ECONSTOR
Make Your Publications Visible.

A Service of
ZBW
Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft
Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Ballesteros, Marife M.

Working Paper

Rental Housing for Urban Low-Income Households in the Philippines

PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2004-47

Provided in Cooperation with:
Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Philippines

Suggested Citation: Ballesteros, Marife M. (2004) : Rental Housing for Urban Low-Income Households in the Philippines, PIDS Discussion Paper Series, No. 2004-47, Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), Makati City

This Version is available at:
https://hdl.handle.net/10419/127870

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Philippine Institute for Development Studies
Surian sa mga Pag-aaral Pangkaunlaran ng Pilipinas

Rental Housing for Urban Low-Income Households in the Philippines

Marife M. Ballesteros

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES NO. 2004-47

The *PIDS Discussion Paper Series* constitutes studies that are preliminary and subject to further revisions. They are being circulated in a limited number of copies only for purposes of soliciting comments and suggestions for further refinements. The studies under the *Series* are unedited and unreviewed.

The views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.

Not for quotation without permission from the author(s) and the Institute.

December 2004

For comments, suggestions or further inquiries please contact:
The Research Information Staff, Philippine Institute for Development Studies
3rd Floor, NEDA sa Makati Building, 106 Amorsolo Street, Legaspi Village, Makati City, Philippines
Tel Nos: 8924059 and 8935705; Fax No: 8939589; E-mail: publications@pidsnet.pids.gov.ph
Or visit our website at http://www.pids.gov.ph

Rental Housing for Urban Low Income Households in the Philippines

Abstract

The objective of this paper is to examine the rental housing market in the Philippines and provide possible policy options for a viable rental scheme for low income households. Rental housing is now seen as a vital component in accommodating large number of families in developing countries. In the Philippines, specifically Metro Manila, the increase in urban population through both migration and natural increase, has been absorbed to a large extent by the rental market. There is thus a need for the government to reexamine its policy on rental housing. In particular, it has to review problematic issues in the rental market such as: (1) affordability and rent control measures; (2) quality of rental housing stock; (3) legal and ejectment issues; and (4) management of public rental housing. The existing rent control law is unable to protect the low income households since most low income renters dwell in self-help rental accommodations, where informal, verbal contracts are not uncommon. Affordability and quality issues can only be addressed by policies that will encourage small scale landlords to provide more and better low cost rental accommodation. Instead of a rent control the paper suggests the following schemes: (1) building rental incentives into upgrading programs; (2) provide micro credit for small scale landlords; (3) create appropriate planning and rental regulations in informal settlements; and (4) direct government subsidies to public rental housing for the urban poor to be undertaken as a joint venture with the local government.

Keywords: housing, rental tenure

Rental Housing for Urban Low Income Households in the Philippines[1]

Marife M. Ballesteros[2]

I. Introduction

For most low income families in developing countries, the choice of residence takes place in a highly constrained environment. The cost of housing is high, location choices are limited due to poor transport system, and the stock of housing in the formal market (own or rent) does not match the needs of low-income households. Land for self-building has also become increasingly scarce and expensive in many cities. Poor households thus have increasingly resorted to informal arrangements outside the state sphere or even outside the state legal framework to house themselves.

This so-called "informal" housing often takes the forms of sharing, unauthorized housing and squatting in public and private lands (including riverbanks, streets, embankments, etc.). These arrangements often lead to congestion and overcrowding but slums and squatter settlements have been tolerated in many developing countries. Slums have dominated the political agenda and are viewed as potentially fruitful field for government involvement (Gilbert and Varley 1991).

In recent years, however, informal settlements have become too costly to governments. These settlements have become a threat to urban development. Overcrowding and unauthorized housing have resulted in serious environmental and health problems while illegal settlements are causing huge losses in revenues. The emergence of megalopolises is forcing governments to address the housing problem in a more realistic manner. In the past, most governments of the Third World have followed western models which encouraged the development of owner-occupation. These countries have now realized that a housing policy based on ownership alone is weak. Colombia, South Africa and Indonesia, for instance, have started to lay the ground works to develop the rental housing market as an alternative housing option in urban areas (Gilbert and Varley 1991). There is also now a growing recognition that rental housing offers major opportunities for improving living standards of the poor (UNCHS 1993). These claims, however, have yet to be translated into real action on the ground. The empirical question for most countries is how the rental housing market can meet the demands of the poor and low income households.

This issue confronts the Philippines as well. The Philippines has one of the highest rates of urbanization in the developing world. It is estimated that by 2010, the urban population will be 60 percent of total, and that by 2050 urban population will further increase to 80 percent or 127 million people (UNCHS, Human Settlements Statistics 2001).

---

[1] The study benefited from the support of JICA and the Housing Urban Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC).
[2] Research Fellow, Philippine Institute for Development Studies. The author is grateful to Maureen Rossellon for excellent research assistance.

The country has also a high level of poverty. In 2000, it is estimated that more than 20 percent of the 7.5 million urban households had incomes below the poverty threshold of P13,915 per capita per year (less than $1 a day level). An estimated 3.5 million urban households had incomes below P28,800 per capita per year (less than $2 a day level). On the other hand, available housing in urban areas requires an annual amortization of at least P24,000 for house and lot under the government social security programs (e.g., HDMF, GSIS).

The low affordability levels of households, the unprecedented increases in land prices (Strassman 1993) and the untamed fiscal problem in the country are conditions that raise the need for government to find alternative solutions to increase the choices of the poor and low-income sector to low-cost and decent housing in the housing market. Under the Philippine Medium Term Development Plan 2004-2010 rental arrangement is recognized as a housing strategy. The form and character of this arrangement, however, is an area that requires further study.

The objective of this paper is to examine the rental housing market in the country and provide possible policy options for a viable rental scheme for low-income households. A discussion of rental housing in a global perspective is first presented in Section 2. This will be followed by a discussion of housing tenure arrangements in the Philippines and the characteristics of households in different types of tenure. Section 4 presents the supply and investment climate for rental housing in the Philippines focusing on the diversity of rental housing and arrangements. Section 5 discusses the key problems often associated with rental housing and landlord-tenant relations. The last section provides the conclusions and options for rental housing in the Philippines.

II. The Relevance of Rental Housing in Developed and Developing Countries[3]

Rental housing is seen as a vital component in accommodating large number of families in both developed and developing countries. The proportion of renters is significant even in countries with high GNP per capita (**Table 1**). Rental housing also has a dominant position in countries with low GNP per capita. For instance, in the city of Kumasi in Ghana about 57% of households are tenants. In urban cities of Nigeria, renting is a popular tenure choice; about 49% in Lagos and 65% in the city of Benin (Ikejiofor 1997). The demand for rental housing is apparent in both rich and poor nations. Rental accommodation thus is an acceptable form of tenure for both rich and poor households.

The desire for ownership seems to be more evident in developing countries but this has been influenced to a large extent by State policy on housing. Most governments in developing countries have been influenced by western models (US, UK, Australia, etc.) that pushed for homeownership. Incentives such as income tax relief and subsidies were provided to households who moved into homeownership. The construction of public

[3] This section is obtained mainly from UNCHS rental housing studies in various countries. See UNCHS 1993; 2003.

housing for rent has also been limited and after the 1970s few governments in developing countries built for rent and those which have been built were quickly sold (UNCHS 2003).[4] Another significant incentive to homeownership in developing countries is that the State distributes public lands for settlements and the poor are permitted to buy or invade public and private lands. In Lima (Peru), Caracas (Venezuela) and Indonesian cities years of invasion have pushed up rates of homeownership (UNCHS 2003). In Chile in the late 1960s and South Africa in the early 1990s, the invasion of land formed part of the competition for votes. Military regimes were often happy to distribute public land as a cheap method of winning support.

In countries or cities where much land has been acquired through invasion, higher rates of ownership are noted. Ownership especially in developing countries covers a broad spectrum of rights. It includes not only legal rights on land but *de facto* rights on land (UNCHS 2003). *De facto* ownership refers to homes where the household owns the structure but not the land on which it is built. Households in settlements founded through land invasions (e.g., squatters) are considered owners because most often rights to own the land is provided through government programs. The expectation of households on ownership rights on land thus defines tenure in these countries. In Karachi (Pakistan), for instance, ownership tenure of households is placed at 83% of which 44% are houses in squatter settlements (UNCHS 1990 Indicators Table).

The trends, however, show that although households with *de facto* rights on land are counted as owners, the incidence of ownership in many countries has been slowing down in recent years. Homeownership have expanded rapidly from 1980 to 1990 but slowed down or declined in the succeeding years. In Metro Manila, for instance, the proportion of ownership increased from 42% in 1980 to 61% in 1990 but declined to 42% in 2000 (**Table 2**). Likewise, in Santiago, Chile, rates of owner-occupation increased from 64% to 80% between 1980 and 1990 but declined to 73% in 2002. A similar pattern is seen in Bangkok where ownership rates increased by 13 percentage points from 1980 to 1990 but declined by 14 percentage points in 1998. In other countries, the slow down in ownership rates is noted as early as the 1990s.

One reason for this trend is that some States have become less tolerant of land invasions. In South Africa, "the period after the 1994 election show the new government undertaking demolitions and becoming more decisive about land invasions" (Gigaba and Maharaj 1996 in UNCHS 2003: 20). Also in Chile, after 1973, the government prohibited land invasions and removed many squatter settlements in the peripheral parts of the city" (Rodriquez and Icaza 1993; Paquette-Vassalli 1998 in UNCHS 2003: 20). In a similar picture, in Argentina, it was noted that "most politicians within a process of increased democratic control, seem to find it increasingly difficult to support invasions and illegal subdivisions" (Coccato 1996 in UNCHS 2003:21).

[4] By contrast, government policy in Denmark, Germany and Switzerland tend to be more tenure neutral and tax incentives are enjoyed by both homeowners and renters. In other countries (Singapore, Hong Kong and most communist countries) the state constructed large numbers of public housing units for rent.

In addition to policy reforms, studies also noted increasing competition in the informal land markets. UNCHS (2001) reports that even illegal land markets have become increasingly commercialized. It has become rare for low-income households to be able to find sites which they can occupy. Likewise Thirkell (1996) in her study of Cebu City in the Philippines noted that informal (or illegal) land markets are increasingly attracting middle-income households thus competing with the low-income group, who are now concentrated on least desirable settlements because they are unable to enter the wider informal land market for housing.

The developments across developing countries are strong indications that the "age of free urban land" is over. There has been a slow down in ownership and an increase importance of renting in many developing countries. The other important development is the growth of shared and other forms of non-ownership such as borrowing houses or rent free accommodations. Due to the inadequate or inappropriate supply of housing in the market, some households live with kin or borrow homes from them for shelter. Even in cities where the proportion of non-owners declined, urban expansion through both migration and natural increase has often led to a considerable increase in the absolute numbers of non-owners. In Mexico City, the number of tenant and sharer households increased from 484,000 in 1950 to 3.7 million in 2000 (UNCHS 2003:14). Similarly, in Metro Manila the number of tenant and sharers increased by 600,000 households between 1990 and 2000.[5]

III. Owners, Tenants and Sharers in the Philippines

Housing Tenure of Low Income Households

What have been the housing tenure arrangements for the low income households in the Philippines? It has been mentioned that low income households in the country choose their tenure in a highly constrained environment. Given location constraints, this choice is largely dictated by the range of supply options available in the market and the household's budget. The types of housing tenure in the Philippines based on the 2000 Housing Census are as follows: (1) ownership of house and lot; (2) rent house or room including lot; (3) Own house, rent lot; (4) own house rent free lot with consent of owners; (5) own house and lot, rent-free lot without consent of owner; (6) rent-free house and lot with consent of owners; and (7) rent-free house and lot without consent of owners. Like other developing countries, informal arrangements are evident in the Philippines. Moreover, there is diversity in ownership, renting or sharing arrangements. Ownership includes not only owners with legal rights but also those with *de facto* rights on land. Tenants, on the other hand, are not only those who rent homes but also those who rent lots or temporarily build their house in lots not their own (e.g., backyard settlers). Sharers are those who share or borrow homes rent free or pay rent irregularly.

It is expected that tenure arrangements would vary across regions and cities depending on the nature of the housing market. In all urban areas in the Philippines, the incidence of

[5] Absolute values based on Philippines Census of Housing 1990 and 2000.

ownership is high among the urban poor and low-income households representing about 60% of total households (**Table 3**).[6] The picture, however, changes as the housing market becomes more localized. In Metro Manila, which is a key urban region in the Philippines, about 50% of low-income households are owners, one-third are tenants and others are sharers. The incidence of ownership among low income households is comparatively lower in the city, where more than 50% are tenants or sharers.

In particular, there have been two responses to acute shortage of affordable housing in the country particularly in metropolitan cities. One, is the increase in the incidence of renting and the growing rental market in informal settlements. Two, is the increase in the proportion of "sharers."

