The Republic of the Philippines Bangsamoro Transition Commission (BTC) Bangsamoro Development Agency (BDA)

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Comprehensive Capacity Development Project for the Bangsamoro

Development Plan for the Bangsamoro

Final Report

Sector Report 2: Infrastructure



April 2016

RECS International Inc. Oriental Consultants Global Co., Ltd. CTI Engineering International Co., Ltd. IC Net Limited



The Republic of the Philippines Bangsamoro Transition Commission (BTC) Bangsamoro Development Agency (BDA)

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Comprehensive Capacity Development Project for the Bangsamoro Development Plan for the Bangsamoro Final Report Sector Report 2: Infrastructure

Source of GIS map on the cover: JICA Study Team (base map by U.S. National Park Service).

April 2016

RECS International Inc. Oriental Consultants Global Co., Ltd. CTI Engineering International Co., Ltd. IC Net Limited

Currency Equivalents (average Interbank rates for May–July 2015) US\$1.00=PHP 45.583 US\$1.00=JPY 124.020 PHP 1=JPY 2.710 Source: OANDA.COM, http://www.oanda.com

Comprehensive Capacity Development Project for the Bangsamoro

Development Plan for the Bangsamoro

Final Report

Sector Report 2-1: Road Transport

Table of Contents

| Chapter 1 Road Administration | 1-1 |
|--|--------------|
| 1.1 Road Administration System | 1-1 |
| 1.2 Functional Road Classifications | 1-1 |
| Chapter 2 Agencies Involved In Road Development in Bangsamoro | 1-3 |
| 2.1 Function and Organization Structure of DPWH-ARMM | |
| 2.2 Budgetary Framework | 1-3 |
| 2.3 Priority Investment Programs/Projects (2014–2015) | 1-4 |
| 2.4 Road Development Programs | 1-6 |
| 2.4.1 Rapid Infrastructure Development Assistance (RIDA) for ARMM | 1-6 |
| 2.4.2 Expanded ARMM Roads Mapping and Management System (E-ARMM System) | 1-7 |
| 2.4.3 Creation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Division | 1-7 |
| Chapter 3 Road Network in Bangsamoro | 1_8 |
| 3.1 Road Length and Road Density | 1-8 |
| 3.2 Pavement Rates | 1-11 |
| 3.3 Road Condition | 1-13 |
| 3.4 Traffic Volume | 1-19 |
| 3.5 Freight Transport in Bangsamoro | . 1-20 |
| 3.5.1 Polloc Port and other alternative Ports for Bangsamoro | . 1-20 |
| 3.5.2 Road conditions leading to alternative ports | . 1-22 |
| 3.5.3 Exit port and freight movement of agroindustry products in Bangsamoro | . 1-23 |
| 3.5.4 Infrastructure and Logistics challenges in Mindanao | . 1-26 |
| 3.6 Summary of Road Issues and Logistics Issues | . 1-26 |
| Chapter A Review of Relevant Policies Plans and Projects for Road Sector | 1_28 |
| 4.1 BDA's Bangsamoro Development Plan: Phase 1 | 1-28 |
| 4.1 DDA's Bangsaniolo Development Plan: Medium Term Undate (2013–2016) | 1_20 |
| 4.3 Asian Highway (Mindanao section) | 1-32 |
| 4.4 Mindanao's Railway Plan | 1-33 |
| | 1.25 |
| Chapter 5 Development Strategies for Road Sector | 1-35 |
| 5.1 Development Objectives | 1 26 |
| 5.2 Development Strategies | 1 26 |
| 5.2.1 Establishment of a road network for agroindustry and tourism development | 1 36 |
| 5.2.2 Establishment of a road network for balance development of all areas | 1 38 |
| 5.2.5 Establishment of logistics corridors | 1-38 |
| | . 1 50 |
| Chapter 6 Development Plan for Road Sector | . 1-42 |
| 6.1 Procedure for Formulation of Road Sector Development Plan | . 1-42 |
| 6.2 Proposed Future Road Network | . 1-42 |
| 6.2.1 Procedure to develop future road network | . 1-42 |
| 6.2.2 Primary inter-city road network in Mindanao | 1 43 |
| 6.2.4 Proposed read notwork for Pongaemore | 1 44 1 44 |
| 6.3 Project Identification | 1-44 |
| 6.3.1 Project identification criteria | 1-51 |
| 6.3.2 Identified projects | 1-51 |
| 633 Approach to FMRs | 1-55 |
| 6.4 Standard Design | 1-57 |
| 6.4.1 Design standard | . 1-57 |
| 6.4.2 Proposed typical cross sections | . 1-57 |
| 6.5 Project Cost Estimate | . 1-57 |
| 6.5.1 DWPH funded projects 2015 | . 1-57 |
| 6.5.2 Construction cost estimate | . 1-57 |

| 6.5.3 | Engineering cost | 1-58 |
|-------|---|------|
| 6.5.4 | Cost of ROW acquisition and resettlement of affected families | 1-58 |
| 6.5.5 | Estimated cost of identified projects | 1-63 |
| 6.5.6 | Project cost summary | 1-68 |

List of Tables

| Table 1.1 Administrative Road Classifications | 1-1 |
|--|------|
| Table 2.1 Past and Present Budget of DPWH-ARMM, 2012-2015 | 1-4 |
| Table 2.2 Summary of DPWH-ARMM Priority Investment Programs/Projects, 2014 | 1-5 |
| Table 2.3 Details of DPWH-ARMM Road Projects, 2015 | 1-6 |
| Table 3.1 National Road Length and Road Density by Region | 1-8 |
| Table 3.2 Pavement Rates of National Roads by Region, 2013 | 1-11 |
| Table 3.3 Pavement Surface of ARMM's Roads | 1-11 |
| Table 3.4 Pavement Types of ARMM's National Roads by Province | 1-12 |
| Table 3.5 Pavement Types of ARMM's Provincial Roads by Province | 1-13 |
| Table 3.6 Road Condition of Paved National Roads | 1-14 |
| Table 3.7 Road Condition of Paved Provincial Roads | 1-14 |
| Table 3.8 Missing Link Roads and Their Lengths | 1-14 |
| Table 3.9 Traffic Volume in Bangsamoro and Surrounding Areas | 1-19 |
| Table 3.10 Distances of Alternative Ports from Cotabato City | 1-22 |
| Table 3.11 Summary of Road Conditions Leading to Alternative Ports | 1-22 |
| Table 4.1 BDP Infrastructure Strategies and Project Types | 1-28 |
| Table 4.2 Project Implementation Arrangement | 1-28 |
| Table 4.3 Proposed Projects for Transitional Plan Period | 1-29 |
| Table 4.4 Characteristics of AH26's Sections in Mindanao | 1-32 |
| Table 4.5 Classification of Asian Highway | 1-32 |
| Table 5.1 Key Components of the Three Logistics Corridors | 1-39 |
| Table 6.1 Profiles of Tier I Cities | 1-43 |
| Table 6.2 General Measures to Road Sector Issues | 1-51 |
| Table 6.3 Summary of Identified Projects and Type of Improvement Works | 1-55 |
| Table 6.4 Estimated Length and Construction Cost of FMRs to Be Improved per Province | 1-55 |
| Table 6.5 Minimum Design Standard of Philippine Highways | 1-58 |
| Table 6.6 Road Construction Cost | 1-63 |
| Table 6.7 Cost Summary of Identified Projects | 1-64 |
| Table 6.8 Cost Estimate for Bangsamoro Regional Artery Road Upgrading Projects | 1-64 |
| Table 6.9 Cost Estimate for Missing Links Development Projects | 1-65 |
| Table 6.10 Cost Estimate for Bangsamoro Corridor Development Projects | 1-65 |
| Table 6.11 Cost Estimate for Corridor Link Roads Improvement Projects (1/4): Lanao | 1-65 |
| Table 6.12 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (2/4): Maguindanao | 1-66 |
| Table 6.13 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (3/4): Basilan | 1-66 |
| Table 6.14 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (4/4): Sulu and Tawi-Tawi | 1-67 |
| Table 6.15 Cost Estimate for Ring Road/Bypass Development Projects | 1-68 |
| Table 6.16 Cost Estimate for Road Projects outside Bangsamoro | 1-68 |
| Table 6.17 Road Projects Cost Summary | 1-68 |

List of Figures

| Figure 1.1 Functional Road Classifications | . 1-1 |
|---|-------|
| Figure 1.2 Functional Road Classification Map of Mindanao by DPWH | . 1-2 |
| Figure 2.1. DPWH-ARMM Organizational Structure | . 1-4 |
| Figure 2.2 Distribution of 2015 Budget by Infrastructure | . 1-5 |
| Figure 2.3 Distribution of 2015 Budget by Province | . 1-5 |
| Figure 2.4 Major Road Infrastructure Projects of DPWH-ARMM for 2015 | . 1-6 |
| Figure 3.1 Present Road Network of Bangsamoro: Mainland Provinces | . 1-9 |
| Figure 3.2 Present Road Network of Bangsamoro: Island Provinces 1 | 1-10 |
| Figure 3.3 ARMM's Road Type, Road Length, and Pavement Type 1 | 1-12 |
| Figure 3.4 Pavement Types of National Roads within ARMM | 1-13 |
| Figure 3.5 Pavement Types of Provincial Roads within ARMM 1 | 1-13 |
| Figure 3.6 Surface Condition of National Road of Bangsamoro (1/2): Mainland Provinces 1 | 1-15 |
| Figure 3.6 Surface Condition of National Road of Bangsamoro (2/2): Island Provinces 1 | 1-16 |
| Figure 3.7 Surface Condition of Provincial Road of Bangsamoro (1/2): Mainland Provinces | 1-17 |
| Figure 3.7 Surface Condition of Provincial Road of Bangsamoro (2/2): Island Provinces 1 | 1-18 |
| Figure 3.8 Missing Links in Bangsamoro Network and Surrounding Regions1 | 1-19 |
| Figure 3.9 Traffic Volume in Bangsamoro and Surrounding Regions 1 | 1-21 |
| Figure 3.10 Locations of Alternative Ports for Bangsamoro | 1-22 |
| Figure 3.11 Number of Lanes of Mindanao's Arterial Roads | 1-24 |
| Figure 3.12 Road Conditions of Mindanao's Arterial Roads | 1-24 |
| Figure 3.13 Exit Ports and Transport Routes of Agroindustry Products in Bangsamoro | 1-25 |
| Figure 4.1 Locations of Proposed Transitional Period Projects (1/2): Mainland Provinces 1 | 1-30 |
| Figure 4.1 Locations of Proposed Transitional Period Projects (2/2): Island Provinces 1 | 1-31 |
| Figure 4.2 Proposed Road Projects in ARMM's RDP (2013–2016) | 1-31 |
| Figure 4.3 Asian Highway's Section in Mindanao | 1-33 |
| Figure 4.4 Mindanao Railway Plan | 1-34 |
| Figure 5.1 Development Issues, Objectives and Strategies for Road Sector | 1-35 |
| Figure 5.2 Poverty Incidence (2012) and Present Road Network | 1-36 |
| Figure 5.3 Locations of Existing Agroindustry, Possible Expansion, and Road Network Condition 1 | 1-37 |
| Figure 5.4 Inter-city Road Network of Mindanao as Logistics Corridor 1 | 1-39 |
| Figure 5.5 Possible Logistics Corridor for Bangsamoro | 1-40 |
| Figure 6.1 Procedures for Formulation of Road Sector Development Plan | 1-42 |
| Figure 6.2 Procedure to Develop Future Road Network of Bangsamoro 1 | 1-43 |
| Figure 6.3 Primary Inter-city Road Network of Mindanao and Distribution of Towns 1 | 1-44 |
| Figure 6.4 Basic Concept of Regional Primary Roads and Secondary Roads 1 | 1-45 |
| Figure 6.5 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Mainland Provinces 1 | 1-46 |
| Figure 6.6 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Island Provinces | 1-47 |
| Figure 6.7 Existing Condition of Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Mainland Provinces 1 | 1-48 |
| Figure 6.8 Existing Condition of Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Island Provinces 1 | 1-49 |
| Figure 6.9 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network with Region's Resources 1 | 1-50 |
| Figure 6.10 Project Identification Criteria. | 1-51 |
| Figure 6.11 Locations of Identified Projects: Mainland Provinces 1 | 1-52 |
| Figure 6.12 Locations of Identified Projects: Island Provinces | 1-53 |
| Figure 6.13 Locations of Missing Links outside Bangsamoro Region1 | 1-54 |
| Figure 6.14 Example of FS of Two Provincial Roads Which Includes FMRs 1 | 1-56 |
| Figure 6.15 FMR Rehabilitation in Sultan Mastura of Maguindanao Using Labor-based | |
| Technology | 1-57 |
| Figure 6.16 Proposed Typical Cross Section for New Road Construction | 1-59 |
| Figure 6.17 Proposed Typical Cross Section for Road Surface Upgrading (Gravel/Earth Road to | |
| PCC Paved Road)1 | 1-60 |
| Figure 6 18 Proposed Typical Cross Section for Rehabilitation of Existing PCC Payed Roads | 1-61 |
| | |

Abbreviations

| AAD | annual average daily traffic | BLMI | Bangsamoro Leadership and |
|--------------|---|----------------|--|
| AAGR | average annual growth rate | | Management Institute |
| AAIIBP | Al-Amanah Islamic Investment Bank of the Philippines | BLMO | Bangsamoro Land Management |
| A&D | alienable and disposable | BOD | board of directors |
| AC | advisory circular | BOI | Board of Investment |
| ACC | Area Control Center | BPO | business process outsourcing |
| ACSR | aluminum conductor steel | BS | Bachelor of Science |
| neon | reinforced | BSP | Central Bank of the Philippines |
| ADB | Asian Development Bank | 201 | [Bangko Sentral ng Pilininas] |
| ΔFR | association of farmer beneficiaries | RSWM | Bureau of Soils and Water |
| AFMA | A griculture and Fisheries | DOWIN | Management |
| | Modernization Act | BTA | Bangsamoro Transition Authority |
| A FD | Armed Forces of the Philippines | BTR | boom truck with bucket |
| AHFF | agriculture hunting forestry and | BTC | Bangsamoro Transition Commission |
| 71111 | fishery | BTD | boom truck with digger |
| A ID | Agrarian Justice Delivery | BuB or BUB | bottom_up budgeting |
| | Al Mujahidun Agro Resources and | | College of A grigulture |
| AMARDI | Development Inc | | compulsory acquisition |
| 10 | Administrative Order | | Conflict Affected Areas of |
| | Administrative Order | CAAM | Mindenae |
| | APP organization | CAAD | Civil Aviation Authority of the |
| ARDO | ARD organization | CAAF | Dhilinning |
| ARC | ABC Development Community | CAD | Philippines |
| ARCDSP | ARC Development Support Project | CAB | Comprehensive Agreement on |
| ARCCESS | ARC Connectivity and Economic | C + DT | Bangsamoro |
| | Support Services | CADT | certificate(s) of ancestral domain |
| ARG or ARMM- | ARMM Regional Government | C L C D | title |
| RG | | CAGR | compound annual growth rate |
| ARMM | Autonomous Region in Muslim | CALABARZON | Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal, |
| | Mindanao | O LIT | and Quezon |
| ARMM HELPS | ARMM Health, Education, | CALI | certificate(s) of ancestral land title |
| | Livelihood, Peace and Governance | CARD | Center for Agricultural and Rural |
| | and Synergy (Program) | G + D7 | Development |
| ARMMIARC | ARMM Integrated Agricultural | CARL | Comprehensive Agrarian Reform |
| | Research Center | | Law |
| ASEAN | Association of South East Asian | CARP | Comprehensive Agrarian Reform |
| | Nations | GARDER | Program |
| ASPBI | Annual Survey of Philippine | CARPER | CARP-Extension with Reforms |
| | Business and Industry | CASELCO | Cagayan De Sulu Electric |
| Al | Agricultural technician | ~~ ~~ | Cooperative |
| ATT | Agricultural Training Institute | CBCRM | community-based costal resource |
| AIM | air traffic movement | | management |
| ATM | automated teller machines | CBFM | Community-Based Forest |
| AWG | American wire gauge | | Management (Program) |
| BASELCO | Basilan Electric Cooperative | CBFMA | community-based forest |
| BASULTA or | Basilan, Sulu, and Tawi-Tawi | | management agreement |
| BaSulTa | | CBO | Cotabato (Awang) Airport |
| BBAC | Bangsamoro Business Advisory | CCA | climate change adaptation |
| | Council | СССН | Coordinating Committee for |
| BBL | Bangsamoro Basic Law | | Cessation of Hostilities |
| BCT | Bangsamoro Core Territory | CCDP or CCDP-B | Comprehensive Capacity |
| BDA | Bangsamoro Development Agency | | Development Project for the |
| BDH | berthing/deberthing hours | | Bangsamoro |
| BDP | Bangsamoro Development Plan | CCT | conditional cash transfer |
| BFAR | Bureau of Fisheries Aquatic | CDA | Cooperative Development Authority |
| | Resources | CD-CAAM | Community Development in CAAM |
| BHC | Barangay Health Center | CDOCCI | Cagayan de Oro Chamber of |
| BIAF | Bangsamoro Islamic Armed Force | | Commerce and Industry |
| BIFF | Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom | CDP | Comprehensive Development |
| | Fighters | | Program |
| BIMP-EAGA | Brunei-Indonesia-Malaysia- | CDP-ELA | Comprehensive Development Plan- |
| | Philippines East ASEAN Growth | | Executive Legislative Agenda |
| | Area | CDRRMC | City Disaster Risk Reduction and |
| BIW | Bangsamoro Investment Window | | Management Council |
| BLGU | Barangay Local Government Unit | CDS | cooperative development staff |
| | | | — |

| CEB | Cebu Pacific Air | ECP | environmentally critical project |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|----------------|--|
| CEC | cation-exchange capacity | EEZ | exclusive economic zone |
| CEPALCO | Cagayan Electric Power and Light | EIA | environmental impact assessment |
| | Company | EIAM | Environmental Impact Assessment |
| CIF | cost, insurance, and freight | | and Management (Division) |
| CIS | communal irrigation system | EIRR | economic internal rate of return |
| CLOA | certificate(s) of landownership | EIS | environmental impact statement |
| 02011 | award | EMB | Environmental Management Bureau |
| CLPC | Cotabato Light and Power Company | EO | Executive Order |
| CLT | certificate(s) of land transfer | EPIRA | Electric Power Industry |
| CLUP | comprehensive land use plan | | Restructuring Act |
| CMO | central management office | FRC | Energy Regulatory Commission |
| COSLICECO | Cotabato Sugar Central Corporation | ERC FSWM(P) | Ecological Solid Waste |
| CP | core project | | Management (Plan) |
| CPO | Cotabato Project Office | FU | Furopean Union |
| CSO | civil society organization | EWS | early warning system |
| CSP | civil society organization | | Eaderal Aviation Administration |
| CSK DA | Department of A griculture | ΓΑΑ | Frequencial Aviation Administration |
| | Department of Agriculture | ГАД | Pranework Agreement on |
| DA-BAK | of A priority of Agriculture's Bureau | EAD | Bangsamoro |
| DA DEO | of Agricultural Research | FAD | Tish aggregating devices |
| DA-RFO | DA-Regional Field Office | FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| DAF | Department of Agriculture and | FDI | foreign direct investment |
| | Fisheries | FFWS | flood forecasting and warning |
| DAO | Department Administrative Order | | system |
| DAR | Department of Agricultural Reform | FGD | focus group discussion |
| DBM | Department of Budget and | FIA | federation of irrigators' associations |
| | Management | FIDA | Fiber Industry Development |
| DBP | Development Bank of the | | Authority |
| | Philippines | FIES | Family Income and Expenditure |
| DCCCII | Davao City Chamber of Commerce | | Survey |
| | and Industry, Inc. | FIT | farmers information technology |
| DD | detailed design | FIT | feed-in-tariff |
| DDP | Distribution Development Plan | FMB | Forest Management Bureau |
| DED | detailed engineering design | FMR | farm-to-market road |
| DENR | Department of Environment and | FNRI | Food and Nutrition Research |
| | Natural Resources | | Institute |
| DILG | Department of Interior and Local | FS | feasibility study |
| - | Government | FTZ | free trade zone |
| DLPC | Davao Light and Power Company | GAA | General Appropriations Act |
| DME | Distance measuring equipment | GDE | grading and balling establishment |
| DOF | Department of Finance | GDP | gross domestic product |
| DOI | Department of Justice | GEM | Growth with Equity Mindanao |
| DOLE | Department of Labor and | 0EM | (Program) |
| DOLL | Employment | GIS | geographical information system |
| DOST | Department of Science and | GIZ | German Society for International |
| 0031 | Technology | UIZ | Cooperation [Doutsche Cosellschaft |
| DOT | Department of Tourism | | für Internationale Zusammanarhait |
| DOTC | Department of Transportation and | CM | ful internationale Zusammenarbeit |
| DOIC | | CMD | |
| DDWII | Communications | CDDD | good manufacturing practice |
| DPWH | Department of Public works and | GPBP | Grassroots Participatory Budgeting |
| DDD (G | Highways | CDU | Program |
| DRIMS | Dynamic Response Intelligent | GPH | Government of the Philippines |
| 55514 | Monitoring System | GPPB | grassroots participatory planning |
| DRRM | disaster risk reduction and | ~~~~ | and budgeting |
| | management | GRDP | gross regional domestic product |
| DRRMCEP | DRRM Capacity Enhancement | GRP | gross regional product |
| | Project | GSR | Green Super Rice |
| DSWD | Department of Social Works and | HACCP | hazard analysis and critical control |
| | Development | | points |
| DTI | Department of Trade and Industry | HDI | human development index |
| DTI-EMB | DTI Export Marketing Bureau | HEART | Humanitarian Emergency Action |
| DUs | distribution utilities | | Response Team |
| DVOR | Doppler VHF omnidirectional range | HF | high frequency |
| EA | environmental assessment | HI | horizontal inequality |
| EC | electric cooperative | HIPC | halal industry promotion center |
| ECA | environmentally critical area | HVC | high-value crops |
| ECC | environmental clearance certificate | | - • |

| HVCDP | High Value Crops Development Program | LMB LMIP | Land Management Bureau |
|----------|---|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| IA | irrigators' association | | Project |
| | inter-agency committee | LOA | length overall |
| | International Air Transport | | Land Pagistration Authority |
| IAIA | Association | | Land Tenure Improvement |
| ICAO | International Civil Aviation | LII Magalaa ar | Maguindanaa Elastria Cooperativa |
| ICAU | Organization | Magerco or | Magundanao Elecure Cooperative |
| ICT | | MAGELCO | Maniainal Aminulture Office |
| ICI | information and communication | MAU | Municipal Agriculture Office |
| ICTU | Lechnology | MASL | meter(s) above sea level |
| ICISI | International Container Terminal | MC | moisture content |
| IDB | Services, Inc. | MDGS | Millennium Development Goals |
| IDP | internally displaced people | MEDP | Missionary Electrification |
| IEC | information and education campaign | MED | Development Plan |
| IEE | initial environmental examination | MEP | Mindanao Energy Plan |
| | (or evaluation) | MF | microfinance |
| IFAD | International Fund for Agricultural | MFI | microfinance institution |
| | Development | MGB | Mining and Geo-science Bureau |
| IFMA | Integrated Forest Management | MHPP | mini-hydro power plant |
| | Agreement (Program) | MICC | Matling Industrial and Commercial |
| IFSAR | interferometric synthetic aperture | | Corporation |
| | radar | MILF | Moro Islamic Liberation Front |
| ILO | International Labour Organization | MIS | Management Information Service |
| ILPC | Iligan Light and Power Company | MIMAROPA | Mindoro, Marinduque, Romblon, |
| IMEM | Interim Mindanao Electric Market | | and Palawan |
| IMT | international monitoring team | MINDA or MinDA | Mindanao Development Authority |
| IP | indigenous people | MLGU | municipal local government unit |
| IPA | Investment Promotion Agency | MMAA | Muslim Mindanao Autonomy Act |
| IPC | Investment Promotion Center | MMDA | Metropolitan Manila Development |
| IPP | independent power producer | | Authority |
| IPRA | Indigenous People Rights Act | MMHCBI | Mindanao Muslim Halal |
| IRA | internal revenue allotment | | Certification Board Inc. |
| IRI | International Roughness Index | MNLF | Moro National Liberation Front |
| IRSG | International Rubber Supply Group | MOA | memorandum of agreement |
| IT | information technology | MOOE | maintenance and other operating |
| IWRM | integrated water resources | | expenses |
| | management | MPA | marine protected area |
| J-BIRD | Japan-Bangsamoro Initiatives for | MPC | multi-purpose cooperative |
| | Reconstruction and Development | MPDC | Municipal Planning and |
| JAKIM | Department of Islamic Development | | Development Coordinator |
| | Malavsia | MRB | Mindanao River Basin |
| JETRO | Japan External Trade Organization | MRBIMDMP | MRB Integrated Management and |
| JICA | Japan International Cooperation | | Development Master Plan |
| | Agency | MRCC | Mindanao Regional Control Center |
| INC | Joint Normalization Committee | MRDP | Mindanao Rural Development |
| JOL | Jolo Airport | | Program |
| JST | JICA Study Team | MRF | material recovery facility |
| JV | ioint venture | MSME | micro small and medium |
| KBA | key biodiversity area | | enterprises |
| KOICA | Korea International Cooperation | MSU | Mindanao State University |
| noren | Agency | MSU-IIT | MSU-Iligan Institute of Technology |
| L | length | MSU-LNCAT | MSU-Lanao National College of |
| LAD | land acquisition and distribution | mbe Ertern | Arts and Trade |
| LAMP | Land Administration and | MSU-TCTO | MSU-Tawi-Tawi College of |
| | Management Project | mbe rere | Technology and Oceanography |
| LAMPCO | Linabu Agrarian Multi-Purpose | NADA | Needs Assessment Design Analysis |
| | Cooperative | ΝΔΙΔ | Manila Ninov Aquino International |
| LASURECO | Lanao Del Sur Electric Cooperative | 1 17 117 1 | Airport |
| IRP | Land Bank of the Philippines | NAMRIA | National Manning and Resource |
| | local conservation area | | Information Agency |
| LCI | less than full container load or less | NAPC | National Anti-Poverty Commission |
| | container load | NASA | National Aeronautics and Space |
| LDRRMC | Local DRRM Council | 1 12 10/1 1 | Administration |
| LDRRME | Local DRRM Fund | NCIP | National Commission on Indigenous |
| IGU | local government unit | 11011 | Peoples |
| LGUOUs | I GU-owned utilities | NCMF | National Commission on Muslim |
| LIDAR | light detection and ranging | 1101011 | Filininos |
| LIDAK | ingin ucicciton and ranging | | i inpinos |

| NCR NDCC | National Capital Region National Disaster Coordinating | PAPI PB | precision approach path indicator Power Barge |
|-------------|---|----------------|--|
| NDRRMC | National Disaster Risk Reduction | PCA PCAARRD | Philippine Coconut Authority Philippine Council for Agriculture, Aquatic and Natural Resources |
| NEA | National Electrification | PCB | Research and Development |
| NECD | non anyironmentally critical project | PCC | Philippine Carabao Center |
| NECI | National Economic Development | PCC | Portland cement concrete |
| NFA | Authority National Food Authority | PCCI | Philippine Chamber of Commerce and Industry |
| NGA | National Grains Authority | РСПР | Provincial Comprehensive |
| NGCP | National Grid Corporation of the | | Development Plan Philipping Crop Insurance |
| NGO | non governmental organization | reie | Corporation |
| NGU | Notional Creaning Program | DCN | corporation |
| NUP | National Greening Program | PUN | Presidential Desires |
| NIA | National Irrigation Administration | PD | Presidential Decree |
| NICCEP | National Industrial Cluster Capacity | PDP | Philippine Development Plan |
| NUDAC | Enhancement Project | PDPFP | Provincial Development and |
| NIPAS | National Integrated Protected Areas | | Physical Framework Plan |
| | System | PEIS | Philippine Environmental Impact |
| NIS | national irrigation system | | Statement |
| NLUC | National Land Use Commission | PENRO | Provincial Environment and Natural |
| NOAH | Nationwide Operational Assessment | | Resources Office |
| | of Hazards | PERF | Production Economic Research |
| NPC | National Power Corporation | | Fund |
| NPC-SPUG | NPC-Small Power Utility Group | PEZA | Philippine Economic Zone |
| NREL | National Renewable Energy | | Authority |
| | Laboratory | PFDA | Philippine Fisheries Development |
| NREP | National Renewable Energy | | Authority |
| | Program | PhilFIDA | Philippine Fiber Development |
| NSO | National Statistics Office | | Authority |
| NWFP | non-wood forest product | PHIVOLCS | Philippine Institute of Volcanology |
| NWRC | National Water Resources Council | THIVOLED | and Seismology |
| OBOR | ontimum berth occupancy rate | PICRI | Philippine Industrial Crops |
| OCD | Office of Civil Defense | Tieldi | Research Institute |
| OCT | original certificate(s) of title | PIOUs | nrivate investor-owned utilities |
| ODA | official development assistance | PMO | project management office |
| OECD | Organization for Economia | PO | project management office |
| UECD | Construction and Development | | Presidential Proclemation |
| OFID | OPEC Fund for International | | Presidential Proclamation |
| OFID | OPEC Fund for International | PPA | Philippine Ports Authority |
| 010 | Development | PPP | public private partnership |
| OIC | Organization of Islamic Cooperation | PRA | Philippine Retirement Agency |
| OPAg | Office of the Provincial | PRDP | Philippine Rural Development |
| 0.04.00 | Agriculturist | DD.T.C. | Program |
| OPAPP | Office of the Presidential Advisor | PRIC | Philippine Rubber Testing Center |
| 0.000 | on the Peace Process | PSA | Philippine Statistics Authority |
| OPEC | Organization of Petroleum | PSALM | Power Sector Assets and Liabilities |
| | Exporting Countries | PSC | project steering committee |
| OPV | Office of the Provincial Veterinarian | PSE | Philippine Stock Exchange |
| OPV | open-pollinated variety | PTA | Parent-Teacher Association |
| ORG | Office of the Regional Governor | PTB | passenger terminal building |
| OSCC | Office for Southern Cultural | PTF-MRBRD | Presidential Task Force on MRB |
| | Communities | | Rehabilitation and Development |
| OTOP | one town one product | RA | Republic Act |
| PA | protected area | RBCO | River Basin Control Office (of |
| PAG | private armed group | | DENR) |
| PAGASA | Philippine Atmospheric, | R&D | research and development |
| | Geophysical and Astronomical | RAED | Regional Agricultural Engineering |
| | Services Administration | | Division |
| PAL | Philippine Airlines | RBOI | Regional Board of Investment |
| PAMANA | Philippine Development Program | RC | reinforced concrete |
| | and Framework for Peace and | RCC | regional control center |
| | Development [Pavapa at | RCM | rice crop manager |
| | Masaganang Pamayanan] | RDC | regional development council |
| PAMB | Protected Area Management Roard | RDE | research development and |
| PAO | Provincial Agriculture Office | | extension |
| 1110 | i iovinciai Agriculture Office | | CAULISION |

| RDRRMO | Regional DRRM Office | USAID | United States Agency for |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| REDPB | Regional Economic and | | International Development |
| | Development Planning Board | USDA | United States Department of |
| RE | renewable energy | | Agriculture |
| REZA | Regional Economic Zone Authority | USM | University of Southern Mindanao |
| RGDP | regional gross domestic product | USMARC | USM Agricultural Research Center |
| RHU | Rural Health Unit | VAT | value added tax |
| RIS | River Irrigation System | VCA | value chain analysis |
| RNS | National Route Numbering System | VHF | very high frequency |
| RPMA | Regional Ports Management | VLT | voluntary land transfer |
| | Authority | VOS | voluntary offer to sell |
| ROPAX or RoPax | roll-on/roll-off passenger | VPA | vehicle parking area |
| RORO or RoRo | roll-on/roll-off | VSU | Visayas State University |
| ROW | right-of-way | VTT | Value transformation training |
| RPDO | Regional Planning and | WASH | Water, Sanitation and Hygiene |
| | Development Office | | (programs by UNICEF) |
| RWY | runway | WB | World Bank |
| SB | Small Business | WDIL | wind direction indicator light |
| SEA | strategic environmental assessment | ZAM | Zamboanga International Airport |
| SERD-CAAM | Socio-economic Restoration and | ZAMBASULTA | Zamboanga, Basılan, Sulu, and |
| | Development of Conflict-affected | | Tawi-Tawi |
| CED CDD | Areas in Mindanao | | |
| SEP-CDP | Socio-Economic Profile- | | |
| | Comprehensive Development | | |
| 0.57 | Program | | |
| SEZ | special economic zone | | |
| SGCP | State of the Grid in China | | |
| SIASELCO | Sial Electric Cooperative | | |
| SME | small and medium-sized enterprise | | |
| SMS | short message system | | |
| SOUSKSAKGEN | South Colabato-Sultan Kudarat- | | |
| SDUC | Saranggani-General Santos City | | |
| SPUG | Sugar Degulatory Administration | | |
| SKA S/S or SS | substation | | |
| 5/5 01 55 SSIDa | substation | | |
| SUC | State Universities and Colleges | | |
| SULECO | Sulu Electric Cooperative | | |
| SV | supervision | | |
| SWIMP | small water impoundments with | | |
| | multipurpose potential (or small | | |
| | water impounding project) | | |
| SWISA | small water irrigation system | | |
| 5 11 151 1 | association | | |
| TAWELCO | Tawi-Tawi Electric Cooperative | | |
| TCP | Technical Cooperation Project | | |
| TCT | transfer of certificate of title | | |
| TDP | transmission development plan | | |
| TESDA | Technical Education and Skills | | |
| | Development Authority | | |
| TIKA | Turkish Cooperation and | | |
| | Coordination Agency | | |
| TISP | Transition Investment Support Plan | | |
| T/L | transmission line | | |
| TMS | Technical Management Services | | |
| ТР | turboprop | | |
| TransCo | National Transmission Corporation | | |
| UAS | Upi Agricultural School | | |
| UN | United Nations | | |
| UNCTAD | United Nations Conference on | | |
| | Trade and Development | | |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment | | |
| LDULOD | Programme | | |
| UNHCR | United Nations High Commissioner | | |
| | tor Refugees | | |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund | | |

Unit of Measurement

| Araa | | Weight | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| $\frac{A1Ca}{m^2}$ | causes motor | weight | miorogram |
| III 1 2 | square meter | μg | |
| km ² | square kilometer | mg | milligram |
| ha | hectare (= $10,000 \text{ m}^2$) | kg | kilogram |
| | | t | ton (=1,000 kg) |
| Energy | | DWT | deadweight tonnage |
| W | watt | GRT | gross register tonnage |
| kW | kilowatt | GT | gross tonnage |
| kWh | kilowatt-hour | kTOE | kilo ton of oil equivalent |
| MW | megawatt | MT | metric ton |
| GWh | gigawatt-hour | | |
| kV | kilovolt | Volume | |
| MVA | megavolt-ampere | L | liter |
| | | m ³ | cubic meter (= 1,000 liter) |
| Length | | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| mm | millimeter | Other | |
| cm | centimeter | °C | degree Celsius |
| ft | foot or feet | % | percent |
| m | meter | mil. | million |
| LM | linear meter | MPa | megapascal |
| km | kilometer | mps | meter per second |
| | | | |
| Time | | | |
| sec, s | second | | |
| min | minute | | |
| hr | hour | | |

year

yr

Currency

| JPY | Japanese yen |
|-------------|----------------------|
| PHP | Philippine peso |
| US\$ or USD | United States dollar |

CHAPTER 1 ROAD ADMINISTRATION

1.1 Road Administration System

Administration of roads in the Philippines is classified into five categories as shown in Table 1.1: *National Road, Provincial Road, City Road, Municipal Road,* and *Barangay Road*. National roads are administered by DPWH-National, but those within Bangsamoro are administered by DPWH-ARMM, based on RA 9054 (Organic Act) and other existing laws (e.g., EO No. 426 dated October 12, 1990).

| Classification | Responsible agency |
|-----------------|--|
| National Road | DPWH-National (except ARMM) DPWH-ARMM (within ARMM) |
| Provincial Road | Provincial government |
| City Road | City government |
| Municipal Road | Municipal government |
| Barangay Road | City/Municipal government |

Table 1.1 Administrative Road Classifications

Source: The Study on Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan for the ARMM, JICA, 2010.

