

NGOs Participation in Local Governance in the Philippines

A thesis
submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Master of Arts in Political Science
in the
University of Canterbury
by
Carmelo Orbista

University of Canterbury

New Zealand

2012

ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with Local Government Unit - Nongovernmental Organizations (LGU-NGOs) partnership in local governance in the Philippines as embodied in the 1987 Philippine Constitution and the Local Government Code of 1991. The main objective is to examine the most effective relationship between the LGU and the NGOs as well as where collaboration is most necessary. This is undertaken by experimentally evaluating the validity of four hypotheses on LGU-NGOs relations. The first hypothesis is that effective LGU-NGOs relationships are hardly felt or visibly seen despite the existing mechanisms. The second hypothesis is that opportunities for NGOs to participate are great; however, participation has not been realized. The third hypothesis examines whether larger LGUs are more effective in addressing the needs of their constituents, taking into consideration the presence of NGOs as conduits between the LGUs and the ordinary citizens. The fourth hypothesis examines whether larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of the substantial resources and staff that they can utilize to reach out to them.

In case studies of two LGUs in the Philippines, one larger and one smaller, the evidence largely verified the first two hypotheses while the last two hypotheses established a conclusion. First, it is found that NGOs have not participated at all in the planning process, although a number of NGOs have been involved in the implementation of programs, projects and activities (PPAs), ordinary citizens do not feel there is an LGU-NGO partnership. Second, the Local Special Bodies (LSBs) do not regularly conduct the mandated meetings, so that the NGOs have not participated in basic policy-making processes in the LGUs. Resources of NGOs do not indicate effective participation although the LGUs utilize the NGOs in the implementation of PPAs. Third, although the smaller LGU provided money to a number of NGOs, this did not ensure their participation, which shows that the NGOs were not accountable for the money they were given. As expressed by ordinary citizens, both the LGUs and the NGOs engage in patronage and influence peddling in providing services. Fourth, the size of the LGU does not indicate effective cooperation with NGOs. Although NGOs in the larger municipality have stronger views than in the smaller municipality, size of the NGOs does not determine effective

participation. The size of the LGU does not matter in multi-sectoral policy making such as those in the Municipal Development Council (MDC) and Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC) since policy formulation is less focused and more complex and that seems to be introducing barriers to participation. Although sector-specific NGOs are more involved in the Municipal Health Board and Municipal School Board in the larger municipality, NGOs in the smaller municipality have a hard time participating.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The task of writing this thesis would not have been possible without the assistance of others in the course of researching and writing. First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my main supervisor, Associate Professor James Ockey. He gave excellent advice and was always patient in giving feedback and guidance from my Honours year to the completion of this thesis. Without him, this thesis would not have been possible. I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor. Alex Tan, my secondary supervisor, for his encouragement during the initial stages of my research.

A particular mention must be made of some very special people. I would like to thank Jill Dolby, who helped me in many ways throughout the years of my stay in the Department of Political Science. Many thanks also to my student adviser from the Student Support Office, Sissi Zhong, who was always generous in giving advises, whose patience never ends. Similar thanks also to Steve Harte of the Student Support Office. Likewise, to my Asian group for the company.

I am very grateful to the New Zealand Aid for International Development (NZ Aid), the Government of the Republic of the Philippines, and the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) for the opportunity to have studied the Bachelor of Arts with Honours major in Political Science and the Master of Arts in Political Science at the University of Canterbury. My gratitude also to Regional Director Evelyn A. Trompeta of DILG - Region VI, former DILG – Aklan Provincial Director Jenny D. Destua (retired) and to all my colleagues at DILG – Aklan for all the support and encouragement.

Many thanks also to my Filipino friends in Christchurch for all their support. Similarly, gratitude also goes to my friends in the Philippines for all the good wishes I received. Thank you also to Raijeli, for her guidance and encouragement especially during the initial year.

Finally, special thanks to my family, Mom and Dad, my brother and sisters, in-laws, nephews and nieces for their love and support. You are my inspiration. This is for you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Tables	vi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background on Local Government-NGO Partnership in the Philippines	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	11
1.3 Aims and Objectives	12
1.4 Significance of the Study	12
1.5 Structure of the Thesis	13
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE, DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESIS, METHODOLOGY	15
2.1 Literature Review	15
2.1.1 Decentralization	15
2.1.2 Citizen Participation	23
2.1.3 Local Government – NGO Collaboration	30
2.1.4 The Philippine Experience	33
2.2 Development of Hypothesis	45
2.3 Methodology	47
CHAPTER 3: MUNICIPALITY OF A	51
3.1 Profile	51
3.1.1 Municipal Profile	51
3.1.2 Organizational Structure and Leadership	55
3.1.3 Resources	56
3.1.4 Performance	56
3.1.5 The Local Special Bodies: Meetings and Output	59
3.2 Hypothesis 1	64
3.2.1 Analysis of Research Findings	82
3.3 Hypothesis 2	91
3.3.1 Analysis of Research Findings	104
3.4 Conclusion	114

CHAPTER 4: MUNICIPALITY OF B	117
4.1 Profile	117
4.1.1 Municipal Profile	117
4.1.2 Organizational Structure and Leadership	120
4.1.3 Resources	120
4.1.4 Performance	121
4.1.5 The Local Special Bodies: Meetings and Output	123
4.2 Hypothesis 1	126
4.2.1 Analysis of Research Findings	138
4.3 Hypothesis 2	148
4.3.1 Analysis of Research Findings	157
4.4 Conclusion	165
CHAPTER 5: COMPARISON OF A LARGER AND A SMALLER MUNICIPALITY	169
5.1 Comparative Profile	169
5.1.1 Municipal Profile	169
5.1.2 Local Government Personnel	172
5.1.3 Local Government Resources	173
5.2 Hypothesis 3	174
5.2.1 Municipality of A	174
5.2.2 Municipality of B	183
5.2.3 Analysis of Research Findings	188
5.3 Hypothesis 4	201
5.3.1 Municipality of A	201
5.3.2 Municipality of B	204
5.3.3 Analysis of Research Findings	206
5.4 Conclusion	210
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	212
APPENDICES	220
BIBLIOGRAPHY	234

TABLES

Table 3.1: Local Special Bodies (Municipality of A) – July 2010 – August 2011	85
Table 3.2: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) statements on how effective are the services they deliver with the LGU	86
Table 3.3: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) – Participation and Resources	107
Table 3.4: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) – Interaction with the Citizens	109
Table 4.1: Local Special Bodies (Municipality of A) – July 2010 – June 2011	143
Table 4.2: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) statements on how effective are the services they deliver with the LGU	144
Table 4.3: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) – Participation and Resources	160
Table 4.4: Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) – Interaction with the Citizens	162
Table 5.1: Non-Government Organizations: Comparison – culled-out Tables 3.3 and 4.3	190
Table 5.2: Several NGOs with Vision, Mission, Goal or Objective vis-à-vis LGU Vision/Strategic Direction	192
Table 5.3: Non-Government Organizations – Participation, Resources and Opinion	195

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Background on Local Government-NGO Partnership in the Philippines

Decentralization entails a lot of implications in modern society. The common assertion is that decentralization places decision-making closer to the people. It encourages a culture of participatory governance and becomes more responsive to local needs. The numbers of countries that have made efforts to decentralize government services has increased in the last few decades. Countries receiving international assistance have also been pressured by donors (such as World Bank, the European Union, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, among others) to decentralize in order to improve the delivery of public services in terms of responsiveness, effectiveness and efficiency. Factors behind decentralization tend to be related to trends worldwide and thinking that development should not be a top down process but rather that it requires community involvement and motivation. Further, governments are decentralizing with the aim of improving local government administration and performance in an attempt to be less bureaucratic. There is also a realization that centrally administered programs do not always provide for effective delivery at the local level as they do not take into account local needs and characteristics in the planning process.

Thus, the current thinking is, to more effectively deliver services, there is a need to involve the citizens, both in decision-making and implementation, to do away with too much bureaucracy and to immediately address urgent problems and local aspirations. Citizens in a lot of countries have organized themselves and have now become more participative and assertive, especially on social, economic, environmental and political issues. They work together through nongovernmental organizations to influence the decision-making process especially when the issue at stake directly relates to them. Citizen participation democratizes the system of government as it increases transparency in the decision-making process. If citizens are involved they will be able to hold government officials more accountable for their decisions in policy

development. Every citizen should participate in the decision-making processes because, in one way or another, he or she will be influenced by the policies implemented by the government.

For a few decades now, non-governmental organizations have seen an unprecedented growth as citizens with common interests organize themselves and take part in the decision-making processes in the government in a voluntary capacity. The fundamental principle behind this phenomenon is that the citizens aim to bring their concerns to the government through non-governmental organizations which thus advocate for the realization of their aspirations and needs in the monitoring of policies and in the provision of information to encourage participation. Non-governmental organizations have become appropriate channels for the citizens to reach out to the government and at the same time for the government to reach out to those who are most in need.

The decentralization of authority to local governments and the growing capacity and stability of community-level non-governmental organizations have the potential to boost the ability of community residents to control their lives and improve their communities. Through participatory decision-making processes involving the local government and the non-governmental organizations that represent the citizens, the planning and administration of programs tend to become responsive and the delivery effective responds to the aspirations of the citizens and at the same time motivates them to take part and eventually empowers them.

In the Philippines, several avenues have been provided under existing statutes and policies for effective participation of non-governmental organizations in local governance. The primary law which defined NGO participation in the structure of local government is the Local Government Code which took effect in 1991. Historically, at the time of the enactment of the law the Philippines had recently emerged from twenty years of autocratic rule under the Marcos regime where governance was centralized. The essence of the law is democratization at the local level which particularly gives the citizens a voice in decision-making based on local needs and aspirations.

The Republic of the Philippines today is a democratic country. The '70s and the '80s were the most turbulent years under the Marcos dictatorship, especially when martial law was declared in 1972 thereby giving the citizens limited rights to enjoy freedom and to participate in governance at all levels. Freedom was curtailed and the writ of habeas corpus was suspended all over the country. In those years silence was the only means for the citizenry to survive. Towards the end of the Marcos era, a significant number of cause-oriented groups arose to fight the dictatorial regime. The groups surfaced to recompense the government's failure to address the deteriorating socio-economic conditions. In fact, the 60s and 70s generated student movements and engendered the well-founded belief that they are the first NGO leaders who worked with labor unions and poor urban communities.

In 1979, a law had been passed providing for sectoral representation in agricultural and industrial sectors in city and municipal councils to be appointed by the President of the Philippines. Subsequently, a Local Government Code was enacted in 1983 during the time of Marcos to pursue local autonomy, but obviously genuine autonomy cannot be realistically implemented in an authoritarian regime, which retained the provisions of the previous law on sectoral representation. Unlike the Local Government Code of 1991 which provides for citizen participation in the decision-making processes through the local special bodies (not in the local legislative body where the membership thereof is elected) the earlier laws do not have such provisions.

The assassination of Marcos' foremost political opponent and critic in 1983, Senator Ninoy Aquino, became the triggering factor for the Filipino people to cry out for justice as all fingers pointed to Marcos as the one responsible for the assassination. Due to widespread demand for a change in leadership as triggered by the Aquino assassination, Marcos called for a snap election in 1986. Marcos ran against Cory Aquino, the widow of Ninoy Aquino. Marcos won by a very slim margin but there was considerable doubt as to his legitimacy due to alleged widespread cheating, massive vote buying and coercion. A coup d'état immediately followed, led by two high ranking military men, which was widely supported by the Filipino people all

over the country and which thereafter installed Aquino in power and ended the 20 year dictatorship. The uprising is now popularly known as people power movement.

In 1986, Aquino initiated the creation of the Constitutional Commission which was tasked to revise the 1971 Constitution (more popularly known as the Marcos Constitution upon which the declaration of martial law was based). Thereafter, the 1987 Philippine Constitution was overwhelmingly ratified which included provisions on social, economic, moral and political reforms, among others.

Among the reforms that the constitution provided was local autonomy. Also embodied in the Constitution is the duty of the State to institutionalize the role of NGOs in Philippine development. Thus, there are provisions in the Constitution which specifically relate that the state shall encourage non-government, community-based, or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation (Article II, Section 23). The state shall also respect the role of independent people's organizations to pursue legitimate and collective interests and aspirations through peaceful and lawful means (Article XIII, Section 15). The Constitution has also vested the right to the people and their organizations to effectively and reasonably participate at all levels of social, political and economic decision-making and establish adequate consultation mechanisms thereof (Article XIII, Section 16).

A governing law was thereafter enacted by Congress in 1991, called Republic Act No. 7160, which is also known as the Local Government Code of 1991. The Code serves as the operative act of decentralization, the first of its kind in the history of governance in the Philippines. Local autonomy is the main focus of decentralization and one of its operative principles is the participation of the NGOs in local governance as an alternative strategy for sustainable development.

Salient features of the Local Government Code of 1991 focus on the relations of the local government units (LGUs) with Nongovernmental Organization (NGOs), and include linkages as well as assistance to such NGOs. Thus, to become active partners in the pursuit of local

autonomy, LGUs are mandated to promote the establishment and operation of people's and nongovernmental organizations (Section 34). They may also enter into joint ventures in the delivery of certain basic services, capability building and livelihood projects, among others (Section 35). LGUs may also provide assistance, financial or otherwise, to such groups (Section 36).

In the Philippines there are four kinds of LGUs: province, city, municipality and barangay. The promotion of general welfare is the essence of the powers granted to such LGUs.. As such, they shall ensure and support the “preservation and enrichment of culture, promote health and safety, enhance the right of the people to a balanced ecology, encourage and support the development of appropriate and self-reliant scientific and technological capabilities, improve public morals, enhance economic prosperity and social justice, promote full employment among their residents, maintain peace and order, and preserve the comfort and convenience of their inhabitants” (Section 16, Local Government Code of 1991).

Spelled out specifically in the Code is the creation or organization by the LGUs of the mandated local special bodies (LSBs), namely:

1. Local Development Council
2. Local Peace and Order Council
3. Local Health Board
4. Local School Board
5. Prequalification, Bids and Awards Committee (PBAC) (Local Government Code of 1991)

In the municipality, Section 106 of the Local Government Code provides for the creation of the Municipal Development Council (MDC) to initiate the formulation of a comprehensive multi-sectoral development plan to be approved by the Sanggunian (local legislative body). It shall assist the Sanggunian in setting the direction of economic and social development, and coordinating development efforts in the municipality. Its functions include the formulation of

development plans and policies, prioritization of development programs and projects and coordinating, monitoring and evaluating such programs and projects, and formulating investment incentives, among others. The MDC is mandated to meet at least once every six months or as often as may be necessary (Section 109).

The MDC is composed of the following:

- Chairman – Municipal Mayor
- Members – All punong barangays (barangay chairmen) in the municipality
 - Chairman of the committee of appropriations of the sangguniang bayan (local legislative body at the municipal level)
 - Representative of the congressman
 - Representatives of **nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)** operating in the municipality who shall constitute not less than one-fourth (1/4) of the members of the fully organized council

Section 98 of the Local Government Code of 1991 provides for the creation of the Municipal School Board in every municipality. The functions of the Municipal School Board include the determination of the annual supplementary budgetary needs for the operation and maintenance of public schools within the municipality, authorize the municipal treasurer to disburse funds from the special education fund of the municipality, serve as advisory committee to the sangguniang bayan on educational matters, and recommend changes in the names of public schools to the sangguniang bayan. The board shall meet once a month or as often as may be necessary.

Its composition includes:

- Co-chairmen - Municipal Mayor and District Supervisor of Schools

- Members - Chairman of the education committee of the
sangguniang bayan
Municipal Treasurer
Representative of the pederasyon ng mga sangguniang
kabataan in the sangguniang bayan (federation of
youth councils in the municipal level)
President of the municipal federation of **parents-teachers
and community associations**
Representative of the teachers' organization in the municipality
Representative of the non-academic personnel of public schools

The Municipal Health Board is established under Section 102 of the Local Government Code of 1991. The Municipal Health Board is tasked to propose to the sangguniang bayan, in accordance with the criteria set by the Department of Health, annual budgetary allocations for the operation and maintenance of health facilities and services within the municipality, and to serve as advisory body of the sangguniang bayan on health matters including appropriations for health purposes. The board shall meet once a month or as often as may be necessary.

Its composition includes:

- Chairman - Municipal Mayor
Vice Chairman - Municipal Health Officer
Members - Chairman of the health committee of the
sangguniang bayan
- Representative from the **private sector or
NGOs** involved in health services
- Representative of the Department of Health

The establishment of the Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC) under Section 116 of the Local Government Code of 1991 is a reiteration of a previous policy which is Executive

Order No. 309 issued by then President Corazon C. Aquino during her transition government in 1987 as far as composition and functions are concerned. Executive Order No. 309 has been amended by Executive Order No. 773 on January 2009 by President Gloria M. Arroyo which enumerated the new composition and the corresponding functions of the council. The MPOC is a body that is tasked to provide a forum for dialogue and deliberation of major issues and problems affecting peace and order including insurgency, recommend measures to improve and enhance peace and order and public safety in the municipality, converge and orchestrate internal security operations of civil authorities and agencies and of military and police, apply moral suasion and/or recommend sanctions against local chief executives who are giving material and political support to communist rebels, monitor the provision of livelihood and infrastructure development programs and projects in the remote rural and indigenous population areas, and perform all other functions assigned by law, by the President or the National Peace and Order Council (Executive Order No. 773).

The composition of the MPOC under EO 773 is the following:

Chairman	-	Municipal Mayor
Vice Chairman	-	Vice Mayor
Members	-	Representative of the sangguniang bayan Chief of Police Representative/s of the Department of Education Three (3) representatives from the private sector
Secretariat Head	-	Representative of the DILG (Department of the Interior and Local Government)

The outputs expected from the local special bodies include the comprehensive development plan (CDP) and annual investment plan (AIP) for the Municipal Development Council, the integrated area community public safety plan (IACPSP) for the Municipal Peace and Order Council, the proper utilization of the special education fund (SEF) for the Municipal

School Board, and the provision of responsive and comprehensive health services for the Municipal Health Board.

All the above LSBs have the mandated representation of NGOs to ensure citizen participation in the participatory planning process of the LGUs as well as in the implementation of programs, projects and activities. PBAC has since been amended by a new law, Republic Act No. 9184 or the Government Procurement Act, which excluded NGOs in its composition. Bottom to top planning is the gist of the Local Government Code of 1991 which means that planning should begin from the smallest LGU up to the national government.

The Local Government Code of 1991 furthered the aim of the 1987 Philippine Constitution of establishing a role for “people power” at the local level by establishing a process of accreditation on NGOs and people’s organizations (POs) (Asian Development Bank 2007). The Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), which is tasked to supervise the local government units, issued Memorandum Circulars on the process of accreditation of NGOs and POs in reiteration of the requirement provided by the Local Government Code of 1991. Memorandum Circulars of this nature are issued after the last local election is conducted or at the start of the term of the newly elected officials. Local special bodies are mandated under the Local Government Code of 1991 to be reorganized once the newly elected officials are in place. Local special bodies are co-terminus to the term of the local chief executive. In July 2001 and 2007, and in August 4, 2010, DILG issued Memorandum Circular 2001-89, 2007-81 and 2010-73, respectively, which specifically provided for guidelines in the accreditation of NGOs, POs and other organized groups, and in the selection of their representatives to the local special bodies. The circulars mandated the Municipal Mayor to conduct through the Municipal Planning and Development Office an inventory of “all POs, NGOs, and business and professional groups, or the updating of such inventory, if already available, within the local government unit.” The sangguniang bayan, thru the presiding officer, shall then issue a Notice of Call for Accreditation to every organization listed in the directory, whether accredited previously or seeking accreditation for the first time.

The circulars serve as a guide to officially require local government units to comply with the provision of the Local Government Code of 1991 on the process of accreditation. It has been observed that a substantial number of local government units do not conform to the requirement of the law by simply designating NGO representatives to the local special bodies without going through the process of accreditation, just for compliance. As a result, some of those who get designated to the local special bodies are NGO representatives who are friendly to the local administration or some lack the expertise to represent thereby defeating the purpose of participatory democracy at the local level. As such, sanctions have been provided by the Memorandum Circular for local government officials who do not comply with the accreditation process.

Within fifteen (15) days after the accreditation process, the DILG officer assigned in the municipality shall call for a meeting with the duly authorized representatives of all accredited organizations where such groups shall choose from among themselves the representative-organizations to the local special bodies. The same memorandum reiterated the provision of the Local Government Code of 1991 which mandates that “in no case shall an organization or a representative thereof be a member of more than one (1) local special body.” The NGO representatives are appointed by the municipal mayor.

This thesis will focus on NGOs based in Local Government Units (LGUs) that are members of the Local Special Bodies (LSBs). In recent times organizations outside of the government have been referred to as Civil Society Organizations (CSO) which include NGOs among its types; however as Songco (2006) explained it will create more confusion than enlightenment to those who are not conversant in this sector of Philippine society trying to understand the nomenclature and typology of Philippine civil society. So the term NGOs instead of CSOs will be employed to refer to all non-state actors and in its broadest sense including people’s organizations, civic organizations, cooperatives, social movements, professional associations, industry associations, among others, or those groups who mostly deal with the underprivileged and marginalized who are more politically inclined from the academe, church, media and business who are either concerned with sectoral or broad public interest (Constantino-

David, 1997, cited in Songco, 2006). Consequently, the term NGO shall be used in coherence with the aforementioned provisions of the Constitution and the Local Government Code of 1991.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

NGO - local government relations are geared towards providing a collaborative mechanism to bring about effective local development efforts. The essence of collaboration is to have an efficient and effective delivery of services at the local level which is responsive to the needs and aspirations of the citizens. In theory, the effectiveness of the collaboration between the two sectors can be deduced from interviews and focus group discussions and from the outcome of their performance. However, it seems that the planning and implementation of programs, projects and activities that require NGO – local government collaboration cannot be felt by the citizens or there is no concrete proof of their output. If in the planning process there is effective collaboration there would be little hindrance in the implementation. The interrelations of program planning, implementation and monitoring efforts cannot be said to be effective because of the intangible output or the lack of it, which leads us to these questions:

Should NGOs exert more effort to participate?

Should local government units be more open to the idea of collaboration?

In order to gain answers to support the general questions, the following sub-questions must be answered first:

1. What relationship is most effective between the local government units and the NGOs in the Philippines? In what aspect of partnership is collaboration most necessary?
2. Are there meaningful participatory opportunities available for NGOs? If yes, what is the extent of participation of the NGOs? If no, what impedes the participation of the NGOs?

3. Does size of the local government unit matter to establish effective partnership in all aspects of collaboration and service delivery?

For question 1, we will hypothesize that mechanisms are in place to establish an effective LGU-NGO relationship but this is hardly felt or visibly seen.

For question 2, we will hypothesize based on the Local Government Code of 1991 that the opportunities for NGOs to participate are great however this has not been realized.

For question 3, we will hypothesize that the larger the local government unit the more effective it is to address the needs of its constituents considering the greater resources available to them. Also, larger LGUs may be more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of the substantial resources and manpower that they can utilize to reach out to them. However, we note that the larger the municipality the bigger the responsibility as well in contrast to that of the small municipality.

1.3 Aims and Objectives

The thesis will seek to answer a number of questions posed in the statement of the problem. Foremost is the need to examine the most effective relationship between the LGU and the NGOs as well as where collaboration is most necessary. It is also necessary to consider the extent of participation of NGOs and the factors leading to the kind of relationship that is most effective between the LGUs and the NGOs. There is also a need to consider the application of the Local Government Code of 1991 as the governing law which promotes and prescribes LGU-NGO partnership and to examine the participatory opportunities available for NGOs. Where such opportunities are effectively availed of by them it is necessary to consider the outcome or result. On the other hand, where there have been participatory opportunities yet they were not availed of effectively there is a need to discover the underlying factors. Lastly, the size of the local government unit shall also be considered, whether collaboration could be dependent on it, and whether that helps reveal the underlying causes that may lead to more effective collaboration.

1.4 Significance of the Study

As noted above, the Local Government Code of 1991 has been the primary law which provides for effective citizen participation in local governance in the Philippines. This research will shed light on the actual relationship between the local government units and the NGOs and whether it differs according to the size of the local government unit and the participatory opportunities available for NGOs as well as the extent of their participation.

In terms of research significance to the Philippines, the findings of the study may be utilized for improving the participation and relationship of LGU-NGOs and helping them identify their strengths and weaknesses to improve their partnership. Furthermore, the results will provide the legislators with information and ideas regarding the current state of LGU-NGO partnership in local governance that may result in improvement of the Local Government Code of 1991. The LGU-NGO may ultimately derive benefits from the results of the study by understanding better the extent of partnership that they may have in program planning, implementation, and monitoring. Researchers may find the information valuable as it may provide an important contribution to the literature on decentralization, especially on the Philippine experience and it may serve as guide in undertaking similar studies.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

This first chapter comprises the introductory part of the thesis which brings out the general setting of the research particularly a brief history of decentralization in the Philippines and the participatory opportunities provided for the citizens. The second chapter reviews related literature to identify critical points of current information on decentralization. This chapter will commence with a review of the motivations behind the decentralization efforts around the world and the corresponding efforts in the Philippines which resulted in the enactment of the Local Government Code of 1991. Finally, the hypothesis and methodology used for the research will be discussed. Chapter 3 sets out the profile of a larger municipality relating to the hypothesis on the relationships of the LGU and the NGOs and the opportunities available to NGOs considering the mechanisms provided by the Local Government Code of 1991. Chapter 4 sets out the profile of a smaller municipality relating to the same hypothesis as the larger municipality spelled out in Chapter 3. The fifth chapter provides a comparison between a larger and smaller municipality,

whether the resources may have a bearing in the partnership and in the effective delivery of services such that the larger the municipality the greater the resources would be and thus they become more effective in addressing the needs of constituents in contrast to the smaller municipality. Also, whether a larger municipality is more effective in cooperating with NGOs in contrast to the smaller municipality, or they may have the same consequences and no difference at all. The concluding chapter draws conclusions from the findings of the study.

This chapter has provided a glimpse of the motivations behind the decentralization efforts in the Philippines and the mechanisms set out by the 1987 Philippine Constitution and the Local Government Code of 1991 on citizen participation through non-governmental organizations. We now turn in to Chapter 2 for the review of related literature, the development of hypothesis and the methodology used for the research.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature, Development of Hypothesis, Methodology

This chapter aims to review critical points of current information on decentralization. Consequently, the review will delve into one of the leading ideas in the concept of decentralization which is citizen participation in local governance. The process of decentralization and the notion of citizen participation in local governance as an offshoot of decentralization shall be shown as well as the corresponding efforts in the Philippines. According to Work (2002), decentralization brings decision-making closer to the people and therefore yields programmes and services that better address local needs. Consequently, active participation of the community may indicate effective delivery of services. Thus, the development of hypotheses shall be anchored towards the idea of decentralization in the Philippines as applied specifically in the local governments; and their practices aimed at involving the citizens through non-government organizations in collaboration and in the effective delivery of services. Likewise, the methodology applied in gathering data in the Philippines and in the analysis will be outlined.

2.1 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.1 Decentralization

In the 1950s, control over development activities in developing countries was generally centralized in the national government through its ministries and agencies. The idea was in tune with the major theories in the 1940s that required strong intervention in investment and production processes by national governments such that economic development theorists called for centrally conceived and comprehensive plans for national development. Economic development theorists in the 1950s and 1960s advocated industrialization policies that were capital-intensive aimed at maximizing gains in the gross national product. Thus, central planning was initiated in most developing countries in the 1950s as a means of providing rational policies

for using limited resources effectively to promote rapid growth in industrial output. International assistance agencies such as the World Bank prescribed central planning as a way of innovation, of hastening social and political change, of generating employment, and of mobilizing capital for more investment. The advantages of industrial investment would spread throughout the economies of developing nations to alleviate poverty and generate income and savings. Hence savings that would be mobilized as capital would be reinvested thus enlarging production and employment, increasing incomes, involving larger numbers of people into productive activities, and eventually motivating poor societies into a condition of sustainable economic growth. Central planning and administration were considered indispensable to guide and control the economy and to amalgamate and solidify nations that were emerging from long periods of colonial rule. Moreover, central control was inherent in the requirements of the international assistance agencies that were providing large amounts of capital during the 1950s and 1960s such that borrowers must have comprehensive and long-term plans of the investment of external capital (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983). In this period, developing countries indulged in centralization as advocated by economic development theorists and also to comply with the prerequisite prescribed by international assistance agencies in their development activities, most particularly in the generation of capital. Centralization became the battlecry to curb poverty through generation of much needed income and savings by utilizing limited resources effectively to promote growth in industrial output. Consequently, the outcome foreseen was to address poverty by leading the poor towards sustainable economic growth, to eventually achieve a level of sustainability towards economic prosperity.