Renting is a plausible response to the acute shortage of low cost housing in the country. In Metro Manila, the incidence of renting increased by 12 percentage points from its level in 1990 (refer to Table 2). About 42% of households in Metro Manila are tenants in 2000 compared to only 30% in 1990. The incidence of renting is noted to be higher in some cities. The Metropolitan Manila region consists of 17 cities and municipalities. While the nature of the housing market are fundamentally similar, development conditions are substantially different. A recent survey by the Asian Development Bank, shows that the incidence of renting has been specifically high in depressed areas of Metro Manila.[7] In cities or municipalities where the proportion of depressed settlements to total area is high the bulk of households are either tenants or sharers (**Table 4; Figure 1**). For instance, about 70% to 80% of households in depressed settlements of Las Piñas, Paranaque, Taguig and Pasay are tenants and about 10% are sharers. In the City of Valenzuela, only 5% are owners, 53% are tenants and 42% are sharers. The proliferation of rental housing is apparent in depressed settlements. It seems that some owner households in these areas (or possibly absentee landlords) have built dwellings for rent to other low income households.

Sharing is another response to the housing problem. Sharers constitute a significant percentage of households in the country. The Philippines Housing Census shows that the proportion of sharers doubled from 1990 to 2000 (refer to Table 2). While the rental market has absorbed a significant proportion of the increase in population of Metro Manila in the last decade, it is also apparent that rental housing supply has not been sufficient. Sharing thus is expected to rise as the numbers of households are increasing rapidly than the numbers of homes. It becomes even more critical in cases when the supply of housing in the formal market does not match the nature of demand.

---

[6] Tenure arrangement as presented in the Philippines Housing Census 2000 has been categorized based on the definition of the UNCHS for comparability. See Table for classification.

[7] Depressed settlements are poorly service informal settlements characterized by the presence of shacks, slums and shanties. These settlements include four types: (1) resettlement of households under government Community Mortgage Program and Row Housing Program; (2) residents of medium rise buildings; (3) squatter settlements; and (4) settlements in danger zones. There are roughly some 1300 depressed settlements in Metro Manila where over 4 million people live (MMUSP Study 2002).

Characteristics of Households in Different Tenures

Are there differences or similarities in the characteristics of households in different tenures? In the Philippines where homeownership is culturally and politically upheld, income is a major constraint to owning a home in the city. On the average, owners have significantly higher incomes than tenants or sharers. Average annual income of owners is about P210,876 as compared to P173,260 and P148,338 for tenants and sharers, respectively (**Table 5**).

Among the low income groups, however, it is observed that there is no significant difference in income between the owners and tenants. Both owners and tenants have incomes above the poverty threshold.[8] The difference lies mainly on their access to government programs and to squatter areas in the city. It has been observed that the poorest households are often owners of dwelling in danger zones (MMUSP 2002). These households do not have the means to pay rent, have limited or poor social ties or have no access to government programs. Thus they settle in danger sites – road and water easements. Median income of owner households in these areas is about P93,000 per year, far below the poverty line on both household and per capita consumption levels (MMUSP 2002).

Only about 4% of owner households, however, can be considered "poor" owners. On the other hand, majority of tenants belong to the lowest 5th income percentile. In Metro Manila about 50% of tenant households belong to the low-income group (**Table 6**). This proportion is higher in some cities. For instance, tenants in Caloocan, Navotas, Malabon, which are located at the coastal margin of Metro Manila, are among the poorest. On the other hand, cities located at the Metropolitan plateau, adjacent to key business districts, tenants are more affluent. The Philippine data, however, does not reflect tenants in formal and informal rental housing.

Sharers, on the other hand, are poorer than tenants. About 70% of sharers in Metro Manila belong to the 5th income percentile as compared to only 50% for tenants (**Table 7**). The average sharer's income is a little over P100,000 per year. This income, however, is still higher than the poverty threshold income of about P78,390 for a family of five in Metro Manila.

In addition to income, demography characteristics of households also affect the choice of tenure. Age, size of household and structure of family group are regarded as critical elements determining tenure choice. For instance, single households choose different kind of accommodation from those selected by married couples. Different stages of the lifecycle can generate different sets of residential needs. For instance, married-headed households where household head is at least 50 years old and household size of three or greater tend toward ownership (Ballesteros 2002).

Recent statistics support the earlier findings. In Metro Manila, bigger-sized households of about 5 persons tend to be owners (**Table 8**). Both tenants and sharers are also smaller-

[8] As of 2000 annual poverty threshold income in Metro Manila is P78,390 for an average family size of 5.

sized households. Among low-income households, however, there is no significant difference in household size by tenure. On the average, household size among low-income groups is about 5 persons. In depressed settlements, however, average household-sized is about 6.75 which imply that in terms of per capita income, households in these areas are poorer (MMUSP 2002). In the same study, it was noted that based on per capita share and median income of households in this area (P15,800), the incidence of poverty in depressed settlements is much higher than the average for Metro Manila low income groups.

In terms of age, household head in the Philippines are of middle age, about 47 to 48 years old (**Table 9**). Female-headed households are relatively older compared to male-headed households. The difference in age across tenure arrangement, however, is not significant. Owners are not significantly older or younger than tenants or sharers. The same trend is also observed for the low-income groups.

The tenure arrangements and characteristics of households show that tenure choice is more complex than what much of housing literature has attempted to explain. Overall, lifecycle factors (income, household size, age) appear to be the most conclusive factor behind residential trajectories. As income and family size increases households tend to move into owner-occupation. However, other social and political factors may come in. For instance, government tolerance of self-help housing in informal settlements provides ownership to poor households thus we find rich as well as poor owners. We also find tenure changes from ownership to renting or sharing (**Table 10**). Rich households may remain tenants for years while there are rich owners who became tenants. Studies noted that the increasing rates of divorce and separation have affected tenure arrangements overtime. Single-headed households tend to move out of ownership to renting. In the Republic of Korea family breakdown has triggered the housing problem (Ha, 2002 in UNCHS 200:64). One in three tenants moved out of owner occupation to renting because of family problems (e.g., divorce, arguments, domestic violence).

IV. Supply of Rental Housing and Rental Investments in Key Cities

Private sector production both formal and the informal supplies the majority of housing in the Philippines. This is also the case with rental housing, possibly, more so considering that the government has built only few public housing for rent. After the 1980s the government shifted to medium-rise buildings or walk-up housing (e.g., condominiums) whereby lease arrangements have become more of an exception rather than the rule.

There are several types of rental housing in the country. Rental housing varies by type, size, construction, quality, ownership, rents, kind of contract and profitability. There is thus diversity in rental housing as with ownership. National and special housing surveys in the country identify the following variations in rental accommodation:

Features of Rental Housing, Philippines							
Type	**Size**	**Ownership**	**Rent Contract**	**Rent**	**Profitability**	**Quality**	**Legality**
single house in private subdivisions/depressed settlements	Shared room	Social	Verbal	Free	Loss-making or subsidized	Condemned or uninhabitable	Illegal
Shacks on rented plots	Room with access to shared facilities	Public	Written	Cheap	Low	Needs major Repair	Legal contract in illegal dwelling
Rowhouse (*accessoria*) in private subdivisions depressed settlements	Self-contained (small)	Employer	None	Moderate	Medium	Needs minor repair	No contract in a legal dwelling
Rooms/beds in multi-unit bldgs. (tenements, medium-rise, high-rise)	Self contained (large)	Private		Expensive	High	Well-maintained	Fully legal
Rooms/beds in houses							
Rooms/beds in commercial/industrial establishments (e.g. warehouse, factory, dormitories, hospitals, camps, etc)							

Types of Rental Accommodation

About 48% of the tenants in Metro Manila live in multi-units such as tenements, *accessorias* (rowhouses) (**Figure 2**). A significant percentage of tenants also dwell in single houses. The proportion differs within the metropolitan region. In areas near the major business centers (e.g., Makati, San Juan, Manila, Mandaluyong, and Quezon City) the bulk of renters occupy multi-unit buildings (**Table 11**). By contrast, those cities at the peripheral area of Metro Manila (e.g., Muntinlupa, Paranaque, Marikina, Navotas, Malabon) more than 50% of renter households lease single houses.

For the low income group, single house is the most common type of dwelling. More than 50% of the urban poor reside in single houses which also include shacks (**Table 12**). It is noted that the correlation between income and type of housing is weak. The type of rental housing does not significantly reflect differences in income among tenants (**Table 13**). Tenants who lease improvised houses are not any poorer than those who lease apartments or townhouses. Those who rent single houses are noted to be the poorest among the tenant households. Likewise, tenants who occupy commercial and industrial establishments have higher incomes than those in single houses and duplex structures.

Ownership

Rental housing is mainly categorized into two types: private and public. Private dwellings are those provided by households and the business sector. This includes dwellings that are provided by employers to employees and also arrangements of temporary occupation among relatives or friends. The bulk of these rental accommodations operate without local business license. In Mandaluyong City, for instance, there are about 465 houses and apartments registered in the City with license to operate a rental unit in 2002. This covers about 8,460 units representing about 47% of the estimated total number of rented units in the City.[9] There are complications in determining if a rental accommodation is in the formal market or not because some middle or high income rental dwellings may have no business registration for rental. The distinction between formal and informal rental dwellings is thus unclear.

Public rental dwellings, on the other hand, are government-owned structures. As mentioned earlier the government has built buildings specifically for rent to low income households. These building are in the form of medium rise walk-up apartments or single structure buildings called tenements. There are currently 22 public rental housing projects consisting of 5,949 usable units (**Table 14**).[10] About 4 medium rise housing are under construction, which will generate an additional 2,712 units. All these buildings are in Metro Manila and have been constructed between 1960 and 2000. These units are provided with a 25-year lease contract and low rental rates. Prior to 1978, public rental housing was provided purely on lease. From 1980 onwards, the concept of public rental housing has changed. One, construction of these units was undertaken for specific clients, i.e., government employees such as public school teachers, police and military aides were given priority. Two, it targeted the middle-income earners. Third, rental units were offered both on lease or lease with option to purchase. The right to purchase may be exercised outright or after three years of occupancy.

Housing Quality

Most (86%) of rented dwellings in Metro Manila are more than 10 years of age (**Figure 3**). About half have been constructed in the 1980s or earlier. This seems to be the case also for the low income sector. Rental dwellings in the City of Mandaluyong rented at P5000 and below are close to 20 years (**Table 15**). It seems that the supply of rental housing even for the low income sector has slowed down in the 1990s. There can be several factors affecting the slowdown in the supply of rental housing. One reason could be the high cost of building materials. The cost of conventional building materials may constrain the production of low cost housing. Another reason is the lack of credit or

[9] Based on 2000 Census of Housing in the Philippines, there are about 18,000 rented units in Mandaluyong City in the formal and informal rental market.

[10] This number excludes units from two tenement housing in the City of Manila (e.g., Vitas and Punta Tenements) constructed in early 1960s but have no existing tenants because the building has been considered uninhabitable.

financing for small scale landlords. In Abuja, Nigeria, small scale housing producers have been constrained by the lack of access to formal credit (Ikejiofor 1997). Borrowing through the informal sector (e.g., supplier's credit) creates significant financial burden and risks. The rent control law may have also adversely affected the supply of rental housing for low income households. Investors may have shied away from low cost rental to avoid coverage of the law.

The dwelling facilities of tenant households are not worst off than the average household in Metro Manila. Tenants have similar housing facilities as those of owners. This is also observed among low income households. Owners and tenants dwelling are predominantly made of strong structural materials, i.e., concrete, brick/stone, wood, GI sheets (**Tables 16**).

Most owners and tenants are in small self-contained dwellings with own toilet facilities but shared faucet. About 70% of low-income households have access to the water system through a community waterline but the bulk of households have no individual waterline connections to their homes. A significant proportion of low income households depend on peddled water for drinking, cooking and laundry. Tenant households are noted to be better off than owner-households with less than 20% of the former dependent on peddled water compared to 23% of the latter. The difference becomes more glaring among urban poor families. This supports the earlier contention that some owner households are too poor to afford rental.

In terms of toilet facilities although 80% of low-income households have water sealed facility about 15% of these households specifically the urban poor have no such facility (none or pail system). These households most often discharge their waste directly to the rivers. The proportion of urban poor households with no toilet facility is slightly higher among owner-households than renter-household.

Ownership tenure among low income groups in the country does not always represent decent shelter. In the same manner rental accommodation does not always represent poor facilities. In some cases, tenants may be better off than the owners specifically in the low income sector. Rental has become a source of income for low-income households. Low income owner households providing rental accommodation to low income tenants have become the trend. This has provided owners additional income to invest on housing. Moreover, low income tenants often live in the same structures as their landlords. A stronger structure has to be built to accommodate increase population in multi-room dwelling.

Profitability

The returns from rental housing are highly variable. It is largely influenced by the landlord's reasons for letting property. Ownership also affects profits. Public and private rental housing should be treated separately.

For private rental housing, homeowners lease or let their properties to obtain an income. However, letting is not always undertaken as a business or commercial exercise. Profitability thus in the rental business has to be seen in terms of the motivations of the landlords. For some landlords, specifically those that cater to the middle and high-income households, letting is clearly a commercial exercise whereby return on capital is calculated, legalized contracts are provided, effects of government rent control laws are considered, advertising and agents are applied. In contrast, landlords who cater to the low-income groups specifically those in depressed settlements are less commercially oriented. Letting is undertaken primarily as income supplement to cover basic needs (e.g. payment of housing loans) or as a safety net against economic recessions. This type of landlords is fairly common in depressed settlements. There is also a group of landlords who invest on rental business for future security. Rent provides a secure investment that provides monthly income specifically to retirees and pensioners. Letting can also be circumstantial. A household starts letting if there is an extra space and often the letting business is temporary.

