



Assessment of the Bottom-Up Budgeting Process for FY 2016


Rosario G. Manasan

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES NO. 2016-23

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

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

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



June 2016

For comments, suggestions or further inquiries please contact:

The Research Information Staff, Philippine Institute for Development Studies

18th Floor, Three Cyberpod Centris - North Tower, EDSA corner Quezon Avenue, 1100 Quezon City, Philippines

Telephone Numbers: (63-2) 3721291 and 3721292; E-mail: publications@mail.pids.gov.ph

Or visit our website at <http://www.pids.gov.ph>

**ASSESSMENT OF THE BOTTOM-UP
BUDGETING PROCESS FOR FY 2016**

Rosario G. Manasan

Philippine Institute for Development Studies
December 2015
(revised May 2016)

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Figures	ii
List of Tables	iii
Abstract	iv
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. General Features of the Bottom-up Budgeting Process for the FY 2016 Cycle	2
2. Objectives of the Study	6
3. Approach and Methodology	7
II. SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE STUDY SITES	9
1. Agusan del Norte.....	9
2. Camarines Sur	12
3. Antique.....	16
4. Zamboanga del Norte Province	20
III. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JMC 5-2014 IN THE FIELD	23
1. Inclusiveness of the CSO Assembly.....	24
2. Quality of CSO Participation in CSO Assemblies	31
2.1. Representativeness of CSOs which Attended CSO Assembly	31
2.2. Conduct of the Poverty Situation Analysis (PSA).....	34
2.3. Selection of CSO Representatives in the LPRAT and CSO Signatories to the LPRAP.....	41
3. LPRAP Workshop, Identification and Prioritization of BUB Projects	43
3.1. Presentation to and Appreciation of CSO Assembly Outputs during the LPRAP Workshop.....	43
3.2. Provenance of Long List of Projects Considered for Prioritization in the LPRAP Workshop.....	44
3.3. Who Actually Participated in the Prioritization of LPRAP Projects?.....	45
3.4. How was the Project Prioritization Done?	46
3.5. Who Prepares the BUB Sub-project Brief	47
3.6. Post-LPRAP Workshop Changes in List of LPRAP Projects.....	48

3.7. LPRAP Projects by Proponent	48
3.8. Other Issues Related to the Choice of LPRAP Projects	51
IV. SUB-PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION FOR FY 2013 AND FY 2014 CYCLES.....	53
1. Status of FY 2014 BUB Sub-project Implementation.....	53
2. Lack of Clarity in NGA Menu of Projects and Pre-implementation/ Pre-funds-download Requirement	54
3. Weak LGU Capacity	57
4. Poor Coordination among the NGAs, LGUs and CSOs During Project Implementation.	58
5. Monitoring of BUB Sub-projects and CSOs' Role in BUB Sub-projects Monitoring....	59
V. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE BUB PROGRAM	62
1. BUB Adds Value to the Project Identification and Prioritization.....	63
2. BUB Adds Value to CSO Empowerment and Greater Demand for Government Accountability.....	63
3. BUB Adds Value to LGU-CSO Relations.....	64
4. BUB Adds Value to Inter-CSO Relations	64
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	64
1. Social Preparation and Other BUB Preparatory Activities.....	64
2. Conduct of CSO Assembly	66
3. LPRAP Workshop	67
4. Sub-project Implementation and Monitoring.....	67

List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of Agusan del Norte study sites	9
Figure 2. Map of Camarines Sur study sites.....	13
Figure 3. Map of Antique study sites	17
Figure 4. Map of Zamboanga del Norte province study sites	20

List of Tables

Table 1.	LGU cash counterpart schedule required under the BUB	3
Table 2.	Case study sites in four provinces.....	7
Table 3.	Profile of study sites in Agusan del Norte	10
Table 4.	Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Agusan del Norte	11
Table 5.	Profile of study sites in Camarines Sur.....	13
Table 6.	Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Camarines Sur.....	14
Table 7.	Profile of study sites in Antique.....	18
Table 8.	Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Antique	19
Table 9.	Profile of study sites in Zamboanga del Norte province.....	21
Table 10.	Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Antique	22
Table 11.	Number of additional CSOs added to CSO inventory due to CSO mapping	25
Table 12.	Attendance rate vis number of invitees and number of attendees in CSO assembly	27
Table 13.	Number of invitees and attendees in CSO assembly in Camarines Sur study sites, FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycle	28
Table 14.	Number of invitees and attendees in CSO assembly in Agusan del Norte study sites, FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycle	28
Table 15.	Sectoral distribution of CSO attendees in CSO assembly vis sectoral distribution of CSOs in CSO masterlist in the study sites in Zamboanga del Norte	32
Table 16.	Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in Antique study sites	33
Table 17.	Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in study sites in Agusan del Norte.....	33
Table 18.	Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in study sites in Camarines Sur.....	34
Table 19.	Sectoral representation in the study sites in Camarines Sur in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycles.....	34
Table 20.	FY 2016 LPRAP projects in 12 study sites by proponent	49
Table 21.	FY 2015 LPRAP projects in 12 study sites by proponent	52
Table 22.	Status of the FY 2014 BUB sub-project implementation in 12 study sites	55
Table 23.	Status of the FY 2013 BUB sub-project implementation in 12 study sites	56

Abstract

Bottom-up Budgeting (BUB) is a government program that is envisioned to institutionalize and incentivize grassroots participation, as represented by Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), in local planning and budgeting in all cities and municipalities nationwide. This study aims (i) to examine how the key steps in the planning and prioritization of projects that will be funded under the BUB for the FY 2016 planning cycle as provided under JMC No. 5-2014 are implemented on the ground in terms of extent of CSO participation, LGU-CSO engagement, and the integration of BUB processes in the mainstream local planning processes; and (ii) to report on the pace of implementation of FY 2013 and FY 2014 BUB sub-projects and to identify the bottlenecks affecting the same.

The approach used in this study is heuristic. Based on the BUB experience in the 12 case study sites covered, this study argues that CSO participation in the BUB may be characterized on the basis of how the LGUs actually operationalized the following key features of the BUB: (i) the inclusiveness of the CSO assembly as reflected in the availability of an inventory of all CSOs that are active in the LGU, in the “openness” of processes and procedures involved in the issuance of the invitations to the CSO assembly, and in the reasons for the failure of invited CSOs from attending the CSO assembly; (ii) quality of participation of CSOs in the CSO assembly as indicated by the representativeness of CSOs that attended the CSO assembly, the manner by which the poverty situation analysis (PSA) is conducted and the nature of the output of PSAs; (iii) quality of the LPRAP workshop as determined by the selection of CSO representatives in the Local Poverty Reduction Action Team (LPRAT), whether the CSO assembly output is considered in the LPRAT discussions, the provenance of the long list of projects considered for prioritization during the LPRAP workshop, who participates in the prioritization of BUB sub-projects, how project prioritization is done, who prepares the project briefs of the prioritized BUB sub-projects and whether the list of BUB sub-projects was changed in meetings conducted after the LPRAP workshop. The study then juxtaposed the extent of CSO participation in the BUB in the 12 study sites as measured by the share of CSO-identified or proposed projects in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects against the actual conduct of the CSO assembly and LPRAP workshop in these LGUs to gain a better understanding of the relative importance of the various aspects that comprise CSO participation in the BUB.

On the other hand, the evaluation of the pace of implementation of the sub-projects prioritized and included in the Local Poverty Reduction Action Plans (LPRAPs) of the 12 study sites for FY 2013 and FY 2014 shows mixed results. While the implementation of FY 2014 BUB sub-projects is somewhat faster than the implementation of FY 2013 BUB sub-projects when viewed in terms project completion, procurement, and provision of NGA feedback to LGUs, some deterioration in the downloading of project funds is evident between these two years.

keywords:

bottom-up budgeting, participatory budgeting, LGU-CSO engagement, accountability, local governance, civil society organizations, basic sector organizations

ASSESSMENT OF THE BOTTOM-UP BUDGETING PROCESS FOR FY 2016

*Rosario G. Manasan**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Aquino administration through the Human Development and Poverty Reduction Cluster (HDPRC) and Good Governance and Anti-Corruption Cluster (GGACC) launched the Bottom-up Budgeting (BUB) exercise in 2012 in time for the preparation of the 2013 National Expenditure Program.¹ The BUB process calls on the municipal local government units (MLGUs) to prepare Local Poverty Reduction Action Plan (LPRAP) and to identify the most urgent anti-poverty priority projects that will be funded by national government agencies under the BUB.

The Bottom-up Budgeting process is one of the major reform initiatives of the Aquino administration and has been tagged as such from several perspectives. First, it is seen as a component of its budget reform thrusts that are aimed at making the national government budgeting process more responsive to local needs. Prior to the introduction of the BUB, the national government budgeting process was primarily driven by the national government agencies that implement the budget although the Regional Development Councils provide LGUs a limited venue to input into the process. Second, the BUB is also viewed as part of the democracy/ empowerment reform as it opens another avenue for people's participation in local planning and budgeting and for generating demand for good governance at the local level. Third, it is also be perceived as part of local governance reform in the sense that it provides incentives for good local governance.

Since its inception, the BUB has formed part of the preparation of the National Expenditure Program for FY 2013, FY 2014, FY 2015 and FY 2016. To assess the implementation of BUB processes, the Government has commissioned three rounds of process evaluations – one for FY2013 round which was conducted by the Development Academy of the Philippines, another one for FY2014 round which was conducted by the Ateneo de Manila University Institute of Philippine Culture² and still another one for the FY 2015 cycle which was conducted by the Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Key findings were that the BUB process was implemented very differently in the sample sites, and that the variations in the implementation were primarily rooted in the locality's appreciation of the involvement of CSOs in local

* The author acknowledges the valuable inputs of the BUB research team: Skilty C. Labastilla, Ma. Fatima Lourdes E. del Prado, and Clarice Colleen Q. Manuel (Agusan del Norte); Cherry Ann D. Madriaga, Maureen Ane D. Rosellon and Christine Ma. Grace R. Salinas (Antique); Cleofe S. Pastrana and Marites B. Lagarto (Camarines Sur); and Danileen Kristel C. Parel, Keith C. Detros, and Reinier T. de Guzman (Zamboanga del Norte).

¹ This is referred to as the FY 2013 round or cycle.

² Institute of Philippine Culture. 2013. "Bottom-Up Budgeting Process Evaluation". Institute of Philippine Culture. Manila.

governance and the use of participatory data-based planning processes. In the three rounds of implementation for FY2013, FY2014, and FY 2015, the BUB appears to have succeeded in making LGUs aware of the need to involve CSOs in development planning and utilizing empirical data for planning purposes. However, the potential of CSO participation in local planning process has not been realized fully largely because of inadequate capacity of many CSOs to engage in local planning and budgeting processes and lack of sufficient facilitation during the BUB processes.

1. General Features of the Bottom-up Budgeting Process for the FY 2016 Cycle

As indicated earlier, the Bottom-Up Budgeting process was introduced with the issuance of DBM-DILG-DSWD-NAPC Joint Memorandum Circular (JMC) No. 1-2012 in March 2012, in time for the preparation of the 2013 National Expenditure Program (NEP). The BUB aims to make planning and budgeting processes at the national and local level more participatory through the genuine involvement of grassroots organizations and communities. It also intends to ensure that the funding for projects identified by 609 targeted poor LGUs in their Local Poverty Reduction Action Plan (LPRAP)³ are included in the budgets of participating national government agencies (NGAs). Furthermore, it is meant to strengthen the convergence of service delivery in local communities.

Subsequently, the DBM-DILG-DSWD-NAPC JMC No. 4-2013 was issued in November 2013 defining the policies and procedures that will govern the implementation of the BUB as part of the preparation of 2015 National Expenditure Program. It defines the BUB as an approach to preparing the budget proposals of national government agencies in a manner that takes into consideration the development needs of cities/ municipalities as identified in their LPRAPs. To ensure this, JMC No. 4-2013 provides that LPRAPs should be formulated with the strong participation of basic sector organizations and other civil society organizations.⁴

³ The LPRAP is the LGU plan which contains the programs and projects that were collectively drawn through a participatory process by the LGU with CSOs and other stakeholders and which will directly address the needs of the poor constituencies and the marginalized sectors in the LGU.

⁴ Basic sector organizations (BSOs) refer to organizations of the marginalized sectors of Philippine society, namely: farmers and landless rural workers, artisanal fisherfolk, formal labor and migrant workers, workers in the informal sector, indigenous peoples and cultural communities, women, persons with disabilities, senior citizens, victims of calamities and disasters, youth and students, children, cooperatives and the urban poor (JMC No. 4-2013). On the other hand, civil society organizations (CSOs) include non-government organizations (NGOs), People's Organizations (POs), basic sector organizations, cooperatives, trade unions, professional associations, faith-based organizations, media groups, indigenous peoples movements, foundations, and other citizen's groups which are non-profit and which are formed primarily to promote social and economic development by way of the following activities: planning and monitoring of government programs and projects, engaging in policy discussions, and actively participating in collaborative activities with the government (JMC No. 4-2013). Meanwhile, NGOs refer to duly registered non-stock, non-profit organizations focusing on the uplifting of the basic or disadvantaged sectors of society by providing advocacy, training, community organizing, research, access to resources, and other similar activities while people's organizations refer to self-help groups belonging to the basic sectors and/ or disadvantaged groups composed of members having a common interest who voluntarily join together to achieve a lawful common social or economic end (Republic Act 8425).

For the FY 2014 round, the exercise was expanded to cover 1,233 municipalities/cities. For FY 2015 round and FY 2016, the coverage of the BUB is extended to all the municipalities/ cities across the country.

To guide the implementation of the BUB for FY 2016, DBM-DILG-DSWD-NAPC JMC No. 5-2014 was issued in October 2014. Twelve (12) NGAs and two (2) GOCCs participated in the FY 2016 round of the BUB, namely: (i) Department of Agriculture (DA) including the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), (ii) Department of Education (DepEd), (iii) Department of Energy (DOE), (iv) Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), (v) Department of Health (DOH), (vi) Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG), (vii) Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), (viii) Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), (ix) Department of Tourism (DOT), (x) Department of Trade and Industry, (xi) National Commission on Indigenous People, (xii) Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA), (xiii) National Electrification Administration (NEA), and (xiv) National Irrigation Authority. On the other hand, the coordinating and oversight agencies of the BUB includes: the Department of Budget and Management (DBM), the DILG, the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) and the DSWD.

The BUB is an additional source of funding for the LGUs. It essentially provides an additional grant from the national government to LGUs that is set equal to PhP 700 times the number of poor people in the LGU (as computed based on the 2009 small area estimates of poverty incidence in each LGU area from the National Statistics Coordination Board (NSCB)). Thus, the BUB allocation for municipalities and cities which have a larger number of poor constituents is larger than that of municipalities and cities which have a smaller number of poor constituents. However, the grant may not be less than PhP 15 million nor more than PhP 50 million per LGU. On the other hand, the BUB requires that LGUs provide a cash counterpart to the national government grant in accordance with the schedule shown in **Table 1**. The LGU counterpart fund must be sourced from LGU funds and the allocation of the same must be formalized by its inclusion in the LGU’s 2015 Annual Investment Plan (AIP).

Table 1. LGU cash counterpart schedule required under the BUB

For municipalities with combined GPB & Kalahi funding	Required LGU Counterpart
less than or equal to 100% of LDF	10% of LDF
between 100% and 150% of LDF	15% of LDF
over 150% of LDF	20% of LDF
All Cities	40% of budget cap

JMC No. 5-2014 prescribes two modalities that should be followed for the formulation of the LPRAPs, namely: the Regular BUB planning and budgeting process which is supposed to be applied in LGUs that have not yet participated in the National Community Driven Development Program or NCDDP (i.e., non-NCDDP areas) and the Enhanced BUB planning and budgeting process which is supposed to be followed in 271 LGUs that have graduated from or are currently

implementing the KALAHI-CIDSS program (i.e., KC areas). The planning and budgeting process under the Regular BUB process consists of the following steps:

1. Conduct of Civil Society General Assembly (CSO Assembly) during which (i) the CSOs will independently elect their representatives⁵ to the Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams (LPRAT) who will then elect among themselves the CSO vice-chairman of the LPRAT and the two other CSO representatives who will be signatories⁶ to the LPRAP, (ii) the City/ Municipal Government Operations Officer (C/ MLGOO) will report on the status of the BUB 2013 projects and the approved list of BUB 2014 projects, and (iii) the assembly as a whole will review, validate and analyze social and economic data of the LGU and propose solutions to identified problems and concerns (i.e., conduct a poverty situation analysis);⁷
2. Constitution of the LPRAT by the Mayor and conduct of the LPRAP workshop to be attended by the members of the LPRAT who will identify the strategies to address poverty reduction in the LGU based on the results of the poverty situation analysis that was undertaken during the CSO assembly and then identify priority poverty reduction projects through consensus among its members;⁸
3. Submission of the list of identified priority projects duly endorsed by the LPRAT to the Regional Poverty Reduction Actions Team (RPRAT) through the DILG regional office (RO) for consolidation;
4. Validation and review of the consolidated list of LGU projects in the region by the RPRAT and feedback of the results of the RPRAT and NPRAT review to the LGUs through their LPRAT representatives; and subsequently, by the National Poverty Reduction Action Team (NPRAT)
5. Submission of the revised list of projects with the Sanggunian resolution adopting the revised list of priority projects to the DILG RO;
6. Integration of LGU projects in the budgets of the NGAs under the FY 2016 NEP;
7. Provision of LGU counterpart; and
8. Project implementation.

⁵ JMC No. 5-2014 provides that elected LGU officials, their immediate relatives (i.e., spouse, parent, sibling or child) and LGU employees are not eligible to be elected as CSO representative.

⁶ The three CSO signatories must include: (i) a Pantawid Pamilya Leader or Parent Teacher Association (PTA) representative in the absence of the former; (ii) representative from BSOs or cooperative from any one of the following sectors: farmers and landless rural workers; artisanal fisherfolk, formal labor and migrant workers, workers in the informal sector, indigenous peoples and cultural communities, women, persons with disabilities, senior citizens, victims of calamities and disasters, youth and children, or urban poor; and (iii) CSO representative who is also a member of Local Development Council (LDC).

⁷ JMC No. 5-2014 provides that the schedule of the CSO Assembly must be announced through invitations to the CSOs, posters in the municipal/ city hall and through the DILG website at least two weeks prior to the CSO Assembly itself.

⁸ Only projects that can be implemented through programs in the BUB Menu of projects can be proposed for funding by the national government but LGUs can propose projects outside the menu projects if said projects will be funded through the LGU counterpart for BUB.

In contrast, the Enhanced BUB process essentially involves a two-step modification of the Regular BUB process in a manner that (i) integrates the participatory barangay development process following the NCDDP process, and (ii) enhances the composition of the Local Development Council. In effect, the planning and budgeting process under the Enhanced BUB process consists of the following steps:

1. Participatory barangay development planning which includes: (1) conduct of barangay assemblies,⁹ (2) selection by the participants in the barangay assembly of sitio community representatives of the barangay vice-chairperson of the expanded Barangay Development Council (BDC), (3) conduct of participatory situation analysis (PSA)¹⁰ to arrive at a medium-term barangay development plan (BDP) and the barangay investment plan (BIP), and (4) validation of BDP in a barangay assembly which will have to be approved by the barangay council and submitted to the City/ Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator for incorporation into the municipal development plan;
2. Conduct of City/ Municipal CSO General Assembly to be participated in by CSO leaders as in the Regular BUB process and by all the elected BDC vice-chairpersons during which (i) participants in the CSO assembly will independently elect at least 5 representatives to sit as CSO representatives in the Enhanced LDC,¹¹ the CSO vice-chairperson of the Enhanced LDC and two other signatories (one of which is a CSO representative and the other one is a BDC vice-chair to the Local Development Investment Plan (LDIP); (ii) the City/ Municipal Government Operations Officer (C/ MLGOO) will report on the status of the BUB 2013 projects and the approved list of BUB 2014 projects, and (iii) the assembly as a whole will review, validate and analyze social and economic data of the LGU and propose solutions to identified problems and concerns (i.e., conduct a poverty situation analysis);
3. Convening of the Enhanced LDC¹² by the Mayor to review, formulate/ update, and approve the medium-term comprehensive development plan (CDP), the Local Development Investment Plan (LDIP), the Executive-Legislative Agenda (ELA) and Annual Investment Plan (AIP), as well as the priority poverty reduction projects to be funded under the BUB and the barangay projects to be funded under NCDDP;
4. Convening of the LPRAT to serve as the technical working group of the Enhanced LDC for the purpose of drafting the LPRAP and so doing identify the

⁹ The barangay is encouraged to conduct at least four (4) barangay assemblies a year for the selection and assessment of performance of sitio volunteers, validation of the barangay development and investment plans, mid-year reporting/ updating of barangay programs, PPAs and the end of the year reporting.

¹⁰ The PSA process shall include gathering and updating of relevant economic and social data to be used as basis for discussion and prioritization of programs, projects and activities (PPAs).

¹¹ Since BDC Vice-Chairs are already automatically members of the Enhanced LDC, they are no longer eligible to be elected as a CSO representative.

¹² The Enhanced LDC is chaired by the Mayor and is composed of the Congressmen or their representatives, the chairperson of the Committee on Appropriation of the Local Sanggunian, all barangay chairpersons, all barangay vice-chairpersons, and at least five representatives of the CSOs who were elected during the CSO assembly.

strategies for reducing poverty and identify the priority projects for inclusion in the LPRAP which it will then submit to the Enhanced LDC for its confirmation;

5. Submission of the list of identified priority projects duly endorsed by the LPRAT to the RPRAT through the DILG regional office (RO) for consolidation;
6. Validation and review of the consolidated list of LGU projects in the region by the RPRAT and feedback of the results of the RPRAT review to the LGUs through their LPRAT representatives;
7. Submission of the revised list of projects with Sanggunian resolution adopting the revised list of priority projects to the DILG RO;
8. Integration of LGU projects in the budgets of the NGAs under the FY 2016 NEP;
9. Provision of LGU counterpart; and
10. Project implementation.¹³

The LPRAT is the group that will spearhead the formulation and monitoring of the LPRAP. It is composed of an equal number of representatives from CSOs and the government sector. Under the Regular BUB process, the composition of the LPRAT is as follows: (i) Local Chief Executive as chairperson; (ii) one CSO representative as co-chairperson; (iii) Chairperson of the Appropriations Committee of the Local Sanggunian; (iv) LGU department heads such as the planning officer, budget officer, agriculture officer, health officer, social welfare and development officer, etc.; (v) representatives of NGAs such as DSWD municipal links; C/MLGOO, etc.; (vi) representatives from BSOs, CSOs, NGOs, and POs; and (vii) a representative from a local business group or association. On the other hand, under the Enhanced BUB process, the LPRAT is composed of the (i) Local Chief Executive as chairperson; (ii) one CSO representative as co-chairperson; (iii) nine government representatives; (iv) 5 CSO representatives as elected during the CSO assembly and 5 BDC vice-chairs as selected by all the BDC vice-chairs from among their rank.

2. Objectives of the Study

The Department of Budget and Management (DBM) commissioned the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) to undertake a process evaluation of the FY2016 round to examine how the LPRAP planning process and prioritization of the projects are being implemented on the ground and suggest areas for further improvement in the implementation of the subsequent rounds. The main focus of the study will be on measuring and analyzing the extent of “participation” and success in ensuring that the “voices” of the target group, i.e. poor households through CSOs and basic sector groups, are heard in the decision-making process in FY2016 round. In this sense, the assessment is focused on the process rather than on the results/outcomes of the BUB.

