), and 180,000 Bahts by CODI (90%).

Moving on, Prof. Takahashi proceeded to discuss the Applied Program in Mongolia. After discussing Mongolia’s general background data, Prof. Takahashi next focused on Community Development in Mongolia.

Mongolia is one of many countries included in the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR) which has a 20-year- working experience in Asia. This is a coalition of Asian organizations, with people and community oriented approach established in 1988.

ACHR key groups support and link broad community process in cities in Asian countries. Among the countries linked are the following:
- Thailand (230 cities: city-wide upgrading, community networks at national and cities, community savings and credit in all networks and cities)
- Cambodia 23 cities community networks, UPDF, savings, upgrading
- Vietnam 8 cities community savings, city development fund, link with cities
- Nepal 12 cities community savings, networking, city partnership
- Laos 5 out of 11 provinces community savings, networking, partner with cities
- Mongolia 12 cities community savings, networking, upgrading
- Philippines 30 cities networking, savings, federation, community organizing,
• Pakistan 30 cities community sanitation, planning, urc
• Sri Lanka 30 cities community savings and fund by WB and WDB network

After 20 years experiences and work, the following insights:

a) Urban poor communities are key actors in making change at city-wide, nation-wide scale and link together into organizations and networks.
b) Community savings and fund are new flexible tools leading to city-wide and holistic people-led development in achieving big scale change.
c) The need to develop Community Development Fund as new public development tools of government and local system.
d) Building city partnership between communities, local authorities, professionals and urban partners as joint development mechanism dealing with city-wide upgrading and other city development, and,
e) The needs for participatory city-development strategy

The objectives of the Asian Coalition for Community action (ACCA Program) include:
- Support development options for community managed delivery
- City-wide upgrading approach and building city partnership
- Building up Community Development Fund to support community-led development at scale
- Change relationship between the poor and the city
- Consolidate city change process leading to change in structure and policy

The ACCA Program 2009-2011 PROGRAM TARGETS for 150 cities in 3 years include:
- Community savings and funds
- City-wide survey and information
- City-wide upgrading action plans
- Community networks
- Building partnership
- Understanding Asian cities
- Community-led disaster rehabilitation

The PR500 SMALL community upgrading projects ($3,000 each) for 50 BIG housing projects (max. 40,000 US$) for at least 100 City Community Development Funds.
After 6 months, the ACHR/ACCA Program:

- Approved support for national process in 14 countries covering 64 cities
- Approved 32 housing projects in 30 cities
- Approved 220 small development projects in 50 cities
- Approved city development budget for 52 cities to support community survey and city-wide information gathering in 12 countries
- Support community savings and community Fund in 50 cities

A short video of a Community Development project in Mongolia through the ACCA Program was next shown.

Prof. Takahashi concluded his presentation with the discussion of the characteristics of Community Development in Ulaanbaatar City, Mongolia as follows:

- The Urban Poor formed Ger Community
- Ger Community can be called "FENCED COMMUNITY"
- After 1990, Economic Policy in Mongolia was Changed to Marketism
- Permitted to own lands by people
- City Edge Area occupied by Ger Communities and Community Dwellers became land owners
- Easier Relocation by land owners
- Aging Dwellers, Aging Community
5. Professor Sang Kyung An  
Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

Innovative Communities: Community-Driven Approaches to Housing Provision in Seoul and Bangkok

Professor An defined the Community-driven Approaches to Housing Provision as an approach that encourages community groups to take initiative for their own socio-economic development as prime actors in the development process, where community groups have direct control over management of the development process, including design and implementation of the development, and as being expressed as a panacea for all development challenges in developing countries.

He raised some questions: What conditions make it possible? Can the approach be sustainable? Can the approach be scaled-up? What strategies do communities need to attain their goals in different contexts?

In his presentation, Prof. An wanted to compare the strategies and struggles in two poor communities that have taken a community-driven approach to housing provisions in very different urban context: Seoul and Bangkok and to seek how different strategies are possible and indeed necessary in different contexts.

He continued to present some facts on Informal Settlements and Redevelopment Policies in Korea. He then moved on to discuss about the Haengdang Community in Seoul, a squatter communities situated on a steep hillside slope 5 km from Seoul City Hall with 72% squatter housing, 15% of land owned by the government, the rest privately owned with 90% of households renters.

In October 1993, 2,300 families were evicted. The evicted people returned
and continued struggling for temporary and public housing for 3 yrs. Forced eviction by hired thugs resulted in strong resistance from the community.

Prof. An then focused on the historical development of the community’s struggle. At the beginning of the Residents' Movement (1987-1992), after democratization in 1987, freedom of speech and civic rights increased. Tenants and squatter eviction still continued, market price rapidly increased.

Religious and universities took on the NGO roles. New NGOs or civil societies for the poor emerged. There was no system of local autonomy.

Despite the change to a civilian government (1993- ), forced tenants and squatter evictions continued. After approval of redevelopment projects in 1993, there were forced evictions.

A government sponsored program providing 2 million housing units was completed in 1993 with elected local government since 1995.

Organizing renters’ association resorted to gain protection of their housing right. Communities resisted forced eviction. Demand for temporary on-site housing was articulated while they waited for the public rental housing to be completed. Solidarity and network with neighboring informal communities for struggle was also observed.

Cooperative Movements were observed within the period of 1995-1998. Although local governments were elected, their powers and community participation were limited. Forced eviction continued.

Redevelopment law was amended to give renters a much clear right to public rental housing.

Some strategies observed were: construction of temporary on-site housing and moving into the house, generation of income and job opportunity to improve the well-being of residents through co-operative production, consumption, credit and social welfare, promotion of solidarity and network and the fostering of community leadership.

A period of negotiation and collaboration followed during the period from 1999-2003.

This period was marked by the birth of the new civilian Kim Dae-Jung Government, the economic downturn with the financial crisis in Asia, and, rapid recovery.

There were many changes in governance, accountability, and people’s participation. The role of NGOs changed from controlling to facilitating, from giving to empowering.

Strategies observed for this period included: moving into public rental house, temporary housing was demolished, scaling up co-operative movements and
community-driven development to district level, collaboration with communities which were moved from other areas into the public rental housing, solving unemployment and creation of job opportunity – employment training, and the opening of residents initiated Social welfare center.

The next period, from 2004 to the present, was characterized by the period of scaling up of community-driven development.

There were programs for children and youth – after-school tutoring program, scout program, environmental awareness and education.

The following were also observed: regional welfare program for the excluded people and senior citizens who live alone, organizing cultural events and festivals, expansion of credit union, regional employment training center, solidarity with other communities and regions, and international network with overseas communities and NGOs.

Lessons learned from Haendang Community Empowerment Struggle were as follows:

- The treat of forced evictions and resistance to them promoted the community to come together and made them stronger
- The community continued to develop programs or projects to address many different needs
- The community organizers and activists played critical role in the stage of community organizing.
- Co-operative movements became a role model to other poor communities
- Once the community achieved the aim of moving into temporary on-site housing, the community has been weakened. Limitation of eviction resistance movement.
- Divisions, both within community and between other communities by greed and egoism – should be accompanied by the restoration of moral values
- Becoming lodged in providing social service to residents, being unable to broaden out into community-driven development.

By comparison, Bangkok’s Housing development, had its particular features. Thailand has been experiencing rather slow urbanization compared to other
developing countries - 33.9% in 2009. The history of urbanization within Thailand is almost exclusively the history of growth of Bangkok - one of the world’s most extreme examples of primate city (population of 6.9 million).

Thailand’s slum population moved increased from 740,000 persons in 1958 (46% of Bangkok Population), to 956,400 in 1985, to 1,099,600 in 796 slum settlements in 2000 (19%) and expanded into adjacent provinces, partly by the eviction and relocation from Bangkok and partly by the outward expansion of urbanized areas.