Clearly, the motivations of landlords are diverse. The market is highly segmented and investments and incomes however vary across types of rental housing. It is often the case that low-income landlords provide rental housing to low-income sector while the middle and high income landlords to the same income group to which they belong. A few case studies of landlords in Mandaluyong City, show that landlords who cater to the low-income groups has minimal rental investments compared to those landlords that cater to the higher-income rental market (**Table 17**). Also, high income landlords have access to both government and private financing. It is possible that lack of credit to the low-income landlords constraints them to expand letting. In the country, low-income households are mostly dependent on government to finance for buying house and/or lot. It is expected that credit becomes even more unavailable to home improvement or expansion. Rental accommodation to low-income households, however, is not necessarily unprofitable. Rental dwelling that targets the middle and high end market receive higher monthly incomes but investments are also high which probably will take them years before return to investment can be obtained. In contrast, landlords of low-income households receive lower monthly rents but have minimal investments thus returns on investments may be obtained in less than a year.

There are also social forms of rental provided by employers. This may be in forms of rent of house and lot, rooms or rental of lot. Often this arrangement is informal in that social rents provide no cash income to owners but are considered part of the employee's compensation for labor services.

In the case of public rental housing, the operation and management is a task given to the National Housing Authority (NHA). NHA has mixed experience with regard to the profitability of public rental housing. Rental houses constructed prior to the 1980s operate at a loss and are highly subsidized. Rental collection performance is poor and fees for maintenance of common facilities (including water supply) have not been paid. Most households have also become permanent residence rather than temporary housing for low income families (Leynes 1989). There are cases when beneficiaries who acquired

housing elsewhere did not cede the premises to management but sold or transferred their rights to relatives or other households. The option to purchase the units thus had been given to beneficiaries of rental housing but this scheme has not been affordable to all residents. Conversion to purchase requires the household to pay a price higher than the current rents enjoyed.

In addition to the option to purchase scheme, NHA also transferred some aspects of building management to tenants associations. Rents are paid directly by the beneficiaries to NHA (or the estate manager) while building management became the responsibility of tenant association. NHA assigns an estate supervisor for the public rental houses. The estate supervisor may simply function as a rent collector or as part of the community. NHA, however, encourages the estate supervisor to be part of the community since cooperation from the tenants is noted to increase with increase presence and participation of the estate supervisor in the association or community affairs (Leynes 1989). The tenants association specifically its officers are responsible for collecting the fees for use of water system, fire insurance and general maintenance of the building.

Under these new schemes, public rental operation improved but some buildings are still operating at a loss. Medium rise public rental housing constructed in Mandaluyong (Project Site 2), for instance, show 100% rental collection performance. In contrast, Project Site 1 in the same City has a collection performance of only 20%. Of the total 60 units on lease, 54 units are in various stages of arrears (**Table 18**). The poor performance of the Project has been attributed mainly to financial reasons (NHA,West Sector Report). About 73% of beneficiaries have monthly incomes of P7,560 and below. Average income of beneficiaries is computed at P2,447 per month while average expenditure is P1,1573 per month. The monthly rental of P750 to P1,600 are thus unaffordable to most households.

V. Problematic Issues in Rental Housing in the Philippines

The principal issues facing the rental sector in the Philippines maybe categorized as follows: (1) the appropriate rent levels and rental rate of increase; (2) the quality of rental housing stock; (3) legal issues and eviction; and (4) management of public rental housing.

Rent Levels and Rent Increase

In general, rent setting in the Philippines has been primarily dictated by market forces. There are no existing controls placed on rent setting. Landlords consider the existing rental rates in the area for similar structure and adjust rates based on facilities and affordability of lessee (**Figure 4**). There are of course differences in rent setting among landlords based on their target market. Rents on middle and high income accommodations are computed based on a reasonable return on capital. Private condo owners, for instance, rent their units in consideration of the monthly amortization on loan obtained to acquire the property, broker's fee and depreciation cost of unit. The low-income landlord, on the other hand, is less concern about return to capital (possibly due

to low investment) and set rates based on existing rent in the area and affordability levels of target tenants.

Most often tenants even in the low income sector would consider the rent levels high. This contention is often based on two factors - one, the amount of rent households would want to pay; two, the comparative cost of homeownership program of the government. Tenants often appropriate a lower percentage of their income for rent relative to ownership. A commonly used criterion for housing affordability in government programs is that housing expenses should not exceed 30% of household income. This standard, however, does not apply in the case of rent. Rent to income ratio shows that regardless of income levels tenants, on the average, allocate less than 15% of their incomes for rent (**Table 19**). Households tend to invest more on housing when legal ownership is ensured.

The cost of rent relative to ownership is also a key issue in rent levels. The cost of ownership in government housing programs is noted to be lower than average rent levels for low-income families. While amortization to rent ratio, on the average, is higher for housing financed under the PAG-IBIG and GSIS housing programs, the difference is not substantial. On the other hand, it is cheaper for families to amortize homeownership under the Community Mortgage Program and other asset reform programs of the government (**Table 20**). The preference for homeownership among low income families has been strongly influenced by the price advantage of owning versus renting. The problem, however, is that urban land has become increasingly scarce and rental or sharing is the most likely alternative for increasing urbanization.

Due to this affordability constraint, the government has sought to keep rents low through the Rent Control Law. The Rent Control Act in the Philippines started as early as the post war years. The law initially imposed a freeze on rents for low cost rental housing. In the 1980s, the law allowed increases in rent but placed a cap on the maximum allowable increase. The maximum increase has been variable over the last two decades from 20% annual increase to 15% and currently to 10%. The rental law also expanded its coverage from rental houses with monthly rents of P480 in 1985 to P7,500 in 2002.

There is, however, a growing sentiment in government that the rent control law may not be relevant at this time. Rent control has been seen as an effective means to control rise in rent and protect the poorer groups from exploitation of “rich” landlords. This rationale, however, is now one of the myths in the rental housing market. To start with, rent levels are comparatively high relative to the cost of ownership. Rent level is set by the market and as such this can only be effectively lowered through the supply side. This means encouraging more and better supply of low cost rental dwellings.

Another reason why the rent control law does not benefit the low income groups is that these households rent mainly in the informal sector. Self-help rental housing is on the rise in informal settlements where low income owners build low cost rental accommodations for the same income group. It is expected that investments in these rental dwellings are also low. Given the target clientele and level of investment, a key question is whether it is possible to extract higher rents under such conditions? Studies suggest that a

"subsistence" theory is possibly in operation for poor tenants in poor settlements (UNCHS 2003). Rents in poor settlements appear to rise and fall with wages. When real incomes fell, rents tended to fall with them. This has been the case in the city of Buenos Aires, where rents decreased in real terms by 44% between 1980 and 1990 and by 20% during the recession that occurred between 1995 and 1999. In Bogota (Colombia), and Mexican cities of Guadalajara and Pueblo actual setting of rents is quite arbitrary. Landlords took the ability of the tenant to pay the rent into account (Datta 1996 in UNCHS p. 82).

A similar system seems to operate in the Philippines. As mentioned earlier affordability levels of tenants is considered in rent setting. Moreover, yearly increase of rents seems not to affect low income renters (**Table 21**) as against those who lease properties at more than 5,000 per month. There are indications that increases are rare. Rental increase affects only one-third of tenants. It has also not been rank as a key problem in rental accommodation for the low income sector (**Table 22**). Some tenants in low cost rental accommodation indicated that rents do not increase yearly. There are also tenants whose initial monthly rent has not changed for a period of more than ten years. The rate of increase in rents of apartments, house and room has also decelerated based on NSO data (**Table 23**). From 1995 to 2002, rental rate increases is lower than the maximum rate increases under the rent control law.

While rent increase seems not to be a critical issue among low income tenants, it is noted that the quality of rental housing is a key concern. It is expected that low rents provides poor facilities, however, concerns about cost sharing in the maintenance of rental dwellings have been raised. The Rent Control Law in the country has been silent with respect to maintenance of low cost rental dwellings. On the other hand, landlords under a rent control law may effectively increase rent by directly increasing the amount of rent or by doing no repairs and transferring the cost of repairs to tenants.

Quality of Rental Housing Stock

The quality of rental housing stock is primarily a function of rent levels. It is expected that rental housing for the middle and high-income sector have better facilities and structure because tenants pay more for better accommodation. On the other hand, low-income families cannot afford the rent or mortgage payment of better located and fully serviced apartments. Moreover, since expenditures on rent, on the average, is only 15% of income there is a considerable demand for rental accommodation with low rents. Based on rental expenditures of low income households (bottom 40% of income decile) this amounts to an average monthly rent of P 926 to P2,075 in Metro Manila (**Table 24**). The formal sector obviously cannot supply rental housing at these rates thus the bulk of rental accommodation for low-income families is increasingly found in informal and depressed settlements. Owners in these settlements provide most of these accommodations in respond to local needs and priorities of low income families. Often these accommodations are in flood prone areas but such conditions affect not only the tenants but also owners living in slums.

The key challenge thus is how to improve the conditions of families living in slums. A rent control law would not be relevant or difficult to monitor in this case. The best approach is for government to influence the supply and demand side. As earlier mentioned, government should give incentives for small scale housing production. One possibility is to undertake or support upgrading programs in slums. Government should also take more control of beneficiaries of asset reform programs. It is noted that in some depressed areas supported by government programs such as the CMP, MRH, Resettlements, most residents are renters (60 to 80%). This indicates that there is a high number of "absentee low-income landlords" who may have found residence elsewhere.

Government may also intervene on the demand side through direct rent subsidy to poor families. This may be done via public rental housing. The other option is to improve incomes of households. Empirical evidences have shown that as incomes increases, households are prepared to pay more for their housing. Poor families are prepared to live in appalling conditions because there are more important claims on the household incomes (e.g., food, education, setting up a business). The housing preferences change and families need different kinds of accommodation at different stages of their lives.

Legal Issues and Eviction

The bulk of low-income rental accommodation in the country is informal and rental agreements are mostly verbal (**Table 25**). In some cases, landlords find the need to provide written contracts but more often these contracts are not entered in legal books (i.e., not notarized) and thus are not strictly legal. Further in the absence of business permit, the landlords are also unable to issue official receipts for rental payments thus tenants are aware that the contracts are informal. This informality of rental transactions has created some flexibility in the agreements between landlords and tenants specifically in the low-income sector.

On the other hand, the presence of a rent control law provides the legal grounds for rental business in both formal and informal sectors. There are two major provisions of the rent control law. One, rental rate increase is fixed at a maximum of 10% annually. Two, ejectment from rental premises is only valid on specific grounds such as: (a) assignment of lease or subleasing including acceptance of boarders or bedspacers without the written consent of the owner/lessor; (b) arrears in payment of rent for a total of three months; (c) legitimate need of owner/lessor to repossess his property for own use or use of immediate member of family as a residential unit, such member not being the owner of any available residential unit within the same city or municipality; (d) absolute ownership by the lessee of another dwelling within the same city or municipality; and (e) need of the lessor to make necessary repairs of the leased premises as certified by appropriate authorities.

Of these provisions, the rules on ejectment have a critical impact on landlord-tenants relations and possibly the supply of rental housing. An almost universal complaint among landlords is that they cannot remove difficult tenants from their property. In low cost dwelling arrears in rent has been the primary cause of disagreements between the landlord and tenant (**Table 26**). However, while the law provides that three months

arrears on rental is a sufficient ground for ejectment, evicting tenants can take several months to complete. About 12% of landlords interviewed said it took about 10 months to eject tenants while others (35%) about 4 to 6 months (JICA Study 2003). Ejectment requires a legal process even in informal settlements. In some cases, the involvement of the barangay officials is sufficient but with difficult tenants, ejectment would require court decision. For low-income landlords, the cost of judicial proceedings is prohibitive. Court action is thus considered only as a last resort.

Management and Operation of Public Rental Housing

The government has been hesitant to pursue rental housing program specifically for the low-income group because these projects so far have not been viable. Maintenance of these buildings has been highly subsidized. In particular, public rental buildings mainly occupied by low income households, which obtain income from informal sources, are the least viable. The problem, however, is mismanagement rather than poor returns from rental business. An assessment of public rental housing show that the problems lies mainly on the following (Leynes 1989): (1) the inability of government to transfer to tenants expenses that results from the tenants' use of the building and its facilities; and (2) the failure of the NHA or tenant association to implement rules on grounds for ejectment. The maintenance on normal wear and tear of the building is shouldered by NHA (including breakdown in the use of water pump). In some cases NHA had to shoulder tenants' water consumption and power consumption in common areas. On the other hand, NHA or the tenants association has been unable to effectively implement the lease contract agreements. For public rental housing the provisions of the lease contract is comprehensive in that it covers all areas of default, losses and depreciation. For instance, interest charges are imposed on late payments; three-month arrears and unauthorized transfer of rights, construction and others are subject to eviction without the need for judicial process. In practice, however, ejectment for violations has not been carried out successfully. Interventions from local politicians and other pressure groups is one reason. Apprehension to court cases and threats from erring tenants is the other reasons. The lack of involvement and responsibility of the tenants in building management encourage "free riders." This becomes a disincentive not only to pay maintenance but also rent.