The primary objectives of this study are:

- To examine how the BUB planning process and prioritization of projects are being implemented on the ground in terms of:
 - extent of participation,

¹³ Note that steps (v) to (x) of the Enhanced BUB process are exactly the same as in the Regular BUB process.

- local government unit (LGU)- civil society organizations (CSO) engagement,
 - integration of BUB process in the local planning process;
- To identify bottlenecks in the implementation of the sub-projects identified during FY 2013 and FY 2014 BUB process; and
 - To provide some insights on areas for further improvement for the subsequent rounds.

3. Approach and Methodology

This study covers four provinces: Antique, Agusan del Norte, Camarines Sur, and Zamboanga del Norte. In accordance with the design of the study, three city/ municipal LGUs are covered in each of these four provinces: (i) an urban CLGU/ MLGU, and (ii) two rural M/CLGU (**Table 2**). A research team composed of three members is assigned to each of the four provinces.

Table 2. Case study sites in four provinces

	Urban	Rural	
Agusan del Norte	Butuan City ^{a/}	Buenavista ^{a/}	Las Nieves ^{b/c/}
Camarines Sur	Goa ^{a/}	Lagonoy ^{a/}	Libmanan ^{b/c/}
Antique	San Jose ^{c/}	Barbaza ^{c/}	Sibalom ^{c/}
Zamboanga del Norte	Dapitan	Polanco	Mutia ^{c/}

^{a/} part of IPC assessment of FY 2013 cycle and PIDS assessment for FY 2015

^{b/} part of PIDS assessment for FY 2015

^{c/} NCDDP area

As indicated in **Table 2**, the CLGUs/ MLGUs in Agusan del Norte and Camarines Norte were also included in the assessment conducted by the Ateneo Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC) for the FY 2014 cycle and the assessment conducted by the PIDS for FY 2015. This will allow some inter-temporal comparison of the conduct of the BUB in these areas.

The assessment of how the various participatory steps involved in the conduct of the BUB were actually operationalized in 12 case study sites involved direct observation of the CSO assemblies and LPRAP workshops in these LGUs, and key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs) with major stakeholders (i.e., CSOs leaders and LGU officials) and to better appreciate their perspectives. On the other hand, the evaluation of the pace of implementation of the sub-projects prioritized and included in the Local Poverty Reduction Action Plans (LPRAPs) of the 12 study sites for FY 2013 and FY 2014 is based on a desk review of documentary evidence and information gathered from the KIIs and FGDs.

Ten key informants were interviewed in each of the CLGU/ MLGU covered by the study: (i) Mayor, (ii) Sanggunian chair of the appropriations committee, (iii) Municipal Local Government Officer, (iv) Local BUB Facilitator, (v) Local Planning Officer, Local Budget Officer and Local Treasurer as a group, (vi) LGU Sectoral Department Heads as a group (e.g., Local Health

Officer, Local Social Welfare and Development Officer, Local Engineer, Local Agriculture Officer, etc.), (vii) CSO chair of the Local Poverty Reduction Action Team (LPRAT) for the BUB, (viii) CSO leader who attended CSO Assembly but who is not a member of the LPRAT, (ix) CSO leader in the LGU who did not attend the CSO Assembly, and (x) head of the Association of Barangay Chairmen in the LGU. Two additional key informants were interviewed in the case of each of the KC MLGUs, namely: (i) one barangay chairman in the LGU, and (ii) the head of the area coordination team (ACT) in the KC area. Moreover, the NAPC BUB focal person in each of the four provinces and the BUB focal person in the relevant regional office of the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) were also interviewed. The guide questions for the key informants are presented in **Annex A**. In addition, the study team also reviewed the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, the Medium-term Development Plan, the Annual Investment Plan and LGU budgets of each of the study sites.

The study team conducted three focus group discussions of 5-10 participants each, in each of the twelve study sites:

- FGD with CSO leaders who attended the CSO assembly for the purpose of finding out how CSO representatives in the LPRAT are selected and to better understand how the CSO Assembly identified strategies to address poverty and/ or identify projects;
- FGD with CSO leaders who did not attend the CSO Assembly for the purpose of assessing possible selection bias in inviting CSOs leaders to the CSO Assembly and identifying the constraints faced by CSO leaders in participating in the CSO Assembly; and
- FGD with barangay chairmen in the LGU for the purpose of getting their views on the BUB process, in general, and the identification/ selection of BUB sub-projects, in particular.


The participants in the FGDs were selected so as to achieve some level of representativeness.

As per the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the study, the study team was supposed to observe the conduct of the CSO Assemblies and the LPRAP workshops in the study sites. The CSO assemblies were conducted in October - November 2014 while the LPRAP workshops occurred in December - January 2014. The instruments for the KIIs were pre-tested in March 3-8, 2014 and the actual conduct of the KIIs and FGDs were done in March - April 2015.

II. SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE STUDY SITES

1. Agusan del Norte

Agusan del Norte is one of the provinces that comprise the CARAGA region which is located in the northeastern part of Mindanao (**Figure 1**). Of its total land area, the bulk (73%) is considered forestland while the rest (25%) is agricultural.



Butuan City, the regional center of the CARAGA region, is a first income class highly urbanized city. It is situated in the northeastern part of Agusan Valley and is located at the center of Agusan del Norte. It is bounded by Butuan Bay on the north, Sibagat on the east, Buenavista on the west and Las Nieves on the south. It is a commercial and trading hub in northern Mindanao with major roads connecting it to other main cities in Mindanao like Davao City, Cagayan de Oro City, and Surigao City. At present, 52% of its land area is devoted to agriculture, 13% to production forests and 10% to protection forests (which includes the Taguibo watershed area, its main source of water). The city has two coastal barangays facing Butuan Bay. It has 86 barangays, 15 of which are urban and 59 are rural (**Table 3**). The different activities that contributed to the economy in order of importance are: (i) commercial and service centers, (ii) industrial establishments, (iii) agriculture, (iv) fishery, and (v) mining (2011-2013 ELA of Butuan City). The city's major agriculture products include rice, bananas, coconuts, poultry, shrimp and milkfish. Its key industries include rice milling, food processing, wood processing, and furniture manufacturing.

Table 3. Profile of study sites in Agusan del Norte

	Butuan City	Buenavista	Las Nieves
LGU income classification	First	First	Second
Per capita LGU income (PhP) a/	4,283	2,575	4,026
BUB budget cap (in million)	50	15	15
% of total LGU income	3.8	10.4	13.9
% of total LGU IRA	5.7	11.9	14.3
Population (2010 census)	309,709	56,139	26,856
Land area	81,662	47,561	58,269
Number of barangays	86 (15 urban)	21 (5 urban)	25 (1 urban)
Geographic characteristic	52% agricultural; 13% production forest; 20% protection forest	85% forestland; coastal	91% forestland
Livelihood	Commercial & service activities; industrial activities including wood industry; agriculture; fishing	Farming; fishing	Farming; forestry
Poverty Incidence (2009)	27.6	38.0	53.0
Poverty Incidence (2012)	18.7	30.8	59.4

a/ 2014

Poverty incidence in the city is 27.6% based on the 2009 small area estimates of poverty incidence, just slightly above the national average of 26%. However, because the city's population is large, the total number of poor people in the city is estimated to be equal to 85,480 in that year. Consequently, the city's BUB budget for FY 2016 is PhP 50 million (or PhP 70 million if the LGU counterpart is included).¹⁴ Butuan City's BUB budget for FY 2016 represents less than 4% of its total LGU income (or less than 6% of its IRA) in 2014.

The current administration of Butuan City envisions the city to be a model for sustainable forest-based economy by 2020. The city's executive agenda for 2014 - 2016 is aimed at achieving the following outcomes: (i) competitive and business friendly LGU, (ii) environmental protective, climate change adaptive and disaster resilient LGU, (iii) socially protective and safe LGU, and (iv) accountable, transparent, participative and effective local governance. On the other hand, during the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study, CSO leaders and LGU officials identify the following as the most pressing issues in the city: (i) agro-forestry productivity, (ii) water supply and watershed protection, and (iii) disaster risk reduction management and climate change adaptation as highlighted by the presence of families in danger zones (**Table 4**).

¹⁴ It is notable that the city's poverty incidence has decreased to 18.7% based on the 2012 small area estimates that became available in December 2014. Had this new dataset been available earlier, the city's BUB budget for FY 2016 would have been equal to PhP 40 million only.

Table 4. Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Agusan del Norte

Perceived Urgent Needs	Buenavista (Rural, KC)			Las Nieves (Rural, KC)			Butuan (Urban, Non-KC)		
	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair
Livelihood and employment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Support to agriculture	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Healthcare/Health Facilities		✓	✓		✓			✓	
Education Services		✓							
Agro-Forestry productivity	✓						✓	✓	
Disaster Risk reduction Management and Climate Change Adaptation measures	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Road networks(FMR, brgy access roads, bridge)	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓			
Poverty reduction				✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
Water systems (potable, irrigation)		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Solid waste disposal		✓						✓	
Public market	✓								
Construction of buildings	✓	✓		✓		✓			
Vehicle (i.e., for evacuation)				✓					
Daycare Centers		✓	✓						
Livelihood skills training						✓			
Social pension/Health benefits for senior citizens below 77				✓					
Peace and order				✓					

Buenavista is a first income class coastal municipality located 16 km from Butuan City and is bounded on the north by Butuan Bay, on the west by Nasipit and Misamis Oriental, on the south by Las Nieves, and on the east by Butuan City. It has 25 barangays, of which 5 are urban (**Table 3**). Its geography has two main features: the coastal plain and the mountainous areas in the southern part which include plateaus that are suitable for agriculture. The major source of livelihood in the municipality is farming and fishing. It is a major producer of coconut, rice, corn, mango, bananas, vegetables and seafood.

Poverty incidence in Buenavista in 2009 was estimated at 38% and the number of poor people in the municipality was estimated to be equal to 21,333. Thus, the BUB budget for the municipality for FY 2016 is set at PhP 15 million (or PhP 17.5 million if the LGU counterpart is included).¹⁵ Its BUB budget for FY 2016 represents 10% of its total LGU income (or 12% of its IRA) for 2014.

The municipality's development goals as articulated in its Executive Legislative Agenda are related to: local infrastructure, health services, education and governance. During the KIIs and FGDs, CSO leaders and LGU officials identify the following as among the most urgent needs in the municipality: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) support to agriculture, (iii) DRRM and climate change adaptation, and (iv) road network (**Table 4**).

Las Nieves is a second income class municipality that has been part of the KALAHI-CIDSS program since 2007. It is located 36 km south of Butuan City and is bordered on the east by Sibagat and Bayugan, Agusan del Sur, on the west by the province of Misamis Oriental and on

¹⁵ Similar to Butuan City, Buenavista experienced a decline in its poverty incidence in 2012 (30.8%). If this new estimate was used, its BUB budget allocation for FY 2016 would still have been at the minimum PhP 15 million.

the north by Butuan City and Buenavista. It is divided into the eastern and western parts by the Agusan River. It has 20 barangays, only one of which is urban (**Table 3**). Majority of its residents rely on farming and forestry. Among the municipalities of Agusan del Norte, Las Nieves is the largest producer of corn and the third largest producer of rice. Other high value crops produced in the municipality include rubber, coffee, banana and durian. Rice and corn are produced by lowland farmers while coffee and banana are produced by farmers in the uplands.

Although the poverty incidence in the municipality is 53%, (more than double the national average), the total number of poor people in the municipality is only 14,234, significantly lower than in Butuan City and Buenavista because total population in Las Nieves is also substantially smaller than in other two study sites in Agusan del Norte. The BUB budget for Las Nieves for FY 2016 is PhP 15 million (or PhP 17.1 million if the LGU counterpart is included). Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to 14% of its total LGU income/ IRA for 2014.

The 2013-2016 Executive-Legislative Agenda (ELA) of Las Nieves reflects the municipality's need to improve the road network (in particular, a bridge that will connect the eastern and western parts of the municipality to help farmers in transporting and marketing their crops). Based on its 2011 CBMS, unemployment in the municipality is low at 4.7%. However, the ELA points out that the source of permanent/ secure employment in the municipality is limited to the local government unit itself, the DepEd and one mini-saw and veneer processing plant.

During the KIIs and FGDs, CSO leaders and LGU officials identify the following as among the most urgent needs in the municipality: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) support to agriculture, (iii) road network, and (iv) DRRM and climate change adaptation (**Table 4**).

2. Camarines Sur

Camarines Sur is the largest of the 6 provinces in the Bicol Region. It lies across the middle of the Bicol Peninsula at the southeastern portion of Luzon island (**Figure 2**). It is bounded on the north by the Pacific Ocean, on the east by Maqueda Channel, on the south by the province of Albay and on the west by Ragay Gulf. Naga City, the provincial capital, is also the province's financial, trade and education center. With a poverty incidence of 41.2% in 2012, it is one of the most impoverished provinces in the country.¹⁶

Goa is a second income class municipality that is located 37 km from the capital town of Pili and 52 km from Naga City. It is a land-locked municipality, bounded by the municipalities of Tinambac and Calabanga on the north-northwest, the municipalities of Lagonoy and San Jose on the northeast-east, and the municipality of Tigaon in the south. It has 34 barangays, of which 6 are urban and the rest are in the uplands (**Table 5**). Goa is considered the commercial, trade and educational center of the third legislative district of the province. Seventy-five percent of its total land area is devoted to agriculture, 13% to agro-forestry and 10% to protected forest. The major economic activities in the area include agriculture, commerce, services, fishery and mining. Most of the agricultural land, especially those in the upland areas, is devoted to coconuts. Abaca, rice and corn are also grown in the area.

¹⁶ The national average poverty incidence is 26.3% in 2009 and 25.2% in 2012.

Figure 2. Map of Camarines Sur study sites



Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camarines_Sur
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Goa,_Camarines_Sur
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lagonoy,_Camarines_Sur
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Libmanan,_Camarines_Sur

Table 5. Profile of study sites in Camarines Sur

	Goa	Lagonoy	Libmanan
LGU income classification	Second	Second	First
Per capita LGU income (Php) a/	2, 067	2, 227	1, 745
BUB budget cap (in million)	20	17	33
% total LGU income	16.5	14.5	18.9
% of total LGU IRA	19.5	15.3	20.6
Population	58, 503	51, 814	100, 002
Land Are (ha)	20, 618	37, 790	34, 282
Number of barangays	34 (6 urban)	38 (4 urban)	75 (4 urban)
Geographic characteristic	75% agricultural; 13 % agro-forestry; 10% protected forest	38% agricultural; 38% forest land; 12% grassland; coastal	71% agricultural; coastal
Livelihood	Farming	Farming; Fishing	Farming; cottage industry; fishing
Poverty incidence (2009)	41.2	46.7	46.9
Poverty incidence (2012)	27.5	37.6	38.0

a/ 2014

With a poverty incidence of 41.2% based on the 2009 small area estimates, the total number of poor people in the municipality is estimated to be equal to 24,103. Given this, its BUB budget for FY 2016 is PhP 17 million (or PhP 21 million if the LGU counterpart is included. Had Goa's poverty incidence based on the 2012 small area estimate (27.5%) been used, its BUB budget for FY 2016 would have been reduced to the minimum PhP 15 million. Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is significant relative to its IRA and total LGU income, being roughly equal to 20% of its IRA (or 17% of its total LGU income) in 2014.

During the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study, CSO and LGU leaders identified the following as among the most urgent needs in the municipality: (i) improved road network between the uplands and the town proper such that farmers in the uplands prefer to sell their produce in the nearby municipality of Tinambac, (ii) potable water supply and sanitation, (iii) health care facilities and (iv) programs to address large proportion of elementary- and high school-aged children who are not attending school (**Table 6**). Other priority needs that were identified during the FGDs include evacuation center.

Table 6. Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Camarines Sur

Perceived Urgent Needs	Goa (Urban)			Lagonoy (Rural Non KC)			Libmanan (Rural KC)		
	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair
Livelihood and Employment	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Support to Agriculture	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	✓
Health Care/Health Facilities (Includes Sanitary toilets, Malnutrition/FP)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Education Services	✓	✓							
Agro-forestry productivity	✓								
DRRM and climate change adaptation measures		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Road Networks (FMRs/Brgy. Access roads)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Poverty	✓		✓	✓	✓				
Water Systems	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	
Solid waste disposal			✓	✓		✓			
Public Market incldg Slaughterhouse		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	
Bus Terminal								✓	
Construction of Bldg./Multi-purpose centers				✓		✓			
Construction of Gymnasium									
Day Care Centers			✓	✓		✓			
Need to address illegal fishing				✓			✓	✓	
Moral recovery				✓					
CBMS updating	✓	✓							
CLUP updating for zoning ordinance	✓								
Land & House for indigent families						✓			

Lagonoy is a second income class municipality that is located 44 km from Pili and 58 km from Naga City. It is a coastal municipality that is bounded on the north by Lamit Bay and the Pacific Ocean, on the east by the municipality of Gatchitorena, on the southeast by Presentacion, on the northwest by Tinambac, on the west by Goa, on the south by the municipality of San Jose, and

on the southeast by Lagonoy Gulf. Lagonoy is politically subdivided into 38 barangays in two major areas, namely North Coastal and Lagonoy South. The former borders Lamit Bay, and the North Pacific Ocean. The first drop-off barangay to the North Coastal area is Bacogan which is 164 kilometers away from the town poblacion. On the other hand, Lagonoy South consists of the mainland areas: poblacion with 6 barangays (only 4 of which are urban), west mainland area with 6 barangays, east mainland area with 8 barangays, and the east coastal area bordering Lagonoy Bay.

Lagonoy is predominantly agricultural, thus farming is the main source of income. The major agricultural crops are coconut, followed by rice, abaca, root crops, and corn. Livestock and poultry farming is the secondary source of income among farmers within the municipality. Its production is widespread, but invariably small-scale in nature. Lagonoy is also rich in fishes and other aquatic resources. The vast mangrove and swamps in the municipality are rich grounds for producing high quality aquatic products.

Industrial establishments in the municipality are limited to cottage and small-scale industries utilizing rattan, bamboo, buho, tiger grass, and nipa for furniture production and housing material production. The present mayor supported the makers of soft broom (made of tiger grass) in the east coastal area through the One Town, One Product (OTOP) program of DTI.

With a poverty incidence of 46.7% based on the 2009 small area estimates (**Table 5**), the total number of poor people in Lagonoy is estimated to be equal to 24,197, roughly equal to the number of poor people in Goa even if the poverty incidence in Goa is lower than in Lagonoy. Thus, its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to PhP 17 million (or PhP 21.4 million if the LGU counterpart is included).¹⁷ Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to 15% of its 2014 IRA as well as its 2014 total LGU income.

The CSO and LGU leaders who participated in the KIIs and FGDs (none of whom came from the North coastal barangays) conducted for this study identified the following as among the most urgent problems of the municipality: (i) need to address flooding in the coastal barangays by constructing seawalls (e.g. in barangay Panicuan in the east coastal area) and evacuation centers, (ii) need for public market, (iii) absence of road network that connects the North coastal barangays to Lagonoy South, including the poblacion,¹⁸ (iv) lack of livelihood and employment

¹⁷ Because the small area poverty incidence estimate for 2012 is lower (37.6%), Lagonoy's BUB allocation would have been lower at the minimum allocation of PhP 15 million had this figure been used in allocating the BUB for FY 2016.

¹⁸ Going to the town proper entails travelling by boat to Tinambac and then by land through the Goa-San Jose-Lagonoy town proper-route, making it difficult for constituents from the North coastal barangays from participating in many municipal-wide activities, such as the CSO Assembly for GPB process. Also, residents of the North Coastal barangays prefer to perform economic activities in Tinambac, Goa or Naga City rather than going to Lagonoy town proper.

opportunities,¹⁹ and (v) lack of access to health facilities and day care centers in the North coastal areas (**Table 6**).

Libmanan is a first income class municipality that was implementing the second cycle of the KALAHI-CIDSS program in 2013 when FY 2015 BUB cycle was undertaken. Fifty-six kms from Pili and 39 kms from Naga City, it is located on the southwestern part of the province and is bounded on the north-northeast by Cabusao, on the west-northwest by Sipocot, on the southwest by Ragay Gulf, on the Southeast by Pasacao and on the east by Pamplona. The land area ranges from flat to mountainous terrain. It is composed of 75 barangays of which 4 are urban (**Table 5**).

Agriculture is the main source of income in the municipality. Agricultural lands are mainly dedicated to rice and coconut cultivation. The second and third leading source of income is commerce and industry, mainly cottage industries such as ceramics, bamboo furniture production, and basket making, among others. Aside from these, residents also make their living by fishing.

Being the most populated municipality in Camarines Sur and having a relatively high poverty incidence of 46.9%, the total number of poor population in Libmanan is estimated to be equal to 46,900. Thus, its BUB budget for FY 2016 is set at PhP 33 million (or PhP 39.4 million if the LGU counterpart is included).²⁰ Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is large relative to its 2014 IRA (21%) and its 2014 total LGU income (19%).

CSO leaders and LGU officials who participated in the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study identified the following as among the most urgent needs in the municipality: (i) adequate support to agriculture, including irrigation, (ii) livelihood and employment, (iii) better road network, (iv) solutions to flooding due to siltation of Bicol/ Libmanan river, (v) lack of safe water, and (vi) illegal fishing (**Table 6**).


3. Antique

One of the 6 provinces in the Western Visayas Region, Antique occupies the entire western side of Panay Island. It is bounded by Aklan in the northeast, Capiz on the east, Iloilo in the southeast and Sulu Sea on the west (**Figure 3**). The topography of the province is rugged and varied. Its poverty incidence is 30.9% in 2012 compared with the national average of 25.2%. Farming is the primary source of income for inland, including highland municipalities. In coastal areas, meanwhile, fishing is the main source of income. The main crop produced in the province is palay, followed by coconut and sugarcane. For livestock and poultry, which is mostly backyard, the primary product is hog followed by cattle and chicken. The aquaculture subsector accounts for 78.3 percent of the total production of the fisheries subsector.

¹⁹ Fisherfolks lose big catch because of illegal fishing, particularly in the north coastal areas, where unregistered bancas are used; or big nets (“malakaya”) used within the 20 meters municipal waters. Farmers also suffer from expensive input cost and low selling prices of their harvest. Meanwhile, graduates and others who seek employment travel to other municipalities and cities to find opportunities.

²⁰ Note that if the 2012 small area estimate of poverty incidence (38%) were used, its BUB budget would have PhP 26.6 million only.

A first income class municipality, San Jose is the capital town and is the most populous in the province. Located in the southwestern part of the province (and the island of Panay), San Jose is bordered on the north by the municipality of Belison, on the east and northeast by the municipality of Sibalom, on the south by the municipality of Hamtic, and on the west by Sulu Sea (**Figure 3**).



San Jose has a total land area of 4,856 hectares, almost 59 percent of which is reported as an agricultural area. The built-up areas are estimated to be 1,452.08 hectares, while the remaining 383.92 hectares are occupied by a river, swamps, marshes, and designated parks and open spaces. Of its 28 barangays, 14 are coastal and the rest are inland barangays. On the other hand, 18 of its 28 barangays are classified as urban barangays (**Table 7**).