Centralization has its drawbacks. First, there is a concentration of power at the top as the government structures draw representatives from affluent regions and sections of the community thereby leaving weaker sections unrepresented and resulting in unequal distribution of power among people. Second, as there is not much scope for people participation in decision-making, implementation becomes weak, since there is no motivation for people to cooperate. In addition, the involvement of non-government organizations (NGOs) and people's organizations, which is most likely to happen at the grassroots level, would help mobilize resources such as voluntary

labor for development and would facilitate monitoring in the implementation process (Aziz, A. and Arnold, D.D., 1996).

However, it was widely recognized that central planning had not achieved these goals at the end of the 1960s. Economic growth remained slow in most developing countries and the gap between the rich and the poor had widened in many countries. The living standards in the least developed nations had declined, and the number of people living in what World Bank officials called “absolute poverty” was increasing. Thus the idea of decentralization came into the picture upon a realization during the 1970s that central control and management of the economies of developing nations did not ensure rapid economic growth and that few countries could easily follow the prerequisites made by economic theorists and international assistance organizations (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983:11).

Directions of development policy shifted radically during the 1970s as questions came into being on many of the basic premises of development theory. The concept of development was widened beyond that of maximizing economic growth as a primary objective. Policymakers became aware that development requires a basic transformation in social, economic, and political structures that enables poor people to help themselves to increase their productivity and incomes. Policies were designed deliberately and carefully to broaden the benefits of growth to increasing numbers of the poor in developing nations, and ways had to be introduced to increase participation of the poor in decisions affecting them (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983).

In essence, governments of developing countries and international development organizations began giving increased attention to the basic needs of the poor so that they could become more productive members in the development process. At the same time they recognized that increasing the income and purchasing power of the rural population would build stronger and more self-reliant local economies. It was argued that greater equity in the distribution of income and wealth required wider involvement in the economic, social, and political practices through which wealth was generated and distributed. Central planning was thought to be

inappropriate for promoting equitable growth and self sufficiency among low-income groups and communities within developing societies as central planning had become a vehicle for an elite group of political leaders, economists, technicians, and administrators to preempt decision-making and prescribe for government agencies, private organizations, and local communities a course of action that reflected their own values and priorities (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983). Central planning subsequently was used to set criteria for others to follow rather than facilitating the course of action that would be planned and carried out by those who were to benefit from development.

The theoretical perspective of decentralization is derived from the assumption that participatory decision-making best ensures the well-being of those who are likely to be affected. The rationale is drawn from the political or democratic imperative that those who are affected ought to take part in the decision-making process to ensure that decisions are consistent with the public good. Under a decentralized system there are positive results which would be realized, since the representation would come from all sections of the community, the power structure would not be all that unequal and the articulation of local needs and aspirations from people of varying background would be more probable (Aziz, A. and Arnold, D.D., 1996).

Decentralization has been aptly defined by Rondinelli and Cheema (1983:18) as “the transfer of planning, decision-making, or administrative authority from the central government to its field organizations, local administrative units, semi-autonomous and parastatal organizations, local governments, or nongovernmental organizations.” As Smith (1985) puts it, decentralization means both reversing the concentration of administration at a single center and conferring powers to local government. The demand for decentralization arises simply for reasons of practical administration since all sectors of the community will come to be represented and is now widely regarded as a necessary condition for social, economic and political development.

Rondinelli and Cheema (1983:18) went on to identify the four major forms of decentralization: “deconcentration, delegation to semi-autonomous or parastatal agencies, devolution to local governments, and transfer of functions from public to nongovernmental

organizations or debureaucratization". Decentralization is the shifting of responsibility from the central government agency to its field offices without transferring to them the authority to make decisions or to exercise discretion in carrying them out. Delegation to semi-autonomous or parastatal agencies includes the delegation of decision-making and management authority for specific functions to organizations that are not under the direct control of central government agencies. Devolution is when the central government relinquishes certain functions or creates new units of government that are outside its direct control. It allows the local government units to be autonomous, independent, and clearly perceived as separate levels of government over which central authorities exercise little or no direct control, provides clear and legally recognized geographical boundaries within which they exercise authority and perform public functions, and confers corporate status and the power to secure resources to perform their functions. Debureaucratization takes place through the transfer of some responsibility, or of public functions, from government to voluntary, private, or non-government institutions. The government transfers responsibilities to or shares them with organizations that represent various interests in society such as farmer's cooperatives, credit associations, mutual aid societies, village development organizations, trade unions, or women and youth clubs (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983).

Shepard (1975, cited in Smith, 1985) declared that decentralization is not merely the opposite of centralization and therefore cannot be assumed to remedy its defects. It is commonly associated with a wide range of economic, social, and political objectives in both developed and less-developed societies. He went on to say that decentralization would improve the efficiency with which demands for locally provided services are expressed and public goods provided. It is also said to reduce costs, improve outputs and more effectively utilize human resources (D.K. Hart, 1972 cited in Smith, 1985). Politically, decentralization is said to strengthen accountability, political skills and national integration and to bring government closer to the people. Better services are provided to client groups, and liberty, equality and welfare is promoted (Maas, 1959; D. M. Hill, 1974, cited in Smith, 1985). Decentralization becomes a training ground for citizen participation and political leadership, both local and national, and a guardian of basic human values (van Putten, 1971 cited in Smith 1985).

Other than those that Smith cited, there are varying arguments according to Rondinelli (1983) that have been made for decentralizing development planning and administration in developing countries. These arguments recognized that decentralization can be a means to delegate authority to officials working in the field who are closer to the problem and to cut enormous amounts of red tape from the overconcentration of power, authority and resources in the national capital. Closer contact between government officials and the local population would allow both to obtain better information to formulate more realistic and effective plans and allow better political and administrative access for national government policies in remote areas. Decentralization could also allow greater representation for various political, religious, ethnic, and tribal groups in decision-making that could lead to greater equity in the allocation of government resources and investments. It could also develop the managerial and technical skills of local officials. Activities of various central government agencies involved in development could also be coordinated more effectively with each other and with those of local leaders and nongovernmental organizations within various regions. Decentralization can facilitate exchange of information about local needs and channel political demands from the local community to national agencies. Local government units may have greater opportunities to initiate innovations without having to justify them for the whole country and if the experiment fails their impacts are limited to small jurisdictions; however, if innovations succeed they can be replicated in other areas of the country (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983).

There are also many critics of decentralization. Smith (1985) acknowledges that decentralization appears to be parochial and separatist as it threatens the unity of the general will, it reinforces narrow, sectional interests and it is anti-egalitarian through its support for regional variation in the provision of public goods. In addition, Kothari (1996) expressed that if power is decentralized it may end up in the hands of the dominant groups who may try to advance their own interests such that local elites would rule and in due time might challenge state authority and jeopardize public policy designed to benefit the people at large.

Effective service delivery is one motivation behind decentralization efforts. There are two reasons for this. First, basic services such as health, education, water and sanitation which are the responsibility of the state, are systematically failing. Second, these services are consumed locally (Ahmad, Devarajan, Khemani and Shah 2005). There are also varied reasons for these reforms, some countries are emerging from dictatorships seeking to disperse power among smaller government units, and others seek to increase public involvement and accountability in government decision-making. Decentralization promotes democracy in many ways. It allows people to participate more effectively in local affairs, local leaders can be held increasingly accountable for decisions that affect citizens' lives, and citizens and their elected leaders gain experience in the practice of democracy (Center for Democracy and Governance, 2000:5). Across the Asia Pacific region, central – local relations are being reconfigured in many different ways. The site for effective governance is now overwhelmingly regarded to be in the local and sub-national areas. Better service delivery, private enterprise promotion and the exercise of new forms of participation and citizenship are emerging throughout the region (Wescott and Porter, 2001, p. 1).

However, problems associated with decentralization have begun to emerge like the lack of capacity of local governments to exercise responsibility for public services, misaligned responsibilities due to political reasons, the possibility of political capture and a host of other problems not associated with service delivery (Ahmad et al 2005). There are also some potential disadvantages to decentralization; wealthy localities take advantage of their new autonomy to push further ahead of low-income areas, increased local authority may in some communities allow elites to dominate politics, when financial oversight is weak it can lead to corruption, and local service delivery may deteriorate where financial and administrative capacity is weak (Center for Democracy and Governance, 2000, p.2).

Consequently, Work (2002) aptly observed that decentralization is a complex process that goes far beyond structural reforms. It tends to address problems or issues of poverty, gender equality, environment, health, education and technology. It affects government and the civil service but it becomes conditional on the involvement of community organizations, the private

sector, international aid organizations and the citizens. Ideally, as part of the process of decentralization, policy-makers and politicians (including in this sense, the local government officials) formulate programmes to increase citizen participation, to promote advocacy groups and to include women and the poor in decision-making. They also formulate programmes and initiatives that assist in poverty reduction, address environmental problems, encourage and strengthen local autonomy and ingenuity in addressing local needs. Community participation and encouraging grassroots development gives a boost in the sustainability of programmes and the improvement of quality of life. Involvement of stakeholders in prioritizing programmes and projects increases interest and gives the stakeholders a sense of ownership, thus promoting sustainability. Essentially, ensuring the culture of participatory democracy shall guarantee accountability of local government officials and enhance the delivery of services.

In conclusion, centralization was introduced with the aim of curbing poverty; however the goals set were not achieved because it was realized that development is not only about maximizing economic growth but also about transforming the social, economic, and political structures that would enable the poor to help themselves to increase their productivity and incomes. Policies had to be designed to increase the participation of the poor in decisions affecting them. Reforms were implemented and the planning and decision-making processes had to be decentralized. For these efforts, decentralization has been aptly defined to be the transfer of planning, decision-making and authority from the central government to field organizations, local administrative units, semi-autonomous and parastatal organizations, local governments and non-government organizations. Further, a theoretical perspective is derived upon assumption that decentralization through participatory decision-making ensures the well-being of those who are to be affected. In essence, decentralization reverses the concentration of administration from the center, conferring it on the local government. Decentralization would improve the efficiency of provision of public goods and allows the demands for services to be more easily expressed. It also strengthens the accountability and political skills of local government officials. It could also become a training ground for citizen participation and political leadership.

On the other hand, critics have averred that decentralization appears to be parochial and separatist, or that dominant groups may try to advance their own interests. Experiences from several countries have identified issues such as in India where decentralization led to increased local politicking, and the strength of organized pressure groups with vested interests determined the extent to which administration could be decentralized, or in Sri Lanka where members of the parliament wielded considerable influence over projects financed by a decentralized budget (Mathur, 1983). In Bangladesh, the functions and structure of the local government neither represent nor serve the interests of the general public as the wealthy elites dominate as reflected in the structure and the local governments have not emerged as decentralized participatory, self-governing units meant to serve the interests of the people (Khan, 1996). Decentralization is indeed a complex process. However, while issues are identified there is a continuing process to reform and address these issues.

2.1.2 Citizen Participation

Participation encompasses a lot of meanings in contemporary society. Many governments promoting cross-cultural dimensions have initiated policies for citizen participation. Some recognized the need for their own convenience while others recognized the need based on history and experience. In a fast changing world and considering the issues that confront the world today, collective efforts in all aspects of society are a must, which should serve as a weapon against all forms of threat (social, economic, political, and environmental, among others) towards continuous development and harmony. Social movements in the 70s and the 80s provided the motivation for the promotion of participatory democracy and their ongoing participation is an indication that democratic ideals are evolving and very much working today.

The essence of participation is captured in Midgley's comment that it "not only humanizes the bureaucracy, but strengthens the capacities of individuals and communities to mobilize and help themselves. In this way, dependence on the state is minimized and ordinary people rediscover their potential for cooperation and mutual endeavor (1986:8)." The ultimate goal is for the citizens to become self-reliant and not be dependent on the state or government.

Empowerment of the citizenry lessens bureaucracy in government, improves and encourages participatory delivery of basic services and leaders tend to be more aware of their responsibility. Local resources can be easily mobilized and the needs of the citizenry are more easily identifiable. The participatory approach in decision-making makes people feel more fulfilled, which results in a heightened sense of community and a strengthening of community bonds. In deliberative democracy, Ife and Tesoriero (2006:149-150) elucidated, the government engages the citizens in the formulation of a plan or proposal instead of simply asking them to comment after it has been developed. The citizens become part of the planning process through consultations and eventually seek the wisdom and experience of the community.

In the mid-1970s, Cohen and Uphoff (1980, cited in Cornwall 2002) noted that citizen participation first caught the attention of mainstream development agencies on how to make their interventions more effective. However, by the early 1980s, Bamberger (1986, cited in Cornwall 2002) said that community participation had come to be associated with the sharing of benefits with the poor, with project efficiency and effectiveness, and with cost sharing, but, as Paul (1987) puts it, with little attention to the empowerment or capacity building goals that were on the self-reliance agenda in the 1970s. Beneficiary participation was a matter of practicality rather than applying the principle of cost-effectiveness and compliance, and one of the best ways to do this was by getting local people organised so that they could have some input into project identification and implementation. The era of the 1980s gave rise to the establishment of new local level institutions that continued to multiply in the 1990s, thus crowding the local institutional landscape. The local institutions ranged from sectoral committees for joint forest or community health service management to village and district development committees. Many nations that are former colonies already have these patterns for use in development administration and for the use of participatory methods to engage local citizens (Paul, 1987).

Since the 1990s citizen participation has gained approval across the variety of development actors as a way to improve development practice. The World Bank, foreign donors and national governments have recognized that participation can assure order, the devolution of

provisions can cut costs to government, prop up the moral and political legitimacy of those who use it, as well as enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of programs (Cornwall, 2002).

As Cornwall (2002) noted, the 1990s marked discourses and practices associated with participation. The two central features include donor and lender support to civil society organizations. Civil society is seen as a check on the state as well as an extension of it as they play an increasingly significant role in providing assistance. They took over some social sector activities so effectively that they have become part of the reconfigured public sector. They have become interlocutors for the poor and other marginalized groups. Thus, new spaces for participation came about. Some of these spaces provide voice and presence to excluded individuals and marginalised groups, and to organizations where democracy, transparency and accountability were weak.

The latter part of the 1990s provided new spaces for the public to get involved as citizens, rather than simply as consumers, as the state recuperates its role in public policy (Cornwall and Gaventa 2001, cited in Cornwall 2002). In some countries, decentralization presented new opportunities for engaging the citizens, while in others, experimentation with new forms of democratic practice provided possibilities for the public to be involved in priority setting and allocation of resources. As Gaventa (2002, cited in Cornwall 2002) appropriately noted, the use of the new opportunities of public engagement require a responsive state and at the same time an informed and organized citizenry. Hence, thinking about citizens' rights rather than consumer choices opened up questions such that there is a need to look closely at who is included and who is excluded from participating, and at those who exclude themselves, as it is necessary to define or address these exclusionary dimensions so as to make the right to participate real for all citizens (Cornwall, 2002).

As Cornwall (2002) appropriately puts it, spaces for public involvement become real only when citizens gain meaningful opportunities to exercise their right to be heard and make accountable those who invite them to participate. In many countries, citizen participation remains an ideal rather than a reality. Traces of different eras of enthusiasm for participation and its

interpretations cover the contemporary development landscape as older forms of participation persist.

The term citizen participation may bring forth different observations of the levels and processes of participation. As Arnstein (1969), Connor (1988) and Potapchuk (1991) (cited in Frankisha, J. C. et al, 2002) put it, there are different levels of citizen participation, ranging from citizens being manipulated to citizens having total control. Different processes of citizen participation have also been identified such as self-help groups, coalitions, committees, forums, and focus groups, among others.

Arnstein (1969) likened the thought of citizen participation to eating spinach because no one is against it in principle as it is healthy. She went on to declare that in theory, the cornerstone of democracy is the participation of the governed in their government. Further, citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power. It is the redistribution of power that enables the poor citizens who are excluded from the political and economic processes to be deliberately included in the future. Also, it is the strategy by which the poor engage in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are put in place, resources are allocated, programs are implemented, and benefits are packaged. In other words, it is the means by which they can seek significant social reform which allows them to share in the benefits of the affluent society.

Cornwall (2002) acknowledged that in recent years, citizens in many countries have been on the receiving end of a wave of interest from governments, NGOs, donors and lenders in involving them more actively in shaping decisions that affect their lives. Innovations in governance have opened up spaces for citizens to deliberate over policies and to a greater degree of control over certain kinds of resources. Efforts to involve citizens more directly in processes of governance are inspired by the idea that to do so makes for better citizens, widely accepted decisions and ultimately better government.

Cornwall and Coelho (2007) tackle the question of representation. Representation comes in a variety of ways such as by individuals speaking about and for themselves, through non-

government organizations, neighbourhood associations, unions or movements, among other variants. They elucidated the diverse forms of representation such as in Bangladeshi Community Groups, the individuals who appear as community representatives are generally elites composed of professionals, teachers, wealthy farmers and their wives who are appointed by the chairman. In South African health facilities boards (HFBs), those who speak for patients' concerns are more likely to be working for community health than representing particular social groups. In São Paulo, Brazil, citizen participation generally refers to the engagement of registered civil society organizations, of which there are hundreds. However, less than 5 per cent of the organizations surveyed represented themselves as descriptive representatives while a similarly small number saw themselves in electoral terms.

However, over the course of the 1990s, contrasting visions and agendas took up the use of participatory approaches. Efforts to include civil society and the initiatives to communicate more directly with the poor have sidelined elected representatives. Thus, as civil society actors became proxies for the poor over national poverty policies, as well as in the globalisation of courses of action with moral legitimacy, questions of representativeness and accountability of participatory processes came about (Cornwall 2002).

Governments can use community-based institutions to push provisioning burdens onto local people, for legitimisation, or for political capital, or can influence dominant interests within communities and use them to reinforce supremacy. As local planning or implementing committees rise overnight through donor urge or local government directives, those who fill the space may be powerful in their communities which would eventually reproduce existing relations of exclusion (Cornwall 2002). As Guijt and Kaul Shah (1998, cited in Cornwall 2002) argued, representations of dominant interests all too easily dampen opposition and inequities within communities.

As Cornwall and Coelho (2007) succinctly puts it, for people living in poverty that are subject to discrimination and exclusion from mainstream society, the thought of entering a participatory space can be tremendously intimidating. Professionals may perceive how they talk

and what they talk about as inadequate or somewhat irrelevant and their participation may be viewed by the powerful as disorganized, troublemaking and unproductive. Iris Marion Young argues that “norms of deliberation are culturally specific and often operate as forms of power that silence or devalue the speech of some people” (1996:123, cited in Cornwall and Coelho 2007). However, these very power dynamics can also imbue participatory spaces with their dynamism. Spaces for participation may be created with one purpose in mind, but can also come to be used to renegotiate boundaries. For example, in the activist NGO Nijera Kori’s work with health watch committees in Bangladesh, the transformation of management spaces into political spaces redefined their possibilities. In Angola, the transformation of donor-introduced institutions reveals how participants’ other projects reconfigured their scope, spawning new leadership and democratizing effects (Cornwall and Coelho, 2007).

In terms of political suasion, the powerful motivating factor for government entities in sharing part of their decision making responsibilities may be the prospect of a more cooperative public rather than the desire to improve policy outcomes by becoming better educated about community preferences. In terms of empowerment, activists in the community may have regular contact with key government decision makers and can persuasively bring forth their point of view in a non-confrontational atmosphere. Similarly, public participation is assumed to be cost-effective as it reduces the probability of litigation (Randolph and Bauer 1999, cited in Irvin and Stansbury 2004).

However, Irvin and Stansbury (2004) also pointed out the disadvantages of citizen participation as they took into consideration what Ostrom (1990) suggested; that the size and homogeneity of a group is an important variable to make collaborative decision-making work. Expecting 10 or 20 citizen representatives to turn around popular opinion may be naive in larger communities and unless they are known to represent a constituency, there are no guarantees that each citizen participant is influential in his or her community. In terms of representation, their assertion is fitting; since citizen participants are not paid for their time, committees may be dominated by strongly partisan participants whose livelihood or values are strongly affected by the decisions being made, or by those who live comfortably enough to allow them to participate

regularly. Further, there are costs of exaggerated expectations on the part of the citizen participants. If they are misled into thinking their decisions are ignored or merely taken under advisement, resentment will develop over time, and lack of representation and of authority to make decisions appear to be key reasons for participatory processes backfiring and actually increasing public dissatisfaction. On persistent selfishness, others see locally-based decision making as an opportunity to influence policy for personal gain.

Thus, Irvin and Stansbury (2004) cited strategies in order to attain the ideal conditions for citizen participation such as the careful selection of a representative group of stakeholders, a transparent decision-making process to build trust among the participants, clear authority in decision-making, competent and unbiased group facilitators, regular meetings, and adequate financial resources for support during the potentially long decision-making processes.

Buček and Smith (2000) have acknowledged that the latest developments in discussions and policy changes in local governance reflect a tendency toward extending participation in local democracy. Local governments have the desire to improve their competency in addressing issues and responsiveness to the needs of various citizens' groups by ensuring increased citizen participation. Local issues can be better expressed by the citizens through participation. Extensive citizen participation can increase the responsiveness of the local government based on the needs of particular groups or sub-local interests. Decentralized competencies make visible the effects of citizen participation.

A re-thinking of the view of 'development' in the 1990s brought about the concept of accountability of governance and responsiveness to the so-called differentiated and unequal public as a way to improve development practice. In addition, participation strengthens the capacities of individuals and communities because the participatory approach in decision-making makes people feel more fulfilled which results in a heightened sense of community. Thus, governments initiated policies for citizen participation as a vital component of development practice. They recognized that devolution of provisions can cut costs to the government and enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of programs while giving political legitimacy to those

who use it. Also, involving the public makes for better citizens, widely accepted decisions and ultimately better government.

However, questions about representativeness also emerge. Those who come to represent the citizens do not always come from all backgrounds. Representation of dominant interests easily dampens opposition and suppresses inequities within the communities. In the same vein, the notion that participation requires special knowledge is a form of stereotyping. Hence, social cleavages appear, thus reducing to silence poorer citizens because they feel being poor makes them ignorant. Lack of representation and authority to make decisions appear to be the key reasons for participatory processes to backfire and increase public dissatisfaction.

Nevertheless, citizen participation is one of the vital components of decentralization. It can strengthen capacities of individuals and communities which will minimize their dependence on the state. It is also assumed to be cost-effective. Essentially, the goal is empowerment of the citizenry resulting in the strengthening of local democracy.

2.1.3 Local Government – NGO Collaboration

One of the dominant features of decentralization is the collaboration of local governments with civil society and non-governmental organizations in planning, policy-making or delivery of services. Snavely and Desai aptly observe that “the decentralization of authority to local governments and the growing capacity and stability of community-level NGOs have the potential to boost the ability of community residents to control their lives and improve their communities” (2000:260). In addition, Fisher (1992, cited in Clark, 1995) pointed out that NGOs may interact closely with the local government and play a strong role in local development activities; the active involvement of such local organizations is a key factor in influencing the degree of benefits reaching the poorer citizens.

Scholars have also noted the benefits of partnership between the government and NGOs such as “reduction of risks and responsibilities on the part of the government, minimization of

public sector debt, and improvement of the quality of public policies” (Farrington and Lewis, 1993; McCormik, 1993 cited in Haque, 2004: 273). In addition, the partiality for NGOs as partners is also due to the awareness that compared to the business sector, NGOs are in a better position to “possess local knowledge, address rural poverty, understand local needs and priorities, and practice consultative management” (Siddiqi and Oever, 1998; Caplan, 2001 cited in Haque, 2004: 273).

White (2009) has observed the potential advantages for both the NGO and the government in their collaboration. For the NGOs, working with the government gives them the opportunity to “expand the scope of their operations, broaden their influence and participate in the formulation of the national development agenda,” while the government may see collaborating with the NGOs as a chance to gain some “reflected moral glory, retrieve a hold on donor funds, neutralize potential opposition, and achieve more efficient and cost effective implementation of policy” (2000: 309).

Involvement in local governance comes in many different forms for non-governmental organizations or the so called “third sector” (Buček and Smith, 2000:10). Their role in service delivery may be performed as an “extension” of local authority such as working under contract or service agreement to provide a specific service (e.g. care of the elderly or education) (Buček and Smith, 2000:11). Occasionally, policy is determined upon consultation by the local authority with the non-governmental organization concerned. In developed countries local governments provide financial support in the form of grants, contracts, or service agreements or even provide training, accommodation, equipment, loans or tax relief. On the other hand, in countries that are poorer or those that are in the process of transition from authoritarian to democratic rule, the role of the third sector may become a “substitute” for public sector service provision with local governments engaging in partnerships to share the cost of housing, health care, waste disposal, environmental protection, and education to develop new methods of service delivery (Buček and Smith, 2000:11). The benefits to local governments in their collaboration with the third sector are many, such as low-cost and flexible labour, supplementary financial resources, community involvement, and acceptance of local authority objectives. This partnership results in increased

productivity, creativity and innovation through pooling of financial, human, technical, political and informational resources (Buček and Smith, 2000:11).

As Buček and Smith contended, in newly democratizing states traditional culture may stress beliefs such as submissiveness to authority, avoidance of conflict, and the impersonality of relationships which are “resistant to the emergence of an active civil society” (2000:13). Contribution to local democracy may be difficult to make when authoritarianism is deeply rooted. Municipalities as legacies of authoritarianism may be the opponents rather than allies of community groups. “Local political elites may represent the old order and resist democratization, not believing in pluralist democracy, participation, and political equality, freedom of speech, or responsiveness to the public”. Leaders of third sector organizations may also become incorporated into the clientilistic politics set up in some newly emerging democracies, with adverse consequences for beneficiary participation and the legitimacy of local institutions (Buček and Smith 2000:13).

Buček and Smith (2000:14) fittingly pointed to the risk of loss of autonomy of third sector organizations involved in local public service provision as they may lack sources of income thus increasing their dependency on the government. Also they fear that contractual relations will require conformity to local authority objectives and politically acceptable behavior, thus diminishing the scope of experimentation and advocacy.

In conclusion, NGOs are perceived to be conduits between the citizens and the local government, and the involvement of NGOs in local governance has the potential to improve the communities and influence provision of benefits to poor residents. On the part of the government, the benefits foreseen include the reduction of responsibilities, because some responsibilities will be shouldered by the NGOs and the improvement of the quality of public policies because NGOs come from the public and therefore know what the public needs. On the part of the NGOs, they have the opportunity to widen their operations and influence and participate in development activities.

However, there are also drawbacks to NGO involvement in local government as experienced in some countries such as in Uganda where the level of participation is much less than is suggested by the legislation as meetings do not happen as frequently as they should, budget conferences are attended by relatively few and voter turnout appears to be declining, the reservation of seats for women, youth and disabled has not had much impact on outcomes because of the limited skills and effectiveness of the representatives and the better off and better educated still dominate the decision-making at all levels, and in Kenya where local authorities have remained very traditional in their approach, offering few opportunities for citizen participation where decision-making about resource use is in the hands of officials and politicians to decide who or what will get the resources available, also most decisions are still being made behind closed doors and there is lack of publicly available information on budget and accounts (Devas and Grant, 2003). Although legislation provides for their participation, it may become more form than substance. The outcomes do not reflect the ideal because of the limited skills and effectiveness of the representatives of NGOs. Also, the traditional forms of patronage may mean local officials and politicians dictate who would benefit from the resources. On the other hand, the clientilistic politics approach of the NGOs due to lack of resources may result in the loss of their autonomy. Further, the lack of resources of NGOs in contractual relations may result in NGOs conforming to the objectives of local authorities.

While there are possible benefits and corresponding drawbacks, collaboration between the LGUs and the NGOs is seen to play a significant role in local development activities and as a key factor in reaching the poorer sectors of the community. As commonly seen, collaboration between the two sectors could further local democracy and emphasize local government responsiveness.