The experience in condominiums has been relatively better since tenants shouldered most of the maintenance cost and NHA was able to successfully disengage itself from the project. However, the transfer of obligation to tenants has been more successful because the beneficiaries of these projects are mainly middle income households. Some low income households were accommodated (e.g., teachers, policemen) but these are mainly regular income earners.

Apparently, the operation and management of public rental housing for low income groups remain a weakness that needs further consideration. The lease-to-purchase agreement while it encourages maintenance and rent payments defeats the purpose of public rental houses. Moreover, this arrangement tends to favor middle income earners. Rental housing is a staging area or possibly a permanent home for households who are unable to acquire homes of their own in their lifecycle. Middle income households have

the potential to acquire homes of their own. Allowing these households to acquire their "staging homes" will displace low income families who are not regular income earners or are not well connected from government subsidy.

In particular, Japan has used public rental housing as a housing strategy for low income households. Housing subsidy has been well targeted through its public rental housing program. Public rental housing development is a task undertaken by the local government with subsidy for the national government (Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport, 2002). National government provides 50 to 65% subsidy. The municipality decides on the rent based on actual cost less subsidy from the government. The rent includes management cost, common service charges (e.g., cleaning of common areas, drainage system, waste disposal, etc.), interest expense on municipality's funds and insurance cost. Rents vary depending on resident income, location, size and years. The rent should also be below the rent of similar housing within the area. Priority is also given to families, those with persons to live with and elderly instead of single persons. Management of the building is done by the local government but auxiliary services (e.g., cleaning, parking, repair, rent collection, tenant services, etc.) are usually commissioned to a private organization or the resident organization.

The key factor for public housing is appropriate management which includes the following basic features: (1) maintaining good living conditions; (2) providing housing and recreation centers as part of the rental housing; (3) making residents recognize management of common space and facilities and to realize that it is natural to pay for repair works even under lease. Moreover, incomes of households are monitored and high income households are discouraged to remain in the public housing by charging a rent equivalent to rental rates in the market.

VI. Options for Rental Housing for the Low Income Groups

The development of the rental housing market has become a critical aspect in urbanization. The sheer volume of urban growth through both migration and natural increase has strengthened the resolve to create a balance of advantage between ownership and renting. Even in countries where ownership has increased, the increase in the magnitude of renters has also been substantial. Being a tenant is an optimum choice for some households in different stages of the lifecycle. Thus, the rental housing market is not simply an alternative to ownership.

In the Philippines, the proportion of renter households has increased considerably in the last decade. While there is a diversity of renter households in the country and that there are rich as well as poor tenants, there are more non-owners (tenants or sharers) among low income households specifically in Metro Manila. In particular, renting and sharing has been the response of households to the acute shortage of affordable housing in the country.

However, the supply of rental dwellings for the low income sector has been increasingly provided through self-help rental developments, which are mostly found in informal settlements. For instance, in Metro Manila, a high of 80% of total households in depressed settlements are renters. Most renters thus are found in the peripheral or coastal cities of Metro Manila where the proportion of depressed areas to total city area is high.

Small scale, low income landlords have taken over the supply of rental accommodation for households in the same income group. These landlords operate on an individual or household scale and provide rental dwellings at an average monthly rate of P900 to P2000. Large scale landlords and multi unit apartment dwellings is a thing in the past. Even in the formal market, specifically in Metro Manila, small scale landlords operate. These landlords buy units in high rise condominiums and have these units leased. Compared to the self-help rental dwellings, however, these units have high rents with restrictive rental contracts.

Given these developments in the rental housing market, there is a need to reexamine government policy on housing in general and rental housing in particular. Housing the poor and low income sector has to be undertaken with a balance view of ownership and rental. Policies have to be tenure neutral and incentives to stimulate the rental housing market should likewise be provided.

A rent control law is a poor substitute to policies that will stimulate the development of low cost rental housing. The rent control law is also not relevant at this time given that most low income renters dwell in self-help rental accommodations, where informal, verbal contracts are not uncommon. When applied to the formal market, rent control, at the most, may be relevant only in cases when quality of rental dwellings becomes a threat to people's lives. In this case, the law has to be applied selectively (e.g., rental dwellings 20 years old or higher) and based on building structure rather than rent levels.

Aside from rent control, government can adopt other schemes to assist or protect the poor and low income renters. First, encourage small scale landlords to provide more and better rental accommodation through the following: (1) building rental incentives into upgrading programs; (2) provide micro credit; (3) create appropriate planning and rental regulations in informal settlements; and (4) provide incentives to investments in low cost renting.

Letting property in informal settlements should be encourage by the government and upgrading programs has to consider the presence of tenants. Upgrading of self help settlements provides an opportunity to improve the conditions of low income tenants. In several countries upgrading has been noted to provide opportunities for more rental accommodation since owners are encourage making improvements of sheltered space (Skinner et al. 1987). However, better controls should be provided by government in its asset reform programs (e.g., CMP, Presidential Proclamation) to ensure that "absentee landlords" will not be a common occurrence in these projects.

Letting also provides an opportunity for income augmentation in informal settlements thus it addresses both household income and better accommodation for tenants. Most often, however, these households lack resources to extend or add space for housing. The provision of credit to small scale landlords will encourage them to engage in rental business. Renting part of their homes could be a better alternative than other livelihood programs often introduce by government in these settlements.

Incorporating rental housing in informal settlements would require some modifications in planning regulations. These regulations may need to be modified and standard lowered. Strict planning regulations can increase the price of housing in these areas creating problems on affordability.

Government can also stimulate middle income landlords to invest in low cost housing letting part of their property. Tax incentives and credit can also be provided for this sector. In addition, low cost arbitration and conciliation avenues to settle landlord tenant conflicts should be available. Speed of decision is critical especially in low cost rental dwellings since probable losses from rents are not included in the computation of rental rates.

Government subsidies may also be directed to providing public rental housing for low income households on a purely lease arrangement. Lease to own scheme has become popular because it satisfies the need for some families to rent at the beginning and to become homeowners one day. The problem, however, with lease-to-own scheme is that it tends to favor the middle income household. Chile and Brazil have both introduced variety of renting-ownership schemes but so far, these schemes have not been totally successful and tended to be geared toward middle-income groups (UNCHS 2003).

The country may learn from the Japanese experience on public rental housing where national government subsidies are directed to the local governments, who will construct and manage public rental housing. Some LGUs notably the City of Makati in Metro Manila has constructed medium rise buildings for rental housing using the City's funds. Joint venture schemes with these LGUs may be explored by the national government.

References

Ballesteros, M. 2002. *Benefits (and losses) from rent control in the Philippines: An empirical study of Metro Manila*. Research Paper Series No. 2002-09. Manila: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Ballesteros, M. 2002. *The dynamics of housing demand in the Philippines: Income and lifecycle effects*. Research Paper Series No. 2002-01. Manila: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.

Coccato, M. 1996. *Alternatives to homeownership: Rental and shared sub-markets in informal settlements*. Thesis, Master of Architecture. McGill University. <http://www.mchg.mcgill.ca/mchg/coc/abstract.htm>

Gigaba, M. and B. Maharaj. 1996. "Land invasions during political transition: The Wiggins Saga in Cato Manor". *Development Southern Africa* 13: 217-235.

Gilbert, A. and A. Varley. 1991. *Landlord and tenant: Housing the poor in urban Mexico*. London: Routledge, Inc.

Ha, S-K. 1994. "Low-income housing policies in the Republic of Korea". *Cities* 11: 107-114.

Ikejiofor, U. 1997. "The private sector and urban production process in Nigeria: A study of small-scale landlords in Abuja". *Habitat International* 12(4): 409-425.

Japan International Cooperation Agency. 2003. *A survey of private rental housing*. Manila, Philippines.

Leynes, A.F. 1989. *Public sector rental housing maintenance in the Philippines*.

Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport, and Infrastructure Development Institute of Japan. 2002. *Investigation of the guidelines for construction technical removal: Maintenance, preservation and improvement of housing*.

National Economic Development Authority (NEDA). 2004. *Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 2004-2010*. Manila: NEDA.

Planning and Development Collaborative International, Inc., et al. 2002. *Metro Manila urban services for the poor*, Final Report Volumes 1 & 2A (Appendices). Manila: Asian Development Bank.

"Rental housing: A rediscovered priority". *The Urban Edge* 8(2, February 1984).

Schill, M.H. and G. Daniels. 2003. "State of New York City's housing and neighborhoods: An overview of recent trends". *Economic Policy Review* 9(2, June): 5-17.

Skinner, R.J., J.L. Taylor and E.A. Wegelin (eds.). 1987. *Shelter upgrading for the urban poor: Evaluation of Third World experience*. UNCHS and Institute of Housing Studies.

Somerville, C.T. and C.J. Mayer. "Government regulation and changes in the affordable housing stock". *Economic Policy Review* 9(2, June): 45-62.

Strassman, P. and A. Blunt. 1993. "Land, income, mobility and housing: The case of Metro Manila". *Journal of Philippine Development* 20(1).

Thirkell, A.J. 1996. "Players in urban informal land markets; Who wins? Who loses? A case study of Cebu City". *Environment and Urbanization* 8(2, October).

United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS). 2003. *Rental housing: An essential option for the urban poor in developing countries*. Nairobi: UNCHS.

_____. 1993. *Support measures to promote rental housing for low-income groups*. Nairobi: UNCHS.

_____ and the World Bank. 1993. *Housing Indicators Program*. Nairobi: UNCHS.

Table 1. Housing Tenure in Selected Cities (in percent).

City (Country)	Year	Ownership	Renting	Other
Developing Countries				
Kumasi (Ghana)	1998	26	57	17
Lagos (Nigeria)	1998	49	49	2
Manila (Philippines)*	2000	38	42	20
Bangkok (Thailand)	1998	54	41	5
Ankara (Turkey)	1998	58	33	9
Buenos Aires (Argentina)	1998	75	23	2
La Paz/El Alto (Bolivia)	2001	55	23	22
Santa Cruz (Bolivia)	2001	48	27	25
Belo Horizonte (Brazil)	2000	76	15	9
Porto Alegre (Brazil)	2000	79	13	8
Rio de Janeiro (Brazil)	2000	75	17	8
Sao Paolo (Brazil)	2000	70	20	10
Santiago (Chile)	2002	73	21	6
Quito (Ecuador)	1998	47	46	6
Guadalajara (Mexico)	2000	62	23	15
Mexico City (Mexico)	2000	76	16	8
Monterrey (Mexico)	2000	84	11	5
Port of Spain (Trinidad)	1998	38	52	10
Developed Countries				
Montreal (Canada)	1998	46	54	-
Toronto (Canada)	1998	58	42	-
Berlin (Germany)	1998	11	89	-
London (UK)	2000	58	41	-
New York (USA)	1998	45	55	-
Washington, D.C. (USA)	1998	62	38	-

Source: UN-HABITAT(2003), Rental Housing: An essential option for the urban poor in developing countries
***** Metro Manila or National Capital Region, source: Census of Population and Housing 2000
Note: Countries have been selected where results look relatively reliable and are for 1994 or later.
Tenure is classified based on UNCHS definition. Owners, include informal owners, including squatters.
Both tenants with formal contracts and those renting with a verbal contract in informal housing areas have been included as tenants. Many countries have failed to separate out non-rental forms of non-ownership, e.g., sharing. The data have many flaws and this table should be regarded as not much more than an approximation of the tenure mix.
Figures may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Table 2. Trends in Housing Tenure in Selected Cities of Developing Countries.

City (Country)	1980-1985			1990*			1994 - 2000		
	Owners	Renters	Others	Owners	Renters	Others	Owners	Renters	Others
Cairo (Egypt)	na	59	na [1/]	32	68	0.0	37	63	-
Kumasi (Ghana)	10	62	25 [1/]	…	…	…	26	57	17
Rabat (Morocco)	33	52	15	46	54	0.0	…	…	…
Bangkok (Thailand)	55	31	8	68	32	0.0	54	41	5
Jakarta (Indonesia)	55	30	11 [3/]	56	44	0.3	…	…	…
Karachi (Pakistan)	64	27	9	83	17	-	…	…	…
Delhi (India)	53	37	10 [2/]	48	52	0.4	…	…	…
Seoul (Korea)	41	59	0 [2/]	40	60	0.0	70	30	-
Metro Manila (Philippines)	42	47	10	61	30	9	38	42	20
La Paz (Bolivia)	49	20	28 [1/]	…	…	…	55	23	22 [4/]
Mexico City (Mexico)	64	36	10	…	…	…	76	16	8
Guadalajara (Mexico)	52	39	8	…	…	…	62	23	15
Caracas (Venezuela)	63	31	6	65	35	-	…	…	…
Santafe de Bogota (Colombia)	57	40	3	62	38	0.3	…	…	…
Santiago de Chile (Chile)	64	20	16	80	20	0.1	73	21	6 [5/]
Sao Paulo (Brazil)	56	35	9	…	…	…	70	20	10

"…" means data not available

"Others" includes sharers, homeless and other forms of tenure

Figures may not add to 100% due to rounding.