San Jose is primarily an agricultural town, with around 64% of the population engaged in farming and fishing activities. It is a net supplier of rice. Other crops produced in San Jose are coconut, corn, mungo, peanut, root crops (cassava and sweet potato), vegetables and fruit trees (mango and banana). Cottage/ home industries (including food processing) and trading is another major activity in San Jose. From only 30 in 1997, the total number of registered business establishments increased to 1,700 in 2013.

San Jose's poverty incidence (23.8% in 2009) is the lowest in the province and the number of poor population in the municipality is estimated at less than 14,000. Thus, its BUB budget for FY 2016 is set at the minimum of PhP 15 million (or PhP 16.7 million if the LGU counterpart is included). Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is roughly equal to 17% of its 2014 IRA (or 10% of its 2014 total LGU income).

Table 7. Profile of study sites in Antique

	San Jose	Barbaza	Sibalom
LGU income classification	First	Fourth	Second
Per capita LGU income (PhP) a/	2,533	2,875	2,416
BUB budget cap (in million)	15	15	15
% of total LGU income	10.2	24.0	11.1
% of total LGU IRA	17.4	25.9	15.2
Population	57,847	21,775	56,058
Land area (ha)	4,856	15,436	20,130
Number of barangays	28 (18 urban)	39 (3 urban)	75 (2 urban)
Geographic characteristic	59% agricultural; 33% built-up; 8% rivers, swamps, marshes and areas designated as parks	73.8% agricultural; 18% natural park	29% agricultural; 60% timberland
Livelihood	Farming; fishing	Farming; fishing	Farming
Poverty Incidence (2009)	23.8	46.3	37.5
Poverty Incidence (2012)	8.3	23.4	21.2

The LGU's overall goal, as articulated in its Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) is to restructure the traditional agriculture-based economy and complement it with the development of modern trade and commercial sector. Specifically, it aims to provide more job opportunities for the marginalized sectors, more local laws and policies for better service delivery and sustainable development, improved health and nutrition conditions of women and children, a vibrant peoples' participation in governance, an environmentally sound socio-economic and infrastructure initiatives, a better learning environment, increased food production through sustainable farming techniques, and an adequate revenue measure and resource mobilization for people-centered and sustainable local development. On the other hand, CSO leaders and LGU officials both indicate during the FGDs which were undertaken as part of this study that the most urgent needs of the LGU include: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) improved road network, (iii) increased support to agriculture, and (iv) improved water supply (**Table 8**).

Sibalom is a second income class municipality and is one of the three interior municipalities of the province. It is surrounded by the municipality of San Remigio on the north western side, Belison and partially by Patnongon on the north eastern part, San Jose on the southwest, Hamtic on the south, and the province of Iloilo on the east. Sibalom is around 10 kilometers from the provincial capital, San Jose.

Sibalom is second most populous municipality in the province. It is composed of 76 barangays, only three of which are classified as are urban (**Table 7**). It has a total land area of 20,130 hectares, 74% of which is considered agricultural. On the other hand, the Sibalom Nature Park, one of the last patches of lowland forest in Panay and the first protected area in the island, accounts for 18% of its total land area and is being promoted as a tourist destination.

The main source of income of the residents of Sibalom is agriculture. The municipality is known as the “rice bowl” of the province with about 34% of its total land area planted to rice.²¹ It is self-sufficient not only in rice but also in terms of other agricultural products such as root crops and livestock. Vast areas, particularly in the upland barangays, are also available for grazing livestock animals such as cows, goats, and carabaos.

Table 8. Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Antique

Perceived Urgent Needs	San Jose			Sibalom			Barbaza		
	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair
Livelihood and Employment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Support to Agriculture	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Health Care/Health Facilities		✓			✓			✓	
Education Services	✓			✓	✓			✓	
Agro-forestry productivity					✓				
Disaster risk reduction on management and climate change adaptatio measures								✓	
Road Networks (FMRs/Brgy. Access roads)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Poverty	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Water Systems	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		
Polital reform	✓		✓				✓		
Address inequality/unequal distribution of wealth							✓		
Moral recovery	✓	✓					✓		
River declogging									✓
Yolanda rehabilitation								✓	
Emergency shelter					✓			✓	
Address malnutrition	✓				✓			✓	
Airport and seaport		✓							
Tourism					✓	✓			
Emergency equipment and transportation (Firetrucks)					✓				

With about 37.5% of its constituents living below the poverty line as per the 2009 small area estimates of poverty incidence, its BUB budget cap is set at PhP 15 million (or PhP 18 million if the LGU counterpart is included). Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is large relative to its IRA as well as its total LGU income, being equal to 26% of its 2014 IRA (or 24% of its 2014 total LGU income).

CSO leaders and LGU officials indicated during the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study that outdated farming technology negatively affects agricultural productivity. Also, inadequate farm-to-market roads do not only make it difficult for farmers in the upland and remote barangays to transport their goods to and from the town center but also adversely affect their access to health and education services. Unemployment and underemployment is also prevalent among the residents of Sibalom. Inadequate water supply, particularly during the dry season, is prevalent in many of the municipality’s barangays (**Table 8**). Also, many of the public schools in the LGU

²¹ About 50% of the area planted with rice is irrigated.

have incomplete facilities, e.g., restrooms, handwashing facilities, and some of them even have no electricity or Internet connection.

Barbaza is located at the central part of the province, 60 kilometers away from San Jose de Buenavista, the provincial capital. Barbaza has a total land area of 15,436 hectares, 60% of which are classified as timberland and 40% as alienable and disposable lands. A fourth class municipality, Barbaza is composed of 39 barangays, of which only 2 are considered urban. Also, 15 of its barangays are in the lowland areas while 24 are in the uplands. Eleven (11) of the lowland barangays are coastal.

Poverty incidence in Barbaza is estimated to be equal to 46.3% in 2009 and its BUB budget cap is set at PhP 15 million (or PhP 17.3 million if the LGU counterpart is included). Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to 15% of its 2014 IRA (or 11% of its 2014 total LGU income).

CSO leaders and LGU officials report during the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study that the most urgent needs of the LGU include: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) support to agriculture, (iii) improved road network, and (iv) adequate water supply (**Table 8**).

4. Zamboanga del Norte Province

Zamboanga del Norte is a province in Region IX (Zamboanga Peninsula) in Mindanao. It is bounded by Zamboanga del Sur and Zamboanga Sibugay on the south, Misamis Occidental on the east, and Sulu sea on the northwest (**Figure 4**). The province occupies a total land area of 730,100 hectares, making Zamboanga del Norte the largest province in the region. Ninety percent of its land area is considered production land, 8% is protection land and 2% consists of built-up areas.

Figure 4. Map of Zamboanga del Norte province study sites



Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zamboanga_Peninsula
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dapitan>
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polanco,_Zamboanga_del_Norte
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mutia,_Zamboanga_del_Norte

Dapitan City is a third income class city located on the northern part of the Zamboanga Peninsula. It is bounded by the Sulu Sea on the north, municipalities of Mutia and La Libertad on the south, Sibutad and Rizal on the east, and Dipolog City and the municipalities of Polanco, Sibutad, La Libertad and Rizal, all in the province of Zamboanga del Norte, on the west. It is composed of 50 barangays, 5 of which are urban.

Seventy-seven percent of its total land area (consisting of 39,053 has.) is considered production land while 18% is classified as protection land. Thus, agriculture and fishery are the main source of income of its population (**Table 9**).

Table 9. Profile of study sites in Zamboanga del Norte province

	Dapitan	Polanco	Mutia
LGU income classification	Third	Third	Fifth
Per capita LGU income (Php) a/	5, 085	2, 385	3, 533
BUB budget cap (in million)	23	15	15
% of total LGU income	3.8	16.8	35.5
% of total LGU IRA	5.9	18.7	36.8
Population	120, 460	37, 472	11, 975
Land area (ha)	24, 113	20, 688	7, 358
Number of barangays	50 (5 urban)	30 (2 urban)	16 (2 urban)
Geographic characteristic	77% production; 18% protection	75% production; 9% protection	51% production; 25% protection
Livelihood	Agriculture; fishing	Agriculture	Agriculture
Poverty Incidence (2009)	40.0	47.3	57.8
Poverty Incidence (2012)	38.3	36.8	43.8

a/ 2014

The city's poverty incidence in 2009 is 40% and its BUB budget for FY 2016 is Php 23 million (or Php 30.8 million if the LGU counterpart is included).²² Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to 6% of its 2014 IRA (or 4% of its 2014 total LGU income).

Viewing tourism to have the biggest potential in contributing to growth, the city aims to increase both domestic and foreign tourist arrivals. In addition, the city aims to maximize productivity in agriculture, livestock and fishery, and to engage in other trade, commercial and industrial activities, to participate and contribute to the Dapitan-Dipolog-Polanco-Katipunan-Roxas-Manukan (DDPKaRoMa) Industrial Corridor. Related to this, adequate infrastructure is aimed to be put into place to support sustainable economic development. CSO leaders and LGU officials indicate the following priority needs of the city during the KIIs and FGDs that were conducted for this study: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) improved road network, (iii) adequate water

²² Its BUB budget would have been Php 21 million had the 2012 small area poverty estimates been used.

supply, (iv) support to agriculture, (v) greater access to high quality health facilities, and (vi) construction of bus terminal (**Table 10**).

Polanco is a third class municipality in the northeastern part of Zamboanga del Norte. To its west and northwest is Dipolog City, to its northeast is Dapitan City, to its east is the municipality of Pinan, and to its south is the municipality of Sergio Osmena. It is composed of 30 barangays, only 2 of which are considered urban.

Table 10. Priority needs of LGUs as identified by CSO leaders and LGU officials during KIIs and FGDs in study sites in Antique

Perceived Urgent Needs	Dapitan City (Urban)			Polanco Rural, Non-KC)			Mutia (Rural, KC)		
	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair	CSO	LGU	Brgy Chair
Livelihood and employment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Support to agriculture	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Healthcare/health facilities	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓	
Education services		✓		✓			✓		
DRRM and climate change adaptation measures				✓	✓				
Road Networks (FMR/brgy access roads)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Poverty				✓	✓		✓		
Water systems	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Solid Waste Disposal				✓					
Public Market		✓						✓	
Bus Terminal	✓	✓						✓	
Public Cemetery		✓							
Vehicle		✓							
Construction of Building		✓							✓
Construction of Gymnasium								✓	
Day-care Centers							✓		

Seventy-five percent of its land area is categorized as production land while 9% is considered protection land. Agriculture is the main source of livelihood of its population. Although the municipality's poverty incidence in 2009 is relatively high (47.3%), its BUB budget is set at the minimum of PhP 15 million (or PhP 18.2 million if the counterpart fund is included) given that its total population is also fairly small.²³ Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is equal to 19% of 2014 IRA (or 17% of its 2014 total LGU income).

CSO leaders and LGU officials report during the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study that the priority needs of the municipality include: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) road network improvement, (iii) support to agriculture, (iv) disaster risk reduction and management, and (v) poverty alleviation (**Table 10**).

Mutia is a fifth class municipality in the province of Zamboanga del Norte located 29 kilometers from the provincial capital of Dipolog City. It the second smallest municipality in Zamboanga del Norte, bordered on the north by the municipalities of La Libertad and Piñan; on the south by

²³ Had its 2012 poverty incidence of 36.8% been used, its BUB budget would have remained at PhP 15 million.

the municipality of Sergio Osmeña Sr; and on the east by the province of Misamis Occidental. It is comprised of 16 barangays, only 2 of which are urban.

Fifty-one percent of its land area is considered production land while 25% is considered protection land. Agriculture is the main source of income of its population.

With a poverty incidence of 57.8% in 2009, its BUB budget is set at the minimum of PhP 15 million, (or PhP 16.3 million if the counterpart fund is included) given its very small total population (**Table 9**). Its BUB budget for FY 2016 is large relative to its 2014 IRA (37%) and its 2014 total LGU income (36%).

As per Mutia's ELA, the present administration believes that overall progress in the municipality can be achieved by implementing major infrastructure projects. The economic, commercial, industrial and social development goals include: public market, integrated bus terminal, a corn mill, concreting of core local roads, and agricultural centers. On the other hand, CSO leaders and LGU officials suggest during the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study that the most urgent of the LGU includes: (i) livelihood and employment, (ii) road network improvement, (iii) support to agriculture, (iv) water supply, and (v) improved health care facilities (**Table 10**).

III. ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JMC 5-2014 IN THE FIELD

The following sub-sections focuses on how well the JMC No. 5-2014 had been able to promote increased participation in both national and local planning and budgeting. Based on the BUB experience in the 12 case study sites, this study argues that CSO participation in the BUB may be characterized on the basis of how the LGUs actually operationalized the following key features of the BUB: (i) the inclusiveness of the CSO assembly as reflected in the availability of an inventory of all CSOs that are active in the LGU, in the "openness" of processes and procedures involved in the issuance of the invitations to the CSO assembly, and in the reasons for the failure of invited CSOs from attending the CSO assembly; (ii) quality of participation of CSOs in the CSO assembly as indicated by the representativeness of CSOs that attended the CSO assembly, the manner by which the poverty situation analysis (PSA) is conducted and the nature of the output of PSAs; (iii) quality of the LPRAP workshop as determined by the selection of CSO representatives in the Local Poverty Reduction Action Team (LPRAT), whether the CSO assembly output is considered in the LPRAT discussions, the provenance of the long list of projects considered for prioritization during the LPRAP workshop, who participates in the prioritization of BUB sub-projects, how project prioritization is done, who prepares the project briefs of the prioritized BUB sub-projects and whether the list of BUB sub-projects was changed in meetings conducted after the LPRAP workshop. The study then juxtaposed the extent of CSO participation in the BUB in the 12 study sites as measured by the share of CSO-identified or proposed projects in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects against the actual conduct of the CSO assembly and LPRAP workshop in these LGUs to gain a better understanding of the relative importance of the various aspects that comprise CSO participation in the BUB.

1. Inclusiveness of the CSO Assembly

CSO mapping. Inclusiveness of the CSO assembly is enhanced if all active CSOs operating in the LGU are invited to attend the CSO assembly. In the FY 2015 planning cycle of the BUB it was found that while the availability of a more expansive inventory of CSOs does not guarantee greater inclusiveness, it does promote the participation of more CSOs in the CSO assembly by broadening/ expanding the masterlist of CSOs given that the CSOs that are actually invited to the CSO assembly are drawn from such a CSO masterlist.

One of the new features of the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle is the conduct of CSO mapping by the community mobilizer (CM), previously known as the local BUB facilitator. The inventory of CSOs that results from the CSO mapping exercise includes not only LGU-accredited/ recognized CSOs but also CSOs registered with or accredited by other government agencies like the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE), Cooperative Development Authority (CDA), Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD), Insurance Commission (IC), National Housing Authority (NHA), and Department of Agriculture (DA), as well as non-accredited CSOs which are actively operating in the LGU, e.g., Pantawid Pamilya Parent Leaders and SEA-K Associations.

The active mapping of CSOs have been carried by the community mobilizers in 7 out of the 12 study sites covered under the assessment of the FY 2016 cycle (namely, Goa in Camarines Sur, all of the three study sites in Antique and all of the three study sites in Zamboanga del Norte) compared with 4 out of the 12 study sites covered under the assessment of the FY 2015 cycle (Gumaca in Quezon province and all three study sites in Negros Occidental). Moreover, although no formal mapping of active CSOs was conducted in Butuan City, all CSOs which attended a pre-CSO assembly meeting (consisting of 38 LGU-accredited and 54 non-LGU-accredited CSOs) were essentially deemed as being included in the CSO map and was used as the basis of drawing the list of invitees to the actual CSO assembly.

The CSO mapping exercise typically involves boosting the CSO masterlist by adding CSOs that are accredited/ recognized by national line agencies as well as CSOs that are otherwise known to be operating in the LGU to the list of LGU-accredited CSOs and validating the list thus generated through site visits. For instance, in all three municipalities of Zamboanga del Norte which are covered under this study, CSO mapping started in June 2015, when the community mobilizer expanded the list of CSOs by including those obtained from various sources including the MLGOO, C/MPDC, Office of the Mayor, LGU department heads and national government line agencies. The CM then validated the CSOs in this expanded list through site visits. The three CMs in Zamboanga del Norte internally targeted to map 50 CSOs per municipality prior to the conduct of CSO assembly. According to the CMs and regional DILG office, CSO mapping is continuously being done even after the FY2016 planning cycle, thereby guaranteeing greater CSO coverage in the following rounds of the BUB.

In areas where CSO mapping was conducted, this effort appears to have been successful in expanding the number of CSOs in the CSO masterlist such that the number of CSOs in the CSO map is significantly greater than the number of total number of LGU-accredited CSOs in these LGUs. For example, the CSO mapping exercise resulted in 71 non-LGU-accredited CSOs being

included in the CSO inventory of Dapitan City, representing a 169% increase over the 42 LGU-accredited CSOs in the city. Similarly, CSO mapping led to 47 non-LGU-accredited CSOs being included in the CSO inventory of Polanco, a 224% increase over the municipality's 21 LGU-accredited CSOs.²⁴ In like manner, CSO mapping increased the number of CSOs in the CSO masterlist from 5 LGU-accredited CSOs to 42 LGU-accredited and non-LGU-accredited CSOs in Mutia, from 50 to 79 in San Jose, from 14 to 41 in Sibalom, 22 to 33 in Barbaza, and from 5 to 36 in Goa (**Table 11**). To the extent that the CSO maps are used as the basis for the identification of invitees to the CSO assembly, the conduct of CSO mapping contributes to improving the inclusiveness of the BUB process.

Table 11. Number of additional CSOs added to CSO inventory due to CSO mapping

	Total no. of LGU accredited and non-LGU-accredited CSOs	Total no. of CSOs in CSO map	Total no. of CSOs added to CSO inventory due to CSO mapping	Total no. of LGU accredited CSOs
Agusan del Norte				
Butuan City ^{a/ c/}	118	92	54	38
Antique				
San Jose (KC) ^{b/}	79	79	29	50
Barbaza (KC) ^{b/}	33	33	11	22
Sibalom (KC) ^{b/}	41	41	27	14
Camarines Sur				
Goa ^{b/}	36	36	31	5
Zamboanga del Norte				
Dapitan City ^{c/}	113	75	71	42
Polanco ^{c/}	68	63	47	21
Mutia (KC) ^{b/}	47	47	42	5

a/ no formal CSO mapping conducted by CM but masterlist used to generate list of invitees included all CSOs, regardless of LGU-accredited or not, which attended pre-CSO-assembly meeting.

b/ all of LGU-accredited CSOs included in CSO map generated by CM.

c/ only 38 of the 64 LGU-accredited CSOs in FY 2015 cycle included in CSO map, only 4 of the 42 LGU-accredited CSOs in Dapitan included in CSO map generated by CM and only 16 to 21 LGU-accredited CSOs in Polanco included in CSO map generated by CM.

Inclusiveness deriving from the issuance of formal invitations and notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly. JMC No. 5-2014 provides that the schedule of the CSO assembly must be announced through a letters of invitation to individual CSOs and through a Notice of the assembly (including the list of CSOs invited and information about the person/ office who may be contacted by other local CSOs that did not receive an invitation or which are not specifically

²⁴ Not all LGU-accredited organizations are included in the CSO map in Dapitan City and Polanco. Specifically, only 4 out of the 42 LGU-accredited CSOs in Dapitan City and 16 out of the 21 LGU-accredited CSOs in Polanco were included in the CSO maps constructed by the CM. This finding may imply two different things: one, the CM has not fully completed the validation of LGU-accredited CSOs, or two, some LGU-accredited CSOs are no longer active and/or functional. This issue was not fully explored in this assessment and should be addressed by validating the functionality of all LGU-accredited CSOs.

listed in the Notice but which wish to attend the assembly) posted in municipal/ city bulletin board or on the DILG/ LGU website at least two weeks before the CSO assembly. The inclusiveness of the BUB process is significantly affected by the manner by which invitations to the CSO assembly are made, specifically in terms of (i) inclusion of a provision in Notice of schedule of CSO assembly that says the CSO assembly is also open to CSOs which are not specifically enumerated in the Notice or to CSOs which did not receive a formal invitation to CSO assembly, (ii) availability of complete CSO map/ inventory; (iii) lack of credibility/ trust issues vis political leadership, (iv) non-inclusion of some CSOs in the CSO masterlist/ map from the list of CSOs that are actually given formal invitation to CSO assembly or specifically enumerated in the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly, (v) inclusion in the Notice of a provision that says transport expense will be reimbursed ; (vi) timing of the posting of the Notice and/ or issuance of formal invitations to the CSO assembly.

At one end of the spectrum in terms of the degree of openness of the CSO assembly are LGUs whose CSO assemblies are open to all CSOs including those which did not receive formal invitations or which are not included in the list of invitees appearing on the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly posted in conspicuous areas in the municipal hall as provided under JMC No. 5-2014. All 3 study sites in Camarines Sur, all 3 study sites in Antique and Las Nieves in Agusan del Norte belong to this group. For instance, a good number of CSOs that were not specifically listed in the Notice actually attended the CSO assembly in the 3 study sites in Camarines Sur (i.e., 9 out of 23 CSO attendees in CSO assembly in Goa, 16 out of 50 CSO attendees in Libmanan and 6 out of 21 CSO attendees in Lagonoy) largely because the Notice of schedule of CSO assembly in all 3 study sites in Camarines Sur provided that the CSO assemblies there were open to all CSOs that wish to attend. Four out of the 7 study sites where the CSO assembly is open to all CSOs posted attendance rates (computed vis the total number of invitees) that are in excess of 75% while the number of attendees in the CSO assembly is highest in Las Nieves relative to that in the other 11 study sites (**Table 12**). On the other hand, the relatively low attendance rates in Lagonoy (64%) and Barbaza (67%) relative to the other study sites in Camarines Sur and Antique may be due to pre-existing trust issues between the LGU and the CSO community in the former and the relatively high poverty incidence in the latter which could have discouraged CSOs from attending the CSO assembly because of the loss of income and transportation cost that are associated with attending the CSO assembly.

At the other end of the spectrum are LGUs, e.g., Buenavista and Butuan City in Agusan del Norte, where (i) the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly did not indicate that the CSO assembly is open to all CSOs, (ii) no CSO mapping was conducted such that the CSO masterlist is restricted to LGU-accredited CSOs only, (iii) some LGU-accredited CSOs in the CSO masterlist are not included in the list of invitees, and (iv) some of the invited CSOs opted not to attend the CSO assembly. For instance, during the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle in Buenavista, only LGU-accredited CSOs were included in the CSO masterlist, only 75% of the total number of LGU-accredited CSOs were invited to the CSO assembly, and only 64% of the CSOs invited chose to attend the assembly ostensibly because of political differences with the current LGU administration.