2.1.4 The Philippine Experience

The argument on Philippine experience in decentralization may well be better discussed by setting forth the political aspect of local governance and its effect on the decentralization of

powers, authority and services, considering the long history of colonization and autocratic rule in the Philippines which has influenced the values in the discharge of powers at the local level.

Among Asian countries the Philippines has had considerable experience with democratic institutions. From the Malolos republic of 1898 to American colonial rule, from the cacique democracy of the postwar republic to the restoration of democracy during the 1986 People Power uprising – Filipinos know the promise of democracy and the problems of making democratic structures work (Hutchcroft and Rocamora, 2003). As Hutchcroft and Rocamora pointed out, more than 100 years after the introduction to the Philippines of national-level democratic institutions, “the sense of frustration over the character of the country’s democracy is more apparent than ever before” (2003:259).

The present political structure stemmed from the time the Americans introduced democracy in the Philippines. As Manacsa (1999:198) contended, when the Americans came, they “transplanted their democratic traditions and institutions atop the prevailing social structure.” However, they failed to institute policies that could have placed the elections and their candidates on a “more level playing field” (1999:198). Peasant-oriented land reform may have broken the monopoly of the landowning families on the economy and allowed other social groups to compete in the political arena. The Americans, however, thought it unwise to institute land reform as it could upset the landowning elite and threaten the “extraction and export of raw materials critical for the operation of American industries” (1999:198). In turn the landed elite legitimized and consolidated their pre-existing hold of political power through elections. Elections basically became clashes among contending elite families to capture the reins of government for particularistic interests.

National politics followed the same framework as the local level. Kawanaka (2007) stated there are the three dominant frameworks in Philippine local politics, the patron-client relationship, political machines, and patrimonialism/bossism. The most dominant according to Kawanaka is the patron-client relationship which emphasizes reciprocal personal relations rather than ideology, class and religion as the main factor in the mobilization of political support. The

patron-client relationship involves an individual of higher economic status (patron) who uses his influence and resources to provide protection or benefits for a person of lower status (client) who reciprocates by offering support and assistance to the patron. However, as commercialization and social mobilization increased, the patron-client relationship transformed with the emergence of the political machine which is a more sophisticated mechanism of distribution of patronage. As Kawanaka puts it, the political machine is not based on reciprocal personal relationship instead it is based on short-term materialistic benefits. The transformation resulted when factions lost their extra-political character and became specialized political organizations. Thus, the change in the central element of the faction from an alliance of families into an electoral machine composed of leaders and their followers organized for political purposes. The reciprocity of the patron-client relationship is very personal and comprehensive while the political machine framework is limited to political purposes.

On the other hand, patrimonialism/bossism does not consider reciprocal relationships as an important factor as it is unilateral. The existence of coercion and the role of state apparatus distinguish patrimonialism/bossism. There is no reciprocal relationship in coercion, and instead of patronage and loyalty, there is intimidation and submission. State apparatus allows the elite to gain wealth and rule through coercion and violence. Thus, this framework stresses the role of violence, fraud, and vote buying which is reduced to the most common term “3Gs (Guns, Goons and Gold)” (Kawanaka, 2007:9). In addition, Sidel (2004) elucidated that local bosses thrive not upon large landholdings or patron-client relations but, rather, the control of elected office gives access to a broad array of state resources and prerogatives such as control over public land, discretion over law enforcement, authority over construction contracts and monopoly franchises. Violence, intimidation, vote-buying and electoral fraud is employed together with the mobilization of local machines for self-perpetuation in office. Sidel went on to argue that the idiosyncratic pattern of colonial era state formation anticipated the prevalence of local bosses in the Philippines. He went on to describe that local bosses in the Philippines are far from being paternalistic, rather they have established themselves in large part through violence and deviousness.

The three dominant frameworks in local politics aptly describe the pattern of how local government offices are obtained. There may be two observations on this. First, the delivery of basic services is compromised because those who have proximity to the local officials get to avail of the services as a form of patronage. Second, decentralization and local autonomy gives rise to more power for local officials especially in the handling of state resources and in the performance of their functions. While this power could be employed to address local needs, however this same power is seen as another opportunity to distribute patronage. It goes without argument that such practices widely affect the concept and principles of decentralization as applied in the local government units.

Brillantes (2002) indicates that the Philippine context of decentralization in the light of the Local Government Code of 1991 take three forms: deconcentration, devolution, and debureaucratization. These forms essentially capture the global context of decentralization enunciated by Rondinelli and Cheema (1983). Deconcentration involves the transfer of functions to lower level administrative units by the central office or agency. Devolution involves the transfer of powers and authorities to local government units. Debureaucratization involves the transfer of powers and authorities to sectors outside of the government such as non-government organizations (NGOs), people's organizations or the private sector, sometimes collectively called "civil society" (Brillantes 2002:28).

Further, debureaucratization institutionalizes people's participation in developing communities. The Local Government Code of 1991 permits and encourages the direct participation of NGOs, people's organizations, and the private sector in local governance through the local special bodies (Co 2002). The local special bodies are the local development council, local health board, local school board, and the local peace and order council. They serve as the primary means for organized groups to articulate their interests and as the connecting point between the local government and the people through their NGO or the private sector (Co 2002). Consequently, NGO participation in areas usually dominated by the government has been seen as one way of expanding the general notion and policy of decentralization and, more broadly, operationalizing citizen participation and democratization (Brillantes 1998). Co (2002) noted that

significant participation of civil society organizations in local governance is carried on in many local government units; however, the extent of participation varies from one jurisdiction to another. Some LGUs have achieved a high level of participation as they explore ways of involving the NGOs and civil society groups while others still lag behind and are stuck in the “old” form of governance (Co, 2002:397). In some LGUs, the participation of NGOs begins and ends with their accreditation for inclusion in the local special bodies after which the local special bodies become inactive, thus the LGU-NGO relationship ceases. In other areas, participation is determined by the perception of the local chief executive towards NGOs especially where the local chief executive and their constituents are unenlightened by the motivation and spirit of decentralization provided by the Local Government Code of 1991 (Co, 2002).

For purposes of this thesis, NGOs, people’s organizations (POs) and civil society organizations (CSOs) are treated identically. Tuaño (2011) reported the weaknesses that NGOs continue to face since the Local Government Code of 1991 paved the way for NGO participation in local development. By 1993, more than 16,000 NGOs and POs were accredited in various local government bodies (Silliman and Garner-Noble, 1998 cited in Tuaño, 2011) and more than 4,600 of them were reported sitting as members of the Local Special Bodies. However, NGO participation has been constrained by the lack of knowledge of government rules and mechanisms (Capuno, 2007; Gonzales, 2005 cited in Tuaño, 2011). In 2004, the majority of the cities in the Philippines had NGO-PO desks; however only 64 out of the 112 cities had functioning desks and only a third of the cities had NGOs participating in projects supported by their local development fund (Bureau of Local Government Supervision, 2006 cited in Tuaño, 2011). On the other hand, it has been noted that NGOs lack the technical competence that is required in developing public programs and projects (Cariño, 2002 cited in Tuaño, 2011). Another weakness is the vulnerability of NGOs to control by politicians and political groups who have set-up non-profit groups as tools to deliver services and goods to their constituents (Alegre, 1996 cited in Tuaño, 2011).

According to Magno (1993:18), the Local Government Code of 1991 has created a “favourable policy context for the pursuit of environmental programs at the community level.”

The best way to articulate this is in the Local Development Council where committees may be created to handle environment and natural resources; this way there would be greater NGO participation in the formulation and implementation of environmental programs at the local level. However, the lack of knowledge and political will of local officials regarding the implementation of the code has prevented the establishment of the committees as a component of the local development council.

The ineffectiveness of the relationship between the LGU and the NGOs in the Local Special Bodies can be gleaned from a 2001 study which showed that LGUs see the institutionalization of the Local Development Council, with the presence of the NGOs, as a “check to their actions” (Iszatt 2002:61). On the other hand, the same study showed that NGO representatives lack the skills and background to be effective in LSBs and that NGO participation in the LSBs is often a token. Consequently, an active LDC composed of independent NGOs would make it more difficult for local officials to control them. NGOs, however, are reluctant to work with LGUs as they are concerned their values would be co-opted if they work with local officials in the LDC (Iszatt, 2002).

In a study conducted on NGO participation in local governance in Cebu City, a progressive and large LGU located in the Visayas in the Philippines, Etemadi discovered that NGO participation in planning is “more form than substance” (2000:60). NGO representation in the local development council was implemented in 1993 as mandated by the Local Government Code however the council seldom meets, contrary to the requirement of the law. When it meets, however, plans and programmes which are already in their final stages are presented to the council merely for approval.

In order to be effective in the Local Health Board (LHB), the Local Government Code of 1991 has required an NGO representative who is involved in health services. In Ramiro et al (2001), a study was conducted on the process of devolution and its effect on the delivery of health services. Of particular importance is community representation in the local health board. The study was conducted in four LGUs in the Central Philippines namely the Municipalities of

Talahib, Iris, Kamia, and Sampaguita. In Kamia, the NGO representative was a senior citizen; in Iris, a member of a women's organization; in Sampaguita, an officer of a consumer cooperative; and in Talahib, the president of the association of barangay health workers. At the time of their appointments, only the Talahib NGO representative was active in community health affairs. Of the four municipalities which conducted the LHB meetings, the Talahib NGO attended 6 out of 8 meetings and the rest either 1 or 2 meetings because they had other priorities. He noted that the three municipalities will most likely not be able to establish effective relationships with the chosen NGO representatives because of their lack of background in health services. Interestingly, the mayor of Iris did not appoint a member from an NGO that was engaged in health because this person was a political enemy.

In Cagayan de Oro City, another developed and large LGU in Mindanao in the Philippines, a sustained NGO-Local Government collaboration has been observed in the delivery of agricultural services programmes, particularly in community organizing to form a cooperative for farmers (Potutan et al 1999). However, there is no indication of NGO-Local Government partnership in the planning process.

The cases just cited have shown how ineffective is the relationship between the LGUs and the NGOs. It has shown the lack of knowledge on decentralization and lack of political will of the local officials to engage the NGOs as partners in local governance such that the involvement of NGOs has just become mere compliance to policy. Local officials see NGOs as a threat so that if they do not control them they would become a check on their actions. On the other hand, NGOs lack the technical competence and the skills and background to be effective. Further, NGOs believe that their values would be compromised if they work with local officials.

The size of the LGU may play an important role in the effectiveness of LGU-NGO relationships. Under the Local Government Code of 1991, the general rule in the creation of the LGU or its conversion from one level to another level is based on three indicators: income, population and land area. Thus, a smaller LGU such as a municipality could become a city (a larger LGU) if it meets the prescribed requirements. In other words, the bigger the resources of

the LGU the more chances it has to be converted to another level LGU. However, both LGUs (municipalities and cities) are imbued with the same duties and responsibilities as far as the Local Special Bodies are concerned. In addition, both the municipality and the city have the same component LGUs, the barangays (villages).

Two large LGUs, the cities of Naga and Marikina in the Philippines have shown their responsiveness in adopting local policies for the urban poor. Naga City established the Naga City People's Council in 1996 as a system for partnership in local governance between the city government and the people. The council is a federation of local NGOs and POs which represents the people at the grass-roots level. It has voting rights in the Local Special Bodies, the standing committees in the local legislative body, and the task forces and boards in the city government. The council not only provides multiple channels of direct democracy but also functions as a community organizer. On the other hand, the City of Marikina encouraged the organization of associations of urban poor to work together with the city government. In Naga City, the civil society was empowered to have influence on local governance from policy making to program implementation while in Marikina City civil society participation has been addressed through the mandatory mechanism of the Local Development Council (LDC) and several suggested schemes to adjust program implementation (Ishii et al, 2007). As Barns (2003:9) puts it, the local chief executives of the two cities "were exceptionally able at bringing people together and instituting structural and transformational change," as both established consultative mechanisms. In Cebu City, another large LGU, the city government contracts out social services to NGOs to fast track its delivery system on health, land and housing, livelihoods, women's rescue and relief operations such as emergency vehicles, responding to construction or maritime accidents and paramedical assistance during fires, typhoons and floods (Etemadi, 2000). The three larger LGUs may have been effective in responding to local needs or in the delivery of services and at the same time instituting reforms in the structure.

The case of the Municipality of Irosin, Sorsogon, a smaller LGU, presents an exceptional experience in implementing the Integrated Area Development Program (IADP). In 1996 the municipality was dependent on the national government for allotment thus in the implementation

of the IADP the national government, other government agencies, national officials, foreign funding institutions and a few local NGOs were approached for financial assistance by the local chief executive. One of the components of the program other than the services that it delivers such as infrastructure, agriculture, and health, sanitation and tourism is people empowerment. Thus, the municipal government in partnership with a national-based NGO initiated and sustained the empowerment process by organizing NGOs, people's organizations, and cooperatives; strengthening the existing organizations while linking them up into networks, and involving them in local policy and plan formulation, program implementation and evaluation. Subsequently, at the end of 1997 there were three NGOs, seven people's organizations, twenty-one functional cooperatives and several civic organizations in the municipality. They are involved in advocacy of vital concerns in the community such as community organizing, capability building, livelihood promotion and other related activities (Ocenar and Martir, 2002).

Another smaller LGU, the Municipality of Balilihan, Bohol, developed a Countryside Action Program (CAP) which recognizes the importance of people participation in local development. It is a partnership between and among the LGU, the national government agencies and the community. CAP was organized in the 1980s and was carried over when the Local Government Code of 1991 took effect. Its purpose was strongly anchored in satisfying the basic needs of the people to effectively enable them to participate actively in the transformation of the local community. The program was already an established mechanism for people participation even before decentralization took place in the Philippines (Santiago and Juaquin, 2002). As Santiago and Juaquin (2002) observed, the CAP has emerged as a rallying banner of the people's role in local governance and it was not the NGOs but CAP that organized the community. The two smaller LGUs have shown dependence on external assistance to institute reforms at their level.

The cited cases have marked differences in decentralizing services and community participation. In some cases, cities on their own engaged in the organization of groups in the community and in collaborating with them. On the other hand, municipalities relied on external support and resources as a pre-existing mechanism to organize and collaborate with the

community. In the same vein, in 2001 a study was conducted of people's participation in the LDCs, with several issues and concerns raised, such as the lack of participation of the NGOs, lack of consultation resulting in improper prioritization of projects, weak collaboration between NGOs and LGU members, among others, however, the comparison between large and small LGUs as far as LDC is concerned has thrown up a new set of issues and concerns. Of primary concern to the municipalities were the inadequate resources to finance all their activities compared to larger jurisdictions. In the eyes of the LDC members, the problem becomes more serious as the size of the LGU declines such that the apparent low income of municipalities has spin-off effects on other LDC-related activities compared to larger jurisdictions such as the cities and provinces. One of the examples given by the members on the reason for the lack of NGO participation in small LGUs is the expense of participation. The problem of lack of knowledge on internal matters seems relatively less important in municipalities than in larger LGUs (DILG, Urban Resources and EBJFI, 2001).

In the Philippines, democratization of the local government is the consequence of a long authoritarian rule which thus provided multiple participatory opportunities to the people in decision-making and service delivery. Although the system is also in place, there is still that sense of inadequacy as far as democratization is concerned. Having come from long authoritarian rule, it is probably safe to say that the local governments in the Philippines may still have that sense of resistance to “pluralist democracy, participation, political equality, freedom of speech, or responsiveness to the public” (Buček and Smith 2000:13). On the other hand, the NGOs may also lack the necessary skills and resources to be effective partners in local governance.

The principles and experiences just cited reveal that mechanisms are in place for citizen participation at all levels of LGUs in the Philippines and that both large and small local government units have to be compliant with the policy. However, the degree of collaboration and effectiveness in the delivery of services vary among the implementing LGUs. In general, NGOs participation in the local special bodies' remains to be desired as it was 'more form than substance.' On the part of the LGUs, local officials lack the political will to engage with NGOs in the concept of participatory governance. Their resistance may be attributed to the notion that

NGOs might check their actions, or they fail to recognize the essence of democracy, participation, and political equality, freedom of speech and responsiveness to the public. On the other hand, NGOs need capacity-building to be technically efficient as they may lack the necessary skills and resources to be effective partners, or they are reluctant because their values might be co-opted.

Local politics may play a huge role between LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services. The three dominant frameworks in local politics, patron-client relationship, political machines, patrimonialism/bossism, compromise LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services, because those who are politically friendly to the administration would most likely be involved in local governance; this can be used as a form of mobilization of political support as in the patron-client relationship. The involvement of politically friendly groups could also form part of a political machine. Patrimonialism would compromise effective delivery of services because state resources are under the control of local officials. In essence, NGO involvement in the local government can become another form of patronage.

In conclusion, decentralization as defined by Rondinelli and Cheema (1983) aptly describes the principles being applied in the Philippines specifically with regards to deconcentration, devolution and debureaucratization. Rondinelli and Cheema's definition of decentralization shall be used in this thesis as the focus is on debureaucratization which is the transfer or sharing of responsibilities by the local government with the non-government organizations and more particularly on the extent of their collaboration in the delivery of services.

Local governance in the Philippines involves citizen participation as a component of decentralization in the decision-making processes and in the delivery of services. In this thesis, citizen participation is viewed through non-government organizations representing the citizens in the local government as they engage in collaboration and in service delivery.

Issues of ineffectiveness of LGU-NGO relations hound the practice of decentralization in the Philippines. Several issues were identified on the part of the LGUs such as the non-inclusion of NGOs in local development projects, lack of knowledge and political will of local officials in the implementation of the Code, the apparent notion that NGO presence is a threat to local officials, the non-involvement of NGOs in the planning process such that the supposed participation is “more form than substance” and the non-representativeness of NGOs because local officials tend to involve NGOs that are politically friendly, which is a form of political patronage. On the other hand, NGOs may lack the knowledge of government rules and mechanisms; they also may lack the technical competence in developing programs and projects and lack the skills and background to be effective in the Local Special Bodies. Further, NGOs may be vulnerable to control by politicians and political groups.

The size of the LGU may also be a factor that could affect LGU-NGO relations. Larger LGUs with its substantial resources may effectively deliver services and forge effective relationships with NGOs, whereas smaller LGUs may rely on external support and resources or pre-existing mechanisms. As was shown, smaller LGUs recognized the inadequacy of their resources to finance local development activities while the reason for lack of participation of NGOs has been attributed to the expense of participation.

Essentially, local government and NGO relations are prescribed by existing mechanisms in the context of decentralization, which was initiated in the country twenty years ago. However, despite the mechanisms that were introduced over a long period of time it seems that the results have been limited. Hence, these research questions. Should NGOs exert more effort to participate? Should local government units be more open to the idea of collaboration? The questions merit a careful analysis of the most effective relationship between the LGUs and the NGOs and the aspects where partnership collaboration is most necessary, the extent of participation of the NGOs and impediments to their participation, and whether the size of the LGU really matters in establishing an effective partnership.

2.2 DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES

The literature review highlighted the concepts and practices of decentralization as it has been applied globally. The experiences in other countries brought to the fore many issues especially in the concept of citizen participation in local governance. The corresponding practices on decentralization in the Philippines which were introduced in 1991 seem analogous to the global perspective especially on the perception of participatory local governance.

The theoretical argument is that the effectiveness of the collaboration between the LGUs and the NGOs can be discovered through interviews and focus group discussions and can be deduced from the outcome of their performance. Thus, in relation to the research questions, the literature has observed that NGOs are active partners in the delivery of services but not as much in the participatory planning processes. They need to exert a great deal of effort to fit-in in the planning processes of the LGU. On the other hand, LGUs are more open in the decentralization of services but not in the democratization of planning. Nevertheless, the literature is wanting as to the consequence of the size of the LGU in establishing effective partnership. The size of the LGU may also play an important role in determining the extent of collaboration between the LGU and NGOs due to financial, technical and human resource considerations. How the Philippine experience matches up with those larger debates on decentralization leads to the following hypotheses:

1. Effective LGU-NGO relationships are hardly felt or visibly seen despite the existing mechanisms.

The mechanisms for NGO participation is in place with the advent of the Local Government Code of 1991. However, it is observed that the local officials lack the knowledge and political will regarding the implementation of the code. The apparent failure to observe the mandate of the Local Special Bodies such as the conduct of regular meetings and consultations makes the mechanisms ineffective. NGO participation has become “more form than substance” rather than being active partners in local development efforts (Etemadi, 2000:60). Thus, the lack

of concrete proof in all aspects of partnership would lead to the conclusion that the mechanism is not effective or at the least, not complied with. The primary focus in this hypothesis is on LGUs.

2. Opportunities for NGOs to participate are great however this has not been realized.

This can be attributed to the notion that LGUs are not open to the idea of collaboration or the lack of skills and resources of NGOs hinder effective collaboration, which will be explored in the research. While NGOs are recognized partners of the local governments under the existing mechanism however the apparent lack of political will of local officials greatly affects the participatory opportunities of NGOs. On the other hand, the NGOs may not be competent enough to become effective partners of the LGU. The primary focus is on NGOs.

3. The larger the local government unit the more effective it is in addressing the needs of its constituents.

The larger the LGUs the bigger the resources also and the responsibilities are bigger as well in contrast to that of the small LGUs. One of the evident networks that it can effectively make use of to address the needs of its constituents would be the non-government organizations (NGOs) since they possess local knowledge, understand local needs and priorities, and practice consultative management. However, compared to larger LGUs, lack of knowledge of NGOs on internal matters or government regulations seems relatively less important in smaller LGUs. In addition, the expense of participation seems an issue more observed in smaller than in larger LGUs. The primary focus in this hypothesis is the LGUs.

4. Larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of the substantial resources and manpower that they can utilize to reach out to them.

The apparent notion is that smaller LGUs have inadequate resources to finance all their activities compared to larger jurisdictions. Thus, the effectiveness of cooperation between the LGUs and the NGOs may be dependent on the resources of the LGUs. The primary focus is on NGOs.

2.3 METHODOLOGY

Qualitative and some quantitative background data will be utilized for the research. Qualitative research employs a set of non-statistical investigation techniques and for data gathering about social phenomena, the use of such data not only describe them but also expedite understanding, subjective interpretation and critical analysis (McNabb, 2004). Further, qualitative research methods are designed to give real meaning to the phenomenon because the researcher is involved directly and indirectly in the process. Its key strength is that they allow researchers access to people's perceptions and understandings (Trumbull, 2000). Thus, a qualitative study is more applicable in a situation where we wish to gain a high level of detail on the ineffectiveness of LGU-NGOs relationship in the Philippines and the participatory opportunities given to NGOs in local governance which are great but have not been realized. Given the seeming lack of information on the underlying factors that contributed to the unproductive relationship between the LGUs and the NGOs; this thesis uses qualitative research methods in order to enhance our understanding of how and to what extent NGOs participate in the local governments. Stakeholders (local chief executives and other local officials, local government department heads, national government agency representatives, and NGO leaders and citizens) were interviewed for primary data while for secondary data, policy documents, departmental reports and issuances, ordinances, resolutions, minutes of meetings, local government reports and the likes were acquired for evaluation. On the other hand, the nature of the topic calls for quantitative data as far as comparative background of the local governments as case studies in this thesis is concerned. Quantitative research makes valid and objective descriptions on phenomena since the researcher tries to achieve objectivity by not allowing his personal biases influence the analysis and interpretation of the data (Taylor, 2000) and the use of numbers with words makes the communication easier, faster and more effective than words alone (McNabb, 2004).

The comparative research method shall be used to identify, analyze and explain similarities and differences. As Peters (1998) contends, the vital component of comparative analysis is that the selections of small number of instances that appear similar or comparable in

some important ways use those instances to shed light on the politics of the institutions to which it occurs. Further, focus of comparison such as explaining the similarities or differences can tell much about the way in which the governments function. This method is used to discover if there are similarities and differences on the partnership of local governments in the Philippines with community-based non-government organizations most particularly between a large and a small municipality as well as what aspects of partnership differ and where they become effective. In a particular case, larger local governments in the Philippines have more resources and therefore can better address the needs of constituents. These resources may be utilized to reach out to NGOs, being conduits of the constituents, as partner of the local governments in collaboration and service delivery. In contrast, smaller LGUs may be hampered by inadequacy of resources to effectively reach out to NGOs. A comparative study of the chosen cases will be adopted in order to discover common patterns and differences and whether there are shared causal factors, enabling the idea that the resources of local governments affect their relationship with NGOs.

The complexity of the issues between a large and small municipality in terms of collaboration and effective service delivery which can be related to financial, technical and human resources makes focus group discussion and semi-structured interviews a suitable research technique.

Focus group discussions were conducted to obtain in-depth information on concepts, perceptions and ideas of a group. Focus group discussions are an appropriate method to research complex phenomena like political attitudes (Devere, 1993). The use of group interaction to elicit data and insights that would be less accessible without those found in a group is the main characteristic of focus group discussions (Morgan, 1988). In this sense, the participants may be stimulated to reveal more of their views, perceptions and reasoning as they interact with each other thus allowing unexpected views to emerge (Punch, 2005; Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). The discussions were conducted among ordinary citizens to elicit ideas and information as to the consequence of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery. The participants were chosen at random from the different sectors of the municipality listed in the registry of inhabitants. This method determined the participant's awareness of NGO representation in the local institutions

(local special bodies), its participation in the delivery of services as well as their perceptions on LGU-NGO collaboration.

Semi-structured interviews present topics and questions to the interviewee, but are carefully designed to draw out the interviewee's ideas and opinions on the topic of interest, as opposed to leading the interviewee toward preconceived choices. As Wengraf (2001) describe, semi-structured interviews are designed to have prepared questions which are sufficiently open and that the subsequent questions are not planned but are improvised in a cautious and theorized method. They are also appropriate for the examination of the insights of respondents as regards complex and sensitive issues and allow probing for more information and explanation of answers (Barriball and While, 1994). Semi-structured interviews were conducted among local officials, department heads and NGO leaders to elicit ideas on the programs, projects and activities implemented with LGU-NGO partnership. The use of semi-structured interviews was appropriate because of the varied professional, educational and personal background of the group instead of the standardized interview outline. This method was conducted to establish the perceptions of the participants about LGU-NGO collaboration including the idea of NGO participation in the local institutions and in the delivery of services.

In the next two chapters, the two case studies involving two LGUs, Municipality of A and Municipality of B, both from the Province of Z in the Philippines, will be undertaken.

The Province of Z is located in the middle part of the Philippines which is approximately 17,000 kilometers north of Manila, the capital. It is one of the oldest provinces in the country. It is a mountainous province which is famous for having one of the best tourist attractions in the country. The province is considered second-class in terms of income which means that its resources are substantial. Land use is predominantly agricultural.

The socio-economic, ecological and political profile of the Municipality of A will be set out. As one of the bustling Municipalities of the province, it has the largest population among the 17 towns of Z with a total projected population of about 75,000 in 2009. It is predominantly

urban with only 3 out of 16 barangays considered rural. The Local Special Bodies (Municipal Development Council, Municipal Peace and Order Council, Municipal School Board, Municipal Health Board) which are in place will be examined to show representation of NGOs. The Municipality of A is considered a large municipality with greater resources (financial, technical, and human).

Likewise, the socio-economic, ecological and political profile of the Municipality of B will be set out. Municipality of B is a small mountainous town in the eastern part of the Province of Z with a projected population of 25,000 as of 2009. The Local Special Bodies (Municipal Development Council, Municipal Peace and Order Council, Municipal School Board, Municipal Health Board) which are in place will again be examined to show representation of NGOs. The municipality is considered small thus having limited resources.

Both LGUs are imbued with the same mechanisms as far as citizen participation is concerned but the degree of participation shall be determined. First, it necessitates a debate on concrete proof to establish if the mechanism is effective or is complied with effectively. Second, the opportunities may be great but the realization can be hampered by the notion that LGUs are not open to collaboration or NGOs lack the necessary skills and resources to be effective.

CHAPTER 3

Municipality of A

This chapter will set-out the profile of the municipality including the organizational and leadership structure, its resources and performance in different aspects of governance relative to the LGU-NGO partnership. It also seeks to establish the proof or the lack of it of an effective LGU-NGO relationship in collaboration and delivery of services. Consequently, it seeks to address the notion that LGUs may not be open to the idea of collaboration or that the lack of skills and resources of NGOs hinder effective collaboration.

