Emerging Best Practices in Participatory, Accountable and Transparent Governance of Local Governments of Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin and Sorsogon

Executive Summary

Poverty remains the biggest challenge of the Philippine government. The inability of the government to meet the demands of the people for social and economic services is the major reason why poverty is still widespread especially in the countryside. To improve delivery of public services to the poor, the national government decentralized most of its functions and delegated them to the local government units. With the passage of the Local Government Code, services for health, education, and other basic and social services have become the main responsibility of the local government units. However, the lack of capacity of the LGUs on this mandate did little impact to reduce poverty. On the one hand, LGUs are confronted by the inadequacy in resources necessary for the provision of basic and social services to its constituents. On the other hand, as viewed by the national government, it is the dismal performance of the LGUs that makes poverty reduction efforts futile.

Over the years, the government has been promoting good governance. Defined as the process of decision making and implementing decisions effective for social and economic development, good governance is believed to be best approach to poverty reduction.

In the Philippines, there a number of laws and policies that provides for good governance, promoting and mandating it as well as giving specific mechanisms for its strict application in government processes. This includes the 1987 Philippine Constitution, Local Government Code, Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act, Anti-Red Tape Act, the law on ethics and standards for government employees, etc. There have some practical approaches for the promotion of good governance. Some are regulatory in nature (full disclosure policy) while others are in the form of incentives (performance challenge fund of Seal of Good Housekeeping). The latest addition was participatory budgeting.

Budget reform is one of the cornerstones of President Benigno Aquino III’s administration. In 2012, the national government launched the Bottom-up Budgeting which was eventually became Grassroot Participatory Budgeting Process, a priority-matching, cost-matching system of budgeting. The LGUs of Sorsogon City and Municipalities of Bulan, Casiguran and Irosin were included in the pilot areas of GBP.

IRDF through its Participatory Governance Project was deeply involved in the implementation of GPB in Sorsogon. Made possible through IRDF’s partnership with the DILG, LGUs and CSOs in Sorsogon, GPB was successfully conducted for last three years. The success is reflected in the results of the processes within the LGUs’ planning and budgeting. But the most inspiring results
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are the best practices in local good governance borne out of LGUs-CSOs-IRDF interaction during the implementation of the Project Promoting Transparency and Accountability in Local Governance through Active CSO Participation.

Three major factors of good governance were adopted by this study in documenting best practices in local governance in 4 LGUs. They are: 1) leadership quality; 2) stakeholders behavior and response; and 3) mechanisms and strategies. These three factors are then used as point of reflection of the study and were analyzed how good governance principles of transparency, accountability and participation were observed or highlighted during the implementation of GPB as well local development processes internal to the LGUs.

By and large, the best practices demonstrated by the 4 LGUs are very much related and attributable to the Participatory Governance Project. This study also shows that to a certain extent of CSO participation in local development processes, LGUs are bound to perform their governmental functions with accountability and transparency. However, while participatory budgeting represents a promising approach for strengthening the demand side of governance, institutionalizing participatory processes can be challenging and the imperative of going beyond the current level of participation and exploring other innovative mechanisms has come to fore.
I. Concept, Definitions and Elements of Good Governance

Good governance received when poverty became a priority concern of the international community. Its concept is closely knitted to World Bank’s reference to governance as an exercise of the power of the state in managing a country’s social and economic resources, as well as other related mechanisms for public accountability, rule of law, transparency, and citizen participation. It is in this sense that good governance is understood as a political undertaking necessary to achieve social and development goals. Because “good” governance establishes a framework for fighting poverty, inequality, and many of humanities’ other shortcomings, good governance was recognized as an essential component of the Millennium Development Goals [MDGs] by the United Nations (UN). Many believe that the concept of good governance was developed and popularized to establish regime that will govern sustainable poverty reduction aspirations of developing countries as well as to provide policy strategy in the provision of grants and loans by multilateral and international development and financing institutions. Soon, the concept was also recognized by international civil society and donor agencies.

Since then, an extant literature was produced that defines good governance. The definition varies depending on the context and perspective.

There is no universal definition of good governance. However, based on the established concepts presented earlier, good governance can be defined as the decision making process and the process by which decisions are implemented in a manner that produces results critical to economic and social development. World Bank offered a simpler definition of good governance as “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development”. These two definitions shall be used for purposes of this study.

The lack of a more concrete and definitive term for good governance for profound understanding is being compensated by factors, elements and indicators of good governance. They help in fleshing out several ideas to provide better term and characterization to the elusive term of good governance.

First is the assumption that good governance is made up of two important elements or factors: 1) resources (the qualities of the leadership and of the stakeholders), as well as the 2) mechanisms/strategies of organizing and mobilizing the above resources.

Another way to elaborate on good governance is through the description of elements that construct good governance in relation to the pursuit of social and economic development. A wide variety of literature in governance presents many elements of good governance. However, to narrow down and put this study in proper perspective, the elements of participation transparency
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and accountability were chosen. The criteria set forth in selecting these three elements are according to their prominence, significance and relevance to the local governance context in the Philippines which is the area for the study. Definitions and characterization presented here were from UN and those from development bank institutions such as the WorldBank (WB), International Development Association (IDA), and Asian Development Bank (ADB) compiled by IFAD⁴:

Participation – Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good governance. Participation could be either direct or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. It is important to point out that representative democracy does not necessarily mean that the concerns of the most vulnerable in society would be taken into consideration in decision making. Participation needs to be informed and organized. This means freedom of association and expression on the one hand and an organized civil society on the other hand.

Good governance requires that civil society has the opportunity to participate during the formulation of development strategies and that directly affected communities and groups should be able to participate in the design and implementation of programmes and projects. Even where projects have a secondary impact on particular localities or population groups, there should be a consultation process that takes their views into account. This aspect of governance is an essential element in securing commitment and support for projects and enhancing the quality of their implementation.

Government structures should be flexible enough to offer beneficiaries and others affected the opportunity to improve the design and implementation of public programmes and projects. The specific areas of action would be in the development of participatory development processes through, for example, participation of beneficiaries, a public/private-sector interface, decentralization/empowerment of local government and cooperation with non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Transparency - means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media.
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Private-sector investment decisions depend on public knowledge of the government’s policies and confidence in its intentions, as well as in the information provided by the government on economic and market conditions. Transparency of decision-making, particularly in budget, regulatory and procurement processes, is also critical to the effectiveness of resource use and the reduction of corruption and waste. [IDA]

Information should be made available to the general public and there should be clarity as to rules and regulations. Access to timely information on the economy can be vital to economic decision-making by the private sector and can also serve to inhibit corruption. [ADB]

The themes of transparency and information pervade good governance and reinforce accountability. Access to information for the various players in the market is essential to a competitive market economy. [WB]

Accountability—Governments and their employees should be held responsible for their actions. [WB]

It is a key requirement of good governance. Not only governmental institutions but also the private sector and civil society organizations must be accountable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders. Who is accountable to whom varies depending on whether decisions or actions taken are internal or external to an organization or institution. In general an organization or an institution is accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions. Accountability cannot be enforced without transparency and the rule of law. [UN]

At the macro level this includes financial accountability, in terms of an effective, transparent and publicly accountable system for expenditure control and cash management, and an external audit system. It encompasses sound fiscal choices, made in a transparent manner, that give priority to productive social programmes—such as basic health services and primary education—vital to improving the living standards of the poor and promoting economic development—over non-productive expenditures, such as military spending. At the micro level it requires that managers of implementing and parastatal agencies be accountable for operational efficiency. Auditing systems should meet international standards and be open to public scrutiny. [IDA]

Public officials should be answerable for government behaviour and responsive to the entity from which they derive authority. The accountability of public sector institutions is facilitated by evaluation of their economic performance. The suggested specific areas of action would be in the building of government capacity through, for example, public-sector management, public-enterprise
management and reform, public financial management and civil-service reform. [ADB]
II. Philippine Legal Framework on Good Governance

A. 1987 Philippine Constitution

The preamble and Declaration of Principles and Policies of the 1987 Philippine Constitution reflects nation’s mission of good governance which is to promote social and economic development and achieve a condition free from poverty. It also gives emphasis the power vested the Filipino people.

“We, the sovereign Filipino people, imploring the aid of Almighty God, in order to build a just and humane society, and establish a Government that shall embody our ideals and aspirations, promote the common good, conserve and develop our patrimony, and secure to ourselves and our posterity, the blessings of independence and democracy under the rule of law and a regime of truth, justice, freedom, love, equality, and peace, do ordain and promulgate this Constitution.”

Article II – Section 1. The Philippines is a democratic and republican State. Sovereignty resides in the people and all government authority emanates from them.

Section 5. The maintenance of peace and order, the protection of life, liberty, and property, and promotion of the general welfare are essential for the enjoyment by all the people of the blessings of democracy.

The succeeding sections of Article II mandate the Philippine government to serve and function with utmost transparency and accountability and provides for citizens participation.

Section 9. The State shall promote a just and dynamic social order that will ensure the prosperity and independence of the nation and free the people from poverty through policies that provide adequate social services, promote full employment, a rising standard of living, and an improved quality of life for all.

Section 23. The State shall encourage non-governmental, community-based, or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation.

Section 27. The State shall maintain honesty and integrity in the public service and take positive and effective measures against graft and corruption.

Section 28. Subject to reasonable conditions prescribed by law, the State adopts and implements a policy of full public disclosure of all its transactions involving public interest.

In Article XI, Section 1 the call for transparency and accountability by public officials was explicitly stated.
Article XI. Section 1. Public Office is a public trust. Public officers and employees must at all times be accountable to the people, serve them with utmost responsibility, integrity, loyalty, and efficiency, act with patriotism and justice, and lead modest lives.

B. Republic Act 7160 - Local Government Code

Local governments in the Philippines have enjoyed local autonomy since the passage of the Local Government Code (LGC) in 1991. The transfer of control over certain types of resources and the authority to deliver public service to the people comes with a great responsibility to be transparent, accountable and participatory in the management of government affairs.

C. Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act (RA 3019)

Section 1. Statement of policy. — It is the policy of the Philippine Government, in line with the principle that a public office is a public trust, to repress certain acts of public officers and private persons alike which constitute graft or corrupt practices or which may lead thereto.

Section 3. Corrupt practices of public officers. — In addition to acts or omissions of public officers already penalized by existing law, the following shall constitute corrupt practices of any public officer and are hereby declared to be unlawful:


Section 2. It is hereby declared the policy of the State to promote integrity, accountability, proper management of public affairs and public property as well as to establish effective practices aimed at the prevention of graft and corruption in government. Towards this end, the State shall maintain honesty and responsibility among its public officials and employees, and shall take appropriate measures to promote transparency in each agency with regard to the manner of transacting with the public, which shall encompass a program for the adoption of simplified procedures that will reduce red tape and expedite transactions in government.

SEC. 6. Citizen’s Charter. All government agencies including departments, bureaus, offices, instrumentalities, or government-owned and/or controlled corporations, or local government or district units shall set up their respective service standards to be known as the Citizen’s Charter in the form of information billboards which should be posted at the main entrance of offices.
or at the most conspicuous place, and in the form of published materials written either in English, Filipino, or in the local dialect, that detail:

a) The procedure to obtain a particular service;
b) The persons responsible for each step;
c) The maximum time to conclude the process;
d) The document to be presented by the customer, if necessary;
e) The amount of fees, if necessary; and
f) The procedure for filing complaints.

SEC. 7. Accountability of the Heads of Offices and Agencies, - The head of the office or agency shall be primarily responsible for the implementation of this Act and shall be held accountable to the public in rendering fast, efficient, convenient and reliable service. All transactions and processes are deemed to have been made with the permission or clearance from the highest authority having jurisdiction over the government office or agency concerned.

SEC. 10. Report Card Survey. All offices and agencies providing frontline services shall be subjected to a Report Card Survey to be initiated by the Civil Service Commission, in coordination with the Development Academy of the Philippines, which shall be used to obtain feedback on how provisions in the Citizen's Charter are being followed and how the agency is performing.

The Report Card Survey shall also be used to obtain information and/or estimates of hidden costs incurred by clients to access frontline services which may include, but is not limited to bribes and payment to fixers.

A feedback mechanism shall be established in all agencies covered by this Act and the results thereof shall be incorporated in their annual report.

E. RA 6713 (Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees)

In 1989, the Philippine legislature passed Republic Act No. 6713, a law embodying the Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees. The Code spells out in fine detail the do’s and don’ts for government officials and employees in and out of the workplace. These do’s and don’ts are encapsulated in the eight norms of conduct to be observed by all government officials and employees. These norms or standards are:

- Commitment to public interest
- Professionalism
- Justness and sincerity
- Political neutrality
- Responsiveness to the public
- Nationalism and patriotism
- Commitment to democracy
• Simple living

The Code, likewise, introduced some reforms in the administrative systems like giving heads of agencies the responsibility of ensuring there is a value development program for their employees; continuing studies on work systems and procedures with the end in view of improving the delivery of public services; and, mandating the designation of a resident Ombudsman in every department, office and agency.