* Figures for Renters & Others are estimates of the author based on UNCHS Husing Indicators Table.

[1/] 1986 figures

[2/] 1987 figures

[3/] 1988 figures

[4/] 2001 figures

[5/] 2002 figures

Sources: UN-HABITAT (2003), Rental Housing: An essential option for the urban poor in developing countries;
UNCHS (1993) Support Measures to Promote Rental Housing for Low-income Groups;
UNCHS & WB (1993), The Housing Indicators Program;
Census of Population and Housing 2000 for Metro Manila

Table 3. Distribution of Households by Tenure and Income group, 2000 (in percent).

Tenure [a/]	All Income groups	Low-income*	Urban Poor	Middle-to-High-income
URBAN PHILIPPINES				
Owner	69.6	64.4	62.8	75.5
Tenant	25.1	29.1	30.4	20.4
Sharer	5.4	6.5	6.7	4.1
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
METRO MANILA				
Owner	64.1	55.9	51.4	69.5
Tenant	29.4	34.9	36.9	25.7
Sharer	6.6	9.3	11.7	4.8
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

* Low-income includes Urban Poor

Note: for Urban Philippines, Low-income is from 1st-7th decile, Urban Poor - 1st-4th decile (on or below the poverty threshold), Middle-to-High-income 8th-10th decile; for Metro Manila, Low-income if from 1st-4th decile, Urban Poor-1st decile (on or below the poverty threshold), and Middle-to-High-income - 5th-10th decile.

[a/] Based on UNCHS definition, tenure arrangements in the Philippines has been classified as follows:
Owner - Own H & L, Own H & rent-free L w/o consent of owner
Tenant - Rent H & L, Own H & rent L, Own H & rent-free L w/ consent of owner
Sharer - Rent-free H & L w/ or w/o consent of owner

Table 4. Housing Tenure in Metro Manila Cities and Depressed Settlements, 2002.

CITY	Total Population				Depressed Settlements				Population in Depressed sett. % to Total Population	Land area of Depressed sett. % to Total Land area
	Owner	Renter	Sharer	All	Owner	Renter	Sharer	All		
Manila	52.3	38.6	9.2	100.0	-	-	-	-	43.0	-
Quezon City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36.6	0.3
Mandaluyong City	-	-	-	-	57.0	32.2	10.7	100.0	33.2	-
San Juan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.5	-
Marikina	-	-	-	-	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	31.8	10.2
Pasig City	66.9	24.5	8.7	100.0	-	-	-	-	11.4	-
Caloocan City	64.3	26.3	9.4	100.0	64.3	26.3	9.4	100.0	26.0	19.2
Malabon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31.0	-
Navotas	-	-	-	-	25.3	68.0	6.8	100.0	41.3	-
Valenzuela	-	-	-	-	4.7	53.0	42.4	100.0	4.0	54.0
Makati City	47.1	40.8	12.2	100.0	-	-	-	-	11.8	-
Las Piñas	35.0	50.0	15.0	100.0	5.3	82.0	12.6	100.0	16.9	33.7
Muntinlupa City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27.3	1.8
Parañaque	40.0	50.0	10.0	100.0	7.4	79.4	13.2	100.0	18.7	31.3
Pasay City	40.0	50.0	10.0	100.0	8.8	71.6	19.5	100.0	22.5	30.2
Taguig	76.5	18.3	5.3	100.0	14.2	71.5	14.3	100.0	11.0	-
Pateros	76.3	19.0	4.8	100.0	-	-	-	-	58.5	-

Source of basic data: Metro Manila Urban Services for the Poor (MMUSP) Survey, 2002
' - ' no data

Table 5. Median Income by Tenure.

TENURE	Urban Philippines		Metro Manila	
	Median Income	Coeff of Variation (%)	Median Income	Coeff of Variation (%)
All Households				
Owner	149,063.00	223.3	210,876.00	240.2
Tenant	116,000.00	134.7	173,260.00	84.3
Sharer	115,733.00	74.0	148,338.00	52.0
Low-income group				
Owner	86,767.00	15.3	116,850.00	7.5
Tenant	83,366.00	15.3	111,142.00	7.7
Sharer	85,600.00	16.0	106,975.00	9.5

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

Table 6. Distribution of Tenants by City and Income Decile, Metro Manila, 2000 (cumulative percentage).

City	First Decile	Second Decile	Third Decile	Fourth Decile	Fifth Decile	Sixth Decile	Seventh Decile	Eighth Decile	Ninth Decile	Tenth Decile
Manila City	12.1	22.4	30.2	41.8	52.5	63.9	74.6	86.9	94.2	100.0
Quezon City	7.3	21.7	32.4	44.9	52.2	60.2	70.0	83.4	92.4	100.0
Mandaluyong City	5.7	11.1	20.1	37.7	49.0	49.0	64.8	73.4	94.6	100.0
San Juan	6.8	13.3	22.2	36.3	40.6	52.4	68.0	78.8	85.0	100.0
Marikina City	15.6	19.8	39.2	47.6	61.9	73.9	78.2	90.9	95.8	100.0
Pasig City	3.6	17.7	33.0	39.5	49.5	62.8	73.3	85.7	96.6	100.0
Caloocan City	20.7	34.5	52.7	62.7	72.6	82.7	93.7	95.2	100.0	-
Malabon	28.4	45.8	56.0	68.0	76.6	86.1	94.9	98.3	100.0	-
Navotas	29.1	52.5	62.9	75.8	78.5	83.9	100.0	-	-	-
Valenzuela City	15.0	38.1	52.5	59.8	67.2	81.6	86.5	92.6	97.1	100.0
Makati City	7.2	15.7	27.1	32.6	40.3	52.4	61.7	77.6	85.9	100.0
Las Piñas City	10.4	19.7	22.6	38.2	55.6	60.5	73.7	81.8	90.7	100.0
Muntinlupa City	17.5	32.7	38.3	52.7	52.7	68.9	84.9	87.7	93.6	100.0
Parañaque City	12.4	23.7	36.2	40.5	54.5	77.3	79.2	85.9	93.9	100.0
Pasay City	12.2	24.4	35.4	47.9	60.4	71.8	81.0	90.5	96.9	100.0
Taguig/Pateros	13.1	26.1	33.3	48.4	59.4	70.6	83.6	87.7	98.4	100.0
All	**12.6**	**25.6**	**36.3**	**47.5**	**56.7**	**67.7**	**78.0**	**87.2**	**94.7**	**100.0**

Source: FIES 2000

Table 7. Distribution of Sharers by City and Income Decile, Metro Manila, 2000 (cumulative percentage).

City	First Decile	Second Decile	Third Decile	Fourth Decile	Fifth Decile	Sixth Decile	Seventh Decile	Eighth Decile	Ninth Decile	Tenth Decile
Manila City	20.2	38.3	47.3	59.0	68.3	75.7	83.2	88.8	96.3	100.0
Quezon City	0.0	0.0	6.1	27.9	43.0	49.1	66.4	71.9	87.8	100.0
Mandaluyong City	25.3	25.3	25.3	35.6	48.3	60.9	73.6	86.2	100.0	-
San Juan	3.9	23.4	38.6	47.5	62.7	73.3	82.2	100.0	-	-
Marikina City	26.9	26.9	66.6	73.3	73.3	78.8	78.8	84.4	92.2	100.0
Pasig City	0.0	20.4	40.7	40.7	61.1	61.1	72.8	83.4	100.0	-
Caloocan City	24.6	46.8	57.6	67.0	86.3	87.6	87.6	96.9	100.0	-
Malabon	36.2	49.8	65.3	65.3	85.7	85.7	85.7	85.7	100.0	-
Navotas	41.7	50.0	66.7	83.3	91.7	100.0	-	-	-	-
Valenzuela City	10.2	22.9	44.9	51.4	68.1	82.5	89.5	96.9	100.0	-
Makati City	5.6	11.3	40.6	53.5	60.3	60.3	70.5	88.7	94.3	100.0
Las Piñas City	12.0	36.0	59.9	62.9	62.9	62.9	88.0	88.0	100.0	-
Muntinlupa City	40.8	40.8	59.2	79.6	79.6	79.6	100.0	-	-	-
Parañaque City	4.7	4.7	4.7	42.3	71.0	95.3	95.3	95.3	100.0	-
Pasay City	2.2	22.9	34.2	50.1	62.0	72.2	84.0	94.2	100.0	-
Taguig/Pateros	25.8	25.8	39.3	39.3	39.3	75.2	75.2	88.7	88.7	100.0

Source: FIES 2000

Table 8. Mean Household Size by Tenure.

	Urban Philippines						Metro Manila					
	Female-headed HH	CV (%)	Male-headed HH	CV (%)	All	CV (%)	Female-headed HH	CV (%)	Male-headed HH	CV (%)	All	CV (%)
All Households												
Owner	4.4	26.4	5.4	16.6	5.2	18.8	4.6	23.8	5.4	17.6	5.2	19.3
Tenant	4.2	24.5	5.2	16.2	5.0	17.9	4.3	19.5	5.0	15.9	4.8	16.9
Sharer	4.1	26.9	5.0	16.6	4.9	18.3	4.4	24.3	4.7	16.0	4.6	17.6
All	4.3	26.0	5.3	16.5	5.1	18.6	4.5	22.9	5.2	17.3	5.1	18.7
Low-income group												
Owner	3.8	28.4	5.0	17.0	4.8	19.8	4.0	23.2	4.9	15.1	4.7	17.3
Tenant	3.8	29.2	5.0	16.0	4.8	18.3	4.0	21.1	4.5	14.3	4.5	15.4
Sharer	3.6	29.3	4.8	18.1	4.7	20.1	3.9	24.0	4.6	17.8	4.5	18.7
All	3.8	28.6	5.0	16.8	4.8	19.4	4.0	22.6	4.7	15.2	4.6	16.8

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

Table 9. Mean Age of Household Head by Tenure

	Urban Philippines						Metro Manila					
	Female-headed HH	CV (%)	Male-headed HH	CV (%)	All	CV (%)	Female-headed HH	CV (%)	Male-headed HH	CV (%)	All	CV (%)
All Households												
Owner	55.6	6.7	48.5	7.0	50.0	7.3	52.5	7.0	47.5	6.8	48.7	7.1
Tenant	50.4	8.5	44.0	7.9	45.1	8.3	46.3	9.1	42.6	8.1	43.4	8.5
Sharer	49.6	8.4	40.9	8.2	42.3	8.9	47.7	5.7	39.8	7.3	41.4	7.5
All	54.2	7.3	46.9	7.6	48.4	7.9	50.5	7.7	45.5	7.6	46.7	7.8
Low-income group												
Owner	58.3	6.4	47.1	8.3	49.4	8.7	53.3	6.8	43.8	7.9	46.2	8.4
Tenant	52.5	7.8	43.5	8.5	44.9	8.9	46.0	9.3	40.6	8.8	41.4	9.1
Sharer	51.1	9.0	39.8	9.0	41.4	10.0	46.2	5.5	38.4	8.9	39.5	8.7
All	56.5	7.1	45.5	8.6	47.6	9.1	50.8	7.8	42.1	8.5	43.9	9.0

Source of basic data: FIES 2000
Tenure definitions:
"Owner" includes the following tenure status: Own house & lot and Own house & rent-free lot w/o consent of owner.
"Tenant": Rent house/room incl. lot, Own house & rent lot, and Own house & rent-free lot w/ consent of owner.
"Sharer": Rent-free H & L w/ or w/o consent of owner.

Table 10. Tenants by City and Type of Building, Metro Manila (in percent).

City	Single house	Duplex	Apartment/accessoria/condo/town house	Commercial/industrial/agricultural bldg/house	Other housing unit	Total
Manila	42.4	6.5	49.3	1.4	0.3	100.0
Mandaluyong City	45.2	8.2	45.7	0.7	0.2	100.0
Marikina City	57.5	10.4	31.6	0.4	0.1	100.0
Pasig City	54.2	11.1	34.3	0.4	0.0	100.0
Quezon City	43.3	9.3	46.3	0.6	0.5	100.0
San Juan	32.8	5.8	60.7	0.4	0.2	100.0
Kalookan City	50.0	10.7	38.1	1.0	0.1	100.0
Malabon	53.8	12.4	33.5	0.2	0.1	100.0
Navotas	67.2	10.2	21.9	0.5	0.2	100.0
Valenzuela City	37.5	12.7	49.2	0.5	0.2	100.0
Las Piñas City	62.5	10.0	26.5	0.6	0.3	100.0
Makati City	36.5	9.0	53.8	0.5	0.2	100.0
Muntinlupa City	54.9	12.5	32.2	0.2	0.2	100.0
Parañaque City	60.7	11.1	27.1	0.9	0.2	100.0
Pasay City	46.1	6.4	46.7	0.7	0.2	100.0
Pateros	55.3	9.9	34.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Taguig	50.5	12.8	36.5	0.2	0.0	100.0
All	47.3	9.6	42.2	0.7	0.3	100.0

Source of basic data: Census of Population and Housing 2000

Table 11. Residential Trajectories in Metro Manila

	%	Ave. Annual HH Income	Income Decile*
Metro Manila, 1983			
Always Owner	4.3	71,022.34	8th
Always Tenant	30.5	28,483.48	4th
Always Sharer	4.9	28,465.09	4th
From owner to tenant	9.4	38,494.70	5th
From owner to sharer	0.5	53,185.72	7th
From tenant to owner	8.8	85,461.44	9th
From tenant to sharer	2.0	28,246.64	3rd
From sharer to owner	13.5	84,256.66	9th
From sharer to tenant	26.1	31,097.71	5th
Mandaluyong City, 2003			
Always tenant	54.2	287,125.00	8th
From sharer to tenant	20.3	246,833.00	7th
From owner to tenant	25.4	265,600.00	7th

Sample size: 1,580 households (1983 survey)
59 households (2003 survey)

* Refers to regional income deciles in 1985 FIES for Metro Manila-1983 and 2000 FIES for Mandaluyong-2003.