1.2 Functional Road Classifications

The functional road classification of the Country's national road was re-classified by DPWH in November 2014 through Department Order No. 119 (D.O. No. 119). Under this new functional classification, national roads are classified into three: Primary Road, Secondary Road and Tertiary Road (Figure 1.1). Likewise, the National Route Numbering System (RNS) was introduced to simplify and rationalized navigation along the network.

Under this new system, national roads categorized as Primary Road and Secondary Road are assigned with route number. No route number is assigned to National Roads classified as Tertiary as these perform local transport functions. The backbone of the entire network is Route Number 1 which originates in Laoag City, Ilocos Norte and terminates in Zamboanga City in Mindanao. Through combination of road and nautical highway, this route effectively links the three major islands of the Country: (Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao). In Mindanao, this road which passes through the Bangsamoro area connects the major urban centers of Surigao, Davao, General Santos, Cotabato, and Zamboanga (Figure 1.2).



Figure 1.1 Functional Road Classifications



Source: Road Numbering System, DPWH, 2014 (www.dpwh.gov.ph)

Figure 1.2 Functional Road Classification Map of Mindanao by DPWH

CHAPTER 2 AGENCIES INVOLVED IN ROAD DEVELOPMENT IN BANGSAMORO

2.1 Function and Organization Structure of DPWH-ARMM

Currently, DPWH-ARMM is responsible for highways, flood control and water resource development systems, and other public works within the Bangsamoro. The powers and responsibilities of ARMM pertaining to infrastructure programs and projects within the Bangsamoro territory may be gleaned from the provisions of RA 9054 (Organic Act) as well as other existing laws, including Executive Orders (EO) No. 426, dated 12 October 1990, EO 125, dated 16 September 2002, and EO 125-A, dated 29 November 2002, of the President of the Philippines, and the Local Government Code (LGC). These powers and responsibilities are exercised by DPWH-ARMM headed by the Department Secretary under the supervision of the Regional Governor.

Pursuant to EO 426, DPWH-ARMM is responsible for highways, flood control and water resource development systems, and other public works within ARMM and shall perform the following responsibilities:

- (1) Undertake and evaluate the planning, design, construction and works supervision for the infrastructure projects whose location and impact are confined within ARMM.
- (2) Undertake the maintenance of infrastructure facilities within ARMM and supervise the maintenance of such local roads and other infrastructure receiving financial assistance from the national government.
- (3) Ensure the implementation of laws, policies, programs, rules and regulations regarding infrastructure projects as well as all public and private physical structures within ARMM.
- (4) Provide technical assistance related to their functions to other agencies within ARMM, especially LGUs.
- (5) Coordinate with other National and Regional Government departments, agencies, institutions, and organizations, especially LGUs within ARMM in the planning and implementation of infrastructure projects.
- (6) Conduct continuing consultations with the local communities, take appropriate measures to make the infrastructure services of the Regional Government responsive to the needs of the general public and recommend such appropriate actions as may be necessary.
- (7) Perform such other related duties and responsibilities within ARMM as may be assigned or delegated by the Regional Governor or as may be provided by law.

DPWH-ARMM is headed by a Regional Secretary appointed by the ARMM Governor. The organizational set-up is illustrated in Figure 2.1. The Office of the Regional Secretary is composed of the Secretary and Assistant Regional Secretaries. The field offices, particularly the eight District Engineering Offices (DEOs), each headed by a District Engineer, who reports directly to the Secretary. Attached to the DEOs are four Area Equipment Services (AESs), as follows:

- Lanao del Sur Area Equipment Services (shared by Lanao I and Lanao II)
- Maguindanao Area Equipment Services (shared by Maguindanao I and Maguindanao II)
- Sulu Area Equipment Services (shared by Sulu I and Sulu II)
- Tawi-Tawi Area Equipment Services

2.2 Budgetary Framework

In recent years, the budget for infrastructure in the Bangsamoro area has increased substantially. For instance, infrastructure budget in 2012 was about PHP 1.09 billion but this amount increased by 38% in 2013 to the amount of PHP 1.5 billion and by 97% in 2014 to the amount of PHP 2.97 billion. This upward trend in infrastructure budget continued and in 2015, the biggest increase was observed in the amount of PHP 10.08 billion which represent 239% increase compared to the previous year (Table 2.1). Overall, DPWH-ARMM is implementing projects worth of PHP 10.13 billion after inclusion of PHP 51.5 million road projects in support to peace by OPAPP.



Source: Sec. Emil Sadain (September 3, 2014).

Figure 2.1. DPWH-ARMM Organizational Structure

| | | | (Ui | nit: PHP '000) |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------|
| Component | 2012* | 2013* | 2014* | 2015† |
| A. Personal services (PS) | 205,159 | 198,293 | 194,256 | |
| B. Maintenance and other operating expenditures (MOOE) | 176,712 | 275,380 | 317,289 | |
| C. Capital outlays (regular infrastructure) | 1,096,630 | 1,510,181 | 2,971,000 | 10,083,000 |
| Total DPWH-ARMM budget | 1,478,501 | 1,983,854 | 3,482,545 | 10,083,000 |
| PAMANA (Roads to Peace)‡ | | | 2,052,400 | 51,500‡ |
| Total | 1,478,501 | 1,983,854 | 5,534,945 | 10,134,500 |

*Based on the presentation by Sec. Emil Sadain of DPWH-ARMM., September3, 2014; †DPWH-ARMM infrastructure projects (CY 2015), National Expenditure Program; ‡National government program that extends intervention to isolated, hard-to-reach, and conflict-affected communities, ensuring that they are managed by OPAPP and not left behind. Source: National Expenditure Program FY 2015 by DBM.

2.3 Priority Investment Programs/Projects (2014–2015)

The priority projects of DPWH-ARMM in 2014 are shown in Table 2.2. The bulk of the infrastructure budget is allocated to development of local roads which is about 65.4%. Funds dedicated for

development of port, water supply and drainage/canal combined for 26.7%. Aside from regular infrastructure program of DPWH-ARMM, OPAPP is also implementing numerous local road projects in support of the peace process amounting to about PHP 2.0 billion.

| | ARMM infra budget | | | OPAPP projects (Roads to Peace) | | |
|--|-------------------|--------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------|------------|
| Programs/Projects (2014) | Projects | Length | Amount | Projects | Length | Amount |
| riograms/riojects (2014) | (n) | (km) | (PHP mil.) | (n) | (km) | (PHP mil.) |
| National roads (repair, rehab, reblocking) | 18 | 14.923 | 241.299 (8.1%) | - | - | - |
| Local roads | 107 | 179.55 | 1,944.10 (65.4%) | 34 | 205.24 | 2,052.40 |
| Bridges | 13 | - | 124.42 (4.2%) | - | - | - |
| Ports | 17 | - | 288.52 (9.7%) | - | - | - |
| Water supply | 30 | - | 264.07 (8.9%) | - | - | - |
| Drainage/canal improvements | 12 | - | 59.01 (2.0%) | - | - | - |
| Other structures | 9 | - | 49.581 (1.7%) | - | - | - |
| Total | 206 | 226.04 | 2,971.00 (100%) | 34 | 205.24 | 2,052.40 |

Table 2.2 Summary of DPWH-ARMM Priority Investment Programs/Projects, 2014

Source: 2013 DPWH-ARMM Accomplishment Report, Presentation of Sec. Emil Sadain during 11th Expanded Cabinet Meeting, Dec. 21-22, 2013, Waterfront Hotel, Davao City.

For the 2015 budget, of the PHP 10.03 billion fund allocated for infrastructure, PHP 8.10 billion is allocated to road network improvement which represents 80% of the budget as shown in Figure 2.2. Distribution of infrastructure budget, among the five provinces revealed that Basilan Province has the highest share at 31% and followed by Sulu Province with a share of 24%. The share of the rest of provinces is depicted in Figure 2.3.



Figure 2.2 Distribution of 2015 Budget by Infrastructure





The bulk of the budget for road infrastructure (62.7%) is dedicated to road surface upgrading from gravel/earth to concrete pavement of major roads (i.e., national and provincial roads) as presented in Table 2.3. When these projects are completed, a total of 274.76 km of paved road will be added to the network of the region. Improvement work for local roads (i.e., projects in support for recovery of communities affected by man-made and natural calamities, tourism development, etc.) involves surface upgrading from gravel/earth to concrete surface. A total of 230.55 km of local roads is subject to this improvement. Figure 2.4 shows the locations of major road projects by DPWH, and these road projects are summarized in Table 2.3.



Note: Only major road projects shown.

Source: DPWH-ARMM's Infrastructure Projects (CY 2015) data.

| | Major road projects | | | Ι | Local road | Bridges | | |
|---------------|---------------------|--------|------------|-----|------------|------------|-----|------------|
| Province | (n) | (km) | (PHP mil.) | (n) | (km) | (PHP mil.) | (n) | (PHP mil.) |
| Basilan | 10 | 64.58 | 1123.60 | 36 | 76.60 | 966.95 | 4 | 80.00 |
| Sulu | 42 | 84.67 | 1587.93 | 30 | 41.99 | 340.49 | 1 | 30.00 |
| Tawi-Tawi | 17 | 21.95 | 438.99 | 24 | 26.70 | 376.41 | 19 | 127.00 |
| Maguindanao | 29 | 64.88 | 1207.12 | 18 | 41.61 | 445.12 | 2 | 97.20 |
| Lanao del Sur | 31 | 38.69 | 721.16 | 35 | 43.64 | 480.40 | 7 | 84.00 |
| Total | 129 | 274.76 | 5078.80 | 143 | 230.55 | 2609.37 | 33 | 418.20 |

| Table 2.3 Details | of DPWH-ARMM | Road Proje | cts. 2015 |
|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | | 11044 1 10jt | 2010 |

Source: DPWH-ARMM Infrastructure Projects (CY 2015), National Expenditure Program, DPWH-ARMM.

2.4 Road Development Programs

DPWH-ARMM has launched several programs aimed to facilitate rapid improvement of the road network in the Bangsamoro. This includes the following.

2.4.1 Rapid Infrastructure Development Assistance (RIDA) for ARMM

The objectives of Rapid Infrastructure Development Assistance for ARMM are

- Rapid and inclusive growth,
- Zero backlog on ARMM infrastructure, and
- Quality infrastructures and services.

The targets in improving the roads of ARMM are as follows:

- **National road:** the target of DPWH-ARMM is 100% fully paved national roads by 2015. Of the total 992.87 km of national road, only 179.67 km are not yet paved.

- **Provincial road:** the target in 2015 is that at least 54.32% of the roads will be funded for upgrading. The next target is 100% paved provincial roads by 2016 and beyond. Of 1,343.95 km, only 277.77 km are paved and the remaining 79% are not yet paved.
- **Municipal road:** the target in 2015 is that 45.82% of the municipal road will be funded for upgrading. The next target is to pave 100% of the road by 2016 and beyond. Currently, of the 2,100 km road length, only 420 km is paved leaving about 1,680 km of road length unpaved.

2.4.2 Expanded ARMM Roads Mapping and Management System (E-ARMM System)

The E-ARMM system is a database system containing all roads information (national, provincial and local) in ARMM, their connectivity and conditions (i.e., pavement type) and other infrastructure facilities within the ARMM.

2.4.3 Creation of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Division

On the institutional side, the proposal by DPWH-ARMM to create the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Division was approved by the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) on 25 July 2014. The ICT Division with 19 technical personnel is geared towards upgrading the systems and enhancement of the operations of the existing Management Information Service (MIS) to cover wider supervision of areas in the field of engineering and Management Information Technology.

CHAPTER 3 ROAD NETWORK IN BANGSAMORO

The road network in Bangsamoro is depicted in Figure 3.1 for the mainland provinces and Figure 3.2 for the island provinces. The two figures show the network connectivity of national and provincial roads as well as the condition of pavement (paved or unpaved). Detailed analysis of the region's roads follows in the succeeding sections.

3.1 Road Length and Road Density

The Bangsamoro area has a total road length of 891 km in 2007 and increased to 993 km in 2013 which represents about 3% of the total national road. It is the only region in the Country where its national road is less than 1,000 km. In terms of road density which was calculated supply of road taking into account land area and population of a region, the Bangsamoro region has the lowest road density (0.10) among the 17 regions and way below the Mindanao average (0.17) and not even half of the National average (0.25). A supply of new 800 km of road is necessary for Bangsamoro to achieve the Mindanao average. Table 3.1 presents the road density of the Country by region.

| | | | Road length (km) | | | Road density‡ | | |
|----------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------|--------|---------------------------|------|------|
| Region | | Population (10 ³ , 2010) | Land area (km ²) | 2007 | 2013 | Difference (2013-2007) | 2007 | 2010 |
| Philippines (I | DPWH-National) | 92,338 | 309,771 | 29,370 | 42,621 | 13,251 | 0.18 | 0.25 |
| | NCR | 11,856 | 620 | 1,032 | 1,141 | 109 | 0.39 | 0.42 |
| | CAR | 1,617 | 19,422 | 1,846 | 2,185 | 339 | 0.34 | 0.39 |
| | Region I | 4,748 | 13,013 | 1,610 | 1,655 | 45 | 0.21 | 0.21 |
| Luzon* | Region II | 3,229 | 28,229 | 1,765 | 1,890 | 125 | 0.19 | 0.20 |
| Luzon | Region III | 10,138 | 22,015 | 2,032 | 2,343 | 311 | 0.14 | 0.16 |
| | Region IV-A | 12,610 | 16,873 | 2,404 | 2,462 | 58 | 0.17 | 0.17 |
| | Region IV-B | 2,745 | 29,621 | 2,185 | 2,285 | 100 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| | Region V | 5,420 | 18,156 | 2,197 | 2,344 | 147 | 0.23 | 0.24 |
| | Region VI | 7,102 | 20,794 | 2,880 | 2,990 | 110 | 0.24 | 0.25 |
| Visayas | Region VII | 6,800 | 15,886 | 2,036 | 2,294 | 258 | 0.20 | 0.22 |
| | Region VIII | 4,101 | 23,251 | 2,372 | 2,511 | 139 | 0.25 | 0.26 |
| Mindanao (av | verage)† | 21,968 | 135,402 | 7,900 | 9,261 | 1,361 | 0.14 | 0.17 |
| | Region IX | 3,407 | 17,047 | 1,218 | 1,622 | 404 | 0.16 | 0.21 |
| | Region X | 4,297 | 20,496 | 1,682 | 1,923 | 241 | 0.19 | 0.20 |
| Mindanao | Region XI | 4,469 | 20,357 | 1,447 | 1,668 | 221 | 0.16 | 0.17 |
| | Region XII | 4,110 | 22,513 | 1,304 | 1,541 | 237 | 0.14 | 0.16 |
| | Region XIII | 2,429 | 21,478 | 1,358 | 1,514 | 156 | 0.19 | 0.21 |
| | ARMM (DPWH-ARMM) | 3,256 | 33,511 | 891 | 993 | 102 | 0.08 | 0.10 |

Table 3.1 National Road Length and Road Density by Region

*Data on Luzon and Visayas as of November 09, 2013 †Data on Mindanao as of December 03, 2013.



Source: DPWH Atlas, 2013 for road data and Philippine Statistics Authority for population.

L : Road Length (km)

‡

P : Population in 1,000

A : Land Area in sq. km



Source: Data from BDP1, DPWH's e-ARMM, JICA's 2010 ARMM Infra Masterplan.

Figure 3.1 Present Road Network of Bangsamoro: Mainland Provinces



Source: ibid.



3.2 Pavement Rates

The pavement rates of national roads by region are presented in Table 3.2. The paved portion of Bangsamoro's national roads increased from 76.8% in 2007 to 81.9% in 2013. The increase corresponds to 50.62 km, increasing the paved national road length from 762.3 km in 2007 to 813.0 km in 2013. It should be noted, however, that the pavement rate in Bangsamoro is still below the national average of 83%.

| Desian | | T_{i} | D ₁ = 1 (1) | | Pavement rate (%) | | |
|---------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------|--|
| | Region | | Paved (km) | Unpaved (km) | 2007 | 2013 | |
| Philippines (| (DPWH-National) | 33,219.5 | 27,585.9 | 5,633.6 | 71.5 | 83.0 | |
| NCR | | 1,140.9 | 1,140.9 | - | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| | CAR | 2,184.8 | 1,304.5 | 880.3 | 35.7 | 59.7 | |
| | RegionI | 1,655.5 | 1,595.0 | 60.4 | 90.0 | 96.4 | |
| Luzon | RegionII | 1,889.5 | 1,578.9 | 310.7 | 69.5 | 83.6 | |
| Luzon | RegionIII | 2,343.3 | 2,207.8 | 135.5 | 87.2 | 94.2 | |
| | RegionIV-A | 2,462.0 | 2,276.4 | 185.5 | 85.8 | 92.5 | |
| | RegionIV-B | 2,285.1 | 1,590.6 | 694.5 | 46.1 | 69.6 | |
| | RegionV | 2,344.1 | 2,047.4 | 296.7 | 72.2 | 87.3 | |
| | RegionVI | 2,989.9 | 2,736.0 | 253.9 | 75.6 | 91.5 | |
| Visayas | RegionVII | 2,293.6 | 2,095.3 | 198.4 | 85.7 | 91.4 | |
| - | RegionVIII | 2,510.6 | 2,291.9 | 218.7 | 81.3 | 91.3 | |
| | RegionIX | 1,567.5 | 1,088.0 | 479.6 | 68.6 | 69.4 | |
| | RegionX | 1,898.3 | 1,416.2 | 482.1 | 69.6 | 74.6 | |
| Mindanao | RegionXI | 1,662.4 | 1,185.9 | 476.5 | 62.9 | 71.3 | |
| | RegionXII | 1,521.3 | 1,093.2 | 428.1 | 62.4 | 71.9 | |
| | RegionXIII | 1,478.4 | 1,125.1 | 353.3 | 46.3 | 76.1 | |
| | ARMM (DPWH-ARMM) | 992.6 | 813.0 | 179.6 | 76.8 | 81.9 | |

 Table 3.2 Pavement Rates of National Roads by Region, 2013

Source: DPWH Atlas, 2013 except data from ARMM which was obtained from DPWH-ARMM.

A closer look at the ARMM's roads as shown in Figure 3.3 reveals the following (as indicated in Table 3.3):

- National roads: Most roads surfaced with concrete (81%) and only 18% surfaced with gravel and earth, accounting for about 180 km.
- Provincial roads: Only 21% with concrete and asphalt surface and the remaining 79% with gravel and earth surface, which corresponds to 1,680 km.
- Municipal roads: Only 20% with concrete or asphalt surface and the rest about 1,680 km with gravel or earth surface.
- Barangay roads and farm-to-market roads (FMRs): Only 0.2% surfaced with concrete or asphalt surface and the remaining 4,814 km with gravel or earth surface.

| Level | Concrete | Asphalt | Gravel & earth | Total (km) |
|-----------------------|----------|---------|----------------|------------|
| National Baad (lum) | 802.62 | 10.35 | 179.62 | 992.59 |
| National Koau (Kill) | 81% | 1% | 18% | 100% |
| Drawingial Daad (Irm) | 277.52 | 0.25 | 1,065.18 | 1,342.95 |
| Provincial Road (km) | 21% | 0% | 79% | 100% |
| | 420 | - | 1,680.00 | 2,100.00 |
| Municipal Road (Kill) | 20% | - | 80% | 100% |
| *Dorongou Dood (km) | 9.51 | - | 4814.72 | 4,824.23 |
| *Barangay Road (Km) | 0.2% | | 99.8% | 100.0% |
| Tatal | 1,509.65 | 10.60 | 7,739.52 | 9,259.77 |
| Total | 16.3% | 0.1% | 83.6% | 100% |

 Table 3.3 Pavement Surface of ARMM's Roads

Source: DPWH-ARMM, 2014 except with * where data was taken from ARMM Regional Development Plan Medium Term Update, 2013.



Source: DPWH-ARMM, 2014 except with barangay data which was culled from ARMM Regional Development Plan Medium Term Update, 2013.

Figure 3.3 ARMM's Road Type, Road Length, and Pavement Type

By disaggregating further the data by provincial level, the following characterized the road network of Bangsamoro (Table 3.4 and 3.5 and Figure 3.4 and 3.5):

- Lanao del Sur has the longest national road length with a total of 306.53 km. Of the length, only 14% has either earth or gravel surface. Provincial roads in Lanao del Sur has a length of 396.34 km, of which 42% is unpaved.
- Maguindanao has the second longest national road length of 282.26 km. Of this only 6% is unpaved. Provincial roads in Maguindanao are mostly unpaved (90% of the total 427.55 km).
- Basilan has the third longest national road length with a total of 153.87 km, of which only 18% is yet to be paved. Basilan's provincial roads are similar to Maguindanao's with 89% of the total 172.65 km still surfaced with gravel or earth.
- Sulu has a total of 135.12 km of national roads, of which 20% is still surfaced with gravel or earth. Provincial roads in Sulu are mostly surfaced with earth or gravel, accounting for almost 200 km. Paved provincial roads have a length of about 16 km.
- Tawi-Tawi has a total of 115.10 km of national roads, of which 46% is paved and the rest is still surfaced with gravel or earth. This province has the longest national road length with gravel or earth surface.

| | | Roads | | | Bric | lges | Total road & |
|-------|---------------|--------|---------|--------|------|--------|---------------|
| No. | Province | Paved | Unpaved | Total | No | Length | bridge length |
| | | (km) | (km) | (km) | INO. | (km) | (km) |
| 1 | Decilon | 125.87 | 28 | 153.87 | 35 | 1.02 | 154.89 |
| 1 | Dashan | 82% | 18% | 100% | | | |
| 2 | Sulu | 107.5 | 27.62 | 135.12 | 29 | 0.24 | 135.36 |
| 2 | Sulu | 80% | 20% | 100% | | | |
| 2 | Touri Touri | 52.64 | 62.46 | 115.1 | 10 | 0.4 | 115.5 |
| 3 | Tawi-Tawi | 46% | 54% | 100% | | | |
| 4 | Maguindanaa | 264.6 | 17.66 | 282.26 | 58 | 2.62 | 284.88 |
| 4 | Magundanao | 94% | 6% | 100% | | | |
| 5 | Lanaa dal Sur | 262.59 | 43.92 | 306.52 | 78 | 2.44 | 308.96 |
| 3 | Lanao del Sul | 86% | 14% | 100% | | | |
| Tatal | | 813.2 | 179.66 | 992.87 | 210 | 6.72 | 999.59 |
| | Iotai | 82% | 18% | 100% | | | |

Table 3.4 Pavement Types of ARMM's National Roads by Province

Source: DPWH-ARMM, 2014.

| | | Roads | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| No. | Province | Paved (km) | Unpaved (km) | Total (km) | Proposed new (km) | | | |
| 1 | Decilon | 18.35 | 154.3 | 172.65 | 58.9 | | | |
| 1 | Dashali | 11% | 89% | 100% | | | | |
| 2 | Sulu | 16.1 | 200.3 | 216.4 | - | | | |
| 2 | 2 Sulu | 7% | 93% | 100% | | | | |
| 2 | т. : т. : | 19.5 | 110.51 | 130.01 | 82.8 | | | |
| 3 | Tawi-Tawi | 15% | 85% | 100% | | | | |
| 4 | Maguindanaa | 44.12 | 383.43 | 427.55 | 108.8 | | | |
| 4 | Magunuanao | 10% | 90% | 100% | | | | |
| 5 | Lango dal Sur | 230.94 | 165.4 | 396.34 | - | | | |
| 5 | | 58% | 42% | 100% | | | | |
| Tatal | | 329.01 | 1,013.94 | 1,342.95 | 250.5 | | | |
| | Total | 24% | 76% | 100% | | | | |

 Table 3.5 Pavement Types of ARMM's Provincial Roads by Province

Source: ibid.



Figure 3.4 Pavement Types of National Roads within ARMM



Figure 3.5 Pavement Types of Provincial Roads within ARMM

3.3 Road Condition

A road surface condition survey was undertaken by the JICA Study Team from February to October 2015 using the Dynamic Response Intelligent Monitoring System (DRIMS) to measure the International Roughness Index (IRI) of roads in the region. DRIMS was developed by the Bridge and Structures Laboratory at the University of Tokyo and this was the first time the equipment was utilized in the Philippines. The equipment gives estimated IRI of the road as a result of measuring and calculating acceleration according to vehicle motion.

Based on this survey, the length of the national road in bad condition thus required immediate intervention is about 180 km which represents 20.7% of the total length of the national road (Table 3.6). Those in poor condition accounts for 281.45 km. Roads in good and fair condition represent 47.2% of the entire network which correspond to 412.60 km. Maps showing the IRI values of the national road network are shown in Figure 3.6 (1/2) and Figure 3.6 (2/2).

As indicated in Table 3.7, paved provincial roads in good and fair condition in the region are limited to 84.60 km, representing about 23.2% of the total length of paved provincial roads. Lack of maintenance of these roads led to the poor condition of large section of the provincial road as indicated in the table below where more than 50% of the network is in bad condition. This is significantly high compared to road in bad condition along the national road which is just 20% of the network. Maps showing the IRI value of the provincial road network are available in Figure 3.7 (1/2) and Figure 3.7 (2/2).

| | Condition | Good | Fair | Poor | Bad | Tatal |
|----------|--------------------|--|---|--|--------|--------|
| | IRI range | 3 <iri< td=""><td>3<iri<5< td=""><td>5<iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<></td></iri<5<></td></iri<> | 3 <iri<5< td=""><td>5<iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<></td></iri<5<> | 5 <iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<> | 7>IRI | Total |
| | Maguindanao (km) | 5.35 | 73.75 | 104.20 | 106.99 | 290.29 |
| Mainland | Lanao del Sur (km) | 41.15 | 131.35 | 76.85 | 32.50 | 281.85 |
| Maimand | Subtotal (km) | 46.5 | 205.1 | 181.05 | 139.49 | 572.14 |
| | (%) | 8.1 | 35.8 | 31.6 | 24.4 | 100.0 |
| | Basilan | 14.90 | 73.95 | 41.50 | 16.10 | 146.45 |
| | Sulu | 3.15 | 57.55 | 44.55 | 13.45 | 118.70 |
| Island | Tawi-Tawi | 0.55 | 10.90 | 14.35 | 11.60 | 37.40 |
| | Subtotal (km) | 18.60 | 142.40 | 100.40 | 41.15 | 302.55 |
| | (%) | 6.1 | 47.1 | 33.2 | 13.6 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 65.10 | 347.50 | 281.45 | 180.64 | 874.69 |
| | (%) | 7.4 | 39.7 | 32.2 | 20.7 | 100.0 |

Table 3.6 Road Condition of Paved National Roads

Note: IRI = International Roughness Index

Source: JICA Study Team.

| | Condition | Good | Fair | Poor | Bad | Total |
|----------|--------------------|--|---|--|--------|--------|
| | IRI range | 3 <iri< td=""><td>3<iri<5< td=""><td>5<iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<></td></iri<5<></td></iri<> | 3 <iri<5< td=""><td>5<iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<></td></iri<5<> | 5 <iri<7< td=""><td>7>IRI</td><td>Total</td></iri<7<> | 7>IRI | Total |
| | Maguindanao (km) | 0.70 | 38.70 | 44.00 | 25.80 | 109.20 |
| Mainland | Lanao del Sur (km) | - | 6.40 | 24.30 | 120.20 | 150.90 |
| Maimanu | Subtotal (km) | 0.70 | 45.10 | 68.30 | 146.00 | 260.10 |
| | (%) | 0.3 | 17.3 | 26.3 | 56.1 | 100.0 |
| | Basilan | 1.00 | 9.20 | 10.60 | 15.30 | 36.10 |
| Island | Sulu | 4.20 | 21.90 | 11.50 | 11.90 | 49.50 |
| | Tawi-Tawi | - | 2.50 | 5.40 | 11.20 | 19.10 |
| | Subtotal (km) | 5.20 | 33.60 | 27.50 | 38.40 | 104.70 |
| | (%) | 5.0 | 32.1 | 26.3 | 36.7 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 5.90 | 78.70 | 95.80 | 184.40 | 364.80 |
| | (%) | 1.6 | 21.6 | 26.3 | 50.5 | 100.0 |

| Table 3.7 Road Condition | of Paved | Provincial | Roads |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|-------|
|---------------------------------|----------|------------|-------|

Source: ibid.

The Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan for the ARMM, supported by JICA, identified five missing links and six new roads as critical sections to complete the primary and secondary road network of Bangsamoro (Table 3.8). The lack of these roads affect accessibility to large area of the region and people are forced to take a long detour. Hence, there are many areas with accessibility problems in Bangsamoro. As indicated in Figure 3.8, the presence of missing links in the Bangsamoro region is notable compared to the neighboring regions.

| Road name | Length (km) | Road class |
|---|-------------|-------------------------|
| Missing Links | 155.4 | |
| 1. Molundo–Wao Road | 30.4 | Regional Primary Road |
| 2. SK Border–Butig–Lumbayanague Road | 25.0 | Regional Primary Road |
| 3. Malabang-Marogong-Tubaran-Bayang Road | 25.0 | Regional Secondary Road |
| 4. Tapian–Lebak Road | 50.0 | Regional Secondary Road |
| 5. Maganoy–Lebak Road | 25.0 | Regional Primary Road |
| New Road (Mainland) | 110.7 | |
| 1. Parang–Balabagan Road | 30.0 | Regional Secondary Road |
| 2. Matanog-Alamada Road (Matanog-Buldon section) | 20.0 | Regional Primary Road |
| 3. Matanog–Alamada Road (Buldon–Alamada section) | 15.0 | Regional Primary Road |
| 4. Manuangan–Parang Road | 20.0 | Regional Secondary Road |
| 5. Midsayap–Datu Piang Road | 20.0 | Regional Primary Road |
| 6. Molundo–Wao (part of Molundo–Wao missing link) | 5.7 | Regional Primary Road |

Source: The Study on Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan for the ARMM, JICA, 2010.



Source: JICA Study Team DRIMS Survey February-October 2015.

Figure 3.6 Surface Condition of National Road of Bangsamoro (1/2): Mainland Provinces



Source: ibid.

Figure 3.6 Surface Condition of National Road of Bangsamoro (2/2): Island Provinces



Source: ibid.





Source: ibid.





Source: ibid.

Figure 3.8 Missing Links in Bangsamoro Network and Surrounding Regions

3.4 Traffic Volume

The traffic volume on the major roads of Bangsamoro is presented in Table 3.9 and depicted in Figure 3.9. Data were taken from the regular traffic count survey of DPWH-National. Since DPWH National is not undertaking traffic survey inside the Bangsamoro region, the 2008 survey data by the JICA study were used as base data to estimate current traffic in Bangsamoro. Annual growth rate of DPWH data (2008–2014) was used as guide to estimate growth rate inside the study area. Based on these traffic data, the following were observed:

- Cotabato–Marawi corridor's traffic volume is about 1,500 vehicles per day, Cotabato–Davao corridor is about 3,200 and Cotabato–Gen. Santos is about 2,200.
- If traffic growth is taken as an indicator to recent progress in the area, arterial roads of major cities of Bangsamoro (Cotabato City and Marawi city) have a lower growth (between 1% and 4% annually) than arterial roads of Davao City and Gen. Santos which have an annual traffic growth of 5% to 16% annually.

| | (Unit: No. of vehicl | | | | | | | vehicles) | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-------|-----|-------|-------|------------------|-----------|-----|-------|-------|
| | Dood name | 2008 AADT (DPWH) | | | | | 2014 AADT (DPWH) | | | | |
| | Koad name | Car | Jeep | Bus | Truck | Total | Car | Jeep | Bus | Truck | Total |
| | Digos–Makar Rd. | 1,118 | 1,050 | 356 | 2,857 | 5,381 | 4,813 | 1,429 | 637 | 595 | 7,474 |
| Mainland Mindanao | Cotabato-Marbel Rd. | 972 | 189 | 95 | 243 | 1,499 | 1,161 | 1,846 | 350 | 390 | 3,747 |
| | Sarangani-SK Coastal Rd. | 327 | 295 | 193 | 39 | 854 | 191 | 625 | 108 | 33 | 957 |
| | Cotabato-Marbel Rd. | 1,957 | 2,241 | 11 | 304 | 4,513 | 384 | 448 | 75 | 143 | 1,050 |
| | Midsayap-Marbel Rd. | 1,693 | 561 | 124 | 642 | 3,020 | 3,345 | 536 | 195 | 715 | 4,790 |
| | Butuan City-CDO-Iligan Rd. | 4,037 | 2,455 | 308 | 748 | 7,548 | 1,112 | 1,544 | 566 | 1,025 | 4,247 |
| | Sayre Highway | 1,118 | 1,050 | 356 | 2,857 | 5,039 | 1,235 | 968 | 415 | 485 | 3,104 |
| | Kibawe-Kadingilan Rd. | 554 | 57 | 46 | 92 | 749 | 135 | 80 | - | 188 | 403 |
| | Sayre Highway | 2,557 | 600 | 542 | 1,110 | 4,809 | 1,746 | 2,055 | 679 | 707 | 5,187 |
| | Davao-Cotabato Rd. (Jct. Digos) | 1,592 | 494 | 178 | 1,138 | 3,402 | 1,175 | 1,677 | 313 | 321 | 3,486 |
| | Cotabato City Circ. Rd. | 3,320 | 2,590 | 743 | 1,119 | 7,772 | 2,390 | 1,380 | 246 | 358 | 4,373 |
| | Davao-Cotabato Rd. (Sultan | 1,736 | 358 | 272 | 656 | 3,022 | 1,279 | 1,304 | 187 | 438 | 3,208 |

| Table 5.7 Hame volume in Dangsamoro and Surrounding mea | Table 3.9 T | raffic Volume | in Bangsamoro | and Surround | ing Areas |
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|
|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----------|

| | | 2008 AADT (DPWH) | | | | 2014 AADT (DPWH) | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------|-------|------------------|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--|
| | Road name | Car | Jeep | Bus | Truck | Total | Car | Jeep | Bus | Truck | Total | |
| | Kudarat–Pigcawayan) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Ozamis City-Oroquieta City Rd. | 2,243 | 275 | 226 | 631 | 3,375 | 1,460 | 1,138 | 255 | 220 | 3,073 | |
| | Linamon-Zamboanga Rd. | 1,202 | 436 | 859 | 635 | 3,132 | 966 | 1,429 | 634 | 489 | 3,518 | |
| | Misamis OMa Cristina Rd. | 5,054 | 3,872 | 5 | 517 | 9,448 | 6,195 | 4,712 | 1,183 | 831 | 12,921 | |
| | Pagadian-Zamboanga City Rd. | 2,851 | 379 | 482 | 1,187 | 4,899 | 1,785 | 1,625 | 641 | 626 | 4,678 | |
| | Iligan City-Marawi City Rd. | 3,134 | 598 | 13 | 248 | 4,157 | 3,414 | 367 | - | 268 | 4,049 | |
| | Maramag-Maradugao Rd. | 621 | 114 | 58 | 243 | 1,036 | 642 | 683 | 222 | 220 | 1,767 | |
| JICA's ARMM In | | frastructu | re Masterj | plan data | a | | Estimated by JICA Study Team | | | | | |
| | Marawi-Saguiaran Rd. | 3,163 | 734 | - | 259 | 4,156 | 4,112 | 954 | - | 337 | 5,403 | |
| | Balindong-Marantao Rd. | 1,728 | 944 | - | 109 | 2,781 | 2,246 | 1,227 | - | 142 | 3,615 | |
| | Maguing-Molundo Rd. | 381 | 579 | - | 113 | 1,073 | 495 | 753 | - | 147 | 1,395 | |
| | Calanogas-Pagayawan Rd. | 97 | 260 | - | 15 | 372 | 126 | 338 | - | 20 | 484 | |
| | Tukuran–Karumatan Rd. | 226 | 167 | - | 73 | 466 | 294 | 217 | - | 95 | 606 | |
| | Labangan–Tukuran Rd. | 378 | 208 | 5 | 110 | 701 | 491 | 270 | 7 | 143 | 911 | |
| | Cotabato-Parang Rd. | 783 | 432 | 1 | 153 | 1,369 | 1,018 | 562 | 1 | 199 | 1,780 | |
| | Cotabato-Polloc Rd. | 191 | 63 | - | 143 | 397 | 248 | 82 | - | 186 | 516 | |
| | Cotabato-Kusiong Rd. | 31 | 111 | - | 61 | 203 | 40 | 144 | - | 79 | 264 | |
| | Cotabato–Upi Rd. | 113 | 35 | - | 164 | 312 | 147 | 46 | - | 213 | 406 | |
| | Upi–Lebak Rd. | 61 | 2 | - | 40 | 103 | 79 | 3 | - | 52 | 134 | |
| | Cotabato-DOS Rd. | 891 | 609 | 38 | 155 | 1,693 | 1,158 | 792 | 49 | 202 | 2,201 | |
| | Midsayap-Datu Piang Rd. | 144 | 129 | - | 108 | 381 | 187 | 168 | - | 140 | 495 | |
| | Ampatuan–Esperanza Rd. | 611 | 334 | 29 | 136 | 1,110 | 794 | 434 | 38 | 177 | 1,443 | |
| | Tacurong–Lambayong Rd. | 488 | 149 | - | 172 | 809 | 634 | 194 | - | 224 | 1,052 | |
| | Kabacan–Pagalungan Rd. | 1,410 | 379 | 122 | 323 | 2,234 | 1,833 | 493 | 159 | 420 | 2,904 | |
| | Carmen-Kabacan Rd. | 689 | 480 | 35 | 282 | 1,486 | 896 | 624 | 46 | 367 | 1,932 | |
| | Kitaotao–Dangcagan Rd. | 897 | 233 | 129 | 420 | 1,679 | 1,166 | 303 | 168 | 546 | 2,183 | |
| | Maramag–Quezon Rd. | 997 | 81 | 70 | 469 | 1,617 | 1,296 | 105 | 91 | 610 | 2,102 | |
| | Magpet-Kidapawan Rd. | 715 | 104 | 216 | 29 | 1,064 | 930 | 135 | 281 | 38 | 1,383 | |
| | Tacurong-Pres. Quirino Rd. | 1,321 | 536 | 66 | 450 | 2,373 | 1,717 | 697 | 86 | 585 | 3,085 | |
| | Gen. Santos-Polomolok Rd. | 2,629 | 1,232 | 201 | 656 | 4,718 | 3,418 | 1,602 | 261 | 853 | 6,133 | |
| | Bansalan–Makilala Rd. | 2,386 | 1,034 | 140 | 915 | 4,475 | 3,102 | 1,344 | 182 | 1,190 | 5,818 | |
| | Gen. Santos-Malungon Rd. | 2,759 | 683 | 243 | 343 | 4,028 | 3,587 | 888 | 316 | 446 | 5,236 | |
| | Balabagan–Malabang Rd.* | 676 | 259 | 1 | 92 | 1067 | 879 | 485 | 1 | 172 | 1,536 | |
| s | Isabela–Lamitan Rd. | 1,208 | 345 | 309 | 677 | 2,539 | 1,570 | 449 | 402 | 880 | 3,301 | |
| JCe | Isabela–Maluso Rd. | 923 | 317 | 117 | 522 | 1,879 | 1,200 | 412 | 152 | 679 | 2,443 | |
| VII | Pasiagan–Patikul Rd. | 546 | 414 | - | 592 | 1,552 | 710 | 538 | - | 770 | 2,018 | |
| Prc | Jolo–Indanan–Parang Rd. | 114 | 455 | - | 391 | 960 | 148 | 592 | - | 508 | 1,248 | |
| pu | Jolo–Talipao Rd. | 80 | 689 | - | 127 | 896 | 104 | 896 | - | 165 | 1,165 | |
| sla | Nalil-Bongao Rd. | 84 | 103 | - | 41 | 228 | 109 | 134 | - | 53 | 296 | |
| Ι | Sanga Sanga–Bongao Rd. | 110 | 93 | - | 52 | 255 | 143 | 121 | - | 68 | 332 | |

*2003 JICA data ARMM Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan, 2010.

Source: DPWH National Road Traffic Survey Program 2014; JICA's ARMM Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan, 2010.

3.5 Freight Transport in Bangsamoro

3.5.1 Polloc Port and other alternative Ports for Bangsamoro

The Polloc Port's operations have considerable influence on how the freight transport in Bangsamoro is moved. Over the years, the level of port operation has shrunk. This has resulted in shippers in Bangsamoro changing to other ports in Mindanao, particularly the Sasa Port of Davao, ports of Cagayan de Oro (Cagayan de Oro port and Mindanao International Container Terminal), and the Makar Wharf of General Santos (Figure 3.10). This was confirmed by a 2009 survey on major agro-industries in the Bangsamoro (e.g., Lamsan, La Frutera, and Matling) as part of the Study on Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan for the ARMM by JICA. The survey results revealed that most of these firms used multiple ports outside Bangsamoro to ship their products. Of all the ports in Mindanao, the ports of Davao, Cagayan, and General Santos were preferred alternatives.

Unless operation of the Polloc Port is significantly improved, shippers in Bangsamoro will be forced to take the route of bringing their cargoes to any of the ports above. In terms of distance, the Makar Wharf of General Santos City and the Iligan Port are the closest (Table 3.10). However, the former has the advantage of passing through more peaceful areas which could explain the preference for the Makar Wharf.



Figure 3.9 Traffic Volume in Bangsamoro and Surrounding Regions


Source: Prepared by the JICA Study Team based on the MINDA's Economic Corridor.

| | • • • | 0 • • • • | D | • | D |
|-------------|--------------|------------------|----------|-----|------------|
| Higure 3 10 | Locations | of Alternative | Porte | for | Rangeamoro |
| riguit 5.10 | Locations | of Anter native | 1 01 13 | 101 | Dangsamoro |

| Port | Distance* from Cotabato | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|--|
| i. Macabalan Port and Mindanao Container | 250 km (via Narciso Ramos Highway) | | |
| Terminal, Cagayan de Oro City | 320 km (via Kabacan-Kibawe Road) | | |
| ii. Iligan Port, Iligan City | 185 km (via Narciso Ramos Highway) | | |
| iii. Ozamis Port, Ozamis City | 220 km (via Narciso Ramos Highway) | | |
| iv. Sasa Port, Davao City | 220 km (via Cotabato-Davao road) | | |
| v. Makar Wharf, General Santos City | 185 km (Tacurong–Koronadal Road) | | |

Table 3.10 Distances of Alternative Ports from Cotabato City

*Estimated based on Google map.

3.5.2 Road conditions leading to alternative ports

The arterial roads linking Bangsamoro to alternative ports are presented in Figure 3.11. Most of the roads are two-lane highway with some4-lane sections. The surface conditions of these roads are illustrated in Figure 3.12. Table 3.11 presents assessments of the following roads:

| Road link | Assessment |
|--|--|
| Cotabato–Davao Road (to Sasa Port; L=220 km) | Two-lane highway with some sections having 4-lane particularly between Digos City and Davao City. Traffic congestion is observed at the road sections passing the town centers such as in Libungan, Midsayap, Pikit, Kidapawan due to mixing of local traffic and through traffic and also inside Davao city before Sasa Port. Road condition is particularly poor in the municipalities of Pikit, Pagagawan and Pagalungan. |
| Cotabato–Gen. Santos Road (to Makar | - Two-lane highway with some sections having 4-lane. However, the section from Isulan to Gen. Santos is a 4-lane highway with the exception of some short sections. |

 Table 3.11 Summary of Road Conditions Leading to Alternative Ports

| Road link | Assessment |
|--|---|
| Wharf; L=185 km) | - Flow of traffic is generally good with the exception of road section passing inside Tacurong and Koronadal due to mixing of local traffic and through traffic. |
| | - Road condition is generally good with the exception of Isulan-Sto. Nino-Suralla section and Koronadal-Tupi section. |
| Cotabato–Cagayan de | - Two-lane highway until Iligan City. Four-lane highway is just observed inside Cagayan de Oro City. |
| Oro via Narciso Ramos Highway (to | - Traffic flow is generally good except the section passing Marawi City, Iligan City and Cagayan de Oro City. |
| Cagayan de Oro Port and Mindanao | - Road condition is generally poor from Parang to Marawi where large pot holes and serious pavement cracks are observed. |
| Container Terminal; L=250 km) | - Road alignment is also poor resulting in sharp curves that are not suitable to large trucks. |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | - This highway has a security concern as well |
| Cotabato–Cagayan de Oro via Kibawe Road (to Cagayan de Oro | Most sections are two-lane highway with some sections having 4-lane Traffic flow is generally good with the exceptions to the section passing major towns such as Libungan, Pikit, Maramag, Valencia City, etc. |
| Port and Mindanao Container Terminal; L=320 km) | Freight destined to Cagayan de Oro Port (Macabalan Whart) passes the city center, thus traffic congestion is experienced Road condition is better than the shorter Narciso Ramos Highway route This route is also passing a more peaceful areas |

3.5.3 Exit port and freight movement of agroindustry products in Bangsamoro

The exit port of products produced by agroindustry firms operating in the Bangsamoro region was clarified through interviews carried out by agroindustry experts of the JST with these firms. In some cases interview with people knowledgeable of the subject as well as review of relevant studies were carried out. Based on the above, the freight flow was clarified as shown in Figure 3.13. The following were observed:

- Most of the agri-industries in Bangsamoro are using ports of Davao and Panabo to ship out their products. Ports of Cagayan de Oro and General Santos are preferred by some.
- As far as agroindustry in Bangsamoro is concerned, users of Polloc Port seem to be limited to a very few firms such as Lamsan Trading, Philippine Trade Inc. and perhaps other small-scale firms.
- Routes used to transport products by these agri-industries are as follows (Figure 3.12):
 - Wao and Bumbaran area to Davao (Wao-Kibawe-Carmen-Kidapawan-Digos-Davao),
 - Malabang area to Davao (Malabang-Parang-Simuay-Kidapawan-Digos-Davao),
 - Malabang area to General Santos (Malabang-Parang-Cotabato-Isulan-Tacurong-Gen. Santos),
 - Datu Paglas and Buluan area to Davao (Buluan-Datu Paglas-Makilala-Digos-Davao), and
 - Talayan and Datu Abdullah Sangki area to Davao (Isulan-Tacurong-Datu Paglas-Makilala-Digos-Davao).

The final destinations of agroindustry products from Mindanao including those coming from the Bangsamoro were also identified through review of the Mindanao Logistics Infrastructure Network Study by the JICA undertaken in 2014:

- Banana Cavendish: Japan (50%) and the rest to China, South Korea, the Middle East (particularly Iran) and other smaller markets,
- Coconut products/oil: USA (24%), Europe (25%) and the rest distributed to other countries,
- Pineapples: major markets and their approximate shares are Japan (55%), Korea (16%), New Zealand (4%), Middle East (9%), among others,
- Mango-Carabao: China, Japan, and others, and
- Palm Oil: Cebu and Manila for further refinement.



Source: DPWH data (2014) and NSCB data.





Source: DPWH Road Condition Data and NSCB data.

Figure 3.12 Road Conditions of Mindanao's Arterial Roads







The current flow of freight from these agroindustry firms appears to be irrational considering that the Polloc Port is very close to the locations of these firms. However, the Polloc Port at present simply cannot offer services required by the industry. This situation indicates at least two disadvantages to the Bangsamoro region: It deprives the region of (1) business opportunity that could result in a number of jobs created and (2) additional income that could be generated from the use of the port services.

In the future, it is reasonable to expect that if the Polloc Port could provide the same level of services (coupled with facility requirements of these agroindustry firms) with the ports in Davao, Cagayan de Oro, and General Santos, freight traffic from Bangsamoro would be gradually shifted back to the Polloc Port. The renewed interest of the private sector in investing in the agroindustry in Bangsamoro offers an opportunity for the Polloc Port management to harmonize its development/improvement with the needs of these firms. Such prospective investments include banana and coffee plantations located in the municipalities of Barira and Buldon with a total area of close to 8,000 ha. Likewise, the private sector is also interested in developing oil palm plantations in Datu Odin Sinsuat Municipality, oil palm, banana and cacao plantations in Talayan Municipality, and another banana plantations in Buluan and Datu Abdullah Sangki Municipalities. Combining all these new investments together will cover about 12,500 ha, indicating that substantial freight traffic will be generated requiring port services for their export.

3.5.4 Infrastructure and Logistics challenges in Mindanao

The issues and bottlenecks, especially transport infrastructure constraints, that affect transport and distribution of agri-fishery in Mindanao have been clarified in a JICA-assisted study, the Survey on Mindanao Logistics Infrastructure Network. Most of these findings are applicable to the Bangsamoro region. These challenges were categorized into infrastructure and logistics, including the following:

(1) Infrastructure challenges

- Poor FMRs
- Fast deterioration of the roads due to heavy loads
- Incomplete DPWH Arterial North-South Backbone and East-West Lateral Road System that promote competition between ports
- Ports are currently not well designed to cater to agri-products though in the long-run, ports should be able to handle containers
- Arterial roads are in many sections inadequate 'container highways' (i.e., pavement not designed for heavy loads, limited number of lanes, no climbing lanes, no direct routes to ports, non-all weather sections)
- Use of inefficient port equipment and practices (e.g., pallets instead of containers, straight instead of articulated trucks, RoPAX instead of RoRo ships (using quayside gantry cranes), straight instead of articulated trucks, etc.)
- Worsening traffic condition in Cagayan de Oro and Davao cities will constrain expanded usage of the PPA base and the Sasa Port, respectively

(2) Logistics challenges

- Immature freight forwarding industry leading to low LCL and backload rates
- High transport cost by RoRo due to the low backloads
- Shipping companies not too flexible and nimble enough to address the needs of shippers (e.g., high rentals of reefer vans, insufficient supply of fruit vans, livestock vans, and reefer vans)
- Low utilization of agri-financing windows catering to associations and cooperatives for loans to be used in consolidation facilities
- Unpopularity of the use of containers, trailers, and prime movers as transport modes

3.6 Summary of Road Issues and Logistics Issues

Based on the initial assessment of the road development in the region as well as freight transport operation, the following issues have been identified:

(1) Road density

The Bangsamoro region's road density (0.10) remains the lowest in the Country, which is not even a half of the national average (0.25). Another 800 km of national roads is necessary to reach the average of Mindanao (0.17), and a further addition of 800 km is in order to reach the national average.

(2) Pavement rate

The pavement rate of national roads in the region improved from 76.8% in 2007 to 81.9% in 2013. However, this is still below the national average of 83%. To reach the national level, paving another 179 km of national roads with gravel or earth surface is necessary.

Provincial roads in the region are mostly gravel- or earth-surfaced, which account for 79% (1,680 km) of the total length. This remains a major development issue to be addressed in the coming years.

Municipal roads are also mostly surfaced with gravel or earth (80% of the total or 1,680 km).

Barangay roads and FMRs are also mostly surfaced with gravel or earth (4,824 km of which only 0.2% has gravel surface).

(3) Road condition of paved national road

This will be confirmed after the road surface condition survey currently undertaken by another study team using DRIMS.

(4) Missing links

There are five missing links (155.4 km in total length), which prevent access to wide area in the region. Likewise, these missing links affect mobility of communities in these areas.

(5) Freight transport

Major challenges in freight transport are the poor condition of FMRs, secondary roads (provincial roads), and artery roads connecting Marawi and Cotabato; and the limited operation of the Polloc Port (which has led agroindustry firms in Bangsamoro to use alternative ports outside Bangsamoro).

CHAPTER 4 REVIEW OF RELEVANT POLICIES, PLANS AND PROJECTS FOR ROAD SECTOR

4.1 BDA's Bangsamoro Development Plan: Phase 1

A review of the Bangsamoro Development Plan (Phase 1) was carried out to confirm the strategic direction/investment as far as infrastructure development is concerned. During the transition, the strategy for roads and bridges will be to: (a) sustain current efforts to improve national roads through rehabilitation, reconstruction, upgrading, and maintenance; (b) address the most immediate and most un-served needs/gaps, especially at the barangay or community level by paving FMRs and building new ones; and (c) develop capacity in infrastructure planning, feasibility preparation, project supervision/management, and monitoring and evaluation for infrastructure staff. Table 4.1 shows the strategies the plan intends to pursue. It appears that the plan's primary concern is the strengthening of infrastructure system of the region. This is in recognition of the poor state of infrastructure which significantly hampered efforts to bring to another level the socioeconomic condition of the region. Key to this overall effort to redress the region's infrastructure is rehabilitation of FMRs that would directly benefits the poor.

| Target strategy | Project type | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| a. Infrastructure to connect to economic growth | National, provincial roads and bridges; airports and seaports; | | |
| centers | telecommunications | | |
| h Infractructure to support production | Farm-to-market roads (FMRs), irrigation facilities, small | | |
| b. Infrastructure to support production | landing ports, energy requirements for economic activity | | |
| a Infrastructure for access/social justice | Access roads, household electrification (especially off-grid) | | |
| c. Infrastructure for access/social justice | for far-flung areas | | |
| d. Infrastructure to support security and | Investments for the six priority camps and other requirements | | |
| normalization outcomes | targeted for normalization | | |
| e Infrastructure for climate-resilience DRRM | Flood control retrofitting of existing infrastructure | | |

 Table 4.1 BDP Infrastructure Strategies and Project Types

Source: Bangsamoro Development Plan - Integrative Report, May 2014, BDA.

The project implementation arrangement was also touched by the plan. It was envisioned that during the transition period, national road projects will be implemented by the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), while provincial and municipal road projects will be done by DPWH-ARMM. Barangay road and FMR projects shall be implemented by the Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (DAF)-ARMM, Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), and DAR-ARMM (Table 4.3).

| Project type | Implementing agency | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| National Road Projects | DPWH National | | |
| Provincial Road Projects | | | |
| Municipal Road Projects | DPWH-ARMM | | |
| Darangey Dood Projects | Department of Agriculture (DA) | | |
| EMB Projects | Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (DAF)-ARMM | | |
| FININ FIOJECIS | Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), and DAR-ARMM. | | |

Table 4.2 Project Implementation Arrangement

Similarly, a review on the projects recommended for infrastructure (road) by the Transition Development Plan by JICA was carried out to see how these projects would fit in the overall plan and to confirm if any of these projects are funded by the National Government or Donor Institution for 2015 or 2016. The recommended projects for the short term (2015–2016) are presented in Table 4.3. It was envisaged that in the short-term, priority should be given to address the main bottlenecks of connectivity including the poor condition of FMRs as well as incomplete and unpaved national roads and main arterial roads which led to low productivity and limited income opportunities for rural communities. Location of these projects is depicted in Figure 4.1.

| No. | Road | Road length (km) |
|-----|---|------------------|
| 1 | Davao-Cotabato Road (reblocking) | 8.8 |
| 2 | Marbel-Ala-Cotabato Road (reblocking) | 4.0 |
| 3 | SK Border–Butig–Lumbayanague Road | 31.0 |
| 4 | Maganoy-Sultan Sa Barongis Road (Provincial Road) | 13.5 |
| 5 | Datu Saudi Ampatuan Road (Provincial Road) | 9.0 |
| 6 | Manuangan–Parang Road | 20.0 |

Table 4.3 Proposed Projects for Transitional Plan Period

Source: Transitional Development Plan, 2014, JICA-PhilKoe International, Inc.

The list of road projects was then compared to the road projects by DPWH-ARMM funded for their 2015 budget. After cross checking, it was found out that identified projects in the Transition Plan are not in the list of 2015 priority projects of DPWH-ARMM. However two projects proposed by the BDP 1 for medium term/long term were included in the 2015 projects of DPWH-ARMM. These are:

- Concreting of alternative road (Matanog–Barira–Buldon in the Province of Maguindanao) (L=1.0 km and budget is PHP 20 million), and
- Concreting of Lakit lakit–Mandulan road, Bongao in the Province of Tawi-Tawi (L=2.0 km and budget is PHP 24 million)

It should be noted that the 2015 budget of DPWH-ARMM covers only 1 km of the 9 km unpaved sections of Matanog–Barira–Buldon.

4.2 ARMM's Regional Development Plan: Medium Term Update (2013–2016)

The updated Regional Development Plan of the ARMM identified a couple of road projects critical to support social and economic development activities of the region. The projects are grouped into two based on the source of fund: (i) projects for funding by the Regional Government and (ii) projects for funding by the National Government or Official Development Assistance (Figure 4.2).

Priority projects to be funded by the ARMM are as follows:

- i.) Completion of trans-central road (Sulu),
- ii.) Jolo island circumferential road (162 km), and
- iii.) Sanga- Sanga-Saldang road (16 km).

Priority projects for funding by the National Government or Official Development Assistance (ODA) are as follows:

- i.) Lake Lanao circumferential road (118.7 km),
- ii.) Concreting of Semba-Linek-Kusiong road (25 km),
- iii.) Lumbatan-Marogong-Tubaran-Malabang road (40 km),
- iv.) Completion of Basilan circumferential road (86.2 km),
- v.) Completion of Cotabato City east diversion road (11.8 km),
- vi.) Concrete Paving of Molundo-Wao road (42 km),
- vii.) Concreting of Midsayap-Dulawan-Makar road, and
- viii.) Concrete Paving of Ganassi Tubod road (12 km).



Figure 4.1 Locations of Proposed Transitional Period Projects (1/2): Mainland Provinces



Figure 4.1 Locations of Proposed Transitional Period Projects (2/2): Island Provinces



Source: ARMM's RDP data.

Figure 4.2 Proposed Road Projects in ARMM's RDP (2013–2016)

4.3 Asian Highway (Mindanao Section)

The Asian Highway (AH) has a strong influence to the future development of the Bangsamoro as it cuts through the heart of its territory. The Asian Highway network which was initiated in 1959 is a regional transport cooperation initiative among countries in Asia and Europe and the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) aimed at enhancing the efficiency and development of the road infrastructure in Asia, supporting the development of Euro-Asia transport linkages and improving connectivity for landlocked countries.

According to ESCAP, the Asian Highway network now comprises over 141,000 km of roads passing through 32 member countries. The network extends from Tokyo in the east to Kapikule, Turkey in the west and from Torpynovka, Russian Federation, in the north, to Denpasar, Indonesia in the south. The Philippines is part of this regional cooperation where the identified route has a total length of 3,379 km that traverses from Laoag City in the north passing Metro Manila, moving further south to Bicol then to Visayas and enters Mindanao via Surigao City (Lipata) down to Davao City and continues to General Santos City before swinging back north to Cotabato City and ends at the International Port of Zamboanga City (Table 4.4 and Figure 4.3).

| Section | Total length | Surface type (km) | | Surface condition (%) | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|
| Section | (km) | Concrete | Asphalt | Gravel | Good | Fair | Poor | Bad | No rating |
| Lipata to Davao City | 398.79 | 198.96 | 199.83 | - | 42.0 | 20.9 | 27.4 | 14.3 | 32.6 |
| Davao City to Gen. Santos | 144.48 | 63.38 | 80.98 | 0.12 | 12.4 | 10.0 | 12.8 | 16.8 | 1.8 |
| Gen. Santos to Zamboanga | 513.86 | 444.51 | 54.34 | 15.02 | 20.4 | 54.7 | 51.2 | 28.1 | 27.3 |
| (Jct. Calinan) Davao City to CDO City | 292.39 | 71.32 | 221.06 | - | 25.2 | 14.3 | 8.6 | 40.8 | 38.2 |
| Total | 1,349.52 | 778.17 | 556.21 | 15.14 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

 Table 4.4 Characteristics of AH26's Sections in Mindanao

Note: Surface condition is based on 2012 Road Condition Data of DPWH

Source: Presentation of DPWH Assistant Secretary, Catalina Cabral, titled "Asian Highway (AH 26)" to UNESCO, 2013.