3.1 PROFILE

3.1.1Municipal Profile

Municipality of A is located at the center of the coastal municipalities of the Province of Z. It is bounded on the north by the sea and on the east, west and south by adjacent municipalities. It has a land area of about 5,000 hectares divided among the barangays (villages) including Poblacion which is the capital barangay. It is generally flat and characterized by intensive agriculture and a high density of urban development. The municipality is predominantly an agricultural domain with agriculture occupying the biggest portion of the total area. Agricultural crops such as rice, coconuts, bananas, corn, root crops and vegetables are planted. There are also areas devoted to fishpond and backyard livestock production. There are built-up areas devoted to residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional activities, parks and playgrounds, and infrastructure. Special land uses include quarrying, grazing land and tourism. Forestland occupies a very minimal land area. Due to its flat features, a heavy downpour causes occasional flooding especially during high tide affecting most of the barangays. Flooding also occurs in the commercial and built-up areas due to insufficient capacity of the drainage facilities. After a heavy downpour, flooding is a common occurrence along the streets with knee-high deep storm water (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Nearly everybody in the municipality is a Filipino although there are a considerable number of persons with foreign origins such as Chinese, Americans and others. The typical family size is at an average of 5 members. The dominant religion is Roman Catholic while a small percentage is composed of other small religious congregations (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

The municipality has the largest population among municipalities in the province with about 75,000 inhabitants in 2009. The increase in population is caused by rapid in-migration from neighboring municipalities and provinces because of the socio-economic potential of the municipality wherein better employment opportunities and presence of amenities such as power, water, telecommunications, recreation centers, business centers and educational institutions are available and still growing in numbers, it being the center of trade, commerce, industry and education. The growth rate is 1.97%. The municipality is predominantly urban with only 19 % of the barangays considered rural. Of the population, 93% are urban dwellers while 7 % dwell in rural areas (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

The present status of well-being of the residents are measured in relation to certain acceptable and desirable standards including the level of social services that are made available such as health, education, social welfare, housing, employment and income, recreation and protective services. Health care delivery in the municipality is considered adequate due to the presence of numerous public and private facilities and services such as a public hospital and a number of private hospitals. There are large numbers of medical professionals both in the public and private sector as well as medical personnel in public health stations. Services are also given to the physically handicapped in a stimulation and therapeutic activity center. Family planning services are provided by the municipal health office. Social welfare programs are provided by the municipality to the underprivileged and socially disadvantaged families and communities with more focus on women's welfare, family welfare, child welfare and special clients like delinquent youths and the physically handicapped. Livelihood projects, disaster assistance, and nutrition feeding programs, among others are extended depending on the client's problems or needs. Pre-marriage and marriage counseling are provided to couples. Day care centers are

manned by workers in all barangays to provide early childhood education and supplemental parental care when parents are at work (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

In terms of education services, there are various modes of intervention and innovation. Pre-school, elementary, secondary and tertiary education as well as technical and vocational courses, both in public and private, are available in the municipality. Post graduate courses are offered in two educational institutions. From pre-school to technical and tertiary, there are 77 private and 563 public schools. The literacy rate of the municipality is almost 98% which explains why there are a considerable number of professionals working abroad, in different cities and in the locality (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Protective services in the municipality include police and fire services. In the maintenance of peace and order, the Philippine National Police (PNP) is the lead agency. The PNP is a national government agency tasked to maintain peace and order in the local government units. For the year 2009, the total crime volume is 1828 incidents, 1447 of which were solved. The crime solution efficiency in 2009 was about 79% while the average monthly crime rate is about 2% (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A). Compared to the national crime solution efficiency rate of 13.21% and the national average monthly crime rate of 27.52%, Municipality of A has much higher average (Santos, 2012). The ratio of police with the population, at 1 police for every 500 population, fall short as there are only 59 police personnel in a population of about 75,000. However, the maintenance of peace and order is complimented by the municipal auxiliary police funded and maintained by the local government. Fire services are provided by the Bureau of Fire Protection (BFP). The BFP is a national government agency assigned in selected local government units to provide protection in the event of emergency. There is no volunteer fire brigade in the municipality (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Housing programs are supplemented by private entities such as realtors and developers because under the laws such as the Local Government Code of 1991 and the Urban Housing and Development Act of 1992, local government units are mandated to implement programs and projects in low cost housing and other mass dwellings especially for the underprivileged and the

homeless; however, due to financial constraints of the local government the private sector has been encouraged to participate in housing provision. The municipality has its shelter program in coordination with various private entities which gives more focus to the shelter requirements of the underprivileged sector and informal settlers (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Sports and recreation facilities also abound in the municipality as usually it is the venue for different recreation, sports and physical activities for the whole province (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

In infrastructure and other facilities, the road network in the municipality involve about 139 kilometers of national, provincial, municipal, barangay and subdivision classifications. About 39% of the road network is concrete, 7% is asphalt and 54% is gravel. There are two bridges which connects the municipality with adjoining municipalities. There is an irrigation system plying a vast tract of agricultural land which provides water to agricultural plants. There is no existing public sewerage system although there is storm water drainage that follows the alignment of some portions of the road while others are open ditches serving as open sewerage and drainage system. In 2009, waste disposal is one of the priorities of the local government. It is estimated that the municipality generates about 40 tons of solid waste daily sourced from households, establishments and industry. The local government operates the collection and disposal of solid wastes generated. Water supply is provided by the local water district serving about 78% of the population or about 78% also of the total households. Power supply is available widely with almost 98% of the households served (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

The most common means of transportation plying most routes in the municipality are motorized tricycles. Since it is the gateway to and from the tourist destinations in the province, there are also tourist buses and vans that cater to local and foreign tourists. Terminals and parking facilities can be found mostly at the Poblacion area. In terms of air transport, it has its own airport facility which is considered one of the busiest airports in the country (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Communication facilities include landline and mobile services as well as postal, telegraphic and messengerial services. There are several radio stations operating in the area as well as cable television providers while newspapers and magazines, national and local, circulate on a daily basis. The local government operates its own community radio station (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

The public market is one of the busiest markets in the province. It is owned and operated by the local government. About 9% of the total income or about 20% of the locally sourced income is derived from the operation of the market (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

It shows that services (health, education, social welfare, housing, employment and income, recreation and protective) in the municipality are substantial and available to constituents to a large extent. It also shows how effective the services are with the availability of health facilities, social welfare programs, the high literacy rate, the shelter program, availability of sports and recreation facilities, infrastructure facilities, high power and water utilization rate, and transportation and communication facilities. Although protective services are hampered by considerable number of crime incidents however this is understandable among urban municipalities and the inadequacy of personnel are complimented by an auxiliary group.

3.1.2 Organizational Structure and Leadership

The local government unit is headed by the Municipal Mayor as its local chief executive while the local legislative body (Sangguniang Bayan) is headed by the Vice Mayor. The local special bodies are all headed by the municipal mayor. The organizational structure of the municipality is in accordance with the structure prescribed under the Local Government Code of 1991. To complement the local chief executive in running the municipality, there are 299 personnel employed by the local government, 213 of whom are permanent and 70 casual (2009 Ecological Profile, Municipality of A).

Representation by NGOs is recognized as mandated by the Local Government Code of 1991. Under Executive Order No. 004, series of 2010, there are fifteen (15) NGOs involved in the Municipal Development Council. There is one (1) NGO in the Municipal Peace and Order Council under Executive Order No. 006, series of 2010, and in a revised issuance there are three (3) NGOs under Executive Order No. 003, series of 2011. One (1) NGO each in the Municipal School Board and Municipal Health Board, under Executive Order 005, series of 2010, and Executive Order 012, series of 2010, respectively.

3.1.3 Resources

Under the Local Government Code of 1991, local government units derive their resources from local sources such as tax and non-tax revenues, share from the national tax such as the internal revenue allotment (IRA), and from aid, loans and borrowings and inter-local transfers. In the 2010 Annual Budget, the municipality had an income from local sources of about P87, 000,000.00 and its IRA was around P77, 000,000.00 or a total of about P164, 000.000.00. In 2011, it had about P 80,000,000.00 from local sources and around P83, 000,000.00 from the IRA or a total of about P163, 000,000.00. The dependency of the municipality to the IRA in 2010 is at 47% while in 2011 is at 51% (2010 and 2011 Annual Budget, Municipality of Q).

3.1.4 Performance

The Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) institutes the Local Governance Performance Management System (LGPMS) program which is a self-assessment, management and development tool that enables local governments to determine their overall administrative capabilities, their service delivery performance and their development conditions. Thus, the Annual Reports of local governments are based on the LGPMS which focus on the state of local governance performance, financial performance and state of local development which is called the State of Local Governance Performance Report (SLGPR). The assessment is conducted by the LGPMS Committee composed of local government officials, local government

department heads and the DILG officer in the municipality based on prescribed indicators who then writes and presents the output. This thesis will benchmark on the 2010 Annual Report.

The year 2010 is a crucial year for local government units as it is an election year. The first half of the year is the last six months of an incumbent administration while the second half is the beginning of a new mandate either by the same administration if they get elected or by a new administration if their term ends or if they lose in the election. The Municipality of A in 2010 covers two administrations because a new administration got elected due to term limitation against the previous local chief executive. Thus, the performance of the local government was measured between two administrations in one year. However, regardless of the circumstances the local government still functions on the same mandate provided by the Local Government Code of 1991 and other relevant laws and issuances.

In the 2010 Annual Report, highlighted are the local government's performance in four areas of governance: administrative, social, economic and environmental. Fundamentals of governance such as participation, transparency and financial accountability are included as a special report (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A). However, only the key issues in relation to the thesis shall be highlighted.

- Administrative Governance

There are six areas which were looked into, local legislation, development planning, revenue generation, resource allocation, customer service and human resource management and development. Of the said areas, the local government obtained excellent rating in human resource management and development which was interpreted as having a desirable organizational performance and productivity. All other areas need to be improved including the consultation process and management of planning database in development planning (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A).

- Social Governance

Social governance looks into four areas such as health services, support to education services, support to housing and basic utilities, and peace, security and disaster risk management. However, none of the four areas obtained excellent performance. Among other recommendations for improvement, there is a need to extend support to quality education and the local school board is encouraged to provide further assistance such as the establishment of a scholarship fund for poor but deserving students. The local health board, as the principal support system, has to do more to improve the performance in health service delivery such as the quality of child care services. In peace, security and disaster risk management, there is a need to strengthen the local peace and order council as well as the local council for the protection of children, and ensure constant financial support to peace and order and public safety initiatives (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A).

- Environmental Governance

The four areas include the forest ecosystem management, freshwater ecosystem management, coastal marine ecosystem management, and urban ecosystem management. The local government obtained excellent performance in coastal marine and ecosystems management, and in freshwater ecosystems management. Both are noted for having employed long-term planning practices, recognized and mobilized CSO and citizen participation, and rehabilitation and protection goals are set and met (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A).

- Valuing Fundamentals of Governance

The report described how the local government values and maintains good governance in the context of transparency, participation, and financial accountability. The local government obtained excellent performance in transparency such as when governmental operations are

communicated to the public through bulletin boards, information desks, print and broadcast media, and forums. It also obtained excellent performance in participation by engaging the citizens and CSOs in local governance which has achieved an admirable level of maturity, the proof include participation of CSOs in decision-making through the local special bodies, involvement in local development projects, and citizen's feedback. The areas for improvement however include the strengthening of administrative capacity to ensure observance of guidelines relative to accounting, internal control, procurement and financial transactions (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A).

3.1.5 The Local Special Bodies: Meetings and Output

This section illustrates the functions and the meetings of the Local Special Bodies. The proceedings during the meetings were reduced in writing called the Minutes. The Minutes at hand are those of the present administration while those of the previous administration are no longer available except one meeting held by the MDC in 2009. The rest of the Minutes are for the meetings held in 2010 and beyond by the present administration. The outputs accessed include the development plan, annual investment plan and the public safety plan.

- Municipal Development Council

The meetings of the Municipal Development Council will show participation of NGOs in the formulation of programs, projects and activities. These meetings are captured in the minutes as to what has been taken up or what transpired in the course of the meeting and best describe the collaboration of the different sectors. In a meeting of the Municipal Development Council during a previous administration sometime in August 2009 attended by different local officials both from the municipality and barangay, department heads, other government agency representatives and NGOs, it is worth noting that there were only 3 NGOs present. The main purpose of the meeting was the presentation of the Annual Investment Plan for 2010 for approval by the council. However, there was no mention whatsoever of NGO participation in the meeting except

for one NGO representative who moved for the approval of the previous minutes and the adoption of the Annual Investment Plan for 2010. The next meeting conducted by the council was in October, 2010; it was also multi-sectoral with 6 NGOs present out of 11 NGOs who are members under the Executive Order. This was the first meeting of the council under the new administration. The meeting was called for the presentation and approval of the Local Development and Investment Program for 2011-2013 (for the term of the new administration), the Annual Investment Program for 2011, and the Priority Development Programs funded by the 20% Development Fund for 2011 by the municipality which was approved. There was no mention of NGO participation at this time. The meetings of the MDC were conducted once in 2009 and once in 2010 contrary to the provision of the Local Government Code of 1991 which requires that meetings be conducted every 6 months.

The Annual Investment Plan covers the different sectors in local governance such as the general public service sector, social services sector and the economic services sector. In the Annual Investment Plan for 2010, NGOs are involved in the social services sector thru its day care service program, in the procurement of materials for information and education campaigns and information technology. NGOs are also involved in the economic services sector through such programs as establishment of techno-demo farm, capability building on marketing strategies, establishment of a municipal nursery, establishment of a greenhouse, construction of a food terminal, formulation of a comprehensive agricultural development plan, park development and rehabilitation, beaches development, and the tourism circuits development program. The Annual Investment Program for 2011 shows NGO involvement in such areas as the social sector and economic sector. In the social sector, NGOs are involved in shelter programs such as the housing project for the poor, and in the day care program such as financial assistance to day care workers and procurement of program materials and instructional handbooks. In the economics sector, NGOs are involved in the tourism circuit development program.

The Local Development and Investment Program for 2011-2013, which provides the direction of the new administration, shows NGO participation in different sectors. The local government aims to strengthen networking and linkages with CSOs, NGOs, POs and the private

sector in such areas as social services and general public services. In economic services, its aim is to provide capability building in partnership with CSOs, NGOs, POs and the private sector in product design and production, packaging and marketing of agricultural products, cooperatives, and small and medium enterprises development, among others. The Priority Development Programs funded by the 20% Development Fund for 2011 shows a substantial amount budgeted for infrastructure projects and a very minimal amount for tourism and cultural development.

- Municipal Peace and Order Council

In the meeting of the MPOC in December 2010, the agenda included the amendment of the Executive Order reorganizing the MPOC which was previously issued to expand its membership by including, among others, additional NGOs. Another agenda item was the crafting of the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan (IACPSP). The third agenda item was the use of intelligence funds and the last was about the forthcoming annual festival. No NGO was present at this time.

Under a new Executive Order, another meeting was conducted in April 2011 where 2 out of the 3 NGO members were present. The first agenda item was the presentation by the Chief of Police of the status of the municipality's peace and order. There was no mention as to the participation of the NGOs in the maintenance of the peace and order in the municipality. However, the local chief executive solicited help from one NGO representative for their group to donate one patrol car for the use of the Philippine National Police. The next agenda item was the report of the Municipal Fire Marshal regarding fire prevention activities and other administrative matters however there was no mention of any participation by the NGOs in these concerns. The next agenda was the traffic plan of the municipality and its operationalization, with no mention of NGO participation in the implementation thereof. The last agenda item was on the solid waste management program of the municipality, corresponding efforts and activities relative to waste disposal and enforcement of laws were reported. However, there was no report as to involvement of NGOs in the implementation. After all the agenda items were taken up, an open forum followed and a shelter program for children-in-conflict-with-the-law was extensively discussed.

The NGOs present at the meeting did not participate at all in the discussion and in the deliberation of issues.

Another meeting was conducted in June 2011, three (3) NGO representatives attended the meeting however only two are members of the MPOC while the other one is not. Another participant in the meeting registered attendance as an NGO representative although he is employed in the local government under the direct supervision of the local chief executive; although he happens to head an NGO, he is not a member of the MPOC. The agenda covered the peace and order situation, fire prevention, children's concerns, traffic, solid waste management, and prison management. In the course of the discussion, the local chief executive announced that one unit patrol car has been donated by an NGO. There was no mention of NGO participation during the meeting other than that instance.

In the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan for 2010, NGOs are involved in several programs, projects and activities such as in crime prevention through the organization of anti-crime volunteer groups, in fire prevention and suppression through the conduct of fire fighting drills and training, in civil defense through the conduct of emergency drills and rehearsals, and in anti-terrorism through the target hardening initiative. For 2011, NGOs are involved in crime prevention such as enhancement of police visibility patrols, in civil defense through the strengthening of disaster risk reduction councils in the municipality and barangays, and in anti-terrorism through the target hardening initiative.

- Municipal School Board

The Municipal School Board had its meeting in August 2010. The agenda of the meeting involved matters related to the new composition of the board, the guidelines about solicitations for sports and other activities of the Department of Education, the purchase of office supplies, facilities and equipment, and the early preparation of the annual budget for 2011. The NGO member was absent. Another meeting was held in November 2010 and the agenda included augmentation of appropriations for school building repairs, travel allowances for training or

cultural activities, to provide the board with guidelines of the Department of Education in the use of the budget, and the approval of the supplemental budget. The NGO member was absent at this time. In January 2011 another meeting was also conducted by the board. The agenda included the presentation and approval of the budget for 2011, electric bills of schools, and a suggestion that the conduct of training and seminars for teachers be done by the School Board. The NGO member was present however there is no mention of his participation in the discussion. The next meeting of the board was in May 2011. The agenda included presentation of the supplemental budget for the year, the insufficient budget for sports activities, the purchase of books, and other matters related to the budget. The NGO member was absent at this time. Another meeting was conducted in June 2011 and the agenda was mainly on the use of the Special Education Fund where a representative of the Commission on Audit was invited to shed light on the proper use thereof. The NGO member was again absent.

Of the meetings conducted, the NGO member was only able to attend once. It is worth noting that there is no NGO participation in the programs, projects and activities presented for discussion in those meetings. The meetings of the board were not held on a monthly basis as required by the Local Government Code of 1991.

- Municipal Health Board

The Municipal Health Board held its meeting in July 2011, the only meeting held under the new administration. The agenda of the meeting included the construction of a new health center based on the Department of Health guidelines, updates on health programs being implemented in the whole municipality, and the assignment of health personnel. The representative of the NGO was absent during the meeting. There was no mention of NGO involvement in the programs, projects and activities discussed during the meeting.

In summary, during the meetings of the MDC, the NGO representatives who were present do not comprise the whole set of NGOs under its composition. The meetings themselves which should have been conducted once every six months were conducted once a year. As of

September 2011, no meeting was conducted by the MDC for the year. The Minutes showed that the NGOs had hardly any participation in the proceedings of the meetings. In the Annual Investment Plan for 2010, the Annual Investment Plan for 2011, and the Local Development and Investment Program for 2011-2013, NGO participation in programs, projects and activities in different sectors of the plans is substantially recognized with NGOs as partners in the implementation; however, which specific NGOs are involved are not named. Consequently, this will be validated if indeed they were involved in the actual implementation of those programs. In the MPOC, a number of meetings were conducted and member NGOs were either absent or present during the meetings however there was no indication of their actual participation during the discussions when they were present except when one NGO was asked to donate a vehicle for the police. The Public Safety Plan shows NGOs as partners in various programs but as to which NGO there is no specific reference. In the Municipal School Board, of the five meetings conducted, the NGO representative attended only once and did not at all participate in the discussion. NGO involvement in the programs, projects and activities presented for discussion and for implementation was not mentioned. The Municipal Health Board conducted its meeting only once, without the NGO present. During the discussion of its programs, projects and activities for implementation, no NGO involvement was mentioned.

3.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

This section considers the hypothesis: *Effective LGU-NGO relationship is hardly felt or visibly seen despite the existing mechanism.*

Thus, it reports on the findings regarding questions that would help ascertain the answers to the idea that there is lack of concrete proof to establish effective LGU-NGO relationships, although the mechanisms are in place. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials, department heads and NGO representatives who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

The local officials and functionaries were asked the question: *What kind of collaboration does your organization have with NGOs?*

During the interview with Local Official 1, who is involved in the Local Special Bodies, on 01 July 2011, he demonstrated how issues were brought to the just concluded meeting of the MPOC and the participation of the NGOs in the maintenance of peace and order in the municipality. However, he failed to mention a specific NGO which greatly collaborates with the local government in the programs, projects and activities (PPAs) of the MPOC. In the Local School Board, he did not specifically mention how the NGO involve itself in the planning and formulation of PPAs. In the Local Health Board, he mentioned the participation of the NGO in the implementation of a just conducted health program. While in the Municipal Development Council, he maintained that before they formulate the development plan they call for a meeting with NGO/members on how to implement the 20% Development Fund. He then went on to enumerate the different PPAs that the local government was implementing at the time.

I: In the MPOC how's your partnership with the NGOs? (Enumerated)

Local Official 1: Yesterday we had a meeting in the MPOC and one problem that was brought to our attention was about the minor delinquents and what we can do to help them. Actually, we are thinking of setting up a curfew for minors at 10^oclock in the evening. Those who have criminal records we want the Social Welfare Office to invite them and do something to help them. We actually want to help these minors go to school and help them pay the fees in high school but the problem is that they do not want to go to school, they want to work. Who would want to hire them when they have criminal records?

I: In the Local School Board how is your relationship with the NGO?

Local Official 1: There are some issues with the Local School Board when I took over so I invited the Auditor from the Commission on Audit (COA) because most of the request of the District Supervisors of the Department of Education (DepEd) is for the purchase of laptop computers and the Auditors ruled that it is not allowed anymore. We were thinking that the budget (Special Education Fund) by the Local School Board should be intended for the use of the children like repair of school buildings because when I went to the schools there are buildings that need immediate repair. So I requested the District Supervisors to prioritize the chairs, tables or offices of their School Principals because all they do is they just give their Principals some P20,000 to P40,000, do you think we can construct or repair a classroom at that amount?

I: Does the NGO provide help?

Local Official 1: The NGO is with the Principal, here in the Local School Board we only monitor their requests since we have no idea if they receive a budget from the National Government but in our budget we want the Special Education Fund to be used in a proper way.

I: In the Local Health Board how is your relationship with the NGO?

Local Official 1: The other day the group of (political figure) held a medical mission and the doctors were there to help, the target was 700 but they were able to serve almost 1000 patients.

I: In the Municipal Development Council we have 10 NGOs (enumerated), how is your relationship with them?

Local Official 1: We are doing fine. Well, the President has this program which gives fuel subsidy to Tricycle drivers in the amount of P150 through the DILG, we followed all the rules in the disbursement as the

Municipal Treasurer is quite strict with the requirements for its release. We have good relationship with the NGOs like the (NGO) which provided as some help, the President of (transport group) comes for a meeting every time there is a problem especially now with their boundary to boundary issues.

I: In the identification of programs, projects and activities (PPAs) how is the participation of those NGOs?

Local Official 1: Before we formulate our development plan we call for a meeting on how to implement the 20% Development Fund. Right now we are already implementing the asphaltting of roads in the public market then we have concreting at this road where we intend to establish the common terminal for public transport coming from the eastern side of the Province. The municipal motor pool has been repaired and the Fire Department holds office there now. Bidding for streetlights and drainage has just been concluded and is now ready for implementation. The repair of the public comfort room at the Plaza is on-going.

Meanwhile, Local Official 2, who is involved in the MDC and the MPOC, during the interview on 24 June 2011 answered:

Local Official 2: The MPOC provides assistance to them for example in bloodletting they assist and for them to achieve the objectives of their activity they ask assistance from the LGU.

I: What about in the MDC?

Local Official 2: These NGOs if you tap them they don't hesitate in giving their help. They really give their all-out support especially in peace and order concerns.

I: How about their participation in decision-making?

Local Official 2: Sometimes they give suggestions and we listen to them.

I: Are they participatory?

Local Official 2: Yes but not full participation because most of the NGOs are hesitant, it seems that they put some limitations on their selves so mostly it is the LGU which has the major role.

Department Head 1, who is involved with the MDC, averred during the interview on 22 June 2011:

I: How is the participation of the NGOs in the MDC?

Department Head 1: They are active also for as long as you invite them.

I: Are they active during the planning?

Department Head 1: Yes, during the action planning.

I: What about in the implementation of programs?

Department Head 1: Yes.

I: What about in the monitoring?

Department Head 1: We created a monitoring team previously but this has not really been utilized.

During the interview with the Department Head 2 on 19 July 2011 and Department Head 3 on 24 June 2011, both involved in the Local Health Board, they maintained that they have "coordinative efforts" with the NGO especially during the medical missions. However, there are other NGOs who are not members of the Local Health Board who also provide support and assistance during their activities.

Department Head 4 who is involved with the MPOC, interviewed on 23 June 2011, replied that a certain NGO that is a member of the MPOC constantly provides some logistical support while Department Head 5 who is also a member of the MPOC, interviewed on 28 June 2011, declared that the same NGO donated a patrol car for the use of the police.

In the Local School Board, Department Head 6, interviewed on 27 June 2011, and Department Head 7, interviewed on 24 June 2011, acknowledged:

Department Head 6: It is good. They have no complaints. Anyway they check whatever is given by the Municipal School Board. They check whether such has been received.

Department Head 7: We are okay. The (NGO) is represented by its President in the meetings of the Municipal School Board.

The same respondents were asked the question: *What are the services delivered with the collaboration of the NGOs?*

Local Official 1 indirectly answered the question during the interview when he answered the first question although there is no specific reference to an NGO or NGOs. However, Local Official 2 contended that the local government provides support to NGOs during their medical and dental missions such as snacks, medicines and some basic commodities to beneficiaries. He also acknowledged the help of an NGO, not a member of the local special bodies, who maintain a vegetable nursery that provides free seedlings to farmers though it is the local government which sustains the nursery.

Both Department Head 2 and Department Head 3 of the Local Health Board maintained that most of the collaborations the local government have with NGO are in the medical missions, which they say are very effective.

Department Head 4 acknowledged the collaboration with an NGO involved in the MPOC as well as the private sector and business establishments. Department Head 5 answered:

R: Immediate police response, rescue, public safety services, police visibility, traffic management, traffic regulation.

I: What kind of NGOs?

R: The transport group and also the owners of transport terminals.

In the Local School Board, Department Head 6 described the services that they provide with the NGO:

I: What are the services that you give in collaboration with the NGO?

R: Repair of school buildings, books, equipments. Right now, there is an order that the funds of the School Boards should only be spent for needs inside the classroom such as science equipments, tables, arm chairs, blackboards and books so that the pupils can also avail of the provision from the School Board. Previously the funds are used for the repair of classrooms and buildings.

Department Head 7 averred that the NGO is their partner in helping the school and that they help whatever the projects of the school are. Sometimes they also provide some funds if the budget of the school is not enough. He went on to say that they have never encountered any conflict with the NGO since there are no parents who oppose their programs.

The next question was: *How effective are these services?*

Local Official 2 of the MDC and MPOC answered the question and contended that:

I: Would you say that the services that you give in collaboration with the NGOs are effective?

R: Case to case basis because there are areas that are really effective especially the indigency program that we have. Unfortunately, though it is not proper to say this but it has really become a habit that these indigents depend too much on the government, they always want a dole-out. I am also a President of an NGO and I am connected with the local government so I tie-up with other NGOs especially the Filipino-Chinese and we really provide sacks of rice and goods.

Department Head 2 and Department Head 3 of the Local Health Board declared that the services they provide in collaboration with the NGO are very effective. Department Head 4 of the MPOC answered that sometimes the NGO provides even if they are not asked. Department Head 5 went on to say that the services are effective although the resources are limited but the cooperation is enormous. Department Head 7 of the Local School Board also declared that the services are effective.

The local officials and department heads were then asked as to their view about the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery towards the development of the LGU. Local Official 1 was asked about his relationship with the NGOs in the delivery of services.

I: Can you say your relationship with the NGOs in the delivery of services is effective?

Local Official 1: For me it's effective. When I started it cannot be denied that there were subgroups within the local government because of the change in administration though this is natural but for me this is nothing for as long as we do our job without being superficial about it. What is important is they do their job as directed.

Local Official 2 was asked if there is a need to increase the participation of NGOs.

