

# A Look at Participatory Local Governance in the Philippines: A CSO Perspective

*An Interim Report*

Presented by:



**PhilDHRRA**



# Outline

- I. Methodology and Limitations of the Study
- II. Study Findings
  - A. Profile of Respondents
  - B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs
  - C. Other Enabling Mechanism on Participatory Governance
  - D. Transparency and Accessibility of Information
  - E. CSO Capacity Building Needs and Recommendations to Improve LDC Functionality
- III. Next Steps



# I. Methodology and Limitations of the Study

- Methodology includes primary (survey) and secondary (review of literature) data gathering
- Selection of respondents was done through purposive sampling
- Survey was administered through phone interviews and online submission
- Assessment is based on survey results, no FGDs were conducted
- Survey scope is constrained by time and available resources

# II. Study Findings

Number of respondents to date: 60 CSOs

51 municipality/city surveys (85%), 9 provincial surveys (15%)

<i>Region</i>	<i>Province</i>
<b>LUZON</b>	<b>14 respondents (23%)</b>
CAR	Benguet, Ifugao, Mountain Province
NCR	Metro Manila
I – Ilocos Region	Ilocos Sur
II – Cagayan Valley	Nueva Vizcaya, Quirino
IVA – CALABARZON	Laguna, Quezon
V – Bicol Region	Camarines Sur
<b>VISAYAS</b>	<b>29 (48%)</b>
VI – Western Visayas	Antique, Capiz, Iloilo
VII – Central Visayas	Bohol, Cebu, Negros Oriental
VIII – Eastern Visayas	Eastern Samar, Leyte, Southern Leyte
<b>MINDANAO</b>	<b>17 (28%)</b>
IX – Zamboanga Peninsula	Zamboanga del Norte, Zamboanga Sibugay, Zamboanga del Sur
X – Northern Mindanao	Bukidnon, Camiguin
XI – Davao Region	Davao, Davao del Sur
XII – SOCCSKSARGEN	Cotabato, Sarangani, South Cotabato
XIII - CARAGA	Surigao del Norte
ARMM	Lanao del Sur, Maguindanao

# A. Profile of Respondents

- Respondents: Head of Organizations
- CSOs covered are affiliated with 2 or more networks, on the average
- Sectors served and thematic areas of sample CSOs:

<i>Sectors</i>	<i>Freq.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Themes</i>	<i>Freq.</i>	<i>%</i>
1. Farmers	53	88%	1. Agrarian reform	31	52%
2. Fisheries	32	53%	2. Environment	50	83%
3. Indigenous peoples	29	48%	3. Education	48	80%
4. Women	54	90%	4. Health	50	83%
5. Children, youth	41	68%	5. Agricultural development	47	78%
6. OFWs, if any	11	18%	6. Rural employment	24	40%
7. Others	16	27%	7. Livelihood/microfinance/coops	50	83%
			8. General family welfare	31	52%
			9. Infrastructure	25	42%
			10. Disaster relief & rehabilitation	30	50%
			11. Local governance	43	72%
			12. Peace and order	27	45%

# A. Profile of Respondents

- 95% of respondents are aware of the Local Government Code
- The respondents gave themselves an average awareness rating of 3.8 (using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest)
- Almost three-fourths (72%) cited that they attended trainings/seminars on the LGC
- A majority of these trainings (63%) were initiated or organized by CSOs (Example: CODE NGO, IPG, IPD, SALIGAN)
- A majority (97%) stated that they are aware of the composition and functions of the LDC
- Average awareness rating is high, at 4.1 (in a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest)

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

- Three-fourths of the respondents (75%) stated that their LGUs have a database or directory of CSOs; half (53%) said that these were regularly updated
- Almost half (49%) stated that a meeting or dialogue for all CSOs has been called by their LGUs to validate the said directory or database of CSOs
- Forty-three respondents (72%) cited that a Notice of Call for Accreditation has been issued by the Sanggunian in 2010
- 68% or forty-one respondents were accredited by their respective LGUs; only half of them (54%) issued with a Certificate of Accreditation or Sanggunian Resolution.
- Less than one-fourth of the respondents (18%) stated that the current list of accredited CSOs was posted in a publicly accessible place within their LGUs
- In a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, the general satisfaction rating of the CSO respondents on the efficiency, effectiveness, and compliance of the CSO accreditation process was 3.2.