Table 12. Attendance rate vis number of invitees and number of attendees in CSO assembly

	Number of CSOs in CSO masterlist	Number of invitees	Number of attendees	Percentage of number of invitees to total number of CSOs in the CSO masterlist	Attendance rate vis number of invitees (%)
Agusan del Norte					
Butuan City	118	92	59	78.0	64.1
Buenavista	134	100	64	74.6	64.0
Las Nieves (KC) ^{al/}	No CSO masterlist	No CSO given formal	82		Not applicable
Antique					
San Jose (KC) ^{al/}	79	40	39	50.6	97.5
Barbanza (KC) ^{al/}	33	33	22	100.0	66.7
Sibalom (KC) ^{al/}	41	41	31	100.0	75.6
Camarines Sur					
Goa ^{al/}	36	25	23	69.4	92.0
Lagony ^{al/}	33	33	21	100.0	63.6
Libmanan (KC) ^{al/}	61	61	50	100.0	82.0
Zamboanga del Norte					
Dapitan City	113	75	39	66.4	52.0
Polanco	68	58	50	85.3	86.2
Mutia (KC)	47	42	39	89.4	92.9

^{al/} CSO assemble open to all CSOs

In between these two extremes are LGUs where (i) the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly does not indicate that the CSO assembly is open to all CSOs, (ii) CSO mapping, albeit incomplete in certain cases, was conducted resulting in a more expansive CSO masterlist, (iii) some LGU-accredited CSOs in the CSO masterlist are not included in the list of invitees, and (iv) some of the invited CSOs chose not to attend the CSO assembly or were prevented from attending the CSO assembly. The 3 study sites of this study in Zamboanga del Norte exemplify this group, namely Dapitan City, Polanco and Mutia. In the case of Dapitan City, although the CSO mapping exercise identified 71 additional non-LGU-accredited CSOs for inclusion in the CSO masterlist and while all of the CSOs included in CSO map generated by the CM were invited to the CSO assembly, 38 out of the 42 LGU-accredited CSOs were excluded from the CSO map and, thus, not invited. Moreover, the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly did not include any information on the person/ office that non-invited CSOs wishing to attend the Assembly may contact. Thus, only 66% of the total number of CSOs in the CSO masterlist were invited to the CSO assembly in Dapitan City and of this number, only 52% attended the CSO assembly. Most respondents in the FGDs in Dapitan City indicate that the low attendance rate is primarily due to (i) lack of information regarding the event with many respondents in the FGDs reporting that they were not able to see the Notice of the schedule of the CSO assembly, (ii) conflict in political affiliation, and (iii) inactivity of CSOs in LGU affairs. In Dapitan City, reports were also received that some CSO representatives who were not allied with the city

government officials were prevented from entering the venue during the day of the event ostensibly because they would only cause distraction. However, there were also reports that the CSO leaders who were not allowed to enter the CSO assembly venue were not members of any CSO in Dapitan City but were in fact from another city. Still other respondents explained that the budget for the CSO assembly was limited and thus not all CSOs can be accommodated. Although it was difficult to confirm these conflicting reports, they do suggest that political affiliation may be a major factor in explaining the non-participation of some CSOs in the CSO assembly in the city.

In like manner, the CSO assembly was also not open to all CSOs in Mutia. In contrast to Dapitan City, however, the CSO map in Mutia was not only fairly expansive but all of the CSOs included in the CSO map were also invited to the CSO assembly. At the same time, there is a provision for the reimbursement of the transport expense incurred by CSOs attending the assembly. Consequently, the outcome of the CSO assembly was creditable with 90% of the total number of CSOs in the CSO masterlist invited to the CSO assembly and 93% of all invited CSOs attending the event.

It is also notable that both the number of invitees and attendees in 3 out of the 3 study sites in Camarines Sur (**Table 13**) and in 2 out of the 3 study sites in Agusan del Norte increased during the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle relative to the FY 2015 planning cycle (**Table 14**).

Table 13. Number of invitees and attendees in CSO assembly in Camarines Sur study sites, FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycle

LGU	No. of CSOs Invited*			No. of CSOs that Attended		
	FY 2015	FY 2016	Increase/ Decrease	FY 2015	FY 2016	Increase No. & (&)
Goa	21	25	4 (19%)	18	23	5 (28%)
Lagonoy	24	33	9 (38%)	20	21	1 (5%)
Libmanan	56	61	5 (9%)	35	50	15 (43%)
Total	101	119	18 (18%)	73	94	21 (29%)

Table 14. Number of invitees and attendees in CSO assembly in Agusan del Norte study sites, FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycle

	Number of Invitees		Number of Attendees	
	FY2015	FY2016	FY2015	FY2016
Buenavista (KC)	104	100	66	64
Butuan City (Urban)	53	92	47	59
Las Nieves (KC)	Open invitation	Open invitation	98	82

Attendance of the BDC-Vice Chairs in the CSO assembly. In the case of LGUs which have either graduated from or which are currently part of the National Community Driven Development Program (NCDDP), formerly known as the Kalahi-CIDSS (KC) program, and which are mandated to follow the Enhanced BUB process, Section 2 of Annex F of JMC No. 5-2014 provides that the DSWD shall ensure that the Vice-Chairs of the expanded Barangay Development Council (BDC) shall participate in the municipal CSO assembly.²⁵ However, BDC Vice-Chairs were not always in attendance in the CSO assemblies of the LGUs covered under this study. The attendance of the BDC Vice-Chairs in the CSO assemblies appears to be a function of (i) whether the conduct of barangay assemblies has been completed prior to the conduct of the CSO assembly which, in turn, is largely a function of the length and level of engagement of local communities in the concerned LGUs in the KC program/ NCDDP, and (ii) whether BDC Vice-Chairs received invitations to attend the CSO assembly which is in turn dependent on the BUB CM's/ NCDDP Area Coordination Team's (ACT's) adherence to the letter and spirit of Annex F of JMC No. 5-2014.

Of the 7 KC study sites covered under this study which adopted the enhanced BUB process for the BUB planning process for the FY 2016 GAA, four became part of the NCDDP/ KC program only in 2014 – namely, all of the 3 study sites in Antique and Buenavista, Agusan del Norte – as part of the government's response to the destruction brought about by Typhoon Yolanda in these places. Barbaza, Antique and Buenavista, Agusan del Norte were able to complete the conduct of the barangay assemblies and to elect the BDC Vice-Chairs for each barangay prior to the holding of the CSO assembly for the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle. However, the Community Mobilizers (CMs) in these LGUs were said to have misinterpreted JMC 5 - 2014 and only invited 5 BDC Vice-Chairs to attend in the CSO assembly.²⁶ Thus, 4 out of the 5 BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT in Barbaza and all of the 5 BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT in Buenavista attended the CSO assembly.

In contrast, not all of the barangays in San Jose and Sibalom were able to conduct the barangay assemblies before the conduct of their CSO assembly in early November 2014. Note that the first round of simultaneous Barangay Assemblies²⁷ (BAs) which are conducted as part of the KC Community Empowerment Activity Cycle (CEAC) was delayed and were completed only in November 2014 in San Jose and in December 2014 in Sibalom. Part of the reason for this delay was the failure to comply with the required 80% attendance of households in barangay assemblies.²⁸ The most common reasons cited for not attending the barangay assemblies were: security (i.e., no one will remain in the house), economic (e.g., work, harvest time), political

²⁵ The BDC Vice-Chairs are community volunteers elected by other members of the barangay during one of the series of Barangay assemblies that are conducted under the NCDDP process to represent them in their respective expanded BDCs.

²⁶ In both areas, the MLGOO convened all the BDC Vice-Chairs for the purpose of electing from among themselves the five who will represent them in the LPRAT.

²⁷ For the purposes of this paper, the BAs referred to are the first round of BAs conducted for the KC process.

²⁸ The most common reasons given by households for not attending the Bas include: security (i.e., no one will remain in the house), economic (e.g., work, harvest time), political issues (e.g., not interested in barangay affairs because they are political opponents) or indifference.

issues (e.g., not interested in barangay affairs because they are political opponents) or indifference. Consequently, no BDC Vice-Chairs were present in the CSO assemblies in San Jose and Sibalom.

On the other hand, while Mutia was a beneficiary of regular funding under the KC/ NCDDP only in 2014, it actually has had a checkered history in the adoption of the KC processes. Mutia implemented two cycles of the KC from February 2010 to July 2012 when the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) decided to use the savings that was generated from the implementation of KC in 2003-2008 to expand the program to include other municipalities that were not originally part of the program. However, the coordinator of the Area Coordination Team (ACT) of the KC assigned to Mutia was pulled out in July 2012 - August 2014 when the savings from the original KC program was exhausted. Although the municipality was not part of the KC program during the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2015 GAA, it ostensibly still adopted the enhanced BUB processes because as per the LGU's understanding of the BUB guidelines, Mutia was required to do so since it was a beneficiary of the KC program in 2010-2012. However, in lieu of the ACT spearheading the barangay assemblies, it was the Mayor, together with the MPDO who conducted said assemblies in all 16 barangays during the last quarter of 2013 through the first quarter of 2014. LGU officials reported that during these consultations, they have validated the PSA results of the previous cycle (mid-2012) and considered the projects as suggested by the barangays then for their FY 2015 LPRAP.

With the assignment of a new ACT coordinator in Mutia in September 2014, the barangay assemblies under this new cycle of the NCDDP started during the month of October and extended into November. As mandated under the NCDDP and BUB guidelines, it was the Area Coordination Team of the DSWD which spearheaded the social preparation of the community development program. However, the timeline for the conduct of activities of the KALAHI-CIDSS-NDCCP and the BUB were not harmonized. Thus, only 9 barangays have conducted their respective barangay assemblies and have selected their BDC Vice-Chairs by the time the CSO assembly was conducted. Nonetheless, 13 (or 81%) of its 16 barangays were represented by their respective BDC Vice-Chairs during the CSO assembly, making them the most dominant group in terms of number during the said assembly. During the KIIs conducted for this study, it was reported that it was the ACT coordinator who contacted and ensured that all barangays have a KC representative in the CSO assembly. The ACT Coordinator reported that the Barangay Sub-Project Management Committee (BSPMC) Chairperson from the previous cycle stood as BDC Vice-Chair of those barangays which have not yet conducted their barangay assemblies prior to the conduct of the CSO assembly in the FY 2016 planning cycle. On a positive note, respondents to the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study reported that the selection of the community volunteers and the BDC Vice-Chairs followed a fairly democratic process with little or no intervention from the barangay chairs and other barangay officials.

On the other hand, two of the seven KC/ NCDDP LGUs covered under this study have had a longer experience under the NCDDP/ KC program. Libmanan, Camarines Sur has been part of the KC since 2012 and all of its 75 barangays have undergone at least one KC CEAC cycle as of the third quarter of 2014. However, only 43 (or 57%) out of the 75 BDC Vice-Chairs attended the CSO assembly. Nonetheless, this number accounts for 38% of the total number of attendees in the CSO assembly even if all BDC Vice-Chairs were invited. It is surprising, at first glance,

that 13 of the 32 absent BDC Vice-Chairs represent poblacion barangays but this number is consistent with reports that securing the required attendance of community residents in the barangay assembly was more problematic in the poblacion barangays in Libmanan where barangay assemblies were usually conducted in the evening after work and where the presence of inactive community volunteers are not uncommon. Also, Libmanan LGU officials reportedly found it difficult to sustain the participation of the community volunteers in the KC in some barangays because of the tediousness of going through the KC processes. At times, some volunteers' spouses were also hired as laborers/workers under the KC subproject to earn income, e.g., in concreting of pathways, construction of roads, etc., in order to sustain the services of the volunteers. It is estimated that barangay captains appointed BDC Vice-chairs in about 10% of the barangays because of the shortage of volunteers. This situation necessarily has some implications on the independence of the appointed community "volunteers" vis-à-vis elected barangay officials. Some of the key informants interviewed under this study said that there were problems in the implementation of the KC subproject in cases where the BDC Vice-Chair was appointed by the barangay captain.

Las Nieves became a beneficiary of the KC program in 2007 and was, in fact, considered a graduate of the said program in 2013. Being a recipient of similar participatory programs from various development partners since then, the local communities have come to recognize the importance of being engaged during the barangay assemblies since their participation in such means access to physical projects for their barangay.

As part of the enhanced planning process for the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2016 GAA, all of the 21 barangays of Las Nieves were able to complete at least one barangay assembly prior to the conduct of the CSO assembly. However, the Community Mobilizer, misinterpreting JMC No. 5-2014, invited only 5 BDC Vice-Chairs to attend in the CSO assembly in sharp contrast to the attendance of 80% of all BDC Vice-Chairs in the CSO assembly held last year (i.e., for the FY 2015 planning cycle). The mis-interpretation of the provision of the JMC No. 5-2014 regarding the attendance of all BDC Vice-Chairs in the CSO assembly in Las Nieves, Barbaza and Buenavista underscores the importance of having competent CMs who are well-versed with the BUB guidelines.

2. Quality of CSO Participation in CSO Assemblies

2.1. Representativeness of CSOs which Attended CSO Assembly

CSO participants in the CSO assemblies for the FY 2016 planning cycle in the 12 study sites came from a wide range of sectors that includes farmers/ fisherfolk, cooperatives, transport sector workers (e.g., tricycle operators and drivers association or TODA), senior citizens, women's organizations and faith-based organizations (**Table 15, Table 16, Table 17, and Table 18**). In some study sites, CSO participants in the CSO assemblies appear to be representative of the active CSOs in the LGUs. This is exemplified best by the 3 study sites in Zamboanga del Norte where the sectoral distribution of CSOs participants in the CSO assembly closely hews to the sectoral distribution of CSOs in the CSO masterlist (**Table 15**).

Table 15. Sectoral distribution of CSO attendees in CSO assembly vis sectoral distribution of CSOs in CSO masterlist in the study sites in Zamboanga del Norte

Sectors	Dapitan				Polanco				Mutia			
	CSO masterlist	%	CSO assembly	%	CSO masterlist	%	CSO assembly	%	CSO masterlist	%	CSO assembly	%
Farmers	23	20.7	9	23.1	37	54.4	30	60.0	1	2.4	1	2.6
Fisherfolks	16	14.4	6	15.4		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
Cooperatives	13	11.7		0.0	6	8.8	3	6.0	4	9.5	4	10.3
PWDs	3	2.7	1	2.6	1	1.5	1	2.0		0.0		0.0
Women	8	7.2	2	5.1	4	5.9	1	2.0	1	2.4	1	2.6
Senior Citizen	1	0.9	1	2.6	1	1.5	1	2.0	1	2.4		0.0
Faith-based	5	4.5	2	5.1	2	2.9	1	2.0	2	4.8	2	5.1
Youth	1	0.9		0.0	2	2.9	2	4.0		0.0		0.0
Professional		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	3	7.1	1	2.6
Business Sector	2	1.8	1	2.6		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0
4Ps	5	4.5	7	17.9	1	1.5	2	4.0	8	19.0	8	20.5
SEA-K	7	6.3	4	10.3		0.0		0.0	4	9.5	4	10.3
Government Employees Assoc	4	3.6	1	2.6	7	10.3	4	8.0		0.0		0.0
IP		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	1	2.4	1	2.6
Other POs	23	20.7	5	12.8	7	10.3	5	10.0	4	9.5	4	10.3
BDC Vice Chair		0.0		0.0		0.0		0.0	13	31.0	13	33.3
Total	111	100.0	39	100.0	68	100.0	50	100.0	42	100.0	39	100.0

However, some dissonance from the overall notion of representativeness in the CSOs participating in the CSO assembly continuous to be observed in the other 9 study sites included in this study. For example, the absence of CSO representatives from youth and IP sectors and the fairly large proportion of participants from faith-based groups in Barbaza, the absence of CSO participants from the youth and the advocacy sectors in Sibalom (**Table 16**), the absence of the youth and PWD sectors in Butuan City, the presence of barangay health workers and homeowners' associations in Buenavista, the absence of the youth sector and the presence of BHW associations in Las Nieves (**Table 17**), the absence of the youth sector in Goa and Lagonoy, and the absence of the PWD sector in Lagonoy and Libmanan (**Table 18**) are notable. Despite these shortcomings, some improvements in CSO representation are evident in the study sites in Agusan del Norte and Camarines Sur in the FY 2016 planning cycle relative to that in FY 2015. For instance, the "small number of representatives involved in farmer/ fisherfolk CSOs who attended the CSO assembly relative to the number of representatives coming from women's group and senior citizens group in Buenavista" that was observed during the FY 2015 planning cycle appears to have been addressed in the FY planning 2016. On the other hand, the absence of CSO leaders representing farmers and fisherfolk sector and the lack of CSO representatives from the north coastal and east coastal barangays, the poorest areas in Lagonoy, in the CSO assembly during the FY 2015 planning cycle was also partly corrected during FY 2016 planning cycle (**Table 19**).

Table 16. Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in Antique study sites

Sector	San Jose		Sibalom		Barbaza	
	No. of CSOs reps in CSO assembly	%	CSO assembly attendance	%	CSO assembly attendance	%
Farmer	10	26.3	14	45.2	8	36.4
Fisherfolk	1	2.6	0	0.0	2	9.1
Senior Citizen	1	2.6	2	6.5	1	4.5
PWD	2	5.3	1	3.2	1	4.5
Women	1	2.6	1	3.2	1	4.5
Cooperative	2	5.3	0	0.0	2	9.1
Faith-based	3	7.9	1	3.2	3	13.6
Indigenous People	1	2.6	1	3.2	0	0.0
Advocacy	4	10.5	0	0.0	2	9.1
Transport	1	2.6	2	6.5	0	0.0
Youth	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Others (PTA, business, 4Ps, POs)	11	28.9	9	29.0	2	9.1
Total	38	100.0	31	100.0	22	100.0

Table 17. Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in study sites in Agusan del Norte

	Butuan City	Buenavista	Las Nieves
Farmers	12%	28%	27%
Fisherfolk	2%	14%	0%
Cooperative	9%	8%	5%
Transport	3%	8%	1%
Youth	0%	6%	0%
Women	17%	5%	12%
Seniors	2%	5%	2%
PWD	0%	2%	2%
IP	7%	0%	7%
Religious/Interfaith	5%	0%	5%
Health workers	0%	3%	1%
Vendors	3%	0%	0%
Environment	0%	2%	0%
Labor groups	8%	0%	0%
Urban poor	17%	0%	0%
4Ps	0%	0%	17%
Kalahi	0%	0%	5%
NGO	15%	3%	2%
Homeowners	0%	3%	0%
Others	0%	14%	13%

Table 18. Sectoral distribution of CSO participants in CSO assembly in study sites in Camarines Sur

Sector	Goa		Lagonoy		Libmanan	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. NGOs	2	8.7	1	4.8		
2. Farmers, Farm Workers, Irrigators	8	34.8	2	9.5	14	28.0
3. Fisherfolks	0	0.0	1	4.8	3	6.0
4. PWDs	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
5. Senior Citizens/OSCA	1	4.3	1	4.8	1	2.0
6. Youth	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0
7. Women & Children	3	13.0	2	9.5	4	8.0
8. Cooperatives	2	8.7	2	9.5	10	20.0
9. Transport	2	8.7	1	4.8	3	6.0
10. Health, Nutrition & Day Care Workers	0	0.0	1	4.8	2	4.0
11. Other Workers (OFWs, SME workers)	0	0.0	1	4.8	4	8.0
12. Civic/peace & Order	1	4.3	3	14.3	0	0.0
13. Faith-based Organizations	1	4.3	2	9.5	3	6.0
14. Professional Organizations	0	0.0	1	4.8	1	2.0
15. Others (PTA, 4Ps, Solo Parents, Media, COMSCA, etc.)	2	8.7	3	14.3	4	8.0
Total no. of CSO attended	23	100.0	21	100.0	50	100.0

Table 19. Sectoral representation in the study sites in Camarines Sur in the FY 2015 and FY 2016 planning cycles

LGU	FY 2015 Sectors Not Represented	FY 2016 Representation
Goa	- Youth - Civic/Peace and Order	X ✓
Lagonoy	- Agriculture/ Farmers - Fisheries - PWDs - No reps for North Coastal & East Coastal areas	✓ ✓ X ✓ Reps from east coastal
Libmanan	- Senior Citizens - PWDs - Civic/peace & Order Groups	✓ X X

2.2. Conduct of the Poverty Situation Analysis (PSA)

Section 6.2.5 of JMC No. 5-2014 stipulates that the CSO assembly “shall review, validate and analyze social and economic data of the city/municipality and propose solutions to its concerns and problems.” It also provides that “the City/Municipal Planning and Development Coordinators (C/MPDC), with the Local Finance Committee (LFC) and other department heads of the LGU, will provide technical assistance to the CSO Assembly in doing the local poverty situation analysis.” This implies that the poverty situation analysis should be (i) data-/ evidence based, and (ii) should yield “proposed solutions” to the LGUs’ “concerns and problems.” The experience in the 12 study sites covered under this study indicates that the ability of the BUB

process to foster evidence-based local planning is not only weak at best but has not also registered noticeable improvement during the FY 2016 planning cycle relative to the FY 2015 planning cycle.

Evidence-based planning. Although data/ information of various types pertaining to the socio-economic and poverty situation are available at the LGU level, it is not evident that these data/ information were actually utilized during the CSO assembly in most of these LGUs to identify the strategies/ solutions/ projects that will address their pressing concerns. Instead, the proposed solutions/ strategies/ projects emanating from the PSAs were based on “common felt needs,” for the most part. As indicated in the assessment of the FY 2015 planning cycle, the problem here may further be broken down into: (i) outdated data, and (ii) the ineffective utilization of available data.

CBMS data in 5 out of the 5 non-KC study sites covered under this study (namely, Goa and Lagonoy in Camarines Sur, Butuan City in Agusan del Norte and Dapitan City and Polanco in Zamboanga del Norte) were presented by the C/MPDC/ C/MLGOO in these LGUs during the CSO assembly. In these LGUs, CBMS data were generally outdated, being 2 years old at best. In particular, the CBMS data used in Polanco circa 2008, those of Goa and Lagonoy circa 2011 and that of Butuan City circa 2012. During the KIIs/FGDs conducted as part of this study, most of the respondents in all the study sites in Camarines Sur indicated the need to update the CBMS, the need to expand the CBMS to consider other indicators (e.g., an LGU official in Lagonoy noted the need for disaster-related indicators), and likewise the need for the LGU to allocate funds for the regular updating of the CBMS. In contrast to this majority view in Camarines Sur, the Mayor in Goa does not see the urgency of updating the CBMS yet primarily because he believes that socioeconomic data on households would not change significantly over a 3 year period.

The utilization of data in the PSA is variable. At best, the problem/issue identification workshops during the CSO assembly basically took off from the CBMS presentations by the MPDC/ MLGOO/ MSWDO. This was the case in Goa, Lagonoy and Libmanan where the participants in the CSO assemblies were asked to identify the causes and effects of the priority problems/issues based on the CBMS presentations. In contrast, there was no noted utilization of the data during the PSA workshop in Dapitan City, Polanco, Butuan City and Buenavista. Rather, respondents to the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study in these LGUs stated that discussions during the CSO assemblies were based on the common felt needs of the participants. Moreover, since CBMS data, albeit outdated, highlighted barangays which fared poorly in terms of certain indicators, it could have been more useful if it were used to identify project beneficiaries. But this was not the case. Also, the KIIs and FGDs in some LGUs (e.g., Goa, Lagonoy and Butuan City) indicate that other sources of data (e.g., Registry of Barangay Inhabitants, which LGUs submit to the DILG, and barangay profiles collected by BHWs, day care workers and Barangay Nutrition Scholars in Camarines Sur and barangay profile and sectoral level data collected LGU department heads in Butuan City) are available but are neither presented nor used during the CSO assemblies.