Policy responses to the slums ranged from forced evictions and clearance through public interventions, to pro-poor and inclusive approaches using community-led participatory methods. Some of the significant responses include: exclusive public housing and slum clearance from 1960 to 1971 and establishment of National Housing Authority in 1973. These did not fit both their practical need and their lifestyle, but also failed to reach low-income target groups.

In mid-1970, assisted self-help and upgrading schemes emerged which emphasized largely on physical improvement without securing the dwellers’ legal tenure status which were mostly expensive and top-down approach.

In mid-1980s, the concept for land for housing the poor was introduced, an innovative approach like land sharing schemes.

The enabling approach’ emerged from the late 1980s which actively promoted private sector participation. The role of NHA has been reduced with the establishment of the Urban Community Development Office (UCDO, later called CODI) in 1992.

This was accompanied by the allocation of government budget to the community driven development projects in poor areas implemented through the Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI).

CODI has helped the poor communities set up savings group, organize communities, form networks, negotiate for securing land tenure and develop their own housing projects.

The ‘Baan Mankong (secure land and housing tenure) Program was launched in 2003 to improve housing, living and tenure security for 300,000 households .

The Suan Plu Community in Bangkok is one of the largest slums in Bangkok, located near wealthy neighborhood, many embassies and in the heart of the city’s financial district. And occupied Treasury Department owned land over 70 years as a squatter settlement .

In 2004, the slum community was almost destroyed by a massive fire . Around 1,200 families (7,000 persons) were living in 814 houses on 27,680 m². The fire consumed 713 houses and left up to about 5,000 people homeless. Fires are often used as an instrument to evict slum dwellers.

The cabinet quickly approved a on-site upgrading with a 30 year long-term land lease contract.
Negotiations about redevelopment options for the community were followed with a variety of concerned agencies.
Initially, the public bodies proposed a plan to provide government-built flats in 5 story blocks but, some dweller group refused the proposal for following reasons:
1) some people might be rejected for housing loan form bank due to their repayment ability
2) it is difficult for people to come together and learn how to address their problems
3) the living space is too small for family to live.
The community split into two groups – those who want to live in ready-made flats in 5 story blocks by NHA, and those who want to live in row house under financial support by CODI. Finally, 264 families chose CODI project and 560 chose NHA project. Ironically, remaining more than 400 families who rented were forced permanently relocated.
The ratio of NHA to CODI project area is 6:4
NHA designed, constructed and sold ready-made flats in 5 story with 33 ㎡, no people’s participation. The sale price per unit was 390,000 Baht in 2009 when the occupancy began. Housing loan for 25 years was provided.
About 30 percent of the original dwellers already sold their right to stay in the unit and move to other place. The unites were being sold for more than 2 times the initial price.
It would not be easy for people in the community to come together and act collectively.
The CODI project, on the otherhand, showed land was given to the community cooperative on a collective 30-year renewable land lease. The residents worked with architects from the CODI to develop a range of house designs and layout options.
This was followed by the development of four different housing types: three sizes of row houses and walk-up flats. The families were divided into sub-groups of 15 households, who would live together in the new project. The sub-group was the basic means for linking members together to plan and collect savings.
During the construction stage, most of the houses were built by a contractor hired by the community with some community labor contribution. Sub-groups were responsible for accounts and project supervision and materials purchasing. The loans for the construction were provided directly from CODI to the cooperative. As a result of community-controlled construction process, house design customization, and collective savings capacity. The costs per unit were also lower.
Below is a graph showing a Comparison of NHA and CODI Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing Body</th>
<th>Baan Eur Arthorn Side</th>
<th>Baan Mankong Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1.7 ha (60% of total area)</td>
<td>1.1 ha (40% of total area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Housing units</td>
<td>560 units</td>
<td>264 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type</td>
<td>Apartments in 5 story blocks</td>
<td>row houses and walk-up flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor area of unit</td>
<td>33 m²</td>
<td>62.5-100 m² &amp; 20 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>NO, Ready-made flats and occupy</td>
<td>Active involvement in design, construction and financing, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price per unit</td>
<td>390,000 Baht</td>
<td>215,000-360,000 Baht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free to transact</td>
<td>OK after 5 years</td>
<td>Only to the cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prof. An moved to a discussion of the lessons learned from Suan Plu Community which showcased a rare case of a community that was split into two areas by two organizations in a community - by completely different development techniques.

There were different outcomes in the community involvements in project design, construction, management, financing and community organizing.

After the project completed, the land prices in the area soon reached the level of full market value. About 30 percent of the owners in NHA sold the right to outsider and moved out. Sold at market price, the seller has earned about 500,000 Baht as a windfall gain.

The housing owners in CODI side are not allowed to sell the property. Such a practice and rule makes them feel the sense of deprivation and hampers social cohesion in the community. There was the other issue that involved the house renters who have lived in the area before a fire. Generally, they are poorer than the house owners.

Both programs for low-income households did not help them much, however.

Continuity in community development activities is another challenge in practice in community development.

What is the ultimate goal of community development? Is it to reduce poverty or is it about increasing people’s participation in community matters?
6. MR. BIMBO FERNANDEZ, Founder and Head, Pagtambayayong Foundation Inc.

Discussion on Community Development; Is Land Tenure Essential in Community Development?

Mr. Bimbo Fernandez raised the following points:

1. Cebu is a model of GO-NGO collaboration or interaction/dynamics.

2. Democracy should be exercised on and off elections. The voters in Cebu are educated politically.

3. Local politicians have placed the urban poor welfare on top of their agenda. This started when Mayor Tomas Osmeña won his first election because of the urban poor vote.

4. The people were organized around the issue of security of tenure.

5. Paulo Friere’s "Action-Reflection-Action" was a popular framework among NGOs.

6. It is important for the poor to realize the power of their votes and make government accountable to them; that government is a servant of the people.
Issues

**Ms. Chuchi Flores:** How do you deal with legal obstacles?

**Mr. Bimbo:** It's challenging because the laws are made to protect the establishment. So if you challenge the establishment, then the laws are stacked against you. There are certain openings that allow you to push for your agenda and you can make the most out of it... There is a growth of political consciousness in Cebu province. I hope they will follow soon, the urban poor in Cebu City.

**Prof. Etemadi:** GO-NGO collaboration is now with a small "c" no longer a big "C". Water is becoming very expensive for the urban poor. If you don't have security of tenure, you pay more for social services like water utility.

**Engr. Dante:** Governance is influenced by many sectors. The Philippines has a feudal-capitalist system. The people who have the capital wield much of the influence in government. We can learn from the examples of Thailand, Mongolia and South Korea as presented in this workshop.

**Prof. Ballescas:** We can encourage more sharing of experiences. We can utilize teleconferencing through Skype organized by RCE-Cebu; for more international conferences like this.

**Mr. Bimbo:** In Japan, structural reform led to cultural and social reform. Because of man’s inherent capacity to reflect, perhaps there is a chance for our country to reform.

**Mr. Vince Cinches:** In the case of Tañon Strait, we thought we could widen the legal accessibility of people.

**Prof. Ballescas:** The concept of community is more social than political.

**PROF. SANG AN** - Community development is tied to the participatory approach. It cannot be sustainable without people's participation.
III. Appendices
a. Powerpoint Presentations
ENSURING HOUSING RIGHTS FOR THE POOR THROUGH LOCAL LEGISLATION: THE CASE OF CEBU CITY

Alvin M. Dizon
Cebu City Councilor
CEBU CITY

- Household population of Cebu City in 2007 was 791,697 persons showing an increase of 10.8% from 714,509 persons in 2000
CEBU CITY

- Since 1993 up to 2006, the Cebu City registered 58,712 informal settlers as part of UDHA implementation.
- About 39,000 (67%) of the registered families already availed of housing project of the City.
- More or less 19,712 informal families (33%) are still living in either private or government lot registered by DWUP.
CEBU CITY

- Cebu City has 4,292 families living in government owned lots.
- There are also 2,653 families living in riverbanks which are considered danger zones.
One of the meaningful ways local government can make a positive impact on the lives of ordinary citizens is through progressive local legislation.
• Local legislations must be responsive to the people’s needs and sensitive to their plight.