AH26 (route number given to the Philippines) is being developed as prime connector to other highways in neighboring countries to facilitate a smoother handling of trade and commerce in the region. To complete this connection, a dedicated sea route is necessary. Mindanao has two: port of Surigao City and port of Zamboanga City.

The entire stretch of AH26 in Mindanao is 1,349.52 km and connects the cities of Surigao, Davao, General Santos, Cotabato, Pagadian, and Zamboanga. Another branch of AH26 connects Davao City to Cagayan de Oro City. The efforts by DPWH to upgrade the AH26 to bring the network in conformity with Asian Highway classification and design standards will at the very least improve the horizontal and vertical curve of the highway linking Cotabato City to Marawi City which prevents the highway to function correctly. This highway is Bangsamoro's primary corridor. Likewise, current efforts by the DPWH on AH26 indicate that there's an intention to elevate the network to Class I. An ADB-assisted study is currently ongoing (TA-8574 PHI: Improving National Roads for Inclusive Growth in Mindanao Project) which tries to explore feasibility of widening from two-lane into four-lane the road from Lanao to Pagadian to Zamboanga. Most of these sections are part of the AH26. At present, four-lane (Class 1) sections of AH26 stands at 13.3% (Table 4.5).

| Classification | Description | Pavement type |
|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Primary | Access controlled motorway | Asphalt or cement concrete |
| Class I | 4 or more lanes highway | Asphalt or cement concrete |
| Class II | 2 lanes | Asphalt or cement concrete |
| Class III | 2 lanes (narrow) | Double bituminous treatment |

Table 4.5 Classification of Asian Highway

Source: Asian Highway Standards, ESCAP 1995.



Source: DPWH data.

Figure 4.3 Asian Highway's Section in Mindanao

4.4 Mindanao's Railway Plan

There is a wide clamor to build a Mindanao circumferential railway system, but it has not been realized due to its substantial investment requirement that puts to question its economic feasibility. Nonetheless, short run railways in high traffic areas are being seriously considered such as the Cagayan–Iligan corridor. A feasibility study on an 82.5 km railway from Cagayan de Oro to Iligan has been completed and reviewed for possible external financing.

The Mindanao Development Authority (MinDA)-initiated plan, Mindanao 2020 Peace and Development Framework Plan (2011–2030), envisions that construction of Mindanao's first railway will start by 2016 and operation will commence in 2020. Phase I is expected to run between Cagayan and Iligan with an estimated budget of PHP 57,733 million and to be financed through PPP.

Since the priority lines are outside Bangsamoro and financing and implementation plans are not yet clear, the impact of this project on the Bangsamoro development seems to be minimal. The planned railway route and stations are shown in Figure 4.4.



Source: Data from BDP1.



CHAPTER 5 DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES FOR ROAD SECTOR

The issues and challenges to overcome to establish a well-functioning road network that respond to the socio-economic development needs of Bangsamoro have been identified in the previous section. At the outset, the road network is not complete leaving wide area inaccessible. Likewise, the narrow and poor condition and alignment of Narciso Ramos Highway affects transport of agri-products from this agricultural corridor. Further, the limited operation of Polloc Port forced shippers in the Bangsamoro region to truck out their cargoes either to General Santos, Davao or Cagayan de Oro. The issues, objectives and strategies to pursue in establishing plan for the road sector are illustrated in Figure 5.1.



Figure 5.1 Development Issues, Objectives and Strategies for Road Sector

5.1 Development Objectives

The development objectives and their requirements in the road sector can be further described as follows:

(1) To supply a road network supporting peace building and poverty reduction encompassing

- Roads supporting development of MILF camps,
- Roads providing access to areas with high poverty incidence, and
- Roads facilitating easy access to services such as hospitals, government centers, and markets.

(2) To develop road network supporting agroindustry and tourism development covering

- Roads providing access to agricultural potential areas,
- Roads connecting agricultural production areas to agri-processing centers to market centers and to ports and airports, and
- Roads supporting access improvement to tourism sites.

(3) To pursue completion of the road network covering

- Roads serving as missing links in the network and can contribute to development of agroindustry and
- New roads identified as critical in the road network.

(4) To revitalize primary port and pursue road network supporting freight transport encompassing

- Roads linking ports and airports to agricultural production areas and agri-processing centers,
- Strengthening of roads linking the Bangsamoro region to alternative ports in Mindanao, and
- Roads that support strengthening of primary urban functions.

5.2 Development Strategies

5.2.1 Establishment of a road network supporting poverty alleviation

One of the development issues to be addressed in the Bangsamoro is the widespread poverty primarily caused by armed conflicts that has been part of the social landscape for decades and shortage of infrastructure supply like roads. Figure 5.2 identified the locations of municipalities having the highest poverty incidence (i.e., more than half of the population). Some of the areas experiencing extreme poverty happened to be hosting some of the missing links as shown in Figure 3.7 earlier. Elimination of these missing links coupled with program addressing the poor condition of FMRs will significantly contribute in the overall effort to alleviate poverty in the region. Thus, the following strategies should be pursued:

- Rehabilitation and strengthening of primary roads down to FMRs, particularly those located in the poverty areas to provide reliable means of transportation; and
- Exploration of the suitability of labor-based approaches to construction of FMRs and other roads, and maintenance of provincial, municipal, and FMRs to provide employment opportunities to the socially deprived.



Figure 5.2 Poverty Incidence (2012) and Present Road Network

5.2.2 Establishment of a road network for agroindustry and tourism development

One of the strategies being pursued in the plan to energize the economy of the region is the promotion of agri-industries with comparative advantage. An interview survey conducted by the agroindustry experts of the JICA Study Team revealed that efforts by the private sector to expand their investment in the Bangsamoro composed of banana, coffee and cacao are in advance stage. The locations of these newly planned plantations are indicated in Figure 5.3.



Source: Interviews by the agriculture experts of the team and various maps.



Currently, access roads of these areas identified for agroindustry development are in poor conditions, and major upgrading of existing roads as well as construction of new roads are necessary to provide reliable means of transportation. Likewise, areas along the Cotabato–Marawi road have potential to become agricultural growth area, and thus strengthening of this corridor as well as upgrading of its secondary roads (provincial, municipal and FMRs) is vital. These efforts should be extended as well to roads leading to rice paddies and cultivated lands. The following strategies therefore will be pursued:

- Strengthening of Cotabato–Marawi road to serve future growth of agriculture and agroindustry processing plants along this corridor;
- Rehabilitation of FMRs leading to rice paddies and cultivated areas. Or in cases where access roads are not present, construct new FMRs connecting to rice paddies and cultivated areas; and
- Development of tourism infrastructure along the corridor and strengthening access roads leading to tourism sites.

5.2.3 Establishment of a road network for balance development of all areas

As mention, one of the issues affecting development of the Bangsamoro region is the absent of access roads to some potential areas. This lack of roads isolates the communities and hold back development in the area. Likewise, produces by the farmers are greatly harmed by high transportation cost further aggravating the little income they could get. Further, these missing links of the network affect law enforcement. The following strategy will therefore

- Eliminate identified missing links to attain balanced development of the Bangsamoro region and
- Pursue realization of the identified new roads necessary for the whole network of Bangsamoro to function effectively.

5.2.4 Establishment of logistics corridors

(1) Definition of logistics corridors

A logistics corridor can be defined as a transport link formed to serve as major trunk route between terminals and play an important role for an effective transport of cargoes and passengers (Figure 5.4). The transport corridor often traverses a number of major urban centers and is composed of road, ports at both terminals of the link, trade facilities, major telecommunication link, power grid and alike. The terminal of a transport link is commonly composed of major urban center, sea port, inland container depot (ICD), economic zone, and other major industrial activities.

(2) Identified logistics corridors in Bangsamoro

In the Bangsamoro area, there are at least three roads that have potential to become logistics corridor and critical to strengthen to support revitalization of Polloc Port (Figure 5.5). Once the port is revitalized, the intention is not only to capture back the lost traffic to other ports but also offer a reasonable alternative to both domestic and international port cargoes produced outside the Bangsamoro region. These are: (i) Cotabato–Marawi–Iligan–Cagayan de Oro which referred as Northern Corridor (ii) Cotabato–Kidapawan–Davao which referred as Central Corridor and (iii) Cotabato–Koronadal–General Santos which referred as Southern Corridor (Figure 5.4). The Cotabato–Kabacan–Kibawe–Cagayan de Oro might serve as an alternative route for the Northern Corridor. The outline of these identified logistics corridors is presented below (see Table 5.1 for the summary).

a. Northern Corridor: This corridor traverses from central to north of Mindanao originating from Cotabato City and passing the major towns of Parang, Malabang, and the cities of Marawi, Iligan before linking up to Cagayan de Oro City. This corridor has high potential for agricultural growth due to suitability of soil and availability of large agricultural land. The road condition, however, is currently poor in terms of road surface and alignment. This road is not yet suitable for container traffic due to many sharp curves that make large cargo transport difficult.

The alternative route to the Northern Corridor is via Kabacan and Kibawe. This corridor follows the

Cotabato–Davao road before move north in the city of Kabacan to follow Sayre Highway passing the cities of Valencia and Malaybalay until it hit the city of Cagayan de Oro.

- b. **Central Corridor:** This corridor moves from west to east passing the thriving municipalities of Sultan Kudarat, Pigcawayan, Midsayap, Pikit, Kabacan, and the cities of Kidapawan and Digos. This corridor is passing through the Mindanao's largest plain and produces most of the region's rice supply. The road condition is generally good and there is an ongoing effort by DPWH to widen the road carriageway from two-lanes to four-lanes.
- c. **Southern Corridor:** This corridor links the Bangsamoro area to the flourishing city of General Santos passing the major towns of Datu Odin Sinsuat, Shariff Aguak, Esperanza, Isulan, and the cities of Tacurong and Koronadal. A newly identified site for banana and cacao plantations is along this corridor in the town of Talayan. The road condition in this corridor is generally good and efforts by DPWH for expansion from two-lane to four-lane have been ongoing for years.



Figure 5.4 Inter-city Road Network of Mindanao as Logistics Corridor

| Corridor | | Trunk road | | Dort | Airport | |
|-------------------------|------------------|------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Contaol | From | via | То | FOIL | | |
| a. Northern | Cotabato | Marawi | Cagayan de | Macabalan Port and | Laguindingan | |
| Corridor | City | Carmen | Oro City | Terminal | International Airport | |
| b. Central Corridor | Cotabato City | Kidapawan | Davao City | Sasa Port | Davao International Airport | |
| c. Southern Corridor | Cotabato City | Koronadal | Gen. Santos City | Makar Wharf | Gen. Santos International Airport | |

Note: There are three international airports in Mindanao (airports of Davao and Gen. Santos and Zamboanga); airports of Cotabato City and Cagayan de Oro city are classified as Principal Class 1



Figure 5.5 Possible Logistics Corridor for Bangsamoro

(3) Strategies for development of logistics corridors

The first strategy in developing logistics corridor is to strengthen the physical link that connects say two major urban centers (e.g., Cotabato City–Marawi City). The second strategy is promotion of the corridor as investment area (e.g., tourism area, agricultural growth corridor, and economic zone), which could be considered as further elevating the corridor into economic corridor. Accumulation of economic activities along the corridor both attracts and generates freight and passenger traffic. The success of

logistics corridor will depend on its ability to attract investments. Attracting investment, in turn, largely depends on ability to provide appropriate infrastructure and policies to facilitate movement of people and freight. Thus the following will be pursued:

- Strengthening of the three identified corridors by upgrading of pavement and widening of lane. This strategy supports strengthening of linkages among major urban areas as well as strengthening linkages between indigenous industries and export industries to ports and airports; and
- Improvement of logistics corridors by strengthening links to agricultural areas and primary processing plants.

CHAPTER 6 DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR ROAD SECTOR

6.1 Procedure for Formulation of Road Sector Development Plan

Figure 6.1 illustrates the procedure to formulate a development plan for the road sector. Both road sector issues and other development issues were considered in establishing development objectives and strategies. The proposed road network is then assembled taking into account both the development objectives and development strategies.



Figure 6.1 Procedures for Formulation of Road Sector Development Plan

6.2 **Proposed Future Road Network**

6.2.1 Procedure to develop future road network

The procedure to develop the future road network of the region (mainland provinces) is illustrated in Figure 6.2. Aside from the development issues identified in the earlier section, it is equally important to take into account distribution of urban centers and accumulation of critical infrastructure for movement of people and goods such as ports and airports. The same procedure is applied for development of future road network of island provinces. The difference is the lack of necessity to identify primary inter-city road (Step 2 in the figure) which serves as primary link of Bangsamoro to other regions in Mindanao. For island provinces, port and airport functions as the primary link to other regions.



Figure 6.2 Procedure to Develop Future Road Network of Bangsamoro

The three road functional classifications shown in Figure 6.3 are further clarified.

(1) Primary inter-city road

- A major road which serves as the primary link of the Bangsamoro region to other regions in Mindanao,
- A major road connecting at least two major urban centers and both ends of the road has a major port and airport, and
- A major road has the potential to function as logistics corridor not only for the Bangsamoro region but also for the island of Mindanao.

(2) Regional primary road

- A major road which serves as the primary link within the Bangsamoro region (intra-regional road),
- A major road connecting two primary inter-city roads, and
- A major road providing access to primary processing center (agroindustry).

(3) Regional secondary road

- A major road which functions as collector/distributor road in the road network of Bangsamoro,
- A major road connecting regional primary road and regional secondary road, and
- A major road connecting to camps, tourism sites, agricultural areas, areas with high poverty incidence, etc.

6.2.2 Primary inter-city road network in Mindanao

The urban hierarchy in Mindanao has been clarified and reflected in Table 6.1. Seven cities were classified under Tier I which gather highest score taking into account population, population growth, income class, and city category. In the Bangsamoro region, Marawi City has the highest score at 8, followed by Sultan Kudarat and Isabela City at 7.

| City | Population 2010 | Pop. change (2010/00) | Income class | Category* |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|
| Butuan City (Capital) | 309,709 | 1.18 | 1st | HUC |
| Cagayan de Oro City | 602,088 | 1.31 | 1 st | HUC |
| Cotabato City | 271,786 | 1.66 | 3rd | ICC |
| Davao City | 1,449,296 | 1.30 | 1 st | HUC |
| General Santos City | 538,086 | 1.31 | 1 st | HUC |
| Iligan City | 322,821 | 1.13 | 1st | HUC |
| Zamboanga City | 807 129 | 1 35 | 1st | HUC |

Table 6.1 Profiles of Tier I Cities

*HUC=Highly Urbanized City; ICC=Independent Component City



Source: JICA Study Team.

Figure 6.3 Primary Inter-city Road Network of Mindanao and Distribution of Towns

6.2.3 Regional primary and secondary roads

The basic concept for the development of regional primary roads and regional secondary roads are as follows (Figure 6.4):

- To form a flexible network around the Greater Cotabato City by linking three primary intercity roads that would eventually form a ring road;
- To form a flexible network around Marawi City by linking two primary inter-city roads and a regional secondary road to support systematic urban expansion by providing a bypass trunk road;
- To form an alternative routes from Cotabato City to General Santos City and Marawi City; and
- To strengthen the Cotabato-Marawi logistics corridor by providing bypass road around Parang Municipality which in turn would strengthen access to Polloc Port.

6.2.4 Proposed road network for Bangsamoro

The proposed road network for the Bangsamoro region is shown in Figure 6.5 for the mainland provinces and Figure 6.6 for the island provinces. Figure 6.7 and Figure 6.8 show the locations of missing links and new roads necessary to construct to realize the proposed network. Likewise, Figure 6.9 clarifies the resources of Bangsamoro that will be opened up if the proposed projects are pursued.



Figure 6.4 Basic Concept of Regional Primary Roads and Secondary Roads



Figure 6.5 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Mainland Provinces



Figure 6.6 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Island Provinces



Figure 6.7 Existing Condition of Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Mainland Provinces



Figure 6.8 Existing Condition of Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network: Island Provinces



Figure 6.9 Proposed Bangsamoro Road Network with Region's Resources

6.3 **Project Identification**

6.3.1 Project identification criteria

Typical measures to usual issues and problems often observed in a road network are presented in Table 6.2. The measures are classified into (i) road network improvement, (ii) road capacity enhancement, (iii) road rehabilitation, and (iv) road surface upgrading.

| Road sector current issues | Measures |
|--|---|
| 1. Poor/Incomplete Road Network | 1. Road network improvement |
| 1.1 Missing links | 1.1 Construction of new road |
| 1.2 Lack of bridge connection | 1.2 Construction of new bridge |
| 1.3 Poor road alignment | 1.3 Road alignment improvement |
| 2. Insufficient road capacity (traffic congestion/ | 2. Road capacity improvement |
| traffic bottleneck) | 2.1 (a) Widening of existing roads |
| 2.1 Traffic congestion | 2.1 (b) Construction of bypass |
| | 2.1 (c) Segregation of through traffic from local traffic |
| 3. Road in poor condition | 3. Road rehabilitation |
| 4.1 Deterioration of paved road surface | 4.1 Pavement rehabilitation |
| 4. Road in gravel surface | 4. Road surface upgrading |
| 4.1 National/Provincial road in gravel surface | 4.1 Upgrade road surface into paved surface |

| fable 6.2 Genera | l Measures to | Road Sector Issues |
|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|
|------------------|---------------|---------------------------|

Table 6.2 is used to establish criteria to identify potential road projects to ensure a systematic way of selecting projects. Based on the above table, the project identification criteria were established as illustrated in Figure 6.10. The five types of project are: (i) surface upgrading, (ii) pavement rehabilitation, (iii) elimination of missing links, (iv) road widening and (v) construction of bypass/ring road.



Figure 6.10 Project Identification Criteria

6.3.2 Identified projects

About 1,271 km of roads is involved in the identified projects. The locations of these projects are presented in Figure 6.11 for the mainland provinces and Figure 6.12 for the island provinces. Another group of roads with a total length of 129 km outside of Bangsamoro (in the provinces of Lanao del Norte, North Cotabato, and Sultan Kudarat) was also identified as important project to complete the missing links originating from the Bangsamoro region (Figure 6.13).



Figure 6.11 Locations of Identified Projects: Mainland Provinces



Figure 6.12 Locations of Identified Projects: Island Provinces



Figure 6.13 Locations of Missing Links outside Bangsamoro Region

The identified projects are grouped into five to fit into the regional development plan. The grouping is as follows: (1) Artery Roads Upgrading Project, (2) Missing Links Development Project, (3) Corridor Development Project, (4) Corridor Link Roads Improvement Project, and (5) Ring Roads/Bypass Roads Development Project.

The Corridor Development Project involved upgrading of 262 km of road inside the Bangsamoro and 292 km in the neighboring regions to complete the proposed three economic corridors. The combined length is about 700 km, of which 21% (144 km) have four lanes or more.

| | INSIDE BANGSAMORO | | | | | OUTSIDE BANGSAMORO | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|---|
| | | T | ype of Wo | ks (kn | n) | | | Туре | of Worl | ks (km |) | | |
| Project Type | Road Length (Km) | New Construction | Surface Upgrading | Rehabilitation | Reconstruction | Total Length to be improved | Road Length (Km) | New Construction | Surface Upgrading | Rehabilitation | Reconstruction | Total Length to be improved | Grand Total for Road to be improved (km) |
| a. Bangsamoro Regional Artery Roads Upgrading Project | 250.2 | 79.4 | 93.9 | - | 7.5 | 180.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 180.8 |
| b. Missing Links Development Project | 168.8 | 136.4 | 23.8 | - | 8.5 | 168.8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 168.8 |
| c. Bangsamoro Corridor Development Project | 267.6 | - | - | - | 13.7 | 13.7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13.7 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads Improvement Project | 692.1 | 93.2 | 478.3 | - | 120.5 | 692.1 | 168.4 | 120.3 | 23.8 | - | - | 144.1 | 836.2 |
| e. Ring Roads/Bypass Roads Development Project | 69.9 | 41.2 | 19.6 | - | 2.5 | 63.3 | 9.1 | - | 9.1 | - | - | 9.1 | 72.4 |
| `Total | 1,448.5 | 350.2 | 615.7 | - | 152.7 | 1,118.6 | 177.6 | 120.3 | 32.9 | - | - | 153.2 | 1,271.8 |

 Table 6.3 Summary of Identified Projects and Type of Improvement Works

6.3.3 Approach to FMRs

The dominant industry in the region is agri-fishery, and thus the road sector should be planned in a way that it supports the agri-fishery industry. This can be done by adopting a new approach in road development in which whenever a national road or provincial road or other type of trunk roads is planned, FMR improvement is included in the project. Labor-based road rehabilitation and maintenance technology should be pursued.

The master plan has identified 80 road projects, and during the project preparation, improvement of FMRs should be included in the scope of work to ensure their inclusion in the feasibility study (FS). The results of FS indicate the specific FMR to be improved in each road project. Figure 6.14 is an example (output) of an FS that included FMRs in the scope of work. In the two road projects implemented in the JICA study (2010), it was observed that for every 10 km trunk road, the length of FMRs to be improved was about 8 km. This is roughly 45% of all the roads linked to the trunk road (and 55% to unproductive areas or in some cases already funded). Assuming that every 10 km of a trunk road has 8 km of FMRs, the estimated length of FMRs to be improved is about 884 km. This ratio should be revised if new figures appear as more feasibility studies are undertaken. Table 6.4 indicates estimated lengths of FMRs for improvement by province.

Table 6.4 Estimated Length and Construction Cost of FMRs to Be Improved per Province

| Province | Road length (km) | Road to improve (km) | Estimated length of FMR | Construction cost (PHP) | Engineering services (PHP) | Total cost (PHP) |
|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Lanao | 325.4 | 138.6 | 110.9 | 1,716,682,464 | 240,335,545 | 1,957,018,009 |
| Maguindanao | 515.2 | 375.3 | 300.2 | 4,647,479,904 | 650,647,186 | 5,298,127,090 |
| Basilan | 228.1 | 228.1 | 182.5 | 2,825,000,928 | 395,500,130 | 3,220,501,058 |
| Sulu | 201.9 | 201.9 | 161.5 | 2,499,883,776 | 349,983,729 | 2,849,867,505 |
| Tawi-Tawi | 178.0 | 161.1 | 128.9 | 1,994,690,880 | 279,256,723 | 2,273,947,603 |
| Total | 1,448.5 | 1,105.0 | 884.0 | 13,683,737,952 | 1,915,723,313 | 15,599,461,265 |



Note: FMRs in pink = recommended for improvement; FMRs in brown = not recommended for improvement Source: The Study on Infrastructure (Road Network) Development Plan for the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM), JICA, 2010.

Figure 6.14 Example of FS of Two Provincial Roads Which Includes FMRs

The average construction cost for an FMR in the ARMM by the Department of Agriculture's Philippine Rural Development Project is PHP 11.5 million/km. Using this figure as a basis, the total construction cost (including direct, overhead, profit, contingency, and VAT) of the 884 km FMRs is about PHP 13.68 billion. Engineering services such as FS, detailed design, and supervision are assumed to be undertaken during the improvement plan for the main trunk road to which these FMRs are connected. If the engineering services are undertaken separately, estimated cost for the 884 km is about PHP 1.92 billion, which would bring the total cost to PHP 15.60 billion.

Taking into account the importance of peace-building and job-creation, which demand immediate attention after combatants return to civilian life, labor-based road construction and maintenance methods should be applied to FMRs works. JICA has recently completed two-pilot projects in the municipalities of Sultan Mastura (Maguindanao) and Matungao (Lanao del Norte) using such labor-based technology. The two projects were successful and useful examples for future projects involving the labor-based technology. From this experience, *Basic Manual for Road Rehabilitation and Maintenance by Labor-Based Technology* was produced. In this manual, the technology is defined as "the construction technology utilizing the participation of the community as labor force supplemented with light equipment such as compactors to ensure the quality of construction works". The manual established correct procedure in terms of (i) road standards (ii) construction methodology, (iii) work supervision and monitoring, (iv) community organization for its involvement, and (v) other important aspects of construction works. It is envisioned that a considerable portion of work force would come from the community and combatants under the overall supervision of a municipal engineer.



Source: Basic Manual for Road Rehabilitation and Maintenance by Labor-Based Technology, JICA, 2015

Figure 6.15 FMR Rehabilitation in Sultan Mastura of Maguindanao Using Labor-based Technology

6.4 Standard Design

6.4.1 Design standard

The minimum design standard for DPWH-National roads, which defines highways by traffic volume, is presented in Table 6.5. In the present study, the recommended design standard to each road class is as follows:

| Road class | AADT Range |
|-------------------------|-------------|
| Primary Inter-city Road | > 2,000 |
| Regional Primary Road | 1,000-2,000 |
| Regional Secondary Road | 400-1,000 |

6.4.2 **Proposed typical cross sections**

The proposed typical road sections by road class and work type are presented in Figure 6.16 through 6.19, which are as follows:

- Proposed Typical Cross Section for New Road Construction (Figure 6.16),
- Proposed Typical Cross Section for Road Surface Upgrading–Gravel/Earth Road to PCC Paved Road (Figure 6.17),
- Proposed Typical Cross Section for Rehabilitation of Existing PCC Paved Road assuming 30% for re-blocking with overly 50 mm (Figure 6.18), and
- Proposed Typical Cross Section for Reconstruction of Existing PCC Paved Road assuming base failure and PCC 230 mm (Figure 6.19).

6.5 **Project Cost Estimate**

6.5.1 DWPH funded projects 2015

Identified projects with funding from the 2015 budget of DPWH are removed from the list if the entire section is covered by the available budget. If not, section without fund is included in the list.

6.5.2 Construction cost estimate

Based on the Cost Estimates for Work Item of Projects by DPWH (as of February 2014), road construction cost per km of road and type of work were estimated as shown in Table 6.6.
| | | | 400- | 1000 | 1000- | -2000 | > 2 | 000 |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Av. daily traffic on opening | < 200 | 200-400 | Minimum | Desirable | Minimum | Desirable | Minimum | Desirable |
| Design speed (km/h) | - | | - | | • | | - | |
| Flat topography | 60 | 70 | 70 | 90 | 80 | 95 | 90 | 100 |
| Rolling topography | 40 | 50 | 60 | 80 | 60 | 80 | 70 | 90 |
| Mountainous topography | 30 | 40 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 60 | 60 | 70 |
| Radius (m) | | | | | | | | |
| Flat topography | 120 | 160 | 160 | 280 | 220 | 320 | 260 | 350 |
| Rolling topography | 55 | 85 | 120 | 220 | 120 | 220 | 160 | 280 |
| Mountainous topography | 30 | 50 | 50 | 80 | 80 | 120 | 180 | 160 |
| Grade (%) | | | | | | | | |
| Flat topography | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 |
| Rolling topography | 8.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 |
| Mountainous topography | 10.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 6.0 | 7.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| Pavement width (m) | 4.0 | 5.5; 6.0 | 6.10 | | 6.70 | | 6.70 | 7.30 |
| Shoulder width (m) | 0.50 | 1.00 | 1.50 | 2.00 | 2.50 | 3.00 | 3. | 00 |
| Right-of-way width (m) | 20 | 30 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Super elevation (m/m) | 0.10 | (max) | 0.10 | (max) | 0.10 | (max) | 0.10 | (max) |
| Non-passing sight distance (| m) | | | | | | | |
| Flat topography | 70 | 90 | 90 | 135 | 115 | 150 | 135 | 160 |
| Rolling topography | 40 | 60 | 70 | 115 | 70 | 115 | 90 | 135 |
| Mountainous topography | 40 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 70 | 70 | 90 |
| Passing sight distance (m) | | | | | | | | |
| Flat topography | 420 | 490 | 490 | 615 | 560 | 645 | 615 | 675 |
| Rolling topography | 270 | 350 | 420 | 560 | 420 | 560 | 490 | 615 |
| Mountainous topography | 190 | 270 | 270 | 350 | 360 | 420 | 420 | 490 |
| Type of surfacing | Gravel, cru | shed | Bituminous | s macadam | Bituminous | s concrete | Bituminous | s concrete |
| | gravel, or c | rushed | pavement, | dense or | surface cou | irse | surface cou | irse, |
| | stone bit, p | reservative | open grade | d plant mix | | | portland ce | ment |
| | treatment, s | single or | surface cou | irse, bitu- | | | concrete pa | vement |
| | double bit, | surface | minous cor | crete sur- | | | | |
| | treatment, l | bituminous | face course | | | | | |
| macadam pavemen | | avement | | | | | | |
| Road Class | | | Proposed S | tandard for | Proposed S | tandard for | Proposed S | tandard for |
| | | | Regional S | econdary | Regional P | rimary | Primary Int | er-city |
| | | | Road | - | Road | - | Road | - |

Table 6.5 Minimum Design Standard of Philippine Highways

Source: Design Guidelines, Criteria and Standards, Bureau of Design, DPWH.

6.5.3 Engineering cost

Engineering cost was estimated based on the past experiences as shown below:

- Feasibility study (2% of construction cost),
- Detailed design (4% of construction cost), and
- Construction supervision (8% of construction cost).

6.5.4 Cost of ROW acquisition and resettlement of affected families

The cost of right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and resettlement of affected families was estimated based on experiences by DPWH-ARMM and DPWH Region XII. The unit price is between PHP 150 and 200 per m². For planning purposes, the upper bracket is adopted:

- Unit price of ROW acquisition and resettlement of affected families: PHP 200 per m²
- Width of ROW to be acquired: 30 m

The unit cost per km for ROW acquisition and resettlement of affected families is, therefore, set at PHP 6.0 million per km.