I:Do you think there is a need to increase the participation of the NGOs because it is not enough or it is enough at this time?

Local Official 2: I think it is not enough because there are NGOs that are really small and the ones who are really active are only few. Like we have this peace and order problem where houses are being robbed and it is rampant, the participation of NGOs in apprehending the perpetrators or help notify the police and without them we cannot cope with the situation. LGU has only 50 plus policemen which is not enough.

Department Head 2 went on to say:

I: You said the delivery of services towards the development of health of the constituency is very effective, what do you think makes it effective?

Department Head 2: I think it is the mindset of the NGO and us here in the local government. The thing is we really reach out to them.

While Department Head 3 declared that it is almost perfect.

I: Last 2 questions, what can you say about the effectiveness of LGU and AMS collaboration and service delivery?

Department Head 3: Both support each other. In percentage it is almost perfect.

Department Head 4 of the MPOC went on to declare that:

Department Head 4: If the Mayor wants to introduce a program he would invite me over for my comments. If the NGOs have problem, the Mayor would refer it to me. That is what is good because there is transparency.

Department Head 5 of the MPOC was asked if the partnership with the NGOs is effective.

Department Head 5: I can say it is, for the LGU to convince or to persuade these NGOs to donate something to the police like the patrol car it means that the NGOs have the trust with the LGU. Another thing is they are satisfied with the performance or the services that we give otherwise if they feel we are not doing our part in maintaining the peace and order I think they will not voluntarily give.

While Department Head 6 of the Local School Board maintained that:

Department Head 6: There is no problem there. There are no political considerations here unlike in other municipalities.

Subsequently, NGOs were given questions that tend to elicit their ideas on participation, their agenda, and whether the services that they deliver in partnership with the LGU are effective. The first question: *How does your organization participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU?*

NGO 1, interviewed on 23 June 2011, is a group whose aim is development of culture and the arts. It is a member of the Municipal Development Council.

I: As member of the MDC, how do you participate in the decision-making of the council?

NGO 1: During meetings they also consult us.

I: Are you free to express your ideas?

NGO 1: Yes.

I: Are your ideas being solicited?

NGO 1: Of course, sometimes we even dominate them (in jest).

I: Do you also present programs to the LGU?

NGO 1: Yes and they like it because sometimes the programs that we present have not crossed their minds. They have so much respect for the NGOs because we are serious and we do not ask for funds from them although this should be professionalized.

I: What is the extent of participation of your organization in planning as member of the MDC?

NGO 1: We have not experienced having joined in the planning as we have not been invited, we only attend the meetings.

I: I think they conducted the Comprehensive Development Planning previously.

NGO 1: I cannot remember if we were invited.

NGO 2, interviewed on 22 July 2011, is another member of the MDC. It is a local chapter of a national based business organization whose objective is to influence the development of opportunities and economic growth in the LGU.

I: In terms of participation, how does your organization participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU?

NGO 2: We are asked to attend public hearings.

I: As member of the MDC, do you participate in meetings?

NGO 2: Yes, yes, we...let me see...we have a new Mayor and we have consistently been invited to share our views...

I: Let's say in planning or implementation the past year.

NGO 2: The one who has been attending the past year is my son-in-law who is the Executive Secretary who is still active but he put up his own business and have to attend to it...maybe I can just ask him for his inputs.

I: As member of the MDC, have you been attending the meetings?

NGO 2: It has been my son-in-law for the past year but recently not so much.

NGO 2: (On the phone with the son-in-law) Mr. Orbista here wants to interview about the organization's participation to the Municipal Development Council, you have attended at least 4? He has some questions for you here.

I: Since you have been attending the meetings of the MDC, what is the extent of your participation in the planning?

Son-in-law (S): Basically, I was able to attend on Solid Waste Management on the environmental sector, also in disaster risk reduction under the new administration.

I: Under the previous administration, were you able to participate also?

S: No, we were not invited.

I: Basically, it is more on planning right now?

S: Yes.

Me: You mean more on planning not yet on the implementation stage?

S: Yes.

I: Okay. Thank you. Bye.

I: It seems that it is only now that you get invited?

NGO 2: It seems that we have not participated during the previous administration.

I: He said it is more on the planning stage right now, the implementation will come later on, I think.

NGO 3, interviewed on 27 June 2011, is another member of the MDC. It is a transport group composed of drivers whose membership is municipality-wide.

I: (NGO) has been a member of the MDC since last year, have you participated in the decision-making in the MDC?

NGO 3: I participate if it's for the good but if it will not bring us any good I also react.

NGO 4, interviewed on 28 June 2011, another member of the MDC, is an environmental group whose aims include community education on environment, implementation of environmental laws, advocacy and linkage with national and international organizations.

I: Next question, with regards to participation in the municipal government.

NGO4: We are now a member of the Municipal Solid Waste Management Board (MSWMB).

I: Yes. But as member of the MDC, how do you participate in the decision-making for the identification of the PPAs?

NGO 4: Right now we are just being identified as part of it, we have not attended any meeting yet asking us how to identify those things.

I: In the identification of PPAs, normally the 20% Development Fund. For the MDC it is for the use of the 20% DF so if you have P100,000,000 you have P20,000,000 for the use of the MDC, so in the identification of PPAs were you given the chance to participate in the identification of PPAs?

NGO 4: Only in the MSWMB.

I: But not in the MDC?

NGO 4: I haven't heard about it yet (laughs)...Because we are very focused on the environment that's what we are going to the municipal hall only.

Another member of the MDC, NGO 5, interviewed on 23 June 2011, was originally a youth organization identified with a certain political figure, which later on was converted into a group advocating unity in the province when the political figure got elected into a higher position, thus funding comes from his office. They provide training to cooperatives, scholarship programs to the youth, and assist in the organization of cooperatives. When asked about their participation in the municipality, the representative stated that they participate in the identification and formulation of programs. One of their accomplishments during the present administration is when they assisted in the organization of a group to manage the local festival.

NGO 6, interviewed on 24 June 2011, which is another member of the MDC, is composed of a small group of women of mixed race engaged in business in the municipality. Their aim is to help indigents and help with the provision of livelihood to the needy. When asked about their participation in decision-making, she declared that she is not aware that they are a member of the MDC and that she was not informed thereof.

NGO 7, interviewed on 28 June 2011, is a women's group whose focus is on women's rights and the empowerment of women.

I: As member of the MDC since 2010, how do you participate in the decision-making for the development of the municipality?

NGO 7: Not yet, we have not been invited yet...like we got helped, or something like that?

I: No, I mean during the meeting of the MDC for example in planning, do they get your ideas?

NGO 7: In the barangay, yes, but not here in the municipal level.

I: You mean, you have not attended any planning activity?

NGO 7: When there is a meeting we participate, that is all.

I: For example, do they get your ideas?

NGO 7: We only attend the meeting. Just like when there was an open forum conducted by the DILG, one NGO who attended said, "Are the NGOs being used?" something like that, but that is true, are we being used? What we only need is to be helped, actually that is what I feel also, we conduct all these meetings, what we need to do is how to help the people who are poor.

I: You mean you have not collaborated with the municipality?

NGO 7: Not yet.

I: So you are in that stage where you are on your way to having collaboration with the municipality?

NGO 7: We are waiting for that.

NGO 8, interviewed on 23 June 2011, is a member of both MDC and MPOC. It is composed of a group of business people who are mixed race.

I: Do you participate in the decision-making in the LGU?

NGO 8: We cannot meddle on their affairs.

I: I mean as member of the Council.

NGO 8: Sometimes we attend the meetings.

I: Do you also participate during the meetings?

NGO 8: Yes.

I: What about during the planning?

NGO 8: If we are invited.

I: Are your opinions solicited or do you give your piece also?

NGO 8: Yes, we were invited when they asked from us a fire truck and a patrol car.

NGO 9, interviewed on 29 June 2011, is also both a member of the MDC and MPOC. It is a local chapter of an international civic oriented organization based in the United States.

NGO 9: Our participation is just an adviser. We advise them what we feel is right and this last program that we have the thrust is garbage collection. We have a dumping site problem right now which is almost full so we try to find means and ways where at least we could utilize it longer and that is where this program of segregation and also we have enacted something like the memorandum where there are penalties already.

I: I think that is an ordinance. Are you free to talk in the MDC?

NGO 9: Yes.

I: Are your suggestions being solicited?

NGO 9: Yes.

I: Do they welcome your suggestions?

NGO 9: Yes.

I: Do they listen to your suggestions?

NGO 9: Yes, the Mayor is even present during those meetings.

Another NGO which is a member of the MPOC, NGO 10, interviewed on 30 June 2011, is also a local chapter of another civic oriented international organization based in the United States. When asked about how they participate in the local government:

NGO 10: The President of our organization regularly delegates who would attend in the meetings in the local government, he would normally ask me or another to attend however I also have my work but as far as actual activities or implementation is concerned we are there but not so much during the planning.

The only NGO member of the Local Health Board, NGO 11, interviewed on 23 June 2011, is composed of medical professionals whose membership is province wide where they

have members in every municipality. Their members are both from the private and the government sector. It is a local chapter of a national organization based in Manila.

I: Can you say you can expressly participate in the decision-making of the Health Board?

NGO 11: Yes, usually the Mayor would resort to us or our members from the government side. We cannot evade that there will be two opinions, on the government side and on the private side, but it always works. We voice our opinions especially when the PPAs are conducted during weekdays because we cannot participate as we prefer weekends while on the government side they would rather have it during weekdays since that is part of their job. More often than not we meet halfway like instead of 20 health professionals we provide 10 for the medical missions. With regards to the programs of the Municipal Health Board that is in line with the programs of the DOH, it becomes part of our schedule for the year.

In the Local School Board, the NGO member is a group of parents of students and teachers of the school, their membership is municipal wide. Interviewed on 24 June 2011, NGO 12 says:

I: As member of the School Board, do you participate also during your meetings?

NGO 12: Yes, we even have seminars sometimes.

I: Do they solicit your ideas?

NGO 12: Yes, they ask you for ideas also.

I: Are you free to give your opinions?

NGO 12: Yes. They have no complaint.

The next question that was asked to the NGOs was: *How do the PPAs of your organization fit with the LGU agenda on service delivery?*

NGO 1 as a group aiming for cultural development replied:

NGO 1: If we are going to speak of the cultural aspect then we have no problem. In so far as programs for community development is concerned we have no problem with that too because they like it especially when we provide the funding. They like it because it helps the community.

NGO 2 qualified his answer, thus:

I:do you have services that you deliver like community outreach programs?

NGO 2: That's the usual thing for civic clubs but for our chamber it is not a charitable organization.

I: What do you mean?

NGO 2: We provide members easier access to other members, seminars on management, trade fairs, so we can easily have a contact with other provinces or regions to do business in.

I: Do you think it fits with the agenda of the municipality? Is it effective?

NGO 2: Some of our activities...let me ask the secretariat (calls the secretary).

I: (Secretary around)...Mr. Orbista is interviewing about our activities in the community. What do you remember? We conducted a seminar on detecting counterfeit money, you remember? We invited Central Bank people to give seminar on how to detect counterfeit money or fake currencies here in the municipality. What else are our activities here in the municipality aside from the food festival?

Secretary: We conducted a seminar on BMBE (Barangay Micro Business Enterprises) Law, and then after Typhoon Frank...

NGO 2: After Typhoon Frank in 2008, we became channel of the national chapter wherein they provided for typhoon victims in cash of about P 100, 000, the goods are worth about P 100, 000 also.

NGO 3, a transport group, replied in the negative but qualified his answer.

I: Do your PPAs fit with the agenda of the LGU in the delivery of services?

NGO 3: I don't think it fits the agenda of the LGU but I have talked to the Mayor about our request to the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office (PCSO) to set-up a sub-office here, we are waiting for the resolution of the Sangguniang Bayan for that request. Hopefully it will push through as we want all the drivers to be issued an ID by the PCSO so that when they go for hospitalization all they have to do is show the ID and the PCSO will pay the bills.

I: What else are the services other than putting up a trash can in your vehicles?

NGO 3: We want to improve our services also. We have this color coding now but we want to change that a little bit. We want to shift back to our color coding before where each barangay will have its own color to easily identify them especially during accidents or like when there is robbery and the tricycle is used as getaway like what happened here where all that the witnesses can point out is the color of the tricycle however there are many barangays which have the same color so it is difficult to point out.

NGO 4 replied that their PPAs fit with the agenda of the LGU inasmuch as they are about the environment like the adopt-a-street program and the clean-up drive in the municipality.

NGO 5 whose funds come from the office of an elected provincial political figure contended:

I: Do you think the PPAs of (NGO) fit with the agenda of the Municipality in the delivery of services?

NGO 5: Right now the Municipality does not have services like hospitalization so those who ask assistance from the Mayor for payment of hospital bills I network with the office of [the provincial political figure] for some funds. The municipality has its own scholarship program but it is limited so I network with the office of [the political figure] for assistance because there are really many who ask for scholarship assistance from the Mayor. Right now we also network with the office of [another elected provincial political figure] for some assistance. Those are among the NGO's help to the municipality.

NGO 6, a women's group of mixed race origin whose leader is a high ranking local official and whose focus is environmental, declared that their agenda practically fits the agenda of the LGU since their priorities are centered on livelihood and for indigents.

NGO 7, a women's group who aims to empower women, replied:

I: What are your PPAs that help in the development of the municipality?

NGO 7: We were able to help in the clean up drive after Typhoon Frank, we volunteered to do that.

I: What else?

NGO 7: In [Barangay X] we have been given a lot.

I: In general, say in the environment?

NGO 7: We did tree planting. In health, we had medical missions. We also gave a livelihood program on weaving.

I: Is your livelihood program only in [Barangay X] or you had in other barangays too?

NGO 7: Only in [Barangay X] then we also provided some help for the sari-sari stores thru the help of [a local politician]. Until now we have a problem because some people have not paid although that is the primary help that we gave after Typhoon Frank.

NGO 8, a group of mixed race business people, declared that they are inactive as of the moment and that they are always willing to provide financial support in times of disaster. On the other hand NGO 9, a civic oriented group, replied:

I: Do you think that the PPAs of NGO 8 fits the agenda of the LGU on service delivery?

NGO 8: Well, I could not say that it really does, I cannot but sometimes there are advise that we offer them and they make any action on it but mostly when we are invited and they invite us all the time I believe that they do appreciate our participation.

I: Does the LGU come to you and approach you and say help us.

NGO 8: They send us a letter, through communications only but for the Mayor to personally come or the representative to personally come, I don't think that has ever happened since I was here.

NGO 10, another civic oriented organization, replied that they do not think their agenda fits with the agenda of the LGU because they do "not really follow what is the program of the LGU and that they have not even been given a copy of the program."

NGO 11, a group of medical professionals, argued:

I: Are the programs of the NGO 11 fit with the agenda of the LGU?

NGO 11: We try to work with them but sometimes we don't jive.

I: Why?

NGO 11: This is a personal opinion. They have a different program.

I: They have a different direction, thrust?

NGO 11: Since their programs are geared more for the barangay level we have difficulty integrating in that because that would mean going to the remotest barangays. It is going to be hard for us to go with the program because we have a hard time getting volunteer doctors because of their busy schedule and because it is remote, as I mentioned we are a volunteer group so for those programs though geared for health and we

are supposed to be part of it but time and again based on our experience (with NGO 8) we find it difficult to fit-in in the programs of the Health Board.

I: Is that because you have different orientation?

NGO 11: Exactly, although we join during the medical mission but in depth immersion like what they do we cannot contribute.

NGO 12, on their part, contended that they have no PPAs because they follow those of the school.

The NGOs were asked: *What are the PPAs that you practice towards the development of the LGU?*

NGO 1 contended that other than cultural and arts development they also have programs such as responsible parenthood in partnership with the Commission on Population, the natural family planning program, the alternative learning system in coordination with the Department of Education, and the medical mission as part of rehabilitation efforts after a strong typhoon hit the municipality in 2008 with funding coming from a Filipino association in the United States. NGO 2 pointed out their participation not only in the municipality but also in the province in the drafting of the Provincial Investment Code. NGO 3 as a transport group gives suggestions to improve the traffic and the putting-up of trash cans in their vehicles in support of the environmental program of the municipality. NGO 4 initiates environmental awareness activities. NGO 5 participates in the identification and formulation of different PPAs. NGO 6 provides food, clothing and livelihood programs for indigents. NGO 7 has environmental programs, medical missions and livelihood programs. NGO 8 provides financial support in times of disaster and emergencies. NGO 9 conducts literacy and feeding programs, and distributes goods to indigents. NGO 10 conducts medical missions not only in the municipality but also in the province. NGO 11, which is a group of medical professionals, conducts civic actions by providing free medical and surgical support. NGO 12 provides support to activities in the schools.

Another question raised with the NGOs is: *How effective are the services delivered by the organization with LGU collaboration?*

NGO 1 went on to elaborate the programs that they deliver in collaboration with the LGU.

I: How effective are the services that you deliver together with the LGU?

NGO 1: Very effective because like in supplemental feeding malnutrition has been eliminated.

I: That is curative what about the preventive aspect of the program?

NGO 1: We conduct trainings like responsible parenthood for mothers as part of the nutrition program.

I: Is this municipal wide?

NGO 1: Right now we are piloting it in 4 barangays but eventually we will expand to other barangays. To sustain it we also have the livelihood component to it where mothers are given the priority to avail of a livelihood program to gain income so they will be able to maintain the needs of the child. On the cultural aspect we have integrated product development like trainings for dyeing of baskets and later on the design. The training is still on going to make their income sustainable.

NGO 2 replied that there is “room for improvement” (need to do some more) while NGO 3 maintained that the collaboration is somehow effective. Meanwhile, NGO 4 remarked:

NGO 4: For me very effective, because we don’t deal with political matters because we only focus on our advocacy, we don’t interfere in politics, more on we just do our job. We are trying to be consistent, the thing is we in (NGO) there are 4 of us, I don’t know until when sometimes you get burnout, isn’t it?

NGO 5 who does networking and whose financial support comes from an elected political figure contended:

NGO 5: Yes like the feeling of relief of those patients who can’t pay their hospital bills and through our assistance we are able to help them as well as those who died in the hospital but because they cannot be issued a death certificate for the dead to be buried so we help them settle their bills, so it is effective.

NGO 6 have not collaborated yet with the local government in the delivery of services. NGO 7, meanwhile, stated that they have yet to collaborate with the local government and that they are still waiting for it. On the other hand, NGO 8 replied that their collaboration is somehow effective. However, NGO 9 elaborated:

NGO 9: Well, probably on our feeding program because the barangay captains (village leaders) are very much involved personally, in the matter yes, but others like big decision making like on this garbage collection program ours is just advisory.

I: What about in the municipal government?

NGO 9: Actually the way I see this present Mayor during this term, the improvement that he is making now for instance in our market and the drainage system and the garbage collection and on some ordinances that he put out I think as you will notice the improvement on our public market, that is commendable.

NGO 10, which is a civic group and a member of the MPOC, replied:

I: As what you have said, you have PPAs in collaboration with the LGU, would you say the implementation is effective? Or has the delivery of services been effective?

NGO 10: As far as we are concerned, there is overwhelming appreciation of the activities we held, in fact we have been requested for more...for example, in the medical mission, the conduct would go overtime supposedly the dentist should only be for 4 hours but it gets extended. Now, those who cannot be attended due to lack of time we normally schedule them at the Provincial Hospital, that is for dental only but for medical it is fast.

Meanwhile, NGO 11 which is composed of medical professionals, declared:

I: How effective are the services delivered by the LGU with your group?

NGO 11: The delivery of the programs is efficient say for example during the medical or surgical mission like circumcision where the LGU is also involved. The implementation is well coordinated and then the target patients are well served. I can say 100% efficient although we cannot do away with patients that really need to be admitted in the hospitals.

NGO 12 which is composed of parents and teachers said that their PPAs are only school-based. In other words, their PPAs are implemented in partnership with the school not with the local government.

Subsequently, a focus group discussion was conducted among ordinary citizens of the municipality. The focus group discussion was conducted in five sessions on 17 July 2011 at 10:00-12:00 noon, 1:00-3:00 and 3:00-5:00, both in the afternoon, and on 23 July 2011 at 10:00-12:00 noon and 1:00-3:00 in the afternoon attended by ordinary citizens such as laborers, drivers, barangay health workers, housewives, security guard, a teacher, farmers, a vendor, a student and self-employed. Questions include their awareness of the presence of NGOs, their interaction, its role in service delivery, responsiveness, its representation in the LSBs, and its partnership with the LGU.

Hence, in the question: *Are you aware of the presence of NGOs?* The citizens replied in a hesitant manner and the answers were varied, some replied “yes” while most of them answered either:

“I am somehow aware.”

“I only got to know about it now.”

“We are not really familiar with their functions.”

“I am not familiar with other NGOs.”

“With some but not with others.”

The next question was: *How do you interact with the NGOs?* Some of the citizens replied that they get to interact only with an NGO that is based in their barangay (village). Some expressed that they get to interact with the NGOs when they conduct their outreach programs such as medical and dental missions or during public hearings specifically by a transport group. Most of them declared that they get to interact when they avail of the services of the NGOs however some of them qualified their answers:

“If they call for a meeting.”

“If we get invited to join.”

“If you are not a member you cannot interact but if you need something from them they also give.”

“When I ask for solicitations (financial or material support) from them.”

“Through the barangay council (village officials).”

The question that followed: *What is the role of NGOs in service delivery?* The citizens acknowledged the big role of NGOs in delivering services especially that they are free and help the poor such as medical and dental missions, livelihood assistance, feeding program for malnourished children, capability building programs, skills training for out-of-school youths, and information dissemination. They also recognized the role of the NGOs in providing help directly to the intended beneficiaries. They declared that NGOs may provide what the government cannot and that some NGOs can reach what the government cannot (in terms of terrain). Some NGOs effectively provided relief during crisis situations and they facilitate faster delivery of relief goods to affected people. Nevertheless, some of them expressed their experiences with NGOs:

“Like [NGO], they provide scholarship programs for the youth however you cannot avail if you belong to a different political party.

“After Typhoon Frank [in 2008] many NGOs provided basic necessities to those affected but they give only to those they know, they don’t give equally.”

“When services by the NGOs go thru the barangay officials [village leaders], the real beneficiaries do not avail of it because of politics [note: NGOs do not have that many people on the ground so they use barangay officials to identify the beneficiaries].”

When asked the question: *Are the NGOs responsive to your needs?* The citizens acknowledged that NGOs are responsive at some point but not all the time, some expressed they are not sure if they were able to avail of the services of the NGOs or that they have not

experienced any help at all. They acknowledge the notion that they cannot demand from the NGOs, they settle for what is available or what is given them, that the NGOs are not obliged to give service and that their services are limited. The others were very specific:

- “The farmer’s cooperative, you buy their products also though at a lesser price.”
- “Yes, during disaster, they are responsive to the needs of those affected.”
- “The others are responsive the others are not.”
- “The others give the exact service (referring to the transport group) but the others do not.”

Consequently, the citizens were asked: *What do you think of NGOs representation in the Local Special Bodies?* The NGOs involved in the different Local Special Bodies were enumerated to the citizens to give them some idea how they are being represented in such bodies. Some stated:

- “It seems the composition is limited.”
- “The people are not properly represented.”
- “We are not aware of how they represent us in the LSB.”
- “We have not felt their representation.”
- “Their representation is sectoral.”
- “Not all represent our interests.”
- “For some of them we are not aware that they are representing us.”
- “Only a few can actually represent us.”

They expressed approval of the representation of the parents and teachers group. However, some of the citizens expressed their observations that only members of the NGOs know that they are represented in the Local Special Bodies. The others went on to argue that since those NGOs represent them they are not exactly sure if their concerns really “reach the top” or maybe it reaches the local government but the help is not really that responsive. As to how they get consulted:

- “They do not come to us (ordinary citizens) to consult.”
- “Maybe they go through the barangay officials (village leaders) in their consultations.”
- “They don’t come to the community to consult except during disaster.”
- “Other NGOs do not go down to the level of the community to consult.”

Meanwhile, the citizens were asked: *How do you assess the partnership between the LGU and NGOs?* The citizens contended that it depends on what specific sector the NGOs come from. The group of medical professionals is effective in their medical missions. The transport group is

very effective in their services. However, some citizens replied that the partnership is not enough or it is insufficient, that only the LGU and the NGOs know about the partnership, that some of the NGOs do not actually represent the interest of some of the citizens, that they have not really felt that there is partnership, or that the partnership is weak. Some of them though, qualified their ideas about the partnership and gave their observations:

“For relief goods, it is better that it is given by the NGO itself and not pass through the government so that the intended beneficiaries would be reached.”

“It is much better if the services by the local government would be delivered in partnership with the NGO to better reach the intended beneficiaries.”

“It is an effective means to provide check and balance in the local government.”

“Government projects are better implemented if the implementation is in partnership with NGOs.”

Others, on the other hand, approved of the idea that government projects are better implemented if it is the NGO that implements them and that they do not trust the government in the implementation of some projects. Some maintained that service is slow or weak if done by the local government alone; however, they also contended that if it is the NGO alone who provide the service it would also be slow or weak since they are not obliged in the first place. Some suggested there is a need to strengthen the partnership between the LGU and NGO and that it should be sustainable.

3.2.1 Analysis of Research Findings

The analysis will take into consideration the performance of the municipality, the meetings and outputs of the local special bodies, and the answers of the respondents to questions relative to the hypothesis.

Municipal Development Council (MDC)

The MDC serves as the primary planning body of the municipality and is responsible in the conduct of development planning activities. A planning activity is a consultative process that seeks to solicit or elicit ideas from a multi-sectoral group to better address the problems or issues

that abound in the municipality. Extensive planning process results in the identification of comprehensive programs, projects and activities. The performance of the municipality in 2010 in terms of administrative governance shows that the consultation process should be improved in relation to development planning. From the Minutes, only one meeting was conducted by the MDC in 2010 and as of August 2011 no meeting was conducted, contrary to the provision of the Local Government Code which requires that meetings be conducted “at least once every six months or as often as may be necessary” (Section 110, Local Government Code of 1991). In that meeting, the Minutes show that NGOs, though more than half of them were present, did not take part in the discussions (Table 3.1, see page 85). However, during the interview the local officials and department heads maintained that they call for a meeting with NGOs on how to implement the 20% Development Fund and that they are active in planning, while one local official said that NGOs barely participate because they are “hesitant and put limitations to themselves hence it is the municipality which has the major role.” One local official declared that there is a need to increase participation of the NGOs because “only a few are really active.” On the other hand, with regards to participation in the decision-making for the development of the LGU, some of the NGOs averred that they attended a meeting but not a planning activity of the MDC while the others declared that they are not aware they are a member of the MDC or they have not heard of the MDC at all. Of particular example, the Local Development and Investment Program (LDIP) for 2011-2013 stipulates NGO participation in several programs, projects and activities, it was presented and approved during a meeting of the MDC attended by a few NGOs. However, there is no showing of NGO involvement in prior planning activities in its formulation as most of the NGOs replied in the negative when they were asked about their participation in the planning activities of the MDC. In other words, the LDIP has been drafted prior to the presentation and approval of the MDC without the NGOs taking part in the planning. Thus, it shows that the LDIP was drafted solely by the local government and presented to the MDC as a mere formality for approval; it was neither consultative nor participatory.

Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)

The performance of the municipality on social governance shows that there is a need to strengthen the local peace and order council and ensure constant financial support to peace and order and public safety initiatives. Several meetings have been conducted by the MPOC but there was no showing of extensive involvement by the NGOs during the discussion except in one instance when one NGO was asked to donate a patrol car (Table 3.1, see page 85). During the interview, a high ranking local official recognized the participation of NGOs in the maintenance of peace and order and that the NGOs are not hesitant when they are tapped. Meanwhile, a department head expressed that the services that they deliver in collaboration with the NGOs are effective and the cooperation is enormous and it involves immediate police response, rescue, public safety, police visibility, traffic management and traffic regulation. On their view about the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery, one department head theorized that “for the LGU to convince the NGO to donate a patrol car to the police means that the LGU have the trust of the NGO,” such that the NGO is probably satisfied with the performance and services that the LGU give. On the other hand, the NGOs contended that they sometimes attend meetings but are not involved in the planning. Hence, planning for the Public Safety Plan cannot be said to be participatory. In the implementation, one NGO said that their group is inactive but they are always willing to provide financial support during disaster while another said that “we really do not follow their program. Besides we have not been given a copy of the program.” Further, the NGOs in the MPOC have PPAs that are entirely different from that of the LGU as far as peace and order is concerned.