• Effective and meaningful legislations promote and protect the rights of the poor.
“One of the indicators of good governance emphasizes reform through human-centered development and political institution reform specifically on making the government accountable, transparent, responsive, participatory, effective and efficient, and most importantly, equitable and inclusive.”

- United Nations Good Governance Indicators
In sum, government must be perceived to be as near and accessible to the people as possible.
Dizon’s shelter plan gets urban poor’s support

Proposal aims to provide safe shelter for informal settlers

VARIOUS urban poor organizations supported the Cebu City Shelter Plan Ordinance of Councilor Alvin Dizon during deliberations on the final draft yesterday. The ordinance aims to provide decent low-cost housing and address homelessness in Cebu City. It will serve as a blueprint for all housing and shelter programs, projects and initiatives in Cebu City from 2011-16.

“We will make available decent affordable housing, basic services and resettlement areas to underprivileged and homeless citizens in Cebu City,” Dizon said.

The Cebu City Shelter Plan Framework aims to ensure that informal settlers will have safe and livable settlements and to provide housing programs for the urban poor and middle-income households.

The Division for the Welfare of the Urban Poor, in close coordination with the committee on housing in Cebu City, will be the primary implementing agency.

The councilor also disclosed yesterday that several inquiries from the City Council were raised regarding existing relocation sites and increasing migration to Cebu City.

“We already revised the ordinance and this is now subject for final approval,” said Dizon.

Paz Turialo of the Presidential Commission for the Urban Poor hopes that the Cebu City Council will approve the shelter plan framework. She said it can minimize the housing problems in the City.

“This will be a great assistance to the poor and the homeless,” Turialo said.

Marlene Paracuelles, president of the Alliance of Barangay Apas Community Associations Inc., added that the shelter plan will alleviate the lives of the urban poor.

“The safety and housing situation of the urban poor in Cebu City will be improved if this will be put into action,” she said.

Dizon revealed the final draft of the shelter plan was already agreed upon by the City Council, and will be deliberated in the next session of the City Council. This policy was drafted as early as 2007.

The shelter plan framework intends to make Cebu City a healthy and peaceful community with decent and affordable housing for all by the year 2020. (INTERNATIONAL DAVINCI MARU)
New councilor proposes ‘shelter framework’ plan

TO ADDRESS the increasing number of urban poor dwellers, a local legislator wants to pass legislation creating a shelter framework plan for Cebu City.

Councilor Alvin Dizon, a former nongovernment organization head, said the plan will define the goals, objectives, and the implementation in addressing the housing and land problem of the homeless and the city’s poor.

Dizon said the City has yet to develop a strategy or framework that seeks to solve the housing problem of the urban poor.

“I will try my best that housing for the urban poor will be given a paramount priority and attention in the council because I am the representative of the urban poor in the council,” he said.

In 2006, there were 58,000 urban poor families registered in the city, 38,000 of whom availed themselves of the housing programs of the City and the National Government.

Bigger

“And this (the number of squatters) has increased today and we now have a bigger problem. Dizon sees need to improve basic facilities in relocation sites

The councilor said he will include in the shelter plan a clear guideline for the purchase and development of relocation sites, as well as their development.

Dizon said there are seven relocation sites in the city, including one in Barangays Busay, Pitsos and Budlaan, but these are not well-developed.

“Daghan kaayo ta’g relocation sites dinhi sa atong syudad pero P5 na la’y plite paingon sa langit, wala’y provision of basic facilities, wala’g tubig, kuryente (The locations are so far and these lack water and electricity),” he said.

Development

Dizon said the development of the relocation sites is imperative as a way of solving the problem on housing for the urban poor.

“Mobalik ra gihapon na ang atong urban poor dwellers sa city kung di na ma-develop kay wa’g tubig, wa’g kuryente, wa’g livelihood components (The urban poor will return to settle in the city center if we can’t develop the relocation sites),” he said.

Dizon assured he will be in constant dialogue with the urban poor to know what laws are needed to strengthen and advance their welfare.
SHELTER PLAN STRATEGIES

1. Ensure that informal settlers have safe and livable settlements

2. Strict implementation of 20% balanced housing development in Cebu City

3. Pursue rental housing program for the urban poor and transients

4. Pursue a housing program for middle-income households
5. Implement financial scheme to ensure sustainable fund allocation for land and housing development;

6. Establish and strengthen partnerships and linkages among government units, NGOs, community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, national government agencies; homeowners associations and the private sector; and

7. Regular strengthening and organizational development of the Division for the Welfare of the Urban Poor as the primary implementing agency of city housing programs and projects.
From 2011 to 2016, Cebu City will need a 25,868 houses due to its housing backlog and 17,118 houses as a result of its population growth.
City to rework housing loan program for poor

About 2,553 out of 3,651 beneficiaries of Cebu City Hall’s Slum Improvement and Resettlement (SIR) program have not fully paid their dues.

In last Friday’s City Council session, Councilor Alvin Dizon said they would have to restructure the loan arrangements with the beneficiaries in barangays Ermita, Pasil, Duljo Fatima, Sawang Calero, Suba and Mambaling.

The 25-year-old SIR program expired last Dec. 31, 2009. It was extended for six months starting last January.

Only 93 beneficiaries paid their amortizations in full during that period.

Councilor Dizon said the delinquent beneficiaries will have to apply for the loan restructuring program.

Under the new arrangement, the principal amount owed will be doubled with interest accumulated in the last 25 years.

It will be payable for 10 years with an annual interest of six percent or a monthly interest of 0.005 percent.

Beneficiaries must pay two months in advance in order to avail of the new loan payment scheme.

Beneficiaries who fail to pay their amortizations for three consecutive months will be automatically forfeited of their rights at any time, in full or in part, without the consent of the city government.

DIZON

Beneficiaries who still fail to pay their loans after 10 years will be totally forfeited of their rights.

The SIR and Division for the Welfare of the Urban Poor will conduct an occupancy survey to identify the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries.

The survey result will serve as basis for the final master list of beneficiaries who will be covered by the Ordinance.

Elsewhere, the Cebu City Task Force on Street Dwellers started transferring street dwellers to a relocation area in barangay Taboan.

Squatters Prevention Encroachment Elimination Division (SPEED) personnel aided dwellers in relocating to Taboan, who were photographed for identification purposes.

Street dwellers may return to the streets at day but are required to return to Taboan on or before 10 p.m. Correspondent: Jane P. Augusto
TRANSFER TAX EXEMPTION TO ALL SOCIALIZED HOUSING BENEFICIARIES ORDINANCE
174 RESOLUTIONS

52 resolutions were on urban poor and housing.
38 resolutions were aimed to provide basic services to barangays
12 for good governance especially transparency, accountability and people’s participation
12 for the protection and promotion of workers’ rights and welfare
23 on various concerns of PWDs, children, women, environment and human rights
ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

- Regular monthly meetings with civil society and other sectoral groups
- Weekly visits in the barangays and urban poor communities
- Weekly Radio program over DYRC (648 khz) - “Urban Poor in Action”
WE SUPPORT GOOD GOVERNANCE!
WE SUPPORT ALVIN DIZON & NIDA CABRERA
Victories are sources of inspiration since they are the small patches of green we have started to nurture at the local level.
The cause of the poor and the marginalized is always worth-taking.

When we side with the poor and work for social justice, we would never go wrong.
“those who have less in life should have more in law.”