Source of basic data: World Bank Metro Manila Housing Demand Survey 1984 and
JICA Private Rental Housing Survey 2003

Table 12. Proportion of Tenants by Income group and Type of housing.

Income group	Single house	Duplex	Apartment/accessoria/condo/townhouse	Commercial/industrial/agricultural bldg/house	Total
Urban Philippines					
Low-income *	85.1	5.8	9.1	0.03	100.0
Poor	92.0	4.4	3.7	-	100.0
Middle-&-High-income	68.1	6.1	25.7	0.1	100.0
All	78.6	5.9	15.4	0.05	100.0
Metro Manila					
Low-income *	64.4	10.0	25.4	0.2	100.0
Poor	69.9	9.9	19.7	0.5	100.0
Middle-&-High-income	57.0	7.2	35.8	0.1	100.0
All	60.5	8.5	30.8	0.1	100.0

Source of basic data: FIES 2000
*Includes urban poor.

Table 13. Income Variation among Tenants by Type of Housing

	Type of Housing					
	Single house	Duplex	Apartment/accessoria/condo/townhouse	Improvised house	Commercial/industrial/agricultural bldg/house	All
Urban Philippines						
Annual Income (median)	106,300.00	123,563.00	178,056.00	134,210.00	150,720.00	116,000.00
Annual Income (mean)	146,301.90	165,488.00	231,210.80	177,095.50	133,637.10	161,021.50
Metro Manila						
Annual Income (median)	161,400.00	149,223.00	200,375.00	212,400.00	150,720.00	173,260.00
Annual Income (mean)	211,636.10	203,022.70	256,880.20	231,595.30	133,637.10	225,192.50

Source: FIES 2000

Table 14. National Housing Authority (NHA) Public Rental Housing (Housing Projects Under Lease or with Lease to Purchase Agreement)

Project	Year Constructed	Total no. of units	Rates Per Month	Collection Performance
I. TENEMENTS		1,809		
Punta Tenement - Manila	1962	697	P100 - P300	…
Del Pan Tenement - Manila	1962	99	P160 - P220	90% of target
Fort Bonifacio Tenement (Macapagal) - Taguig	1963	709	P8 - P158 - *Old tenants* P100 - P300 - *New tenants* ** lease rates are adjusted at 20% annually starting 2002*	55% - 60% of target
Vitas Tenement - Manila	1964	272	P100 - P300	…
Teacher's Tenement (Phil North Ave Apts) - Quezon City	1969	32	P309 - P347	54% of target
II. CONDOMINIUMS		2,020		
Bagong Barangay Housing Project - Manila	1954	520	P4 - P97	almost 100% fully paid
Bagong Lipunan Condominium - Taguig	1977	526	P373 - P1,965 *; increment of 5% p.a. for 25 yrs.*	55% - 60% of target
Bagong Lipunan Condominium - Quezon City	1978	524	P825 - P1,370 *; increment of 5% p.a. for 14 yrs.*	66% of target
Teachers BLISS Condominium - Pasay City	1981	206	P370 - P536	…
Teachers BLISS Condominium - Caloocan City	1983	244	P409 - P429 *; increment of 5% p.a. for 25 yrs.*	…
III. MEDIUM RISE HOUSING		3,212		
Maharlika MRH Project - Taguig	March 5, 1997	420	P750 - P1,600 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Tala MRH Project Phase 1 - Caloocan City	May 7, 1998	840	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Malaria MRH Site 1 - Caloocan City	March 19, 1998	240	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Malaria MRH Site 2 - Caloocan City	April 20, 1998	120	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Bagong Pangarap Condominium 3 - Caloocan City	June 17, 1998	120	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
TBC 2 MRH Project - Quezon City	Sept. 6, 1999	92	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Karangalan MRH Project Site 1A - Pasig City	Aug. 24, 1998	360	Unoccupied	…
Karangalan MRH Project Site 1B - Pasig City	Aug. 24, 1998	240	Unoccupied	…
Philippine Refugee Transit Center (PRTC) - Pasig City	Sept. 11, 1999	300	Unoccupied	…
Mandaluyong MRH Project Site 1 - Mandaluyong City	Sept. 1999	60	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Mandaluyong MRH Project Site 2 - Mandaluyong City	Sept. 1999	180	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…
Muntinlupa MRH Project Phase 1 - Muntinlupa City	1999	240	P750 - P2,130 *; 10% increase, 4th year onwards*	…

Source: NHA Corporate Planning Office.
"…" means no data available
See Appendix Table A.1 for details

Table 15. Average Age of Rental Dwelling Units, City of Mandaluyong, Metro Manila.

	Rent level			
Type of Building	**2,370 & below**	**2,371 - 5,000**	**> 5,000**	**All**
no. of samples	*4*	*21*	*75*	*100*
House	19.3	14.3	20.7	18.9
Rowhouse/Duplex	20.0	10.0	25.3	18.9
Walk-up Apartment	-	27.3	20.1	21.2
All	19.5	18.6	20.6	20.1

Source of basic data: A survey of private rental housing - JICA (2003).

Table 16. Housing Facilities of the Low-Income Group, Metro Manila (in percent)

	Low-income		Urban Poor	
	Owners	Tenants	Owners	Tenants
Structural Materials				
Strong	82.5	80.4	70.8	71.0
Light	12.6	15.1	19.4	22.7
Makeshift	4.9	4.5	9.8	6.4
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Source of Water				
Own use, faucet, community water system	45.0	46.1	33.6	35.1
Shared, faucet, community water system	28.8	33.5	35.0	42.9
Own use, tubed/piped well	1.3	0.4	1.4	0.8
Shared, tubed/piped well	1.3	0.9	1.3	1.2
Dug well	0.6	0.3	1.6	-
Spring, river, stream, etc.	-	-	-	-
Rain	-	-	-	-
Peddler	23.1	18.7	27.1	19.9
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Toilet Facility				
Water sealed	88.2	87.0	79.9	77.5
Closed pit	3.7	4.3	3.8	6.2
Open pit	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.5
Others (pail system, etc.)	4.6	6.0	8.3	9.6
None	2.7	1.7	7.0	5.3
All	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

Table 17. Profile and Rental Investment of Landlords by Rent Level, Mandaluyong City, Metro Manila, 2003

	Rent level			
	2,370 & below	2,371 - 5,000	> 5,000	All
A. Socio-economic profile				
No. of respondents	1	2	37	40 (100%)
Mean annual income	…	700,000.00	738,571.43	737,500.00
Median annual income		1/	750,000.00	725,000.00
Primary source of income				
Business	-	2	15	17 (42.5%)
Employment	1	-	17	18 (45.5%)
Rental Housing	-	-	5	5 (12.5%)
Ave. Household size	4	5.5	5.8	6
Ave. Age of household head	78.0	61.5	51.9	53.0
B. Rental Investments				
No. of rental units owned per landlord* (range)	2	2 - 14	1 - 12	1 - 14
Ave. no of years rented out	3	26.5	15.7	16.0
Source of investment/capital				
Land ownership				
Inheritance	1	-	10	11 (27.5%)
Purchase:				
Borrowed from gov't lending program	-	-	4	4 (10.0%)
Borrowed from private sector	-	2	23	25 (62.5%)
Capital for building 2/	-- *n.a.* --			
Ave. amount of monthly rent	2,000.00	3,875.00	7,128.00	6,940.00
Annual cost of maintenance (ave. per unit)	*nil*	2,500.00	4,274.21	4,224.92
Approximate Annual Gross Profit 3/	*12,000*	44,000.00	81,261.79	79,055.08

Source: A survey of private rental housing 2003 - JICA
'…' means *not reported/answered*
*includes rental units in other locations.
1/ only one of two responded
2/ information not asked in the survey
3/ Average annual rent less average annual cost of maintenance

Table 18. Collection Report, Mandaluyong MPH Project 1, Guinhawa Street, Mandaluyong City, (as of June 2003)

	Number of Units	Amount (P)
Total transactions	60	
up-to-date payments	6	7,150.0
with arrears	54	334,798.8
w/ 01-30 days arrears	12	10,252.0
w/ 31-90 days arrears	15	30,219.4
w/ 91-180 days arrears	7	28,493.7
w/ 181-365 days arrears	9	84,929.4
over 1 year but less than 3 years	11	180,924.3
over 3 years not more than 5 years	0	-
over 5 years	0	-

Source: NHA, West Sector, NCR.

Table 19. Rent to Income Ratio by Decile.

Income Decile	Urban Philippines			Metro Manila		
	Ave. Monthly Rental	Ave. Monthly Income	Rent-to-Income ratio (%)	Ave. Monthly Rental	Ave. Monthly Income	Rent-to-Income ratio (%)
First Decile	202.71	2,061.10	9.8	926.61	6,055.84	15.3
Second Decile	341.23	3,302.85	10.3	1,263.40	8,513.93	14.8
Third Decile	453.28	4,295.85	10.6	1,462.30	10,528.11	13.9
Fourth Decile	555.74	5,380.02	10.3	2,075.89	12,668.50	16.4
Fifth Decile	776.77	6,732.06	11.5	2,063.83	14,880.60	13.9
Sixth Decile	997.75	8,381.32	11.9	2,356.46	17,473.61	13.5
Seventh Decile	1,263.69	10,669.93	11.8	2,774.20	21,405.79	13.0
Eighth Decile	1,642.31	14,008.00	11.7	3,697.88	26,229.56	14.1
Ninth Decile	2,276.96	19,663.42	11.6	4,751.15	35,471.57	13.4
Tenth Decile	4,346.51	41,521.98	10.5	8,162.04	71,365.76	11.4
All	1,501.40	13,418.46	11.2	2,533.78	18,766.04	13.5

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

Table 20. Rent Levels and Loan Amortization of Selected Government Programs

Program	Maximum Loanable Amount	Monthly Amortization (range/maximum)	Monthly Rent*	Amortization-to-Rent Ratio
HDMF				
Socialized Housing	150,000 - 225,000	1,074.65 - 2,024.38	892.57	1.2 - 2.3
Low-Income	250,000 - 500,000	2,412.55 - 4,825.11	1,555.16	1.6 - 3.1
GSIS				
Socialized Housing	180,000 and below	1,285.92	892.57	1.4
Non-socialized	181,000 - 500,000	2635.49 - 5,040.92	1,555.16	1.7 - 3.2
Community Mortgage Program (CMP)				
Undeveloped/developed lot	80,000	515.44	892.57	0.6
House construction	40,000	257.72	892.57	0.3
House & lot	120,000	773.16	892.57	0.9

notes:

Amortizations exclude insurance premiums (e.g. fire, mortgage redemption)

HDMF: payable up to 20 yrs, at 6-9% interest p.a. for Socialized housing and 10% p.a. for Low-income housing

GSIS: payable up to 30 yrs at 8% interest p.a. for socialized housing and up to 25 yrs at 10% interest p.a. for a non-socialized housing loan maximum of P300,000 and at 12% p.a. for a maximum loan of P500,000.

CMP: these loan packages are applicable to the Metro Manila area, payable up to 25 years, at 6% interest p.a.

Sources: HUDCC, NHMFC, GSIS

*Monthly rent data comes from FIES 2000, P892.57 is average for the 1st decile and P1,556.16 for the 2nd-4th deciles in Metro Manila.

Table 21. Average Rental Increase

	Rent level				
	2,370 & below	**2,371 - 5,000**	**5,001 - 7,500**	**> 7,500**	**All**
No increase in rent					
Length of stay (yrs.):					
Average	1.1	1.7	4.2	2.0	2.5
Min	0.3	0.4	0.04	0.6	0.04
Max	2.0	10.0	29.0	7.3	29.0
no. of samples	*3*	*14*	*14*	*15*	*46*
With increase in rent					
Average annual increase (%)	-	5.0	7.9	7.1	6.6
Length of stay (yrs.):					
Average	-	11.3	7.8	16.2	11.4
Min	-	2.1	2.3	8.6	2.1
Max	-	30.0	20.0	28.0	30.0
no. of samples	*0*	*4*	*4*	*3*	*11*

Source of basic data: JICA Private Rental Housing Survey 2003

Table 22. Ranking Things Most Liked/Disliked in Rental Dwelling.