Conduct of the PSA during the CSO assembly. As indicated earlier, Section 6.2.5 of JMC No. 5-2014 not only provides that the CSO assembly “shall review, validate and analyze social and

economic data of the city/municipality” but also “propose solutions to its concerns and problems.” The conduct of the poverty situation analysis in 10 out of the 12 study sites included under this study (namely, all of the study sites in Antique, all of the study sites in Camarines Sur, the two non-KC study sites in Zamboanga del Norte, and in the two KC study sites in Agusan del Norte) followed some variant of the problem tree/ solution tree analysis approach in form, if not in substance, where participants are asked to identify their priority issues/ problems and their corresponding causes, effects and solutions. However, some variations around this approach is evident.

In contrast, after the data on poverty incidence in the LGU was presented, the CSO participants in Butuan City were simply made to write their perceived priority needs or top problems on meta cards. The responses of the CSO participants were then read out loud and subsequently categorized under five headings (Health, Skills Training, Livelihood, Environment, and Disaster Preparedness) by the community mobilizer (CM) who facilitated the CSO assembly. In Mutia, at the time of the CSO assembly for the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2016 GAA, only 7 of its 16 barangays have completed their PSAs and even those barangays which have done so were not able to have the same validated by their expanded BDCs. Because of this, the participants in the CSO assembly were tasked to use the results of the municipal-level PSA done in 2012 when all of the municipality’s barangays were able to conduct their barangay-level PSAs in identifying the projects they want to propose for BUB funding in FY 2016. During the prioritization process, both the CSOs and the BDC-Vice Chairpersons were given the chance to vote. The criteria set by the facilitators were: time component (25%), availability of resources (15%), beneficiaries (25%), and sustainability (35%). It is notable, however, the CSOs did not propose any additional projects to the list presented by the ACT. This is significant because this is the only chance in the entire BUB process that the CSOs can propose sector-based projects in Mutia.

Barangay-level PSAs in KC areas. Annex F of JMC No. 5-2014 provides that prior to the conduct of CSO assemblies at the municipal level, the Area Coordination Teams (ACT) of the KALAHI-CIDSS program with support from DILG shall facilitate the conduct of participatory barangay development planning for all barangays in the municipality through the KC program. It calls on the barangay chairpersons to convene the expanded BDC to conduct the participatory situation analysis (PSA) and prepare the Barangay Development Plan (BDP) through a workshop or series of workshops. The expanded BDC shall discuss poverty problems affecting their communities and prioritize programs, projects and activities (PPAs) that will potentially address these problems. The PSA process shall include gathering and updating of relevant economic and social data to be used as basis for discussion and prioritization of PPAs. From the BDP, the expanded BDC shall identify the barangay investment plan, a one year plan that shall reflect the priority projects for the year with the corresponding amount and source of funding for every item in the plan. The expanded BDC then through the barangay chairperson shall present the BDP and the barangay annual investment plan to the barangay assembly for validation. The validated BDP and barangay annual investment plan shall be approved by the barangay council for submission to the municipal planning and development coordinator and incorporation in the municipal development plan.

Clearly, the intent of the enhanced grassroots budgeting process under the BUB is (i) to facilitate the engagement of the local community itself in coming up with the strategies and specific

projects that will address the most pressing issues/ problems affecting the barangay through the participation of community volunteers in the barangay-level PSA (conducted by expanded BDC), and (ii) to provide the venue for elevating the output of the barangay-level PSAs to municipal level through the CSO assembly. The likelihood that these objectives are achieved is dependent on the success of the social preparation under the KC program in building the capacity of the local community, specifically the community volunteers, (i) to identify and prioritize development solutions/ projects based on the issues they have discussed during the barangay-level PSAs, (ii) to articulate and elevate the barangay-level PSA output in the municipal-level PSA during the CSO assembly, and (iii) to monitor the status of their communities across various aspects of development, the progress in implementation of projects and other policy initiatives, and impact of the same on the barangay's initial conditions in order to determine what new projects would be needed in the next cycle in consideration of changes in the communities' needs in the interim as a result of the emergence of which new problems/ issues and/or the completion of project/s. In more practical terms, real grassroots participation in the planning and budgeting process in the context of the enhanced BUB process involves the following key elements: (i) the engagement of local communities in the barangay assemblies and the selection of barangay Vice-Chairs, (ii) the conduct of participatory barangay-level PSAs where local communities deliberate on the urgent issues affecting their barangay and generate strategies/ project ideas to address the same, and (iii) empowered local communities to feed the output of the barangay-level PSAs into the discussions during the CSO assembly through the presence and active participation of BDC Vice-Chairs in the assembly. The experience of the KC-area study sites covered under this study indicates the importance of (i) the length of engagement of local communities in the concerned LGUs in the KC program/ NCDDP, (ii) the quality of social preparation that local communities receive from the NCDDP's ACT and the BUB's community mobilizers/ facilitators which is a function of the quality of the ACTs and the community facilitators and their appreciation of the letter and the spirit of Annex F of JMC No. 5-2014, and (iii) attendance of the BDC Vice-Chairs in the CSO assembly.

As indicated earlier, all the municipalities of Antique were identified as NCDDP beneficiaries only in 2014 as part of the government's response to the devastation brought about by Typhoon Yolanda. Because of this, not all barangays were able to conduct the barangay assemblies as well as the barangay-level PSAs before the conduct of the CSO assembly for the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle in the 3 Antique LGUs covered under this study. Moreover, since no BDC Vice-Chairs attended the CSO assemblies in San Jose and Sibalom while only 4 BDC Vice-Chairs attended that in Barbaza, these LGUs essentially followed the largely regular BUB process rather than the enhanced process.

However, the barangay-level PSAs appear to have been used in a meaningful way in the identification of NCDDP projects for Yolanda rehabilitation in the 3 Antique study sites. Unfortunately, this experience was not replicated in the identification and prioritization of BUB projects for FY 2016 despite the adoption of the enhanced BUB process. This may be attributed to the non-synchronization of the conduct of the barangay assemblies and the barangay-level PSAs under the NCDDP with the schedule for the conduct of BUB processes, i.e., the conduct of the barangay assemblies and the barangay-level PSAs was not completed in time for the BUB CSO assembly. For instance, it is reported that in San Jose the barangay assembly also served as a forum for the identification of the needs of the barangay based on the damages brought about

by Typhoon Yolanda and was particularly helpful because in this way the data from the barangay and from MDRRMO can more easily be verified and validated. The constituents were grouped according to purok or sitio. Each group discussed and illustrated the damages they have seen after the onslaught of the typhoon. Their outputs were then reported to the barangay assembly. The top three problems of the barangays were then identified by the body through analysis and discussion. The participants were then asked what projects they want to address the issues identified. The priorities agreed upon by the barangay assembly are later endorsed through a Barangay Resolution and reported to the Municipal Emergency Action Council (MEAC). The representatives of each barangay and the MEAC together decide the project that will be funded in each barangay, usually the top priority identified by the barangay itself. Like the barangays, the MEAC also pass a resolution to adopt the projects identified for each barangay.

Barangay officials report that the participation of the community volunteers in barangay affairs is already evident even before the implementation of the KC process with sitio representatives being the barangay government's partners at the grassroots level. They also note that the formalization of involvement in the BDC is welcome to the barangay officials and they recognize that it is better if they are part of the planning, and not just beneficiaries of programs.

Like the 3 municipalities in Antique, Buenavista, Agusan del Norte became part of the NCDDP in 2014 under the Typhoon Yolanda response modality. The ACT coordinator of the NCDDP in the municipality reported that the barangay-level PSAs during which the needs and issues of the barangays were discussed and dissected were completed for all of the barangays in the municipality prior to the CSO assembly. Despite this, the NAPC focal person describes the enhanced process in Buenavista as raw, implying that the municipality is not quite ready for it yet. First, the results of the barangay-level PSAs were not fully utilized during the CSO assembly because, as indicated earlier, only 5 BDC Vice-Chairs were invited to attend the CSO assembly and, thus, the participation of the community volunteers in the assembly was more limited than envisioned under JMC No. 5-2014. Second, the municipal-level PSA conducted during CSO assembly was done quite independently of the output of the barangay-level PSAs although the NCDDP coordinator did present the list of projects identified during the barangay-level PSAs including a delineation of which ones were to be funded under the NCDDP so as to prevent duplication of funding under the BUB.

On the other hand, as indicated earlier, only 7 out of the 16 barangays in Mutia, Zamboanga del Norte were able to complete the barangay-level PSA workshops before the conduct of CSO assembly for the 2016 BUB planning cycle. As a result, the ACT decided to present the list of projects that were identified under an earlier round (circa 2012) of barangay-level PSAs during the CSO assembly for consideration of the body. The high attendance rate of BDC Vice-Chairs in the CSO assembly and the fact that the CSO representatives did not propose any additional projects to the list of projects from the barangay-level PSAs are perhaps indicative of the relatively higher level of participation of community volunteers compared to CSO representatives during the CSO assembly. Related to this, the ACT coordinator observed that the community volunteers were very active during the barangay assemblies although community participation was noticeably more muted in urban barangays compared to those in rural ones.

In contrast, Libmanan, Camarines Sur has been part of the KC program since 2012.²⁹ Thus, all 75 barangays were able to conduct their PSAs before the conduct of the CSO Assembly for the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2016 GAA. Ideally, the results of PSA should be presented to the CSO Assembly and the LPRAP workshop. This was done in the BUB planning for FY 2015. However, for the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle, the DSWD KC Area Coordinator did not present the barangay-level PSA results in the CSO Assembly but simply posted the list of projects identified during the barangay-level PSAs which were not funded under the KC. Moreover, with only 57% of all BDC Vice-Chairs attending the CSO assembly, the FGDs conducted under this study also suggest that in Libmanan the CSOs were more participative compared to the BDC Vice-Chairs. Among the BDC Vice-Chairs, those who are volunteers were more active compared to those designated by the Barangay Chairpersons.

The shortcomings in the implementation of the enhanced BUB process in Libmanan may partly be due to the delays in the implementation of KC sub-projects as a result of difficulties encountered in the procurement process, late release of counterpart funds, and inadequate social preparation. In the first cycle, communities were eager to participate in the PSA and were looking forward to implementing their own community subprojects. However, the repeated tedious processes, e.g., PSA, barangay assemblies, canvassing, bidding, procurement, etc., raised many complaints from the barangays and discouraged them to continue through the cycle. This was aggravated by the delay in the release of counterpart funds due to political conflict between the mayor and the provincial governor. Delay in the first two and a half years of implementation was also attributable to the fast turn-over of KC Community Facilitators and DSWD KC Area Coordinator. However, the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study suggest that with the recruitment and training of more Community Facilitators (CFs) making possible more vigorous advocacy efforts in the community, the implementation of the KC project is slowly improving. According to the ABC President, the CFs now have better communications with the barangay officials, providing regular feedback and clarifying their role in the community.

On the other hand, all 21 barangays of Las Nieves were able to conduct at least one BA before the CSO Assembly for the FY 2016 BUB planning cycle. Barangay-level PSA workshops were also conducted during the said BAs. The MLGOO or the ACT Head facilitated the discussions on the community's most urgent needs together with an identification of possible solutions to address said needs.

During the CSO assembly in Las Nieves, the NCDDP Area Coordinator presented (i) the list of priority projects identified during the 2013 barangay-level PSAs, including a delineation of which ones were funded under the KC program, and (ii) the outputs of the more recent barangay-level PSA workshops which consist of a list of the top five problems identified by barangay residents in each of the municipality's barangays. After the presentation, all the attendees (consisting of CSO representatives and the 5 BDC Vice-Chairs who attended the CSO assembly) were tasked to group themselves according to barangay, to validate the results of the barangay-level PSAs and to identify the topmost problem/s of each one. In essence, the municipal-level PSA during the CSO assembly merely repeats the process done during the barangay-level PSAs.

²⁹ Out of its 75 barangays, 39 availed of sub-projects in the first cycle, 27 availed of sub-projects in the second cycle, and 22 availed of sub-projects in the third cycle including those which completed cycle 1 and those which availed of sub-projects for the first time.

The KIIs and the FGDs reveal that because only five BDC Vice-Chairs were present in the CSO assembly, the CSO representatives dominated the discussions in plenary. However, when the assembly divided into small groups for the identification of issues and strategies per barangay, the BDC Vice-Chairs were said to be as active as the CSO representatives.

Output of the CSO assembly. A review of the output of the CSO assembly in the 12 study sites suggests that the LGUs appear to have varying perceptions as to what the expected output of the PSA exercise should be: (i) identification and/ or ranking of problems/ issues, (ii) identification and/ or ranking of problems/ issues and the corresponding solutions/ strategies to address them in a generic sense; or (ii) identification and/ or ranking of problems/ issues, their corresponding strategies/ solutions as well as specific projects.³⁰ The variation in CSO assembly outputs appears to be largely dependent on the appreciation of the community mobilizer/ facilitator of what the CSO assembly is meant to deliver. At one end of the spectrum are Butuan City and Libmanan, Camarines Sur where the output of the CSO assembly consisted solely of a listing of issues/problems in these municipalities. In the case of Libmanan, the CM and MLGOO deemed it better for the participants in the CSO assembly to focus on identifying the top 5 problems/ issues in the municipality which when addressed would contribute most to poverty reduction while leaving the identification of solutions/ strategies/ projects to the LPRAT. As indicated earlier, after the data on poverty incidence in the LGU was presented, the attendees in the CSO assembly in Butuan City were made to write their perceived priority needs on meta cards and after that their responses were categorized under five headings (Health, Skills Training, Livelihood, Environment, and Disaster Preparedness) by the CM who facilitated the CSO assembly.

At the other end of the spectrum are the 3 study sites of Zamboanga del Norte, Lagonoy, Camarines Sur and Sibalom, Antique where the output of the CSO assembly consisted of the major problems/ issues prevalent in the said LGUs as well as the corresponding solutions/ strategies and projects that were identified by the CSO participants. For instance, in Dapitan City and Polanco, the CSO assembly participants were asked to identify core problems, their causes, and effects in four areas: governance, social services, economic development and environmental services. However, after the identification of the major problems in the LGU, the BUB menu of projects was presented in Dapitan City and the CSO participants then proceeded to select projects from the menu through consensus without any apparent validation of whether said projects address the issues/ problems earlier identified. Thus, only 6 of the 30 projects identified during the CSO assembly in Dapitan City were found to be in line with the identified problems in the locality. In the case of Polanco, while there was also no observed utilization of the PSA results in the selection of proposed projects, the identified core problems, from the economic and social sectors, appear to be related with most of the identified projects. In the case of Mutia, after a validation of the problems and solutions identified during the barangay-level PSA, both the CSO representatives and the BDC-Vice Chairs were asked to prioritize the projects that they want to be considered for BUB funding in FY 2016 from a list of projects (as presented by the ACT coordinator) that came from the barangay-level PSAs conducted in 2012 when all of the barangays were able to conduct their respective PSAs. The prioritization criteria used include: time component (25%), availability of resources (15%), beneficiaries (25%), and sustainability (35%). It is also worth noting the CSOs representatives did not add any projects to the list

³⁰ No PSA was undertaken during the CSO assembly in Polanco.

presented by the ACT. Similarly, after the participants in the CSO assembly in Sibalom were asked to revalidate the output of problem tree/ solution tree analysis in the previous CSO assembly, they were then tasked to come up with projects to be proposed for BUB funding in FY 2016 by the CSO representatives to the LPRAT.

In between these two extremes are San Jose and Barbaza in Antique, the Goa in Camarines Sur, and the 2 KC study sites (i.e., Buenavista and Las Nieves) in Agusan del Norte where the CSO assemblies simply came up with a list of problems/issues and their corresponding solutions/strategies. For instance, the CSO assembly in San Jose came up with more generic solutions or strategies (e.g., sustainable livelihood and income generating programs) to the LGU's most urgent problems, with the identification and prioritization of specific projects being given as "homework" for the CSOs to do after the CSO assembly. Meanwhile, in Barbaza, the identification of projects to be proposed by CSOs for BUB funding was done in a revalidation workshop and CSO meeting conducted by the Area Coordinator after the CSO Assembly. In the case of Goa, Buenavista and Las Nieves, specific projects were not identified even after the CSO assembly in time for the conduct of the LPRAT workshop.

2.3. Selection of CSO Representatives in the LPRAT and CSO Signatories to the LPRAP

Section 6.2.2 of JMC No. 5-2014 provides that "CSOs shall independently select the organizations that will represent CSOs in the LPRAT. The number of CSO representatives in the LPRAT shall equal the number of government representatives. Elected officials, their immediate relatives (spouse, parent, sibling, child), and LGU employees are ineligible to be elected as CSO representatives. Meanwhile, Section 6.2.3 provides that "the assembly will also elect the LPRAT co-chair and two other CSO signatories in the LPRAP from among the elected representatives. They must include a Pantawid Pamilya parent leader, a basic sector organization representative and a CSO member of the local development council." In the case of LGUs that follow the enhanced BUB planning process, Section 3.1.1 of Annex F of JMC No. 5-2014 provides that the LPRAT shall be composed of 20 members of the enhanced LDC with 10 coming from local government, 5 from the BDC Vice-Chairpersons, selected by them from among themselves, and 5 from the CSO representatives elected during the CSO assembly. While all of the 12 study sites strictly followed the provision of JMC No. 5-2014 pertaining to election of the CSO LPRAT co-chairperson and the two other CSO signatories to the LPRAP by the selected CSO representatives to the LPRAT. However, the same is not true of the provision of the JMC pertaining to the selection of CSO representatives to the LPRAT who were either elected following two modalities: (i) election of CSO representatives to the LPRAT based on sectoral representation, and (ii) election of CSO representatives via votation with each attendee in the CSO assembly being entitled to one vote. Compared to the latter, the former approach helps ensure that no one sector will be able to unduly influence the outturn of the selection process on the basis of sheer numbers in the CSO assembly so that the dominant sector/s³¹ in the LPRAT are also able to unduly influence the identification and prioritization of BUB projects during the LPRAP workshop.

On the one hand, CSO leaders who attended the CSO assembly in Goa and Lagonoy in

³¹ Here, "dominant" is used in the sense of having any one sector/s holding more seats in the LPRAT than other CSOs.

Camarines Sur, Dapitan City and Polanco in Zamboanga del Norte were grouped into specified sectors and CSO representatives belonging to the same sector were then asked to select/ elect the representative of their sector to the LPRAT. In Goa, CSOs were grouped into 9 sectors: (i) farmers/ fisherfolk, (ii) PWDs, (iii) senior citizens, (iv) transport/ rescue groups, (v) 4Ps leaders/ day care workers, (vi) NGOs, (vii) coops, (viii) faith-based organizations, and (ix) women. In Lagonoy, CSOs were grouped into 12 sectors: (i) farmers, (ii) fisherfolk, (iii) women and children, (iv) coops and NGOs, (v) faith-based organizations, (vi) civic groups, (vii) victims of disasters/ calamities, (viii) OFWs, (ix) health groups, (x) transport groups, (xi) senior citizens, and (xii) 4Ps leaders. In Dapitan and Polanco, CSO representatives in the LPRAT was composed of one representative per sector, except in the case of the more dominant sectors (e.g., farmers, fisherfolk, 4Ps leaders) which were allowed to elect two representatives each.

On the other hand, the election of the CSO representatives in Butuan City was not done based on sectoral representation. Instead, the selection of the CSO representatives in the LPRAT was done by direct votation among all the participants in the assembly, with all of the CSO leaders attending the CSO assembly getting one vote each. Similarly, the CSO representatives in the LPRAT in all of the 7 LGUs that adopted the enhanced BUB process (i.e., Libmanan, Mutia, San Jose, Barbaza, Sibalom, Las Nieves and Buenavista) were elected at large by all the CSOs leaders who attended the CSO assembly.

The 7 study sites that adopted the enhanced BUB planning process for the FY 2016 planning cycle likewise differ with respect to the election of the 5 LPRAT members from the ranks of the BDC Vice-Chairs. On the one hand, in Libmanan, Camarines Sur and in Mutia, Zamboanga del Norte where all of the BDC Vice-Chairs were invited to attend the CSO assembly, the representatives of the BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT were elected by all the BDC Vice-Chairs who attended the assembly. On the other hand, in San Jose and Barbaza in Antique and Buenavista and Las Nieves in Agusan del Norte where not all of the BDC Vice-Chairs were invited to the CSO assembly, the LPRAT members from the ranks of the BDC Vice-Chairs were elected by the other BDC Vice-Chairs in these municipalities in a meeting especially called for the purpose. For instance, in San Jose, the MLGOO convened the 27 BDC Vice-Chairs whose barangays were participating in the NCDDP in a special meeting outside of the CSO assembly to nominate and elect of the 5 BDC-VCs to the LPRAT.

Although the election of CSO/ BDC Vice-Chairs representatives in the LPRAT was generally non-controversial, a number of problem areas were observed in some the case study sites. First, with 8 out of the 16 nominees coming from farmers groups in Libmanan, it is not surprising that 3 representatives from the said group were elected to the LPRAT. Although there was a suggestion that the selection be done by sector to avoid the domination of any one group (farmers, in this case), this was not carried by the body. Second, the former vice-mayor of Dapitan City who represented the business sector was elected as CSO co-chair of the LPRAT, a direct contravention of Section 6.2.3 of JMC No. 5-2014 which states that the CSO co-chair and the other two CSO signatories to the LPRAP should belong to any one of the following groups: (i) 4Ps parent leaders, (ii) a CSO representative to the local development council, or (iii) a representative from a basic sector organization or cooperative of any one of the following sectors, namely, farmers and landless rural workers, artisanal fisherfolk, formal labor and

migrant workers, workers in the informal sector, indigenous people and cultural communities, women, persons with disabilities, senior citizens, victims of calamities and disasters, youth and students, children, or urban poor. Third, while the 5 representatives of the BDC Vice-Chairs to the LPRAT were selected by votation in the other 6 KC/ NCDDP study sites covered under this study, the 5 BDC Vice-Chairs who represented their group in the LPRAT in Sibalom were not elected by the other BDC Vice-Chairs but were selected by the LGU officials.

3. LPRAP Workshop, Identification and Prioritization of BUB Projects

JMC No. 5-2014 provides that the LPRAT shall review previously identified strategies and priority poverty reduction projects and update the strategies to be undertaken by the LGU and other stakeholders. Identification of strategies should be based on the results of the poverty situation analysis. The LPRAT shall discuss and identify major causes of poverty in the area and specify how these can be addressed. It shall also identify priority poverty reduction projects through a consensus among its members. If consensus cannot be reached, the decision will be made through a majority vote.

Essentially, during the LPRAP workshop the long list of poverty reduction projects is first drawn up from proposals coming from (i) the ranks of the CSOs/ the BDC vice-chairpersons, and/ or (ii) the LGU. After some discussion and negotiation, the LPRAT then arrives at a prioritized list of projects for BUB funding that will be submitted by the LPRAT to the RPRAT.

The discussion below highlights the key elements that enhances the participatory character of the BUB during the conduct of the LPRAP workshop: (i) presentation of the CSO assembly output/s for the consideration of the LPRAT to help ensure that not just the voices of CSO representatives and BDC Vice-Chairs who were elected to be members of the LPRAT but also those of the other CSOs leaders and other BDC Vice-Chairs who attended the CSO assembly are heard in the identification and prioritization of BUB sub-projects, and (ii) processes and schemes that enhance the role of CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs in coming up with the long list of projects that are considered during the LPRAP workshop and in the prioritization of the same.