— Former President Ramon Magsaysay
Thank you!
PARTICIPATION IN A COMMUNITY

September 30, 2011

HON. NIDA C. CABRERA
Cebu City Councilor
THE BARANGAY
LUZ
Experience
Barangay Luz Profile

- One of the most dynamic barangays in Cebu City
- Total Land Area : 19.9858 hectares
- Population : 15,545 as of 2002 census
- Political Subdivisions : 16 sitios
- Homeowners Associations : 20
- Accredited NGOs-POs : 25
- Source of Income (People): Vending, Professionals, Pensioners, Employment in Private and Public Institutions.
Barangay Luz Map
In April 1956, a greatly destructive fire starting from the former Philippine Constabulary Headquarters at Jones Avenue razed to the ground hundreds of residential houses in the barangay and rendered thousands of families homeless.

Then Mayor Sergio Osmeña Jr. succeeded in securing from the President Ramon Magsaysay P100,000.00 as assistance to the fire victims. From this fund was taken the amount used in buying roofing materials for those who could immediately construct temporary shelters. Many however were housed in a number of school buildings.

As school opening was approaching and knowing these homeless families were at loss to find temporary places to stay, Mayor Osmeña ordered that from what was left of the Magsaysay funds, an amount would be spent for the construction of several big barracks on a three-hectares government land at the junction of Archbishop Reyes Avenue and San Jose dela Montaña Street (now Juan Luna). In these barracks the fire victims were made to reside. These temporary homes were provided with light, two artesian wells, latrines, and a police precinct. One of the barracks was converted into a schoolhouse for children of the victims and of the nearby residents.
The place at once grew into a comparatively big community. It was immediately suggested that the barrio be named Ramon Magsaysay in honor of the President who helped its people through the devastation of the fire and who in essence was their benefactor. But this suggestion met stiff opposition by the people who saw the folly of honoring somebody who was still alive at that time. At the recommendation of Gervarion L. Lavilles, then secretary of Mayor Osmeña, the barangay was named Luz instead, in honor of the President’s First Lady, Mrs. Luz Banzon Magsaysay. This was unanimously approved. Ans this was how the barangay got its name.

Presently, the barracks-residences have been reconstructed and remolded to suit the needs of the families there. Among the famous landmarks in the barangay are the Bureau of Internal Revenue Regional Office, San Carlos Seminary Mayor and Minor. Most of the newly constructed buildings at the Cebu Business Park are with its jurisdiction, including the WTI-Pag-ibig Tower, FGU Tower and Ayala Center Cebu.
The original settlers of the barangay are a few families of poor farmers who make their living by tending cows, carabaos and horses, since the area is abundant with napper grasses favorable for pasture of the aforementioned animals. And the major means of transportation during those period is the caleza an tartanilla.
THE CHAIN OF RELOCATEES

The first relocatees of Barangay Luz are the victims of the Camp Sergio Osmeña Sr. conflagration that hit the very hearth of Cebu City that prompted then Mayor Sergio Osmeña Jr., Governor Jose Briones and the late President of the Republic Ramon Magsaysay to relocate the poor fire victims in the suburban portion of the city in what is known as Barangay Luz in honor of the First Lady Mrs. Luz Banzon Magsaysay.

They are occupying the north western portion of the barangay and they named their sitios in memory of the names of the evacuation centers after that fateful fire. Thus the fire victims call their sitio Zapatera, Abellana and City Central.

The next batch of the relocatees that followed are the former settlers of the north foreshore area of Cebu City that is called Mori-Morio they were transferred in the barangay to give way to the development and construction of the Cebu City’s North Reclamation Area that was started way back 1957. the others that followed suit are also fire victims of Warwick Barracks at the Carbon Market at Cebu City and they are the residents of what is now Sitio Sto. Niño I of Barangay Luz.
THE CHAIN OF RELOCATEES

This was followed by the families of the military personnel’s living in the 3rd Military Hospital at Gorordo Avenue which was also asked to vacate their place to give way to the development of General Sotero Cabahug of the Philippines Constabulary Unit. They are now the occupants of San Vicente, Nangka, and San Roque.

The last batch of official relocatees are the constituents of San Antonio, Kalinao, and Mabuhay who are formerly settling along Pier 1 & 2 of Cebu City.

At present, the Sangguniang Barangay is lobbying to the City Mayor and the members of the Sangguniang Panlungsod for them to pass a City Ordinance identifying Barangay Luz, Cebu City as Area for Socialized Housing pursuant to the provisions of Republic Act 7279.
## List of Homeowners Association

**Beneficiaries:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Association</th>
<th>No. of Homelots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ilang-ilang HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sta. Cruz HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nangka HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SRO HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mabuhay Catholic HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lubi HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. San Roque HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Friendly HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mabuhay HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. St. Vincent Fraternal HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sampaguita HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. UPRAI HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Seminary Side HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Abellana HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Narra HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Association</td>
<td>No. of Homelots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. City Central HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Zapatera Residents HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Zapatera Neighborhood HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Era HOA, Inc.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL NO. OF HOMELOTS** 2,187
PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN

- **Lot Acquisition**
  - CMP – 3 associations awarded
  - City Socialized Housing Program (5 association avail of this program and the actual occupants of the City owned lots)
  - Province Housing Program under Ord. 93-1 (11 associations)

- **Micro – finance through BLHMPC / ALL R-Up**

- **Environmental Management**
  - Solid Waste, KSBP
    - Management of Recyclables
    - Composting

- **Educational Program**

- **Networking / Linkages to other NGOs/Pos**

- **Rental Housing – BLHMPC / ALL R-Up**
The Partnership

The Barangay Luz Government entered into a partnership with the Center for Participatory Governance on BDP-PRA last December 2002.
Capacitating the Barangay Development Council

- Before going into BDP-PRA, the Barangay Luz Development Council was convened and activated.
- A seminar-workshop to capacitate BDC was conducted last November 30-December 1, 2002.
Barangay Development Plan – Participatory Resource Appraisal (BDP-PRA) 
Trainors’ Training

- To prepare the BDC in the task of formulating the BDP, a trainers’ training was held last January 23-26, 2003.
- A total of 35 community leaders were trained as BDP-PRA facilitators.
Community Planning Proper

Barangay Luz went through seven consecutive nights from 7:00-11:00 pm of formulating its comprehensive development plan with multi-sectoral inputs (Feb 24-March 2, 2003).

The resulting plan contain the socio-economic development thrusts of the barangays for the next five years. (150 participants)
BDP-PRA Steps
STEPS IN BDP-PRA

- Social Preparation
- Community Orientation
- Data Gathering
- Data Analysis and Interpretation
- Problem Prioritization
- Cross Sectoral Validation
- Community Vision and Mission Setting
- Setting up of Indicators for Development
- Strategy Formulation
- Goals and Objective Setting
- 5-Year and 1-year Development Planning
- Presentation and Approval of the Plans
- Pledging Session
- Monitoring and Evaluation
Goals and Objective

Vision

After 5 years, Barangay Luz is a model to all other barangays, peaceful, progressive and being served by honest and active officials with political will together with God-fearing, educated, disciplined, healthy, happy and united residents with sustainable, legal and honest economic life in a clean, peaceful and orderly environment.
Mission

**Officials...**
To perform their duties diligently....To guide and encourage the people to participate in barangay activities.

**Residents...**
To unite, be aware and support the activities of the barangay in order to achieve the envisioned den

**NGOs / POs...**
- To provide seminars, trainings and other services that could develop the people in the barangay.
- To protect and promote the rights of the people.
Sitio Consultations

The draft 5-year Barangay Development Plan was presented to the Barangay residents for their comments and feedback during a week-long sitio consultations.
• The 5-Year BDP was formally approved and adopted by the Barangay Luz residents during a General Assembly held last May 3, 2003.

• Congressional representatives, city officials, officers of national line agencies and key NGO leaders were invited to provide feedback and inputs on how they can assist in the realization of the BDP (P1.9 million worth of pledges were solicited)
Tasks Ahead

- Resource Mobilization - Claimaking and Social Marketing of BDP

- Project Implementation - Setting up working structures and participatory mechanisms to oversee BDP implementation.