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

- In a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, the general satisfaction rating of the CSO respondents on the efficiency, effectiveness, and compliance of the CSO accreditation process was 3.2

<b>No</b>	<b><i>Reasons for rating on CSO accreditation process</i></b>	<b><i>Freq.</i></b>
1	Efficient/speedy accreditation process	3
2	LGU complied with guidelines	5
3	All CSOs were involved/better informed	3
4	Requirements for accreditation can be easily complied with	2
5	Biased accreditation process	4
6	Not all CSOs were involved	6
7	Info dissemination on accreditation process is insufficient	12
8	Cannot comply with tedious accreditation requirements	5
9	Inefficient/slow process	3



## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

<b><i>Local Special Bodies</i></b>	<b><i>Existing ?</i></b>	<b><i>Average rating of functionality (1 = not functional, 5 = very functional)</i></b>	<b><i>With CSO reps?</i></b>
Local Development Council	58 (97%)	3.5	47 (81%)
Local School Board	51 (85%)	3.6	33 (65%)
Local Health Board	49 (82%)	3.6	30 (61%)
Local Peace and Order Council	49 (82%)	3.5	29 (59%)

- Less than half (48%) stated that a meeting was convened by their LGUs for all accredited organizations for the

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

<i>Non-mandated Bodies</i>	<i>Existing?</i>	<i>Average rating of functionality (1 = not functional, 5 = very functional)</i>	<i>With CSO reps?</i>
Municipal Anti-drug Abuse Council	24 (40%)	2.9	12 (50%)
Municipal Agriculture and Fishery Council	33 (55%)	3.2	22 (67%)
Municipal Cooperative Development Council	30 (50%)	2.9	15 (50%)
Municipal Council for the Elderly	30 (50%)	3.6	18 (60%)
Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council	40 (67%)	3.4	21 (53%)
Council for the Protection of Children	32 (53%)	3.4	21 (66%)
Municipal Literacy Coordinating Council	16 (27%)	3.2	8 (50%)
Municipal Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council	23 (38%)	3.0	14 (61%)
Municipal Gender and Development Council	26 (43%)	3.0	14 (54%)
Municipal Price Coordinating Council	10 (17%)	2.4	3 (30%)
Municipal Council for the Welfare of Disabled Person	21 (35%)	3.3	10 (48%)
Municipal Sustainable Organic Agriculture Council	17 (28%)	3.0	9 (53%)

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

- When asked how the CSO representatives in the various bodies were selected in general, 43% of the respondents stated that they were elected among the CSOs themselves
- 10 respondents (17%) revealed that the representatives in their areas were appointed/selected by the local chief executives; remaining respondents had no idea on the selection process (40%)
- Using a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, the efficiency, effectiveness, and compliance of the CSO representative selection process was rated at 3.1, on average

<b>No.</b>	<b><i>Reasons for rating on CSO rep selection process</i></b>	<b><i>Freq.</i></b>
1	Complied with guidelines on CSO representative selection process	4
2	Consultative process, several CSOs were represented	7
3	CSO representatives appointed by LCE	10
4	No or minimal CSO participation	6
5	Insufficient information on CSO representative selection process	6 11

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

<i><b>LDC functions</b></i>	<i><b>Respondents' Participation</b></i>	<i><b>Level of participation (Scale of 1 to 5)</b></i>
Formulation of development plans and policies	36 (60%)	3.4
Formulation of annual public investment programs	24 (40%)	3.0
Appraisal and prioritization of development programs and projects	25 (42%)	3.1
Implementation of development programs and projects	22 (37%)	3.0
Formulation of local investment incentives	12 (20%)	2.9
Monitoring and evaluation of development programs and projects	25 (42%)	2.9