3.1. Presentation to and Appreciation of CSO Assembly Outputs during the LPRAP Workshop

The CSO assembly output/s were presented and served as the starting point of the discussions during the LPRAP workshop in all of the 12 study sites with the exception of Las Nieves, Polanco and Goa. For instance, while the CSO assembly output consisting of list of problems/issues and their corresponding solutions/strategies was presented in Las Nieves, the same was not discussed during the LPRAP workshop. Instead, the LPRAT proceeded to review the BUB menu of projects and to identify projects on the basis of their perception of their own barangay's needs. Similarly, the list of projects from the CSO assembly was not explicitly used in the identification of projects during the LPRAP workshop in Polanco although the said list was projected during the preliminary part of the workshop there. On the other hand, the CSO assembly output which consisted of identified issues/ problems and their corresponding solutions/ strategies was not presented during the LPRAP workshop in Goa. There was also no in-depth discussion and validation of the poverty situation after the CSO Co-chair's presentation of the 2011 CBMS.

3.2. Provenance of Long List of Projects Considered for Prioritization in the LPRAP Workshop

The 12 study sites differ in terms of how the long list of projects considered for prioritization during the LPRAP workshop is generated. Two major approaches followed by LGUs in this regard are evident. The first approach is one where the LGU, on the one hand, and the CSOs, on the other hand, separately present a list of projects for the LPRAT's consideration during the LPRAP workshop (e.g, Dapitan City, Mutia, Las Nieves, and the 3 Antique study sites). Under this approach, CSOs have greater opportunity to bring forward projects quite independently of inputs from the influence of LGU officials. However, there is also considerable variation even among the LGUs that follow this model. The typical case is that of San Jose, Antique. During the LPRAP workshop for the BUB planning cycle for FY 2016, the CSOs in San Jose presented a list of projects they are proposing for funding under the BUB based on the priority issues and projects identified during the CSO Assembly. Like the CSOs, the sector heads of the local government unit also prepared a list of projects that may be funded under the BUB. These two lists were then compiled and the LPRAT jointly discussed which projects best address the LGU's needs in terms of relevance, urgency, magnitude, importance and doability. In like manner, the LPRAT CSO Co-Chair presented the projects that the CSOs prioritized for BUB funding during the CSO assembly in Mutia while the LGU presented the projects that have been prioritized and pipelined by the Municipal Development Council.

On the other hand, Las Nieves is a not-so-typical case of the first approach – one where the CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT are given a fairly wide discretion in identifying and prioritizing projects for BUB funding but where the LGU retains some control over a small portion of the BUB funds. For instance, during the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2016 budget, the local government of Las Nieves unilaterally decided to allot the amount equivalent to the LGU counterpart fund for the BUB to a tourism development project in barangay Bokbokon and to give the CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs full discretion in identifying and prioritizing the projects that will be funded from the LGU's share of the BUB funds from the national government.

In contrast, the second approach is one where all members of the LPRAT (both LGU officials, CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs) who are present during the LPRAP workshop jointly draw up the list of projects to be prioritized during the workshop itself (e.g., Polanco, Libmanan, Lagonoy, Butuan City, Buenavista and Goa). For example, the LPRAT members who attended the LPRAP workshop in Lagonoy were divided into 5 groups, each of which was composed of a balanced number of CSO and LGU representatives. After a presentation of the CSO assembly output, each of the 5 groups was tasked to validate the CSO assembly output by filling in the problem/ solution finding matrix. A by-product of this exercise was a list of projects that respond to the major issues facing the LGU as identified by the different groups. A plenary discussion then ensued where the LPRAT members compared the list of projects identified during the CSO assembly with the list of projects culled from the problem/ solution finding matrix accomplished during the LPRAP workshop itself in order to come up with a preliminary list of projects that will be considered for BUB funding. In like manner, after the MLGOO presented the list of problems/ issues and projects identified by the CSOs during the CSO assembly, the members of the LPRAT began crossing out projects that (i) already have funding,

(ii) are in the negative list of the BUB, or (iii) are vague. Subsequently, the members of the LPRAT (from the ranks of CSOs, BDC Vice-Chairs, and LGU officials) were then allowed to add additional projects to the original list from the CSO assembly.

The two approaches followed by LGUs in identifying the projects that will be included in the long list of projects that will be considered for BUB funding are roughly equivalent when the representatives of CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs to the LPRAT are articulate, are able to take a holistic view of the problems and issues facing the local communities in the LGU, have had some experience in engaging with the LGU, and are well-versed in the intricacies of LGU planning and budget. However, when CSO representatives and BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT do not possess these qualities, their voices tend to be dominated by those of LGU officials when the identification of projects is done jointly by representatives of the BDC Vice-Chairs, CSOs and the LGU officials in the LPRAT during the LPRAP workshop.

3.3. *Who Actually Participated in the Prioritization of LPRAP Projects?*

Two alternative modalities were evident in terms of who participated in the prioritization of the BUB sub-projects. One, most of the study sites followed provision of JMC on this matter and BUB projects were prioritized by the members of LPRAT who were present during the LPRAP workshop (e.g., Goa, Mutia, all 3 study sites in Antique, and all 3 study sites in Agusan del Norte). The balance between number of LGU representatives and BDC Vice-Chairs/ CSO representatives in LPRAT who attended the LPRAP workshop is even in Sibalom, Barbaza, and Buenavista. On the other hand, the balance is favorable to BDC Vice-Chairs/ CSOs in Mutia (9 versus 8) and Las Nieves (8 versus 6) while the opposite is true in Goa (5 versus 7). For instance, the KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study suggest that the poor attendance in the LPRAP workshop of BDC Vice-Chairs/ CSOs representatives in Goa may be attributable to the frustrating experience they had in the previous year's LPRAP workshop where the identification and prioritization of LPRAP sub-projects was dominated by the municipal mayor.³²

Two, in addition to the elected members of the LPRAT, non-LPRAT members who attended the LPRAP workshop were allowed to participate in the identification and prioritization of BUB sub-projects in some of the study sites included in this study (e.g., Lagonoy, Libmanan, Dapitan City, Polanco, San Jose and Butuan City). In Dapitan City and during the first LPRAP workshop in Libmanan³³ where non-LPRAT LGU officials attended and participated in the identification and prioritization of BUB sub-projects, the participation of these non-LPRAT members during the LPRAP workshop was not problematic since they essentially substituted for designated LGU representatives in the LPRAT who were absent. However, the opposite is true in the case of San Jose, Lagonoy, and Polanco where the participation of extra LGU officials in the LPRAP workshop tilted the balance in favor of the LGU. In particular, only 32% of those who participated in the identification and prioritization of BUB sub-projects during the LPRAP workshop in Polanco came from the ranks of CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs. In contrast, the

³² The same thing happened in the LPRAP workshop for the BUB planning cycle for the FY 2016 budget.

³³ It is notable that the output of the first LPRAP workshop in Libmanan was changed by a second LPRAP workshop which was attended by 7 representatives from CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs and 9 attendees from the LGU side.

identification and prioritization of projects was tilted in favor of CSOs in Butuan City, since the members of the LPRAT from the LGU side noticeably absent. Moreover, two CSO leaders (namely, the wife of the LPRAT CSO co-chair and the wife of the BUB regional coordinator) who were not voted as members of the LPRAT were present and participated during the LPRAP workshop.

It is also notable that the positive effect on CSO participation that comes with balance in the number of LPRAT members representing the LGU vis those who represent CSOs/ BDC Vice-chairs can easily be negated with the participation of dominant/ influential personalities aligned with the LGU in the LPRAP workshop. For instance, the edge gained by BDC Vice-Chairs/ CSOs in terms of the larger number of CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs who attended the LPRAP workshop relative to the number of attendees from the LGU side in Mutia is muted by the very active participation of the mayor who argued during the LPRAP workshop that external funds, such as funds from the KC-NCDDP and the BUB, should be used to fund bigger infrastructure projects that the LGU cannot fund on its own. As a compromise, the mayor assured the CSOs that livelihood projects which they proposed will be funded from the 20% development fund. Given this, the LPRAT agreed to allocate the bulk of the BUB funding to the construction of roads and other infrastructure projects. In contrast, the negative impact on CSOs' ability to influence the outcome of the project prioritization because of the unfavorable balance in the attendance of LPRAT members during the LPRAP workshop in Goa was exacerbated by the strong endorsement given by the mayor to water supply project under the Salintubig despite the fact that the lack of potable water supply was not identified as a priority problem in the CSO assembly. On the other hand, the CSO co-chair of the LPRAT in Dapitan City (who was the former vice-mayor of the city and who attended the CSO assembly in her capacity as a representative of the business sector) was observed by the study team to have successfully steered project prioritization towards some projects that were not likely to have been included in the CSO list but which are aligned with development goals of the local chief executive.

3.4. How was the Project Prioritization Done?³⁴

The 12 study sites included in this study also vary in terms of how project prioritization is done during the LPRAP workshop. In some LGUs (e.g., Buenavista in Agusan del Norte, Goa and Libmanan in Camarines Sur), project prioritization was done by asking the LPRAT members to rank the different projects included in the long list in terms of priority after some open discussion on the merits of each project. The projects which garnered the highest scores in terms of the "votes" given by the members of the LPRAT are then included in the final LPRAP list of projects. For instance, the members of the LPRAT in Buenavista were asked to rank the projects included in the long list on the basis of the following criteria: relevance, urgency, magnitude, importance and doability.

In other LGUs (e.g., Lagonoy, Las Nieves, all 3 study sites in Antique, and all 3 study sites in Zamboanga del Norte), project prioritization was achieved through an open but generally unstructured discussion among the LPRAT members until a consensus and/ or negotiated agreement is reached. For instance, in Lagonoy, the long list of proposed projects was trimmed

³⁴ The foregoing discussion on the conduct of the poverty situation analysis with respect to the use of data and tools like the problem tree analysis is applicable to this sub-section as well.

down through consensus to arrive at the final LPRAP list of sub-projects by delisting some projects in view of the BUB project menu, earlier experience in working with different national government agencies in implementing various BUB sub-projects and the LGU's Annual Investment Plan. Meanwhile, after the presentation of the CSO list and LGU list of projects proposed for BUB funding in Mutia, a discussion ensued as to which projects in these two lists are most deserving of funding. Contentious debate was avoided during the discussion because the LGU assured the CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT that projects that will not be funded by the BUB funds will be funded either by the 20% development fund or other funds that the local government can secure. On the other hand, in Las Nieves, each of the CSO representatives and the BDC Vice-Chairs who were present during the LPRAP workshop simply went through the menu of eligible programs under the BUB and prioritized project/s that will benefit each of their own barangays to the exclusion of projects that will benefit other barangays or other sectors regardless of need. This is evident in some of the comments they made during the LPRAP workshop: "*Pangita na diha'g imo!*" ("Look for your own [project] already!") and "*Alkansi sila kay wa man sila diri!*" ("They won't get anything because they're not here!"), referring to the two LPRAT members who were absent. Because fewer projects have to compete for the municipality's BUB allocation, reaching consensus among the LPRAT members was easier.

In contrast, no project prioritization was done in Butuan City. The LPRAP facilitator in Butuan City decided to accept all projects proposed by the CSO members of the LPRAT. As a result, the aggregate project cost of all the proposed projects exceeded the amount allocated by the national government for the city under the BUB by 30%. Instead of asking the LPRAT to prioritize the projects in the original list by either cutting back on the number of projects or reducing the budgets of some or all the projects, the BUB coordinator for the LGU unilaterally decided on the projects that will get less allocation without any input from the LPRAT members.

Note that the LGU will tend to have the upper hand in the project prioritization process under the BUB when the prioritization of projects is decided either by consensus after an unstructured discussion among the members of the LPRAT or left at the discretion of the BUB coordinator or some other LGU official. This is particularly true when representatives of CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs in the LPRAT do not have good communication skills and experience in engaging with the LGU, and are not knowledgeable in project development and LGU planning and budget.

3.5. *Who Prepares the BUB Sub-project Brief*

In all of the study sites covered under this study, the preparation of the project briefs fell on the shoulders of one of the LGU department heads or the community facilitator, a situation that provides the LGU the opportunity to change the result of the project prioritization made during LPRAP workshop. For instance, the members of the LPRAT in Mutia only identified and prioritized projects but not the location and or beneficiaries of the projects. The LGU, while preparing the project briefs, decided on the location of the projects, particularly in the case of road projects. Although such a situation is vulnerable to political patronage, the research team was able to verify that the mayor did not make any distinction between barangays whose barangay chairmen are politically allied with him and those who are not. On the other hand, the Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator (MPDC) in Polanco reduced the budgets originally allocated for two CSO proposed projects that were prioritized during the LPRAP

workshop in the course of preparing the project briefs and reallocated the “savings” thus generated in favor of a project proposed by the LGU. Moreover, these budgetary adjustments were done without consulting or informing the CSO members of the LPRAT. In like manner, the City Planning and Development Officer (CPDO) of Dapitan City unilaterally dropped 2 projects, reduced the budgets of 2 other projects, and added 2 new projects in the list of prioritized BUB sub-projects approved by the LPRAT during the LPRAP workshop while finalizing the submission to the RPRAT. The changes made in the LPRAP list of projects were not consulted with all the members of LPRAT due to the limited time before the date of submission to the RPRAT. Also, the CSO signatories report that they were not given enough time to review and were not furnished with copies of the LPRAP for future reference despite efforts to request them.

3.6. Post-LPRAP Workshop Changes in List of LPRAP Projects

Changes in the list of projects and/ or budget allocations for prioritized sub-projects approved by the LPRAT during the LPRAP workshop were made after the actual conduct of the LPRAP itself in a number of LGUs (e.g., Buenavista in Agusan del Norte, Libmanan, Camarines Sur, and all the 3 study sites in Zamboanga del Norte). In the case of Buenavista, immediately after the LPRAP workshop, the mayor convened the expanded Municipal Development Council. Following the expanded MDC meeting, 2 CSO-proposed projects and 1 LGU-proposed project was delisted from the list of BUB sub-projects prioritized by the LPRAT during LPRAP workshop to give way to the spring development project proposed by the mayor which was meant to improve the supply of potable water in 3 barangays. On the other hand, the LGU convened a second LPRAP workshop in Libmanan. It was attended by 2 out of the 5 CSO representatives, all of the 5 BDC Vice-Chairs and 9 LGU representatives to the LPRAT³⁵ as well as the barangay chairman of Barangay Busak. The SB Chair of the Committee on Appropriations facilitated the workshop. In the second LPRAP workshop, one project that was in the original list was delisted and the budgets allocated to 2 other projects were reduced in order to accommodate the barangay chairmen’s request for additional road projects in 5 barangays which were identified in the previous year’s list of BUB projects for FY 2016. In the case of Dapitan City and Polanco as discussed above, the changes in the LPRAP list of projects occurred during the preparation of the project briefs and finalization of LPRAP documentation prior to the submission of the same to the RPRAT.

3.7. LPRAP Projects by Proponent

The share of sub-projects that are proposed by LGU officials in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects for FY 2016 may be viewed as a summary measure of the extent and quality of CSO participation in the BUB with greater CSO participation being associated with the lower share of LGU-proposed projects in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects in the LGU. **Table 20** presents a summary of the LPRAP projects in the 12 study sites broken down by proponent: (i) LGU officials, (ii) CSOs representatives/ BDC Vice-Chairs, and (iii) jointly proposed by LGU officials and CSO representatives/ BDC Vice-Chairs. At one end of the spectrum are Goa and San Jose where the share of LGU-proposed projects in total project cost of their FY 2016 LPRAP is higher than 65%. At the other end of the spectrum are Las Nieves, Mutia, Butuan

³⁵ The CSO co-chair and the representatives from the agrarian cooperative and the women sector were absent.

City, Lagonoy, Libmanan and Polanco where the share of LGU-proposed projects in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects is lower than 35%.

In the case of Goa, the entire BUB funding for FY 2016 was allocated to a single project, the water supply under the Salintubig which the mayor strongly recommended to the LPRAT as he delivered his “short” message when he opened the LPRAP workshop. Surprisingly, the lack/inadequacy of potable water supply was not identified as a priority problem in the CSO Assembly. Other factors that contributed to this situation are: (i) the CSO assembly output was not presented nor validated by the LPRAT during the LPRAP workshop, (ii) the identification of projects included in the long list of projects considered for prioritization during the LPRAP workshop was jointly decided by the members of the LPRAT after an unstructured discussion, (iii) although prioritization was done by asking each LPRAT members to rank the projects in the long list in terms of priority, the poor attendance of CSO representatives during the LPRAP workshop put them at a disadvantage. As indicated earlier, the frustrating experience of CSOs in past LPRAP workshop where the mayor likewise dominated the project identification and prioritization may have contributed to the poor attendance of CSO representatives in the LPRAP workshop.

Table 20. FY 2016 LPRAP projects in 12 study sites by proponent

	LGU-identified		CSO/BDC VC-identified		Jointly identified		Total	
	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%
Agusan del Norte								
Butuan City	10.5	15.0	59.5	85.0			70.0	100.0
Buenavista	8.3	44.0	10.5	56.0			18.8	100.0
Las Nieves (KC)	2.1	12.3	15.0	87.7			17.1	100.0
Antique								
San Jose (Urban KC)	12.4	65.4	4.0	20.9	2.6	13.7	18.9	100.0
Sibalom (KC)	13.3	50.0	4.0	15.1	9.3	34.9	26.5	100.0
Barbaza (KC)	9.3	61.7	5.8	38.3			15.0	100.0
Camarines Sur								
Goa	21.1	100.0	0.0				21.1	100.0
Lagonoy	4.4	20.7	2.7	12.6	14.3	66.7	21.4	100.0
Libmanan (KC)	10.9	27.7	22.7	57.7	5.8	14.6	39.4	100.0
Zamboanga del Norte								
Dapitan	16.8	54.7	11.6	37.7	2.4	7.8	30.8	100.0
Polanco	5.3	32.6	11.0**	67.5			16.3	100.0
Mutia (KC)	2.1	13.4	1.0***	6.7	12.6*	80.0	15.7	100.0

* Include road projects, also a priority of the LGU

** CSO projects include those which are identified during CSO assembly

*** Jointly identified by CSO reps and BDC-vice chairs

Meanwhile, the following factors appear to have contributed to the relatively large share of LGU-proposed projects in the total project cost of all BUB sub-projects for FY 2016 in San Jose (65%): (i) the poor attendance of representatives from the ranks of BDC Vice-Chairs (3) and CSOs (4) was further exacerbated by the attendance and participation in project prioritization of 12 LGU officials (2 more than the number mandated in the Annex F of the JMC) during the

LPRAP workshop, (ii) project prioritization was done by consensus, (iii) the 3 BDC Vice-Chairs may have not been as ready to engage in the process considering that San Jose was fairly new to the NCDDP in 2014.

On the other hand, the BUB budget share of LGU-proposed projects in Las Nieves, Mutia, Butuan City, Lagonoy, Libmanan and Polanco is lower relative to the other study sites included in this study. Las Nieves posted the lowest BUB budget share of LGU-proposed projects at 12%. This came about as LGU officials gave CSOs representatives and BDC Vice-Chairs full discretion in the identification and prioritization of BUB projects to be financed from BUB funds coming from the national government even as the LGU unilaterally decided how to allocate the amount equivalent to the LGU counterpart in the BUB. In the case of Mutia, there was a large overlap between projects proposed by CSOs and those proposed by LGU officials independently of each other so that even if the mayor actively pushed for the inclusion of infrastructure projects in the LPRAP and even if project prioritization was done via an open exchange of views among LPRAT members until consensus is reached, a relatively low share of LGU-proposed projects in the BUB budget was achieved.

In Butuan City, the relatively low share of LGU-proposed projects in the BUB for FY 2016 is largely to due to (i) the relatively larger number of CSO representatives during the LPRAP workshop compared to that of LGU representatives, and (ii) the more active participation of CSO representatives relative to that of LGU representatives in identifying projects. For instance, most of the LGU representatives were observed to have not actively participated in project identification. Moreover, the LPRAP facilitator decided to accept all projects proposed by the LPRAT members, with each CSO representative in the LPRAP identifying more than one project. Not surprisingly, the total project costs of all the projects in the initial list amounted reached PhP 92 million (compared with the total BUB budget of PhP 70 million). However, instead of asking the participants to prioritize the projects in the said list either by limiting the number of projects to only one per CSO or asking them to limit the project cost per proposed project, the BUB coordinator for the LGU decided by herself which projects had to have their proposed budget reduced, and which ones had to have their proposed budgets kept intact.

In Lagonoy and Libmanan, despite the larger number of representatives from CSOs/ BDC Vice-Chairs relative to the number of representatives from the LGU side, the former were observed to be quite active in participating in the discussions during the LPRAP workshop. Moreover, the CMs appeared to be competent and to have good facilitation skills and the CSO/ BDC Vice-Chair representatives appeared to have held their own despite the fact that (i) the identification of projects for inclusion in the long list of projects was done jointly by the LPRAT member in Lagonoy and (ii) the prioritization of BUB sub-projects was done by consensus in Libmanan.

In Lagonoy, the LPRAT compared the list of projects identified in the CSO Assembly with the list of projects resulting from the problem-solution finding exercise done in the LPRAP workshop. The participants also referred to the latest BUB Menu of Programs. By consensus, the LPRAT was able to identify 15 projects. More intense discussions but not necessarily disagreements on priority projects were settled by considering not only the need of the LGU but also the existence of similar projects (regular and BUB) as well as previous performance of NGAs in the implementation of BUB projects. In the process, some projects were delisted for

various reasons, e.g., identified projects were not in the Menu, some projects may be clustered or grouped together, and projects are part of the NGAs regular program.

In Libmanan, group discussions by the LPRAT members identified strategies and projects using the following as references: (i) indicative FY 2016 GPB projects, which is part of the rolling 2015-2017 plan prepared in the previous LPRAP workshop in January 2014; (ii) approved FY 2015 LPRAP; (iii) 5 priority issues identified by the LPRAT in the initial part of the LPRAP Workshop; and (iv) latest BUB Menu of Programs. LPRAT members were then asked to rank the initial list of projects by according to their priority. Before voting, participants agreed to delist some projects which were already covered in the previous year's LPRAP, e.g., farm implements and small irrigation. For the access roads, it was agreed that sites to be identified are those with ready/available right of way. River dredging was also delisted because it is "highly technical".

FY 2016 LPRAP results vis FY 2015 LPRAP results. **Table 21** presents the budget share of LGU-proposed projects in the FY 2015 LPRAP of 12 study sites covered in the PIDS assessment of FY 2015 BUB process (Manasan 2015). The BUB budget share of LGU proposed projects is lower than 35% in only 2 of the 12 LGUs included in the FY 2015 BUB assessment (**Table 21**) as opposed to 6 out of 12 for the FY 2016 BUB study (**Table 20**). On the other hand, the BUB budget share of LGU-proposed projects is greater than 65% in 5 out of the 12 LGUs included in the FY 2015 assessment (**Table 21**) as opposed to 2 out of the 12 LGUs included in the FY 2016 BUB study (**Table 20**). Needless to say, some bias in a straightforward comparison of the LPRAP results shown in these two tables cannot be discounted because the LGUs covered in these assessments are not identical. However, if the comparison is limited to the study sites in Agusan del Norte and Camarines Sur which are covered in the two assessments, some decline in the BUB budget share of LGU-proposed projects is evident in 4 out of these 6 LGUs (i.e., Butuan City, Buenavista, Lagonoy and Libmanan).