- Monitoring and Evaluation - Identifying a schedule for regular monitoring and evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Funded By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Replacement of Sodium Lamps</td>
<td>All Sitios</td>
<td>City Government Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Installation of Community Billboard</td>
<td>All Sitios</td>
<td>Rep. Mario Aguja, Akbayan Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acquisition of Two (2) Motorcycle for Traffic Use</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. Sylvan Jakosalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procurement of One (1) Fire Truck</td>
<td>All Sitios</td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Installation of Suggestion Boxes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Installation of Gigantic Siren</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Installation of Centralized Paging System</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Establishment of Barangay Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Establishment of Barangay Job Placement Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Holding of Livelihood Skills and Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>TESDA, DMDP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5 Year Comprehensive Barangay Development Plan
2003 - 2007
Barangay Luz, Cebu City
Infrastructure and Environment Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Funded By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Construction of Footbridge</td>
<td>Sitio Nangka</td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drainage Repair Project</td>
<td>Sitio Mabuhay, City Central, Lubi</td>
<td>City Gov't Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas R. Osmeña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cementing of Pathways</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomas R. Osmeña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Holding of Capacity Building Seminar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tesda, DMDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Holding of Small Vendors Special Assistance Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5 Year Comprehensive Barangay Development Plan

**2003 - 2007**

**Barangay Luz, Cebu City**

**Infrastructure and Environment Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Funded By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Asphalting of roads</td>
<td>All Interior Roads Including Cabantan</td>
<td>City Government thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña, Rep. Raul V. Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Installation of water tank with motor pump (for deep well)</td>
<td>Sitio Nangka</td>
<td>Rep. Raul V. Del Mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drainage Project</td>
<td>Sitio San Roque</td>
<td>Hon. Nestor Archival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Drainage Project</td>
<td>Sitio Kalinao</td>
<td>Hon. Manuel Legaspi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Holding of product fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>Funded By</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Holding of Anti-Drug Awareness Seminar</td>
<td>City Gov't. Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Holding of Senior Citizens Forum</td>
<td>City Gov't. Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Holding of Sports Clinic and Tournament</td>
<td>City Gov't. Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Holding of Community Volunteers Formation Prog.</td>
<td>City Gov't. Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Holding of Leadership Training and Seminar</td>
<td>City Gov't. Thru Hon. Mayor Tomas Osmeña</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Holding of Values Formation Seminar</td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Holding of Small Vendors Special Assistance Program</td>
<td>CPAG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barangay Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Onward to Good Barangay Governance!

THANK YOU...
"A Process of Community Development and Accumulated Social Capital Case of Barangay Luz"

Dr. Yuko Kobayakawa
Visiting Researcher: Centre for Sustainable Development Studies
Lecturer: Faculty of Regional Development Studies, Toyo University

Toyo University Workshop in Cebu, September 30, 2011
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transformation

Step 1
squatter
indifferent to communal matters

Step 2

Step 3
formal resident
The most respected Brgy. in Cebu City

3 Steps of Community Development
Ideal Community

A community that is led by endogenous and sustainable community activities.
How can it be realized?

- Every mean of resources
  - Economic
  - Social
  - institutional

- Suppose there exist...
  - Adequate programs (projects) to fulfill needs of the community
  - Supports (governments, NGOs, churches, etc.)

- If a community doesn’t have
  - Good leadership
  - Good governance

- How can a community implement those resources?
  - social networks - information
  - human capital – techniques and knowledge to implement

- Willingness of people to change…. If not, the community will stay the same or even worse.
A Single Actor Cannot Solve Every Problem Exists in Community

- Individual level
- Association level
- Nation state level

Aggregation Problem
Social Capital

Social capital is a relation-based resource.

It enhances collective, autonomous, and sustainable actions within a community through accumulations of trust, concern for community, reciprocal relationship, social networks, and willingness of people to take actions.
Data

• Period: 2006-2009
  - total of 12 visits of 2-3 weeks home stays in Brgy. Luz.

• Methods
  - Qualitative Surveys
    • Interviews
    • Focused-group-discussions
  - Quantitative Surveys in 2008
    • 85/300 questionnaires to residents
      - living conditions before, during, and after implementation of the land acquisition programs
  - Quantitative Surveys in 2009
    • 30/30 questionnaires to organization/activity group leaders
    • 338/338 questionnaires to residents
      - accumulation of social capital
  - Participant observations
  - Data gatherings from Brgy. Hall, City Hall, DWUP, web sites
Demography of Brgy. Luz (as of 2008)

- land size: approx. 20 ha.
- population: approx. 16,000
- original land owner: Provincial Government
- number of sitios: 16
- number of HOAs: 19
- number of community organizations: 20
- the year Brgy. Luz initiated: 1956
Step 1
Barangay Luz and Its Surroundings

Waterfront Hotel

Cebu Business Park

Barangay Luz
The Process of Implementing CMP

- Suggestion for alleviation of urban poor
  - effective land use
  - alleviation of urban poor

- Role as Originator

- Cebu City
  - newly designed CMP
  - location for implement

- Provincial

- Fear
  - Plead for selling the land

- Pressure from Urban Development

Implementation of CMP opened up a way to formalization.

The first land acquisition program was implemented with an action made by the occupants.
Step 1: Implemented Land Acquisition Programs

- 1988 – Community Mortgage Program (CMP)
- 1993 – Ordinance 93-1
- 2002 – Cebu Socialized Housing Program (CSHP)
Step 1: Why 14 years of Time Lag in Implementations?

- Absence of trust between residents and gov’t
  - Rejection/Fear to an unknown program
  - Squatters were treated as criminals in the past (Presidential Code of PD772)
  - Experience of evictions

- Payment involvement
  - No experience of paying for the land they have lived
  - Well tight household economy

- Dependence of people on aids
  - Material supplies by churches and NGOs
  - Sense of victims (eviction, fire, etc.)

- Possessed no idea of becoming principal actors
Step 1: Physical Change

Unorganized → Organizing → Registered residents
Step 1: Accumulated Elements

Awareness  Ownership  Willingness for better environment
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Programs</th>
<th>CMP</th>
<th>Ordinance 93-1</th>
<th>CSHP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided by</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payer</td>
<td>HOAs</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year launched</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment initiated from</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year for Termination</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(terminated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land size/price (Php/m²)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly amortization per household (Php)</td>
<td>143.3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>346.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of payment (regular payer)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Paid with title=7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paid=24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying=47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No payment=22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 1: Reality

- Failure of getting the land as a whole community
- Increased dissatisfaction and discrimination among the residents
- Possible disruption of the community
Step 2

Implementation of Livelihood Programs
Expanded Networks

- women’s activities
- income generation
- savings
- sanitary and environmental health
- education
- skill and vocational support
- peace and order
- cultural activities
- men’s organization
- youth organization
- senior citizens’ organization

variety of activity groups for every sex, age, and interest
Implementation Method

GO/NGO led implementation
- Explanation of programs/projects by GO/NGOs
- People’s will

Skill and knowledge obtaining
- Trainings

Community members’ participation
- Workshop back in the community
- Participatory plan designing

Accumulation of experiences
- Execution
- Adjustment

Community led implementation

Toyo University Workshop in Cebu, "Community Development in Asia", September 30, 2011
Community Led Implementation

- Common interest
- Workshops
- Planning
- Exercise
- Adjustment

People’s will

Group Organizing

Support of GO/NGO at request

Empowering

Toyo University Workshop in Cebu, "Community Development in Asia", September 30, 2011
Step 2: Physical Change

Formation of activity groups  Expansion of social networks
Step 2: Accumulated Elements

Awareness of communal problems and needs

Confidence gained from accumulated small successes

Governance
Step 3:

Introduction of Participatory Development Plan
Organized Barangay Development Council (BDC) leaders and councilors were trained as facilitators BDC, activity groups and residents participated in designing plans Launched and completed the plans. Formulation of the next plan.
Step 3: Physical Change

Individual activities to satisfy individual purpose

Realization of communal problems

Collective and sustainable actions
Step 3: Accumulated elements

- Necessity to organize to fulfill individual needs
- Pride and responsibility as residents
- Collective and sustainable acts toward betterment of the community
Participatory Development Plan
2012-2014
Conclusion

- Development started with land acquisition programs
  - A method of leading squatters with no collateral to the formal world by financing them to tenure the land.