Figure 6.16 Proposed Typical Cross Section for New Road Construction



Figure 6.17 Proposed Typical Cross Section for Road Surface Upgrading (Gravel/Earth Road to PCC Paved Road)





and crack sealing

Figure 6.18 Proposed Typical Cross Section for Rehabilitation of Existing PCC Paved Roads





(Assumption: Base failure and PCC 230mm)

Figure 6.19 Proposed Typical Cross Section for Reconstruction of Existing PCC Paved Roads

| | | | | | | | | Cost | per Km | | | (| | |
|--|---------------|---------|----------------|---------------|----------|------------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|-------|-------------------|--|--------|
| | Deed | | | | Construc | tion Cost | | | Engir | eering Ser | vices | Land Acqui- | | |
| Case | Road Class | Area | Direct Cost | Over- head | Profit | Contin- gency | VAT | Sub-Total | F/S | D/D | S/V | sition, Compe- | Sub-Total | Total |
| | | | Total | 6.00% | 6.00% | 5.00% | 12.00% | | 2.00% | 4.00% | 8.00% | nsation | Sub-Total 10,650 10,515 10,657 11,193 10,269 10,144 10,558 10,766 9,9576 9,972 9,9819 9,992 2,709 2,859 2,2859 2,2911 2,395 2,663 2,2911 2,663 2,2444 2,2688 2,395 3,3622 2,2444 2,2522 2,3651 3,3624 2,2722 2,3653 3,3634 2,7722 2,995 3,3130 | |
| | | Urban | 25,750 | 1,545 | 1,545 | 1,288 | 3,090 | 33,218 | 664 | 1,329 | 2,657 | 6,000 | 10,650 | 43,868 |
| | Primary | Flat | 25,000 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,250 | 3,000 | 32,250 | 645 | 1,290 | 2,580 | 6,000 | 10,515 | 42,765 |
| | Road | Rolling | 27,500 | 1,650 | 1,650 | 1,375 | 3,300 | 35,475 | 710 | 1,419 | 2,838 | 6,000 | 10,967 | 46,442 |
| | | Mt. | 28,750 | 1,725 | 1,725 | 1,438 | 3,450 | 37,088 | 742 | 1,484 | 2,967 | 6,000 | 11,193 | 48,281 |
| | | Urban | 23,635 | 1,418 | 1,418 | 1,182 | 2,836 | 30,489 | 610 | 1,220 | 2,439 | 6,000 | 10,269 | 40,758 |
| New | Regional | Flat | 22,946 | 1,377 | 1,377 | 1,147 | 2,754 | 29,601 | 592 | 1,184 | 2,368 | 6,000 | 10,144 | 39,745 |
| Construction | Road | Rolling | 25,241 | 1,514 | 1,514 | 1,262 | 3,029 | 32,560 | 651 | 1,302 | 2,605 | 6,000 | 10,558 | 43,118 |
| | | Mt. | 26,388 | 1,583 | 1,583 | 1,319 | 3,167 | 34,040 | 681 | 1,362 | 2,723 | 6,000 | 10,766 | 44,806 |
| | | Urban | 19,800 | 1,188 | 1,188 | 990 | 2,376 | 25,542 | 511 | 1,022 | 2,043 | 6,000 | 9,576 | 35,118 |
| | Regional | Flat | 19,223 | 1,153 | 1,153 | 961 | 2,307 | 24,797 | 496 | 992 | 1,984 | 6,000 | 9,472 | 34,269 |
| | Road | Rolling | 21,145 | 1,269 | 1,269 | 1,057 | 2,537 | 27,277 | 546 | 1,091 | 2,182 | 6,000 | 9,819 | 37,096 |
| | | Mt. | 22,106 | 1,326 | 1,326 | 1,105 | 2,653 | 28,516 | 570 | 1,141 | 2,281 | 6,000 | 9,992 | 38,508 |
| | Primary | Flat | 17,500 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 875 | 2,100 | 22,575 | 0 | 903 | 1,806 | 0 | 2,709 | 25,284 |
| | Inter-City | Rolling | 19,250 | 1,155 | 1,155 | 963 | 2,310 | 24,833 | 0 | 993 | 1,987 | 0 | 2,980 | 27,813 |
| Road Surface | Road | Mt. | 20,125 | 1,208 | 1,208 | 1,006 | 2,415 | 25,962 | 0 | 1,038 | 2,077 | 0 | 3,115 | 29,077 |
| Upgrading | Regional | Flat | 16,062 | 964 | 964 | 803 | 1,927 | 20,720 | 0 | 829 | 1,658 | 0 | 2,487 | 23,207 |
| (Gravel/Earth surface to | Primary | Rolling | 17,669 | 1,060 | 1,060 | 883 | 2,120 | 22,792 | 0 | 912 | 1,823 | 0 | 2,735 | 25,527 |
| Gravel/Earth Surface to Concrete Surface) | Road | Mt. | 18,472 | 1,108 | 1,108 | 924 | 2,217 | 23,829 | 0 | 953 | 1,906 | 0 | 2,859 | 26,688 |
| surface) | Regional | Flat | 13,456 | 807 | 807 | 673 | 1,615 | 17,358 | 0 | 694 | 1,389 | 0 | 2,083 | 19,441 |
| | Secondary | Rolling | 14,802 | 888 | 888 | 740 | 1,776 | 19,094 | 0 | 764 | 1,527 | 0 | 2,291 | 21,385 |
| | Road | Mt. | 15,475 | 928 | 928 | 774 | 1,857 | 19,962 | 0 | 798 | 1,597 | 0 | 2,395 | 22,357 |
| | Primary | Flat | 17,200 | 1,032 | 1,032 | 860 | 2,064 | 22,188 | 0 | 888 | 1,775 | 0 | 2,663 | 24,851 |
| | Inter-City | Rolling | 18,920 | 1,135 | 1,135 | 946 | 2,270 | 24,406 | 0 | 976 | 1,952 | 0 | 2,928 | 27,334 |
| Rehabilitation of | Road | Mt. | 19,780 | 1,187 | 1,187 | 989 | 2,374 | 25,517 | 0 | 1,021 | 2,041 | 0 | 3,062 | 28,579 |
| Paved Road | Regional | Flat | 15,787 | 947 | 947 | 789 | 1,894 | 20,364 | 0 | 815 | 1,629 | 0 | 2,444 | 22,808 |
| (Assumption: | Primary | Rolling | 17,366 | 1,042 | 1,042 | 868 | 2,084 | 22,402 | 0 | 896 | 1,792 | 0 | 2,688 | 25,090 |
| 30% for | Road | Mt. | 18,155 | 1,089 | 1,089 | 908 | 2,179 | 23,420 | 0 | 937 | 1,874 | 0 | 2,811 | 26,231 |
| overly 50mm) | Regional | Flat | 13,225 | 794 | 794 | 661 | 1,587 | 17,061 | 0 | 682 | 1,365 | 0 | 2,047 | 19,108 |
| | Secondary | Rolling | 14,548 | 873 | 873 | 727 | 1,746 | 18,767 | 0 | 751 | 1,501 | 0 | 2,252 | 21,019 |
| | Road | Mt. | 15,209 | 913 | 913 | 760 | 1,825 | 19,620 | 0 | 785 | 1,570 | 0 | 2,355 | 21,975 |
| | Primary | Flat | 17,500 | 1,050 | 1,050 | 875 | 2,100 | 22,575 | 452 | 903 | 1,806 | 0 | 3,161 | 25,736 |
| | Inter-City | Rolling | 19,250 | 1,155 | 1,155 | 963 | 2,310 | 24,833 | 497 | 993 | 1,987 | 0 | 3,477 | 28,310 |
| Reconstruction of Existing PCC Paved Road (Assumption | Road | Mt. | 20,125 | 1,208 | 1,208 | 1,006 | 2,415 | 25,962 | 519 | 1,038 | 2,077 | 0 | 3,634 | 29,596 |
| | Regional | Flat | 15,072 | 904 | 904 | 754 | 1,809 | 19,443 | 389 | 778 | 1,555 | 0 | 2,722 | 22,165 |
| | Primary | Rolling | 16,579 | 995 | 995 | 829 | 1,990 | 21,388 | 428 | 856 | 1,711 | 0 | 2,995 | 24,383 |
| with base failure and PCC | Road | Mt. | 17,333 | 1,040 | 1,040 | 867 | 2,080 | 22,360 | 447 | 894 | 1,789 | 0 | 3,130 | 25,490 |
| 230mm) | Regional | Flat | 15,072 | 904 | 904 | 754 | 1,809 | 19,443 | 389 | 778 | 1,555 | 0 | 2,722 | 22,165 |
| | Secondary | Rolling | 16,579 | 995 | 995 | 829 | 1,990 | 21,388 | 428 | 856 | 1,711 | 0 | 2,995 | 24,383 |
| | Road | Mt. | 17,333 | 1,040 | 1,040 | 867 | 2,080 | 22,360 | 447 | 894 | 1,789 | 0 | 3,130 | 25,490 |

Table 6.6 Road Construction Cost

(Unit: PHP 1,000)

Note: Rolling terrain = cost factor of 10%; Mountainous terrain = cost factor of 15%

Source: DPWH's Cost Estimates for Work Item of Projects (as of February 2014).

6.5.5 Estimated cost of identified projects

The estimated cost for identified road projects is about PHP 38.93 billion as indicated in Table 6.7. Projects are classified as follows with their corresponding cost:

- a. Cost estimates for Bangsamoro Regional Artery Roads Upgrading Project (Table 6.8),
- b. Cost estimates for Missing Links Development Project (Table 6.9),
- c. Cost estimates Bangsamoro Corridor Development Project (Table 6.10),
- d. Cost estimates for Corridor Link Roads Improvement Project (Table 6.11 through Table 6.14), and
- e. Cost estimates for Ring Roads/Bypass Roads Development Project (Table 6.15)

The estimated cost for projects outside of the Bangsamoro is provided in Table 6.16. The estimated cost is about PHP 6.20 billion.

| | _ | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | gineering S | ervices | | |
|--|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | . , | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| a. Bangsamoro Regional Artery Roads Upgrading Project | 250.2 | 79.4 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 6723.4 | 134.5 | 268.9 | 537.9 | 476.3 | 8141.0 |
| b. Missing Links Development Project | 168.8 | 136.4 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 5436.8 | 108.7 | 217.5 | 434.9 | 818.5 | 7016.4 |
| c. Bangsamoro Corridor Development Project | 267.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 332.8 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 372.8 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads Improvement Project | 692.1 | 93.2 | 478.3 | 0.0 | 120.5 | 16847.9 | 337.0 | 673.9 | 1347.8 | 559.3 | 19765.9 |
| Ring Roads/Bypass Roads Development roject | 69.9 | 41.2 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2809.4 | 56.2 | 112.4 | 224.8 | 247.3 | 3632.2 |
| Total | 1448.5 | 350.2 | 615.7 | 0.0 | 152.7 | 32150.3 | 636.3 | 1286.0 | 2572.0 | 2101.4 | 38928.3 |

Table 6.7 Cost Summary of Identified Projects

Table 6.8 Cost Estimate for Bangsamoro Regional Artery Road Upgrading Projects

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|---------------------------|-------|--|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | RA-L1 | Malundo- Bumbaran-Wao Rd | RPR | 69.7 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 693.1 | 13.9 | 27.7 | 55.4 | 0.0 | 790.1 |
| a. Bangsamoro | RA-M1 | Parang-Buldon- Barira-Butig- Lumbayanague Rd. | RPR | 25.6 | 17.1 | 8.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 972.0 | 19.4 | 38.9 | 77.8 | 102.4 | 1210.5 |
| | RA-M2 | Matanog-Barira- Alamada-Libungan Rd | RPR | 21.2 | 21.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 912.4 | 18.2 | 36.5 | 73.0 | 127.0 | 1167.1 |
| | RA-M3 | Pagalungan- Mamasapano- Sharief Aguak Rd | RPR | 43.8 | 17.4 | 26.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1416.5 | 28.3 | 56.7 | 113.3 | 104.2 | 1719.0 |
| Artery Roads Upgrading | RA-T1 | Biraddali-Parangan Road | RSR | 26.0 | 0.0 | 22.8 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 1206.0 | 24.1 | 48.2 | 96.5 | 0.0 | 1374.9 |
| Project | RA-T2 | Languyan Coastal Road | RSR | 23.8 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 916.5 | 18.3 | 36.7 | 73.3 | 142.8 | 1187.6 |
| | RA-T3 | Kamagong Road | RSR | 5.9 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 147.5 | 2.9 | 5.9 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 168.1 |
| | RA-T4 | Seratang-Dungon Road | RSR | 11.3 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 300.2 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 342.3 |
| F | | Lapid-Lapid-Batu- Batu Road | RPR | 9.3 | 0.0 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 159.1 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 12.7 | 0.0 | 181.4 |
| | RA-T5 | Sanga-Sanga- Lapid-Lapid Road | RPR | 13.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| | | Sub-total | | 250.2 | 79.4 | 93.9 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 6723.4 | 134.5 | 268.9 | 537.9 | 476.3 | 8141.0 |

Note: RPR=Regional Primary Road; RSR=Regional Secondary Road

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|------------------------------------|-------|--|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | ML-M1 | Parang-Balabagan Road | RSR | 23.6 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 809.3 | 16.2 | 32.4 | 64.7 | 105.5 | 1028.1 |
| | ML-B1 | Sta. Clara- Tumahubong- Sumisip Road | RSR | 38.5 | 38.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1482.6 | 29.7 | 59.3 | 118.6 | 231.0 | 1921.1 |
| b. Missing Links Development | ML-B2 | Kamanggaan- Tumahubong- Sumisip Road | RSR | 20.4 | 20.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 785.6 | 15.7 | 31.4 | 62.8 | 122.4 | 1018.0 |
| Project | ML-T1 | Dungon-Parangan Road | RSR | 42.0 | 42.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1617.4 | 32.3 | 64.7 | 129.4 | 252.0 | 2095.8 |
| - - - | ML-T2 | Batu-Batu-Dungon Road | RSR | 40.8 | 14.4 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 610.3 | 12.2 | 24.4 | 48.8 | 86.3 | 782.0 |
| | ML-T3 | New Port Access Road | RSR | 3.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 131.7 | 2.6 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 21.3 | 171.4 |
| | | Sub-total | | 168.8 | 136.4 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 8.5 | 5436.8 | 108.7 | 217.5 | 434.9 | 818.5 | 7016.4 |

 Table 6.9 Cost Estimate for Missing Links Development Projects

Note: ML=Missing link

| Table 6.10 Cost Estimate f | or Bangsamoro Co | orridor Development | Projects |
|----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | | | |

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|--|------|--|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-----|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| c. Bangsamoro Corridor (Development Project (| CD-N | Cotabato-Marawi- Iligan-Cagayan de Oro | PICR | 157.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 323.1 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 25.8 | 0.0 | 361.8 |
| | CD-C | Cotabato- Kidapawan-Digos- Davao | PICR | 31.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 8.2 |
| | CD-S | Cotabato- Koronadal-Gen. Santos | PICR | 74.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 2.7 |
| | | Sub-total | | 262.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.7 | 332.8 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 26.6 | 0.0 | 372.8 |

Note: CD-N=Corridor Development (Northern Corridor); CD-C=Corridor Development (Central Corridor); CD-S=Corridor Development (Southern Corridor)

| Table 6.11 Cost Estimate for | Corridor Link Roads | Improvement Projects | (1/4): Lanao |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Tuble 0.11 Cost Estimate for | Corrigor Link Roads | improvement i rojects | |

| | | | | | | Type of V | /orks | | | Enç | gineering S | ervices | | |
|---|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | CL-L1 | Marawi-Kapai Road | RSR | 17.4 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 388.0 | 7.8 | 15.5 | 31.0 | 0.0 | 442.3 |
| | CL-L2 | Madalum Road | RSR | 7.4 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 165.4 | 3.3 | 6.6 | 13.2 | 0.0 | 188.6 |
| | CL-L3 | Ganassi-Tubud Road | RSR | 11.4 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 252.9 | 5.1 | 10.1 | 20.2 | 0.0 | 288.3 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads Improvement Project | CL-L4 | Malabang-Lumba- Caunayan Road | RSR | 27.6 | 0.0 | 12.9 | 0.0 | 14.7 | 972.7 | 19.5 | 38.9 | 77.8 | 0.0 | 1108.8 |
| Project . | CL-L5 | Piagapo-Marantao- Balindong Road | RSR | 17.4 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 14.9 | 385.9 | 7.7 | 15.4 | 30.9 | 0.0 | 439.9 |
| | | Makir-Sibutu Road | RSR | 14.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 313.0 | 6.3 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 356.8 |

Note: CL-L=Corridor link Lanao

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Enç | jineering S | ervices | | |
|---------------------------|---------|--|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | | Sibutu-Blensong- Nuro Road | RSR | 14.0 | 0.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 313.0 | 6.3 | 12.5 | 25.0 | 0.0 | 356.8 |
| | CL-M1 | Nuro-Pinansaran Road | RSR | 10.5 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 404.7 | 8.1 | 16.2 | 32.4 | 63.1 | 524.4 |
| | CL-M2 | Ramongaob- Pandan-Pilar-Itao San Jose Road | RSR | 15.6 | 0.0 | 15.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 347.6 | 7.0 | 13.9 | 27.8 | 0.0 | 396.3 |
| | | Lipongo-Sayap- Ahan Road | RSR | 18.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 18.9 | 419.4 | 8.4 | 16.8 | 33.5 | 0.0 | 478.1 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads | CL-M3 | Maganoy-Lebak Road | RSR | 24.4 | 12.5 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 747.2 | 14.9 | 29.9 | 59.8 | 75.1 | 926.8 |
| Project | CL-M4 | Ganta-Gambar Libungan Road | RSR | 12.3 | 2.5 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 316.3 | 6.3 | 12.7 | 25.3 | 15.2 | 375.8 |
| | CE-INI4 | Tabiran-Ganta Road | RSR | 16.2 | 0.0 | 16.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 362.0 | 7.2 | 14.5 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 412.6 |
| | CL M5 | Ligawasan Road | RSR | 44.5 | 17.7 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1126.6 | 22.5 | 45.1 | 90.1 | 106.0 | 1390.3 |
| - | CE-INIJ | Alip-Lumoyon Road | RSR | 7.2 | 0.0 | 7.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 139.2 | 2.8 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 0.0 | 158.7 |
| | CL-M6 | Tamontaka-Tapian Road | RSR | 13.0 | 0.0 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 290.6 | 5.8 | 11.6 | 23.3 | 0.0 | 331.3 |
| | CL-M7 | Tapian-Lebak Coastal Road | RSR | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1925.4 | 38.5 | 77.0 | 154.0 | 300.0 | 2495.0 |

Table 6.12 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (2/4): Maguindanao

Note: CL-M=Corridor link Maguindanao

Table 6.13 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (3/4): Basilan

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|---------------------------|-------|---|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | CL-B1 | Sumagdang- Kumalarang Road | RSR | 7.9 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 175.3 | 3.5 | 7.0 | 14.0 | 0.0 | 199.9 |
| | | Kumalarang- Pangasaan Road | RSR | 29.8 | 0.0 | 28.3 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 664.8 | 13.3 | 26.6 | 53.2 | 0.0 | 757.9 |
| | | Kumalarang- Lumbang Road | RSR | 4.7 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 105.6 | 2.1 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 120.4 |
| | CL-B2 | Lumbang- Mahayhay Road | RSR | 26.8 | 0.0 | 24.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 598.6 | 12.0 | 23.9 | 47.9 | 0.0 | 682.4 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads | CL-B3 | Baluno-Balas Coastal Road | RSR | 19.4 | 0.0 | 18.4 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 432.4 | 8.6 | 17.3 | 34.6 | 0.0 | 492.9 |
| Improvement Project | CL-B4 | Kulay Bato- Tuburan Proper Road | RSR | 18.1 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 403.8 | 8.1 | 16.2 | 32.3 | 0.0 | 460.4 |
| | | Lamitan-Tuburan Road | RSR | 16.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 16.3 | 361.3 | 7.2 | 14.5 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 411.9 |
| | | Parangbasak- Guinanta Road | RSR | 12.3 | 0.0 | 6.3 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 267.3 | 5.3 | 10.7 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 304.7 |
| | CL-B5 | Tipo-Tipo-Al Barka Circumferential Road | RSR | 10.4 | 0.0 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 223.9 | 4.5 | 9.0 | 17.9 | 0.0 | 255.3 |
| | CL-B6 | Kanas-Baiwas Road | RSR | 21.3 | 0.0 | 21.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 475.3 | 9.5 | 19.0 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 541.8 |

Note: CL-B=Corridor link Basilan

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|---------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|-------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | Road Length (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | CL-S1 | Jolo-Silangkan Road | RSR | 18.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.0 | 6.6 | 390.1 | 7.8 | 15.6 | 31.2 | 0.0 | 444.7 |
| | CL-S2 | Mampallam-Jolo Road | RSR | 7.8 | 0.0 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 167.3 | 3.3 | 6.7 | 13.4 | 0.0 | 190.7 |
| | CL-S3 | Silangkan Pob Indanan Road | RSR | 9.6 | 0.0 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 205.3 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 16.4 | 0.0 | 234.0 |
| | CL-S4 | Parang-Talipao Road | RSR | 25.4 | 0.0 | 25.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 493.8 | 9.9 | 19.8 | 39.5 | 0.0 | 562.9 |
| | CL-S5 | Patao-Kabungkol Road | RSR | 19.0 | 0.0 | 19.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 369.4 | 7.4 | 14.8 | 29.6 | 0.0 | 421.1 |
| | CL-S6 | Bilaan-Panglima Estino Road | RSR | 4.3 | 0.0 | 4.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 92.0 | 1.8 | 3.7 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 104.8 |
| | CL-S7 | Kabungkol-Kulay- Kulay Road | RSR | 10.4 | 0.0 | 10.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 221.5 | 4.4 | 8.9 | 17.7 | 0.0 | 252.6 |
| | | Seit-Tayuagan- Camp Andres Road | RSR | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 52.4 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 59.8 |
| | CL-S8 | Punay-Seit Road | RSR | 5.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 97.2 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 7.8 | 0.0 | 110.8 |
| | CL-S9 | Kulay Kulay- Karungdong Road | RSR | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 128.3 | 2.6 | 5.1 | 10.3 | 0.0 | 146.3 |
| d. Corridor Link Roads | CL-S10 | Karungdong- Pitogo Road | RSR | 5.3 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 113.3 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 129.2 |
| Project | CL-S11 | Pitogo-Niyog Niyog Road | RSR | 6.4 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 137.4 | 2.7 | 5.5 | 11.0 | 0.0 | 156.6 |
| | CL-S12 | Karungdong-Niyog Niyog Road | RSR | 9.2 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 197.7 | 4.0 | 7.9 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 225.4 |
| | | Pitogo-Sucuban Road | RSR | 5.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 119.7 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 9.6 | 0.0 | 136.4 |
| | CL-S13 | Camp Andres- Sucuban Road | RSR | 6.4 | 0.0 | 6.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 136.9 | 2.7 | 5.5 | 10.9 | 0.0 | 156.0 |
| | CL-S14 | Sucuban-Lahing Lahing Road | RSR | 16.5 | 0.0 | 16.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 352.8 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 402.2 |
| | CL-S15 | Camp Andres- Lahing Lahing Road | RSR | 10.2 | 0.0 | 9.4 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 218.7 | 4.4 | 8.7 | 17.5 | 0.0 | 249.4 |
| | CL-S16 | Tandu Batu-Lahing Lahing Road | RSR | 11.3 | 0.0 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 241.6 | 4.8 | 9.7 | 19.3 | 0.0 | 275.5 |
| | CL-S17 | Seit-Kansipat- Tandu Batu Road | RSR | 10.8 | 0.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 231.0 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 18.5 | 0.0 | 263.3 |
| | CL-S18 | Taglibi-Pansol Road | RSR | 12.5 | 0.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 267.1 | 5.3 | 10.7 | 21.4 | 0.0 | 304.5 |
| | CL-T1 | Pahut- Swangkagang | RSR | 1.7 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 36.0 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 41.1 |
| | | Sub-total | | 692.1 | 93.2 | 478.3 | 0.0 | 120.5 | 16847.9 | 337.0 | 673.9 | 1347.8 | 559.3 | 19765.9 |

Table 6.14 Cost Estimate for Corridor Links Development Projects (4/4): Sulu and Tawi-Tawi

Note: CL-S=Corridor link Sulu

| | | | | | | Type of W | /orks | | | Eng | jineering S | ervices | | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | Road Name | Road Type | ad Road Length e (Km) | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabili tation | Recon- struction | Const Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Land Acquisition, Compensation | Total |
| | | | | | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Mil) | 2% | 4% | 8% | (PhP Mil) | (PhP Mil) |
| | BR-L1 | Marawi City Ring Road | RSR | 16.7 | 9.7 | 6.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 522.6 | 10.5 | 20.9 | 41.8 | 58.4 | 836.3 |
| | BR-M1 | Parang East Diversion Road | RSR | 11.3 | 11.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 434.8 | 8.7 | 17.4 | 34.8 | 67.7 | 563.4 |
| e. Ring Roads/Bypa | BR-M2 | Parang Bypass Road (small) | RSR | 2.5 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 94.5 | 1.9 | 3.8 | 7.6 | 14.7 | 122.5 |
| ss Roads Development | BR-M3 | Pinaring-Simsiman Road | RSR | 20.1 | 0.0 | 17.6 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 431.8 | 8.6 | 17.3 | 34.5 | 0.0 | 492.2 |
| Project | BR-M4 | Manuangan- Parang Road | RSR | 17.0 | 17.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 631.2 | 12.6 | 25.2 | 50.5 | 102.1 | 821.6 |
| | BR-B1 | Isabel City Bypass Road | RSR | 2.4 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 835.7 | 16.7 | 33.4 | 66.9 | 4.4 | 957.1 |
| | | Sub-total | | 69.9 | 41.2 | 26.2 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2950.5 | 59.0 | 118.0 | 236.0 | 247.3 | 3793.1 |

Table 6.15 Cost Estimate for Ring Road/Bypass Development Projects

Note: BR=Bypass Road

Table 6.16 Cost Estimate for Road Projects outside Bangsamoro

| | | Road Name | Road Length | Type of Works | | | | En | | eering Ser | rvices | Land | |
|------------------|-------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------|------------|--------|--|-----------|
| Project Type | Code | | | New Const | Road Surface Upgrading | Rehabilit ation | Reconstru ction | Construction Cost | F/S | D/D | S/V | Acquisition, Compensatio n Sub-7 | Sub-Total |
| | | | (Rill) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (km) | (PhP Million) | 2.00% | 4.00% | 8.00% | (PhP Million) | |
| | CL-L2 | Madalum Road | 38.1 | 14.3 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 548.7 | 11.0 | 21.9 | 43.9 | 85.5 | 711.1 |
| d. Corridor Link | CL-L3 | Ganassi-Tubud Road | 40.2 | 15.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 612.7 | 12.3 | 24.5 | 49.0 | 95.5 | 793.9 |
| Roads | CL-M3 | Maganoy-Lebak Road | 46.3 | 46.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1782.2 | 35.6 | 71.3 | 142.6 | 277.7 | 2309.4 |
| Improvement | CL-M5 | Alip-Lumoyon Road | 40.2 | 40.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1547.3 | 30.9 | 61.9 | 123.8 | 241.1 | 2005.0 |
| Project | CL-M7 | Tapian-Lebak Coastal Road | 3.7 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 142.5 | 2.8 | 5.7 | 11.4 | 22.2 | 184.6 |
| | | Sub-total | 168.4 | 120.3 | 23.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4633.3 | 92.7 | 185.3 | 370.7 | 721.9 | 6003.9 |
| e. Ring | BR-M3 | Pinaring-Simsiman Road | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 177.1 | 3.5 | 7.1 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 201.9 |
| Roads/Bypass | | Sub-total | 9.1 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 177.1 | 3.5 | 7.1 | 14.2 | 0.0 | 201.9 |
| | | GRAND TOTAL | 177.6 | 120.3 | 32.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4810.4 | 96.2 | 192.4 | 384.8 | 721.9 | 6205.8 |

6.5.6 **Project cost summary**

As presented in Table 6.17, the estimated cost of the projects identified in the plan is about PHP 66.36 billion. Cost per project type is indicated in the table below. The total cost of projects inside the Bangsamoro is about PHP 52.62 billion and of those outside the Bangsamoro (road projects that terminate in the neighboring regions) is about PHP 6.22 billion. The cost estimate on FMRs that branch out from the trunk road is about PHP 13.69 billion.

| у |
|---|
| • |

| | Cost (PHP million) | | | |
|---|--------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Project | Inside Bangsamoro | Outside Bangsamoro* | | |
| Artery roads upgrading project | 8,141.0 | | | |
| Missing links development project | 7,016.4 | | | |
| Corridor development project | 372.8 | | | |
| Corridor link improvment project | 19,765.9 | 6,003.9 | | |
| Ring roads/bypass roads development project | 3,632.2 | 201.0 | | |
| FMRs | 13,683.73† | | | |
| Total | 52,612.03 | 6,205.8 | | |
| Grand Total (Inside + Outside Bangsamoro) | 66,3 | 57.81 | | |

*Continuation of project roads originating in Bangsamoro and beyond the Bangsamoro boundary. †If construction engineering services are undertaken separately, estimated cost for the 884 km FMRs is about PHP 1.92 billion, bringing the total cost from PHP 13.683 billion to PHP 15.60 billion. Consequently, the grand total will be PHP 68.27 billion.

Comprehensive Capacity Development Project for the Bangsamoro

Development Plan for the Bangsamoro

Final Report

Sector Report 2-2: Port Development

Table of Contents

| Chapter 1 | Port System and Water Traffic | 2-1 |
|-----------|---|------|
| 1.1 | Philippine Port Development Strategy | 2-1 |
| 1.2 | Existing Ports Network in Mindanao | 2-1 |
| 1.3 | Cargo, Passenger Traffic and Ship Calls of Major Ports in Mindanao | 2-1 |
| Chapter 2 | Existing Ports Network in Bangsamoro | 2-5 |
| 2.1 | Overview | 2-5 |
| 2.2 | Cargo, Passenger Traffic and Ship Calls at Major Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-5 |
| 2.3 | Characteristics of Major Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-7 |
| 2.4 | Other Small Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-8 |
| 2.5 | Existing Port Facilities of Each Port | 2-8 |
| 2.5.1 | Polloc port | |
| 2.5.2 | Bongao, Jolo, Sitangkai, and Isabela ports | 2-13 |
| Append | lix A: Historical Data on Cargo and Passenger Traffic at Existing Polloc Port | 2-17 |
| Chapter 3 | Demand Forecast for Bangsamoro Ports | 2-18 |
| 3.1 | Historical Growth of Traffic at Polloc Port | 2-18 |
| 3.2 | Projected Cargo Traffic for Bangsamoro | 2-18 |
| 3.3 | Cargo Traffic Shares of Island Provinces Ports | 2-19 |
| 3.4 | Cargo Traffic Projection for Polloc Port | 2-19 |
| 3.5 | Share of Polloc Port in Total Cargo Traffic of Bangsamoro | 2-19 |
| 3.6 | Growth of Cargo Traffic | 2-19 |
| 3.7 | Future Passenger Traffic | 2-20 |
| Append | lix B: Detailed Projections of Polloc Port Cargo Traffic | 2-22 |
| Chapter 4 | Proposal of Priority Projects | 2-23 |
| 4.1 | Cargo and Passenger Traffic of Bangsamoro Ports | 2-23 |
| 4.2 | Polloc Port | 2-23 |
| 4.2.1 | Overview | 2-23 |
| 4.2.2 | Existing system of the port operation | 2-23 |
| 4.2.3 | Cargo handling capacity of representative ports in Mindanao and Manila ports | 2-24 |
| 4.2.4 | Present conditions for new development for Polloc port | 2-25 |
| 4.2.5 | Proposed port development | 2-27 |
| 4.2.6 | Urgent improvement plan | 2-30 |
| 4.2.7 | Institution of Polloc port | 2-31 |
| 4.2.8 | Necessity of cargo and passenger traffic between Polloc and BaSulTa | 2-31 |
| 4.2.9 | Development plan of new Cotabato port | 2-31 |
| 4.3 | Bongao Port | 2-32 |
| 4.3.1 | Present conditions of Bongao port | 2-32 |
| 4.3.2 | Urgent expansion of the port | 2-32 |
| 4.3.3 | Cargo and passenger forecast | 2-33 |
| 4.3.4 | Proposed port development | 2-34 |
| 4.4 | Jolo Port | 2-36 |
| 4.4.1 | Present condition of Jolo port | 2-36 |
| 4.4.2 | Cargo and passenger forecast | 2-37 |
| 4.4.3 | Proposed port development | 2-37 |
| 4.4.4 | Rough cost estimate | 2-39 |
| 4.5 | Isabela Port | 2-39 |
| 4.5.1 | Present conditions of Isabela port | 2-40 |
| 4.5.2 | Cargo and passenger forecast | 2-41 |
| 4.5.3 | Proposed port development | 2-41 |
| 4.5.4 | PPA expansion plan and land acquisition by Provincial Government | 2-41 |

List of Tables

| Table 1.1 Philippine Port System Strategy | 2-2 |
|--|--------|
| Table 2.1 Summery of Characteristics of Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-7 |
| Table 2.2 General Layout of Bongao, Jolo, Sitangkai, and Isabela Ports | . 2-13 |
| Table 2.3 Results of Cargo and Passenger Traffic and Shipcall Forecast for Bongao, Jolo, Sitangk | ai, |
| and Isabela Ports | . 2-14 |
| Table 2.4 Proposed Development According to FS | . 2-15 |
| Table 3.1 Growth Rate of Traffic at Polloc Port | . 2-18 |
| Table 3.2 Projected Cargo Traffic Volume for Mindanao and Bangsamoro | . 2-18 |
| Table 3.3 Bangsamoro Port Traffic and Island Provinces Ports Traffic | . 2-19 |
| Table 3.4 Projecting Current Cargo Traffic at Polloc Port | . 2-19 |
| Table 3.5 Cargo Traffic Volume at Ports in Bangsamoro and Their Shares, 2013 | . 2-19 |
| Table 3.6 Share of Ports in Total Bangsamoro Cargo Traffic for 2013, 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-20 |
| Table 3.7 Projected Growth in Cargo Traffic at Ports in Bangsamoro for 2013-2030 | . 2-20 |
| Table 3.8 Cargo Volume at Ports in Bangsamoro for 2013, 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-20 |
| Table 3.9 Existing Data and Projections on Passenger Traffic | . 2-21 |
| Table 4.1 Future Port Traffic at Ports in Bangsamoro (2015–2030) | . 2-23 |
| Table 4.2 Tons per Lineal Meter of Berth in Mindanao and Manila | . 2-25 |
| Table 4.3 Latest Data on Cargo Volume at Polloc Port (2013–2015) | . 2-26 |
| Table 4.4 Relation of Water Depth and Berth Length | . 2-27 |
| Table 4.5 Cargo Forecast for Polloc Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-27 |
| Table 4.6 Required Berth Length for General Cargo at Polloc Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-27 |
| Table 4.7 Required Berth Length for Container Cargo in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-27 |
| Table 4.8 Required Berth Length for General and Container Cargo in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-27 |
| Table 4.9 Completion of Port Facilities at Polloc Port by 2022 and 2030 | . 2-29 |
| Table 4.10 Estimated Polloc Port Construction Costs for 2022 and 2030 | . 2-30 |
| Table 4.11 Estimated Cost of Fenders and Bollards Replacement | . 2-30 |
| Table 4.12 Rough Cost Estimate for Urgent Expansion of Bongao Port | . 2-33 |
| Table 4.13 Cargo Forecast for Bongao Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-33 |
| Table 4.14 Required Berth Length at Bongao Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-34 |
| Table 4.15 Completion of Port Facilities at Bongao Port by 2022 and 2030 | . 2-35 |
| Table 4.16 Estimated Bongo Port Construction Costs for 2022 and 2030 | . 2-36 |
| Table 4.17 Cargo Forecast for Jolo Port Based on FS in Southern Mindanao | . 2-37 |
| Table 4.18 Cargo Forecast for Jolo Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-37 |
| Table 4.19 Estimated Cargo Volume by Vessel Type at Jolo Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-37 |
| Table 4.20 Required Number of Berths at Jolo Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 | . 2-38 |
| Table 4.21 Rough Cost Estimates of Jolo Port Development for 2030 | . 2-39 |
| Table 4.22 Cargo Volume and Passenger Traffic at Isabela Port (1980–1997) | . 2-40 |
| Table 4.23 Cargo Forecast for Isabela Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030. | . 2-41 |

List of Figures

| Figure 1.1 Existing Ports in Mindanao | 2-3 |
|---|------|
| Figure 1.2 Cargo Throughput for Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Zamboanga | 2-3 |
| Figure 1.3 Passenger Traffic for Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Zamboanga | 2-3 |
| Figure 1.4 Ship Calls for Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Zamboanga | 2-4 |
| Figure 2.1 Existing Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-5 |
| Figure 2.2 Cargo Throughput for Major Ports in Bangsamoro | 2-6 |
| Figure 2.3 Passenger Traffic for Major Port in Bangsamoro | 2-6 |
| Figure 2.4 Ship Calls for Major Port in Bangsamoro | 2-6 |
| Figure 2.5 Process of Concrete Deterioration | 2-11 |
| Figure 2.6 General Layout Plan of Existing Polloc Port | 2-13 |
| Figure 2.7 Master Plan of New Isabela Port | 2-15 |
| Figure 2.8 Master Plan of Jolo Port | 2-16 |
| Figure 4.1 Schematic Drawing of Oil Handling and Deposit at Polloc Port | 2-25 |
| Figure 4.2 Polloc Port Development Plan by 2022 | 2-29 |
| Figure 4.3 Polloc Port Development Plan by 2030 | 2-29 |
| Figure 4.4 Existing Organization of Polloc Port (REZA) | 2-31 |
| Figure 4.5 Cargo and Passenger Traffic between Polloc and BaSulTa | 2-32 |
| Figure 4.6 General Plan of Urgent Expansion of Bongao Port | 2-33 |
| Figure 4.7 General Layout Plan of New Bongao Port for Year 2022 and 2030 | 2-35 |
| Figure 4.8 General Layout Plan of Jolo Port for 2019 and 2030 | 2-39 |
| Figure 4.9 General Layout Plan of Isabela Port | 2-41 |
| Figure 4.10 General Plan of New Isabela Port | 2-42 |
| Figure 4.11 Location Map of Proposed New Port | 2-42 |

Abbreviations, Unit of Measurement, and Currency

(Refer to Sector Report 2-1: Road Transport, pp. 1-v through 1-x.)