Municipal Health Board (LHB)

The performance of the municipality in 2010 says that the Local Health Board has to do more to improve performance in service delivery such as the quality of child care services. Under the new administration, the body met only once, contrary to the requirement of the Local Government Code which requires that meetings be conducted monthly or as often as may be necessary (Table 3.1, see page 85). In that lone meeting, the NGO was absent. During the interview however the local officials and department heads recognized the participation of the

Table 3.1 Local Special Bodies (Municipality of A) – July 2010 – August 2011

Local Special Body	Mandated Number of Meetings Under the LGC of 1991	Number of Meetings Actually Held		Number of NGOs Under the Executive Order (EO)	Number of NGOs Present	Extent of Participation of NGOs	Source
		Frequency	Date				
Municipal Development Council (MDC)	Once every six months or as often as may be necessary	Once (1)	October 2010	11	6	-Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues	Minutes of Meeting
Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)	-	Three (3) times	December 2010	1 (Under EO 006-2010)	None	-	Minutes of Meeting
			April 2011	3 (Under EO 003-2011)	2	-Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues *Note: the LCE announced that he solicited 1 unit patrol car from one of the NGOs	-same-
			June 2011	3	2	-Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues *Note: the LCE announced that 1 unit patrol car has been donated by an NGO	-same-
Municipal School Board	Once a month or as often as may be necessary	Five (5) times	August 2010	3	None	-	Minutes of Meeting
			November 2010	3	1	-Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues	-same-
			January 2011	3	2	-Moved for the approval of the Annual Budget for 2011 -Suggested that LSB shall be the one to conduct trainings and seminars to teachers	-same-
			May 2011	3	1	--Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues	-same-
			June 2011	3	None	-	-same-
Municipal Health Board	Once a month or as often as may be necessary	Once (1)	July 2011	1	None	-	Minutes of Meeting

Table 3.2 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) statements on how effective are the services they deliver with the LGU

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	PPAs that the NGOs Practice Towards the Development of LGU	Effectiveness of Services Delivered with LGU Collaboration
1	MDC	Foundation (Culture and Arts)	Provincial	A small group of professionals based in Mun. of A (approximately 100)	-other than cultural development they also have responsible parenthood, natural family planning program, alternative learning system, and medical mission	-very effective especially in supplemental feeding, livelihood program for mothers (family planning), product development (cultural)
2	MDC	Business Group (a local chapter of a nationwide organization)	Provincial	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	-participated in the drafting of the Provincial Investment Code	-there is room for improvement
3	MDC	Transport Group	Municipal	A larger number of transport drivers and operators (approximately 3000)	-gives suggestions to improve the traffic problems and the putting-up of trash cans in their vehicles in support of the environmental program of the municipality	-somehow effective
4	MDC	Environmental Group	Municipal	A small group of concerned citizens (approximately 4)	-initiates environmental awareness activities	-very effective because they do not deal with political matters, only their advocacy
5	MDC	Youth Group advocating unity	Provincial	A moderate number of individuals (approximately 400)	-participates in the identification and formulation of PPAs in the LGU	-it is effective
6	MDC	Women's Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of women (approximately 50)	-provides food, clothing and livelihood programs to indigents	-they have not collaborated yet with the LGU
7	MDC	Women's Group	Municipal	A large organization of women (approximately 1000)	-environmental programs, medical missions and livelihood programs	-they have not collaborated yet with the LGU; they are still waiting
8	MDC/MPOC	Business Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	-provides financial support during disaster and emergencies	-somehow effective

9	MDC/MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	-conducts literacy and feeding programs, and distributes goods to indigents	-their feeding program is very effective
10	MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	-conducts medical missions	-their medical missions are effective
11	Health Board	Medical Professionals	Provincial	A large group of medical practitioners (approximately 500)	-civic actions by providing free medical and surgical support	-target patients are well served in medical and surgical missions
12	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 6000)	-provides support to activities in schools	-only school-based services

NGO in their activity and that they have “coordinative efforts” with them during their medical missions. The department heads happen to be members of the said NGO thus coordination becomes easier. One department head maintained that the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery can be attributed to the mindset of the LGU because the LGU really reached out to the NGOs. However, the NGO described their coordination in a different manner by saying that they try to work but sometimes they do not “jive” because the LGU has a different direction or thrust. Although they join during the medical mission, they cannot contribute in in-depth immersion in the barangays (villages).

Municipal School Board (LSB)

The performance of the municipality in terms of education services says that the Local School Board shall provide further assistance to support quality education such as the establishment of a scholarship fund for poor but deserving students. Meetings are supposed to be conducted once a month or as often as may be necessary however the board met only five times (Table 3.1, see page 85). Of the five meetings, the NGO only attended once. In that meeting, the Minutes do not show any participation by the NGO in the discussion. During the interview, a local official has not mentioned NGO involvement in planning and implementation of activities of the board. The department heads however averred that the NGO does not have any complaints and that the NGO checks whatever is given by the board to the schools. One department head even described the collaboration that “there are no political considerations here unlike in other municipalities.” On the other hand, the NGO maintained that their ideas are also sought; however, they do not have a program of their own because they only follow that of the school.

In Table 3.1 (see page 85), the conduct of meetings by the Local Special Bodies and the extent of participation of NGOs are highlighted. There is a clear pattern that meetings are not regularly conducted as prescribed by the Local Government Code of 1991 in the case of the MDC, Municipal School Board and the Municipal Health Board. It also shows that the NGOs are not prominent figures during the meetings although some of them were present, most particularly in the MPOC and the Municipal School Board. Several observations can be deduced from the table; first, it appears that in its failure to conduct the meetings regularly, the local government may be seeking to avoid involving the NGOs. If meetings were held on

a regular basis the opportunity for NGOs to participate would have been great. Second, the failure on the part of the NGOs to attend the meetings may demonstrate that they do not understand why the local government involved them and they thought that there is no real opportunity to participate therefore it is a waste of time. At this point, the NGOs may not have been properly oriented to their role in the Local Special Bodies. Third, the local government does not bother involving the NGOs because they do not understand why the NGOs should be involved. In this sense, the local government lacks proper understanding of the concept of decentralization and the participation of NGOs in local governance which the Local Government Code of 1991 mandates.

In Table 3.2, (see page 86) the statements of the NGOs on the PPAs that they practice towards the development of the LGU and the effectiveness of services delivered with LGU collaboration can be carefully examined. In terms of representativeness of the NGOs based on type and the PPAs that they practice towards the development of the LGU, it can be drawn from the table that the NGOs have impact according to the sector they represent. For example, NGO 2, which is a business group, has participated in the drafting of an investment code, NGO 3, which is a transport group, gets involved in the improvement of traffic regulations, NGO 4, which is an environmental group, initiates environmental awareness programs while NGO 11, which is a group of health professionals, provides medical and surgical support. NGO 1, which is a culture and arts group, provides services other than those they advocate but most, if not all, of the NGOs are sector-specific in terms of PPA provision.

The scope and size of the NGOs do not matter as far as PPAs towards the development of LGU is concerned. Provincial-wide and municipal-wide NGOs do not make any difference because provincial-wide NGOs also cover the municipality in their operations.

In terms of effectiveness of services delivered with LGU collaboration, there is no particular type of NGO that is more effective because they are all effective according to the advocacy or sector they represent. On the other hand, the scope of the NGOs has impact on the effectiveness of services because provincial-wide NGOs such as NGOs 1, 2, 5, 9, 10 and 11 are more effective than municipal-wide NGOs. Two municipal-wide NGOs have not even collaborated with the LGU. The size of the NGOs does not have any impact on the effectiveness of services. As an example, a larger NGO like NGO 11 is effective but the same

cannot be said for other larger NGOs like NGOs 3 and 12 while smaller NGOs such as NGOs 1 and 4 are very effective; however, small NGOs 2 and 8 are not as effective.

There are several observations here. First, in general, NGO representations are interest-oriented and effective in their respective sectors. Second, NGOs that have wider scope of coverage are more effective. Third, size does not matter in determining effectiveness. Fourth, although the MDC and the MPOC have broader functions, they require no specific type of NGOs as members; consequently, NGOs may represent narrow interest groups focused only on specific issues instead of broad-based constituencies. Fifth, in the Municipal School Board and the Municipal Health Board, sector-specific NGOs which are required under the Local Government Code of 1991 are more effective. Sixth, sector-specific representation is more appropriate rather than multi-sectoral representation.

In conclusion, the mechanism for an LGU-NGO partnership is provided under the Local Government Code of 1991 however as to its effectiveness there seems to be no distinction as to which part they are doing effectively. Planning in the MDC seems lacking in participation and consultation, NGOs are not given the chance to participate much less be consulted on their ideas and initiatives that can highly contribute in the planning process to come up with effective PPAs. In the MPOC, there is lack of participation and consultation in planning as the NGOs have their own agenda different from that of the LGU. There is no synchronicity as far as peace and order and public safety PPAs are concerned although the NGOs are always willing to take part. In the Local Health Board, the NGO has acknowledged that they are not participative in the different aspects of health service delivery except during the medical mission because their priorities differ with that of the LGU. In the Local School Board, NGO participation cannot be said to be effective because they do not have initiatives of their own, they are dependent upon the PPAs of the school only. This means that their participation may not be needed anymore once the school officials enter their ideas and initiatives in the Local School Board.

On the other hand, some of the ordinary citizens are not aware of the presence of NGOs while most of them are not familiar with their functions. Most of them said they get to interact only with NGOs during their outreach programs such as when they avail of the services that they provide. However, the ordinary citizens widely recognize the role of the

NGOs in service delivery but they also recognize that the NGOs cannot be obligated to provide those services. In other words, the interaction is purely service delivery, without consultation. Subsequently, ordinary citizens expressed their pessimism on how they are represented by the NGOs in the local special bodies. Some stated that they are not properly represented, that they are not aware how the NGOs represent them, that they have not felt their representation, and that they are not sure if their concerns really “reach the top.” This demonstrates that the citizens do not feel the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs in the Local Special Bodies.

In essence, had there been effective LGU-NGO relationship this would be felt and recognized by ordinary citizens. There is a need to improve the consultation processes in the MDC by involving extensively the NGOs who are members and for the NGOs to also be oriented towards going down to the grassroots level to consult in order to come up with effective PPAs that the citizens would notice. In the MPOC, NGOs are involved only during the implementation but not during the planning of PPAs. The NGO in the Local Health Board is widely recognized for its participation in medical missions but not in the planning of PPAs much less in the implementation of several other health programs that the LGU implement. Likewise, the NGO in the Local School Board is active in the implementation of PPAs but not in the planning thereof.

The mechanism is in place yet it is not effective, much less it is complied with. The process of consultation is neither concrete nor institutionalized as shown by the intermittent conduct of meetings and the seeming lack of consultative planning processes to arrive at a common agenda towards effective identification and implementation of PPAs.

3.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

This section posits the hypothesis: *Opportunities for NGOs to participate are great however, this has not been realized.*

It reports on the findings to questions that would establish the notion that, despite the opportunities NGOs are given to participate, this has not been realized. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials and department heads and NGO

representatives who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

The local officials and department heads involved in the local special bodies were asked questions on NGO participation: *What is the extent of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of PPAs?*

Local Official 1 who is involved in all the local special bodies stated that in the identification of PPAs for the 20% Development Fund they call for a meeting on how to implement it. He went on to enumerate the various projects that they are currently implementing in the municipality. Meanwhile, Local Official 2 who is involved in the MDC and MPOC simply stated:

Local Official 2: Sometimes they give suggestions and we listen to them.

Department Head 1, involved in the MDC, stated that they would conduct an action planning activity and the NGOs would be asked of their ideas, to be incorporated in the plan, and then the office of Department Head 1 would finalize it and present the plan to the council for approval. Department Head 2 expressed that the NGO involved in the Local Health Board is very supportive and that they just “fit-in” in the programs of the local government because they are really not aware of the programs of the government since most of them are private practitioners although they really want to take part in it. The NGO gives suggestions and participates also in the decision-making in the Local Health Board. Meanwhile, Department Head 3 affirmed what Department Head 2 said regarding the NGO and added that they conducted planning activities and that they really expressed their opinions and ideas. Both Department Head 2 and Department Head 3 however are also members of the NGO.

In the MPOC, Department Head 5 contended that when they formulated the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan, it was participatory and consultative and that a workshop has been conducted for action planning.

In the Local School Board, Department Head 6 stated:

I: Do they participate in your meetings and in the implementations of your PPAs?

R: In the Municipal School Board the (NGO) President is really there.

I: Do they ask questions?

R: We have a very good (NGO) President now, he is from District 1.

I: Are his suggestions also heard?

R: Of course.

I: When you do your PPAs, do you have consultations with the (NGO) President?

R: Yes, we cannot have our budget approved without the approval of the School Board.

I: Do you do a consultation with the (NGO)?

R: The one who does the consultation is the School Principal already. What I do is provide them the budget and the principal then consults the (NGO) officials in the schools.

I: So the one who conducts the consultation is the...

R: School Principal. For example I give them a certain amount then with proper consultation with the (NGO) it is up to them what project they want to do.

While Department Head 7 opined:

I: In the decision-making in the School Board, does the PTA President or his representative participate?
 Department Head 7: If they have some ideas to present we also listen to them, we have no problem with that because we agree and we have a free flowing discussion as to how the budget would be utilized.

The next question asked to local officials and department heads: *Do you believe that LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services (failed/succeeded) in the LGU, and why?*

Local Official 1 did not categorically state whether the collaboration failed or succeeded but he acknowledged:

Local Official 1: NGOs are really needed for without them there will be no cooperation from the people. We cannot do our plans without the help of the NGOs. The relationship of both parties should be smooth sailing. There should be transparency because sincerity is what they are after.

However, Local Official 2 replied that it is a “case-to-case” basis and did not elaborate further. Department Head 1 stated in the affirmative:

Department Head 1: Yes because there would be coordination with the community.

I: That’s the ultimate goal, community empowerment.

Department Head 1: Then there is transparency.

I: So far successful?

Department Head 1: Yes and they are willing to give if the LGU asks for their help.

I: You never had problem with them so far?

Department Head 1: Never.

I: They are not demanding?

Department Head 1: No, they even help us.

On the other hand, Department Head 2 acknowledged that the LGU cannot stand alone, that it needs the NGOs to deliver the services effectively and went on to say:

Department Head 2: As I said they are vital partners, of course the LGU can stand alone but the LGU need to tap their services because there are some needs or concerns that the LGU cannot address. If there is partnership we can address the concerns because they form part of the community.

While Department Head 3 declared:

Department Head 3: We can do it but it would be much better if there is someone to assist you not only in the manpower but also in their ideas.

I: Right now do you think there is a need to increase the collaboration?

Department Head 3: As of now it is enough but if there is a chance it would be much better.

Department Head 5 maintained that the collaboration is very effective because the Mayor is transparent in dealing with problems that the NGOs present, Department Head 5 expressed that the collaboration is much needed because the LGU cannot rely on its funds alone, so they need the support of the NGOs in their programs. Department Head 6 and Department Head 7 contended that collaboration and service delivery is effective because there are no political considerations and when they implement a PPA in the schools they make sure that the NGO knows about the funding.

On the other hand, the NGOs were asked: *What is the extent of your participation in the LGU (planning → implementation → evaluation)?*

NGO 1 which is a member of MDC described their participation, thus:

I: What is the extent of participation of (NGO) in planning as member of the MDC?

NGO 1: We have not experienced having joined in the planning as we have not been invited, we only attend the meetings.

I: I think they conducted the Comprehensive Development Planning previously.

NGO 1: I cannot remember if we were invited.

NGO 1: In cultural activities we are strong on that because we get invited to all the cultural activities of the LGU.

I: How about in the implementation of programs?

R: They trust us too.

I: Do you conduct an evaluation of the programs that you implement?

NGO 1: I think it should be the LGU that should do the evaluation.

I: But then if the program is in collaboration with the NGO then the NGO should take part in the evaluation.

NGO 1: If they invite us.

NGO 2 for its part maintained that they have been invited to a planning activity for a Solid Waste Management program but not with the MDC. NGO 3 of the transport group involved with the MDC argued:

I: In the MDC, you have the planning for the PPAs, how far is your participation in the planning?

NGO 3: My participation as President is quite wide just like during the rerouting plan before where I helped explain to the people why there is rerouting but that was *ningas cogon* (this means temporary or not meant to last). I have varied participation also in the planning during the previous administration especially if it concerns the traffic situation.

I: Do they also get your ideas during the meetings in the MDC?

NGO 3: Yes, yes also give me a chance to talk and express my ideas and if they think my ideas are not right they also tell me. I also accept if I think I am wrong.

I: In the implementation of PPAs together with the LGU, how's your partnership with the LGU?

NGO 3: Sometimes I am not satisfied with the implementation because they implement without involving us.

I: When you are supposed to be involved?

NGO 3: Yes, just like when they increased the tariff for tricycle fare last year. We were the petitioner but we were not involved in the committee hearing, they should have asked us some questions during the hearing, the increase was approved without us knowing it. So when the new tariff came out I questioned it myself because they have no means of knowing the problems of tricycle operators and drivers especially those plying the interior barangays since they have not gone to those barangays. We had a heated debate in the *municipio* but then what can we do they are the administration.

I: In this kind of implementation do you do evaluations?

NGO 3: No more, if I do an evaluation and bring it to their attention and if they will not accept then it's useless.

I: What I mean is you evaluate together with the LGU on the effects of the implementation?

NGO 3: No. During the previous administration everything that is concerned with transportation we do the evaluation because we had a good relationship with them but this time I don't even know who really is the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation at the Sangguniang Bayan (legislative body). The one who is supposed to be the chairman does not entertain us and points to some other people to take care of our concerns.

NGO 4, an environmental group and a member of the MDC described their participation in the local government:

I: Next question, with regards to participation in the local government...

NGO 4: We are now a member of the Municipal Solid Waste Management Board.

I: Yes. But as member of the MDC, how do you participate in the decision-making for the identification of the PPAs?

NGO 4: Right now we are just being identified as part of it, we have not attended any meeting yet asking us how to identify those things.

I: In the identification of PPAs, normally the 20% Development Fund. For the MDC it is for the use of the 20% DF so if you have P 100,000,000 you have P 20,000,000 for the use of the MDC, so in the identification of PPAs were you given the chance to participate in the identification of PPAs?

NGO 4: Only in the ESWMB.

I: But not in the MDC?

NGO 4: I haven't heard about it yet hehe...Because we are very focused on the environment that's what we are going to the *municipio* only.

I: But you have been a member for a year now.

NGO 4: What we are going is only for the invitation if they have a problem with ESWM, that's what I only learned about it, I only learned it from you now. I'm sure the President will also comment on that.

NGO 5 however stated rather categorically their participation in the municipal government.

I: As member of MDC, what is the extent of your participation in the decision-making?

NGO 5: I can say we recommend and also lobbying for good programs, projects and activities (PPAs) to be implemented in the municipality.

I: What is the extent of your participation in planning, implementation and monitoring?

NGO 5: I have a partly dual responsibility right now as chairman of (NGO 5) and at the same time as consultant of the Mayor so there are times when we monitor also the projects to see the manner of implementation if it follows what has been programmed.

I: What is the extent of your participation in the identification of projects in the MDC?

NGO 5: We submit proposed projects since the MDC has the process by inviting the members to present their proposed projects for adoption.

I: Do you inquire or question also?

NGO 5: Yes, more particularly the budget for agriculture which is quite low. How can we sustain the farmers? That's our problem.

Meanwhile, another member of the MDC, NGO 6, which is being represented by its President who is also a local official, replied that they are not aware that they are a member of the MDC.

I: You are a member of the MDC.

NGO 6: As NGO, I don't think so.

I: You are.

NGO 6: Are we?

I: Yes.

NGO 6: I didn't know about this because I was not given a copy of the composition.

I: It's here.

NGO 6: I was not given a copy of that.

NGO 7, a women's group and member of the MDC argued that they have not been invited to any activity by the MDC except during a meeting in the *municipio* (municipal hall). NGO 8, which is both a member of the MDC and MPOC, averred that they attended the meetings but did not mention of any participation in a planning activity or program implementation. However, he contended that the local government invited them when they solicited a fire truck and patrol car from them. NGO 9, also a member of both the MDC and MPOC, expressed:

I: What is the extent of your participation in the planning stage of the PPAs, are you involved?

NGO 9: Yes, well like I said our involvement is something like the consultancy, they consult us, we give them our ideas.

I: What about during the implementation of the program, are you involved in the implementation?

NGO 9: Yes, yes, because they have decided on this Solid Waste Management program we had we have this general meeting and we were all present, and those policies that have given where the things they have been consulting from the persons involved. I think that the present administration under Mayor xxx is very serious in having the LGU get involved with the NGOs in their decisions

I: Other than these programs what other PPAs do you conduct with the LGU?

NGO 9: Actually...

I: Like information dissemination...

NGO 9: Yes, yes, probably about info dissemination only but on projects that we, (NGO), are the only one that we get involved with is the library that we have put up, that is solely by the work of the (NGO).

Meanwhile, NGO 10 of the MPOC, a civic group, stated in a rather categorical way:

I: I have questions here on your collaborative efforts and partnership with the municipal government...

NGO 10: Not at all times, only medical missions.

I: With regards to that, I have some questions with regards to your partnership with the municipal government...

NGO 10: Anyway, I have to mention the participation of [Mayor XXX], he is our honorary member, for many years when he was connected with [XXX (a government agency)], he regularly supplied us with medicines, almost P 75, 000 to P 100, 000 per delivery.

I: Being a member of MPOC, I think you are aware of that, I got the Executive Order yesterday...NGO 10 is one of the members of the MPOC, prior to that were you able to participate in the municipal government?

NGO 10: Actually, there was a directive (from the President) to all that I have to specify who should regularly attend in the person of [XXX] but lately due to his many appointments he can't attend so when, I think, Hon. [XXX (another local official)] won, we tied-up with his cousin (member of NGO 10) so it was activated, I think during Typhoon Frank we failed to participate.

On the other hand, NGO 11 of the Local Health Board described their participation,

thus:

I: What is the extent of your participation in planning?

NGO 11: As part of the Municipal Health Board we are involved in the planning stage but sometimes we cannot evade that the directive coming from the Department of Health (DOH) is channeled thru the municipal level on the government side so sometimes we are not involved anymore just like the *ligtas tigdas* (prevent measles campaign).

I: What about in the implementation?

NGO 11: We are involved in a sense that those who implement the DOH programs are also members of the (NGO 11) though the situation may be complicated but it is simply like this all the doctors in the province are members of (NGO 11) including the Municipal Health Officers. Whatever it is they are doing in their capacity as Municipal Health Officers they are doing it in their capacity as members of (NGO 11), they are dual purpose.

I: Do you do evaluations in the Health Board?

NGO 11: The evaluations are with DOH, they have the mechanism to ascertain the success of the program for example is if the level of dengue is low.

I: But from time to time, do you do evaluations on the programs that you implement?

NGO 11: Yes, on our end especially if (NGO 11) is the proponent but as far as other programs involving the municipal government there is none, that's true. Like I said there is bifurcation of the medical side in the government. The (NGO 11) on the private side then on the government side are the Municipal Health Officers, so there is a dichotomy of our roles in the sense that we in the private are dealing with private cases then those on the government are dealing with the public. We actually have the same programs every year plus those from the National Association like the Medicine Week though the Municipal Health Officers are also involved because they are also members of the (NGO 11). So the programs of the Municipal Health Officers that they implement as directed by the DOH, they review the program but we are not involved anymore. For example, we take up *Ligtas Tigdas* in the Municipal Health Board when they do a report about it only however we are not involved in the evaluation anymore.

NGO 12, for its part, described how they participate in the Local School Board:

I: What is the extent of your participation during the planning for the budget of the School Board?

NGO 12: The School Principals list down their needs.

I: They present that to the board?

NGO 12: Yes, then we approve it.

I: Do you question?

NGO 12: I ask questions if the schools really need such request.

I: Do you also agree?

NGO 12: Yes, we discuss before we finalize the projects.

I: You have no problem with it so far?

NGO 12: If there is a problem I immediately raise it to them.

I: For example, there is a problem in a certain barangay (village), do they approach the School Board through you?

NGO 12: No. I have no proximity in the barangays (villages), sometimes they go to the district then the District Supervisor calls my attention.

The NGOs were asked: *What are the resources of your organization and where it is coming from?* Other than the voluntary nature in the membership of the organizations, the resources of the organizations speaks of the funds that they derive from donations, membership fees and other outside sources. NGO 1 conducts fund raising activities to source out funds. They also receive donations from rich individuals to support their scholarship programs. They constantly receive funds for their scholarship program from a Filipino association in the United States which goes to the trust fund. They also get funding from a national government agency handling culture and arts programs. They charge entrance fees for their cultural exhibits to raise funds. NGO 2 derived their funds from membership fees and annual dues. NGO 3 stated they do not have a single centavo. On the other hand, NGO 4 gets funding from the Priority Development Assistance Fund (PDAF) of a high ranking government official. NGO 6 gets its funds from monthly dues as well as voluntary contributions from members. They also ask for support from the national organization if they need big amounts for their programs. NGO 7 asks assistance from financially stable organizations, the local government and local officials for their funding resources. They also conduct fund raising activities. NGO 8 has their annual dues and a minimal amount from a private school and a cemetery that they manage. NGO 9 has fundraising activities and donations. NGO 10 charges membership fees from its members and has some support from their international counterpart. NGO 11 maintained they do not have funds but they have the “table manpower, professional manpower, technical support, human resources.” NGO 12 solicits from individuals as well as pledges from their members.

The next question asked of the NGOs: *What is the nature of your interaction with the citizens?* NGO 1 stated that they interact with the citizens through their cultural activities while NGO 2 declared that they have no direct interaction except during the conduct of the annual trade fair. NGO 3 interacts with the citizens through the monthly meeting of the chapters in the barangays (villages). Meanwhile, NGO 4 describes how they interact:

NGO 4: What we do is we go around, we reach out to them. We reach out to the people like we go to every barangay and co-NGOs, we teach them how to treat solid waste materials, so we do that, I go with the doctors like I talk about smoking, if you talk about ESWM it would be about its harmful effects, then we also have a doctor to explain the law and ordinance, we explain in layman's term, so we do that we reach out to them because they will never come to you, as NGOs what we do as part of advocacy so what we are doing we have to go to them.

NGO 5, however, responded in the negative, thus:

NGO 5: So far we have not done that because I am still trying to figure out what good interventions to initiate but actually [(X) Multi-Purpose Cooperative] came here to ask assistance for the conduct of trainings on fish preservation so I am networking now with the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) to provide us with trainers.

NGO 6, for its part, stated that they interact through the leaders in the community and the citizens submit their problems to the leaders who will then contact the NGO. However, before the NGO provide help they meet the beneficiaries first to validate their problems. NGO 7 has not done any interaction with the citizens in the municipality except in the barangay (village) where it is based. NGO 8 interacts with the citizens only during disasters or emergency when they provide some help or support. NGO 9 and NGO 10 get to interact with the citizens when they have projects. NGO 11 maintains:

NGO 11: We have the regular weekly program on radio and then we are always involved in the regular Kapehan (Media forum) especially if the topic is on health...

I: Do you conduct forums with the citizens?

NGO 11: As part of the medical missions...

NGO 12 contended that they interact with the community only during the annual Brigada Eskwela (School Brigade).

The NGOs were also asked the question: *How often do you interact with the citizens?* NGO 1 described the frequency of their interaction with the citizen, thus:

NGO 1: Every year, every quarter. Every January we invite local artists. Almost everybody like the youth through summer art classes, women, then the photographers.

I: Do you follow some schedule of activity for the whole year?

NGO 1: We have the regular activities then we encourage other institutions to join here in the venue. That is one thing that we want to strengthen, integration in the community.