- Barangay improvement developed from the change in people’s consciousness toward permanent stay
  - Simplified implementation method that can be easily duplicated
  - From the GO/NGO led approach to the autonomous activities

- Participatory Barangay Development
  - Creation of a tool/manual that promotes borderless participation of the barangay members

- Never changed mutual goal among actors
  - Every actor focused on the mutual goal even at the hardest time
  - The development showed patience and flexibility for the barangay members to build willingness to act for the betterment of themselves as well as the community.
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Thailand
Map of Thailand
On Thailand

- A unified Thai kingdom was established in the mid-14th century. Known as Siam until 1939, Thailand is the only Southeast Asian country never to have been taken over by a European power.
- A bloodless revolution in 1932 led to a constitutional monarchy.
- A military coup in September 2006 ousted then Prime Minister THAKSIN Chinnawat.
- December 2007 elections saw the pro-THAKSIN People's Power Party (PPP) emerge at the head of a coalition government that took office in February 2008.
- The anti-THAKSIN People's Alliance for Democracy (PAD, aka yellow-shirts) in May 2008 began street demonstrations against the new government, eventually occupying the prime minister's office in August and Bangkok's two international airports in November.
- After an early December 2008 court ruling that dissolved the ruling PPP and two other coalition parties for election violations, the Democrat Party formed a new coalition government and ABHISIT Wetchachiwa became prime minister.
- In October 2008 THAKSIN fled abroad in advance of an abuse of power conviction and has agitated his followers from abroad since then.
- THAKSIN supporters under the banner of the United Front for Democracy Against Dictatorship (UDD, aka red-shirts) rioted in April 2009, shutting down an ASEAN meeting in Pattaya. Following a February 2010 court verdict confiscating half of THAKSIN's frozen assets, the UDD staged large protests between March and May 2010, and occupied several blocks of downtown Bangkok. Clashes between security forces and protesters, elements of which were armed, resulted in at least 92 deaths and an estimated $1.5 billion in arson-related property losses.
- These protests exposed major cleavages in the Thai body politic that continue to hamper the current government.
- The ABHISIT administration has announced a plan for a general election some time in 2011 ahead of its full term by the year-end. Since January 2004, thousands have been killed as separatists in Thailand's southern ethnic Malay-Muslim provinces increased the violence associated with their cause.
General Information

• Area: 513,120 sq km
• Population: 66,720,153 (July 2011 est.)
• Major cites-population: BANGKOK (capital) 6.902 million (2009)
• Ethnic groups: Thai 75%, Chinese 14%, other 11%
• Religions: Buddhist 94.6%, Muslim 4.6%, Christian 0.7%, other 0.1% (2000 census)
General Information

• Country Name:
  conventional long form: Kingdom of Thailand
  conventional short form: Thailand
  local long form: Ratcha Anachak Thai
  local short form: Prathet Thai
  former: Siam
General Information

- Government Style: Constitutional Monarchy
- Administrative Divisions: 76 provinces
- Executive Branch:
  - chief of state: King PHUMIPHON Adunyadet, also spelled BHUMIBOL Adulyadej (since 9 June 1946)
  - head of government: Prime Minister YINGLAK Chinnawat, also spelled YINGLUCK Shinawatra (since 8 August 2011);
Community Development in Thailand

Background

- 1960’s: Economic Growth increased
- 1970’s: Population concentrated to Bangkok
- 1980’s: Slums Expanded in BKK, EVICTION!
- 1990’s: Community Development by Community Dwellers (Bottom up) by UCDO
- 2000’s: Baan Mankong Program by CODI
Slums in Klongtoey
UCDO in 1990’s

• Traits of 1980’s – EVICTION by Central and Local Government
  ↓
• UCDO(Urban Community Development Office)
  Established in 1992 divided from NHA(National Housing Authority)
    ↓ Urban Poor Development Fund from Government
    ↓ 1,250 million Bahts
To Support urban community development activities and
Provide low-interest loans to community organizations for
income generation and housing
CODI in 2000’s

• UCDO merged with Rural Development Fund

⇓

• In 2000, **CODI** (Community Organization Development Institute), a new public organization

• CODI manages various funds for the development of the community organizations in rural and urban areas.

• The amount totals 3.3 billion Bahts
A New Approach by CODI since 2003

“BAAN MANKONG PROGRAM”

“Secure Housing Program”

• An effort to solve problems and make cities livable
• For Everyone including the poor
How CODI links groups together
Main Concepts of “BAAN MANKONG”

1. Community Organizations and Community Networks be the core actors.

2. Change from “Supply Driven” to “Demand Driven”.

3. Flexible financial management.

4. Integrate housing development with city development.
Income Generation Activities
Community Enterprises Activities:
Bangkok Community Handicrafts Promotion Center
Environmental Development Activities
Environmental Development Activities
Community Welfare Activities
Community Welfare Activities
Housing Development Activities: Townhouses
Mutual housing construction in Uttraradit (repayment of 15 Baht/day)
Housing Development Activities:
Kham Phang Ngarm community, Chiang Mai
Housing Development Activities:
Kham Phang Ngarm community, Chiang Mai

Alternative 1

Alternative 2
Example of Ayutthaya, Wat Chula Community

- Community Committee Bought land
- 7 Rai (11,200 square meter), 2.6 million Bahts
- 15 year-long loan from CODI (Community Housing Cooperative)
- 103 units and Community Space (Hall)
Two years later
Wat Chula Community

• Started to Saving 4 years ago
• Saved 260,000 Bahts by 4 years
• Could make loan 2,600,000 Bahts for Land
• Should pay back by 15 years

• 35,000 Bahts per a unit for Infrastructure (side walk, electricity, water supply, etc.) from CODI (Subsidy)
Wat Chula Community

• 5 Types of House
• Ex. 200,000 Bahts (Two storey House)
  20,000 Bahts by Dweller Family (10%)
  180,000 Bahts by CODI (90%)

Pay back 1,806 Bahts/month to CODI by 15 years
Applied Program in Mongolia
Map of Mongolia
On Mongolia

- The Mongols gained fame in the 13th century when under Chinggis KHAAN they established a huge Eurasian empire through conquest.
- After his death the empire was divided into several powerful Mongol states, but these broke apart in the 14th century.
- The Mongols eventually retired to their original steppe homelands and in the late 17th century came under Chinese rule.
- Mongolia won its independence in 1921 with Soviet backing and a Communist regime was installed in 1924.
- The modern country of Mongolia, however, represents only part of the Mongols' historical homeland; more ethnic Mongolians live in the Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region in the People's Republic of China than in Mongolia.
- Following a peaceful democratic revolution, the ex-Communist Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) won elections in 1990 and 1992, but was defeated by the Democratic Union Coalition (DUC) in the 1996 parliamentary election.
- The MPRP won an overwhelming majority in the 2000 parliamentary election, but the party lost seats in the 2004 election and shared power with democratic coalition parties from 2004-08.
- The MPRP regained a solid majority in the 2008 parliamentary elections but nevertheless formed a coalition government with the Democratic Party.
- In 2010 the MPRP voted to retake the name of the Mongolian People's Party (MPP), a name it used in the early 1920s.
- The prime minister and most cabinet members are MPP members.
General Information