Incentives and rewards system has also been put in place. Another comprehensive law passed to address and curb the commission of malfeasance in government is Republic Act No. 3019 or the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act. In Section 1 of this law, it states that: It is the policy of the Philippine Government, in line with the principle that a public office is a public trust, to repress certain acts of public officer and private persons alike which constitute graft and corrupt practices which may lead thereto. This law specifies eleven (11) instances of corrupt practices in addition to acts or omissions already penalized by existing laws.

To guide in the enforcement of the code and conduct, an IRR was subsequently issued. The rules provide for mechanisms to promote transparency and accountability of public employees. To wit:

**(IRR) Rule III - Reforms on Public Administrative Systems**

*Section 1. Every department, office and agency shall, as soon as practicable and in no case later than ninety (90) days from the effectivity of these Rules, start conducting value development programs for its officials and employees in order to strengthen their commitment to public service and help promote the primacy of public interest over personal interest in the performance of their duties. Such programs and other parallel efforts on value development shall include, among other things, the following subject:

a. Ethical and moral values;
b. Rights, duties and responsibilities of public servants;
c. Nationalism and patriotism;
d. Justice and human rights;
e. Democracy in a free and just society;
f. Philippine history, culture and tradition; and
g. Socio-economic conditions prevailing in the country, especially in the depressed areas, and the need for a Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards.

Continuing refresher courses and seminars and/or workshops to promote a high standard of ethics in public service shall be conducted.
Section 5. Every department, office and agency shall consult the public they serve for the purpose of gathering feedback and suggestions on the efficiency, effectiveness and economy of services. They shall establish mechanism to ensure the conduct of public consultation and hearings.

Rule IV - Transparency of Transaction and Access to Information

Section 1. Subject to reasonable conditions prescribed by law, the State adopts and implements a policy of full public disclosure of all its transactions involving public interest.

Section 2. It is the responsibility of heads of departments, offices and agencies to establish measures and standards that will ensure transparency of and openness in public transactions in their respective offices, such as in biddings, purchases, other financial transactions including contracts, status of projects, and all other matters involving public interest.

They shall establish information system that will inform the public of the following: (a) policies, rules, and procedures; (b) work programs, projects, and performance targets; (c) performance reports; and (d) all other documents as may hereafter be classified as public information.

Such public information shall be utilized solely for the purpose of informing the public of such policies, programs and accomplishments, and not to build the public image of any official or employee or to advance his own personal interest.

Section 3. Every department, office or agency shall provide official information, records or documents to any requesting public, except if:

(a) such information, record or document must be kept secret in the interest of national defense or security or the conduct of foreign affairs;
(b) such disclosure would put the life and safety of an individual in imminent danger;
(c) the information, record or document sought falls within the concepts of established privilege or recognized exceptions as may be provided by law or settled policy or jurisprudence;
(d) such information, record or document comprises drafts of decisions, orders, rulings, policy decisions, memoranda, etc.;
(e) it would disclose information of a personal nature where disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;
(f) it would disclose investigatory records compiled for law enforcement purposes or information which if written would be contained in such records, but only to the extent that the production of such records or information would (i) interfere with enforcement proceedings, (ii) deprive a person of a right to a fair trial or an impartial adjudication, (iii) disclose the identity of a
confidential source and in the case of a record compiled by a criminal law enforcement authority in the course of a criminal investigation, or by an agency conducting a lawful national security intelligence investigation, confidential information furnished only by the confidential source, or (iv) unjustifiably disclose investigative techniques and procedures; or (g) it would disclose information the premature disclosure of which would (i) in the case of a department, office or agency which agency regulates currencies, securities, commodities, or financial institutions, be likely to lead to significant financial speculation in currencies, securities, or commodities, or significantly endanger the stability of any financial institution; or (ii) in the case of any department, office or agency be likely or significantly to frustrate implementation of a proposed official action, except that subparagraph (f) (ii) shall not apply in any instance where the department, office or agency has already disclosed to the public the content or nature of its proposed action, or where the department, office or agency is required by law to make such disclosure on its own initiative prior to taking final official action on such proposal.

Section 4. Every head of department, office and agency shall establish information systems and networks that will effect the widest possible dissemination of information regarding the provisions of the Code, and the policies and programs relative thereto.

Rule VI. Duties of Public Officials and Employees

Section 1. As a general rule, when a request or petition, whether written or verbal, can be disposed of promptly and expeditiously, the official or employee in charge to whom the same is presented shall do so immediately, without discrimination, and in no case beyond fifteen (15) days from receipt of the request or petition.

Section 6. All public documents must be made accessible to, and readily available for inspection by, the public during office hours, except those provided in

Section 7. All heads or other responsible officers of departments, offices and agencies of the government and government-owned or controlled corporation shall, within forty five (45) working days from the end of the year, render a full and complete report of performance and accomplishments, as prescribed by existing laws and regulations.

Another report of compliance with the provisions of the Code and these Rules shall be prepared and submitted to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission may require officials to provide additional information or furnish documents, if necessary.

In 02 November 1989, then President Corazon Aquino issued an Executive Order, in pursuit of the government’s decentralization policy, efforts are directed to make institutions more effective and more responsive to the needs and conditions of local communities by bringing decision making and action at the local level. The main feature of the said E.O. is the creation of Regional Project Monitoring and Evaluation System (RPMES).

The RPMES primarily aims to expedite project implementation and devolve project facilitation, problem-solving, monitoring and evaluation to the regions and sub-regional levels, particularly to the provincial and municipal levels (Section 1).

One of the objectives of the RPMES is to provide a venue for greater participation of non-government organizations (NGOs) in the development planning process.

The E.O. strictly emphasizes the CSOs participation by stipulating the following provisions:

Section 3. - The extensive participation of non-government organizations (NGOs) as project monitors shall be advocated at all levels. NGO membership in the provincial, city and municipal levels shall include, but shall not be limited to, representatives from either civic and/or religious groups.

At the regional level, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) Regional Director shall be the Chairman of the Regional Project Monitoring Committee (RPMC) with the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) Regional Director as Co-Chairman. The Committee shall have representatives from the Department of Local Government (DLG) and non-government/religious organizations as members. The NEDA Regional Office shall serve as the Secretariat of the Regional PMC.

The PMCs created through Memorandum Order No. 175, as amended, to implement the RPMES at the sub-regional levels (province and municipality) will each be composed of representatives from the DLG, NGOs and the Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) President or PTA Federation representative. There shall likewise be established City Project Monitoring Committees with the same functions and membership, as applicable to the city. The Provincial/City/Municipal Budget Officer will be the Chairman of the Committee with the Provincial/City/Municipal Development Coordinator as Co-Chairman. Secretariat support to the sub-regional PMCs will be provided by the Provincial/City/ Municipal Planning and Development Office.
Then in Section 4 the roles and responsibilities are defined as follows:

*NGO Authorized Monitors*

*a. Assist the PMC or development council in monitoring and evaluation of projects by identifying implementation problems or outstanding performance through project exception reports;*

*b. Ensure effective/efficient implementation of project through vigilance; and*

*c. Act as government partners in ensuring transparency in project implementation.*
III. Practical Approaches to Best Practices on Good Local Governance in the Philippines

a. Local Governance Performance Management System

Local Governance Performance Management System is a system for evaluating the extent to which local governments perform their functions and responsibilities. The purpose of the LGPMS is to help develop LGUs (with exception to Barangay LGUs) in assessing and managing their own performance. It focuses on management concerns like the delivery of social, economic, and environmental services, and ensuring good local governance as a whole. Being a tool for progress, it also guides the local leaders in the said areas in determining the state of development they are in. All of this is very crucial in the planning and decision-making processes of the local public administration.

The result of the evaluation will determine if the LGU is doing an excellent performance in valuing 3 fundamentals of governance identified as: Transparency, Accountability and Participation. The LGPMS indicators set a standard that cultivates a logical basis for our local leaders in making wise decisions.

The discussion by Fro’kre in his work Measuring Performance in Philippine Local Government Units (LGUs)5 provides an overview of the LGPMS uses and benefits to local governments.

As a whole, the LGPMS serves these primary uses:

✓ To build a culture of high performance that is critical in an environment of local autonomy.
✓ To build and pursue an accessible database management for Administrative Governance, Social Governance, Economic Governance, Environmental Governance, and Valuing Fundamentals of Governance that encourages open convergence among stakeholders.
✓ It informs national policy-makers on the state of development in local governments.
✓ It benchmarks local government performance against established standards.

The usefulness of the LGPMS for local government units:

✓ Stimulates innovations
✓ Improves local government management and operations
✓ Suggests ways to provide high quality and essential public services
✓ Improves planning, budgeting, and rational allocation of resources

✓ Strengthens transparency, accountability and participation
✓ Helps achieve a focused vision for the future

There are two major aspects covered by LGPMS: 1) governance aspect; and 2) development aspects. Each aspect is reflected by their elements and their corresponding components enumerated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Aspect</th>
<th>Development Aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Administrative Governance - Local Legislation; Development Planning; Revenue Generation; Resource Allocation &amp; Utilization; Customer Service; Human Resource Management &amp; Development</td>
<td>✓ Social Development - State of Health &amp; Nutrition; State of Education; State of Housing &amp; Basic Utilities; Peace &amp; Order Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Social Governance - Health Service; Support to Education; Support to Housing &amp; Basic Utilities; Peace, Security &amp; Disaster Risk Management</td>
<td>✓ Economic Development - State of Income; State of Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Economic Governance - Support to Agriculture Sector; Support to Fishery Services; Entrepreneurship; Business &amp; Industry Promotion</td>
<td>✓ Environmental Development - State of Agricultural Ecosystem; State of Forest Ecosystem; State of Freshwater Ecosystem; State of Coastal Marine Ecosystem; State of Urban Ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Environmental Governance – Forest Ecosystem Management; Freshwater Ecosystem Management; Coastal Ecosystem Management; Urban Ecosystem Management</td>
<td>✓ Valuing Fundamentals of Good Governance – Transparency; Participation; Financial Accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. From Seal of Good Housekeeping to Seal of Good Local Governance

The 2014 Seal of Good Local Governance otherwise known as Pagkilala sa Katapatan at Kalusuyan ng Pamahalaang Lokal is assessment-type, incentive-based mechanism that promotes good local governance. It builds on the success of its earlier version, the Seal of Good Housekeeping and the DILG’s Full Disclosure Policy. The SLG provides for a process for assessing performance of local government units on the following criteria:

1. **Good Financial Housekeeping** (formerly the Seal of Good Housekeeping) - an LGU that exhibits compliance with accounting and auditing standards, rules and regulations, i.e., with an Unqualified or Qualified COA Opinion of the immediately preceding year; as well as Compliance with the Full Disclosure Policy of Local Budget and Finances, Bids and Public Offerings e.g., Annual Budget, Statement of Receipts and Expenditures, Annual Procurement Plan or Procurement List, and Bid Results On Civil Works. Goods and Services and Consulting Services, among others.
2. **Disaster Preparedness** - an LGU that shows preparedness for disasters, indicators include being an awardee of the National Gawad KAI-A.SAG for
Best Local Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council; or having structures, plans and systems in place for disaster preparedness e.g., Local Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM) Council and local DRRM Office, Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan/Comprehensive Land Use Plan, DRRM plan, Contingency Plan, Local Climate Change Action Plan, early warning and evacuation alert system, evacuation centers, Standard Operating Procedures, transportation, relief operations, medical services, registration, and security.

3. **Social Protection** - an LGU that is sensitive to the needs of vulnerable sectors like women, children, senior citizens, indigenous peoples and persons with disability (PWD), among others. This includes access to justice, especially on cases of violence against women and children; access to quality public health facilities certified by PhilHealth; support to basic education, particularly alignment of the Local school Board (LSB) Plan with the School Improvement Program certified by Department of Education-representative in the LSB; providing privilege access for PWDs, senior citizens and pregnant women in frontline services; enhancing mobility for PWDs in public infrastructures like local government centers and hospitals in accordance with the Accessibility Law; mandatory representation of indigenous people in compliance with the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act of 1997; and representation from nongovernment organization(s) in local development council consistent with Section 107, Local Government Code of 1991.

4. **Business-friendliness and Competitiveness** - an LGU that demonstrates good performance in business promotion as a result of Business-Friendliness or Competitiveness Assessment by the Philippine Chamber of Commerce and Industry or the National Competitiveness Council; or at the minimum, having a simplified business processing and licensing system, tracking of economic data, having a designated local economic investment promotion officer or its equivalent.

5. **Peace and Order** - an LGU that shows considerable efforts in maintaining peace and order in the community by adopting a Local Anti-Criminality Action Plan or Peace and Order Council Action Plan, providing logistical or financial support to the local police station, convening the local peace and order council, and establishing a community oriented policing mechanism.