CHAPTER 1 PORT SYSTEM AND WATER TRAFFIC

1.1 Philippine Port Development Strategy

The Philippine Development Plan (PDP) 2011–16 was formulated by the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA) through coordination and collaboration with all the related organizations. They include all departments/agencies of the National Government, government-owned and controlled corporations (GOCC's), government financial institutions, and State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in identifying and prioritizing key programs and projects.

As one of the specific outputs in the PDP, the Study on the Master Plan for the Strategic Development of the National Port System in the Republic of the Philippines was conducted by Department of Transportation and Communications (DOTC) supported by JICA in January 2004. The Philippine Port System Strategy was drawn up in the study as shown in Table 3.1. Strategic ports in Mindanao covering Davao, Cagayan de Oro, Zamboanga, and General Santos have been selected as the international ports out of nine ports in the Philippines to be a major window to the global market that will be developed until 2024. This means that Mindanao is considered very important in the sea transportation network especially for transportation of agricultural and marine products.

The Philippines port system strategy is summarized in Table 1.1.

1.2 Existing Ports Network in Mindanao

The existing ports network in Mindanao is shown in Figure 1.1. The ports are classified as follows:

- 1) Base ports, mainly the major ports operated by PPA,
- 2) Terminal ports with less activities operated by PPA,
- 3) Secondary ports,
- 4) Private ports, and
- 5) Fishing ports.

Administratively, PPA is mandated to develop commercial ports all over the Philippines as well to regulate private ports and control port tariffs. Other small municipal ports are operated by LGU's.

1.3 Cargo, Passenger Traffic and Ship Calls of Major Ports in Mindanao

There are four major ports around the Bangsamoro region: Davao, General Santos, Zamboanga, and Cagayan de Oro. Figures 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 show the historical change in cargo throughput, passenger traffic, and ship calls for the four major ports, respectively.

The average annual growth rate (AAGR) of cargo throughput of the Davao port is 5.7%, which is the most remarkable compared to 2.1% to 5.0% for the other major ports as shown in Figure 1.2.

The AAGR for passenger traffic of Zamboanga port decrease by 3.9%. The AAGR for Cagayan de Oro, General Santos and Davao are -1.8%, -14.4% and -18.5% respectively as shown in Figure 1.3. The decrease in the number of passengers is due to the conversion from sea to air transportation by low cost carriers (LCC).

Number of ship calls in Zamboanga decreased drastically while cargo throughput slightly increased. This means that ship size calling at the Zamboanga port has become larger progressively. For the other three ports, number of ship calls still maintain the similar levels, but cargo throughput increased as ship size calling at these ports is also increasing. These tendencies are common in the Philippines and worldwide as well.

| Mission | Establishment of a fast, economical, reliable and safe maritime transport network accelerating the development of national economy Formation of maritime transport bases to support regional society | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Planning Strategies | Establishment of a nationwide port development plan coordinated with the plans of various port management public corporations | | | | | | |
| | Port classification LEGEND International C Port | Gateway | S. his Manila | | | | |
| | Principal Inter Trade Port 2 Lane Nat'l F 4 Lane Nat'l F | national Roads Roads | Batangas Batangas Batangas CDO/MCT Zamboanga General Santos Davao | | | | |
| | Principles for planning 1) Establishment of nationwide maritime transport | Concentrated Development of Specific International Container Gateway Bases Improvement of Domestic Container Transport Efficiency Development of Facilities for Break Bulk and Bulk Cargo Port Planning at the Greater Capital Region Formation of Major Corridors Enhancing the Mobility of People and Goods in the Region Securing Transportation Bases to Support Daily Life in Remote Islands Supporting Social Reforms | | | | | |
| | 2) Formation of maritime transport bases to support regional society | | | | | | |
| | Strategic development port | Investment in long term development plan (2004–2024); about 150 billion pesos Investment in short term development plan (2004–2009); about 41 billion pesos | | | | | |
| Management and Operation | Modification of port administration as well as improvement of port management/operation - Establishment of National Plan for Port Development (NPPD) Council - Increasing cargo handling efficiency - Appropriate port tariff setting | | | | | | |
| Investment and Financing | Appropriate port tariff setting Investment scheme and proper financial resource allocation for feasible port development Proposed financial policies for public port development Acceleration of private sector participation to port projects | | | | | | |

Table 1.1 Philippine Port System Strategy

Source: The Study on the Master Plan for the Strategic Development of the National Port System in the Republic of the Philippines.



Figure 1.1 Existing Ports in Mindanao



Figure 1.2 Cargo Throughput for Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Zamboanga







Figure 1.4 Ship Calls for Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Zamboanga

CHAPTER 2 EXISTING PORTS NETWORK IN BANGSAMORO

2.1 Overview

The port network in the Bangsamoro includes 13 major ports under the Regional Economic Zone Authority (REZA), 11 Regional Ports Management Authority (RPMA) and the Philippine Ports Authority (PPA) as shown Figure 2.1 (Final Report; Survey on Mindanao Logistics Infrastructure Network, Volume 1 Main Report, January 2014, Applied Planning and Infrastructure, Inc.).



Figure 2.1 Existing Ports in Bangsamoro

2.2 Cargo, Passenger Traffic and Ship Calls at Major Ports in Bangsamoro

The historical change of cargo throughput, passenger traffic and ship calls for the major ports are shown in Figures 2.2 through 2.4. Cargo throughput for Isabela and Cotabato gradually decreased from 2004 to 2013, but that of Bongao and Lamitan increased as indicated Figure 2.2. The largest cargo handling volume in 2013 in the Bangsamoro is at the Polloc port. There are no data available for the Polloc port from 2006 to 2012, but the data from 1995 to 2003 are available as attached in Appendix A. According to this record, the maximum cargo throughput of the Polloc port was 742,923 ton in 1992.

The passenger traffic volume has not basically changed, except Isabela and Lamitan, as shown Figure 2.3. Considering the population of Basilan is around 300,000, passenger traffic of 1.2 million is quite large. This reflects active economic transactions between Isabela and Zamboanga as well as students commuting from Basilan to Zamboanga.

The number of ship calls in Isabela decreased once but drastically increased in 2010 as shown in Figure 2.4. Ship calls for the other ports gradually decreased or unchanged, the cargo volume of the other ports also unchanged. This implies that economic activities around these ports were stagnant during

this period. Cargo throughput of Bongao rapidly increased more than the number of ship calls, implying the ship size has become larger recently.



Figure 2.2 Cargo Throughput for Major Ports in Bangsamoro



Figure 2.3 Passenger Traffic for Major Port in Bangsamoro



Figure 2.4 Ship Calls for Major Port in Bangsamoro

2.3 Characteristics of Major Ports in Bangsamoro

Basic data and information collected for the ports in the Bangsamoro region are summarized in Table 2.1. All major ports are managed by REZA, RPMA, and PPA except small ports managed by LGUs. The Polloc port has the largest volume handled among the ports in Bangsamoro, about 300,000 ton per annum followed by Bongao and Isabela. Isabela has the largest volume of passenger traffic and the main origin and destination are Zamboanga, followed by Jolo and Bongao. The Polloc port has the most modern and developed port facilities among all ports including berth, apron, backup area building facilities, port access, etc. There are designated Freeport and Ecozone located behind the port.

All the ports are operated by private operators including cargo handlers. Privatization of operations and management of the port facilities has been promoted in the world even for small ports in order to establish a more efficient operation and keep competitive power among other ports. Advantages of privatization include efficiency of the system operation, responding to demand promptly and in an innovative manner under the absolute criterion of profit making.

There are feasibility studies (FSs) for the Polloc, Bongao, Jolo, Sitangkai, and Isabela ports development. These ports are considered of high potential to be developed by PPA, ADB, and ARMM. These FSs will be discussed later. According to the available information, cargoes handled at these ports are copra, banana, rice, sugar, flour of agricultural product, fresh/dried fish, shell and seaweeds of marine product, general cargo, bottled cargo of consumable materials and cement, plywood, log, and equipment of construction materials.

| Name of Port | Body/ Owner | Cargo throughput | Passenger Traffic | Ship call | Berthing Facility Length and depth | Other facility | Backup area | Building Facility | Operator | Operating Shipping Company | Main Commodity |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Polloc | REZA | 296,354t in 2013 | 0 | 181 in 2013 | Marginal wharf 400m (- 10.5m), Lighter dock 67m(-3m) | Anchorage, area for private warehouse 75,645m2, parking area 23,364m2 | Open storage area 42,940m2 | Transit shed 2x 5,980m2, PTB 600 persons, Amenity Bldg. 760m2, Barter trade bldg. 900m2 | Lamsan (PTC) till 2022 | Lorenzo shipping corp., Philippine Span Asia Carrier Corp | OUT: Corn 95,289t, River sand 63,076t, Plywood 5,622t, Rolling cargo 2,142t, IN: Iron steel 52,243t, Corn 44,832t, Rice 16,578t |
| Bongao | RPMA | 125,331t in 2013 | 223,522 in 2013 | 392 in 2012 | Main wharf 139x9m(-6 to 7m), RORO 24x9m(- 8m), Fast craft 21x9m(- 4.5 to 5m) | Causeway20x10m, Channel 680m(-15.3 to 18m), B. Dolphin2set | None | MPTB35x12m | 3K Corporation | Aleson Shipping Lines, Ever Shipping Lines | OUT: Seaweeds, Copra, Live fish/Octopus, Dried fish, Sea shells |
| Jolo | RPMA | 157,027t in 2013 | 459,826 in 2013 | 1,746 in 2013 | Total berth length 585m | Coast buard, BFAR, SULU Barter Trade, Ice plant | 1.0ha | ADM, PTB, Ticketing office, Gate house | Piyagsulutan, INC. | Katrafar shipping lines, Aleson shipping lines, Ebenezer Shipping Lines | IN: Cement, Salt, Flour, Sugar, Fresh eggs, Dress chicken, Lard/Margarine OUT: Copra, Seaweeds, Abaca, Charcoal, Dried fish, Fresh fish |
| Siasi | RPMA | 276 May 9 to31, 2013 | 4,064 May 9 to31, 2013 | 20 May 9 to31, 2013 | Main wharf 65m, RoRo ramp 15x10m | Gate house | None | Terminal Management office | SIASI Arrastre and Stevedoring Services | Magnolia Shipping Lines, Ever Shipping Lines | IN: Cement, Flour, Sugar OUT: Copra, Dried fish |
| Sitangkai | RPMA | 10,526t in 2013 | 26,466 in 2013 | 150 in 2013 | Main wharf 60m (3.02m depth), Maneuvering area (6.03m) | Rock causeway | 60mx36m | Terminal Management office, CHO office, PCG Detachment, Warehouse | Anakmoslem Multi-Purpose Cooperative | Aleson Shipping Lines | OUT: Seaweeds, Copra, Drieć fish, Sea shells |
| Is abe la | РРА | 106,195t in 2013 | 1,203,187 in 2013 | 3,745 in 2013 | 209x9m(-5m) in 2000, Extension to 300m in 2014 | Seawall 275, Rock bulkhead 235m | Open storage area 1,242m2 | Passenger terminal 91m2, Temporary storage 12m2, ADM 80m2 | Basilan Dockhandlers Corp. | Aleson Shipping Lines | Out; Copra, General cargo, In; Bottled cargo, Petroleum product, Palay/Rice, Cement |
| Lamitan | RPMA | 39,965t in 2013 | 255,908 in 2013 | 740 in 2013 | Total berth length 82m | Causeway 50m | None | Passenger terminal bldg. | Lamitan Dockholder, INC. | | Out: Copra, rubber, fish, banana In: rice, sugar, fish, equipment |
| Mapun | RPMA | 8,664t in 2013 | 4,857 in 2013 | 246 in 2013 | Pier (30m x 11.5m) Piles for 30m extension are installed at site | None | None | None | Tripler Muti- Purpose Cooperative | Charter only | OUT: Copra, Dried fish |

Table 2.1 Summery of Characteristics of Ports in Bangsamoro

2.4 Other Small Ports in Bangsamoro

In addition to the major ports in Bangsamoro, there are small ports under LGUs according to the information from RPMA as listed below. There are no available data and information such as cargo volume, passenger traffic, size of port facility, ancillary facilities, etc. for the region.

- A. Sulu
 - a. Banguingui, Municipality of Tongkil
 - b. Pata, Municipality of Pata
 - c. Maimbung, Municipality of Maimbung
 - d. Poblacion, Poblacion Parang, Parang
 - e. Tando Bato Port, Tando Bato, lunk
 - f. Pangutaran
 - g. Panamao Port, Brgy. Su'uh
- B. Tawi-Tawi
 - a. Port in Balimbing, Panglima Sugala
 - b. Port in Sapa-sapa, Poblacion
 - c. Chinese Pier, Municipality of Bongao
 - d. Ubol Simunul
 - e. Tubig Indangan
 - f. Nusa Simunul
 - g. Languyan
- C. Basilan
 - a. Sub-Port of Maluso, Municipality of Maluso
- D. Malaban
 - a. Sub-Port of Malabang, Municipality of Malabang

2.5 Existing Port Facilities of Each Port

2.5.1 Polloc port

(1) General information of Polloc port

Basic information on facilities at the Polloc port is summarized below.

| Location: | | Lat. 07° 21' 22", long. 124' 113'E | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Port limits: | : | Entrance to Bay | | | | | | |
| Navigation | al approach: | Mariga Bato Point | | | | | | |
| Entrance cl | hannel: | Parang Channel | | | | | | |
| Turning ba | sin: | Polloc Anchorage | | | | | | |
| Description | n: | RC structure, general purpose marginal wharf with two lighter docks on both sides, handling conventional and containerized cargo | | | | | | |
| Area: | | 129 ha | | | | | | |
| Pilotage: | | Compulsory pilotage for all vessels 100 GRT and above | | | | | | |
| Total berth | length | | | | | | | |
| a. M | larginal wharf: | 400 LM | | | | | | |
| b. Li | ighter dock: | 67 LM | | | | | | |
| Draft Limi | itation | | | | | | | |
| a. M | lain wharf: | Depth 10.5 m | | | | | | |
| b. Li | ighter dock: | Depth 3.0 m | | | | | | |
| c. A | nchorage: | No draft limitation | | | | | | |
| d. Tı | ransit shed 01: | 5,980 m ² | | | | | | |
| e. Ti | ransit shed 02: | $5,980 \text{ m}^2$ | | | | | | |
| Total bac | kup area | | | | | | | |
| a. O | pen storage: | $42,940 \text{ m}^2$ | | | | | | |
| b. Pr | rivate warehou | sing: $75,645 \text{ m}^2$ | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| c. | Parking area: | $23,364 \text{ m}^2$ |
|--------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Engine | ering/navigational aids | |
| a. | Beacon light: | 1 |
| b. | Service roads: | 127, 836 m ² |
| c. | Buoys: | 1 pilot station |
| d. | Weighbridge: | 52 tons |
| e. | Passenger terminal bldg.: | Capacity 600 passengers |
| f. | Amenity bldg.: | 760 m^2 |
| g. | Public restrooms: | 48 m ² x 2 |
| h. | Water resource facility: | Capacity 1,060 m ³ |
| i. | Barter trade center bldg.: | 900 m ² |
| | | |

(2) Advantages for natural and physical environmental

The Polloc port has high potential as a major port with respect to construction, operation and management, and it is considered one of the best ports in the Philippine considering the following.

Wind

According to the wind rose analysis for South Cotabato taken from the daily data for the period 1971-2000, 43.5% of the time the wind direction comes from the south with 43.4% ranging from 1 to 4 m per second (mps), 0.1% in the range of 5–8, and 0.0% greater than 8 mps. The prevailing wind direction throughout the year is south followed by north direction with 99.2% ranging from 1 to 4 mps.

Wave

No wave behavior data from direct measurement is available in South Cotabato, but according to the available information no significant wave has occurred to prevent the port operation throughout the year. It should be considered that the port and marine structure is given adequate protection from destructive waves related to cyclonic activities. The Polloc port is protected topographically from the southwest monsoon wave and sheltered from the west wave by the Bongo Island facing the port area.

Current

The current outside the Molo Gulf is 0.01–0.02 knot based on PAGASA. The tidal current in front of the Polloc harbor is north to south during flood tide and south to north during ebb tide based on the available chart. It is expected that velocity in front of the Polloc harbor is small in view of the local topography.

Water depth of the approach to the port

Water depth around the Polloc port is suitable for ship anchorage and maneuvering for docking to the berth. Water depth can reach 4,000 m at 80 km to southwest from the Polloc port, and 400 m within 7 km near the port and the depth of Polloc harbor in front of the berth is 40 m.

Accessibility to the port

The Polloc port is accessible by land from Cotabato City through a 13 km modern four lanes (two lanes partially) concrete pavement.

Siltation issues

There are no siltation issues as no major river exist around the port and no littoral drift from outside of the Polloc harbor.

(3) Current conditions of the port facilities

Berth structure

The main berth structure is generally fine despite more than three decades of service operations after its completion in 1977 except damage/deterioration. However, the following are found by inspection on the structure and facilities.

a. All upper portions of the steel pipes supporting concrete deck have been corroded and some of concrete cover is peeled off and re-bars are corroded (Photos 1–7). It is very important to repair pile heads immediately to protect them from the re-bar corrosion.







Photo 2: Exposed and corroded re-bars

b. All rubber fenders are either broken or totally damaged.



Photo 3: Totally damaged

Photo 4: Broken fender

c. Many bollards are totally damaged but several new bollards are installed on the wharf



Photo 5: Damaged bollard



Photo 6: New bollard

d. Concrete cover on the concrete beam of the deck slab is peeled off and re-bar is corroded.



Photo 7: Corroded re-bar

Even with proper design, reinforced concrete structures in the coastal zone normally undergo a process of deterioration as illustrated in Figure 2.5. At the initial stage, re-bars in concrete are statically corroded. The expansion of corrosion causes small cracks of concrete and some rust gradually appears

on the surface at the next stage. Width of concrete cracks is widening and rust on the concrete surface is widely expanded on the surface at the third stage. At the final deterioration stage, stripping of concrete cover is found at many locations to expose re-bars, which are corroded. The deterioration/damage of pile heads and concrete beams investigated above are assessed as the final deterioration stage.



Figure 2.5 Process of Concrete Deterioration

Water depth in front to the berth

Based on the hydrographic survey in front of the wharf, average water depth below LWL is -10.7 m, which is more than design depth of -10.5 m but the shallowest point is -8.5 m and about 10% of survey points are shallower than -9.5 m. The shallow area is located at the north and south ends of the wharf. Although the maximum draft of present calling vessel of full container of 1,500 DWT is 5.0 m, water depth of -10.5 m shall be maintained as the original design depth in order to accommodate larger vessels as soon as possible.

Two transit sheds and other buildings

Floor concrete of transit shed has been repaired due to the crack and loose concrete at many locations (Photo 8). According to the inspection, concrete cover of re-bars is too small and less than the design (Photo 9).



Photo 8: Removed concrete surface

Photo 9: Re-bar arrangement

Water supply

There exists a water supply system, which takes water 3.9 km from the port. The water pipelines are damaged and deteriorated. The deep well and the right of way along the regional road are very narrow (Photos 10 and 11).



Photo 10: Existing deep well

Photo 11: Narrow right of way

(4) Existing port layout plan

The existing port layout plan is shown in Figure 2.6. Container cargoes are loaded/unloaded on the apron and transported to the container stack yard behind two transit sheds by a trailer (Photos 12–13). After several dwelling days at the container yard, the containers are loaded/unloaded on trucks by the land cranes (Photo 14). River sand from the Simuay River is stockpiled at the back yard temporarily and is loaded to a bulk barge (Photo 15) and transported to the Sulu archipelago for the construction materials.



Photo 12: Container handling



Photo 13: General cargo handling



Photo 14: Bulk cargo handling



Photo 15: Liquid bulk handling



Figure 2.6 General Layout Plan of Existing Polloc Port

2.5.2 Bongao, Jolo, Sitangkai, and Isabela ports

(1) Overview

A feasibility study on the Bongao, Jolo, and Sitangkai ports was conducted in the Intermodal Transport Development Project (ITDP) supported by Asian Development Bank (ADB) in September 2006. The Bongao and Jolo ports are expected to become important sub-hub ports connecting numerous smaller nearby island ports to other ports in the Sulu Archipelago as well as the regional hub of Zamboanga and west Mindanao. For this purpose, improvement and expansion of port facilities are planned in order to increase the port capacity. The Sitangkai port can function as a maritime linkage between remote islands and the sub-hub for Zamboanga and to BIMA-EAGA as well by improvement of the port facilities.

The handling volume at the port of Isabela decreased in 2000 due to the limited work area, low operating hours, and limited back-up area in the port. In view of this, PPA conducted the FS of transferring the existing port to an alternative site, about 1 km from the town, where a modern seaport would be established for economic growth of the entire Basilan Island.

(2) Present port facilities

Present port layout, magnitude of the port facilities, cargo and passenger traffic are summarized in Table 2.2. The Jolo port is the largest port handling largest cargo traffic among the four ports, but the Isabela port handles the largest passenger traffic volume at present.

| | Port Layout | Major Port Facilities | Traffic Volume |
|--------|-------------|--|--|
| Bongao | | - Main wharf 139 m - RORO 24 m - Fast craft 21 m - MPTB 35 x 12 m | Cargo: 125,331t in 2013 Passenger: 223,522 in 2013 |

Table 2.2 General Layout of Bongao, Jolo, Sitangkai, and Isabela Ports

| | Port Layout | Major Port Facilities | Traffic Volume |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| Jolo | Congle arth | - Total berth length 585 m - A part of wharf (left) has been improved based on FS | Cargo: 157,027t in 2013 Passenger: 459,826 in 2013 |
| Sitangkai | 6 (2015 Google 93 m Image C 2015 CNES / Astrium | - Main wharf 60 m | Cargo: 10,526t in 2013 Passenger: 26,446 in 2013 |
| Isabela | e 2019 Gasedo Bitan Iungore 2019 Gasedo Googliceanti | - General cargo berth length 280 m - RORO berth 20 x 12 m | Cargo: 106,195t in 2013 Passenger: 1,203,187 in 2013 |

(3) Cargo/passenger traffic and shipcall forecast

Cargo and passenger traffic and shipcalls at the Bongao, Jolo, Sitagkai, and Isabela ports for 2020, 2030, and 2036 was estimated by ADB in 2006 and by PPA in 2000 as summarized in Table 2.3. The cargo throughput at both Bongao and Jolo in 2013 was 140,000 ton/year, but the AAGR of Bongao at 5.1% is higher than that of Jolo which is 3.2% only. For passenger traffic, the AAGRs of Bongao and Jolo are 7.2% and 6.2%, respectively. Based on this, the Bongao port should be given slightly more priority than the Jolo port for development.

| I | Port | 2020 | 2030 | 2036 |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Cargo | 283,912 | 377,256 | 447,470 |
| Bongao | Passenger | 776,554 | 1,032,034 | 1,224,073 |
| | Shipcall | 4,788 | 6,362 | 7,546 |
| Jolo | Cargo | 192,995 | 253,055 | 297,660 |
| | Passenger | 1,078,922 | 1,426,169 | 1,677,703 |
| | Shipcall | 3,509 | 4,601 | 5,412 |
| | Cargo | 59,934 | 96,790 | 129,217 |
| Sitangkai | Passenger | 180,260 | 239,564 | 284,142 |
| | Shipcall | 856 | 1,383 | 1,846 |
| | Cargo | 435,800 | 530,000 | |
| Isabela | Passenger | 1,931,000 | 2,212,000 | |
| | Shipcall | 8,490 | 9,129 | |

Table 2.3 Results of Cargo and Passenger Traffic and Shipcall Forecast for Bongao, Jolo,Sitangkai, and Isabela Ports

Note: Values of 2020 and 2030 for Isabel are those of 2017 and 2022, respectively.

(4) **Proposed development**

The proposed development works for the Bongao, Jolo and Sitanagkai ports are shown in Table 2.4. The proposed Isabela port is a totally new port recommended at 1 km from the town proper.

| Scope of work for Bongao | Major SOW of Jolo | Major SOW of Sitangkai |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Expansion of Back-up area | Banca landing quay | Expansion of wharf |
| Rehabilitation of existing pier | Motor launch berth | PTB, ADM, etc. |
| Reclamation for motor launch berth | Fast craft berth | Utilities (water, electricity, |
| PTB, Cargo shed, etc. | Conventional berth | etc.) |
| Utilities (Water, Power, etc.) | PTB, cargo shed, etc. | |
| | Utilities (water, electricity, etc.) | |

Table 2.4 Proposed Development According to FS

(5) Economic analysis

According to existing tariff structure, the proposed development of the ports is not feasible. Therefore, the revenue sources such as dockage, wharfage, arrastre, stevedoring, etc. shall be increased to cover operation and maintenance cost as well as construction cost as well.

| | Bongao | Jolo | Sitangkai | Isabela |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Total cost for development (PHP) | 428,621,000 | 673,720,000 | 179,292,000 | 220,000,000 |
| Base case of EIRR (%) | 30.7 | 19.9 | 32.0 | 41.5 |

(6) Master plan of Isabela and Jolo ports

The master plan of Isabela according to the FS is shown in Figure 2.7. The master plan includes 1st Phase development and 2nd Phase development for the target year of 2008 and 2022, respectively. The port facilities for the general cargo and passenger vessels in one area and fast craft vessels in the other area are separately provided. The berthing for the fast craft vessels are exclusively for their use. The close storage facilities or transit sheds shall be provided behind the wharf with a wide road. A passenger terminal building and parking area for vehicles are provided behind the fast craft berth.



Figure 2.7 Master Plan of New Isabela Port

Besides the ADB FS described above, PPA prepared a master plan of the Jolo port as indicated in Figure 2.8. The berths are allocated to motorized bancas, fast craft, RORO, conventional vessels, and liners. Motorized banca berths are provided for transport to/from the surrounding islands, and other berths for cargo and passenger transport to/from the surrounding islands and the sub-hub ports of Bangsamoro.