	Rent level			
	2,370 & below	**2,371-5,000**	**5,001-7,500**	**> 7,500**
no. of respondents	*3*	*19*	*20*	*18*
Most liked = rank 1				
Low cost of rent	2	1	2	7
Rent does not increase yearly	1	4	5	2
Less restrictions on contract	4	6	6	5
Accessibility to public transportation	3	5	4	1
Near schools and CBD	5	2	1	3
Well-maintained dwelling unit	5	3	3	4
Others:				
Privacy	-	7	-	-
Quiet	-	-	-	6
Does not get flooded	-	-	6	7
Most disliked = rank 1				
High cost of rent	1	2	2	1
Yearly increase in rent	-	4	1	2
Restrictive rent contract	-	2	3	-
Place gets flooded	2	3	4	4
Dilapidated dwelling unit	3	1	5	3
Others:				
Water supply	-	2	-	-
Neighbor (not welcoming)	-	-	-	-

Source: A survey of private rental housing 2003, JICA

Table 23. Rental Index, Philippines (1994=100)

Year	Apartment & House Rentals	Room Rental (4x6 sq.m. floor area)	All		Yearly Increments		
					Apartment & House Rentals	Room Rental	All
1994	99.9	100.2	100.0		-	-	-
1995	111.4	106.8	111.5		11.5	6.6	11.5
1996	123.2	117.9	123.8		10.6	10.4	11.0
1997	137.1	130.6	137.1		11.3	10.8	10.7
1998	153.8	151.2	153.4		12.2	15.8	11.9
1999	168.3	172.9	168.3		9.4	14.4	9.7
2000	177.6	186.5	177.5		5.5	7.9	5.5
2001	189.8	203.4	189.7		6.9	9.1	6.9
2002	199.3	210.7	199.4		5.0	3.6	5.1
2003 June	203.5	217.0	203.5		2.1	3.0	2.1
				Ave:	8.3	9.0	8.3

Source of basic data: Economic Indicators & Indices Division, National Statistics Office

Table 24. Monthly Rental Rates of Renter-HHs by Income Decile, Urban Philippines and Metro Manila, 2000 (in pesos)

Income Decile	Urban Philippines		Metro Manila*	
	Ave. Monthly Rental	Range	Ave. Monthly Rental	Range
First Decile	202.71	20 - 1,000	926.61	50 - 4,000
Second Decile	341.23	35 - 1,520	1,263.40	150 - 5,000
Third Decile	453.28	50 - 1,545	1,462.30	400 - 4,000
Fourth Decile	555.74	35 - 2,500	2,075.89	400 - 7,200
Fifth Decile	776.77	50 - 4,000	2,063.83	500 - 8,000
Sixth Decile	997.75	60 - 5,000	2,356.46	250 - 7,000
Seventh Decile	1,263.69	100 - 7,200	2,774.20	500 - 7,000
Eighth Decile	1,642.31	70 - 8,000	3,697.88	500 - 12,000
Ninth Decile	2,276.96	17 - 12,000	4,751.15	340 - 21,000
Tenth Decile	4,346.51	175 - 60,000	8,162.04	900 - 60,000
Average	1,501.40	17 - 60,000	2,533.78	50 - 60,000

Source of basic data: FIES 2000

*See Appendix Table A.4 for details by city.

Table 25. General Provisions of Rental Contracts.

		1984				2003			
		Rent level				Rent level			
		375 & below	376 - 700	> 700	All	2,370 & below	2,371 - 5,000	> 5,000	All
No. of samples		*518*	*147*	*73*	*738*	*4*	*21*	*75*	*100*
Rental increase (annual ave.)		13.6	12.7	20.9	14.2	…	5.0	5.7	5.6
Proportion of units w/ rent increase		53.9	61.9	65.3	69.5	…	33.3	32.3	32.4
Proportion of units w/ formal written contract		10.6	32.0	63.9	20.1	0.0	42.9	80.0	69.0
Validity:	6 mos.	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	5.0	8.7
	1 yr	50.9	63.8	69.6	60.8	-	66.7	91.7	88.4
	2 yrs	7.3	8.5	13.0	9.5	-	-	1.7	1.4
	3 - 5 yrs	12.7	12.8	13.0	12.8	-	-	1.7	1.4
	> 5 yrs	20.0	7.0	4.3	10.8	-	-	-	-
% of Tenants threatened with eviction		12.0	6.1	5.5	10.2	33.3	5.3	2.7	5.1
no. of samples		*518*	*147*	*73*	*738*	*3*	*19*	*38*	*60*

Source of basic data: for 1984, World Bank Metro Manila Housing Demand Survey: for 2003, A survey of private rental housing - JICA.
'…' means no response

Table 26. Ejectment Proceedings.

Ejectment Proceedings	
Number of times (mean)	2
Reason for ejection (rank, 1-most common)	
Inability to pay	1
Unsettled differences w/ owner	2
Violations in contract	3
Action taken (rank, 1-most common)	
Application to advance rental paid	1
Termination of contract w/o legal action	2
Barangay	3
Resort to legal action	4

Source: A survey of private rental housing 2003, JICA

Figure 1. Distribution of Low-Income Renters in Metro Manila

Low-Income = Tenant households up to the 4th decile.

Figure 2. Change in the Number of Housing Units by Type of Building, Owned & Rented, Metro Manila

Source of basic data: Census of Population and Housing, NSO

Source of basic data: Census of Population and Housing 2000, NSO

Figure 4. Basis of Rental Rate
Affordability of Lessee 5%
Cost of Development 20%
Market Rate 72%
Facilities 3%

Appendix Table A.1 Annual Income by Decile, Metro Manila (from FIES 2000)

Income Decile	N	Sum Wgts (wgtd N)	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Metro Manila					
First Decile	402	218,690	70,870	15,658	89,780
Second Decile	414	219,028	101,880	89,800	114,280
Third Decile	410	219,143	125,770	114,295	138,413
Fourth Decile	409	218,115	151,629	138,452	164,393
Fifth Decile	409	219,234	178,670	164,440	193,084
Sixth Decile	437	218,869	211,087	193,092	232,600
Seventh Decile	431	218,658	255,893	233,000	282,926
Eighth Decile	423	219,192	316,838	283,000	355,198
Ninth Decile	411	218,826	432,154	355,279	534,000
Tenth Decile	395	218,921	1,157,872	535,000	8,441,242
ALL	**4,141**	**2,188,675**	**300,304**	**15,658**	**8,441,242**

Metro Manila annual per capita poverty threshold (2000): P15,678
Average family size (2000) = 5
P15,678 x 5 = P78,390

Appendix Table A.2a National Housing Authority Housing Projects Under Lease or with Lease to Purchase Agreement

Revised 8/5/03

Project/Location	Year Constructed	Bldg. Description	No. of Units Residential	No. of Units Commercial	Beneficiaries	Rates Per Month	Residents Association	Other fees collected by NHA other than rental	Collection Performance	Status of Disposition
I. TENEMENTS										
Punta Tenement Sta. Ana, Manila	1962	Single Structure H-Shape 7-storey walk-up	680	17	Low-income families	*Old Rates* 7th Floor / 1st Floor Current P100 - P220 Commercial - P300	Kabalikat Inc.	N/A	N/A	Condemned building since 1994 (no existing tenants)
Del Pan Tenement Del Pan, Tondo, Manila	1962	T-shape 4-storey walk-up	99		Tondo Squatter Families	*Old Rates* 4th Floor / 1st Floor P160 - P220	Del Pan Homeowners Association	None Assessment fee is being collected by the Homeowners Association	90% of target Selling price *original awardees and kin: P52,000-57,000 per unit * unregistered lessees: P62,000-68000	Mode of Disposition changed from **lease to sale** (MC 1815: 12 May 2003)
Fort Bonifacio Tenement (Macapagal) Western Bicutan, Taguig	1963	Single Structure H-shape 7-storey walk-up	671	38	Relocated Squatter Families	7th Floor / 1st Floor Starting P4 - P14 Current (Old Tenant) P8 - P27 Curent (New Tenant) P100 - P226 Commercial Old Tenants P158 New Tenants P300 ** lease rates are adjusted at 20% annually starting 2002* (MC 1755: 28 October 2002)	Tahanan Incorporated	P14 per unit per mo. (for the electricity of water pump) P2 per unit per mo. (electricity for the pathways) Assessment fee collected by the Homeowners Assoc. for the maintenance and cleanliness of the project	55% - 60% of target	No changes except lease rates were updated
Vitas Tenement Vitas, Tondo, Manila	1964	H-Shape 7-storey walk-up	252	20	Public School Teachers	*Old Rates* 7th Floor / 1st Floor Residential P100 - P220 Commercial - P300	Vitas Residents Association	N/A	N/A	Condemned bldg. since 1991 (No existing tenants)
Teacher's Tenement (Phil North Ave Apts) Pag-Asa, Quezon City, Metro Manila	1969	Single Structure 5-storey walk-up	32		Public School Teachers	Current Rates 5th Floor / 1st Floor P309 - P347	Bagong Pag-Asa Homeowners Assoc. Inc.	Land rent: P6.50/mo. Fire Ins: P8.33 These fees were collected per month per year.	54% of target	No changes

Appendix Table A.2b National Housing Authority Housing Projects with Lease to Purchase Agreement revised 8/8/2003

Project/Location	Year Constructed	Bldg. Description	No. of Units		Beneficiaries	Rates		Residents Association	Other fees collected by NHA other than rental	Collection Performance	Status of Disposition
			Residential	Commercial		Fixed	Escalating				
II. CONDOMINIUMS											
Bagong Barangay Housing Project Pandacan, Manila	1954	Medium-rise 3-storey walk-up; 17 bldgs.	510	10	Gov't. Employees	Type A P4 - P20 Type B P45 - P97	None	Bagong Barangay Condominium Corporation		Almost 100% fully paid	No changes
Bagong Lipunan Condominium - Taguig Western Bicutan, Taguig, Metro Manila	1977	Medium-rise 3-4 storey walk-up; 44 bldgs.	513	13	Gov't. Employees	Studio P373 - P413 2-Bedrooms P550 - P872 3-Bedrooms P792 - P920	Studio P312 - P1,109 2-Bedrooms P363 - P1,429 3-Bedrooms P523 - P1,965 (Increment of 5% p.a. for 25 years)	BLC Taguig Residents Association	Water fees - **₱38 - ₱42** (electricity used for the water pump) Assessment fees * collected by the Homeowners Assoc. for the maintenance and cleanliness of the project.	55% - 60% of target	No Changes
Bagong Lipunan Condominium - Pag-asa Pag-Asa, Quezon City, Metro Manila	1978	Medium-rise 4-astorey walk-up; 45 bldgs.	512	12	Middle Income families	Duplex P1,150 - P1,318 Single P1,239 - P1,370	Duplex P825 - P877 Single P825 - P945 (increment of 5% p.a. for 14 yrs.)	Bagong Lipunan Pag-asa Condominium Homeowners Association	GSIS Fire Insurance **₱23 - ₱30** per unit per month Land rent **₱9.50** per unit per month	66% of target	No changes
Teachers BLISS Condominium - MIA Merville, Pasay City, Metro Manila	1981	Medium-rise 4-storey walk-up; 9 bldgs.	180	26	Public School Teachers	Studio P370 - P420 2-Bedroom P472 - P536	None	Teachers Bliss Condo I Association	Land rent **₱8.50 - ₱9.50/mo.** Fire Ins. - **₱17 - ₱24/mo.** Assessment fee - **₱50/mo.** (these fees are included in their montly amort. As per MC No. 243 dated 18 Jan. 1983)		Original Mode of Disposition: ***lease of residential lots, sale of units*** Mode of disposition of residential lots, ***changed from lease to sale*** MC No. 1427 dated
Teachers BLISS Condominium - Balintawak Balintawak, Caloocan City, Metro Manila	1983	Medium-rise 3-storey walk-up; 32 bldgs.	220	24	Public School Teachers	none	P409 - ₱429 at 5% p.a. for 25 years	Teachers Bliss Homeowners Association	Land rent **₱9.00/mo.** Fire Ins. - **₱19 - ₱22/mo.** Assessment fee - **₱50/mo.** (these fees are included in their montly amort. As per MC No. 244 dated 18 Jan. 1983)		Original Mode of Disposition: ***lease of residential lots, sale of units*** Mode of disposition of residential lots, ***changed from lease to sale*** MC No. 1427 dated

* Assessment fee for maintenance and project upkeep.