6. **Environmental Management** - an LGU that displays substantial efforts in safeguarding the integrity of the environment. The initial focus is assessing compliance with the Ecological Solid Waste Management Act of 2000, particularly developing a Ten-Year Solid Waste Management Plan, or enacting an ordinance on solid waste management, having a material recovery facility or its equivalent, or access to sanitary landfill or alternative technology for final waste disposal.

LGUs who can meet the criteria, also an indication of their readiness to take on greater challenges, will be conferred with the Seal of Local Good Governance. Recipients of the Seal are eligible to access the Performance Challenge Fund (PCF), a support fund to finance local development
initiatives in furtherance of national government goals and strategic thrusts. Details of the PCF incentive design shall be issued in a separate Circular.

Access to other program windows and capacity development assistance from the Department will form part of the incentives package, subject to national policies and guidelines.

The SLG mechanism is a continuing challenge for local governments to perform better, and ultimately, achieve a desirable condition where local governments: (a) Sustain the practice of transparency and accountability in the use of public funds; (b) Prepare for challenges posed by disasters; (c) Demonstrate sensitivity to the needs of vulnerable and marginalized sectors of society; (d) Encourage investment and employment; (e) Protect constituents from threats to life and security; and (f) Safeguard the integrity of the environment.

c. From Bottom-up Budgeting (BuB) to Grassroot Participatory Budgeting

The Grassroot Participatory Budgeting Process (GPB) is the latest mechanism for good governance introduced by the DILG. It is a priority-matching and cost-sharing initiative of the government designed to make national programs and projects responsive to the needs of the people as well as to capacitate local governments in public service delivery and to empower civil society in local development processes. It is aligned with the government’s policy to promote good governance at the local level. The Human Development and Poverty Reduction Cluster (HDPRC), through the Grassroots Budgeting Oversight Agencies, shall implement the GBP in pursuit of attaining the Philippine Development Plan's goal of inclusive growth and poverty reduction.

The GBP process includes the following activities to be undertaken by different agencies, with the participation of broad stakeholders at different levels.

- **CSO Assemblies**
  - Orientation on grassroot budgeting
  - Election of LPRAT representatives and signatories
  - Report of LCE on status of previous year’s projects under grassroot budgeting
  - Poverty situation analysis
- **LPRAT Orientation and LPRAP Workshop**
  - Orientation on JMC 4
  - LPRAP Workshop
  - Multi-year planning
  - Project Identification
- **Submission of list of priority projects complete supporting documents**
- **Consolidation of list of projects by DILG Regional Office**
- **Submission of consolidated list of projects to NAPC**
- **NAPC distributes lists to RPRAT members**
- **Validation Review and Replacement of Projects**
- **Adoption of Final list of priority projects by local Sanggunian (to be submitted to DILG RO**
- Integration into the National Budget
- Provision of Funding for LGU counterpart in Local Budget
IV. Overview of the IRDF Participatory Governance Project

The IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project is being initiated within the context in which sustainable development and poverty reduction cannot be achieved if governance remains opaque and captured by elite interests. The absence of authentic CSO participation in governance affairs further exacerbate problems of low accountability and poor transparency of LGUs, leading to inadequate and poor public services and infrastructure. Many LGU officials are steeped in the practice of patronage, and many view their constituents as mere number of votes to be delivered during elections. There is no drive to engage the people in meaningful partnership that will pull them out of poverty. This deep-seated practice has contributed to much of the disempowerment and impoverishment of a huge segment of the country’s population.

Active CSO participation in the various stages in local governance thus is a prerequisite to achieving sustainable and equitable development.

The IRDF Participatory Governance Project is intended to support and strengthen citizen participation in local governance to push for greater accountability and transparency of LGUs in the six identified municipalities in Sorsogon.

1. Sorsogon City
2. Municipality of Bulan
3. Municipality of Casiguran
4. Municipality of Irosin
5. Municipality of Matnog
6. Municipality of Pilar

This action complements on-going efforts at the international and national level to push for greater civil society engagement and participation in local governance as an important ingredient to achieving national development goals and international commitments such as the Millenium Development Goals (MDG). It supports policy initiatives and administrative actions by the Aquino government to push LGUs to meet their obligations under MDG and to adopt participatory, accountable and transparent governance. It also builds upon the achievements of government especially the DILG in monitoring and evaluating the performance of LGUs as a way of improving local governance.

More specifically, this undertaking supports inter-agency initiatives to promote bottom up planning process in 600 municipalities in the country. The DBM, DILG, DSWD and the National Anti-Poverty Commission targets to draw up local poverty reduction action plans (LPRAP) that will be funded from 10% of the funds of national agencies. The planning process is the point of engagement for the participation of basic sectors in the target municipalities.

The key stakeholder groups are the organizations of farmers, fisherfolks, women and the CSOs active in rural development and good governance in the province and identified municipalities as

---
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well as the target LGUs, their municipal legislative councils and the Provincial Legislative Council. IRDF has working relationships with the LGUs and a number of national government agencies like the Department of Agriculture, environment, trade and industry. Most of the municipal LGUs have adopted the CBMS and other instruments for the localization of MDG planning and are open to working with CSOs at different stages on specific issues. IRDF has forged cooperation with them on agriculture, food security and disaster risk reduction. Most LGU executives in the six municipalities are aware of existing guidelines for participatory governance but do not practice them in their planning and budgetary processes. But since they have worked with CSOs on specific themes, they are open to working around these concerns.

The steps and actions that are involved are the following:

- Advocacy and Lobby for LGUs to adopt and implement legal obligations, mechanisms and guidelines for participatory, transparent and accountable governance
- Capacity-building of CSOs and people’s organizations participating in the project.
- Participatory Budgeting and Planning processes are supported or initiated by LGUs
- Research of best practices in participatory, accountable and transparent governance.
- Public dissemination of information.

The project activities are carried out are grouped into three main phases, namely: inception and social preparation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

All the participating CSOs and LGUs form the target groups. A total of 30 CSOs were targetted, with a minimum of 5 CSOs per municipality. The six LGUs , together with their Mayor, Vice Mayor and 11 municipal councilors plus the Sangguniang Panlalawigan are the target groups in government. The CSOs take active part in the workshop consultations, trainings, lobby, citizen-based monitoring of LGUs and mobilization, and other related activities. They are the beneficiaries of the training program. The six LGUs, being another target groups serve as facilitator of participatory municipal planning sessions as part of their official mandate and shall also attend the policy dialogues and workshops.
V. Brief Profile of LGU Case Studies

The Province of Sorsogon

The Province of Sorsogon is located at the southernmost tip of the Bicol Peninsula. It is bounded on the north by the Province of Albay, on the east and northeast by the Pacific Ocean, on the south by the San Bernardino Strait and the west and northwest by the Ticao and Burias Passes. The province has an irregular coastline with good harbors in Bulan, Magallanes and along the shore of Sorsogon Bay. Sorsogon has 14 municipalities, one city and 541 barangays with two congressional districts. It covers an area of 2,119.01 square kilometers. With a population of 740,743 in May 1, 2010, it had a population density of 349.6 persons per square kilometer. Sorsogon had an average annual population growth rate of 1.31 percent between 2000 and 2010. The province has an agricultural economy with coconut, rice, corn, abaca, and pili nuts as the major products. Its rich marine resources yield various products such as fish, crabs, clams, mollusks and seaweeds.

Sorsogon is known for its historic and panoramic places such as the "baluarte" in Sta. Magdalena, Bacon, Matnog, Casiguran and Bulusan; the "Tulong Gapo" and Rizal Beaches in Bacon and Gubat, respectively; the Irosin Church in Irosin; the tranquil Bulusan Lake and the geologically young Bulusan Volcano in Bulusan. The province of Sorsogon connects Bicol Region and the rest of Luzon to the Visayas and Mindanao areas through the ferry service in Matnog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Series</th>
<th>Reference Period</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Population</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>739,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>377,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>361,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Ratio (males per 100 females)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>104.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>153,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (Persons/HH)</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Families</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>121,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Income</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>87,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Expenditures</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>78,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sorsogon province, which used to be the second province of Region V with the highest GGI in 2005 slid down to third place in 2008 with only a 4.78 point increase representing 4.8 percent rise.

Only two municipalities were able to make it to ten (10) most improved municipalities in good governance index in the Bicol Region in 2008. These are Castilla (5th) and Juban (10th).

---
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1. **Sorsogon City**

Sorsogon City, is a third class city in the Province of Sorsogon, Philippines. It is the capital city of the province located on the Bicol Peninsula at southern tip of Luzon. This city was formed by merging the Bacon and Sorsogon towns comprising the total land area 312 km². The population now stands at 159,263 based on 1.78% growth rate for the period 2000-2007. The has 27.6% poverty incidence based on NSCB’s City and Municipal-level Small Area Poverty Estimates in 2009. Agriculture and fisheries sector is still the driving force of its economy. Main agricultural products include rice, coconut, abaca, pili nuts, root crops and vegetables.

2. **Municipality of Casiguran**

Casiguran is a 4th class Municipality comprises of 25 Barangays. As of 2010, its population stood at 30,995. 38.9% of Casiguran’s population are in poverty. The local government of Casiguran got a good governance index of 125.93 in 2005 placing it in the 698th place out of the 1,484 municipalities. However in 2008, Casiguran slid to 1239th ranking after garnering a lower good governance index of 105.22.

3. **Municipality of Irosin**

The 2nd class Municipality of Irosin has 28 barangays. Irosin can be considered as the center of Sorsogon Province. Surrounded by other municipalities of Sorsogon, Irosin is the only municipality with no coast. Irosin has 51,777 population as of 2010 with 34.2% poverty incidence.

In terms of governance, Irosin did not performed well during the period between 2005 and 2008. In 2005 Irosin got 97.11 good governance index making the LGU 1151st among the 1484 municipalities. In 2008, its ranking declined at 1193rd with a grade of 109.30 GGI.

4. **Municipality of Bulan**

Bulan has recently earned the 1st class municipality rating. The improvement was made possible by the booming commercial activities in the town. However, Bulan is still experiencing a high poverty incidence. Out of the 93,943 population living in the 63 barangays, 38.8% are considered poor.

---
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The local government of Bulan, like the first 3 LGUs, has not performed well in terms of governance from 2005 to 2008. In fact, Bulan LGU was among the bottom 10 (9th among the 10) of Municipalities’ good governance index for Region V (the Bicol Region: 2008). At the national level Bulan got poorer rating of 75.52 GGI (1432 out of 1473) in 2008 from its 90.57 GGI (1235th) in 2005.

Overall, the 4 LGUs performance in public service delivery during the last decade can be considered poor as reflected in their respective good governance indices. However, the changes in leadership and political climate that took place from 2010 to 2013 offers an opportunity to improve their local governance.

VI. Processes, Steps and Activities Initiated by IRDF through Good Participatory Governance Project

The first phase of the implementation of IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project included the activities of consultations with the local chief executives and their respective planning officers, civil society groups and national government agencies like the Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), etc. The series of consultations run for one year from October 2012 till October 2013. These consultations served to gather information about existing policies and guidelines for CSO participation in local planning, budgeting and monitoring, CSO accreditation process and requirements, status of projects, and others. These were complemented by data gathered from the CSOs and institutional mapping done by the project team. The analysis derived enabled IRDF to identify the CSOs who have the capacity to influence local and planning priorities.

The next phase focused on training leaders and representatives of CSOs and sectoral organizations in areas such as planning, policy and institutional analysis, organizational management, budgeting and communications and negotiations. IRDF partner organizations like BIGKIS Farmers Federation, GABAY Women’s Organization and ALPAS Fisherfolk Federation benefited from the various formation of technical working groups or through the establishment of Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams (LPRAT) and made formal through a memorandum of agreement between the LGUs and IRDF and the DILG and IRDF.

The major activities of engagement and cooperation between IRDF and the LGUs were in the budgeting and planning processes initiated in January – March 2013 and another set of planning activities from September 2013 to November 2013. These exercises provided the platform for the sectoral leaders to articulate their issues and needs and proposed concrete projects.

Other activities included media and information education campaign that promoted citizen’s rights to information and promoted the accomplishments of the program as well as the support provided by the European Union. Consultations and meetings of CSOs were initiated in preparation for the launching of the Sorsogon Citizen Watch Action Group, an advocacy group on good governance.
VII. Mechanisms for Good Governance: Best Practices in Transparency, Accountability and Participation of Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin and Sorsogon LGUs

This study is a documentation of best practices demonstrated by LGUs of Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin and Sorsogon City. The analysis is done by looking into three major factors of governance namely: 1) leadership; 2) stakeholders response and behavior; and 3) mechanisms and strategies.