Figure 2.8 Master Plan of Jolo Port

(7) Cargo handling on the berths at Jolo port

Of the ports of Bongao, Jolo, Isabela, and Sitangkai, the Jolo port is the busiest port at present. At the Jolo port, all cargoes are temporary stacked on the berth prior to loading onto ships. The narrow berths are occupied by the cargoes, and there is no space for port vehicles to pass. This causes inefficient performance and low productivity in cargo handling at the Jolo port.

| Year | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | Decrease | GR (%) |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|--------|
| 1. Total Cargo Throughput (MT) | 742,923 | 504,840 | 525,115 | 704,633 | 559,981 | 606,043 | 570,875 | 414,789 | 347,000 | 452,370 | 322,105 | 361,505 | 284,486 | 249,788 | 454,845 | 2.05 |
| a. Domestic | 712,610 | 481,035 | 484,733 | 552,613 | 459,679 | 496,567 | 471,622 | 340,540 | 284,887 | 371,396 | 264,448 | 296,795 | 233,564 | 205,076 | 347,527 | 1.35 |
| Inbound | 274,418 | 180,714 | 198,934 | 243,401 | 206,195 | 222,424 | 250,834 | 152,897 | 127,914 | 166,757 | 118,737 | 133,261 | 104,870 | 92,079 | 151,322 | 2.26 |
| Breakbulk | 19,840 | 39,502 | 33,549 | 50,997 | 89,805 | 97,400 | 109,364 | 66,657 | 55,770 | 72,706 | 51,769 | 58,102 | 45,723 | 40,146 | 10,851 | 3.94 |
| Bulk | 254,578 | 53,742 | 63,279 | 79,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79,299 | |
| Containerized | 0 | 87,470 | 102,106 | 113,105 | 116,390 | 125,024 | 141,470 | 86,240 | 72,144 | 94,051 | 66,968 | 75,159 | 59,147 | 51,933 | 61,172 | 4.37 |
| Outbound | 438,192 | 300,321 | 285,799 | 309,212 | 253,484 | 274,143 | 220,788 | 187,643 | 156,973 | 204,639 | 145,711 | 163,534 | 128,694 | 112,997 | 196,205 | 1.08 |
| Breakbulk | 313,983 | 123,904 | 111,525 | 108,855 | 95,418 | 103,078 | 83,016 | 70,554 | 59,022 | 76,944 | 54,787 | 61,489 | 48,389 | 42,487 | 66,368 | 0.67 |
| Bulk | 117,666 | 10,665 | 6,493 | 17,016 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,016 | |
| Containerized | 6,543 | 165,752 | 167,781 | 183,341 | 158,066 | 171,065 | 137,772 | 117,089 | 97,951 | 127,695 | 90,924 | 102,045 | 80,305 | 70,510 | 112,821 | 6.75 |
| b. Foreign | 30,313 | 23,805 | 40,382 | 152,020 | 100,302 | 109,476 | 99,253 | 74,249 | 62,113 | 80,974 | 57,656 | 64,710 | 50,923 | 44,712 | 107,308 | 5.14 |
| Import | 26,396 | 10,151 | 30,490 | 120,694 | 76,443 | 82,659 | 75,631 | 56,578 | 47,330 | 61,702 | 43,934 | 49,309 | 38,803 | 34,071 | 86,623 | 5.29 |
| Breakbulk | 22,479 | 10,151 | 30,490 | 120,694 | 76,443 | 82,659 | 75,631 | 56,578 | 47,330 | 61,702 | 43,934 | 49,309 | 38,803 | 34,071 | 86,623 | 5.11 |
| Bulk | 3,917 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Containerized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Export | 3,917 | 13,654 | 9,892 | 31,326 | 23,859 | 26,817 | 23,622 | 17,671 | 14,783 | 19,272 | 13,722 | 15,401 | 12,120 | 10,641 | 20,685 | 4.64 |
| Breakbulk | 3,917 | 13,654 | 9,892 | 31,326 | 23,859 | 26,817 | 23,622 | 17,671 | 14,783 | 19,272 | 13,722 | 15,401 | 12,120 | 10,641 | 20,685 | 4.64 |
| Bulk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Containerized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| c. Transit cargo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Domestic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Inward | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Outward | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Foreign | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Import | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Export | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| d. Foreign (transshipment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2. Passenger Traffic (n) | 76,728 | 124,526 | 149,196 | 159,501 | 299,492 | 300,593 | | | | | | | | | 159,501 | 1.62 |
| Disembarking | 39,981 | 58,837 | 74,297 | 77,212 | 140,659 | 141,279 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77,212 | 1.53 |
| Embarking | 36,747 | 65.689 | 74,899 | 82,289 | 158,833 | 159,314 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82,289 | 1.61 |

Appendix A: Historical Data on Cargo and Passenger Traffic at Existing Polloc Port

CHAPTER 3 DEMAND FORECAST FOR BANGSAMORO PORTS

3.1 Historical Growth of Traffic at Polloc Port

As presented in Table 3.1, the growth rate of the cargo traffic at the Polloc port keep on declining at any given period. The latest data recorded were for 2005. From that period onward, no data have been recorded. Since no major improvement has been made to the port during the recent years, the declining number of -6.3% per year was applied to estimate the 2014 and 2015 cargo traffic.

| Particulars | AAGR (1002, 1007) | AAGR (1002, 1000) | AAGR | AAGR |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Cargo and Passenger Traffic | (1992–1997) | (1992–1999) | (1992–2005) | (2000–2005) |
| 1 Total Cargo Throughput | -3.99% | -7 99% | -7 49% | -6 36% |
| a Domestic | -6 97% | -10.01% | -8 51% | -6.36% |
| Inbound | -4 11% | -8.02% | -7 50% | -6.36% |
| Breakbulk | 37.47% | 18.90% | 5.16% | -6.36% |
| Bulk | | | | |
| Containerized | | | | -6.36% |
| Outbound | -8.95% | -11.41% | -9.23% | -6.36% |
| Breakbulk | -19.97% | -19.21% | -13.31% | -6.36% |
| Bulk | -100.00% | -100.00% | -100.00% | |
| Containerized | 92.08% | 51.00% | 18.51% | -6.36% |
| b. Foreign | 29.28% | 13.65% | 2.82% | -6.36% |
| Import | 25.65% | 11.51% | 1.84% | -6.36% |
| Breakbulk | 29.75% | 14.10% | 3.02% | -6.36% |
| Bulk | | | | |
| Containerized | | | | |
| Export | 46.92% | 24.01% | 7.40% | -6.36% |
| Breakbulk | 46.92% | 24.01% | 7.40% | -6.36% |
| Bulk | | | | |
| Containerized | | | | |
| c. Transit Cargo | | | | |
| Domestic | | | | |
| Inward | | | | |
| Outward | | | | |
| Foreign | | | | |
| Import | | | | |
| Export | | | | |
| d. Foreign (Tran-shipment) | | | | |
| 2. Passenger Traffic | 31.40% | | | |
| Disembarking | 28.72% | | | |
| Embarking | 34.09% | | | |

| Table 3.1 | Growth | Rate o | f Traffic | at Polloc | Port |
|-----------|--------|---------|------------|-----------|------|
| | GIUMU | Itate 0 | 1 II allie | at I onot | IUIU |

3.2 Projected Cargo Traffic for Bangsamoro

Cargo traffic for Bangsamoro is expected to reach 4.8 million ton in 2019, 5.4 million ton in 2022 and further increase to 7.7 million ton in 2030 (Table 3.2).

| | Mir | ndanao Tot | al (1,000 t | on) | Bangsamoro (1,000 ton) | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|--------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Commodity | 2013 | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 | 2013 | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 | | |
| Total | 25,310 | 32,980 | 37,770 | 54,850 | 3,730 | 4,790 | 5,440 | 7,740 | | |
| Inbound | 13,100 | 18,600 | 22,200 | 35,600 | 1,600 | 2,300 | 2,800 | 4,400 | | |
| Outbound | 12,300 14,400 15,600 19,300 | | | | | 2,500 | 2,700 | 3,300 | | |

3.3 Cargo Traffic Shares of Island Provinces Ports

Assuming that the five ports captured all the port cargo traffic in the island provinces, the share of ports from island provinces would be as follows: 12.5% in 2019, 13.7% in 2022 and 13.3% in 2030. It is assumed then that the remaining cargo traffic has its origin/destination in the mainland and ship out/in via the Davao, Cagayan de Oro, General Santos, and Polloc ports.

| Port | 2013 (ton) | 2019 (ton) | 2022 (ton) | 2030 (ton) |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Bangsamoro total | 3,730,717 | 4,785,359 | 5,438,968 | 7,741,208 |
| 1. Isabela Port | 114,653 | 129,118 | 145,240 | 170,172 |
| 2. Bongao Port | 182,709 | 253,363 | 348,384 | 538,728 |
| 3. Jolo Port | 167,795 | 196,880 | 230,528 | 285,291 |
| 4. Lamitan Port | 4,747 | 5,473 | 6,300 | 7,616 |
| 5. Sitangkai Port | 9,428 | 12,490 | 16,444 | 23,928 |
| Share of ports in island provinces (%) | 12.8 | 12.5 | 13.7 | 13.3 |

Table 3.3 Bangsamoro Port Traffic and Island Provinces Ports Traffic

3.4 Cargo Traffic Projection for Polloc Port

The latest available data of cargo traffic at the Polloc port are for 2005 (249,788 MT). From 2000 to 2005, the cargo traffic was estimated by applying an annual rate of -6.3%. Since no major improvement was effected since then, it is fairly reasonable to assume that the decrease continued from 2005 to the present time. Assuming that is the case, the 2014 cargo traffic was about 138,232 MT (see Appendix B for details).

| Tabla 2 4 D | nationa C | unnont Congo | Traffic at | Dolloo Dowt |
|---------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| 1 a Die 3.4 F | | urrent Cargo | If affice at | FONOC FOIL |
| | | | | |

| | | | | | 1000mg | Curre | me Cu | 50 11 | and a | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| | | | | | - | | | - | | | | | J) | Jnit: MT) |
| | 1992 | 1999 | 2000 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
| AAGR | AAGR | =-7.9% | AAGR | =-6.3% | | | | | Projected (growth rate -6.36%) | | | | | |
| Total Cargo | 742,923 | 414,789 | 347,000 | 249,788 | 233,894 | 219,012 | 205,077 | 192,028 | 179,810 | 168,369 | 157,656 | 147,625 | 138,232 | 129,436 |

3.5 Share of Polloc Port in Total Cargo Traffic of Bangsamoro

The share of the Polloc port and the island provinces in the total port traffic generated in and attracted to the Bangsamoro region was 16.8% in 2013 (Table 3.5). Of that, the Polloc port's share was only 4%. Given this, it can be assumed that more than 80% of the cargo traffic enter and exit the ports of Davao, General Santos, and even Cagayan de Oro.

| Гab | ole 3.5 | Cargo | Traffic | Volume a | t Ports in | Bangsamoro | and Their | r Shares, 2 | 013 |
|-----|---------|-------|---------|----------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|-----|
| | | | | | | | | | |

| Port | 2013 (MT) | Share (%) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Bangsamoro total | 3,730,717 | 100 |
| 1. Polloc | 147,625 | 4.0 |
| 2. Isabela | 114,653 | 3.1 |
| 3. Bongao | 182,709 | 4.9 |
| 4. Jolo | 167,795 | 4.5 |
| 5. Lamitan | 4,747 | 0.1 |
| 6. Sitangkai | 9,428 | 0.3 |
| Island provinces total | 479,333 | 12.8 |
| Polloc and island provinces total | 626,957 | 16.8 |

3.6 Growth of Cargo Traffic

The annual growth rates of cargo traffic in the Bangsamoro region are assumed to be 4.2% for 2013–2019, 4.4% for 2019–2022, and 4.5% for 2020–2022. The Polloc port's share in 2013 is estimated to be about 4.0% of the total Bangsamoro cargo traffic as shown in Table 3.6. If at least 5% of the total
cargo traffic is to pass through the Polloc port in 2019, traffic volume must increase by 8.4% annually taking 2013 as the base year. This will bring the share of the Polloc port and the island provinces in the total cargoes passing through Bangsamoro ports to 17.5%.

If the Polloc port's share in the Bangsamoro cargo traffic increases to 10% by 2019, the traffic volume must grow at an annual rate of 31.5% (Table 3.7). Such increase is possible if the needs of shippers are met and all the plantations in Bangsamoro planned for expansion will use the Polloc port instead of the Davao port or the General Santos port.

It should be noted that a 10% share of all the cargoes at Bangsamoro ports in 2022 means 543,897 MT (Table 3.8). The Polloc port once handled a traffic volume of 742,923 MT in 1997. Thus, the port capacity is not an issue. Inbound and outbound cargoes to/from Bangsamoro are mostly from outside of the region.

| Port | 2013 (%) | 2019 (%) | 2022 (%) | 2030 (%) |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Polloc (target share) | 4.0 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 15.0 |
| 2. Isabela | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.2 |
| 3. Bongao | 4.9 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 7.0 |
| 4. Jolo | 4.5 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.7 |
| 5. Lamitan | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| 6. Sitangkai | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Island provinces total | 12.8 | 12.5 | 13.7 | 13.3 |
| Polloc and island provinces total | 16.8 | 17.5 | 23.7 | 28.3 |

Table 3.6 Share of Ports in Total Bangsamoro Cargo Traffic for 2013, 2019, 2022, and 2030

| Port | 2013–19 (% p.a.) | 2019–22 (% p.a.) | 2022–30 (% p.a.) |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Bangsamoro total | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| 1. Polloc | 8.4 | 31.5 | 9.9 |
| 2. Isabela | 2.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |
| 3. Bongao | 5.6 | 11.2 | 5.6 |
| 4. Jolo | 2.7 | 5.4 | 2.7 |
| 5. Lamitan | 2.4 | 4.8 | 2.4 |
| 6. Sitangkai | 4.8 | 9.6 | 4.8 |
| Island provinces total | 3.7 | 7.7 | 4.0 |
| Polloc and island provinces total | 4.9 | 15.6 | 6.8 |

| | a b b a | | D 0 0010 0000 |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| Lable 3.7 Projected | Growth in Cargo |) Traffic at Ports in | Bangsamoro for 2013–2030 |

| Table 3.8 Cargo | • Volume at Ports in | Bangsamoro for 2013, | 2019, 2022, and 2030 |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

| Port | 2013 (ton) | 2019 (ton) | 2022 (ton) | 2030 (ton) |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Bangsamoro total | 3,730,717 | 4,785,359 | 5,438,968 | 7,741,208 |
| 1. Polloc | 147,625 | 239,268 | 543,897 | 1,161,181 |
| 2. Isabela | 114,653 | 129,118 | 145,240 | 170,172 |
| 3. Bongao | 182,709 | 253,363 | 348,384 | 538,728 |
| 4. Jolo | 167,795 | 196,880 | 230,528 | 285,291 |
| 5. Lamitan | 4,747 | 5,473 | 6,300 | 7,616 |
| 6. Sitangkai | 9,428 | 12,490 | 16,444 | 23,928 |
| Island provinces total | 479,333 | 597,325 | 746,896 | 1,025,735 |
| Polloc and island provinces total | 626,957 | 836,593 | 1,290,793 | 2,186,916 |

3.7 Future Passenger Traffic

The only passenger traffic data available for the Polloc port are for the period between 1992 and 1997. During this period, the annual growth rate was 31.4%. Assuming that this trend continued, the traffic volume in 2013 would have been about 24 million. This may not be a reasonable estimate. The existing and projected passenger traffic are presented in Table 3.9.

| | Existing Data | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|--|
| | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | | | |
| Passenger Traffic (n) | 76,728 | 124,526 | 149,196 | 159,501 | 299,492 | 300,593 | | | |
| - Disembarking | 39,981 | 58,837 | 74,297 | 77,212 | 140,659 | 141,279 | | | |
| - Embarking | 36,747 | 65,689 | 74,899 | 82,289 | 158,833 | 159,314 | | | |
| Growth Rate (%/year) | | | | | | | | | |
| Passenger Traffic | | 62 | 20 | 7 | 88 | 0 | | | |
| - Disembarking | | 47 | 26 | 4 | 82 | 0 | | | |
| - Embarking | | 79 | 14 | 10 | 93 | 0 | | | |

| | Projections | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| | 1998 | 2013 | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 | AAGR (92–97) | | | | |
| Passenger Traffic (n) | 394,988 | 23,749,738 | 122,261,240 | 277,398,295 | 2,465,720,028 | 31.40% | | | | |
| - Disembarking | 181,854 | 8,024,062 | 36,497,493 | 77,839,029 | 586,618,489 | 28.72% | | | | |
| - Embarking | 213,629 | 17,408,306 | 101,203,370 | 244,013,697 | 2,550,735,864 | 34.09% | | | | |
| Growth Rate (%/year) | | 1998-2013 | 2013-19 | 2019-22 | 2022-30 | | | | | |
| Passenger Traffic | | 31 | 31 | 31 | 31 | | | | | |
| - Disembarking | | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 | | | | | |
| - Embarking | | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | | | | | |

| Year | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| AAGR | | | | 7.9 | 9% | | | | | | 6.3 | 3% | | |
| 1. Total Cargo Throughput (MT) | 742,923 | 504,840 | 525,115 | 704,633 | 559,981 | 606,043 | 570,875 | 414,789 | 347,000 | 452,370 | 322,105 | 361,505 | 284,486 | 249,788 |
| a. Domestic | 712,610 | 481,035 | 484,733 | 552,613 | 459,679 | 496,567 | 471,622 | 340,540 | 284,887 | 371,396 | 264,448 | 296,795 | 233,564 | 205,076 |
| Inbound | 274,418 | 180,714 | 198,934 | 243,401 | 206,195 | 222,424 | 250,834 | 152,897 | 127,914 | 166,757 | 118,737 | 133,261 | 104,870 | 92,079 |
| Breakbulk | 19,840 | 39,502 | 33,549 | 50,997 | 89,805 | 97,400 | 109,364 | 66,657 | 55,770 | 72,706 | 51,769 | 58,102 | 45,723 | 40,146 |
| Bulk | 254,578 | 53,742 | 63,279 | 79,299 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Containerized | 0 | 87,470 | 102,106 | 113,105 | 116,390 | 125,024 | 141,470 | 86,240 | 72,144 | 94,051 | 66,968 | 75,159 | 59,147 | 51,933 |
| Outbound | 438,192 | 300,321 | 285,799 | 309,212 | 253,484 | 274,143 | 220,788 | 187,643 | 156,973 | 204,639 | 145,711 | 163,534 | 128,694 | 112,997 |
| Breakbulk | 313,983 | 123,904 | 111,525 | 108,855 | 95,418 | 103,078 | 83,016 | 70,554 | 59,022 | 76,944 | 54,787 | 61,489 | 48,389 | 42,487 |
| Bulk | 117,666 | 10,665 | 6,493 | 17,016 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Containerized | 6,543 | 165,752 | 167,781 | 183,341 | 158,066 | 171,065 | 137,772 | 117,089 | 97,951 | 127,695 | 90,924 | 102,045 | 80,305 | 70,510 |
| b. Foreign | 30,313 | 23,805 | 40,382 | 152,020 | 100,302 | 109,476 | 99,253 | 74,249 | 62,113 | 80,974 | 57,656 | 64,710 | 50,923 | 44,712 |
| Import | 26,396 | 10,151 | 30,490 | 120,694 | 76,443 | 82,659 | 75,631 | 56,578 | 47,330 | 61,702 | 43,934 | 49,309 | 38,803 | 34,071 |
| Breakbulk | 22,479 | 10,151 | 30,490 | 120,694 | 76,443 | 82,659 | 75,631 | 56,578 | 47,330 | 61,702 | 43,934 | 49,309 | 38,803 | 34,071 |
| Bulk | 3,917 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Containerized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Export | 3,917 | 13,654 | 9,892 | 31,326 | 23,859 | 26,817 | 23,622 | 17,671 | 14,783 | 19,272 | 13,722 | 15,401 | 12,120 | 10,641 |
| Breakbulk | 3,917 | 13,654 | 9,892 | 31,326 | 23,859 | 26,817 | 23,622 | 17,671 | 14,783 | 19,272 | 13,722 | 15,401 | 12,120 | 10,641 |
| Bulk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Containerized | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c. Transit Cargo | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Domestic | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Inward | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Outward | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Foreign | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Import | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Export | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| d. Foreign (transshipment) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Particulars | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|--|--|
| AAGR | 6.36% (projected) | | | | | | | rojected) | | | | |
| 1. Total Cargo Throughput (MT) | 233,894 | 219,012 | 205,077 | 192,028 | 179,810 | 168,369 | 157,656 | 147,625 | 138,232 | 129,436 | | |
| a. Domestic | 192,027 | 179,809 | 168,368 | 157,655 | 147,624 | 138,231 | 129,436 | 121,200 | 113,488 | 106,267 | | |
| Inbound | 86,220 | 80,734 | 75,597 | 70,787 | 66,283 | 62,066 | 58,117 | 54,419 | 50,956 | 47,714 | | |
| Breakbulk | 37,592 | 35,200 | 32,960 | 30,863 | 28,899 | 27,060 | 25,338 | 23,726 | 22,217 | 20,803 | | |
| Bulk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Containerized | 48,629 | 45,535 | 42,637 | 39,924 | 37,384 | 35,005 | 32,778 | 30,693 | 28,740 | 26,911 | | |
| Outbound | 105,807 | 99,075 | 92,771 | 86,868 | 81,341 | 76,165 | 71,319 | 66,781 | 62,532 | 58,553 | | |
| Breakbulk | 39,784 | 37,252 | 34,882 | 32,663 | 30,584 | 28,638 | 26,816 | 25,110 | 23,512 | 22,016 | | |
| Bulk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Containerized | 66,024 | 61,823 | 57,889 | 54,206 | 50,757 | 47,527 | 44,503 | 41,671 | 39,020 | 36,537 | | |
| b. Foreign | 41,867 | 39,203 | 36,709 | 34,373 | 32,186 | 30,138 | 28,220 | 26,425 | 24,743 | 23,169 | | |
| Import | 31,903 | 29,873 | 27,973 | 26,193 | 24,526 | 22,966 | 21,505 | 20,136 | 18,855 | 17,656 | | |
| Breakbulk | 31,903 | 29,873 | 27,973 | 26,193 | 24,526 | 22,966 | 21,505 | 20,136 | 18,855 | 17,656 | | |
| Bulk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Containerized | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Export | 9,964 | 9,330 | 8,736 | 8,180 | 7,660 | 7,172 | 6,716 | 6,288 | 5,888 | 5,513 | | |
| Breakbulk | 9,964 | 9,330 | 8,736 | 8,180 | 7,660 | 7,172 | 6,716 | 6,288 | 5,888 | 5,513 | | |
| Bulk | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Containerized | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| c. Transit Cargo | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Domestic | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Inward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Outward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Foreign | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Import | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| Export | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| d. Foreign (transshipment) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |

CHAPTER 4 PROPOSAL OF PRIORITY PROJECTS

4.1 Cargo and Passenger Traffic of Bangsamoro Ports

The future cargo and passenger traffic at the ports in Bangsamoro reported in Chapter 3 is summarized in Table 4.1.

| Port | Item | 2015 | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 |
|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Polloc | Cargo (MT) | 432,598 | 921,197 | 1,060,318 | 1,542,860 |
| Icobolo | Cargo (MT) | 119,285 | 129,118 | 145,240 | 170,172 |
| Isabela | Passenger | 1,365,269 | 1,443,345 | 1,568,013 | 1,752,480 |
| Domago | Cargo (MT) | 203,746 | 253,363 | 348,384 | 538,728 |
| Bongao | Passenger | 213,974 | 233,434 | 265,623 | 316,135 |
| Iala | Cargo (MT) | 282,950 | 314,769 | 368,564 | 456,118 |
| J010 | Passenger | 471,158 | 524,141 | 613,720 | 759,511 |
| Lomiton | Cargo (MT) | 4,978 | 5,473 | 6,300 | 7,616 |
| Lamitan | Passenger | 332,271 | 384,245 | 476,015 | 636,577 |
| Sitangkai | Cargo (MT) | 10,355 | 12,490 | 16,444 | 23,928 |
| | Passenger | 28,576 | 32,037 | 37,941 | 47,691 |

 Table 4.1 Future Port Traffic at Ports in Bangsamoro (2015–2030)

4.2 Polloc Port

4.2.1 Overview

The Polloc port was constructed by Nam Kwang Construction Company, Ltd. in 1977 funded by ADB. Port operation was started by PPA in March 1980 and transferred to DOTC-ARRM. Operation and management of the Polloc Freeport was started in 2010 by REZA. As mentioned in Chapter 2, the Polloc port has high potential as a major port with respect to construction, operation and management, and it is one of the best ports in the Philippines.

4.2.2 Existing system of the port operation

The study of the port operation of the Polloc port is based on available actual statistical data obtained from REZA. There are no data available for the Polloc port from 2006 to 2012, but data from 1995 to 2003 are available as attached in Appendix A. The latest record of cargo throughput at the Polloc port in 2013 was 296,354 tons.

| 1) Berth length: | 400 m |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 2) Ship call: | 181 ships |
| 3) Ship size: | 2,000 GT container ship |
| 4) Vessel waiting time: | Once a month |
| 5) Forklift: | 2 units |
| 6) Truck chassis: | 6 units |
| 7) Reach stacker: | 2 units (new) |

For port operation, productivity is the primary concern for the production and any service activities. This could be measured in many ways, as in the manufacturing and services sectors, but the bottom line always is to produce more at the least possible cost. Indicators of productivity in port operation are used to measure the proficiency and ability to serve the port's constituents. These are as follows.

(1) Indicators of output

The major indicators of output are the annual berth throughput, ship output and gang output. The annual berth throughput measures the total volume of cargo handled at the berth yearly. As indicated above, no data are available for the Polloc port from 2006 to 2012. The ship output indicator measures

the rate at which cargo is handled to and from a vessel at a berth. It is expressed in one of three ways, depending on the time period used to measure the weight of cargo handled such as working hour, ship-hour at berth and lineal meter of berth. These records, however, are not available for the Polloc port.

(2) Indicators of service

There are many indicators that can be used to measure the quality of service that a port provides for its users (shippers, importers, ship owners), but the most commonly used indicator is ship turnaround time, i.e., the total time spent by a particular vessel in the port.

(3) Indicators of utilization

Indicators of utilization are measures of how intensively berth facilities and resources are used. There are two important indicators in this group: berth occupancy (the proportion of time a berth is occupied by vessels) and capacity utilization (the proportion of actual traffic to either the optimum capacity using optimum berth occupancy rate (OBOR) or maximum capacity using 100% OBOR. Berth occupancy effectively indicates the level of demand for port services. It can be measured over various time intervals, and is normally expressed as a percentage:

Berth occupancy rate = {(Ship calls)(Average LOA)(Spacing factor)(Average service time)(100)}/{(Available berth length)(Days/year)(Hours/day)}

High berth occupancy causes quality of service to decline. It is signals for congestion, and there is a danger that ships have to queue for a berth. The other extreme, low berth occupancy (45% or less in the case of general cargo berth) indicates that resources are being underused.

Berth occupancy is an indicator to be used with caution- aiming for high values may be very dangerous (in terms of congestion delays), while low values may be uneconomic (in terms of return on investment). Research and experience have shown that, at a general cargo berth, berth occupancy values within the range of 40% to 70% are perhaps the optimum.

(4) Indicators of efficiency

Indicators of efficiency, as measured by the cost per ton of cargo, are determined from a cost-based study. It is analogous to time utilization, but in this case, it involves prorating the cost among the contributory port facilities and related services.

There are no available data for the Polloc port to measure the port performance by the four indicators described above, therefore, it is recommended to apply general indicators for port development. For reference, tonnage per lineal meter of berth specified in UNCTAD standard will be examined in the next paragraph.

Tons/Lineal meter of berth = Total tonnage/Berth length

4.2.3 Cargo handling capacity of representative ports in Mindanao and Manila ports

In order to determine the required scale of the plan for future cargo traffic, it is necessary to determine the present cargo handling capacity of the port. Port capacity is generally calculated in terms of the volume of cargo. Since port capacity varies according to the types of the cargo, size of lot, size of the berth, methods of loading and unloading, etc., it is often represented simply as the volume of cargo handled at the port.

To assess the handling volume per lineal meter for busy and increasing handling volume of cargo, the Davao, General Santos, Zamboanga and Manila North Harbor ports were selected and the ton/lineal meter was calculated together with ratio of container cargo. Generally, if container cargo is increased, the handling volume of cargo is increased as well due to the efficiency of the movement of cargo. The result of the calculation is indicated in Table 4.2.

The present handling ton/lineal meter at the Polloc port is 296,354 tons/400 m = 740 ton/m which indicates under-utilization of the port and port facilities. According to the statistic of cargo throughput of the Polloc port in 2013, percentage of container cargo is 47% which is less than that of the Zamboanga

port. Based on the above, the port capacity of Polloc port is estimated at 2,000 ton/m/year considering the increase in the containerization of cargos handled at the port in the future.

| | Davao | Zamboanga | General Santos | Manila North Harbor |
|------------------------|-------|-----------|----------------|---------------------|
| Ton/LM | 3,925 | 1,503 | 3,154 | 2,581 |
| Ratio of Container (%) | 88 | 57 | 83 | 80 |

Table 4.2 Tons per Lineal Meter of Berth in Mindanao and Manila

4.2.4 Present conditions for new development for Polloc port

(1) Fuel oil depot

Based on the REZA information, DS3 Management started the construction of an oil supply facility in the Polloc port in May 2015. The information is summarized as follows (Figure 4.1).

- 1) DS3 will invest in the Polloc port with strong Philippines based fuel supply
- 2) Initially floating storage will be used to provide immediate storage
- 3) Once fuel volumes have grown, storage tanks will be built in the eco-zone of Polloc port; the proposed size of the tanks is two 8 million liters tanks for diesel oil and one 5 million liter tank for gasoline for a total of 21 million liters.
- 4) By providing local storage, the serious logistical problems of delivering fuel by road from Davao will be removed.
- 5) Local fuel price will be reduced, which will promote economic growth with larger fuel usage



Figure 4.1 Schematic Drawing of Oil Handling and Deposit at Polloc Port

(2) Corn import from Indonesia

The import of 40,000 tons of corn from Indonesia for the LAMSAM corn starch company started in June 2015. The port operator LAMSAM purchased a pneumatic unloader for corn unloading from ship to truck (Photo 16).



Photo 16

(3) RORO ramp

REZA prepared a RORO ramp construction plan (Photos 17 and 18). Objectives of the RORO ramp (12 m x 20 m) are as follows:

- 1) RORO transportation will become part of the Strong Nautical Highway of the Philippines and included in the Western Mindanao RORO link.
- 2) RORO will enhance mobility and improve linkages between islands, provide access to markets or activity centers, and support different business sectors in ARMM.
- 3) The delivery of basic goods and farm produce is made easier, economical and efficient as travel time to and from destinations as well as transportation costs are considerably reduced.



Photo 17

Photo 18

(4) Latest cargo volume handled in Polloc port

The latest statistic of cargo volume handled in the Polloc port is indicated in Table 4.3. According to the above data, increase of the cargo volume is significant in recent years.

| Table 4.3 Latest Data on C | Cargo Volume at Polloc | e Port (2013–2015) |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|

| Year | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 |
|------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| Cargo throughput (ton) | 296,351 | 358,111 | 433,380 |
| Growth ratio (%) | - | 20.8 | 21.0 |

Note: Cargo throughput in 2015 estimated from January-June data.

4.2.5 **Proposed port development**

(1) Required number of berths

The number of berths required to handle a given volume of cargo differs greatly depending on the nature of the port, kind of cargos, cargo handling facilities, etc. There are several methods in determining the berth length. For the rough estimate of the required total length of berth, the unit productivity method is mainly used as below.

Unit productivity = (Converted cargo volume)/(Converted berth length) = 700–1,100 t/m

(1,000ton/m for general cargo and 2,000 ton/m for container to be used for calculation.)

The adjusting rates for bulk and general cargo and containers are 0.5 and 1.0, respectively, and the adjusting rate for berth is as shown in Table 4.4.

| Water depth of berth | Converted berth length |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| 2.10–3.90 m | 1/3 x berth length |
| 4.00–7.40 m | 2/3 x berth length |
| 7.50 m ≤ | Berth length |

Table 4.4 Relation of Water Depth and Berth Length

Projections of cargo volume and required berth lengths at the Polloc port for 2019, 2022, and 2030 are summarized in Tables 4.5 through 4.8.

| Table 4.5 Cargo | Forecast f | or Polloc | Port in | 2019. | 2022. | and 2 | 030 |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|---------------|-------|-----|
| Table 4.5 Cargo | I of cease f | | IUIU | ZUI), | LULL , | and 2 | 000 |

| Dolloo nort | Year | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 |
|-------------|------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Fonoc port | Cargo (MT) | 921,197 | 1,060,318 | 1,542,860 |

Table 4.6 Required Berth Length for General Cargo at Polloc Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030

| Year | Cargo throughput (ton) | Required berth length* (m) [a] | Existing berth length (m) [b] | Required extension of berth [a]-[b] |
|------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 2019 | 460,599 | 230 | 200 | 30 |
| 2022 | 530,159 | 265 | 200 | 65 |
| 2030 | 771,430 | 386 | 200 | 186 |

*Assuming that general cargo accounts for 50% of total throughput.

Table 4.7 Required Berth Length for Container Cargo in 2019, 2022, and 2030

| Year | Cargo throughput (ton) | Required berth length (m) [a] | Existing berth length (m) [b] | Required extension of berth [a]-[b] |
|------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 2019 | 460,599 | 230 | 200 | 30 |
| 2022 | 530,159 | 265 | 200 | 65 |
| 2030 | 771,430 | 386 | 200 | 186 |

*Assuming that container cargo accounts for 50% of total throughput.