Appendix Table A.2c National Housing Authority
Medium Rise Housing
List of Completed and On-going Projects
(1997- June 2003)

Name of Project/ Location	Proj. Duration (Mo./Yr.) Start/(Com.)	Total Project Cost (PM)	Total Number of			Floor Area Per Unit	Monthly Lease Rate (P)		Other Fees/Charges Collected
			Bldgs.	Storeys	Units		Initial Year 1-3	Escalating Year 4-onwards	
T O T A L		**2,893.712**			**5,924**				
COMPLETED		**1,010.882**			**3,212**				
1. Maharlika MRH Project Maharlika Village Project, Upper Bicutan Taguig, Metro Manila	March 5, 1997 Sept. 9, 1999	110.533	7	5	420	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-1,600	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1378)	Collects P30 per month for water
2. Tala MRH Project Phase 1 Lot 3, NHC Property, Tala Estate Kaloocan City	May 7, 1998 2nd quarter of 2002 2nd quarter of 2002	286.314	14	5	840	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	* Proposed for approval by NHA Management: P100 monthly assessment fee to cover maintenance (repair of clogging sewer lines, payment of electricity along hallways & salary of security guards)
3. Malaria MRH Site 1 Bagong Silang, Kalookan City	March 19, 1998 Oct. 26, 1999	62.183	4	5	240	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	
4. Malaria MRH Site 2 Bagong Silang, Kalookan City	April 20, 1998 March 28, 1999	32.280	2	5	120	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	
5. Bagong Pangarap Condominium 3 (Malaria Area Site 3) Blk. 6, Pkg. 3 Phase XI Malaria Area , Caloocan City	June 17, 1998 Sept. 23, 2000	30.842	2	5	120	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	-do-
6. TBC 2 MRH Project Filipino Avenue, Cor. Science Avenue Balintawak, Quezon City	Sept. 6, 1999 Feb. 6, 2001	61.250	1	4	92	32.50 35.20 37.60 42.40	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	None
7. Karangalan MRH Project Site 1A, Karangalan Village, Pasig City	Aug. 24, 1998	94.297	6	5	360	22.50 24.00	Unoccupied		
8. Karangalan MRH Project Site 1B, Karangalan Village, Pasig City	Aug. 24, 1998	61.113	4	5	240	22.50 24.00	Unoccupied		
9. Philippine Refugee Transit Center (PRTC) Kalayaan Avenue, Pasay City	Sept. 11, 1999 May 2001	117.140	5	5	300	22.50 24.00	Unoccupied		
10. Mandaluyong MRH Project Site 1 Ginhawa St., Mandaluyong City	Sept. 1999 June 2000	15.449	1	5	60	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	Collects P20/month for fire insurance

Appendix Table A.2d National Housing Authority
Medium Rise Housing
List of Completed and On-going Projects
(1997- June 2003)

Name of Project/ Location	Proj. Duration (Mo./Yr.) Start/(Com.)	Total Project Cost (PM)	Total Number of			Floor Area Per Unit	Monthly Lease Rate (P)		Other Fees/Charges Collected
			Bldgs.	Storeys	Units		Initial Year 1-3	Escalating Year 4-onwards	
11. Mandaluyong MRH Project Site 2 Aglipay St., Mandaluyong City	Sept. 1999 Nov. 2001	52.178	3	5	180	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	Collects P85.77 per month for fire insurance
12. Muntinlupa MRH Project Phase 1 Soldiers Hills, Bgy. Pututan Muntinlupa City	1999 April 2002	87.303	4	5	240	22.50 24.00	P750-1,400 P800-2,130	+10% increase +10% increase (MC 1460)	Collects P100 per month for building maintenance (repair of clogging sewer lines & payment of electricity along hallways) Collects P15/cu. meter for water
ON-GOING		**1,882.830**			**2,712**				
1. Camarin1 (AIC) Camarin, Caloocan City		48.877	4	5		22.50 24.00	Not applicable		
2. Camarin2 (R2) Camarin, Caloocan City		35.765	3	5		22.50 24.00	Not applicable		
3. Alay Pabahay Housing 1 Bgy. Baritan, Malabon	Nov. 1999	79.978	4	5	192	22.50 24.00	Not applicable		
4. Smokey Mountain Development and Reclamation Project R-10 Vitas, Tondo, Manila	January 1995	1,718.210	30	5 (28 bldgs.) 4 (4 bldgs.)	2,520	32.00	Not applicable		

Source: NHA Corporate Planning Office.

* Land cost estimated at P2,200/m2 plus 5% related costs
** Present Zonal Valuation Cost P7,000.00 per meter square
* LGU acquired land at P300/m2
* Families from one building (temporary housing) gutted by fire
* 120 units x 28 buildings = 3360
80 units x 2 buildings = + 160

Total 3520

Appendix Table A.3a National Housing Authority Income Statement, For the Year Ended December 31, 198

TENEMENTS

		TOTAL	DEL PAN	FORT BONIFACIO	PUNTA	VITAS	PNAA
INCOME							
Service Income		34,440		9,623	20	3,640	21,157
Interest Earned		0					
On ICR		67,016					67,016
On Misc. Interest Income		114,434	50,502	33,017	17,495	2,512	10,908
Rental Income		1,376,350	449,429	415,170	270,952	227,661	13,138
Misc. Income		489,305		135,235	313,916	5,987	34,167
Total	*	2,081,545	499,931	593,045	602,383	239,800	146,386
	**	100,752	24,198	28,705	29,157	11,607	7,085
EXPENSES							
Personal Services		130,688	48,009	21,606	39,467	21,606	
Depreciation		754,024	148,928	190,825	263,917	150,354	
Insurance		44,958		18,989	18,489	7,480	
Power Consumption		212,309		212,309			
Prov. for Doubtful Accounts		249,964	30,386	93,351	60,807	54,684	10,736
Repair and Maintenance		459,226			459,226		
Water Consumption		328,961			328,961		
SS Benefit Reward & other claims		7,097	3,971		3,126		
Total	*	2,187,227	231,294	537,080	1,173,993	234,124	10,736
	**	105,868	11,195	25,996	56,824	11,332	520
EXCESS (Deficit) of Income over Expense	*	(105,682)	268,637	55,965	(571,610)	5,676	135,650
	**	(5,115)	13,003	2,709	(27,667)	275	6,566

* Philippine Peso
** US Dollars
Current Exchange Rate: US$ = P20.66

Source: Leynes, Angelo (1989). Public Sector Rental Housing Maintenance in the Philippines, National Housing Atuhority: Manila

Appendix Table A.3b National Housing Authority Income Statement, For the Period January-June 1989.

TENEMENTS

		TOTAL	DEL PAN	FORT BONIFACIO	PUNTA	VITAS	PNAA
INCOME							
Service Income		28,159		4,200	23,959		
Profit Real. from Coll. of ICR		0					
Interest Earned							
On ICR		0					
On Misc. Interest Income		30,509	3,958	6,360	10,830	6,682	2,679
Rental Income		470,914	119,456	133,566	150,663	66,291	938
Misc. Income		234,654		49,713	171,740	6,967	6,234
Total	*	764,236	123,414	193,839	357,192	79,940	9,851
	**	36,991	5,974	9,382	17,289	3,869	477
EXPENSES							
Personal Services		60,419	16,847	14,630	14,312	14,630	
Depreciation		364,632	74,464	95,412	123,754	71,002	
Insurance		19,662		6,677	9,245	3,740	
Power Consumption		53,608		53,608			
Prov. for Doubtful Accounts		108,855	15,581	38,429	35,467	22,378	
Water Consumption		474,498			474,498		
Total	*	1,081,674	106,892	208,756	654,276	111,750	0
	**	52,356	5,174	10,104	31,669	5,409	0
EXCESS (Deficit) of Income over Expense	*	(317,438)	16,522	(14,917)	(297,084)	(31,810)	9,851
	**	(15,365)	800	(722)	(14,380)	(1,540)	477

* Philippine Peso
** US Dollars
Current Exchange Rate: US$ = P20.66

Appendix Table A.3c National Housing Authority Income Statement, For the Year Ended December 31, 198

CONDOMINIUMS

		TOTAL	BLC PAG-ASA	BLC TAGUIG	TBC MIA	TBC BALINTAWAK	BBHP
INCOME							
Service Income		273,835	204,445	43,625	11,171	14,594	
Profit Real. from Coll. of ICR		403,353	280,985	122,368			
Interest Earned		0					
On ICR		6,977,280	4,330,873	774,861	476,883	1,394,663	
On SBL		2,540	2,540				
On Misc. Interest Income		593,144	393,330	76,340	33,878	89,596	
Rental Income		2,990,277	212,492	1,760,994	913,483	103,308	
Misc. Income		977,580	401,433	344,383	95,679	136,085	
Total	*	12,218,009	5,826,098	3,122,570	1,531,093	1,738,245	
	**	591,385	281,999	151,141	74,109	84,136	0
EXPENSES							
Personal Services		526,139	245,462	68,639	84,932	127,106	
Depreciation		2,358,314	286,357	759,994	634,924	677,039	
Communication		2,086		2,086			
Insurance		347,839	132,311	69,312	104,176	42,040	
Power Consumption		548,443	35,377	491,323	21,743		
Prov. for Doubtful Accounts		1,853,954	735,977	163,865	550,083	399,810	4,219
Repair and Maintenance		87,449	57,089		30,360		
Supplies and Materials		860		860			
SS Benefit Reward & other claims		45,162	19,192	9,234	6,986	9,750	
Total	*	5,770,246	1,511,765	1,565,313	1,433,204	1,255,745	4,219
	**	279,296	73,174	75,765	69,371	60,781	204
EXCESS (Deficit) of Income over Expense	*	6,447,763	4,314,333	1,557,257	97,889	482,500	(4,219)
	**	312,089	208,825	75,375	4,738	23,354	(204)

* Philippine Peso
** US Dollars
Current Exchange Rate: US$ = P20.66

Appendix Table A.3d National Housing Authority Income Statement, For the Period January-June 1989

CONDOMINIUMS

		TOTAL	BLC PAG-ASA	BLC TAGUIG	TBC MIA	TBC BALINTAWAK
INCOME						
Service Income		214,555	178,061	27,224	160	9,110
Profit Real. from Coll. of ICR		30,663	3,065	27,598		
Interest Earned		0				
On ICR		5,473,433	3,320,782	778,663	59,897	1,314,091
On SBL		833	833			
On Misc. Interest Income		335,932	207,920	58,532	14,703	54,777
Rental Income		1,766,684	139,718	1,321,023	210,226	95,717
Misc. Income		298,518	109,771	130,704	26,405	31,638
Total	*	8,120,618	3,960,150	2,343,744	311,391	1,505,333
	**	393,060	191,682	113,444	15,072	72,862
EXPENSES						
Personal Services		276,453	114,122	60,874	40,583	60,874
Depreciation		1,179,156	143,178	379,997	317,462	338,519
Insurance		191,051	81,578	38,018	51,961	19,494
Power Consumption		207,013	16,571	124,238	66,204	
Prov. for Doubtful Accounts		438,862		312,418	4,505	121,939
Supplies and Materials		3,000			3,000	
Total	*	2,295,535	355,449	915,545	483,715	540,826
	**	111,110	17,205	44,315	23,413	26,177
EXCESS (Deficit) of Income over Expense	*	5,825,083	3,604,701	1,428,199	(172,324)	946,507
	**	281,950	174,477	69,129	(8,341)	46,685

* Philippine Peso
** US Dollars
Current Exchange Rate: US$ = P20.66

Appendix Table A.4 Average Monthly Rental Rates by Income Decile and City, Metro Manila, 2000 (in pesos)

Income Decile	First Decile	Second Decile	Third Decile	Fourth Decile	Fifth Decile	Sixth Decile	Seventh Decile	Eighth Decile	Ninth Decile	Tenth Decile	Average
Manila	1,212	1,170	1,509	1,982	2,429	2,661	3,167	4,080	4,679	6,154	2,717
Quezon City	934	1,326	1,254	2,577	2,319	2,288	3,671	3,743	6,281	7,119	3,037
Mandaluyong City	752	1,500	902	1,640	1,412	-	3,676	3,389	5,939	20,000	3,868
San Juan	940	1,803	1,267	1,235	1,226	2,047	1,918	2,642	3,625	15,264	3,863
Marikina	1,503	1,000	1,790	5,600	2,033	2,691	4,000	2,839	6,500	4,250	2,738
Pasig City	1,150	1,483	1,877	2,109	2,295	2,774	3,117	2,942	3,756	44,407	3,876
Caloocan City	714	1,392	931	2,027	1,463	1,351	1,858	3,000	2,276	-	1,352
Malabon	730	1,027	1,473	1,904	2,184	1,950	2,989	2,814	2,300	-	1,536
Navotas	727	1,004	1,019	1,231	1,150	1,525	1,748	-	-	-	1,106
Valenzuela	844	1,125	1,350	1,347	1,980	2,111	1,496	1,904	2,130	7,820	1,645
Makati City	1,106	1,473	1,870	1,262	1,309	2,775	2,841	3,984	5,714	8,372	3,477
Las Piñas	1,224	1,375	1,100	1,605	1,944	3,087	2,282	3,463	5,791	5,750	2,659
Muntinlupa City	536	1,455	1,591	2,175	-	2,389	2,016	3,000	4,684	3,637	2,019
Parañaque	798	793	2,804	1,900	2,215	2,956	750	5,464	5,522	4,118	2,677
Pasay City	1,147	1,511	1,644	1,879	2,114	2,482	2,816	4,354	3,807	4,096	2,330
Taguig/Pateros	948	1,165	1,528	1,898	1,613	1,303	1,944	2,902	2,284	2,300	1,649

Source of basic data: FIES 2000