These three factors are in turn treated as areas for intervention by three local development processes taking place in four project areas. They are: 1) Local Government Processes (LGP); 2) IRDF Participatory Governance Project (IGP); and 3) Grassroot Participatory Budgeting Process (GPB). The basic presumption is that the operationalization of the development processes in the areas of intervention results to participation, transparency and accountability in governance. These virtues of governance will serve as the bases for concluding that best practices have indeed emerged. The next level of analysis is will point at establishing the claim that the IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project has contributed in the promotion of participation, transparency, and accountability and therefore instrumental in the emergence of best practices in local governance.

References were made to applicable indicators of good governance indicators to fully establish the claims and to further substantiate the analysis presented in this paper. These indicators (the discussion will come later in the succeeding sections) are also being used in evaluating the three strategic objectives of the LGUs.

---

1) **Optimized resource support for human priority concerns.** - This does not only mean raising and allocating money (even if budgeted for human development concerns). It also means diversifying revenue sources as well as providing the policy and legal framework to ensure a steady source of income that can be programmed for productive use.

2) **Improved effectiveness and efficiency in social services delivery.** - LGUs need to make serious attempts to (a) observe standards and benchmarks for devolved social services; (b) increase the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries with the services delivered; (c) use non-traditional and innovative modes of service delivery; and (d) encourage private institutions to take an active part in social service delivery.

3) **Responsive and transparent decisions.** - This requires the presence of a pro-active citizen feedback mechanism and strong intergovernmental relations to promote innovations in local resource management and social service provision. It also means that accounting and auditing procedures that promote restraint (to curb corruption and arbitrary action) and flexibility (to encourage new and better ways of doing things) are developed and implemented.

These strategic objectives are contributory to the LGUs' goal of achieving a higher level of human development in their areas of jurisdiction. This goal also represents the development goal of the four LGUs studied.

The formulation of this analytical framework is based on the very limited capacity to provide (using their own resources) for social and economic services and for this reason their performance on human development is relatively poor.

Take note that social and economic services essential for human development is dependent on LGUs' financial resources and on their resource management capability across the wide array of development needs. These two variables are the most fundamental elements central to the three development processes GPB, IGP, and LGP. Hence, this paper has included discussion and analysis on vertical, intergovernmental and inter-institutional relationships as well as the interplay between and among different stakeholders.

Finally, the analytical framework employed in this study was developed and tailored-fit for the following purposes: 1) *ascertain if IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project has contributed in the promotion of good governance principles of transparency: accountability, and participation*; 2) *document best practices that demonstrate principles of transparency, accountability and participation in local governance*; and; 3) *identify the different mechanisms and analyze how these mechanisms succeeded in influencing the LGUs’ improved performance*.
Grassroot Participatory Budgeting Process (GPB) as platform for Transparency, Accountability and Participation in Governance

For so many years, many the local governments in Sorsogon Province have faced the toughest social and economic challenges that keep them at the bottom of development ranking. The poverty situation is being worsened by the increasing magnitude of problems on health, education, agricultural productivity, peace and order, insurgency, corruption in local governments, environmental degradation, and other social ills. So much so that the region has become the favorite destination of humanitarian efforts, development interventions and testing grounds for innovations on social, political and economic interventions.

The concept, processes and mechanisms of Bottom-up Budgeting (eventually changed to Grassroot Participatory Budgeting Process or GPBP) are not new. Not even to the four partner LGUs of IRDF. However, when the GPBP was introduced to the local governments, it came with a number of opportunities and benefits waiting to be maximized. Hence, the implementation of the IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project and the BuB Process in 2012 can be considered as the latest attempt towards the much-awaited and elusive development in the Bicol Region and its inhabitants.

Guided by the project mission of promoting transparency and accountability of local governments through active CSO participation, the IRDF opted to complement its activities and processes with the BuB initiative. The IRDF is strongly believes that GPBP is the most ideal platform for transparency, accountability and participation in governance. In fact, even during the conceptualization stage of the Participatory Governance Project, it was already clear to IRDF that working within the BuB/GPBP framework was the best option available around that time to foster good governance in the target areas.

The GPBP brought forth a mechanism that offers a higher level of CSO participation than any other existing mechanisms. The sign-off procedure, membership composition, and planning and budgeting process are just some of the elements and features of the GPBP that would allow a better, meaningful and substantial participation by the CSO.
The results and outcomes of the IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project activities in different key result areas were instrumental to operationalize the GPBP mechanism for greater and enhanced CSO participation. The CSOs were able to successfully perform the roles and responsibilities delegated to them. By taking the active role, their LGU counterpart gave them more leeway in determining strategies, identifying development options, and choosing programs and projects. This has stirred the interest and consciousness of the CSOs in local development processes more particularly in planning and budgeting. As CSOs became more and more involved, they begin to develop their confidence and became more aggressive. Lately, the CSOs have developed an entrenched persistence to change. The LGUs were challenged by the upcoming CSO’s result-oriented mindset. The LCE’s saw the demand for improved local governance as participation by the CSOs continue. The LGUs responded positively and their responses can be considered as best practices in local governance.

### Outputs and Outcomes of IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Areas</th>
<th>Outputs/Immediate Results</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership Building</strong></td>
<td>✓ Partnership made official through MOU</td>
<td>✓ Institutionalization of CSO-LGUs-Stakeholders collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Leveled-off on Roles and Responsibilities of stakeholders</td>
<td>✓ Guided actions by having a clear direction and initiation of appropriate activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networking and Consolidation</strong></td>
<td>✓ Identification of CSOs working in the projects areas</td>
<td>✓ Achieved significant number of CSOs for future activities and engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Establish/ensure broadest possible size and composition of CSO Assembly</td>
<td>✓ Reorganization, reactivation, or formation of federations, alliance building, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobilization of CSOs</strong></td>
<td>✓ Participate in stock-taking and claim-making exercises</td>
<td>✓ Exerted greater influence to local and national state-actors/government entities and illicit positive response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Building of CSOs</strong></td>
<td>✓ Familiarization on GPBP, local development processes, local government operations</td>
<td>✓ Active participation in the GPBP, local development processes, local government operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Knowledge on different analytical tools, planning and budgeting process, fiscal management, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>✓ Taken active role in co-management and co-administration of LGU processes, undertakings, projects, programs, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Engagement</strong></td>
<td>✓ Guided processes of the CSO Assembly, LPRAT, implementation of strategies and creation of other mechanisms for the realization of the project objectives</td>
<td>✓ Full realization of development goals, project objectives and experience benefits from improved CSO participation in local development processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching and Mentoring</strong></td>
<td>✓ Provide guidance and technical assistance to all stakeholders</td>
<td>✓ Progressive and sustained local development activities, processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Develop new/second-line leaders</td>
<td>✓ Continued CSO engagement with different stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. *Leadership Quality*

It is inevitable to discuss leadership when trying to describe good governance. Leadership and good governance are two inextricable concepts. In fact, Mactaggart and Shie (1997) posited that effective governance cannot occur without leadership. This argument suggests that the simplest way to depict good governance is to look for evidences that prove good leadership in the manner local governance is being administered.

The first test is on political will. Based on the lessons learned from the innovative programs of Cities of Naga and Puerto Princesa documented by Guiza and Fernandez (1997), the local executives showed political will, that is, faithful in delivering one’s commitments and pronouncements, along with actual enforcement of laws and regulations. Towards this end, Sorsogon City Mayor Lee has demonstrated her political will by religiously following policy instructions that concerns local development processes. In doing so, Mayor Lee fostered a kind of governance that allows participation in local governance.

| Policy Issuances of Mayor Lee Demonstrating Commitment to Promote Participation |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Executive Order               | Date Issued     | Title                                                          |
| E.O. No. 08, Series of 2013  | 12 Sep 2013     | Reorganization of City Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (CDRRMC) |
| E.O. No. 10, Series of 2013  | 24 Sep 2013     | Reconstituting the City Development Council of Sorsogon         |
| E.O. No. 12-A, Series of 2013| 02 Dec 2013     | Reorganization of the LPRAT                                     |
| E.O. No. 13, Series of 2013  | 25 Sep 2014     | Reconstituting the City School Board of Sorsogon City           |
| E.O. No. 14, Series of 2013  | 25 Sep 2014     | Reconstituting the City Peace and Order Council                |
| E.O. No. 15, Series of 2013  | 25 Sep 2014     | Organization of the City Project Monitoring Team              |
| E.O. No. 17, Series of 2013  | 07 Oct 2013     | Organizing the Core Team for the Implementation of the MDG – Family-based Actions for Children and their Environments in the Slum (MDG-Faces) |
| E.O. No. 18, Series of 2013  | 25 Sep 2014     | Designating Mr. Tayo as Local Economic and Investment Promotion Officer (LEIPO) of Sorsogon City |
| E.O. No. 19, Series of 2013  | 07 Nov 2013     | Reconstituting the Sorsogon City Multi-Sectoral STI/HIV/AIDS Council |
| E.O. No. 20, Series of 2013  | 07 Oct 2014     | Reconstituting Ecological Solid Waste Management Board          |
| E.O. No. 21, Series of 2013  | 07 Oct 2014     | Reorganizing Sorsogon City Anti-Drug Abuse Council             |
| E.O. No. 22, Series of 2014  | 09 Oct 2014     | Designating Mr. Bustamante as Persons with Disabilities Affairs Officer (PWDAO) |
| E.O. No. 09, Series of 2014  | 22 May 2014     | Reorganizing Sorsogon Gender and Development Council           |

Another testament of commitment to CSO participation coupled with transparency in local governance was made possible by Irosin Municipal Mayor Eduardo Ong and his planning czar Noel Mercado II.

The first step of Mayor Ong when he assumed the office of town’s local chief executive in 2010 is the crafting of Irosin’s Comprehensive Development Plan (2011-2016). The presentation of the CDP 2011-2016 of Irosin was on top of the agenda of the first MDC meeting under his term.
Then in April 2011, the Department of Budget and Management (DBM) and the DILG issued JMC No. 2011-1. The said issuance calls for enhanced transparency and accountability of LGUs in undertaking development projects and that all the LCEs must ensure that the 20% of the IRA is optimally utilized to help achieve desirable socio-economic development and environmental outcomes.\(^\text{17}\)

This prompted the neophyte Mayor to reorganize the Municipal Development Council of Irosin for purposes of revisiting the AIP of Irosin and make necessary adjustments to make it compliant to the newly issued joint memorandum circular. The reorganization took effect in 05 May 2011 by virtue of Executive Order No. 4 Series of 2011. Mayor Ong’s policy initiative was designed to improve and broaden the participation of the CSOs in local governance. True to his objective, the new MDC has 45 members with 14 or 31% representing sectoral and non-government organizations. This is more than the required 25% representation of the basic sectors and non-government organizations in the MDC as provided by the Local Government Code.

Mayor Lee and Mayor Ong’s policy issuances are strong indication of their genuine trust and confidence in people and were ready to develop their capacities and competencies. But trust and confidence were only vested after the CSOs like BIGKIS, GABAY, ALPAS, and IRDF were able to proved their capacity to engage, willingness to cooperate and legitimacy to represent the basic and marginalized sectors.

Moreover, the two have religiously followed the rules and procedures of local development processes and raised the standard of transparency and participation in governance to a level where their predecessors have failed to achieve. The facilitating factors in this case were the technical assistance and guidance rendered by their respective DILG-M/CLGOO and Local Planning Officers on the one hand, and assertions and claim-making initiated by the CSOs. IRDF meanwhile supported CSOs in their consolidation and capacity building activities prior to their claim-making engagements.

\(^{17}\) DILG-DBM Joint Memorandum Circular No. 2011-1, Dated April 13, 2011
The next leadership traits indicative of local good governance are being sensitive to community demands, being consultative, and with long-term visions which they communicated and shared with their own people.

*KAPAMAHALA Peoples Council and Mayor Robles’ Vision-guided Governance with Legitimacy*

The review of literature on public governance indicators done by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations provided a concept of transparency as a means for achieving legitimacy. Legitimacy, as discussed the review, is essential and must be established and maintained to achieve government efficiency.

“The efficiency of a government can be seriously reduced, if its regulatory policies are not viewed as being legitimate by the eyes of the public at large. Regulations and policies can be accepted as legitimate only if they are fundamentally transparent and based on objective criteria. In order to legitimize their policies, governments must provide transparency about state actions, as well as about the procedures that underpin the carrying out of state actions.”

The review also rationalizes why government should strengthen legitimacy and how it can work for the benefit of the government itself. The authors are firm in saying that public scrutiny as a result of being transparent fosters stable and predictable policy environment.

“Transparency requires that governments not only do not impede the flow of information to the public, but also an active involvement on their part to make the necessary provisions to ensure that public information can have a feedback effect on governmental performance, since it empowers the public to put pressure on government to deliver services and to do so properly. It can thus strengthen the legitimacy of government. In order to instill a stable and predictable policy environment, governments must therefore subject themselves to the scrutiny of the public.”

This view of transparency, its indications, and results reflects the kind of leadership and governance that the first-termer Municipal Mayor Marnellie Robles would like to gradually but firmly establish in the town of Bulan.