Table 4.8 Required Berth Length for General and Container Cargo in 2019, 2022, and 2030

| Year | Cargo throughput | Required berth | Existing berth | Required extension | Proposed extension |
|------|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | (ton) | length (m) [a] | length (m) [b] | of berth [a]-[b] | of berth (m) |
| 2019 | 921,197 | 460 | 400 | 60 | 0 |
| 2022 | 1,060,318 | 530 | 400 | 130 | 200 |
| 2030 | 1,542,860 | 772 | 400 | 372 | 200 |

(2) Required transit shed area

The transit shed area required to handle the cargo volume is determined by the following:

Transit shed area = (VET x RF x 2.2)/SD

Where

VET = (DT x ET x PF)/365

| | VET: | Volume within a dwell time |
|---------|----------|--|
| | DT: | Design traffic volume |
| | ET: | Dwell time |
| | PF: | Peak factor |
| | RF: | Re-stowing factor |
| | SD: | Stacking density (1.0–1.50 MT/m ² for general |
| Transit | shed are | ea = (DT x ET x PF x RF x 2.2)/(SD x 365) |
| | | $= (771,430 \times 25\% \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.2)/(1000)$ |
| | | $= 4,556 \text{ m}^2$ (existing shed 11,960 m ²) |

cargo)

.5 x 365)

No additional transit shed is necessary.

(3) Required open storage

The open storage area required is calculated as follows:

Open storage area = (VET x RF x 2.0)/SD $VET = (DT \times ET \times PF)/365$ Where VET: Vol. within a dwell time DT: Design traffic volume Dwell time ET: PF: Peak factor RF: **Re-stowing factor** Stacking density $(1.0-1.50 \text{ MT/m}^2 \text{ for general cargo})$ SH: Open storage area = $(DT \times ET \times PF \times RF \times 2.0)/(SD \times 365)$ $= (771.430 \times 55\% \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.0)/(1.5 \times 365)$ $= 9.113 \text{ m}^2$ $= 9,200 \text{ m}^2$ (using existing open yard)

(4) Required container yard

The container yard necessary to store and handle the expected volume of containers is determined as follows:

Ground slots = (VET x RF x 2.0)/SH $VET = (DT \times ET \times PF)/365$ Where VET: Volume within a dwell time Design traffic volume DT: ET: Dwell time PF: Peak factor RF: Re-stowing factor Stacking height SH: Ground slots = (DT x ET x PF x RF x 2.0)/(SH x 365) $= (771,430 \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.0)/(1.0 \times 365)$ $= 24,854 \text{ m}^2$ $\approx 25,000 \text{ m}^2$

(5) Medium/long-term development plans for Polloc port

The construction of the wharf including the aforementioned expansion and construction of the berth and other facilities will be completed by 2030 as presented in Table 4.9. The medium- and long-term development plans for 2022 and 2030 are indicated by Figures 4.2 and 4.3 based on the required facilities described above.

Table 4.9 Completion of Port Facilities at Polloc Port by 2022 and 2030

| | 2022 | 2030 |
|----------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| Completion of wharf construction | 200 m | 200 m |
| Completion of container yard | | 25,000 m ² |

(6) Cost estimate on Polloc port development

The costs of the medium- and long-term development plans for 2022 and 2030 are estimated and summarized in Table 4.10.



Figure 4.2 Polloc Port Development Plan by 2022



Figure 4.3 Polloc Port Development Plan by 2030

| | | | | | | (Unit: US\$) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | 2022 | | | 2030 | |
| Cost component | Local portion | Foreign portion | Total | Local portion | Foreign portion | Total |
| A. Construction | 10,616,806 | 7,940,070 | 18,556,876 | 14,214,224 | 10,659,147 | 24,873,371 |
| 1. Preparation works | 580,000 | 1,270,000 | 1,850,000 | 580,000 | 1,270,000 | 1,850,000 |
| 2. Dredging and reclamation | 2,614,500 | 560,500 | 3,175,000 | 2,956,500 | 596,000 | 3,552,500 |
| 3. Berth construction | 5,168,650 | 2,741,050 | 7,909,700 | 5,168,650 | 2,741,050 | 7,909,700 |
| 4. Yard construction | 1,431,150 | 682,350 | 2,113,500 | 4,402,875 | 1,923,375 | 6,326,250 |
| 5. Other expenses | 782,506 | 1,926,170 | 2,708,676 | 1,021,199 | 2,513,722 | 3,534,921 |
| 6. Equipment procurement | 40,000 | 760,000 | 800,000 | 85,000 | 1,615,000 | 1,700,000 |
| B. Contingency and taxes | 3,129,704 | 952,808 | 4,082,513 | 4,619,471 | 1,598,872 | 6,218,343 |
| 1. Physical contingency | 530,840 | 397,003 | 927,844 | 710,711 | 532,957 | 1,243,669 |
| 2. Price escalation | 743,176 | 555,805 | 1,298,981 | 1,421,422 | 1,065,915 | 2,487,337 |
| 3. Taxes and duties | 1,855,688 | 0 | 1,855,688 | 2,487,337 | 0 | 2,487,337 |
| C. Consulting services | 467,633 | 1,019,144 | 1,558,778 | 626,809 | 1,462,554 | 2,089,363 |
| Total project cost (A+B+C) | 14,214,144 | 9,984,022 | 24,198,166 | 19,460,504 | 13,720,573 | 33,181,077 |

4.2.6 Urgent improvement plan

Due to the minimal maintenance since 1977, after the completion of port facilities, the fender system and bollards need to be replaced, the water supply system should be rehabilitated, and the soil deposit in front of the wharf should be removed. A detailed investigation should be conducted before the implementation of the improvement of these works. Damaged fenders and bollards are shown in Photos 19 and 20). A rough cost estimate of fenders and bollards replacement is presented in Table 4.11.



Photo 19: Damaged Fenders



Photo 20: Damaged Bollards

Table 4.11 Estimated Cost of Fenders and Bollards Replacement

| | Estimated cost (US\$) |
|----------|-----------------------|
| Fenders | 656,000 |
| Bollards | 115,500 |
| Total | 771,500 |

4.2.7 Institution of Polloc port

The Polloc port was constructed in 1977 funded by ADB and started its operation in March 1980 by RPMA until 2010. By virtue of MMAA No. 154 and Proclamation No. 1 dated May 15, 2010, the Polloc port was transferred to REZA as the Polloc Freeport and Ecozone as shown on the right. The organization of the Polloc port is composed of the port Manager and Divisions of Resource Management, Port Services, Planning, Business and Investment, Port Police and Engineering Services as shown in Figure 4.4. The Polloc port is operated by a private operator, PTC. However, a new operator of Lamsan Trading will continue the port operation until 2022.





Figure 4.4 Existing Organization of Polloc Port (REZA)

4.2.8 Necessity of cargo and passenger traffic between Polloc and BaSulTa

Cotabato City with its surroundings is envisioned to be the capital of Bangsamoro. With the port and other means of transportation, it is a central location for the transfer of goods and people to and from the nearby main islands, namely, Basilan, Sulu, and Tawi-Tawi. In addition, the Polloc port will be along a trunk line for marine transportation with the three main islands, which may constitute the fundamental infrastructure development to support economic and social activities.

In addition, small islands which are located near the three main islands shall be interconnected to the main islands by feeder lines. The inter-connection between Isabela and Zamboanga is also very important for three main islands. Figure 4.5 shows the schematic flow of marine transportation among all ports in Bangsamoro considering the volume and origins and destinations.

Conventional type ships or RORO ships are commonly used in the Philippines to transport cargos and passengers. The BaSulTa area is rich in agriculture and fishery resources and it also has the potential to establish an agri-industrial center for the processing of agriculture and fishery products. There is a plan to develop the Bongao port into an international seaport and a gateway for trade with Indonesia of BIMP-EAGA.

4.2.9 Development plan of new Cotabato port

The new Cotabato port (Timaco port) was proposed by the defunct Metro Cotabato Regional Agro-Industrial Center. The proposed Timaco port development was denied by the Regional Planning and Development Office (ARMM NEDA) because of the existing and nearby Polloc port only 25 km away.



Figure 4.5 Cargo and Passenger Traffic between Polloc and BaSulTa

The incumbent Congresswoman of Cotabato still supports the development for the Timaco port and made a request to MINDA for its implementation. MINDA endorsed the request on the condition that it is approved by the PPA Board and the results of the assessment of conflict between the Polloc port and the Timaco port, under process financed by USAID, should be reflected.

4.3 Bongao Port

Tawi-Tawi is one of the most remote island provinces in the Philippines. Its residents are highly dependent on the maritime travel because of the remoteness of the islands. The Bongao port is an important sub-hub connecting numerous smaller nearby island ports to other ports in the Sulu archipelago as well as the regional hub of Zamboanga. An improved Bongao port will strengthen the economic linkage between Tawi-Tawi and Zamboanga City and to BIMP-EAGA.

4.3.1 Present conditions of Bongao port

According to statistics of the Bongao port, cargo throughput was 125,331 tons per year in 2013 and the total length of cargo berth is 163 m. The productivity of the Bongao port is 770 ton/m/year. Considering the lack of backup area and very narrow apron of 9 m, it is assumed that the existing port facility is almost saturated in its capacity. The total ship calls to the Bongao port was 392 in 2012 and the average ship size is 400 GT. The berthing time of the ships was 6 to 12 hours/call for loading and unloading. Calling ports to and from the Bongao port are Zamboanga, Iligan, Sitangkai, Siasi. The main commodities handled in the port are seaweeds, copra, live fish and octopus, dried fish, and sea shells.

4.3.2 Urgent expansion of the port

In order to mitigate the congestion at the Chinese pier, 130 m berthing space through the reclamation of $3,800 \text{ m}^2$ and cargo marshalling area, which would mainly serve motor launches (wooden hulled vessels

with GRT ranging from about 60 to 125 tons) and some conventional vessels (steel-hulled vessels with GRT about 100 tons), should be provided. The expansion of the port will help to decongest the Chinese pier. The Chinese pier would then be better able to accommodate inter-island provincial traffic which uses smaller vessels.

Transit sheds will also be constructed to provide storage space for cargo. An additional small passenger terminal will be constructed to serve vessels at the reclaimed area. Perimeter fences and gates will be constructed to allow for better security. A lighting system will be built to allow for better operations at night. These improvements are expected to increase the capacity of the port while improving efficiency, security and safety. The improvement plan is indicated in Figure 4.6.



Figure 4.6 General Plan of Urgent Expansion of Bongao Port

Rough cost estimate for the urgent expansion of the Bongao port is as presented in Table 4.12.

| | | | (Unit: US\$) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Cost component | Local portion | Foreign portion | Total |
| A. Construction | 1,656,202 | 1,095,067 | 2,751,269 |
| 1. Preparation works | 136,000 | 284,000 | 420,000 |
| 2. Dredging and reclamation | 76,680 | 8,520 | 85,200 |
| 3. Berth construction | 661,260 | 421,260 | 1,082,520 |
| 4. Yard construction | 268,383 | 132,643 | 401,025 |
| 5. Other expenses | 286,379 | 151,145 | 437,524 |
| 6. Equipment procurement | 227,500 | 97,500 | 325,000 |
| B. Contingency and taxes | 473,871 | 131,408 | 605,279 |
| C. Consulting services | 161,775 | 69,332 | 231,107 |
| Total project cost (A+B+C) | 2,291,847 | 1,295,807 | 3,587,655 |

Table 4.12 Rough Cost Estimate for Urgent Expansion of Bongao Port

4.3.3 Cargo and passenger forecast

Estimated cargo volume and passenger traffic at the Bongao port for 2019, 2022, and 2030 are presented in Table 4.13.

Table 4.13 Cargo Forecast for Bongao Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030

| Bongao port | Year | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 |
|-------------|------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Cargo (MT) | 253,363 | 348,384 | 538,728 |
| | Passengers | 233,434 | 265,623 | 316,135 |

4.3.4 Proposed port development

(1) Required number of berths

The number of berths required to handle a given volume of cargos differs greatly depending on the nature of the port, kind of cargo, cargo handling facilities, etc. There are several methods in determining the number of berth length. For the rough estimate of the required total length of berth, the unit productivity method is mainly used as below.

Unit productivity = (Converted Cargo volume)/(converted berth length) = 700–1,100 t/m

The adjusting rate for bulk and general cargo is 0.5, and the adjusting rate for berth is presented in Table 4.4 (see the subsection 4.2.5 for the Polloc port). The required berth length at the Bongao port for the target year of 2019, 2022, and 2030 is projected as presented in Table 4.14.

| Voor | Cargo throughput | Required berth | Existing berth | Required extension | Proposed extension |
|------|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| real | (ton) | length (m) [a] | length (m) [b] | of berth [a]-[b] | of berth (m) |
| 2019 | 253,363 | 189 | 163 | 26 | 0 |
| 2022 | 348,384 | 260 | 163 | 97 | 200 |
| 2030 | 538.728 | 402 | 163 | 239 | 100 |

Table 4.14 Required Berth Length at Bongao Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030

(2) Required transit shed area

The transit shed area required to handle the expected volume of cargos is calculated as follows:

```
Transit shed area = (VET x RF x 2.2)/SD
VET = (DT x ET x PF)/365
```

Where

- VET: Volume within a dwell time
- DT: Design traffic volume
- ET: Dwell time
- PF: Peak factor
- RF: Restowing factor
- SD: Stacking density $(1.0-1.50 \text{ MT/m}^2 \text{ for general cargo})$

```
Transit shed area = (DT x ET x PF x RF x 2.2)/(SD x 365)
```

```
= (538,728 \times 25\% \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.2)/(1.5 \times 365)
```

- $=3,182 \text{ m}^2$
- \approx 3,200 m²

(3) Required open storage

The open storage area required is calculated as follows.

Open storage area = (VET x RF x 2.0)/SD
VET = (DT x ET x PF)/365
Where
VET: Vol. within a dwell time
DT: Design traffic volume
ET: Dwell time
PF: Peak factor
RF: Restowing factor
SD: Stacking density (1.0–1.50 MT/m² for general cargo)
Open storage area = (DT x ET x PF x RF x 2.0)/(SD x 365)
= (538,728 x 55% x 5 x 1.12 x 1.05 x 2.0)/(1.5 x 365)
= 6,364 m²

$$\approx$$
 6,400 m²

(4) Development plan for new Bongao port

The construction of the wharf including the aforementioned expansion and construction of the berth and other facilities will be completed by 2030 as presented in Table 4.15.

| Table 1 15 Communication | of Doved Foodliding of Domeson | Dand La. 2022 and 2020 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| I able 4 15 Completion | OF PORT FACILITIES AT BODOAO | Port by 2022 and 2030 |
| Lable 1115 Completion | of I of t I achieve at Dongao | 1010 by 2022 and 2000 |

| | 2022 | 2030 |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Completion of wharf construction | 200 m | 100 m |
| Completion of transit shed | 1,600 m ² | 1,600 m ₂ |
| Completion of open storage area | 3,200 m ² | 3,200 m ² |

The provincial government plans to implement the Tawi-Tawi ecozone agri-industrial project with 83 ha in Barangay Marasa of Bongao Municipality. Due to the narrow passage and shallow water depth and the lack of space for expansion at the existing Bongao port, a new Bongao port will be constructed in this project area as illustrated in Figure 4.7.



Figure 4.7 General Layout Plan of New Bongao Port for Year 2022 and 2030

(5) Cost estimate on new Bongao port construction

A summary of cost estimates for the Bongao port development is presented in Table 4.16.

| | | | | | | (Unit: US\$) |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | | 2022 | | | 2030 | |
| Cost component | Local portion | Foreign portion | Total | Local portion | Foreign portion | Total |
| A. Construction | 8,642,198 | 8,294,967 | 16,937,165 | 4,140,292 | 4,057,868 | 8,198,160 |
| 1. Preparation works | 242,000 | 498,000 | 740,000 | 144,000 | 286,000 | 430,000 |
| 2. Dredging and reclamation | 1,255,950 | 165,300 | 1,421,250 | 648,000 | 72,000 | 720,000 |
| 3. Berth construction | 1,530,400 | 2,545,600 | 4,076,000 | 695,450 | 1,169,050 | 1,864,500 |
| 4. Yard construction | 3,472,700 | 1,560,300 | 5,033,000 | 1,720,250 | 773,250 | 2,493,500 |
| 5. Building construction | 1,255,100 | 537,900 | 1,793,000 | 504,000 | 216,000 | 720,000 |
| 6. Other expenses | 836,048 | 2,037,867 | 2,873,915 | 398,592 | 971,568 | 1,370,160 |
| 7. Equipment procurement | 50,000 | 950,000 | 1,000,000 | 30,000 | 570,000 | 600,000 |
| B. Contingency and taxes | 2,730,780 | 995,396 | 3,726,176 | 1,316,651 | 486,944 | 1,803,595 |
| C. Consulting services | 533,521 | 1,244,882 | 1,778,403 | 482,052 | 206,594 | 688,645 |
| Total project cost (A+B+C) | 11,906,499 | 10,535,245 | 22,441,744 | 5,938,995 | 4,751,406 | 10,690,401 |

| Table 4 16 Fatimated D. | ango Dout Construction | Costs for 2022 and 2020 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Table 4.10 Estimated B | ongo Port Construction | Costs for 2022 and 2030 |

4.4 Jolo Port

The port of Jolo is the main entry port via the sea to the province of Sulu. It is protected on the northwest by the islands of Cabucan, Marongas and Pangasinan, and on the east by the mountainous range on the island. The port has adequate water and land frontage for the development of port facilities and port oriented industries. According to the feasibility studies and the formulation of a master plan for selected ports in Southern Mindanao conducted in April 2012 by PPA ("the FS in Southern Mindanao" hereinafter), the superstructure of the pier has deteriorated and reinforcing bars have been exposed which are severely corroded. The concrete piles above water have cracks, and many reinforcing bars are rusted completely (Photos 21 and 22).



Photo 21: Superstructure



4.4.1 Present condition of Jolo port

According to the statistics of the Jolo port, cargo throughput at the port is 157,072 tons in 2013 and the total length of the cargo berth is 585 m. The productivity of the Jolo port is only 268 ton/m/year. The one of reasons for under-utilization of the port is the considerable deterioration of the port facilities. Urgent rehabilitation of the berthing facility should be undertaken for handling of increased cargo volume and safety of the port operation. The total ship calls to the Jolo port in 2013 was 1,746, the average ship size was 321 GT and the average berthing time of the ships was 16 hours per call for loading and unloading as recorded in 2009 and 2010. The calling ports to and from the Jolo port are Zamboanga, Sandakan, Bongao, Sitangkai, Siasi, and Luuk. The main commodities handled at the port are cement, food (inbound), copra, seaweeds, abaca, charcoal, and dried/fresh fish (outbound).

4.4.2 Cargo and passenger forecast

Based on the FS in Southern Mindanao, cargo throughput and passenger traffic are estimated and presented in Table 4.17. In the present study, cargo and passenger traffic is estimated as presented in Table 4.18.

| Voor | Motor launch | RoRo cargo | Conventional | Liner/RoPax | WHV cargo | Total cargo | Passengers |
|------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| Teal | cargo (t) | (t) | cargo (t) | (t) | (t) | (t) | (n) |
| 2011 | 26,886 | 72,592 | 169,381 | | 8,856 | 277,715 | 621,690 |
| 2012 | 28,012 | 75,634 | 176,478 | | 9,227 | 289,351 | 649,355 |
| 2013 | 29,186 | 78,803 | 159,969 | 23,903 | 9,614 | 301,475 | 678,251 |
| 2014 | 30,409 | 82,104 | 165,551 | 26,026 | 10,016 | 314,106 | 708,433 |
| 2015 | 31,683 | 85,545 | 171,268 | 28,336 | 10,436 | 327,268 | 739,959 |
| 2016 | 33,011 | 89,129 | 177,115 | 30,852 | 10,873 | 340,980 | 772,887 |
| 2017 | 34,394 | 92,863 | 183,090 | 33,592 | 11,329 | 355,268 | 807,281 |
| 2018 | 35,835 | 96,754 | 189,186 | 36,574 | 11,804 | 370,153 | 843,205 |
| 2019 | 37,336 | 100,808 | 195,398 | 39,821 | 12,298 | 385,661 | 880,727 |
| 2020 | 38,901 | 105,032 | 201,719 | 43,357 | 12,814 | 401,823 | 919,920 |
| 2025 | 50,151 | 128,243 | 233,263 | 65,970 | 15,733 | 493,360 | 1,143,648 |
| 2030 | 64,508 | 156,578 | 264,493 | 100,856 | 19,317 | 605,752 | 1,421,786 |

Table 4.17 Cargo Forecast for Jolo Port Based on FS in Southern Mindanao

| Table 4.18 Cargo | Forecast for | Jolo Port i | n 2019. | 2022. | and 203 | 6 |
|------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|-------|---------|---|
| Table 4.10 Cargo | r or ccast for | JUIU I UI U | u 2017, | 2022, | anu 205 | 0 |

| Jolo Port | Year | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 |
|-----------|------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Cargo (MT) | 314,769 | 368,564 | 456,118 |
| | Passengers | 524,141 | 613,720 | 759,511 |

The difference in both forecasts by the FS in South Mindanao is due to the decrease in cargo and passenger traffic between 2010 and 2013; specifically the cargo throughput decreased from 268,268 tons in 2010 to 153,769 tons in 2011, 98,835 tons in 2012 and 157,027 tons in 2013. It is considered that the Jolo port still has the potential cargo volume of 268,268 tons in 2015 after the normalization of Bangsamoro, and therefore, the decreasing cargo volume from 2011 to 2013 is not taken into account.

The estimated cargo throughput by vessel type for the target years is summarized in Table 4.19.

| Fable 4.19 Estimated | Cargo Volume by | Vessel Type at Jolo | Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030 |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------|

| Year | Motor launch | RoRo cargo | Conventional | Liner/RoPax | WHV cargo | Total cargo |
|------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| | cargo (t) | (t) | cargo (t) | (t) | (t) | (t) |
| 2019 | 30,473 | 82,278 | 159,480 | 32,501 | 10,037 | 314,769 |
| 2022 | 35,681 | 96,339 | 186,736 | 38,056 | 11,753 | 368,564 |
| 2030 | 48,573 | 117,900 | 199,157 | 75,942 | 14,545 | 456,118 |

4.4.3 Proposed port development

The required capacities of facilities are calculated based on the types of vessels calling such as RoRo passenger/cargo type, RoPax passenger/cargo vessels, fast craft type, motor launches, the motorized banca/wooden hulled passenger/cargo vessels and the conventional cargo vessels. The requirements of berths in 2030 are calculated for each vessel type are calculated below.

(1) RoRo berth

Number of berth (NOB) = (Design traffic)/(Gross productivity [{8,760 x ABOR} - BDH]) Where:

| NOB: | Number of berth |
|-------|---|
| DT: | Design traffic |
| GP: | Gross productivity considering the effects of berthing/deberthing hours (BDH) |
| NOB = | 117,900/(22.83 x (8760 x 0.51) |

= 1.15 berths

(2) Conventional berth

NOB = $199,157 / (10.09 \times (8760 \times 0.65))$ = 3.47 berths

Berth length 4 x 1.1 x 55 = 242 m

(3) Liner/RoPax berth

NOB = 75,942 / (68.21 x (8760 x 0.47))= 0.27 berths

(4) Motor launch

NOB = $48,573 / (7.99 \times (8760 \times 0.55))$ = 1.26 berths

Berth length 1 x $1.1 \times 95 = 104.5 \text{ m}$

Berth length $1 \ge 1.1 \ge 35 = 39 \text{ m}$

(5) Motorized banca/WHV (wooden hulled vessel)

NOB = $14,545 / (0.63 \times (8760 \times 0.67))$ = 3.93 berths

Berth length $4 \times 1.1 \times 15 = 66 \text{ m}$

(6) Transit shed

Transit shed area = $(DT \times ET \times PF \times RF \times 2.2)/(SD \times 365)$ $= (456,118 \times 25\% \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.2)/(1.5 \times 365)$ $= 2,694 \text{ m}^2 (\approx 2,700 \text{ m}^2)$

(7) Open storage

Open storage area = $(DT \times ET \times PF \times RF \times 2.0)/(SD \times 365)$ $= (456,118 \times 55\% \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.0)/(1.5 \times 365)$ $= 5,388 \text{ m}^2 (\approx 5,400 \text{ m}^2)$

(8) Container slots

Ground slots = (DT x ET x PF x RF x 2.0)/(SH x 365) $= (75,942 \times 5 \times 1.12 \times 1.05 \times 2.0)/(1.0 \times 365)$ $= 2,446 \text{ m}^2 (\approx 2,500 \text{ m}^2)$

The number of berths required in 2019, 2022, and 2030 is presented in Table 4.20. Considering the berth arrangement, one finger pier will not be constructed by 2019 as indicated in Figure 4.8.

| Veor | RoRo berth | Conventional | Liner/RoPax | Motor | Motorized | Fast craft |
|------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|---------------|------------|
| Teal | (n) | berth (n) | berth (n) | launch (n) | banca/WHV (n) | (n) |
| 2019 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 2022 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 2030 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

Table 4.20 Required Number of Berths at Jolo Port in 2019, 2022, and 2030



Figure 4.8 General Layout Plan of Jolo Port for 2019 and 2030

4.4.4 Rough cost estimate

Rough cost estimates of the Jolo port development for 2030 are summarized in Table 4.21.

| Cost component | Amount (US\$) |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| A. General expenses | 339,284 |
| B. Marine works | 9,573,925 |
| - Reclamation | 1,603,885 |
| - Finger pier | 1,108,919 |
| - RC wharf (piles) L=152 m | 1,843,714 |
| - RC wharf (RC sheet piles) L=138 m | 2,511,035 |
| - Retaining wall | 1,674,304 |
| - RoRo ramp (1 & 2) | 478,580 |
| - Revetment | 156,647 |
| - Demolition works | 196,842 |
| C. Civil works | 2,611,171 |
| D. Building works | 2,332,565 |
| E. Utilities | 723,530 |
| Subtotal (construction cost) | 15,580,476 |
| F. Contingency and taxes | 3,428,305 |
| - Physical contingency | 779,024 |
| - Price escalation | 1,090,633 |
| - Taxes and duties | 1,558,648 |
| G. Consulting services | 1,246,438 |
| Total project cost (A+B+C+D+E+F+G) | 20,255,218 |

Table 4.21 Rough Cost Estimates of Jolo Port Development for 2030

4.5 Isabela Port

The port of Isabela handled only domestic cargo traffic up to the present. The traffic cargo volume handled at this port as compared to the port of Zamboanga was very much smaller and most of the cargo traffic was transported to and from the port of Zamboanga. From 1980 to 1997, the cargo volume and passenger traffic is indicated as shown in Table 4.22.

506,877

496,033

| | Year | 1 | 980 | 19 | 984 | 19 | 985 | 19 | 86 | - 19 | 87 | 198 | 38 | 198 | 9 | 199 | 0 |
|---|------------|------|-------|-----|-------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|-----|-------|----|
| C | Cargo (MT) | 11: | 5,723 | 107 | 7,005 | 102 | ,807 | 109 | ,681 | 110, | 069 | 116, | 336 | 138,9 | 972 | 153,1 | 98 |
| | Passengers | 533 | 3,193 | 292 | 2,442 | 295 | ,541 | 298 | ,800 | 299, | ,244 | 817, | 877 | 620,4 | 179 | 615,4 | 34 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | γ | lear | 199 | 1 | 199 | 92 | 19 | 93 | 19 | 94 | 19 | 95 | 19 | 996 | 19 | 997 | |
| | Cargo (N | (TN | 116,7 | 781 | 119,3 | 312 | 137, | 114 | 160. | ,223 | 187 | ,210 | 175 | ,072 | 198 | 3,793 | |

571,283

653,776

708,189

731,111

618,324

 Table 4.22 Cargo Volume and Passenger Traffic at Isabela Port (1980–1997)

The cargo volume at the port in the past years was characterized by fluctuation. The trend in 1980 to 1985 was downward and decreased steadily to only 102,807 tons, which is equivalent to a negative growth rate of 2.34% per year. The cargo traffic started increasing in 1986 and for the period from 1885 to 1997, the trend was increasing at an average rate of 5.65% per year although the cargo volume went down in 1991. This decrease in volume may have been due to in the effect of the oil price increase in December 1990 and the power crisis that started in 1991. However, in spite of the decrease of volume, the trend for this period was a positive growth. The record of maximum volume in this period is 198,793 tons in 1997.

On the other hand, the port of Isabela handled 533,193 passengers in 1980. The number of passengers has increased to 731,111 in 1997. The average growth rate of passengers handled by the port was only 1.87% per year. The number of passengers went down to 292,442 in 1984, and decreased at the rate of 11.13% per year. However, the number increased in the succeeding years at the rate of 15.80% per year from 1985 to 1990 and by 2.49% per year from 1990 to 1997. The largest number of passengers recorded in this period was 817,877 in 1988, but the largest number of passengers until 2013 was 1,618,837 in 2004.

4.5.1 Present conditions of Isabela port

Passengers

According to statistics of the Isabela port, cargo throughput was 106,195 tons in 2013 and the total length of the cargo berth is 300 m. The productivity of the Isabela port is only 354 ton/m/year. One of the reasons for the under-utilization of the port is the considerable cargo throughput decrease from 150,000 tons in 2004 to 100,000 tons in 2013 and the lack of a backup area behind the wharf. The total ship calls to the Isabela port was 3,745 in 2013, the average ship size was 283 GT and the average berthing time of the ships was 15 hours/call for loading and unloading in the record of 1980 to 1997.

The calling ports to and from the Isabela port are Zamboanga, Jolo and Bongao. The main commodities handled in the port are bottled cargo, petroleum products, palay/rice, cement (inbound), and copra and general cargo (outbound). In addition, deterioration of the port facilities was found in the feasibility study with the master plan port package V port of Isabela, Basilan in 2000 by PPA (FS PPA 2000). Urgent rehabilitation of the berthing facility should be undertaken for the handling of increased cargo volume and safety of the port operation. Typical damages are shown in Photos 23 and 24.



Photo 23: Peeled concrete cover and exposed re-bars



Photo 24: Badly damaged concrete pile of deck

4.5.2 Cargo and passenger forecast

Estimated cargo volume and passenger traffic at the Isabela port for 2019, 2022 and 2030 are indicated in Table 4.23.

| | Year | 2019 | 2022 | 2030 |
|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Isabela port | Cargo (MT) | 129,118 | 145,240 | 170,172 |
| | Passengers | 1,443,345 | 1,568,013 | 1,752,480 |

| Table 4.23 | Cargo | Forecast | for | Isabela | Port | in 2019. | 2022. | and 2030 |
|-------------|-------|------------|-----|---------|------|----------|-------|----------|
| 1 abic 4.20 | Cargo | I UI CCASt | 101 | isabela | IUIU | m #0179 | | anu 2000 |

4.5.3 Proposed port development

Estimated cargo throughput in 2030 is 170,172 tons per year which is smaller than the recorded maximum cargo throughput of 198,793 tons in 1997. The total berth length in 2000 was only 209 m but the berth length has been extended up to 300 m as of 2015. This means the present port capacity will be increased to more than 198,793 tons to accommodate the estimated cargo throughput in 2030. Also, the passenger forecast of 1,752,480 in 2030 is almost the same as the maximum record of the passengers of 1,618,837 in 2004. Therefore, expansion of the port facilities will not be necessary for the Isabela port. As mentioned above, however, urgent rehabilitation of the wharf structure such as concrete slab and piles should be made immediately for the handling of increased cargo volume and safety of the port operation. In addition, the apron width for the loading/unloading of cargo is very narrow at present and this causes the low productivity, and so it is recommended to expand the backup area to stack the incoming cargo temporarily from outside in order to load at night time.



Figure 4.9 General Layout Plan of Isabela Port

4.5.4 PPA expansion plan and land acquisition by Provincial Government

A new port construction is proposed in the northern area based on the cargo throughput of 530,000 tons per year in the FS PPA 2000 as shown in Figures 4.10 and 4.11. For the new port, the provincial government purchased the land for the new port construction area south of Isabela City (Photo 25).



Figure 4.10 General Plan of New Isabela Port



Figure 4.11 Location Map of Proposed New Port



Photo 25: Land purchased by Provincial Government