- Area: 1,564,116 sq km
- Population: 3,133,318 (July 2011 est.)
- Major cites-population: ULAANBAATAR (capital) 949,000 (2009)
- Ethnic groups: Mongol (mostly Khalkha) 94.9%, Turkic (mostly Kazakh) 5%, other (including Chinese and Russian) 0.1% (2000)
- Religions: Buddhist Lamaist 50%, Shamanist and Christian 6%, Muslim 4%, none 40% (2004)
General Information

- Country Name:
  conventional long form: none
  conventional short form: Mongolia
  local long form: none
  local short form: Mongol Uls
  former: Outer Mongolia
General Information

• Government Style: Parliamentary
• Administrative Divisions: 21 provinces (aymguud, singular - aymag) and 1 municipality* :
  (Ulaanbaatar*)
• Executive Branch:
  chief of state: President Tsakhia ELBEGDORJ
  (since 18 June 2009)
  head of government: Prime Minister Sukhbaatar BATBOLD (since 29 October 2009)
Community Development in Mongolia
Asian Coalition for Housing Rights

20 years working experiences in Asia

A coalition of Asian organizations, with people and community oriented approach established in 1988
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Community Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>City-wide upgrading, community networks at national and cities, community savings and credit in all networks and cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Community networks, UPDF, savings, upgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community savings, city development fund, link with cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Community savings, networking, city partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>5 out of 11</td>
<td>Province community savings, networking, partner with cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Community savings, networking, upgrading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cities networking, savings, federation, community organizing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cities community sanitation, planning, urc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srilanka</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cities community savings and fund by WB and WDB networks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After 20 years experiences and work

- Urban poor community to be key actors in making change at city-wide, nation-wide scale and link together into organizations and networks
- Community savings and fund are new flexible tools leading to city-wide and holistic people-led development in achieving big scale change
- The need to develop Community Development Fund as new public development tools of government and local system
- Building city partnership between communities, local authorities, professionals and urban partners as joint development mechanism dealing with city-wide upgrading and other city development
- The needs for participatory city-development strategy
Asian Coalition for Community action (ACCA Program)

**OBJECTIVES:**

- Support development options for *community managed delivery*

- *City-wide upgrading approach* and building city partnership

- Building up *Community Development Fund* to support community-led development at scale

- *Change relationship* between the poor and the city

- Consolidate city change process leading to *change in structure and policy*
ACCA Program 2009-2011

PROGRAM TARGETS:

150 cities in 3 years
- Community savings and funds
- City-wide survey and information
- City-wide upgrading action plans
- Community networks
- Building partnership
- Understanding Asian cities
- Community-led disaster rehabilitation

-500 SMALL community upgrading projects ($3,000 each)
-50 BIG housing projects (max. 40,000 US$)
-At least 100 City Community Development Funds
Result from 6 month ACHR/ACCA

• Approved support for national process in 14 countries covering 64 cities
• Approved 32 *housing projects* in 30 cities
• Approved 220 *small development projects* in 50 cities
• Approved city development budget for 52 cities to support community survey and city-wide information gathering in 12 countries
• Support community savings and community Fund in 50 cities
Let’s Take a look at Video on Community Development by ACCA Program in Mongolia
Ulaanbaatar, Capital City
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Описание</th>
<th>Усл. №</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Изделие</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Количество</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Стоимость</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Примечание: Некоторые столбцы не заполнены.
Traits of Community Development in Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

• The Urban Poor formed Ger Community
• **FENCE COMMUNITY**
• After 1990, Economic Policy in Mongolia was Changed to Marketism
• Permitted to own lands by people
• City Edge Area occupied by Ger Communities and Community Dwellers became land owners
• Easier Relocation by land owners
• Aging Dwellers, Aging Community
Thank you very much for listening.
Innovative Communities: Community-Driven Approaches to Housing Provision in Seoul and Bangkok

Sang Kyung An, Toyo University, Japan
September 30, 2011, Cebu Workshop, Philippines
Introduction

Problem Statements

- What is Community-Led or Community-Driven Development?
- Defined as an approach that encourages community groups to take initiative for their own socio-economic development as prime actors in the development process
  - community groups have direct control over management of the development process, including design and implementation of the development
  - being expressed as a panacea for all development challenges in developing countries
- Questions raised;
  - What conditions make it possible?
  - Can the approach be sustainable?
  - Can the approach be scaled-up?
  - What strategies do communities need to attain their goals in different contexts?
In order to answer the questions

- To compare the strategies and struggles in two poor communities that have taken a community-driven approach to housing provisions in very different urban context: Seoul and Bangkok
- To seek how different strategies are possible and indeed necessary in different contexts
Informal Settlements and Urban Redevelopment Policies in Korea

- Urbanization rate in 2010 - 83%, nearly half of national population is living in Seoul Metropolitan region.
- Growth of informal settlements has been the product of rapid urbanization
- Majority of illegal housing units have existed in Seoul – in 1995, about 75,000 units were illegal.
- Policy Response to Slums in Seoul
  - Until mid-1970s, strict demolition and relocation policy
  - Upgrading and re-blocking techniques were applied, but not working.
  - In the early 1980s, shifted to private sector initiated redevelopment program which developers and land owners make a lot of money.
Informal Settlements and Urban Redevelopment Policies in Korea

- Between 1985 and 1988, 700,000 poor people were evicted.
- Radical changes in squatter development in 90’s
- required private developers to build public rental housing for all renters in the redevelopment project area
- new policy of “Residential Environmental Improvement” based on in situ upgrading approach
- Only 17% of tenants allowed to re-house in public rental housing by New Town Law in 2007
Haengdang Community in Seoul

Characteristics of the Community

- One of squatter communities situated on a steep hillside slope 5 km from Seoul City Hall
- 72% of housings - squatters, 15% of land owned by the government, the rest is privately owned. 90% of households are renters.
- In October 1993, 2,300 families were evicted. The evicted people returned and continued struggling for temporary and public housing for 3 yrs.
- Forced eviction by hired thugs: strong resistance to the eviction
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (1)

■ Beginning of Residents’ Movement (1987-1992)

- Socio-political Background
  - After democratization in 1987, freedom of speech and civic rights increased
  - Tenants and squatter eviction still continued, land price rapidly increased.
  - Religious and universities took on the NGO roles. New NGOs or civil societies for the poor emerged. No local autonomy system.

- Strategies
  - Major Community Activities: focused on squatters’ empowerment and community organizing – building playground and day-care center, sponsoring night school for youth, community center, literacy program for mothers, cultural festival.
  - Core actors: Community mobilizers, religious groups (catholic and protestant churches, NGOs)
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (2)

Struggle and Confrontation (1993-1995)

- Socio-political Background
  - Despite the change to a civilian government (1993- ), forced tenants and squatter evictions continued. After approval of redevelopment project in 1993, there were a forced eviction.
  - Government sponsored program providing 2 million housing units was completed in 1993. Elected local government since 1995.

- Strategies
  - Organizing renters’ association to gain protection of their housing right, community’s resistance to a forced eviction.
  - Demand for temporary on-site housing while they wait for the public rental housing to be completed.
  - Solidarity and network with neighboring informal communities for struggle.
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (3)


- Socio-political Background
  - Although local governments were elected, their powers and community participation were limited. A forced eviction continued.
  - Redevelopment law was amended to give renters a much clear right to public rental housing

- Strategies
  - Construction of temporary on-site housing and moving into the house
  - To generate income and job opportunity and to improve well-beings of residents through co-operative production, consumption, credit and social welfare
  - Promoting solidarity and network, fostering community leadership
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (3)

Temporary housing, credit union, productive and consumption co-operatives
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (4)


- **Socio-political Background**
  - Birth of new civilian Kim Dae-Jung government, Economic downturn by financial crisis in Asia and rapid recovery.
  - Many changes in governance, accountability, and people’s participation.
  - Role of NGOs changed from controlling to facilitating, from giving to empowering.