The political environment in the Municipality of Bulan differs from the three other LGUs being examined for traces of best practice in local governance. Mayor Robles acceded to the Municipal’s highest office after winning in the last May 2013 elections. She was incumbent vice mayor then. As vice mayor, she found allies in the Sangguniang Bayan. Her alliance with the majority of the Municipal Council worked in her favor to win the election. It was a sweet victory for Mayor Robles as she is now in the position where she has much authority to fulfill her vision.

---
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for Bulan. Everything seems fine. Municipal employees and the newly elected officials were working in unity between and among them.

All of a sudden, the political climate has changed. One by one, her political allies in the legislative branch of the LGU, who were able obtain seats in the Sanggunian with her help, became her detractors. She was accused and people are being made to believe that she was corrupt, incompetent and with no respect for law. Cases were filed against her on allegations of corruptions due to donation she gave, graft for not releasing the retirement pay of Municipal retirees, grave abused of authority for allowing the cutting of trees to pave way for road widening, other unfounded accusations. Mayor Robles believe that the cases filed against her are politically motivated as they were all unfounded and without a fact. Those people behind these malicious acts are hell-bent in maligning her character and trying to discredit her political authority.

In spite of all these attempts to demolish her administration, Mayor Robles continued on her mission towards the vision she has for Bulan and its people. Her marching orders to her key officials are clear. Prioritize program and projects designed to uplift and improve the living condition of the poor, work hard with passion and professionalism, respect the rule of law and most of all, listen to and work with the people.

Determined to pursue her development goals for Bulan, she brought her administration closer to the people. She conducted community consultations and paid attention to people’s issues and concerns and kept to her heart and mind views and recommendations of the people on how to resolve their social and economic problems. The GPB is one of the avenues of her interaction with the people of Bulan. Then she realized, her legitimacy is slowly being restored. This was the time when she thought she needed a mechanism where Bulan is being co-managed by local government that is transparent and a civil society that is strong and empowered. Her idea of such mechanism resembles that of Naga’s People Council and was inspired by such practice in Quezon City.

Mayor Robles sought the guidance and assistance of Mr. Andy Rosales, one of the pioneers and has persistently working for the advancement of genuine democratic governance in local governments around the country. Mr. Rosales shared his concept of local people’s council that directly engages the local government and the stages and process for its creation. The concept for setting up a co-management mechanism through a people’s council was
consulted to the CSOs of Bulan. The idea was warmly accepted by the different people’s organizations and community people.

By August 2014, the formation of the people’s council of Bulan was getting clearer and closer to reality. The council is called KAPAMAHALA People’s Council of Municipality of Bulan or KPCMB. The name KAPAMAHALA, a tagalog term for co-manager was chosen so that the local government and people of Bulan be reminded always of their shared goals and mission for a progressive, poverty-free and ecologically sound Municipality of Bulan.

The powers, duties and responsibilities of KAPAMAHALA People’s Council, as stipulated in the Sangguniang Bayan Resolution that will formalize and institutionalize it, are the following:

1. Serve as the highest policy-making body of all accredited NGOs, PSOs and POs operating in Municipality of Bulan;
2. Create appropriate standing and working committees, task force and the like to effectively carry out its duties and responsibilities;
3. Act as final arbiter on the appeals/petitions;
4. Convene at least twice a year to review and approve the Integrated Sectoral Agenda (ISDA) of KPCMB to be submitted to MDC for consideration and integration to Comprehensive Multi-sectoral Development Plan of Municipality of Bulan;
5. Shall continue to act as officers until the newly elected officers officially sworn;
6. Create and head a transition committee to appraise the newly elected KPCMB officers to ensure proper turn-over of all documents, finances, etc;
7. Perform such other function as maybe necessary.

The healthy interaction of Mayor Robles and active engagement and participation of the CSOs in the local government affairs, the legitimacy of her administration has become stronger than during her first months in office. At present, while in the process of empowerment, the CSOs that will form part of the KPCMB are actively involved in the GPB, MDC and other Special Bodies making them as their training ground and venue to exercise the higher calling of CSOs – to serve as an oversight of the Bulan LGU to effectuate a transparent governance that seeks government efficiency for the benefit of all the people of Bulan.
B. Stakeholders Response & Behavior

Citizens' participation and citizens' empowerment complement each other. Hence, the ability to cause good local governance by mere participation is flawed. Similarly, a CSO that weak or is not equipped to participate is susceptible to co-optation by state-actors with wrong motives. This goes to show that good governance is guaranteed when CSO participate in an empowered state. When used within the context of this study, response and behavior is a function of CSOs level of influence on actions and decisions of the local government at the City/Municipal level. And since Barangay LGUs also lobby their agenda before the City/Municipal LGUs, they are treated here as stakeholders as well and their response and behavior inside the local development processes can affect its outcome. Together, participation and empowerment would adequately portray the effectiveness of citizen oversight. These two sets of indicators provide crucial feedback to guide government response to the demand and complaints of its clients. In this sense, NGOs and barangays help to hold LGUs fully accountable to the public they serve.  

The piloting of the Bottoms-up-Budgeting (BUB) in the four municipalities (Bulan, Irosin, Matnog and Casiguran) of Sorsogon in the first quarter of 2012, through the intervention of the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) had encouraged the local executives to set up structures such as the Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams (LPRATs), which were tasked to draw up budgets for projects identified as priorities by communities and basic sector representatives. IRDF’s engagement with the LGUs as early as then, enabled representatives of its partner people’s organizations like the BIGKIS (farmers), ALPAS (fisherfolks) and GABAY (women) to sit in the LPRAT. This paved the way for the timely engagement and participation of IRDF and its partner farmer, fisher and women organizations to prepare for the BUB planning sessions starting November 2012 until January 2013. Both IRDF municipal facilitators and PO leaders were elected as co-chairs and signatories of the LPRATs convened in the municipalities of Bulan, Irosin, Matnog, Casiguran, Pilar and Sorsogon.

The same representatives to the local poverty reduction action teams (LPRATs) or BUB teams were also elected as CSO representatives to the Municipal Development Councils when these were convened by the DILG-LGU in August 2013.

---

Based on discussions with and proposals from the LGUs, IRDF decided to focus on supporting and strengthening the LPRATs, instead of setting up another committee such as the Technical Working Groups. IRDF and the LGUs agreed that the LPRATs would also serve as the TWG for this particular cooperation, since the members of the LPRATs as the same as those envisioned in the TWG composition. However, IRDF is still working towards institutionalization of the TWG apart from the structures established under the BUB initiatives through the passage of legislative resolutions or ordinance from the municipal council or SB. In fact, in Sorsogon City, IRDF, together with the other CSOs already planned to set up a Sorsogon City People’s Council, similar to the Naga City People’s Council. This is envisioned to institutionalize CSO participation in local planning and governance. The proposed ordinance for the institutionalization of the people’s council is now being prepared.

**CSO+Barangay LGU Engagement**

The construction of Level 2 Water System Project in Brgy. Bolos is a classic example of how the tactical alliance between CSOs and Barangay LGUs influenced Irosin Municipal LGU.

Barangay Bolos is home to 807 families in 608 households. Since time immemorial, people living in the barangay have to rely and get water from a nature’s spring at least 200 meters from their houses. The distance is actually not the main problem, but the terrain leading to it. Barangay folks have to endure the steep slope and rocky roads just to fetch water for drinking, do the laundry and even to bathe. The situation is indeed an added burden to women and children who are usually in charge of doing the laundry and fetching water either for drinking or for household use.

In 2012, Sorsogon District Representative Salvador Escudero III took the initiative in making potable water available to every household in Barangay Bolos. Through his Priority Development Assistance Fund (PDAF), a budget was made available for the construction of motor-driven potable water system. But the project was futile due to technical aspect of the motorized pump that was supposed to bring water from the source up to elevated area where houses are located. The frustration of the people to have access to potable water resurfaced and this time they thought there is no really way they can experience water pouring in their homes.

A sudden turn of events happened before the end of year 2012. A contingent from DILG Region V Office paid a visit in the area to see the viability of implementing the SALINTUBIG in Brgy. Bolos. SALINTUBIG or “Sagana at Ligtas na Tubig para sa Lahat Project” is a nationwide joint-project undertaking of the DILG, DOH, LWUA and NAPC. It is part of the Philippine Development Plan of the Aquino administration consistent with the MDG target of reducing by 50% the country’s population without access to potable water as enshrined in the Philippine
Water Supply Sector Roadmap. The DILG Regional Office commitment for the SALINTUBIG Project in Bolos is P2 million.

Since potable water system has been one of the priority concerns of CSOs and the Local Government of Barangay Bolos, both camps decided to work together, to make sure this time they will prevail. Barangay Bolos Chairman Jocelyn Cater and farmers and women groups of Bolos through their organization BIGKIS and GABAY respectively started to communicate and coordinate with the Engineering Office to implement the project soonest possible. First, they made it clear to the Municipal Engineer that pump-driven water system is not an option. The Municipal Engineer proposal is to source the water from the other barangay (Gulang-Gulang), which is elevated so that they won’t be needing any kind of power to flow water from the source to its destination. The water will flow naturally with the pull of gravity because Bolos is lower than the water source. Both camps agreed to the proposal of the Municipal Engineer.

Immediately, Larry Vidar the project engineer assigned to the project prepared the technical plan. It was well crafted. The design is perfect. However, there is one problem. The P2 million budget for the project is not enough.

To address the problem, the Municipal Engineering and the Planning Office of Irosin, the local government of Barangay Bolos and civil society organizations of BIGKIS and GABAY sat in a meeting to find solution to the problem. After hours of meeting, they agreed on a number of measures to be able to proceed with the project construction and ensure successful completion of the same. The main objective is to keep down the construction cost at the least possible. From this objective, they came up with the following measures:

- The construction has to be implemented “by administration.” Meaning, the Municipal LGU will do the construction itself. This will allow flexibility for the adoption of schemes that will minimize construction cost.
- The Barangay LGU and the CSOs shall assist the Engineering Office in canvassing for the construction materials to find the cheapest yet quality materials for the water system
- Materials such as pipes, fittings, etc must be locally sourced. Other materials like gravel and sand will be

**Mang Boy Basister, 54 years old.**

MangBoy works as a carpenter for the water system project in their barangays earning P250 a day. All through those years, he has never tasted safe and clean potable water. He thought he will die without experiencing water flowing in their community.

“This is the legacy we will live by and leave to our children and the next generation after them”
supplied by the community people by collecting them from rivers within their barangays. This could provide livelihood to people in the community.

- Source of labor is also local. They should come from Barangay Bolos and Gulang-Gulang to provide jobs to their constituents.
- The remaining cost, in excess to P2 million will be shouldered by Irosin LGU. Plan is to include in the AIP of the Municipality. The Barangay LGU and CSOs will work together to convince the LDC for its adoption and inclusion in the 2014 AIP of Irosin.

According to the municipal planning office, an additional P700,000 is needed for the completion of the water system. The Barangay LGU and CSOs succeeded to secure funds needed. The required budget is now already included in the 2014 AIP of Irosin Municipality.
It is also interesting to note how Barangay LGUs-CSOs interface succeeded in pushing for their common agenda through the selection and prioritization of GPB programs and projects. Their points of convergence served as criteria in the identification of GPB project proposals. These are: magnitude of impact in terms of poverty alleviation potentials, relevance to MDG goals, the number of beneficiaries who could benefit from these programs and projects, and the absorptive capacity of beneficiaries. Below are just some of the high-impact programs and projects proposed by Barangays and CSOs that were already completed. Benefits from these programs and projects are being enjoyed by the beneficiaries at present.