NGO 2 do not have a regular interaction with the citizens except during the annual trade fair while NGO 3 have their regular monthly meeting by chapter. NGO 4 conducts monthly visitations for their advocacies on a rotational basis or at one barangay each month on rotation. NGO 5 has not done any interaction yet with the citizens while NGO 6 interacts through community leaders on a project basis. NGO 7 has not done any interaction on a wider scope except during their activities in the barangay (village). NGO 8 interacts only during disasters or emergency while NGO 9 interacts on a project basis which is almost every month. NGO 10 interacts also on a project basis or every quarter depending on the availability of medicines for their outreach programs. NGO 11 gets to interact with the citizens on a weekly basis during their weekly program on radio while NGO 12 stated they interact once a year.

The last question asked from the NGOs was: *What is your general opinion on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services?* NGO 1 explained their partnership with the LGU forthrightly:

NGO 1: Well, the activity of the Museo (museum) and the organization is being developed for the volunteers and for others that we can tap. There are other activities where the LGU tap us but this is not regular. They do their own plan and we do our own and if we need them or they need us it is the only time that we meet. I think we have not really maximized the coordination or collaboration. We are looking forward to that stage where the LGU will be funding the programs so we do not have to seek elsewhere because they (LGU) have the resources.

I: They will fund the program and you implement it for them?

NGO 1: It is not like that yet. We have not reached that stage, maybe because the administration keeps changing.

NGO 2 stated that there is room for improvement while NGO 3 maintained that there is a need to increase the collaboration. On the other hand, NGO 4 argued that the LGU “cannot do it alone” and went on to explain:

NGO 4: They lack the people to do the job and then some political leaders I noticed do not have the political will. Whereas, what happened why we have this ESWM there are political considerations because we were there, we keep pushing, that’s anti-littering eh, so we have to be consistent, now we have a case like supposedly there are other NGOs who are supposed to help but they are the ones who are more demanding, they would say we are not doing it right, they would say the enforcement is wrong, when in fact as member of ESWMB we are supposed to be the model, not that when we violate

and we get charged we would resist, so the Mayor should really make sure in the enforcement of the laws. Yes the LGU will not be very effective, they cannot do it alone, there should be a collaboration, first their budget is not enough, while even without a budget we can do a seminar, all they have to do is ask us. What is good is that, like when we conduct the training together with the LGU, we were empowered because they come to us to help them, our efforts have been recognized.

NGO 5 recognized the need of the LGUs to have the NGOs take an active part in local governance:

NGO 5: First, it is good that in all program undertakings of the local government there is NGO participation because they are the direct players in the community and at the same time they can also provide assistance in the delivery of services, without their participation the implementation would be poor because they will not be able to get active support from the community. These NGOs represent certain sectors and through them the much needed intervention would be sought as the LGU cannot perceive what the community need on the ground because planning is done up there and if there is no NGO participation there would be no realization because the intervention may not actually be needed.

NGO 6 replied that there is a need to increase the collaboration and partnership and that there is a need to have a massive campaign for it while NGO 7 declared that the NGOs are needed as partners because the LGU cannot resolve the problems alone. NGO 8 maintained that there is effective NGO participation in the LGU and that NGO participation can encourage transparency in the government. NGO 9 declared that no corruption will happen if there is continued LGU-NGO partnership. Meanwhile, NGO 10 argued:

NGO 10: In my own opinion, it is also known in our club that we are there to help in our own little way to address the many problems. In our own little way we address a certain problem, our contribution to the upliftment of the less privileged people especially the children, now the club especially in Boracay, one of the projects of (NGO 10) is the feeding program at the Aeta barangay...the government could not do it alone, the services of NGOs like us is very vital.

I: As of this time, do we still need to strengthen the relationship between the LGU and NGO?

NGO 10: It depends, there are many NGOs that have no achievement...they are just there for "picture taking," maybe I can vouch for my club that for 33 years by doing the quarterly medical missions we were able to help the less privileged children.

I: But do you believe that the government cannot do it alone?

NGO 10: Yes, actually if you visit the squatters area there are still plenty of things to be done.

Meanwhile, NGO 11 maintained that the collaboration "is not enough in a sense that we are not represented in some PPAs, we are only represented in the Health Board but there are many programs that [NGO 11] should be involved in." NGO 12 argued that they need to participate more in the Local School Board and that the implementation of PPAs should have the guidance of the [NGO 12].

Subsequently, during the focus group discussion with ordinary citizens as aforementioned, various questions were asked with a focus on participation and the participatory opportunities available to them.

The participants to the focus group discussion were asked: *Do you have the opportunity to participate in decision-making and in service delivery?* Most of the participants stated that they have not participated in any decision-making in the community. However, there are some who said they have participated during the barangay (village) assembly. Some replied that decisions are already made before the people know while others said there is no consultation among ordinary citizens. There is one participant who simply stated that as ordinary citizens they have no chance to participate. Another stated that “if you speak out they will brand you an oppositionist and that you belong to a different political party.” Some said they have participated in the decision-making in church meetings. Everyone agreed though that they are willing to participate if they are invited. On the other hand, all of them have participated in the delivery of services both in their personal capacity and through collective effort of the community. Some provide voluntary service in health service delivery while others help in information dissemination to the residents when there are forthcoming medical and dental missions. They have volunteered in giving relief goods provided by the LGU and the NGOs to those affected during disasters. Some facilitated assistance for the poorest of the poor. Some specifically stated that they participated in the Brigada Eskwela (School Brigade, a school-based cleaning activity before the school opening), provided free transport during emergency, street cleaning, and rescue operations.

The next question tries to elicit from the participants the factors that led them to participate in a certain activity: *What leads you to participate?* Some replied that they participated because somebody they know brought them. Some participated because they were motivated to help their fellow residents and that it is “an obligation to the community and for the good of the community.” They said there is a sense of fulfillment when you are able to help other people. Some declared that they help so that they can also be helped when they are in need.

They were also asked the factors that hinder participation: *What prevents you from participating?* Most of the participants contended that they cannot participate in the decision-

making because “if you belong to a different political party you have to go through a political leader before you can reach the concerned local government official” or that “you must have a *padrino* (sponsor) to reach the local officials.” Some declared that local officials do not want to involve ordinary citizens in the decision-making. One of them expressed that “if you are an ordinary citizen, your duty is only to vote during elections and those who get elected make it their duty to decide what’s good for the community.” Most of them said they participate at the barangay (village) level only and that the barangay officials are the ones participating in the municipal level. Some of them acknowledged that in the barangays (village) there is a sickening practice that if you do not belong to the same group as the administrator of the barangay you will not be informed. Most of them said they were not informed that they can possibly participate. There are those who specifically replied that some local officials promised during the election campaign that they were going to bring the sessions of the Sangguniang Bayan (municipal legislative body) to the barangays if they win and that it could be a good chance for them to participate, however, this has not been realized. Some of the participants acknowledged their failure to participate in the delivery of services due to financial constraints or that they are busy with their family or work although they are always willing to provide some help.

The participants were asked: *What might encourage you to participate more?* Most of them expressed that the leaders should be the ones to encourage participation. Some stated that they are willing to participate in the sessions or meetings if they are given the chance or if they get invited, involved and informed. If the objective is good they will participate. Some acknowledged that the gratefulness of the people they have helped will encourage them to participate more.

When they were asked: *Are you aware of the opportunities available to participate in the local government?* Most of them declared they have no idea how to participate in the local government. Some replied that they can participate through the barangay (village) officials but “it depends, if they belong to the same political party.” Some of them may participate if it concerns them. Some acknowledged that “if you are a member of any group in the municipality” you can participate.

Consequently, the participants were asked: *How do you interact with the local government in the delivery of services?* The farmers acknowledged that they interact with the agricultural technicians of the local government as far as farm inputs are concerned. Likewise, ordinary citizens get to avail of the services of the health center in every barangay. Some acknowledged the services of the social welfare office especially when they were beneficiaries themselves. Some of them described that they interact with the local government as a beneficiary of their programs, projects or activities such as indigency program, skills training, summer jobs, or health and agricultural services. However, some of them asserted that they are reluctant to go near the local government while others said you have to invite yourself to go near. Some went as far as saying “if you are a supporter of the political party (the local officials are in) otherwise you will not avail of their help.”

3.3.1 Analysis of Research Findings

The analysis will take into consideration the performance of the municipality, the meetings and outputs of the local special bodies, and the answers of the respondents to questions relative to the hypothesis.

Municipal Development Council (MDC)

As previously noted, the Municipal Development Council is the primary planning body of the municipality and as revealed in the 2010 performance report, the local government needs to improve the consultation process in development planning. Meetings are not regularly conducted and planning sessions are not held. When asked of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of PPAs, local officials averred that they call for a meeting of the council and that sometimes the NGOs give suggestions and that they are listened to while a department head declared that “they conduct a planning activity and that NGOs would be asked of their ideas to be incorporated in the plan for the approval of the council.” A local official expressed in relation to LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services that they “cannot do their plans without the help of NGOs” while another official said it is a “case-to-case basis” as far as failure or success of their collaboration. A department head stated that it is successful because the NGOs are always

willing when the LGU asks them for help. On the other hand, most of the NGOs averred that they have not participated in planning activities while some are not even aware they are members of the council. The NGOs also expressed varied ideas on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services by saying that they look forward to the stage where the LGU will be funding their programs because they have the resources, that there is room for improvement, that there is a need to increase the collaboration, that the LGU lack the people to do the job and some political leaders lack the political will. However, some of them expressed that there should be NGO participation in all the undertakings of the LGU because they are the “direct players in the community and at the same time they can also provide assistance in the delivery of services, without their participation services will be poor because they will not be able to get active support from the community,” while others said the LGU cannot solve the problem alone and that transparency would be encouraged thus corruption will be eradicated.

There seems to be a lack of congruity with the ideas of the LGU and the NGO. The local officials and department head expressed their ideas entirely differently from that of the NGOs as far as experience with collaboration and effective delivery is concerned. In other words, there is no effective consultation process which hinders participation of NGOs in the planning process in the MDC. The improvement of consultation process seeks to address the problem of lack of regular conduct of meetings and planning sessions by the MDC which greatly affects the participatory opportunities of NGOs in the identification of programs, projects and activities.

Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)

Several meetings have been conducted by the council however it could be prominently noted that there does seem to be weak participation of the NGOs who are present in the discussions that will show that they are being consulted or their ideas solicited. A department head declared that when they formulated the Public Safety Plan it was participatory because a planning workshop was conducted. When asked whether the partnership between the LGU and the NGO is a failure or a success, the department heads averred that it is a success because the Mayor is transparent in dealing with problems that the NGOs present and that the collaboration is necessary because the LGU cannot rely on its

funds alone. However, a careful perusal of the Public Safety Plan for 2010 and 2011 would reveal that several PPAs are to be conducted in coordination with the NGOs but the member NGOs when asked about their participation in planning, implementation and evaluation revealed that “they attended the meetings but not sure about planning and implementation,” that their involvement is only “consultancy,” and that their partnership is “not at all times, only during medical missions.” In other words, there is no concrete PPA that the LGU and the NGOs partner with in relation to peace and order concerns.

Local Health Board (LHB)

There was only one meeting conducted and the NGO was absent although the department heads are also members of the NGO and they were present. However, the department head averred during the interview that the NGO just “fit-in” in the health programs of the local government because they are really not aware of the programs of the local government as most of them are private practitioners. As to whether the partnership is a success or failure, a department head put it succinctly that NGOs are vital partners, that there are some concerns that the LGU cannot address and that if there is a partnership with the NGOs the concerns would be addressed effectively because they form part of the community. Meanwhile, the NGO described their participation based on their experience, that “they are involved in the planning stage but not so much in the implementation and evaluation.” On the status of their collaboration, the NGO declared that it is not enough since they are only represented in the Local Health Board but there are many programs that they should be involved in.

Local School Board (LSB)

Although several meetings were conducted by the board, the NGO only attended once. The department head maintained that if the NGO have some ideas to present they are listened to and that the discussion is free flowing. On the success or failure of LGU and NGO partnership, a department head revealed that it is very effective because there are no political considerations when they implement the PPAs. On the other hand, during the interview the NGO revealed that they have not participated in the planning for the budget although they are involved in the implementation of several programs. The NGO even argued that they need to

Table 3.3 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) - Participation and Resources

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Resources (Manpower; Financial)	Participation in Planning	Participation in Implementation
1	MDC	Foundation (Culture and Arts)	Provincial	A small group of professionals based in Mun. of A (approximately 100)	-manpower -fundraising -donations -funds from Filipinos in the US -funds from a national government agency -entrance fees	-none	-the LGU trusts them as partner in some programs
2	MDC	Business Group (a local chapter of a nationwide organization)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	-membership fees -annual dues	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-none
3	MDC	Transport Group	Municipal	A larger number of transport drivers and operators (approximately 3000)	-none	-widely participated in planning for traffic management but not with the MDC	-has not been widely involved in implementation
4	MDC	Environmental Group	Municipal	A small group of concerned citizens (approximately 4)	-none	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-have not heard of the MDC
5	MDC	Youth Group advocating unity	Provincial	A moderate number of individuals (approximately 400)	-funds from a government official	-recommend good PPAs	-monitoring of PPAs
6	MDC	Women's Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of women (approximately 50)	-monthly dues from members -voluntary contributions from members	-not aware that they are a member of the MDC	-
8	MDC/ MPOC	Business Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	-annual dues -minimal amount from a private school and cemetery that they run	-none	-none

9	MDC/ MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	-fund-raising activities -donations	-consultative	-only in the solid waste management program
10	MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	-membership fees -support from their international counterpart	-none	-none
11	Health Board	Medical Professionals	Provincial	A large group of medical practitioners (approximately 500)	-no financial resources but has table manpower, professional manpower, technical resources, human resources	-has not been extensively involved	-partly involved
12	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 6000)	-solicitations -pledges from members	-the school head lists down their need then present it to the board	-follows that of the school

Table 3.4 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of A) – Interaction with the Citizens

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Interaction with the Citizens	
					Nature	Frequency
1	MDC	Foundation (Culture and Arts)	Provincial	A small group of professionals based in Mun. of A (approximately 100)	Through cultural activities	Every year or every quarter depending on the activity
2	MDC	Business Group (a local chapter of a nationwide organization)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	No direct interactions, only through annual trade affair	Annual
3	MDC	Transport Group	Municipal	A larger number of transport drivers and operators (approximately 3000)	Through meetings by chapter in the villages (barangays)	Monthly
4	MDC	Environmental Group	Municipal	A small group of concerned citizens (approximately 4)	Through information dissemination and environmental awareness activities	Monthly visitations to pre-scheduled areas
5	MDC	Youth Group advocating unity	Provincial	A moderate number of individuals (approximately 400)	None	None
6	MDC	Women's Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of women (approximately 50)	Through community leaders	Project-based
7	MDC	Women's Group	Municipal	A large organization of women (approximately 1000)	None except in the barangay where it is based	Project-based
8	MDC/ MPOC	Business Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen (approximately 100)	Financial and relief support	During disasters and emergency
9	MDC/ MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	Community outreach programs	Project-based

10	MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people (approximately 200)	Community outreach programs	Project-based
11	Health Board	Medical Professionals	Provincial	A large group of medical practitioners (approximately 500)	Through regular radio program Medical missions	Weekly Project-based
12	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 6000)	Brigada Eskwela (School Brigade)	Annual

participate more in the Local School Board and that the implementation of the PPAs should have their guidance.

In Table 3.3 (see page 107), the type of NGO does not determine participation in planning and implementation. Almost all NGOs have not participated in planning except the health professionals (NGO 11) although not extensively, while in the implementation, a number of NGOs have participated such as NGOs 1, 3, and 5. Sector-specific representations such as NGOs 11 and 12 have been involved in the Municipal Health Board and Municipal School Board, respectively. In terms of scope, four out of five of the provincial-wide NGOs have participated in implementation while only two out of seven municipal-wide NGOs have been involved. On the other hand, the size of the NGO does not matter in implementation. NGOs 3, 11 and 12 which are larger groups have not been widely involved while another large group, NGO 7, has not participated. Moderate sized groups like NGOs 5 and 9 participated in a specific sector while NGO 10 has not. Among the small groups, only NGO 1 has participated and the rest have not.

A perusal of the level of resources of the NGOs and its effect on their level of participation merits careful consideration (Table 3.3, see page 107). For example, NGO 1 which receives donations from rich individuals, funds from a Filipino group in the US and from fund-raising activities, among others, has not been invited to participate in any planning activity; however, the LGU trusts them in some programs. NGO 2 whose resources come from membership fees and annual dues have never been invited to participate in the planning much less in the implementation. NGO 3, a transport group, which does not have any resources except manpower, attended a planning activity on traffic regulations; however, they are seldom involved in implementation. NGO 4 does not have any financial resources; they attended sessions on solid waste management but not planning in the MDC, have not even heard of the MDC. NGO 5, which derives its funds from a political figure, recommends and lobbies for PPAs in the LGU and monitors the PPAs of the MDC. NGO 6 derives its resources from membership dues, contributions from members and from the national organization; they are not aware they are a member of the MDC. NGO 7 which receives funds from other organizations, from the LGU and from other local officials, has not been invited to the MDC sessions. NGO 8, whose resources

come from annual dues and from businesses, have attended meetings especially when the LGU solicited a patrol car from them but not planning activities. NGO 9 have funds from fund raising activities and donations, they have attended meetings and implemented programs on solid waste management. NGO 10 get their funds from membership fees, donations and from their international counterpart, they have not attended any MPOC meeting or been involved in implementation. NGO 11, which does not have funds except table manpower, professional manpower and human resources, gets involved in the planning and implementation stage, while NGO 12, whose resources come from solicitations and pledges from members, somehow participates in planning and implementation.

Thus, it can be said that first, in general, NGOs have never been an important part of planning; second, NGOs are convenient partners of the LGU in implementation; third, scope matters in involvement in implementation, as the provincial-wide NGOs have been involved more than the municipal-wide NGOs; fourth, there is no relationship between the size of the NGOs and their participation; fifth, those that have no resources have not participated; and sixth, having adequate resources appears to be a necessary condition but does not appear to be a sufficient condition as some NGOs with adequate resources do not participate.

In conclusion, the resources of the organizations involve voluntary provision of services by their members as well as financial support. Nevertheless, most of the organizations derive their financial resources from their members, from other individuals and from fund raising activities. However, it is worth noting that the organizations have networking and linkage with other organizations, international and local, that provide them substantial assistance for their programs, projects and activities. Thus, the organizations are without question capable of providing support by themselves or through their networks that the local government can tap. A perusal of the PPAs of the NGOs tells of the various undertakings that they provide on their own to the community in partnership with other government and non-government entities. They have shown their capabilities in implementing different social, economic and environmental programs in the municipality.

In terms of representation (Table 3.4, see page 109), there is no specific type or scope of NGOs that is effective when it comes to interaction with citizens; all of them interact based on the nature of their advocacies and the frequency is activity-based or project-based. In terms of size, large groups like NGOs 3 and 4 interact more frequently with the citizens, the rest of the NGOs interact with the citizens less frequently. NGOs conduct various interactions with the citizens, but in varying circumstances such as during project implementation, community outreach programs, provision of support during emergency or disasters as well as through community leaders and local chapters. However, as to frequency of their interaction with the citizens they contended that it is dependent on the frequency of the project that they implement, except for the health NGO which has its own regular radio program. Notably, none of the interactions of the NGOs with the citizens are done with LGU collaboration, which goes to show that NGOs are not involved by the LGU in the conduct of consultation for planning or implementing purposes, if there is any. Generally, the interactions of the NGOs with the citizens are based on the programs that they implement or information on advocacies that they disseminate. However, as far as consultation with the citizens as members of the Local Special Bodies, there is none. Hence, it can be observed that first, there is relatively limited contact between the NGOs and the citizens, and second, there is no clear pattern, the NGOs are not really representing the opinions of their constituency, though they may be representing their interests in a general fashion.

In the meantime, when asked about the participatory opportunities in decision-making and service delivery, some of the ordinary citizens revealed that they have not participated in the decision-making in the community and that decisions are already made before the people know because there is no consultation among ordinary citizens. In terms of service delivery, all of them have participated in their personal capacity and through collective effort of the community. Most of them however have idea on how to participate in the local government except at the barangay (village) level. Some expressed that political inclination plays an important part in participation. As to interaction with the local government in the delivery of services, most of them acknowledged the services they availed as beneficiary as well as the social and infrastructure programs that tend to help address the problems of the community. Obviously, there is no

referral to a particular NGO as a conduit of their participation both in decision-making and service delivery in the local government. Hence, there is lack of consultation at the ground level.

Local officials and department heads are one in saying that the local government needs the NGOs. However, the events betray the fact that the NGOs are not being tapped closely by the LGU. Despite the structure provided by the Local Government Code of 1991 for NGO participation in the Local Special Bodies there seems to be no visible or real partnership between the two sectors. Thus, the opportunities given to the NGOs have not been realized because the LGU, generally, cannot be said to be open to the idea of collaboration.

3.4 CONCLUSION

In Valuing Fundamentals of Governance, the performance of the Municipality in terms of transparency, participation and financial accountability described how the local government values and maintains good governance. Worth noting are the reports on transparency which described how effectively the local government communicates its operations to the public through the use of different mediums and the report on participation which described how the local government attained a level of maturity in engaging the citizens and the CSOs through their participation in decision-making in the local special bodies and involvement in local development projects.

However, as it was found out, there is no effective LGU-NGO relationship and the mechanism is not effective, much less complied with. Decision-making in the local special bodies is not participatory and consultative while the citizens and NGOs barely participate in local development projects. NGOs have the skills and the resources however these are not tapped properly. Even so, the level of resources of the NGOs has little relationship to their level of participation, once a minimal level is reached.

The local officials and department heads aver that NGOs in the local special bodies are active participants but the NGOs say otherwise, while the minutes of the meetings shows very little participation. Several factors can be derived from the findings. First, the local officials and

department heads are aware of the policy on NGO involvement in the local special bodies because it is provided for by law and they must comply. The partial compliance was embodied in the Executive Orders issued by the local chief executive. However, partial compliance to policy does not indicate effective participation or ensure effective involvement by the NGOs; there was no effort on the part of the local officials and department heads to reach out and involve the NGOs. They do not really care whether the NGO speaks or not or absents themselves in the meetings or planning sessions, as long as they have somehow complied with the policy. Some of the NGOs are not even aware that they are a member of a local special body. Second, NGOs get recognized only when they give or do something for the local government such as the donation of a patrol car, the conduct of medical missions, or when they volunteer on environmental programs. However, recognition does not come for basic policy-making. Planning outputs are presented for approval without NGO taking part in its formulation. Most of the NGOs maintained that they have not been invited or involved in the planning. As one NGO said, “Are we being used?” In other words, NGOs are used by the local government for their convenience; they involve the NGOs when it is convenient under the circumstances. Third, the scope of NGOs matters because those that have wider scope, province-wide, are more effective than those that are municipal-wide. Fourth, there is a clear pattern that sector-specific representation of NGOs such as those in the Municipal School Board and the Municipal Health Board provide more appropriate representation, rather than multi-sectoral representation such as those in the MDC and MPOC. Fifth, some citizens do not feel there is partnership between the LGU and the NGOs. Further, the citizens contended that service delivery reach the intended beneficiaries when they are delivered with the NGOs and government projects are better implemented if there is NGO partnership. Some citizens went as far as saying that they prefer that government projects be implemented by NGOs because they do not trust the government.

Nevertheless, politics seems prevalent on both sides. The citizens have argued that participation in the local government depends on political inclination. In other words, if you belong to a different political party than that of the local officials you cannot participate. In the same vein, local government support comes most to those who belong to the same political party as the local officials. The citizens also took notice how NGOs deliver their services. An NGO supported by a political figure provides scholarship only to those who are politically inclined.

Some NGOs provide relief assistance to selected individuals especially those they know. Nevertheless, when services by the NGOs are delivered through the village leaders, only supporters of those leaders get access.

On the other hand, the disconnection between the NGOs and the citizens is largely evident. Some of them have not felt the partnership. As one citizen aptly observed, they do not come to the community to consult. Most of the citizens, furthermore, believe that the citizens are not properly represented in the LSBs.

As was shown, there is no effective LGU-NGO relationship. NGOs are not without skills and resources to cause effective LGU-NGOs partnership; however, it is evident that the LGU is not entirely open to the idea of collaboration.

CHAPTER 4

Municipality of B

This chapter will set-out the profile of the municipality including the organizational and leadership structure, its resources and performance in different aspects of governance relative to the LGU-NGO partnership. It also seeks to establish the proof or the lack of it of an effective LGU-NGO relationship in collaboration and delivery of services. Consequently, it seeks to address the notion that LGUs may not be open to the idea of collaboration or the lack of skills and resources of NGOs hinder effective collaboration.

4.1 PROFILE

4.1.1 Municipal Profile

Municipality of B is a 4th class municipality in the northeastern part of the Province of Z and a gateway to and from the province to other provinces (Source: Municipal Ecological Profile 2010). It is approximately 39 kilometers from the capital town of the Province. It has a land area of about 11,000 hectares divided among the barangays (villages). Land use is predominantly agricultural, covering 80%, and the rest is residential, educational, commercial, governmental, religious and other (Municipal Profile 2011).

All the barangays are accessible by private and public vehicles; however, there are portions of the barangays that cannot be accessed due to terrain. The northern and southern part of the municipality is considered to be a wet zone and the rainy season starts in June and peaks in August through September and ends in December; dry season runs from January to May. It is a hilly town, the highest peak is more than 250 meters and the hills begin to rise directly from the coastal swamplands (Source: Municipal Profile 2011). Flooding is caused by heavy downpour of rains, although it occurs very rarely and subsides in a few minutes (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

As of 2010, the population is about 25,000 at a growth rate of 1.42% while the number of households in the same year is about 5,300. Population density is 2.87 persons per hectare while the average household size is 5. Almost all the inhabitants in the municipality are Filipinos while a small number have foreign origins such as Chinese, American, Korean and others (Source: Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

The per capita income is approximately P 3,500 per month (NZ\$100). Major types of livelihood include farming, livestock production and fishing while other sources of income include farm and industry labor. Major crop production includes rice, coconuts, bananas and vegetables, while livestock production includes hogs, chickens, cows, carabaos and goats (Municipal Profile 2011).

The literacy rate is at 85%. The municipality has one tertiary public school, one vocational school, four secondary public schools, thirteen elementary schools, one private elementary school and two private primary schools (Municipal Profile 2011). It has one public hospital run by the provincial government which also serves other municipalities, 1 municipal health center, 7 barangay (village) health stations and 1 private medical clinic. Health care delivery needs an upgrade due to inadequate public and private health facilities and services (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010). There are five communication facilities servicing the municipality, three are for mobile phones and two are for landlines. There are four private banks operating in the municipality (Municipal Profile 2011).

The municipality is predominantly Roman Catholic comprising about 91% of the whole population while the rest are comprised of smaller religious denominations such as the Iglesia ni Kristo, Philippine Independent Church, Jehova's Witness, Mormons, Seventh Day Adventist, Baptist and Fellowship (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

As of 2010, the total number of households is about 5,300. Of the number of households, 70% have a sanitary toilet while 30% are without. In terms of potable water supply, about 48% of the households rely on dug wells, pump and rain, 47% use jetmatic and artesian wells and

only 5% avail of the services of the local water supply system. Electric power supply is availed of by 77% of the households (Municipal Profile 2011).

Major industries of the municipality include high value commercial crops, handicraft-making, livestock production, floriculture, meat processing, fruit and vegetable processing, and aquaculture. In 2010, there were 327 business establishments, 255 were registered with the local government (Municipal Profile 2011).

An estimated 56% of the land area is dedicated to agricultural production. Rice is the major crop planted on irrigated land at 229 hectares while rainfed land is at 1,670 hectares. About one-fourth of the total land area is planted with coconut trees and the rest is corn, bananas, vegetables and fruit trees. The average yield per cropping of rice is at 3.4 metric tons for irrigated land, while for rainfed it is 3.3 metric tons. Coconut is at 4 metric tons, corn at 2 metric tons, bananas at 4 metric tons, fruit trees at 5 metric tons and vegetables are at 4 metric tons per hectare (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

The waste disposal system is complimented by a 10,000 square meter controlled dumpsite while a material recovery facility was constructed in two barangays as pilot areas for waste segregation for recycling and composting; however, it has been non-operational and needs enhancement for activation. It is estimated that the municipality generates an average of about 1,100 metric tons of waste per day. Most of the waste generated comes from households, commercial establishments and public markets (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

In terms of transportation, most of the vehicles, private and public, plying routes are motorcycles, while there are a number of vans, motorized tricycles, jeepneys and trucks plying certain destinations in and out of the municipality (Municipal Profile 2011).