- **Strategies**
  - Moving into public rental house, the temporary housing was demolished
  - Scaling up co-operative movements and community-driven development to district level
  - Collaboration with communities which were moved from other areas into the public rental housing.
  - To solve unemployment and create job opportunity – employment training
  - Opening of residents initiated Social welfare center
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (5)

- Scaling up Community-Driven Development (2004-present)
  - Programs for children and youth – after-school tutoring program, scout program, environmental awareness and education
  - Regional welfare program for the excluded people and senior citizens who live alone
  - Organizing cultural events and festivals
  - Expansion of credit union
  - Regional employment training center
  - Solidarity with other communities and regions
  - International network with overseas communities and NGOs
Community-Driven Approach to Housing Movement in Haengdang Community (5)
Lessons Learned from Haengdang Community

- The treat of forced evictions and resistance to them promoted the community to come together and made them stronger.
- The community continued to develop programs or projects to address many different needs.
- The community organizers and activists played critical role in the stage of community organizing.
- Co-operative movements became a role model to other poor communities.
- Once the community achieved the aim of moving into temporary on-site housing, the community has been weakened. Limitation of eviction resistance movement.
- Divisions, both within community and between other communities by greed and egoism – should be accompanied by the restoration of moral values.
- Becoming lodged in providing social service to residents, being unable to broaden out into community-driven development.
Informal Settlements and Policy Responses in Bangkok (1)

Urbanization and Slum in Bangkok
- Thailand has been experiencing rather slow urbanization compared to other developing countries - 33.9% in 2009
- History of urbanization within Thailand is almost exclusively the history of growth of Bangkok - one of the world’s most extreme examples of primate city (population of 6.9 million)
- Slum population:
  - 740,000 persons in 1958 (46% of Bangkok Population), 956,400 in 1985, 1,099,600 in 796 slum settlements in 2000 (19%)
  - expanding into adjacent provinces, partly by the eviction and relocation from Bangkok and partly by the outward expansion of urbanized areas.

Policy Responses to the Slums
- Ranging from forced evictions and clearance through public interventions, to pro-poor and inclusive approaches using community-led participatory methods
Informal Settlements and Policy Responses in Bangkok (2)

- exclusively public housing and slum clearance from 1960 to 1971
  - establishment of National Housing Authority in 1973
  - didn’t fit both their practical need and their lifestyle, but also failed to reach low-income target groups.

- Assisted self-help and upgrading schemes emerged from mid-1970
  - Emphasized on largely physical improvement without secure of the dwellers’ legal tenure status. Mostly expensive and top-down approach.

- In mid-1980s, the concept for land for housing the poor was introduced: an innovative approach like land sharing schemes

- ‘The enabling approach’ emerged from the late 1980s
  - actively promoted private sector participation. Instead, the role of NHA has been reduced
  - Establishment of Urban Community Development Office (UCDO, after CODI) in 1992
Informal Settlements and Policy Responses in Bangkok (3)

- allocation of government budget to the community driven development projects in poor areas
- implemented through the Community Organizations Development Institute (CODI)
- CODI has helped the poor communities set up savings group, organize communities, form networks, negotiate for securing land tenure and develop their own housing projects
- The ‘Baan Mankong (secure land and housing tenure) Program’ launched in 2003 to improve housing, living and tenure security for 300,000 households
Characteristics

- One of the largest slums in Bangkok, located near wealthy neighborhood, many embassies and in the heart of the city’s financial district.
- Occupied on Treasury Department owned land over 70 years as a squatter settlement
- In 2004, the slum community was almost destroyed by a massive fire
- Around 1,200 families (7,000 persons) were living in 814 houses on 27,680 m².
Suan Plu Community in Bangkok (1)

Location and Temporary Shelters
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The fire consumed 713 houses and left up to about 5,000 people homeless.

Fires are often used as an instrument to evict slum dwellers.

The cabinet quickly approved a on-site upgrading with a 30 year long-term land lease contract.

**Negotiation and Project Design Stage**

Negotiations about redevelopment options for the community were followed with a variety of concerned agencies.

- Initially, the public bodies proposed a plan to provide government-built flats in 5 story blocks,

- but, some dweller group refused the proposal for following reasons: 1) some peoples might be rejected for housing loan form bank due to their repayment ability 2) it is difficult for people to come together and learn how to address their problems 3) the living space is too small for family to live.
the community split into two groups – those who want to live in ready-made flats in 5 story blocks by NHA, and those who want to live in row house under financial support by CODI.

Finally, 264 families chose CODI project and 560 chose NHA project. Ironically, remaining more than 400 families who rented were forced permanently relocated.

The ratio of NHA to CODI project area is 6:4
Suan Plu Community in Bangkok (4)

- NHA project
  - NHA designed, constructed and sold ready-made flats in 5 story with 33m², no people’s participation
  - The sale price per unit was 390,000 Baht in 2009 when the occupancy began. Provided housing loan for 25 years to them.
  - 30 percent of the original dwellers already sold their right to stay in the unit and move to other place. Being sold for more than 2 times the initial price.
  - it would not be easy for people in the community to come together and act collectively
Suan Plu Community in Bangkok (5)

- **CODI project**
  - the land was given to the community cooperative on a collective 30-year renewable land lease
  - The residents worked with architects from the CODI to develop a range of house designs and layout options
  - the development of four different housing types: three sizes of row houses and walk-up flats.
  - The families divided into sub-groups of 15 households, which would live together in the new project. The sub-group was the basic means for linking members together to plan and collect savings.
Construction Stage

- Most of the houses were built by a contractor hired by the community with some community labor contribution.
- Sub-groups were responsible for accounts and project supervision and materials purchasing.
- The loans for the construction were provided directly from CODI to the cooperative.
- As a result of community-controlled construction process, house design customization, and collective savings capacity, the costs per unit could lower.
## Comparison of NHA and CODI Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baan Eur Arthorn Side</th>
<th>Baan Mankong Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing Body</strong></td>
<td>NHA</td>
<td>CODI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1.7 ha (60% of total area)</td>
<td>1.1 ha (40% of total area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Housing units</strong></td>
<td>560 units</td>
<td>264 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Type</strong></td>
<td>Apartments in 5 story blocks</td>
<td>row houses and walk-up flats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floor area of unit</strong></td>
<td>33㎡</td>
<td>62.5-100 ㎡ &amp; 20㎡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement</strong></td>
<td>NO, Ready-made flats and occupy</td>
<td>Active involvement in design, construction and financing, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price per unit</strong></td>
<td>390,000 Baht</td>
<td>215,000-360,000 Baht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free to transact</strong></td>
<td>OK after 5 years</td>
<td>Only to the cooperative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Stage

Unlike the NHA project, the housing owner is not allowed to sell the property at all or is able to his or her cooperative.

The community has actively involved in a lot of collective activities, including income generation, environment activities, culture, education, youth group, elderly group and community finance.
Lessons learned from Suan Plu Community

- A rare case that was split into two areas by two organizations in a community - by completely different development techniques.
  - Different outcomes in the community involvements in project design, construction, management, financing and community organizing.
- After the project completed, the land prices in the area soon reached the level of full market value.
  - 30 percent of the owners in NHA sold the right to outsider and moved out. Sold at market price, the seller has earned about 500,000 Baht as a windfall gain.
  - The housing owners in CODI side are not allowed to sell the property. Such a practice and rule makes them feel the sense of deprivation and hampers social cohesion in the community.
- Other issue is on the house renters who have lived in the area before a fire. Generally, they are poorer than the house owners. However, the both programs for low-income households didn’t help them much.
- Continuity in community development activities is another challenge in practice in community development.
  - What is the ultimate goal of community development? is to reduce the poverty or is about increasing people’s participation in community matters.
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