Table ___. Completed High-Impact BuB/GPBP Programs and Projects as of October 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGU</th>
<th>High-Impact Development Programs/Projects</th>
<th>Program/Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulan</td>
<td>Mangrove Reforestation</td>
<td>P 172,465.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gulayan sa Paaralan</td>
<td>P 60,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental Feeding for 300 Poor and Severely Wasted School Children</td>
<td>P 821,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Water Supply System in Brgy. Danao</td>
<td>P 7,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancement of BHS Quezon to Birthing Facility</td>
<td>P 1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of Detecho Weighing Scale to 27 Barangays</td>
<td>P 400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental Feeding for 250 TB Patients</td>
<td>P 750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casiguran</td>
<td>Pineapple Production</td>
<td>P 300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved Traditional Fish Products and Value-Adding</td>
<td>P 200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Improvement of Lictin Communal Irrigation System</td>
<td>P 2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEA-K Livelihood Assistance</td>
<td>P 1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of Day Care Centers in Poblacion and Boton</td>
<td>P 800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental Feeding to Malnourished Children</td>
<td>P 1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irosin</td>
<td>High-Value Crops Seedlings Propagation</td>
<td>P 500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement of Organic Fertilizer Production Center and Demo Farm</td>
<td>P 1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Municipal Food Terminal</td>
<td>P 3,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Improvement of Gulang-Gulang Communal Irrigation System</td>
<td>P 1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Improvement of Gabao Communal Irrigation System</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Public School Classrooms</td>
<td>P 26,239,589.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening of Alternative Learning System</td>
<td>P 58,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of Level II Water System</td>
<td>P 2,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cacao Production</td>
<td>P 500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pili Production Propagation</td>
<td>P 500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorsogon City</td>
<td>Farm Inputs for Food Production/Farm Diversification</td>
<td>P 1,750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MERGE to 2451</td>
<td>P 1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vegetable Production Project for Livelihood &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>P 3,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion of Organic Agriculture</td>
<td>P 600,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concreting of Sition Banao, Brgy. Salvacion Farm-to-Market Road</td>
<td>P 9,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Employment Assistance/Cash-for-Work Program</td>
<td>P 4,900,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills Training for Farmers, Fishers, Urban Poor, Women and Youth</td>
<td>P 3,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LGUs</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>P 74,551,814.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*undetermined budget/not included in the total
The exercise of CSO’s roles and responsibilities prescribed by the GPB in connection with local planning and budgeting has helped the four LGUs become transparent even in the most sensitive and delicate government function such as local budgeting and fiscal management. As CSOs become more and more familiar with the local development processes, they became more articulate and assertive. But credit also goes to the LGUs who have genuinely welcomed CSOs participation and treat them as development partners. Slowly, it has become a way of life for the LGUs of Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin and Sorsogon to conduct their affairs transparently knowing that this encourages greater and higher level of participation.

This interaction between the LGUs and the CSOs could not be made possible without the latter’s insistence to take active role in local governance. But such level of confidence of the CSOs has to be developed, strengthened, and sustained. The opportunity unleashed by the GPBP and the capacity building component of the IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project by way of providing technical assistance such trainings and seminars to CSOs has contributed largely towards this end.

**Strengthening of POs for Meaningful Participation in LGU Processes**

GPBP is not just the means for CSO participation, it is also the end.

During the early stages of the Participatory Governance Project, people could not see their place in local governance. While there were several instances and different avenues for LGU-CSO interface, the LGU had been contented with the level of CSO participation in local development processes. On the other hand, people thought there is no value for CSO participation because nothing has changed in social, economic and political terms. Majority of the population remain poor and their local government is incapable of alleviating them from poverty.

A year after the first round of BuB, the implementation of projects and programs has started. These are the programs and projects proposed by the CSOs. The same sets of programs and projects which they believe could address their problems. Then the CSOs started to realize that the BuB process is authentic. They began to realize that their participation matters.

The outcome can affect the manner of CSO participation and vice versa.

When CSOs see the fruits of their participation or witness the positive result yielded by their involvement, they realize its importance and the tendency for more participation by the CSO is
high. In the same manner, if the CSOs directly gained from his participation, the tendency for continued participation is higher. This phenomenon was observed by Sorsogon’s City Agriculturist Adelaida J. Detera in their GPBP experience.

On the other hand, the kind of CSO participation can affect the outcome as well. If CSOs are capacitated and equipped with all the capabilities necessary for their engagement with their counterpart, the rate of success of achieving the objective and purpose of a particular shared undertaking is very high. This was the basis of IRDF for considering the capacity building of CSOs as one of its strategies and made it an integral component of the Participatory Governance Project.

This outcome-participation symbiotic relationship is well-placed in Sorsogon City Mayor Lee concept of good governance. Hence, when BIGKIS, GABAY, ALPAS and KALIPI recommended that people’s organizations must be strengthened, the LGU prioritized the Strengthening of PO’s for Meaningful Participation in LGU Processes under the GPBP Program for 2014.

While there are elements to cite that strengthening people’s organizations is one best practice in local governance, to prove otherwise is also easy because of its form and the simplicity in its approach. However, by looking very closely to its intentions and the anticipated impact, this initiative possesses almost all the criteria set forth by this study. Finally, this action is not just about CSO participation. It is being implemented to develop a different kind of accountability. One that is to be observed and practiced voluntarily. One that doesn’t require pressure to do so.
C. Mechanisms and Strategies

*AIP: The Vehicle for Getting through the Local Development Process*

The Annual Investment Plan (AIP) of the LGU is the basis for the utilization of the LGUs annual 20% development fund derived from its Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA) from the national treasury. There are two major and critical components of the AIP: the Social Services and the Economic Services. These two components are crucial for LGUs especially those with high incidence of poverty. These include the delivery of public services on health, education, livelihood, farm productivity, water and sanitation among others. The determination of programs and projects and their corresponding budget in the AIP is a primary responsibility and function of the Local Development Council (LDC). However, the annual investment programming has been politicized due to the composition of the Local Development Council. This is also the reason why patronage politics continue to exist especially in rural municipalities or cities. As can be observed, the majority members of the LDC are the local chiefs of all component barangays of a city or municipality. They are the “influential bloc” in every LDC. They comprise more than half of the LDC membership. Thus, they can dominate the planning and budgeting processes that are asked from the LDC in the formulation of the AIP. At the end of the day, the City or the Municipal Mayor is forced to subscribe to the proposals of the Barangay Captains to maintain the Mayor’s political clout and preserve his or her popularity to the people. Even if the CSO cluster of the LDC decides otherwise, the final decision usually favors the agenda of the Barangay Captains.

That should not be an issue if only the Barangay Captains truly represent the will and the interests of their constituents. But that is not the case most of the time. Usually, the Barangay Captains capitalize on their membership to the LDC to push for projects or programs that could serve his or her own interest like requesting for Service Vehicle which the he or she can utilize even for personal use. In other cases, Barangay Captains will not propose a project that would run against his or her own business. In one Barangay of Bulan Municipality, the village chief has always rejected the request of his constituents to construct a covered basketball court cum plaza where community-based organizations can hold their functions such as meetings or trainings. The plaza is also being put forward by the CSOs in that barangays for the children and youth’s recreational activities. The village chief has always turned a deaf ear to his people for the construction of a covered court cum plaza because this might affect his business that provide venue and catering services for special events and functions.

With the advent of IRDF’s Participatory Governance Project and the GPBP, the CSOs realized the significance of their participation and how these two undertakings promoted transparency in local development processes such as planning and budgeting for the preparation of the LGU’s AIP.
At present, the manner by which AIP is being structured is being dictated by the LPRAT planning and budgeting undertaking of the GPBP. The LDC must adopt the proposals made by the LPRAT and consequently, the LDC should make way for the allocation of funds to cover the funding counterpart of the LGU for the fulfillment of Local Poverty Reduction Action Plan outlined by LPRAT under the GPBP. The AIP is then drafted and must be approved through LDC Resolution which is the main prerequisite of the Sanggunian Bayan for its enactment.

**Transparency and Information as Elements of Good Governance**

The on-going debate in congress whether to pass the Freedom of Information bill has become irrelevant to the four LGUs involved in the Participatory Governance Project of IRDF. This study found out that making government documents available to the public is no big deal. In fact, each of the 4 LGUs covered by this review has been providing the relevant public records and information about how they are running their respective local governments. The four local chief executives are confident in showing off financial transaction records and they are not selective. “After all, we got nothing to hide” was the remark of Mayor Lee of Sorsogon City.

Manasan et. al had this contention.

> “Transparency implies the provision of relevant and reliable information to all. The private sector needs accurate and timely information about the economy and government policies for effective decision making. Transparency in decision making and implementation reduces uncertainty and can curb corruption among public officials. It complements and reinforces accountability (by enhancing efficient use of resources and by promoting participation) as well as predictability (by lowering uncertainty and transactions costs)”.

---

An example of providing accurate and timely information to the private sector is the practice of transparency and accountability common to Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin, and Sorsogon City LGUs. It is being done by their adherence to the full disclosure policy on local government financial transactions. In its Memorandum Circular No. 2012-141 issued on August 9, 2012, the DILG provided guidelines in furtherance of the Full Disclosure Policy in all provincial and municipal local governments. The directive is for all the LCEs of provinces and municipalities to post financial records and to follow the posting schedule for each kind of financial records.22

In response to the policy, all 4 LGUs have their own bulletin board or what is otherwise known as Full Disclosure Policy board. They are placed either at the lobby of the Municipal/City Hall (Sorsogon, Casiguran, Irosin), the hall that leads to the Mayor’s office (Irosin) or even in places outside the Municipal Hall like in the case of Casiguran where they have installed transparency board in public places (town plaza, municipal gym and public market).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Reports</th>
<th>Bulan</th>
<th>Casiguran</th>
<th>Irosin</th>
<th>Sorsogon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. BUDGET REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Budget Report</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Debt Service</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Receipts and Expenditures</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Statement of Cash Flows</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. PROCUREMENT REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Procurement Plan</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items to BID</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid Results on Civil Works, Goods &amp; Services, and Consulting Services</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract of Bids as Calculated</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Procurement Plan</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. SPECIAL PURPOSE FUND REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Fund Income and Expenditure Estimates</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Special Education Fund Utilization</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Gender and Development Accomplishment Report</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Trust Fund (PDAF) Utilization</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Component of the Internal Revenue Allotment Utilization</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of Local Risk Reduction and Management Fund Utilization</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. OTHER REPORTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unliquidated Cash Advances</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower Complement</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from implementing the full disclosure policy by posting vital types of reports, the LGU of Casiguran and Irosin has become more transparent and accountable by not asking any requirements from the public requesting copy of reports or documents pertaining programs and projects such as implementation design, project description, funding requirements, etc.

---

At first, the practice of fulfilling the obligations laid down in the full disclosure policy by the four LGUs is motivated in whole by the financial incentives that await those LGUs who can satisfy all the requirements and be conferred with the Seal of Good Housekeeping (now Seal of Good Local Governance). When the Seal of Good Local Governance was made part of the basic requirements to access programs and projects of the national government agencies through the GPBP, LGUs were enticed even more to demonstrate transparency and accountability in local governance more particularly in the administration and management of local government finance.

*Flexibility in Structures Mirrors Accountability and Participation in Governance*

One way to check if the LGUs operate with accountability is by looking at the manner by which the LGU delivers public service or by answering the question – is the LGU responsive to the demands of its constituents? Accountability is reflected by the LGUs effectiveness in the delivery of public service. To achieve this status, there is a need for flexibility in the governance structures of the LGU that would allow beneficiaries to improve program/project design and implementation. This capacity for flexibility also refers to accountability in governance at the local level. Therefore, to determine whether the LGU has attained a certain degree of accountability in governance, there has to be evidences that manifest flexibility in local governance structures.

The GPB experience in 4 LGUs is a good reflection of how accountability in local governance is reinforced.

The creation of the Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams tested the flexibility of governance structures of the 4 LGUs covered by the project. Each LGU has LPRAT working at different levels. Each LPRATs formed its own Project Monitoring Team (PMT). At first, the LGUs expressed their apprehension on the creation LPRAT Project Monitoring Team. This initial reaction by the LGUs is expected because of the fact that LGUs have already created many local special bodies. These are, among others, the Project Monitoring Committee of the Local Development Council, Monitoring and Evaluation Teams of KALAHICIDSS-PAMANA Projects, Municipal Agriculture and Fisheries Council, Gender and Development Monitoring Team, Local Council for the Protection of Children, and the list goes on. There are also municipal/city-level task forces and ad hoc committees created in the past with similar function as the LPRAT-PMT’s. Creating a new body adds up to the already complex bureaucratic structure that the local government has. There are admissions where the LGU itself gets confused with the intertwining roles, duties and functions of these different bodies. Their roles and

---

functions usually overlap hence the tendency of duplication of tasks. This overlapping of roles, duties and functions resulted to competition and lack of coordination among offices within the LGU. And since POs and NGOs are also involved in these different quasi-local government or special structures, the negative effect is disunity and fragmentation among CSOs. The practical side of the LGUs apprehension about LPRAT-PMT is the cost that may incur to sustain its activities. LGUs that are highly dependent on IRA will instantly decide against any endeavor that would entail additional expense.

The imperatives of forming LPRAT-PMT were realized by the magnitude of benefits that may be put aside by not doing so. And besides, the LGU has to make sure that its investment, the local counterpart fund for programs and projects, will not be put to waste. On the part of the CSOs, the LPRAT-PMT is their means to pressure their local governments to fulfill its commitments to LPRAP.

Indeed, the LPRAT-PMT is serving its purpose. It is their training ground for participation. It is also their battle ground to make local government transparent and accountable.

**CSO Participation in the Procurement and Contracting: A Bolder Step towards Greater Transparency and Accountability in Governance**

Another discovery of an inspiring and genuine exhibition of transparency and accountability can be observed in Casiguran LGU’s procurement and contracting process.

It is known to many that the weakest point of Philippine governance is in the procurement and contracting system. This government activity is the most susceptible to corruption and red tape. There are already thousands of reported incidents of corruption and red tape in the government involving high level officials down to street level bureaucrats. Cases are being filed and the number increases over time.