## B. Status of Accreditation, Selection, Reconstitution, and Functionality of LSBs

<b><i>Sectoral committees</i></b>	<b><i>Existing in the LDC</i></b>
Social development committee	26 (43%)
Economic development committee	26 (43%)
Physical and infrastructure committee	27 (45%)
Environment and natural resources committee	25 (42%)
Administrative and institutional development committee	22 (37%)

## C. Other Enabling Mechanisms on Participatory Governance

- Less than one-third of the respondents (28%) stated that an LGU-designed desk or support mechanism for CSOs was established
- Feedback mechanism was established to generate citizens' views as reported by 37% of the respondents (Examples: availability of feedback forms and suggestion boxes, regular radio programs where citizens' views are received, text and phone hotlines within the LGU, convening of community forums, consultations, and assemblies)
- Half of the respondents (53%) stated that public consultations were organized by the LGU to generate citizens' feedbacks or inputs on a particular policy, legislation, program, or project (State of the City Address, public hearings or consultations before the passage of local legislations, barangays assemblies)
- Only one-fourth of the respondents (25%) cited that there are existing local policies that directly support CSO networking, strengthening, and expansion activities or similar endeavors (Examples: initiative to create a Civil Society Municipal Network, Shelter Code of Davao City provides representation for urban CSOs in the Local Housing Board, annual NGO week organized by the LGU, ordinance providing allocation from LGU funds for CSOs support and development)



## D. Transparency and Accessibility of Information

- A majority of the respondents (85%) stated that local ordinances and resolutions are accessible in their LGU
- Forty-one respondents (68%) reported that a public information office or desk is established in their LGU
- In terms of information on their local government's plans and programs, two-thirds of the respondents (63%) stated that these were disseminated through various means (Example, LGU website, bulletin board, local radio programs)
- A high percentage of respondents (75%) reported that their LGU's budget is not publicly disclosed
- Still, there are efforts or initiatives by CSOs to promote transparency in their locality, as cited by 38 respondents (63%).

## E. CSO Capacity Building Needs and Recommendations to Improve LDC Functionality

<b><i>Capacity-building needs</i></b>	<b><i>Freq.</i></b>	<b><i>Rank</i></b>
Development planning and budgeting	36	1
Roles and functions of LDC members, including CSO reps	21	2
Participation on local governance	21	
Laws (LGC orientation), policies on participatory local governance	20	3
Policy advocacy	10	4
Networking, partnership building	10	
Monitoring and evaluation	8	5



## E. CSO Capacity Building Needs and Recommendations to Improve LDC Functionality

<b><i>Perceived problems in the LDC</i></b>	<b><i>Freq.</i></b>	<b><i>Rank</i></b>
Limited or no CSO participation	39	1
Lack of transparency and accountability	23	2
Insufficient capacity/technical skills of LDC members	21	3
Politicized LDCs	16	4
Lack of cooperation, communication among LDC members	14	5
Non-functional LDCs	12	6
Limited CSO representation, biased CSO rep selection process	11	7
Financial constraint	8	8

# E. CSO Capacity Building Needs and Recommendations to Improve LDC Functionality

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Freq.</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Promote active CSO participation in development process (planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation)	30	1
Capacity building of LDC members	17	2
Promote transparency and accountability	16	3
Provide incentives to functional LDCs, sanctions to non-functional LDCs	11	4
Efficient monitoring of LDC status by the DILG	9	5
Provide secretariat and logistical support to LDCs	8	6
Promote CSO-LGU partnerships in project implementation, monitoring and evaluation	8	
LDCs should not be politicized	8	
Allocate funds to LDCs	6	7
Conduct awareness raising activities to encourage people's participation	3	8



# III. Next Steps

- Completion of survey – target respondents: 100
- Comparison of assessment results with the findings of the DILG study (2001) on people's participation in the LDCs and the survey on good local governance of the SWS (2010) and other related studies
- Final report: December
- Dissemination of study findings



**Thank you!**