3.8. Other Issues Related to the Choice of LPRAP Projects

Livelihood vs infrastructure projects. The conventional wisdom is that there is some dissonance between CSOs leaders and LGU officials regarding the need of livelihood projects vis infrastructure projects. In contrast, the KIIs and FGDs conducted in the 12 study sites as part of this study indicate that there is substantial congruence in what LGU officials and CSO leaders perceive to be the most urgent needs of their LGUs (**Tables 4, 6, 8, and 10**). LGU officials and CSO representatives agree in 10 out of the 12 study sites that livelihood and support to agriculture are among the top priority needs in their respective LGUs. On other hand, LGU officials and CSO representatives agree in 9 out of the 12 study sites on the need to improve the road network and in 8 out of the 12 study sites on the need for improvements in the water supply system. Nonetheless, CSO representatives do tend to view livelihood projects as more responsive to the needs of the local community than infrastructure projects. To wit, livelihood is cited by CSO representatives in all 12 study sites as an urgent LGU need. In comparison, road network improvement is reported by CSO representatives to be a priority need in their LGU in 10 out of the 12 study sites. On the other hand, the same tables indicate that LGU officials perceive support to agriculture, livelihood, improvements in the road network and water supply as equally important in addressing the LGUs' most urgent needs.

Table 21. FY 2015 LPRAP projects in 12 study sites by proponent

	LGU-identified		CSO / BDC VC-identified				LGU-identified		Total
			CSO-identified		BDC VC-identified				
	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%	Amount (PhP M)	%	
Agusan del Norte									
Butuan City	23.6	29.5%	56.4	70.5%			23,614,293	29.5%	80.0
Buena Vista	15.9	84.7%	2.9	15.3%			15,905,000	84.7%	18.8
Las Nieves (KC)	0.0	0.0%	3.1	14.0%	19.0	86.0%			22.1
Camarines Sur									
Goa	12.3	64.8%	6.7	35.2%			12,311,215	64.8%	19.0
Lagonoy	11.9	61.8%	7.3	38.2%			11,871,100	61.8%	19.2
Libmanan (KC)	27.6	69.7%	9.6	24.2%	2.4	6.1%	27,600,000	69.7%	39.6
Negros Occidental									
Sagay	17.2	43.9%	22.0 *	56.1%			17,200,000	43.9%	39.2
Hinigaran	10.9	60.7%	7.1	39.3%			10,920,000	60.7%	18.0
Cauayan (KC)	24.8	57.7%	13.2	30.7%	5.0	11.6%	24,800,000	57.7%	43.0
Quezon									
Gumaca	18.9	81.6%	4.3	18.4%			18,900,000	81.6%	23.2
Mauban	18.0	94.5%	1.0	5.5%			17,950,000	94.5%	19.0
San Antonio (KC)	9.0	51.6%	8.4	48.4%			8,959,000	51.6%	17.4

* Includes 6,500,000 for water project that was jointly identified by CSO and LGU

However, the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study reveal that CSO representatives' and LGU officials' do exhibit disparate preferences for livelihood and infrastructure projects when they prioritize projects that will be funded under the BUB quite apart from how they appreciate the critical needs of their localities. On the one hand, LGU officials (e.g., mayor of Libmanan) argue that livelihood projects are more difficult to implement than infrastructure projects because the shortage of bidders and suppliers make the procurement of the goods in implementing more cumbersome, particularly for the smaller LGUs. Also, some officials of LGUs belonging to 4th – 6th income class municipalities (e.g., Barbaza and Mutia) where the BUB funding from the national government is even larger than the Local Development Fund (LDF), otherwise known as the 20% Development Fund, maintain that BUB funds are better utilized for infrastructure projects rather than “band-aid” solutions since the LGUs' LDF is not big enough to finance LGUs' critical infrastructure requirements which address the underlying causes of the LGUs' problems (as noted in the Zamboanga del Norte KIIs and FGDs).

On the other hand, livelihood/ employment projects are the top of the mind response of many CSO representatives when asked to name the type of projects that should be included in the LPRAP. This appears to be anchored on their belief that livelihood projects are the most responsive to the communities' needs by providing the most direct and immediate benefits to the various sectors concerned. However, the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study show that many CSO representatives and LGU officials alike now have a more nuanced and critical view of livelihood projects than when the BUB was first launched. One, there is now a greater emphasis on the need for the projects to be sustainable in the medium-term if not in the long term as manifested in comments like “Hanggang tocino-making na lang ba? Lagi na lang short-

term?” as well as those related to the need to develop the entire value chain from the production of the primary product to its processing and marketing. Two, there is also a recognition that for the livelihood projects to be sustainable, project design have to take into account the existing endowments, facilities and skills available in the community. Some of the comments from the KIIs and FGDs reflect this view: “Why cacao in agro-processing? Why propose cacao manufacturing facility when we only have small production of cacao. Kasi uso lang, pero walang pag-aaral.” ... “What type of livelihood projects should be implemented to create impact? What type of services should be provided by these projects (e.g., financial capital, skills training)?” ... “How much assistance (of various types) should be considered adequate to create an impact?” Three, there is likewise a realization that for livelihood projects to be effective in addressing poverty, the projects should be well targeted, as exemplified by comments like: “Are the livelihood projects targeting the right beneficiaries? Do the identified livelihood projects match the needs of target beneficiaries?”

Menu of projects under BUB. KIIs and FGDs conducted for this study reveal that CSO representatives and LGU officials perceive the NGAs’ menu of projects for the BUB as effective in restricting the choice of projects that they can propose for BUB funding. For instance, CSO representatives and LGU officials in Camarines Sur point out that (i) DepEd’s project in the menu include construction of fence and library which do not respond to basic education issues like high number of school leavers at the high school level; (ii) most CSOs articulated that what they need under the Livelihood Project is “working capital” but the menu could only offer “inputs in kind”, e.g., equipment, fertilizer; (iii) some CSOs were looking for goat dispersal which the coco farmers identified for added income, but the DA does not have this in its menu. Thus, it is not surprising that the LPRAT in some of the LGUs covered under this study proceeded to directly identify/ prioritize sub-projects that will be included in the LPRAP after a review the BUB menu of projects even before or, at best, after a cursory identification/ analysis of the major problems of the LGU and their underlying causes and their immediate/ intermediate effects.

IV. SUB-PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION FOR FY 2013 AND FY 2014 CYCLES

While the interest on the BUB process is concentrated on project identification and prioritization, sub-project implementation is equally important because it influences CSO trust and participation in subsequent BUB planning cycles.

1. Status of FY 2014 BUB Sub-project Implementation

Funds to implement 63³⁶ (or 37%) out of the 171 FY 2014 BUB sub-projects of the 12 study sites included in the present study have been downloaded as of the end of March 2015, 3 months after the end of year when implementation of said projects is scheduled for completion. Buenavista and Las Nieves in Agusan del Norte were the best performers in this regard with funds having been downloaded for 63% and 57%, respectively, of all their FY 2014 BUB sub-projects as of March 30, 2015. On the other hand, 8% of all the BUB sub-projects programmed

³⁶ This number represents the sum of the number of BUB sub-projects that fall under any one of the following categories: completed, ongoing, or funds downloaded but not yet implemented.

for implementation in FY 2014 in the same 12 study sites have been completed as of end of March 2015 while 20% may be classified as on-going (**Table 22**). Sibalom, Antique and Lagonoy, Camarines Sur ranked first and second in terms of having the highest proportion of completed BUB sub-projects with sub-project completion rates of 33% and 20%, respectively, while Sibalom and Buenavista, Agusan del Norte ranked first and second in terms of having the highest proportion of completed/ ongoing BUB sub-projects in FY 2014.

A comparison of the experience in implementing BUB sub-projects in FY 2013 (**Table 23**) and FY 2014 in selected LGUs included in the 2014 and 2015 PIDS BUB process assessments provides mixed results with respect to the progress in the pace of BUB sub-project implementation. The implementation of FY 2014 BUB sub-projects is somewhat faster than the implementation of FY 2013 BUB sub-projects when viewed in terms project completion, procurement, and provision of NGA feedback to LGUs. In contrast, some deterioration in the downloading of project funds is evident between these two years. To wit, the proportion of completed BUB projects is higher in FY 2014 (8%) compared to FY 2013 (less than 1%). Also, the number of BUB sub-projects that are either completed or are on-going as a proportion of the total number of sub-projects for which BUB funds from the national government have been downloaded is higher in FY 2014 (78%) than in FY 2013 (60%), indicating improvements in procurement at either the NGA or LGU level and/ or improvements in LGUs' compliance with pre-project implementation requirements of national government line agencies. Moreover, the proportion of "no NGA feedback" BUB sub-projects to total number of BUB sub-projects is lower in FY 2014 (13%) than in FY 2013 (29%). However, the proportion of sub-projects which are still awaiting the downloading of project funds is higher in FY 2014 (34%) than in FY 2013 (7%).

2. Lack of Clarity in NGA Menu of Projects and Pre-implementation/ Pre-funds-download Requirement

The implementation of BUB sub-projects for FY 2014 is hampered by the poor NGA feedback/ guidelines to LGUs at various stages of the BUB process. For instance, some respondents from the Zamboanga del Norte study sites argue that communication with the NGAs is usually one way, and that unless the LGU makes an effort to make direct follow-up with these agencies, no information is provided to the LGUs.

NGA feedback after approval of BUB sub-projects by RPRAT. Lack of NGA feedback to LGUs was one of the most common problems faced by LGUs in the implementation of FY 2013 BUB sub-projects. To wit, the 12 study sites included in the 2014 PIDS BUB process assessments as a group did not receive any information/ update from the national government agencies concerned regarding the status of implementation (e.g., when funds will be downloaded, documentary requirements) of 40 (or 29%) out of the 136 BUB sub-projects programmed for implementation in FY 2013 as of the end of March 2014. At that time, the problem was particularly intense in Sagay City with 24 (or 80%) out of its 30 sub-projects with DTI, DAR and DENR suffering setbacks in this regard. Hinigaran, Negros Occidental had similar issues in 6 (or 55%) out of its 11 sub-projects with DSWD and DILG). It was also true as well in San Antonio, Quezon which did not get any feedback from DepEd and DAR with regards to the status of 3 (or 50%) out its 6 FY 2013 BUB sub-projects (**Table 22**).

Table 22. Status of the FY 2014 BUB sub-project implementation in 12 study sites

FY 2014	Agusan del Norte				Antique				Camarines Sur				Zamboanga del Norte				All 12 study sites
	Butuan	Buenvista	Las Nieves	All	San Jose	Sibalom	Barbaza	All	Goa	Lagonoy	Libmanan	All	Dapitan	Polanco	Mutia	All	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	26	14	8	48	22	18	23	63	1	5	26	32	12	10	6	28	171
(1) Completed	2	2	1	5		6		6		1		1	1	1		2	14
(2) On-going	2	5	2	9	7	4	4	15			6	6	3	1	2	6	36
(3) Funds downloaded but not yet ongoing	4	1	2	7				0				0	2	3	1	6	13
(4) Awaiting download of funds	12	6		18	11	5	2	18	1	2	18	21			1	1	58
(5) Validation on-going				0				0				0				0	0
(6) Reprogrammed	1		3	4		2	3	5		1		1		2	1	3	13
(7) No feedback				0			14	14				0	2	3	1	6	20
(8) Discontinued	3			3				0			2	2	3			3	8
(9) Approved for 2015 implementation	2			2	4	1		5		1		1	1			1	9
FY 2014 Percent Distribution	Agusan del Norte				Antique				Camarines Sur				Zamboanga del Norte				All 12 study sites
	Butuan	Buenvista	Las Nieves	All	San Jose	Sibalom	Barbaza	All	Goa	Lagonoy	Libmanan	All	Dapitan	Polanco	Mutia	All	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	26.0	14.0	8.0	48.0	22.0	18.0	23.0	63.0	1.0	5.0	26.0	32.0	12.0	10.0	6.0	28.0	171
(1) Completed	7.7	14.3	12.5	10.4		33.3		9.5		20.0		3.1	8.3	10.0		7.1	8
(2) On-going	7.7	35.7	25.0	18.8	31.8	22.2	17.4	23.8			23.1	18.8	25.0	10.0	33.3	21.4	21
(3) Funds downloaded but not yet ongoing	15.4	7.1	25.0	14.6				0				0	16.7	30.0	16.7	21.4	8
(4) Awaiting download of funds	46.2	42.9		37.5	50.0	27.8	8.7	28.6	100.0	40.0	69.2	65.6			16.7	3.6	34
(5) Validation on-going				0				0				0				0	0
(6) Reprogrammed	3.8		37.5	8.3		11.1	13.0	7.9		20.0		3.1		20.0	16.7	10.7	8
(7) No feedback				0			60.9	22.2				0	16.7	30.0	16.7	21.4	12
(8) Discontinued	11.5			6.3				0			7.7	6.3	25.0			10.7	5
(9) Approved for 2015 implementation	7.7			4.2	18.2	5.6		7.9		20.0		3.1	8.3			3.6	5
Memo item:																	
(1)+(2) a/	15.4	50.0	37.5	29.2	31.8	55.6	17.4	33.3	0.0	20.0	23.1	21.9	33.3	20.0	33.3	28.6	29.2
(1)+(2)+(3) b/	30.8	57.1	62.5	43.8	31.8	55.6	17.4	33.3	0.0	20.0	23.1	21.9	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	36.8
(1)+(2)/[(1)+(2)+(3)] c/	50.0	87.5	60.0	66.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	66.7	40.0	66.7	57.1	79.4

a/ % of ongoing and completed projects

b/ % of projects for which funds have been downloaded

c/ number of ongoing and completed projects (i.e., procurement completed) as % of number of projects for which funds have been downloaded

Table 23. Status of the FY 2013 BUB sub-project implementation in 12 study sites

FY 2013	Agusan del Norte 2013				Negros Occidental 2013				Camarines Sur 2013				Quezon				All 12 study sites
	Butuan	Buenavista	Las Nieves	All	Sagay	Hinigaran	Cauayan	All	Goa	Lagonoy	Libmanan	All	Mauban	Gumaca	San Antonio	All	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	19	14	3	36	30	11	14	55	7	10	12	29	3	7	6	16	136
(1) Completed		1		1				0				0				0	1
(2) On-going	10	8	1	19	1	1	2	4	4	9	4	17	1	1	1	3	43
(3) Funds downloaded but not yet ongoing	2	2		4	4	4	11	19			1	1	2	2	2	6	30
(4) Awaiting download of funds		2		2				0	1		6	7				0	9
(5) Validation on-going				0				0				0				0	0
(6) Reprogrammed		1		1				0			1	1		2		2	4
(7) No feedback			2	2	24	6	1	31	1	1		2		2	3	5	40
(8) Discontinued	7			7	1			1	1			1				0	9
(9) Approved for 2015 implementation								0				0				0	0
FY 2013 Percent Distribution	Agusan del Norte				Antique				Camarines Sur				Zamboanga del Norte				All 12 study sites
	Butuan	Buenavista	Las Nieves	All	San Jose	Sibalom	Barbaza	All	Goa	Lagonoy	Libmanan	All	Dapitan	Polanco	Mutia	All	
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS	19.0	14.0	3.0	36.0	30.0	11.0	14.0	55.0	7.0	10.0	12.0	29.0	3.0	7.0	6.0	16.0	136.0
(1) Completed		7.1		2.8													0.7
(2) On-going	52.6	57.1	33.3	52.8	3.3	9.1	14.3	7.3	57.1	90.0	33.3	58.6	33.3	14.3	16.7	18.8	31.6
(3) Funds downloaded but not yet ongoing	10.5	14.3		11.1	13.3	36.4	78.6	34.5			8.3	3.4	66.7	28.6	33.3	37.5	22.1
(4) Awaiting download of funds		14.3		5.6					14.3		50.0	24.1					6.6
(5) Validation on-going																	
(6) Reprogrammed		7.1		2.8							8.3	3.4		28.6		12.5	2.9
(7) No feedback			66.7	5.6	80.0	54.5	7.1	56.4	14.3	10.0		6.9		28.6	50.0	31.3	29.4
(8) Discontinued	36.8			19.4	3.3			1.8	14.3			3.4					6.6
(9) Approved for 2015 implementation																	
Memo item:																	
(1)+(2) a/	52.6	64.3	33.3	55.6	3.3	9.1	14.3	7.3	57.1	90.0	33.3	58.6	33.3	14.3	16.7	18.8	32.4
(1)+(2)+(3) b/	63	79	33	67	17	45	93	42	57	90	42	62	100	43	50	56	54
(1)+(2)/[(1)+(2)+(3)] c/	83.3	81.8	100.0	83.3	20.0	20.0	15.4	17.4	100.0	100.0	80.0	94.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	59.5

a/ % of ongoing and completed projects

b/ % of projects for which funds have been downloaded

c/ number of ongoing and completed projects (i.e., procurement completed) as % of number of projects for which funds have been downloaded

As indicated earlier, improvements in NGA feedback to LGUs regarding BUB sub-project implementation was evident in FY 2014 when the proportion of BUB sub-projects affected by this problem went down to 12%, i.e., 20 out of the 171 BUB sub-projects programmed to be implemented in the 12 study sites included under the present study (i.e. the 2015 PIDS BUB process assessment). Nonetheless, significant problems related with the lack of NGA feedback were observed in Barbaza, Antique (in 14 [or 61%] out its 23 BUB sub-projects) and Polanco, Zamboanga del Norte (in 3 [or 30%] out of its 10 BUB sub-projects). For instance, Dapitan City experienced problems with the implementation of two of its FY 2014 BUB sub-projects under the DA. Despite efforts by LGU department head concerned to go directly to the DA to follow up on project status, the LGU has not received updates from the DA as of the date of the interviews conducted under this study in March 2015, as to whether these two sub-projects that are slated for implementation in FY 2014 will be implemented at all and, if so, when the funds will be downloaded.

Lack of clarity in NGA pre-implementation/ pre-funds-download requirements. Delays in sub-project implementation may also be traced to the lack of clarity and changes in the guidelines governing the menu of a number of NGA line departments/ agencies and/ or the requirements that LGUs have to submit/ comply with prior to the downloading of funds to LGUs or the sub-project implementation by the concerned NGA in case the LGU does not have a Seal of Good Financial Housekeeping. For instance, the requirements for certain projects are not fully laid down for consideration in project identification during the LPRAP workshop, like in the case of the National Greening Program where the required land area needs to be contiguous. Worse, some projects that are sometimes approved during validation at the RPRAT level had to be discontinued at the time of implementation (e.g., NGP sub-project proposed by Dapitan City for FY 2014 implementation). Note that the menu of projects for FY 2016 as spelled out in Annex D of JMC No. 5-2014 only specifies that the land eligible for development under the NGP should have an area greater than 50 hectares but does not mention that said land that should be contiguous.

Moreover, the KIIs conducted under this study indicate that each of the NGAs participating in the BUB program has its own set of implementation guidelines with respect to project proposal preparation, procurement, auditing, and other documentary requirements. LGU officials found this confusing and frustrating, with many of them also complaining that many NGAs give out the information on these requirements piecemeal, rather than up-front in one go. As a result, LGUs report that they have no other option but to also submit these additional requirements one at a time, thereby making coordination with the NGAs even more tedious and time consuming and adding to the delay in project implementation.

3. Weak LGU Capacity

Several factors contribute to the delay in the implementation of BUB sub-projects from the LGU side. First, many LGUs fail to submit well-specified program of works, detailed engineering design (in the case of infrastructure projects) and other documentary requirements either because their staff complement is inadequate to support the additional work required or because LGU personnel lack the technical capacity. For instance, as of the end of March 2015, the Municipal Agriculture Officer of Lagonoy has not yet submitted the revised project

proposal, program of works and other paper requirements related to one of the projects that is included in its FY 2014 LPRAP, a coastal resource management project under the DA. There are also instances when the LGU is unable to implement a BUB sub-project because of the lack of capacity. For example, raw material inputs for the dried fish production sub-project of Buenavista, Agusan del Norte under its FY 2013 LPRAP has already been delivered to the LGU as of the end of March 2015 but the LGU does not have the human resources to implement and complete the project. Second, the JMC provides that when LGUs have unliquidated cash advances with national government line agencies beyond the reglamentary period, the funding and implementation of affected BUB sub-projects will not be held in abeyance, if not completely forfeited. Third, BUB sub-project implementation or funding download may also fall behind schedule when the required LGU counterpart funds for the BUB sub-projects is not included in the LGU appropriation ordinance and Annual Investment Plan for whatever reason (e.g., a conflict between the local chief executive and the local Sanggunian in Libmanan). Fourth, many of the LGUs which are eligible to implement BUB sub-projects experienced difficulties in procurement, especially in the context of implementing many livelihood sub-projects. In the first instance, a number of LGUs with non-existent or poor internet connection report finding it hard to access the Philippine Government Electronic Procurement System (PhilGEPS). Moreover, the broader implementation of the BUB, the NCDDP and other similar programs (which involve the procurement of goods, services and works at the local level) appears to be hamstrung by the absorptive capacity of local suppliers and contractors. Also, Republic Act 9184 (Government Procurement Reform Law) provides that procurement through shopping can only be done for procurement valued at less than PhP 100,000. Any procurement valued beyond this amount has to go through competitive bidding. The value of the procurement involved in most of the approved livelihood sub-projects under the BUB varies between PhP 200,000 and PhP 450,000, apparently not large enough to attract many bidders. As a result, the chances of “failed bidding” tend to increase, which necessitates reposting of the “invitation to bid.” Should the public bidding fail twice, the LGU can then use the “negotiated procurement” modality. Related to the use of this procurement mode, smaller LGUs (e.g., Libmanan, Camarines Sur) report that when there is a shortage of interested locally based suppliers of goods and services they have to engage with suppliers based in the more urbanized centers, a situation which entails additional expense, time, and effort.

Delays in sub-project implementation appear to have some adverse effects on the satisfaction of CSO leaders with BUB projects. For instance, respondents of the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study in Camarines Sur report that CSOs’ interest and eagerness to participate in the BUB have waned. They express frustration that the planning process is too demanding in terms of process and deadlines and the beneficial effects of the sub-projects are not yet evident because of delays in release of funds and project implementation since FY 2013.

4. Poor Coordination among the NGAs, LGUs and CSOs During Project Implementation.

The PIDS process assessment of the FY 2015 BUB planning cycle and the implementation of the FY 2013 BUB sub-projects found that poor coordination in project implementation between the NGAs/ LGUs, on the one hand, and CSOs, on the other hand, is (i) hampering the effective implementation of the sub-projects, and (ii) inhibiting rather the facilitating NGA-LGU-CSO

engagement. This finding still holds true for the present study as it relates to the implementation of FY 2014 BUB sub-projects.

A case that highlights the need for better inter-national agency coordination as well NGA-LGU coordination was observed in Polanco, Zamboanga del Norte. The officer in charge of the BUB at the DILG regional office in Region 9 clarified that the implementation of construction projects under DepEd and DOH is to be undertaken by DPWH. However, LGU officials in Polanco were not made aware of said arrangements, and as such, did not know which NGA offices they had to follow-up with regarding the implementation status of their BUB sub-projects.