While several laws, mechanisms, and campaigns to make the system foolproof are already in place, corruption in government procurement is still widespread and has become systemic that people are getting hopeless and cynical if this can be really prevented. But the people and the local government of Casiguran taught otherwise.

On September 2014, an assembly of civil society organizations in Casiguran was in preparation for GPB for 2016. As part of the agenda, the CSOs reviewed the 2013-2014 GPB projects. After reviewing the list projects, the CSOs pushed for their involvement in the monitoring of the Project Monitoring Committee since most of the projects is about to be implemented. Apart from PMC, a parallel CSO monitoring mechanism was also proposed. There was also a proposal for
all agencies involved in the projects to place transparency board so that CSOs can check on the status of every project.

However, it not just the status of project implementation that concerns CSO but equally important is the bidding and awarding of projects especially those that will be administered by the LGU. Hence, the CSOs moved for their involvement in the procurement and contracting process of Casiguran LGU. The LGU agreed. Casiguran MPDO Arlie Coranes that participation in the procurement can be done by fielding CSO representatives to the Bidding and Awards committee.

Before the assembly adjourned, a selection process for the CSO representative to the Bidding and Awards Committee of Casiguran LGU was initiated. On unanimous accord by all the members of the CSOs who attended the Municipal CSO Assembly, Ms. Carmern Bueza (Municipal Chairperson of GABAY Casiguran Chapter) and Ms. Shirlet Castro (representing Boton Handicraft Women’s Association and Barangay Health Workers Association) were made official CSO representative to Bidding and Awards Committee of Municipality of Casiguran. Mr. Benigno Benjison, Municipal Agriculture Office Head and concurrent Chairperson of the Bidding and Awards Committee of Casiguran LGU welcomed the participation of the CSOs.

Meanwhile, a Sangguniang Bayan Resolution for the inclusion of CSO representatives in the Bidding and Awards Committee is yet to be approved by the Council to make their participation official.

Accountability and transparency has become icons of good governance. These two virtues are very much interrelated.
Definitions of accountability by many scholars on the field as well as international development institutions such as World Bank, UNDP, ADB and others convey a strong message of transparency and trustworthiness. It implies that accountability can be characterized by transparency. However, being transparent does not necessarily equate to being accountable. For example, by posting report on unliquidated cash advances made by different offices of an LGU will surely pass the transparency test. However, if no efforts made to liquidate those cash advances, then the LGU failed to be accountable. Accountability, in this context is indicated by the government institutions to correct its actions. In a proactive manner, accountability is the ability of the government to ensure they make right decisions or their actions in relation to their governmental duties and functions are favorable to the interests and beneficial to the public. Therefore, to be transparent and accountable at same time, the requirement is to have a mechanism where the state shares its decision making functions and administrative discretions with the public.

Undoubtedly, Casiguran LGU’s decision to share and allow CSOs to exercise roles and functions normally exclusive to the public sectors such as the procurement and contracting process has proven its commitment towards transparency and accountability. Obviously, it is actual practice and the results of bidding and awarding undertaking that will determine if the said LGU has achieved such kind of transparency and accountability. But nevertheless, the initiative deserves to be recognized as best practice in local governance.

---

The service adequacy indicator was also used in this study to confirm and highlight the GPBP to induce best practice in local governance. The service adequacy indicator of good governance is measured by evaluating the LGU performance in the delivery of basic social services. The LGU performance in service delivery in turn may be gauged by the presence of systems which allow LGUs to access increased resources through stronger linkages with national government agencies.25

Clearly, the GPB represents the system which allows the LGUs tap others resources (other than the IRA). The GPB is the multiplier of LGUs resources for public service delivery. For every P1 million of LGU’s 20% Development Fund, the LGU can access P9 million more from different national agencies. This gives several extra miles for LGUs limited public funds. Through GPB, LGUs have to opportunity to broaden their menu for local development and to allocate more to their social and economic services for the poor. However, GPB require a certain degree of social and technical capacity. The project matching and cost-sharing scheme between national and local governments is not that easy as explained or the way it is being presented to LGUs. GPB follows a protocol and require criteria and standards for the approval and funding of the proposed programs and projects (those identified and proposed by the LPRATs and indicated in the LPRAPs). In Municipality of Pilar, 16 out of 25 projects they proposed during the 2013 BuB were not considered due to technical issues and for not complying the requirements. In Casiguran, the funding for its 11 BuB 2013 projects was delayed misunderstanding on funding procedure. Sorsogon City was ineligible for BuB in 2012 because they still have to wait for the conferment of Seal of Good Housekeeping from the DILG. These problems can be easily avoided, if LGUs have full a grasp of the GPBs 5Ps principles, processes, procedures, programming and paper requirements.

To fill the gaps on technical capacity and to make CSOs fully aware about GPB, IRDF conducted trainings on Planning, Budgeting and Budget Monitoring during the last quarter of 2013. The trainings delved into the more specific and technical details of the following:

- Local Planning Guidelines and Practices - MPDO, DILG
- Bottoms up Budgeting - DILG

---

These trainings enabled a total of 250 basic sector leaders and representatives of CSOs to actively participate in the preparation for the GPB and the planning for the 20% development fund of six (6) LGUs.

A total of 176 leaders recommended specific projects with their budgets for the GPB planning while 50 leaders and organizers participated in the monitoring of 2012 BUB projects in 3 LGUs. The assistance which IRDF has been providing through its Participatory Governance Project paved the way for smooth (almost 100%) compliance to GPB by Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin, and Sorsogon LGUs in the succeeding rounds of GPB for 2014 and 2015.

GPB is not the only option LGUs got to stretch their local funds. There are other systems and mechanisms that provide this kind of opportunity for increased access to resources so that LGU can improve on their public service delivery performance. The 4Ps of the DSWD, PAMANA-KALahi CIDSS and SALINTUBIG of the DILG, and several special projects launched by the national government agencies are there waiting to be tapped. LGUs can also partner with the NGOs (local or international) who work for social and economic development. Private sector can also be a good development partner.

The partnership with the DILG for the implementation of the Participatory Governance Project through a Memorandum of Understanding and the IRDF’s good working relationship with national agencies like DA, DAR, DILG, NAPC, development institutions and even with the private sector have provided strong national-local linkages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Total GPB Funding Accessed by 4 LGUs and Sources as of 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGUs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount of Resources Accessed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulan</td>
<td>P 35,528,578.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casiguran</td>
<td>P 8,700,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irosin</td>
<td>P 37,097,589.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorsogon</td>
<td>P 35,400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>P 116,726,167.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Government Units of: Municipalities of Bulan, Casiguran, Irosin, Matnog, Pilar, and Sorsogon City
Another interesting practice observed in Sorsogon City that typifies best practice in local governance is City-funded television and radio program. The City’s public service program is being used by the LGU to make its people aware on the status and updates of the projects of the local government, thus TV and radio program title: “Sorsogon City Update” The program was also used as the City’s medium for exchange and dissemination of information on GPBP. The program is being aired daily on television via DCTV-5 (local channel) and on radio via ESTV -1. What made this unique compared to other LGUs is the mechanism for collecting and the manner of selecting the information to broadcast or topic to discuss on Sorsogon LGU’s public service program on TV and radio.

Mayor Lee has instructed all the heads of departments and offices of the local government to provide her with updates on day-to-day operations and the status of programs or projects that each department and office are implementing or their accomplishments. The submission of reports by the department/office heads is on a weekly basis. The reports are being reviewed by Mayor Lee herself. She gives comments, formulates recommendations and even provides critiques based on the reports. She asks for additional information or would warrant explanations should there be need to complete missing data/information, clarify on issues, reasons for dismal performances, justifications for failing to meet the objectives, targets, or deadlines of a particular project/program, measures for ways forward, and recommendations for improvements. This is done through the regular (weekly) meeting of the LGUs Management Committee or if necessary, she would summon the concerned official for a one-on-one consultation.

All the reports are written. One plastic folder/clear book is assigned for each department/office/unit. All of them are being compiled by the LCE herself in keep them on a shelf placed in the Mayor’s Office for easy access and constant review. The City Information Office is tasked to consolidate all his comments, inputs, etc, prepare summaries and develop the program and content for TV and radio broadcasting. She serves as the regular speaker of TV and radio program with an anchor at her side to guide the Mayor on the flow of the program and moderate during the question and answer’s segment of the program.
There is no contention that this policy and procedure for reporting of Mayor Lee demonstrate best practice in local governance that promotes good governance virtues of transparency, accountability and participation working simultaneously and directed at different actors/stakeholders of local development.

To the Local Chief Executive herself, this makes Mayor Sally A. Lee more transparent.

To the City’s public officials and employees, the practice transformed them into public services providers with great sense of accountability. As such, they have set the standards in the performance of their official duties and functions. These standards are based on core values and work ethics such professionalism, honesty, diligence, quality output and client-satisfaction.

The CSOs and the general public, this practice is a continuing invitation for people’s participation.
VIII. Challenges, Lessons and Recommendations

- **Internal Resource Mobilization and Diversification of Revenue Sources**

With devolution, LGUs are faced with greater expenditure responsibilities. Thus, one of the major challenges they must deal with is how to mobilize additional revenues from local sources even with the higher IRA share mandated under the 1991 Local Government Code.

In this regard, LGUs must increasingly seek to diversify their revenue sources, particularly through the institution of cost recovery measures. That is, they have to look beyond traditional sources of revenue like the real property tax and local business taxes. Although higher local taxes are usually met with some resistance, experience in other countries shows that citizens generally have a greater willingness to pay fees in exchange for benefits received or services rendered.

At the same time, LGUs now have greater responsibility in providing human development concerns with the devolution of many health and social welfare functions previously discharged by national government agencies. To a large extent, the ability of LGUs to provide adequate social services will be determined by the amount of resources they allocate to these sectors.

However, while increased financial support to the social service sectors is an advantage, it is not sufficient in ensuring improvement in the quality of life of local constituents. Just as important are effective and efficient service delivery mechanisms as well as strong accountability mechanisms. In addition to the actual generation and utilization of revenues, the achievement of

- **Pursue the Creation of Budget Monitoring Teams and Make Sure They Work**

Opening up the budgetary process to sharing and discussing information may be as simple as just training local government councils on legal requirements and establishing systems to monitor budget and service delivery performance. However, the corruption issues relating to government of funds occur during the disposition of the government funds even if they were allocated for social or economic purposes. In LGUs whose accountability is weak and the level of corruption is high, the actual budget expenditures are at risk of being spent on non-budget items. In such cases, budget monitoring is at least as useful an area for public involvement as budget planning. But make sure they work.

- **Fund Transfers Help but it is Internal Resource Mobilization that Matters most**

The design of intergovernmental transfer systems has implications for accountability because it affects the fiscal dependency on central government and local revenue-raising ability.

---


Four elements of the transfersystem (as experienced in the GPB) determine local government’s fiscal dependency on central governments:

✓ Rules that determine the total amount of transfer—the distributable pool.
✓ The way the distributable pool is allocated among local governments.
✓ The purpose of the transfer system—an unconditional general purpose grant versus a conditionalspecific transfer.
✓ Local government involvement in the design and management of the intergovernmental transfersystem (Yilmaz and Bindebir 2003).

Because of the “Menu-System” of GPB, the financing that comes through transfers leaves little room for local decision-making and prioritysetting, and it is often insufficient to meet all the and the exact development needs on the ground. This situation puts LGUs at the mercy of the national government. To avoid this, LGUs must strive to increase its local revenue and the CSOs must also see it as important avenue for participation in local governance.