On the other hand, Buenavista, Agusan del Norte, Goa and Lagonoy, Camarines Sur provide some examples of the lack of LGU-CSO coordination in the implementation of BUB sub-projects. For instance, a CSO leaders in Buenavista complained that the LGU replaced the original beneficiaries of the laundry soap-making project and pastry- and bibingka-making project under its approved FY 2014 LPRAP without any consultation with the CSOs and without formally informing the intended beneficiaries about the change. In Goa, the mayor was reported to have caused the deviation from the original project design during the actual implementation of its approved FY 2013 BUB sub-project under the DA from “tilapia hatchery and nursery cum fingerlings dispersal” to “fingerlings dispersal” without consulting the CSOs concerned. Moreover, said change is argued to have likely adverse effects on the project sustainability. In the case of Lagonoy, CSO respondents and LGU officials report that the DENR regional office did not coordinate with the LGU and has not been providing reports (e.g., budget allocation, expenditures and barangays covered under its sustainable environment sub-project) to the MPDC. Because of this experience, LGU officials in Lagonoy recommend that since the LGU does not implement the approved BUB projects, coordination among the NGA, beneficiaries at the ground level (barangays, CSOs), and the LGU should be in place. To realize this, LGU respondents suggested the following: (i) for NGA to officially write a letter to the LGU informing them about the implementation of their approved projects in certain barangays; (ii) for NGA to regularly inform the LGU about the progress of implementation of their projects including operational problems; and (iii) for NGA to clarify the role of the LGU in monitoring the implemented projects.

5. Monitoring of BUB Sub-projects and CSOs’ Role in BUB Sub-projects Monitoring

Section 10.2.3 of JMC No. 5-2014 provides that “the LPRAT shall conduct quarterly meetings to monitor the status of the approval and integration of the priority poverty reduction projects into the budgets of participating agencies and to monitor the implementation and status of the projects.” On the one hand, the conduct of quarterly LPRAT meetings is evident in only a few of the LGUs covered under this study (e.g., Libmanan). Even in the said LGUs, there is no formal body responsible for monitoring the progress in the implementation of BUB sub-projects. In many of the other LGUs, the task of monitoring of BUB sub-project implementation is assigned to the MLGOO (e.g., Las Nieves), the MPDC (e.g., Polanco), the CM/ BUB focal person (e.g., Butuan City), or LGU department heads who monitor the implementation of BUB sub-projects that are related to the core mandate/ responsibility of their respective departments (e.g., Lagonoy, Dapitan City). In most of the study sites, reporting of the status of BUB sub-projects to the mayor

or other members of the LPRAT was done informally and on an *ad hoc* basis. For example, while individual BUB sub-projects are being monitored, no single body is assigned to consolidate status of all BUB sub-projects in Dapitan City, except for purposes of reporting to the CSO assembly at the start of the planning cycle. Hence, if the mayor or other interested parties want information regarding the status of implementation of BUB projects, they need to approach the department head involved individually.

A small subset of the 12 LGUs covered under this study report having a Municipal Project Monitoring Committee (MPMC) in place at least on paper (e.g., Lagonoy, Dapitan City and Mutia). Of these three LGUs, it is only Mutia that has a functional MPMC that is in charge of monitoring all the projects of the LGU, including the BUB. While the MPMC in Lagonoy was created to monitor and evaluate implementation of programs, projects and activities (PPAs) funded by local and national funds, it is not yet functional. On the other hand, while the CLGOO of Dapitan City claims that the city has an existing CPMC, the CPMC has not been tasked to monitor BUB sub-projects.

Mutia is also the only LGU out of the 12 study sites covered under this study where CSOs are formally involved in the monitoring of BUB projects. To wit, Mutia's MPMC is headed by the mayor and is composed of the MPDC, the Municipal Engineer, the MLGOO and 3 accredited CSO representatives. However, for projects undertaken in coordination with national government line agencies, the monitoring is fairly limited to financial accomplishment and releases of funds.

In general, while CSOs and BDC Vice-Chairs are given a major role in the identification and prioritization of BUB sub-projects, their role in project monitoring remains fairly limited. Many CSO respondents in the KIIs and FGDs conducted under this study pointed out that they are only called during the CSO assembly and the LPRAP workshop if they happen to be elected to be members of the LPRAT. After said activities, they say they are "forgotten only to be paraded again" during the following year's CSO assembly. For the most part, only the CSO representatives in the LPRAT are informed of the progress in the implementation of BUB sub-projects. This occurs for a number of reasons: (i) no formal monitoring body for BUB sub-projects is in place in many LGUs, (ii) the LPRAT does not meet regularly to review and monitor the status of BUB sub-projects despite the provisions of the JMC to the contrary, (iii) even in cases where (ii) is not true, the information gathered by the CSO members of the LPRAT on the status of BUB projects is not shared with other CSOs because of lack of venue and logistics to make such sharing possible.

Despite the limited role of CSOs in project monitoring under current arrangements, CSOs in some LGUs have actually started to get more involved in this task in a fairly spontaneous and unstructured manner. For instance, the beneficiaries of a women's livelihood project in Libmanan returned the equipment to the supplier because the equipment was found to be sub-standard. On the other hand, CSOs in Libmanan narrated to the research team that the DA-implemented Umalo-Concepcion road was not efficiently built because per program of works (POW), one lane was shorter by 3 meters due to an error on the part of the contractor regarding the starting point of the construction. They also noted that the construction was such that no provision was made to prevent soil erosion on road's shoulders.

Moreover, a number of DILG/ NAPC-led initiatives to harness CSOs in the monitoring of BUB sub-projects are evident on the ground during the KIIs and FGDs undertaken as part of the present study in the first quarter of 2015. One, in early 2014, the Caritas Diocese of Libmanan (CDL), in collaboration with NAPC, coordinated the conduct of training for community leaders in 8 municipalities of Camarines Sur, including Goa, Lagonoy and Libmanan, on citizens-led government project monitoring and evaluation (or the Third Party Monitoring). The participants who were selected from the batch of CSOs elected as LPRAT representative for the FY 2015 BUB planning cycle, were organized into community monitoring teams (CMT) to monitor government projects such as infrastructure and livelihood projects under BUB. Trainers included livelihood specialist from the DSWD Regional Office, volunteer Engineers from the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance (CCAGG), and Project Management Staff of the Coalition for Bicol Development (CBD), an NGO coalition group in Camarines Sur affiliated with Code-NGO. While clearly a useful endeavor, CSO respondents in Camarines Sur pointed out that the results of the pilot monitoring of the CMTs have not been shared with the concerned LGUs and LPRATs. Also, not all community leaders trained in the Citizens-led monitoring, got elected again as LPRAT CSO reps in the succeeding years and, hence, might not be tapped for future monitoring work under the BUB.

Two, the regional DILG focal person in Region 9 pushed for the creation of a BUB monitoring team at the LGU level. In January 2015, the CMs in the Zamboanga Peninsula region started to mobilize a core group of 6-8 active CSOs, most of which are members of the current LPRAT, while some come from specific sectors like faith-based organizations that have the capacity and influence to spearhead the monitoring of BUB sub-project. It is envisioned that the composition of the core group will not change annually but will be expanded to include some of CSO reps from the current year's LPRAT.

The involvement of CSOs/ POs/ BDC Vice-Chairs in BUB project monitoring appears to be well justified when viewed from various perspective. First, CSOs, POs and BDC Vice-Chairs in the LGU have the comparative advantage to do project monitoring relative (i) to LGU department heads who are likely to suffer from conflict of interest when asked to monitor sub-projects that they help prepare and implement, and (ii) to CSOs based outside the LGU by virtue of being closer to the ground and more familiar to the real situation and needs of the LGU. Second, being direct beneficiaries of BUB sub-project, CSOs have a large stake in ensuring that said projects are implemented efficiently (i.e., in the least costly manner) and effectively (i.e., such that expected benefits from the sub-projects are actually realized). As such, they are more likely to want to exact accountability from the NGAs and the LGU involved in implementation of the BUB sub-projects as illustrated by the experience of Libmanan (as cited above) where CSOs are even now involved in project monitoring.

However, the more active involvement of CSOs, POs and BDC Vice-Chairs in the monitoring of BUB sub-projects is hampered by a number of factors. One, the absence of a formal structure that monitors BUB sub-project implementation at the LGU level is probably the first stumbling block to the effective tracking of the progress in the implementation of these projects. A mix of CSO and LGU respondents propose the creation of a local monitoring team composed of CSO representatives and LGU officials that will be selected during the CSO assembly. The beneficiaries and implementers of the BUB subprojects may also be involved in monitoring

activities. Two, many CSOs are held back from volunteering to monitor project implementation because they do not have the wherewithal to support this activity. Thus, the institutionalization of a functional BUB monitoring team comprised of representatives from CSOs, POs, and BDC Vice-Chairs requires regular and predictable funding that will support the logistical requirements of the team. In this regard, some CSOs have suggested that a small percentage of the LGUs' allocation for the BUB funds from the national government be set aside to fund the activities of the BUB monitoring team. Three, many of the CSOs operating at the LGU level are not technically well-equipped in project monitoring. Thus, a massive and systematic capacity development initiative is needed to address this problem. One MLGOO respondent suggested that the NG should issue a circular on the use of uniform BUB monitoring tool for all LGUs nationwide. The tool is a simple checklist to be accomplished quarterly with pictures of the projects attached to the report. A mix of LGU and CSO respondents said that the Program of Works (POW) of implemented projects should be used as reference tool in monitoring.

V. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE BUB PROGRAM

First and foremost, the BUB program is valued by LGU officials and CSO leaders alike because of the additional financing it provides. The BUB allocation to LGUs is substantial, either approximating or exceeding the LGUs' Local Development Fund in 6 out of 12 LGUs included under this study (e.g., Mutia, Barbaza, Goa, Libmanan, San Jose and Polanco). As such, BUB creates fiscal space for the LGU allowing it to finance and implement more projects than can be accommodated from its own resources.

Also, the distribution of BUB funding across municipalities and cities is rules-based rather than discretionary and as such is less vulnerable to patronage politics compared to the allocation of more discretionary non-IRA transfers to LGUs from the national government like the PDAF of Congressmen and Senators (prior to the abolition of the PDAF) and other *ad hoc* transfers to LGUs that are funded under the GAA. First, the BUB provides larger funding to LGUs that have a higher number of residents living below the poverty line as identified in the National Household Targeting System (NHTS). As such, it tends to be equalizing. Second, while there are two sets of rules governing the BUB process, said rules are clearly delineated and applied to two categories of LGUs – KC/ NCDDP areas, on the one hand, and non-KC/ non-NCDDP areas, on the other. Third, the evaluation by the RPRAT and by the NPRAT of the list of projects proposed by LGUs for BUB funding appears to be limited to checking compliance of the LPRAPs to the guidelines set out in the JMC with respect to alignment of the proposed LGU projects with the menu of projects of the various NGAs, and provision of LGU counterpart.

But beyond, and perhaps, more important, the BUB process increases CSO/ citizen participation in local governance. Under the BUB, the involvement and empowerment of CSOs (and BDC vice-chairmen in KC areas) is fostered by giving them a more direct role in the identification of poverty alleviation projects. As such, they are better able to ensure that the projects they need are indeed included in the projects that will be funded under the BUB. Despite the fact that not all of the projects that are actually included in the LPRAP are identified by CSOs/ BDC Vice-Chairs, the BUB process has helped ensure that some of the projects that are needed from the perspective CSOs and local communities are able to secure some funding under the BUB.

1. BUB Adds Value to the Project Identification and Prioritization

By providing the formal venue and structure where CSOs are able to participate in the identification and prioritization of projects, the BUB process enables LGUs to get information directly from the sectors whose urgent needs and concerns are typically not considered and addressed in the regular LGU planning and budgeting processes. The BUB program not only allots CSOs a bigger role in the identification and prioritization of projects that will be funded under the BUB, it also promotes their more active and inclusive participation in the same. First, CSOs account for 50% of the total number of LPRAT members. In contrast, the representation of NGOs in the Local Development Council (LDC)³⁷ is generally limited to 25% of its total membership. Second, while the Local Government Code (LGC) provides that NGOs shall choose their representatives to the LDC from among themselves, the influence of LGU officials in the actual selection of NGO representatives in the LDC from the pool of LGU-accredited NGOs cannot be discounted because the processes governing said selection is not well spelled out in the LGC. In comparison, all CSOs, in principle, have the chance to participate in the planning process by attending the CSO assembly. Also, the process by which CSOs elect their representatives to the LPRAT is set out clearly in the JMC. Third, while NGOs, in principle, can participate in identifying and prioritizing projects that will be funded by their Local Development Fund, in reality they have little participation in the preparation of the local development plan, being typically involved at the very tail end of the process only. According to some CSO representatives during the KIIs and FGDs undertaken as part of this study, the role of NGOs in the LDC is limited to approving³⁸ a development plan and its corresponding investment program that have been prepared by LGU officials oftentimes with little involvement from NGOs. In contrast, under the BUB process, the processes and procedures that govern CSOs' involvement in project identification and prioritization are clearly spelled out in the JMC.

All LGUs in the 12 study sites have included the LGU BUB counterpart in their Annual Investment Plans. However, there is little evidence that the processes prescribed in the BUB are integrated in the regular development planning processes of the LGU as called for under JMC No. 5-2014 (e.g., the LPRAT is established as a committee of the LDC; the Enhanced LDC shall approve all of LGU development plans including the AIP).

2. BUB Adds Value to CSO Empowerment and Greater Demand for Government Accountability

By giving the CSOs the opportunity to identify projects that can potentially improve their lives and influence the actual allocation of budgetary resources, CSOs' sense of self-worth is enhanced, thereby, empowering them. The BUB process has also encouraged the basic sectors to organize themselves, and to become more active in LGU affairs, especially now that they have gained a better understanding of the processes involved. Also, there appears to be an emerging clamor among CSOs to be more involved in the monitoring of the status and actual

³⁷ The LDC is mandated to formulate the long-term, medium-term and annual socio-economic development plan of the LGU as well as its medium-term and annual investment program.

³⁸ Some would say "rubber stamping" is a better term.

implementation of BUB sub-projects. At the same time, the BUB appear to have prompted CSOs (who are the direct beneficiaries of the program) to demand greater transparency in its implementation and to hold accountable the NGAs and the LGU involved so as to ensure the efficient and effective implementation of the BUB sub-projects (e.g., Libmanan).

3. BUB Adds Value to LGU-CSO Relations

The BUB provides a more structured space for LGU-CSO interaction. In principle, under BUB, the LGU and CSOs are provided the venue to engage in open discussions and joint decision-making, with certain safeguards for minimizing political interference and vested economic interests. Thus, the BUB process has helped build trust and strengthen the relationship between the local government and the CSOs. The BUB has promoted a collaborative (but critical) engagement between LGUs and CSOs in the 12 study sites with the exception perhaps of Goa and Buenavista, Agusan del Norte. In Buenavista, the BUB has failed to heal the long festering mistrust between the LGU and the CSOs. In Goa, some CSO representatives in the LPRAT were heard saying “sinabi ko na nga eh” and “moro-moro lang” after the mayor successfully maneuvered that the entire funding coming from the BUB be allocated to his pet project (i.e., water supply project).

4. BUB Adds Value to Inter-CSO Relations

In a number of the LGUs included in this study, the BUB process has somehow helped CSOs develop a better appreciation of the needs of other CSOs/ sectors and, at the very least, a sense of camaraderie. Some of the respondents in the KIIs and FGDs have raised some apprehension that CSOs tend to focus on projects that benefit their sector, if not their specific organization only. However, there is some evidence that this situation is slowly changing as more CSOs are becoming open and supportive of other CSOs and are pushing for the interest of sectors other than their own. Also, in some LGUs, stronger CSOs have started to help in build the capacity of other CSOs, particularly in terms of project development and monitoring.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations flow directly from the observations from the foregoing observations on the conduct of the BUB in 12 study sites. Many of these recommendations have already been raised in the earlier PIDS assessment of the BUB.

1. Social Preparation and Other BUB Preparatory Activities

- a) Conduct CSO mapping regularly. CSO mapping is an important step towards properly identifying the various (including LGU-accredited and non-LGU accredited) CSOs that are actively operating in the LGU. CSO mapping helps LGUs in targeting which CSOs need assistance to improve their involvement in the BUB.

- b) Promote the federation of CSOs belonging to the same sector. If one or more of the various sectors are represented by a multiple number of CSOs within the LGU, inviting all CSOs to the CSO assembly can be rather unwieldy. In this case, the basic sectors which are represented by several CSOs will tend to dominate the results of any voting. One way to address this possibility is by grouping the CSOs by sector during the CSO assembly itself. Another way is by helping the various CSOs belonging to any given sector to organize themselves into umbrella organizations or federation. If CSOs are organized by sector, each umbrella organization/ federation can organize a special assembly prior to the CSO assembly where (i) representatives to the main CSO assembly can be selected, and (ii) sectoral issues and the corresponding strategies/ solutions/ projects can be discussed by the CSOs belonging to the federation in preparation for the CSO assembly. Equal representation among sectors will, thus, be ensured while broad-based participation of all CSOs in the analyzing the problems and issues faced by the LGU, in general, and their sector, in particular, and identifying the appropriate strategies/ projects that the group as a whole want to bring up during the CSO assembly. This, however, would need the strengthening of horizontal relationship among CSOs belonging to the same sector.
- c) Encourage CSOs leaders to consult with the members of their organization. Some CSOs leaders note that only the head of the organizations (or their representatives) decide on what projects to propose during the CSO assembly and LPRAP workshop with little or no consultation and discussion among the members of the CSO.
- d) Enhance capacity CSOs to improve the quality of their participation in the BUB process. There is a need to upgrade the capability of CSOs to effectively engage with the LGU in local planning and budgeting. The technical capacity of CSOs on strategic planning so that they are better able to identify the solutions to the problems in the LGU and the corresponding projects that best correspond to their identified solutions needs to be strengthened. Likewise, there is a need to build up the capacity of CSOs in project development and project monitoring. The capacity development program for CSOs should include training on the drafting of project briefs/ proposals for various types of projects. There is also a need to link CSOs with competent providers of capacity development interventions and to explore alternative sources of financing for this effort.
- e) Ensure increased investment in social preparation to help improve quality of CSO and grassroots participation in the BUB process. Social preparation, however, is not cost-free and requires adequate time to be effective. Take for example the KC/ NCDDP where funds are allocated to finance the Community Empowerment Activity Cycle which involves series of barangay assemblies, purok-level/ barangay-level poverty situation analyses as well as training of community volunteers in project development, implementation and monitoring.
- f) Adopt the Enhanced BUB process in more areas but only to the extent that it is supported by the requisite social preparation, specifically the conduct of barangay level planning activities a la KC/ NCDDP. The KIIs and FGDs in a number of KC/ NCDDP areas (e.g., in Las Nieves, Libmanan and Mutia) suggest that where the KC/ NCDDP is working well

there is more genuine grassroots participation in local planning. KC/ NCDDP investment in social preparation is currently being harnessed under the BUB program. However, it is essential that LGUs which are new to the NCDDP program be given enough time to complete the CEAC before they are asked to adopt the Enhanced BUB process. Otherwise, LGUs may comply with the Enhanced BUB process only in form but not in substance.

- g) Improve the capacity and clarify the roles of the DILG-appointed community mobilizers. The experience of the 12 study sites covered under this study indicates that not all of the CMs are well-oriented on the details of the JMC. As a consequence, LGUs assigned to said ill-prepared CMs have had to contend with flawed interpretation of certain provisions of JMC 5- 2014.
- h) CMs should also be given proper orientation and training with respect to the conduct of the CSO mapping on a regular basis to ensure that the inventory of active CSOs in the LGU remains current. CMs may likewise be tasked to (i) administer client satisfaction survey of CSOs that have participated in the CSO assembly, (ii) help CSOs belonging to the same sector in federating themselves, and (iii) identify the training needs of the CSOs in their coverage areas.
- i) Establish and maintain barangay level data base at the LGU level and train LGU officials and CSO representatives how to use sub-LGU level data. Such data base will help LGUs better target where interventions are most needed. The most commonly used information system of this nature that is present in some of the study sites is the CBMS. While other systems (e.g., Registry of Barangay Inhabitants) are available in other LGUs, they are not always utilized for planning purposes.

2. Conduct of CSO Assembly

- j) Issue invitation two weeks prior to the actual conduct of the CSO assembly. KIIs and FGDs in the study site indicate that the short notice given for the conduct of the CSO assembly is one of the more prominent reasons why some of the CSO leaders fail to attend the CSO assembly.
- k) Provide the CSO representatives with logistical/ financial support to enable them to attend the CSO assembly and the LPRAP workshop. A few LGUs covered under this study have reimbursed the transportation expense incurred by CSO representatives who attended the CSO assembly for the FY 2016 planning cycle. However, this is not generally the case and lack of transportation money and loss of income continue to be the most common reasons given by CSOs for not being able to attend the CSO assembly.
- l) The CSO assembly should come up with a list of the projects they want included in the LPRAP. This will help ensure that the concerns of all CSOs, not just the CSOs whose leaders are elected as LPRAT members, are considered in the preparation of the LPRAP. Also, given the tendency of LPRAT members to disregard available demographic or poverty data and instead use their own felt needs to identify priority projects, it would be

better if project identification and prioritization is done during the CSO Assembly, where more participants are present and a more broad-based discussion on the urgency and relevance of the identified priority projects.

3. LPRAP Workshop

- m) BUB guidelines should clarify that only the elected members of the LPRAT should be involved in the prioritization of BUB projects. Opening the LPRAP workshop to CSOs leaders who were not elected to be members of the LPRAT makes project prioritization vulnerable to political interference.

4. Sub-project Implementation and Monitoring

- n) Continue to improve coordination between NGAs, LGUs and CSOs during sub-project implementation. As indicated earlier, poor coordination in project implementation between the NGAs/ LGUs, on the one hand, and CSOs, on the other hand, is (i) a major cause of the delay in the implementation of BUB sub-projects, and (ii) hampering the effective implementation of the sub-projects.
- o) Require LGUs to designate a BUB focal person who will be assigned to coordinate, and consolidate all BUB related activities.
- p) Require LGUs to create a BUB monitoring team (composed of CSOs and LGU officials) which will be task to monitor the status and implementation of all BUB sub-projects, to prepare and to submit a consolidated BUB monitoring report to the LPRAT on a quarterly basis. CSOs, especially those directly benefitting from BUB sub-projects, clearly have the incentive to be involved in monitoring the progress of project implementation and ensuring that said projects are implemented well. One way to finance the logistical and other requirements of the BUB monitoring team is by setting aside a certain portion of the LGU Counterpart Fund for this purpose.
- q) Conduct another meeting of CSO leaders, say 1-2 months, prior to the conduct of the CSO assembly in order to provide the venue for informing a broader CSO audience, not just the members of the LPRAT, about the status of BUB sub-project implementation. The reporting of the status of BUB sub-project implementation in a pre-CSO assembly meeting is desirable from the perspective of being able to provide CSOs with useful inputs that they can feedback to the members of their respective organizations as they prepare for the actual conduct of the CSO assembly.

- r) Significant disparity in the level of awareness regarding the status of sub- project implementation is evident among CSO representatives, including both LPRAT and non-LPRAT members. This situation is indicative of the absence of a mechanism to provide updates to key stakeholders. This situation has also resulted in some CSOs being disappointed about the BUB process. Under the current JMC, reporting of the status of BUB sub-project implementation is prescribed to be part of the agenda of the CSO assembly. Many CSO leaders report that the agenda of the CSO assembly is too packed to be completed in one day and, as a result, the reporting of the status of BUB sub-projects tends to be perfunctory for the most part.