- Avoid Using the Sangguniang Bayan as Stamp Pad - Strengthen Council Oversight Function

The relationship between elected local councilors and executives also pertains to budget planning, execution, and monitoring and evaluation. Local councilors are supposed to oversee the localgovernment’s executive branch during the entire public financial management process and provide lokalexecutives with constant feedback. This requires establishing a link between planning and budgeting(whether budgets reflect planning) and between planned and executed budgets (budget executionperformance), and producing policy-oriented budgets (outcome-oriented budgeting responsive to demands and preferences of local citizens).29

- Make National Government Accountable to Local Governments

Coupled with the inexperience and weak capacity of local governments, decentralization is often blamed for not fulfilling its promises—and for not having a positive impact on development. So, reforms are frequently revisited and sometimes reversed. Many central governments around the world respond to such frictions by imposing stricter control and excessive accountability measures over local governments, sometimes revoking some crucial aspects of discretionary powers and resources extended to local governments. Yet, reducing powers and functions is not a form of accountability. It just makes local governments irrelevant. The cause of failure is the absence of effective accountability systems, both upward and downward.30

- Grassroot Participatory Process must go beyond project identification and resource allocation

30 Ibid., p. 26
By introducing mechanisms for poor people to participate in decision-making and for local transparency and accountability, community-driven development programs have promoted a culture of citizen oversight.31

Participatory budgeting mechanisms and processes vary. The most important question to answer is at what extent does the CSOs able to influence the budgeting process of the local governments and of the national government as well. An important part of the process is the formation of the Participatory Budget Council whose delegates are elected each year. In other countries, participatory budgeting encompasses a broader set of practices and includes mechanisms that make information about public budgets clearer and more accessible; efforts to increase participation in all stages of budgeting and not just allocation, and efforts to strengthen participation and capacity among socially excluded and under-represented groups such as women to influence the local budgeting process (Reames and Lynott 2006, Shah 2007).32

- **From Participatory Budgeting to Citizen’s Audit**

Clarity of local government budgeting formats significantly impacts whether civil society can evaluate and monitor local government expenditures. Oftentimes, this is particularly true when monitoring the current (operational or administrative) expenditure proportion of the budget, which receives almost no review by the public or local government legislative (council) branch. Efforts to introduce performance (program) budgeting are useful in allowing the general public to examine costs in detail and to connect expenditures to expected outcomes. However, local governments are often confronted with human resource (ability) constraints in implementing this type of budgeting and the underlying accounting systems.33

---

31 "A community-driven development approach tries to improve the well being of poor people by increasing their control over the way investment resources are planned, executed, and managed. Because communities do not act in isolation but in a local space where they interact with local governments, sectoral service delivery units, the private sector, and civil society organizations, the community-driven development approach has lately been expanded into a broader local governance approach that captures the quality of these local interactions."(Helling, Serrano, and Warren 2005; McLean et al. 2006).


33 Ibid. p. 19-20
Conclusion

While participatory budgeting represents a promising approach for strengthening the demand side of governance, institutionalizing participatory processes can be challenging. A combination of four factors makes it more likely that participatory budgeting programs will be adopted:

1. enabling legislation and strong political support;
2. a vibrant civil society willing and able to contribute to ongoing policy debates;
3. a generally supportive political environment that insulates participatory budgeting from legislators’ attacks;
4. financial resources to fund the projects selected by citizens.

Critics argue that participatory budgeting creates a conflict of legitimacy by exposing tensions between participatory democracy and representative democracy as has been the case in Porto Alegre where the legislature has lost some powers (Utzig 2007). A primary weakness of participatory budgeting is that it principally focuses on specific public works only and does not really engage citizens around discussions on broader social policies and long-term planning.34
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Questionnaire/Guide Question for Interviews

(for the City/Municipal mayor; MLGOO-DILG; Planning and Development Officer)

I. Respondent’s Profile

Name of Respondent:

Date of birth:

Place of birth:

Town/Province of origin:

Highest educational attainment:

Religious affiliation:

Year of start of residence in the city:

Name of spouse:

Number of children:
II. Fill in the blanks with the appropriate response to open-ended questions, or encircle the number in case of multiple choice items or scaled items.

1. What is your area of specialization (college preparation)?

2. Describe how your college preparation contributed to your competence in city administration, governance, and ability to manage the city government’s services, programs, and projects.

3. Describe how your political experience contributed to your competence in dealing with and answering the needs and problems of the city residents.

4. Describe how your business experience contributed to your competence or ability to run the city government on a sound financial basis?

5. Rate yourself by encircling the appropriate number in the 5-point scale, with 1 as “not me” and 5 as “most truly me.”

   a. tolerant of others’ faults: 1 2 3 4 5
   b. an understanding person: 1 2 3 4 5
   c. disciplinarian: 1 2 3 4 5
   d. high-income family: 1 2 3 4 5
   e. middle-income family: 1 2 3 4 5
   f. public-oriented: 1 2 3 4 5
   g. private interest-oriented: 1 2 3 4 5
6. Rate your decision-making behavior preference using a 5-point scale, with 1 as “not my preference” and 5 as “my most preferred decision-making.”

   a. I decide based on my own criteria: 1 2 3 4 5

   b. I decide independently: 1 2 3 4 5

   c. My decisions prove better than others’ decisions: 1 2 3 4 5

   d. I consult others before making the decision: 1 2 3 4 5

   e. I solicit the opinion or advice of others to come up with a good decision: 1 2 3 4 5

7. The moment you assumed your post as city/municipal mayor, which five tasks immediately demanded your attention?

   a.

   b.

   c.

   d.

   e.
8. What were the problems that made these tasks stressful? Please elaborate a little on your response.
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.

9. Looking back during your previous term(s), which do you now consider as your most successful programs/project? Please explain why.

10. What lessons have you learned during your terms at the city/municipal hall:
   a. what programs the mayor should prioritize:
   b. what kind of followers to rely on for the successful implementation of a program or project:
   c. what the most important factor in leadership is:
On Accountability

1. Is there an office responsible for the formulation, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of programs? How are these tasks performed? What are the processes and activities involved?

2. Are the expected outputs of the office concrete and measurable? Give concrete outputs expected from the office being referred in the previous question.

3. For every projects and programs, there has to be stakeholders that should be involved. Are the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders well-defined? What are these?

4. Are the program’s activities monitored and evaluated? Is the monitoring and evaluation conducted regularly? How is monitoring and evaluation conducted?

5. Do the programs allow or timely and necessary changes in implementation?

6. Are there planning tools used (work plan, Ghantt chart, SWOT analysis) in the programs? What are these?

7. Is the attainment of program objectives included in the performance evaluation of the mayor and program directors/coordinators/heads of departments/offices, LGU employees, etc?

8. Do auditing rules and procedures (internal through the Accounting Office and by the COA resident auditor) facilitate the programs’ implementation?

9. Are audited reports and schedules of the programs posted in public places? Where are they posted?

10. What measures/actions/responses do you take on COA observations/findings on irregularity in fund utilization?
On Transparency

1. Is there accurate and updated information about the extent of poverty in the community? What is the latest poverty data being used by the LGU?

2. Is this available to the public? In what form (newsletter, Mayor’s Report, etc)

3. Is there a community data board?

4. What kinds of data/information are posted?

5. Is the data board updated? When is it being updated?

6. Who posts and updates data and information on the board?

7. Does the public know where they can access information about the programs of the city hall?

8. Are reports and other pertinent documents from design and implementation of the programs easily available to the public? What is the process and requirements in getting copy of these reports and documents?

9. Are the criteria used for selection of beneficiaries in the programs made available? Who selects the beneficiaries?

10. Is information on the process made clear?

11. Are there feedback or built-in corrective mechanisms established to obtain inputs from stakeholders?
On Participation

1. Are there mechanisms to encourage participation and obtain feedback from the stakeholders? What are these and explain each in brief.

2. Are there sectoral representatives for the marginalized communities, such as the urban poor, women, senior citizens, in the local special bodies and Sanggunians? What are these Special Bodies and who are the sectoral representatives for each?

3. Do the local special bodies meet regularly? What are the schedules of their meetings?

4. Are minutes of the meeting kept? Who keeps the minutes and where they can be accessed?

5. At what point has civil society been involved in the programs? What activities where CSOs usually partake or asked to get involved?

6. Are there incentives provided by the city hall to encourage public-business sector-civil society partnerships?

7. Are there policies and ordinances, office policies, protocols enacted or adopted by the city to ensure participation of the poor and vulnerable in the programs?

8. Are the NGO/PO representatives/bonafide members of their sectors?
I. Respondent’s Profile

Pangalan: ____________________________________________________________
Petsa ng Kapanganakan: ___________ Edad: ________ Kasarian: ___ Lalaki ___ Babae
Lugar ng Kapanganakan: _____________________________________________
Address/Tirahan: _____________________________________________________
Taon kung kalian nanimulang manirahan sa nasabing address/tirahan: ______
Trabaho/Pinagkakakitaan: ____________________________________________
Pinakamataas na inabot sa edukasyon:
(_____elementarya, _____high-school, _____college, _____vocational)
Pangalan ng Samahan/Organisasyon:
______________________________________________________________
Sektor na Kinakatawan: ______________________________________________
Taon kung kalian naitatag ang Samahan/Organisasyon: ____________________
Katungkulan sa Samahan/Organisasyon: _________________________________
Ilang taon na sa katungkulang ito? ________________________________
Ano ang iyong mga Tungkulin at Responsibilidad sa Samahan/Organisasyon:
1. ________________________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________________________
5. ________________________________________________________________
Mga Local Special Bodies kung saan ka kasapi or kung saan napapabilang ang iyong samahan/organisasyon: *(Lagyan ng Check at ilagay ang kaukulang impormasyon sa patlang)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Special Bodies (City/Municipal level)</th>
<th>Kasapi Bilang... (hal. Sectoral Rep, etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____ Municipal/City Development Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Local School Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Local Health Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Peace and Order Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ People Law Enforcement Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Project Monitoring Committee (LGU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Municipal/City DRRM Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Council for the Protection of Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Anti-Drug Abuse Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Ecological Solid Waste Mgt. Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Anti-HIV/AIDS Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Gender and Development Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Council for Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Culture and the Arts Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ Poverty Reduction Action Team (LPRAT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ LPRAT Project Monitoring Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iba pa:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
1. Kailan kayo nagsimulang makibahagi/maki-alam sa pamamahala sa inyong Munisipyo/Siyudad?

2. Anong dahilan at papaano nagsimula ang inyong pakikibahagi sa pamamahala?

3. Anu-anong mga bagay/pangyayari ang nakatulong para kayo ay makabahagi sa pamamahala?

4. Sa anong aspeto kayo nagiging bahag ng pamamahala? (lagyan ng Check ang mga angkop na sagot)
   __ pggpupulong
   __ pagpaplan
   __ pagdidisenyng proyekto
   __ pagdetermina ng mga proyekto
   __ pagtutukoy ng mga sulirarin
   __ pagtutukoy ng mga solusyon
   __ implementasyon ng mga proyekto/programa
   __ pagdedetermina ng pondong gagamitin
   __ pagdedesisyon
   __ magmo-monitor ng mga aktibidades kaugnay ng mga proyekto/programa
   __ pagtatasa ng mga resulta ng proyekto/programa

5. Gaano kadalas mangyari ang mga gawain kung saan kayo ay kabahag sa pamamahala?
   __ Araw-araw
   __ 2 beses sa isang lingo
   __ lingo-linggo
   __ 2 beses sa isang buwan
   __ buwan-buwan
   __ kada ikatlong buwan
   __ 2 beses sa isang taon
   __ minsan lang sa isang taon
6. Sinu-sino sa mga kawani/anu-anong opisina ng LGU ang madalas ninyong makasama sa mga gawaing ito?

____ Mayor 
____ Vice-Mayor 
____ Konsehal 
____ Administrator 
____ Planning and Development 
____ Budget Officer 
____ Agriculture 
____ Social Work & Devt 
____ Engineering 
Iba pa:

________________________________ _____________________________ 
________________________________ _____________________________ 

7. Lagyan ng grado/marka ang mga sumusunod ayon sa inyong karanasan:

1  pinakamababa – 10 pinakamataas

_____ Dinidinig ang inyong mga mungkahi/rekomendasyon

_____ tinatanggap ang inyong mga mungkahi o ibinigay ng suhestyon/rekomendasyon

_____ Umaayon sa inyong mga analysis

_____ Umaayon sa inyong mga naiisip na solusyon

_____ Tinatanggap ang inyong puna or reklamo

_____ Binibigyan kayo ng report hinggil sa kalagayan o status ng mga proyekto/programa

_____ Nililihim sa inyo ang mga maling gawain o palpak na performance ng LGU

_____ Humihingi ng paumanhin sa mga pagkakamaling nagawa ang mga kawani ng LGU

_____ Hinhikayat kayo na dumalo at makibahagi sa mga pulong at mga gawain ng LGU

_____ May suportang binibigay sa inyo para makadalo/makibahagi sa mga gawain ng LGU

_____ Kusang ibinibigay sa inyo ang mga dokumentong may kinalaman sa programa/proyekto ng LGU

_____ Madali humingi ng mga dokumento sa opisina ng LGU

_____ May mga trainings o seminars na ibinibigay ang LGU para lubos nyong maunawaan ang Lokal na Pamamahala
8. Alam nyo ba na may Vision at Mission Statement ang inyong Munisipyo/Siyudad?  
  ____OO  ____HINDI.

Ano ito?

Vision: ____________________________________________

Mission: ____________________________________________

9. Anu-ano ang mga priorities ng inyong LGU?

1. ______________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________

4. ______________________________________________

5. ______________________________________________

10. Anu-ano sa tingin mo and dapat na priority ng inyong LGU?

1. ______________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________

3. ______________________________________________

KABUUAN: Bigyan ng Marka ang inyong LGU (1 pinakamababa; 10 pinakamataas)

_____ TRANSPARENT – Naglilingko ng hayag at walang inililihim

_____ ACCOUNTABLE – Handang managot sa kanyang mga desisyon at Gawain

_____ PARTICIPATORY – Namahala kabahagi ang mga taong pinagsisilbihan