The road network includes the national highway, provincial, municipal, and barangay roads covering about 150 kilometers, 25 kilometers of which are concrete while the rest are asphalt, gravel and dirt roads (Draft Municipal Ecological Profile 2010).

On peace and order, the total crime volume in 2009 is 239, but 75 just from January to October 2010, with crime solution efficiency rate of 91% and 76% in 2009 and 2010, respectively. To maintain peace and order, there are 22 Philippine National Police personnel and 10 firemen from the Bureau of Fire Protection assigned in the municipality (Municipal Profile 2011).

4.1.2 Organizational Structure and Leadership

The local government unit is headed by the Municipal Mayor as its local chief executive while the local legislative body (Sangguniang Bayan) is headed by the Vice Mayor. The local special bodies are all headed by the municipal mayor. The organizational structure of the municipality is in accordance with the structure prescribed under the Local Government Code of 1991. In 2009, to complement the local chief executive in running the municipality, there are 90 personnel employed by the local government, 53 of whom are permanent and 37 casual (Human Resource Management Office, Municipality of B).

Representation by NGOs is recognized as mandated by the Local Government Code of 1991. Under Executive Order No. 004, series of 2010, there are five (5) NGOs involved in the Municipal Development Council. There are four (4) NGOs in the Municipal Peace and Order Council under Executive Order No. 009, series of 2010. One (1) NGO in the Municipal School Board under Executive Order 014, series of 2010, and one (1) in the Municipal Health Board under Executive Order 006, series of 2010.

4.1.3 Resources

Under the Local Government Code of 1991, local government units derive their resources from local sources such as tax and non-tax revenues, share from the national tax such as the internal revenue allotment (IRA), and from aid, loans and borrowings, and inter-local transfers. In the 2010 Annual Budget, the municipality had an income from local sources (tax, non-tax and

economic enterprise) of about P 7,500,000.00 and its IRA was around P 40,000,000.00 or a total of about P 47,500,000.00. In 2011, it had about P 8,000,000.00 from local sources (tax, non-tax and economic enterprise) and around P 42,000,000.00 from the IRA or a total of about P 50,000,000.00. The dependency of the municipality to the IRA is approximately 84% both in 2010 and 2011 (2010 and 2011 Annual Budget).

4.1.4 Performance

As in Chapter 3, the performance of the municipality will be based on the 2010 assessment using the Local Governance Performance Management System (LGPMS). Also, the circumstances relating to local governance and the local elections conducted that year has some bearing, considering that Municipality of B had a new local chief executive after the previous one lost in the elections. Thus, the performance of the local government was measured between two administrations in one year. However, regardless of the circumstances the local government still functions on the same mandate provided by the Local Government Code of 1991 and other relevant laws and issuances.

The 2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report (SLGPR) highlighted the performance in four areas of governance: administrative, social, economic and environmental. Fundamentals of governance such as participation, transparency and financial accountability are included as a special report (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of B). However, only the key issues in relation to the thesis shall be highlighted.

- Administrative Governance

There are six areas which were looked into such as local legislation, development planning, revenue generation, resource allocation, customer service and human resource management and development. None of the areas obtained excellent performance. Improvement of the consultation process and management of planning database in development planning is

one of the areas that need to be improved (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of A).

- Social Governance

Social governance looks into four areas, health services, support to education services, support to housing and basic utilities, and peace, security and disaster risk management. The municipality obtained excellent performance in one area which is support to housing and basic utilities, due to an existing administrative mechanism dedicated to addressing the multiple requirements of housing services. Among the areas that need improvement include: peace, security and disaster risk management, strengthening of the Municipal Peace and Order Council and Local Council for the Protection of Children; in support to education services it is interpreted that the Local School Board might have to do more to advance the cause of those in need of quality education with the suggested actions to invest the Special Education Fund in activities that improve the quality of human capital, such as educational research, to establish a Scholarship Fund for the poor but qualified students, and to establish or improve the quality of Alternative Learning Systems; and in health services where the principal support system is the Local Health Board, it is suggested that they have to do more to improve the quality of primary health care and curative services, and improve the quality of child care services (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of B).

- Environmental Governance

The four areas include forest ecosystem management, freshwater ecosystem management, coastal marine ecosystem management, and urban ecosystem management. The municipality obtained excellent performance in three areas however it failed in urban ecosystems management and presented that pollution control and proper solid waste management are essential in preserving the integrity of the environment, suggested actions to be taken include the strengthening of the Solid Waste Management Board, improve the quality of Solid Waste Management Plan, ensure that every barangay has material recovery facility, improve solid waste

collection practices, and move from open dumpsite facility to controlled dumpsite facility to a sanitary landfill as the final disposal facility (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of B).

- Valuing Fundamentals of Governance

The report described how the local government values and maintains good governance in the context of transparency, participation, and financial accountability. None of the areas obtained excellent performance and the suggested actions include: promoting and practicing transparency in governmental transactions, communicating information which the public should know or should be aware of such as plans, programs, services and special events, and maximizing communication channels like a Bulletin Board, a Public Information Office or Desk, the print or broadcast media, and a website and public forum is desired. In financial accountability, the strengthening of administrative capacity to ensure observance of guidelines relative to accounting, internal control, procurement and financial transactions. In participation, the strengthening of CSO participation in Local Special Bodies and Citizen Feedback system, including the maximization of CSO engagement in development projects (2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report, Municipality of B).

4.1.5 The Local Special Bodies: Meetings and Output

As in Chapter 3, this section illustrates the meetings of the Local Special Bodies. The proceedings during the meetings were reduced in writing in the Minutes. The Minutes at hand are those of the present administration while those of the previous administration are no longer available. A document called a Resolution, in the absence of the Minutes, demonstrates the conduct of meetings as will be shown. The outputs accessed include the municipal development plan (2011-2013), annual investment plans and the public safety plans both during the previous and the present administration.

- Municipal Development Council

From July 2010 to June 2011 under the new administration, the Municipal Development Council met only once, sometime in October 2010. An excerpt from the Minutes of the MDC meeting is embodied in a Resolution that approves the appropriation of 20% Development Fund for social, economic and environmental programs, projects and activities of the municipality for the year 2011. It was the first and only meeting. None of the NGOs were present (MDC Resolution No. 2 Series of 2010, Municipality of B).

In the 2010 Annual Investment Plan crafted by the previous administration, the Executive Summary presented its vision of “responsive participatory governance” in its programs, projects and activities especially in the general public services sector. Part of the PPAs include the utilization of the 20% Development Fund. However, none of the programs, projects and activities embodied in the plan reveals NGO involvement. For the 2011 Annual Investment Plan, part of the plan is the 20% Development Fund for 2011 mentioned above where there is no NGO participation in the identification of PPAs.

The municipality has its Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013 which shows direction of the present administration. The plan covers three prominent sectors, General Public Services, Social Services, and Economic Services. In the General Public Service sector, the practical vision speaks of “strengthening and improved public service thru participatory governance by both public and private stakeholders to take part in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation towards public satisfaction and public interest” while in the Social Services sector the policy decisions aims to “strengthen the People’s Organizations such as Women, Youth, Senior Citizens, Peasants, Fisherfolks, religious organizations and other partners in the Municipal Development Plan implementation.”

- Municipal Peace and Order Council

The first meeting of the MPOC under the present administration was held on 11 March 2011, conducted jointly with the Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council and the Municipal Anti-Drug Abuse Council. The Minutes showed two NGOs present in the meeting. The meeting deliberated on different issues confronting the municipality which include preventive actions to address disaster problems and drug abuse, as well as protective services for peace and order concerns and the implementation of laws and ordinances. One of the suggestions taken up to which everyone agreed was the regular conduct of the MPOC meeting every 2nd week of the month. A perusal of the Minutes shows non-participation of the NGOs present in the deliberation and discussion. As of June 2011, no meeting was held by the MPOC as previously agreed.

In the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan for 2010, NGOs are involved in several programs, projects and activities such as in fire prevention and suppression through the conduct of fire safety inspection in all kinds of establishments, in health and sanitation through environmental sanitation, nutrition program and reproductive health, and in environmental protection through tree planting and a coastal resource management program. For 2011, NGOs are involved in the same PPAs as in 2010.

- Municipal Health Board

Under the present administration, the first meeting of the Health Board was held in July 2010. Other than health matters that were taken up, the board agreed to conduct its meetings every 2nd week of the month. No NGO was present at this time. The second meeting was held on the 3rd week of August 2010, the NGO was present. However, the Minutes do not mention any participation by the NGO member in the discussion and deliberation on health issues and services. As of June 2011, no further meetings had been held by the Health Board.

- Municipal School Board

As of June 2011, under the present administration the first and only meeting was held in March 2011. A resolution was passed approving the budget for priority education projects by the

Municipal School Board. The NGO representative was present during the meeting. The same kind of resolution was passed sometime in February 2010 during the previous administration, no other meetings were also held thereafter.

4.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

This section considers the hypothesis: *Effective LGU-NGO relationship is hardly felt or visibly seen despite the existing mechanism.*

Thus, this section reports on the findings regarding questions that would help ascertain the answers to the idea that there is lack of concrete proof to establish that an effective LGU-NGO relationship exists, although the mechanisms are in place. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials and department heads and NGO representatives who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

The local officials and functionaries were asked the question: *What kind of collaboration does your organization have with NGOs?*

In an interview with Local Official 1, who is involved with the Local Special Bodies, on 07 July 2011 he contended that they meet with NGOs before they “take action.” He went on to say that the meeting is consultative and the NGOs give suggestions also. He expressed that he is also an active member of one of the NGOs. In the delivery of services, he averred that the partnership is much stronger now because they go together to the community.

I: Let’s go to the participation of NGOs in the LSBs (enumerating the NGOs), how’s your partnership with those NGOs?

Local Official 1: We are doing fine. We have a strong relationship. We have no problem there because we cooperate with each other.

I: In the identification of program, projects and activities (PPAs), how is the participation of the NGOs?

Local Official 1: Of course before we take action we have to meet first.

I: Do they give suggestions?

Local Official 1: Yes.

I: Is it consultative?

Local Official 1: It is.

I: How is your collaboration with these NGOs as partner of the LGU in delivering the services?

Local Official 1: Our partnership is good as we go to the community. Actually we are much stronger now.

Meanwhile, Local Official 2 who is involved in the MDC and interviewed on 04 July 2011 said:

Local Official 2: Sometimes we allocate certain amount for the NGO as assistance. If there are requests we include them in our 20% Development Fund for their projects and then we make a Memorandum of Agreement on that.

While Department Head 1, a member of the MDC, interviewed on 01 July 2011 described their collaboration:

Department Head 1: When we invite them when we have activities they are also active. They also participate though not that much because we don't have that much activities that involve them in the LGU.
I: How is the participation of the NGOs in the MDC?

Department Head 1: Twice a year they attend during the hearing for the budget because they are invited.

I: Do they participate in the decision-making?

Department Head 1: At times they also give suggestions. They also lobby in the Sangguniang Bayan (SB) for funding for their organization.

Local Official 3 who is involved in the MPOC and interviewed on 04 July 2011 maintained that they have "closeness" with the NGOs and that they "cooperate and are active." While Local Official 4 who is also with the MPOC and interviewed on 18 July 2011 said:

Local Official 4: The way I see it the communications are good especially during the meetings although here in Municipality of B criminality is not really a problem. They also give their ideas and opinions for example on how to make (Municipality of B) more peaceful and orderly.

I: Do they suggest on what to do?

Local Official 4: Yes, they also suggest. Like the (NGO) they do community service like cleaning in the plaza, like the (NGO) they are also there to cooperate.

Another member of the MPOC, Department Head 2, interviewed on 26 July 2011, revealed that two NGOs in the MPOC are active partners and very supportive of peace and order activities while one NGO has not been active and another one is not really active on peace and order concerns but on other programs of the LGU. Department Head 3, also of the MPOC, interviewed on 07 July 2011 maintained that his department has not collaborated with any NGO.

Meanwhile, Health Personnel 1 who is a member of the Local Health Board, interviewed on 07 July 2011, averred that they are "doing fine because they (NGO) are under the direct

supervision of the rural health midwives.” In the Local School Board, Department Head 4 who was interviewed on 19 July 2011 said:

Department Head 4: ...the President is the one invited to represent in the School Board or when there are activities to be represented by the Federation so that's the time that I get along with the President.

The same set of local officials and department heads were asked about the services that the local government delivers with the collaboration of the NGOs. Local Official 1, who is also a member of the NGO involved in the MPOC, elaborated the activities of the said NGO such as community service and maintenance of peace and order. He also acknowledged the partnership with the NGO involved in the Local Health Board and that the local government has provided them insurance as an incentive. On the different farmers groups involved in the local special bodies, the same official averred that the local government provides them with seedlings such as rice and corn as well as fertilizers. Local Official 2 of the MDC declared that the local government and the NGOs collaborate in providing financial support and projects such as “livelihood programs, farm to market roads, infrastructure projects, seminars and trainings, also jobs thru NGOs.” Department Head 1 of the MDC cited one NGO which conducts counseling on family planning and their participation in information dissemination especially to those involved in early marriage. Local Official 3 of the MPOC expressed that the NGOs help implement ordinances of the local government. Local Official 4 of the MPOC stated that “the plans that we do to maintain peace and order should also be known to them so that they can help disseminate to their member and to the people.” Health Personnel 1 of the Local Health Board stated that the collaboration involved services:

Health Personnel 1: Family planning, maternal and child health, immunization, nutrition. In all health services they are tapped because the ratio is for every 25 to 30 households there should be one worker, so they are really the frontliners.

While Department Head 4 of the Local School Board stated:

I: Let us go to the so called delivery of services which in your case is on education, literacy programs, what are the services that you deliver in collaboration with the NGOs particularly the (NGO)?
 Department Head 4: Everything that is kept by the department, all the programs of the department, we try to convene the NGO officers, NGO members, to present the programs for their approval.

On the question: *How effective are these services?* Local Official 1 averred that the services that they provide in collaboration with the NGOs are very effective. Meanwhile, Local Official 2 revealed:

Local Official 2: I think it helps because the LGU cannot afford to provide for the whole Municipality as the resources are limited. The manpower that we lack here sometimes it is the NGO which provides especially in far flung places.

While Local Official 3 expressed that the services are effective “but we cannot say that all the NGOs take part.” Health Personnel 1 declared that the services are very effective and that through the NGO “it would be easier for us to reach the constituents.”

The local officials and department heads were asked: *What is your view about the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery towards the development of the LGU?* Local Official 1 contended that the local government needs the NGOs because they can help them in providing for the constituents in terms of financial, infrastructure and medical support, while Local Official 2 acknowledged that NGOs have ideas that are much better than that of the local government. Department Head 1 declared that the local government needs the NGOs “because we share ideas and so we will know also what their problems are to help us in our governance.”

I: And the implementation is more efficient when they are there?

Department Head 1: Yes, it seems that you are forced to provide or to address their needs.

I: In other words, the LGU cannot do it alone?

Department Head 1: It is difficult, it would be much better if they are there.

Meanwhile, Department Head 2 averred:

Department Head 2: The concern on peace and order is not only the responsibility of one sector. It is the concern of each and everyone so the help of the NGOs is really needed.

I: Last question, as of today do you think the partnership of the NGOs and the LGU is sufficient or it needs to be strengthened?

Department Head 2: So far it is good but it should be strengthened some more to provide excellent service to the people.

Health Personnel 1 described:

I: What can you say about that effective collaboration?

Health Personnel 1: The nature of our work entails really reaching out to the people and besides we only have one station for every 3 barangays and the target areas are really far flung so through them you can

reach out to your target. Like data gathering or communication towards the people you really have to employ them.

I: You can say you have a successful partnership with the health NGO?

Health Personnel 1: Yes.

I: Coming from the LGU, why do you say it is successful?

Health Personnel 1: Because they can help to reach out in delivering the services.

I: And you recognize that they are really needed?

Health Personnel 1: Yes and through them we are able to learn the needs of the people.

On the other hand, Department Head 4 theorized:

Department Head 4: Maybe because of the good relationship of the stakeholders and administrators of the school because if you have good relations with them they would also treat you in a good way and maybe because also of the good heart of the people of the municipality. We never had difficulty lobbying, for example, during the opening of kindergarten classes the good Mayor would always say yes and we have opened kinder classes in barangay schools in not so hard situations compared to others.

Consequently, NGOs were asked questions that tend to elicit their ideas on participation, their agenda, and whether the services that they deliver in partnership with the LGU are effective. The first question asked: *How does your organization participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU?*

NGO 1, an environmental group based in only one barangay and a member of the MDC, interviewed on 06 July 2011:

I: Being a member of MDC previously and until now, how do you participate in the decision-making in the LGU based on your experience before and now?

NGO 1: I also participate when there are programs being presented or being deliberated and then we give our inputs.

I: As you participate, do the local officials listen to your ideas and suggestions?

NGO 1: Yes they do.

I: You can talk freely?

NGO 1: It is open, it is transparent.

On the other hand, NGO 2 which is a municipal-based group whose purpose is historical research and a member of the MDC, interviewed on 18 July 2011, contended:

NGO 2: So far when it was organized (MDC) and I became a member of that we have not met. When it was reorganized by the DILG up to now we have not met again. I don't know what the status of MDC is now. I am ready to participate and contribute my experience, ideas but so far we have not...

I: Meaning you have not participated in the planning of PPAs in the LGU. What about in the implementation?

NGO 2: Nothing, I was just invited and became a member about 4 or 5 months ago, now we don't have any activities.

I: Previously were you also a member of the MDC?

NGO 2: Not yet but our organization has been accredited by the SB.

In the same vein, NGO 3, which is a women's group based in only one barangay, interviewed on 04 July 2011, and expressed their participation:

I: As member of the MDC, how do you participate in the decision-making?

NGO 3: I am always with the Barangay Captain (village chief) during the meetings before but I cannot speak on my own because he is also there.

I: Last year under the new administration you became a member again of the MDC, how is your participation in the planning?

NGO 3: The last time, we had an election with other NGOs to choose who will represent in the Local Special Bodies but after that no meeting has been conducted since then. Previously there was this planning for the 20% Development Fund which we have observed for the first time but the programs, projects and activities were already there, we were only asked to approve it.

I: There was no consultation among the members?

NGO 3: There was none. My point is I would ask the members of our NGO first before I give my approval.

I: The PPAs are already there for your approval?

NGO 3: It was already drafted beforehand. Some suggested that we should have this or that and there are some who made corrections on the amount, that this is bigger than the others, then this amount should be taken...

I: In the implementation of PPAs based on your experience before, how is your partnership with the LGU?

NGO 3: We have no problem because the Mayor is very supportive of us especially when we have some concerns that we raise before him.

NGO 4 is a cooperative composed of farmers whose membership is municipal-wide and a member of the MDC, interviewed on 26 July 2011:

I: So basically your programs are geared for the farmers. In terms of participation, do you participate in the decision-making in the LGU?

NGO 4: When I am in the meeting I also give suggestions. Lately all the NGOs were called and we had an election that's why I was placed there in the MDC after that I have not received any communications.

I: Previously do you also participate?

NGO 4: For as long they invite us I participate. My point is that this is for the good of the municipality.

I: This time as member of the MDC, you have not been invited?

NGO 4: I have not received any communication.

I: Were you also a member of the MDC before?

NGO 4: Yes but we were not being invited anymore.

I: You don't attend meetings then?

NGO 4: No because we are not invited.

I: You mean to say you have not participated during the planning or in the implementation.

NGO 4: One time I was there but we were told of the projects and the corresponding budget, it was presented to us for approval?

I: There was no planning?

NGO 4: Nothing like that!

I: In the implementation you did not participate too?

NGO 4: No.

I: You mean to say the projects are presented pro-forma?

NGO 4: Yes, there was no consultation. The way I see it they do not like me around probably because I really talk when I see something inappropriate. What they probably want is just use me that is why they are antipathetic towards me.

While NGO 5, a farmers group based in two barangays and member of MDC, interviewed on 06 July 2011, answered in the negative, thus:

I: As member of the MDC, how's your participation in the decision-making of the LGU?

NGO 5: I was invited only once.

I: Only once?

NGO 5: Yes. I was asked to take part in the bamboo project introduced by the DTI (Department of Trade and Industry – a national government agency). Other than that I was not invited anymore.

I: In the MDC there is the identification of PPAs for the development of Municipality of B, how's your participation during the planning?

NGO 5: Somehow ok but I cannot say that much because it was once only.

I: How about in the implementation?

NGO 5: Only those projects that we have.

NGO 6, interviewed on 04 July 2011, is a municipal chapter of a national organization whose leader is a high ranking local official and whose aim is the promotion of brotherhood and a member of MPOC expressed their participation thus far:

I: As member of the MPOC, do you also participate in the decision-making?

NGO 6: Yes during the meeting.

I: Do they listen?

NGO 6: They also accept and the LGU recognize us also.

I: In terms of participation, do they accept your suggestions?

NGO 6: We had a meeting twice and we gave suggestions also especially before the fiesta regarding traffic regulations here and they also listened to us.

I: In the planning of PPAs, how is your participation there?

NGO 6: Not really.

I: Previously?

NGO 6: Previously there is no such thing in the municipal. At times we are the ones who would go directly to the Mayor and ask what we can do to participate.

I: What about in the implementation?

NGO 6: Yes we join.

I: In other words, you are not involved in planning but in the implementation you are there?

NGO 6: Yes.

Meanwhile, NGO 7 which is a transport group based in the municipality and a member of the MPOC, interviewed on 05 July 2011, averred that they get invited to the meetings of the MPOC, there are exchanges of ideas, and suggestions are also listened to. However, another transport group based in the municipality, NGO 8, interviewed on 06 July 2011, revealed:

I: As member of the MPOC since last year, have you attended their meetings?

NGO 8: Once but it has not been repeated.

I: You attended a meeting?

NGO 8: During the election of NGOs which designated this...

I: But you have not attended the meetings of the MPOC?

NGO 8: Not yet.

I: I think they conducted a meeting.

NGO 8: I have not attended.

I: I am supposed to ask you questions about your participation in the meetings but since you have not attended...Is your group inactive?

NGO 8: It really is inactive.

I: If you are inactive how come you became a member of the MPOC?

NGO 8: The LGU called for a meeting and I said we are not really active but they said the tricycle is there so it is just okay to put us there. I myself would want to reorganize this group with the help of the LGU.

Another farmers group which is based in only one barangay and a member of the MPOC, NGO 9, interviewed on 06 July 2011, described their participation:

I: For example, if the LGU has PPAs on peace and order do you participate in the discussions?

NGO 9: Yes especially when we are around during the meeting. I cannot remember not having attended any meeting.

I: Are your suggestions asked?

NGO 9: Yes.

On the other hand, NGO 10 involved in the Local Health Board, is a municipal wide group composed of health workers, interviewed on 04 July 2011, revealed:

I: You have been a member of the Municipal Health Board for a long time since the 1990s until now, how is your participation in the decision-making in the Health Board?

NGO 10: When Dr. X (already left the service) and Dr. Y (retired from the service) was still our doctor the Health Board would meet almost every month. We have not met already for a long time the last time was in August 2010 during the time of Dr. X.

I: In the planning of PPAs, do you participate?

NGO 10: The doctor would identify the programs and then he would present it to us for our approval.

NGO 11, whose membership is municipal-wide, composed of parents and teachers and a member of the Local School Board, interviewed on 05 July 2011, described their participation:

I: Being a member of the School Board, how do you participate in the decision-making for the identification of programs in the School Board?

NGO 11: We only met once, my participation there is when I looked at the needs of the school head because I know what the needs are in the district office. It was presented and then it was just fine with us.

I: Were you able to suggest or did you have ideas that you presented?

NGO 11: Actually, I did not really voice-out because the school head is somehow close to me and that I know that there are a lot to be done in her office. I think the school head listed down beforehand all her needs.

I: Is the funding from the Special Education Fund (SEF)?

NGO 11: I have no idea.

I: You have no idea about the SEF?

NGO 11: No.

I: What is the extent of your participation during the planning of those PPAs?

NGO 11: I cannot remember what the school head enumerated but we are okay with that.

Only four out of eleven NGOs have actually participated in decision-making for the development of the LGU while the rest of the NGOs have not participated at all or have been inactive for several years. Two of the NGOs expressed that PPAs are pro-forma.

Several NGOs have been asked the question if their PPAs fit with the agenda of the LGU on service delivery. Other NGOs would obviously reply in affirmative since some of them derive funds from the local government for their PPAs. Other NGOs are headed by incumbent local officials or some local officials are members of the NGO, while one NGO was organized by the local government to handle a national government initiated project. Some of them have been inactive for several years yet they remain to be a member of the local special bodies. However, some NGOs contended:

NGO 2: There is relevance because for instance the projects that we do since they could not do that because they have no budget or they have no time so when there is a civic organization that is putting up that project, they are very thankful that this NGO is helping much for the improvement of the community.

NGO 7: Yes, we should be aligned. We cannot do contrary to what they do.

I: Since your cooperative has its own PPAs, do you think these PPAs fit with the agenda of the LGU?

NGO 9: Yes because we have coordination.

I: With whom?

NGO 9: The LGU.

While NGO 10, which is composed of health workers, declared that they do not have PPAs of their own because “we follow what the rural health unit prescribes.” On the other hand, NGO 11 composed of parents and teachers, when asked how effective their services are, revealed:

I: I think you have PPAs that you implement together with the LGU, how effective are these?

NGO 11: There are no PPAs that has really been presented that we have joined or I was able to talk, there was nothing like that.

I: Nothing?

NGO 11: A program that should be done by the group together with the School Board? Except for that one that the school head presented, it was only like she was asking permission from the Mayor for her needs and we were there from different sectors, that was the only instance nothing more.

On the question: *What are the PPAs that you practice towards the development of the LGU?*

NGO 1 contended stated:

NGO 1: On the economic maybe because we have vegetable gardening, hog raising and the sari-sari store (micro convenience enterprise). The problem is that the members come and go so it is hard to maintain...

I: Its sustainability?

NGO 1: Yes.

While NGO 2 elaborated:

NGO 2: In 1988 we celebrated the separation of (Municipality of B) from (adjoining municipality), that is the 70th Anniversary, then in 1998 we repeated that but we did not celebrate anymore because I am out of the country...and some of our projects are the naming of the street for a local veteran, one of the streets here was named and approved by the Sangguniang Bayan, we have secured a historical marker from the National Historical Institute in Manila and we have that near the municipal building, that was the effort of the Society, when we had some projects there like the waiting shed there in front of the market, then the marker that we have put up there on the left side there, then we have just our latest project which is the portrait of the first judge of the (Municipality of B) which we hang in the sala of the Municipal Building. The first judge of (Municipality of B) we have a big portrait donated by the relatives that we hang, that was the effort of the society. It was our project. Then we had lots of projects that we have accomplished.

I: Do you have projects like educating the constituency or information dissemination?

R: We don't have that.

NGO 3 which is based in only one barangay (village), for its part, described their PPAs:

NGO 3: We normally join at the LGU in the Women's Month Celebration. Then we partner with the Mayor in some of his projects here (barangay). Then with DAR (Department of Agrarian Reform) we have a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) because they gave us some farm inputs as well as some funds for the Bagsakan (Trading) Center. The Governor also gave us P 60,000.00 for Gender and Development Programs.

I: Do you have PPAs that you do not only implement in your barangay but also here in the LGU?

NGO 3: We used to have a micro enterprise at the town center but it did not prosper so we pulled it out.

NGO 4 has been inactive for ten years already, so they do not have PPAs that they currently practice. Meanwhile, NGO 5, a local government organized group, does not have PPAs that they initiate on their own. NGO 6 conducts civic actions such as cleanliness drives, helps maintain peace and order through augmentation in traffic management as well as intelligence networking in the barangays. NGO 7 which is a transport group is involved in peace and order programs and solid waste management. NGO 8, which is a transport group, has been inactive for several years. NGO 9, which is a farmers group, based in only one barangay does not have PPAs of their own. Meanwhile, NGO 10 of the Local Health Board has PPAs that are LGU initiated. NGO 11 of the Local School Board does not have its own PPAs.

On the question: *How effective are the services delivered by the organization with LGU collaboration?* NGO 1 averred that the services they deliver with LGU collaboration are very effective but "at times the result is not immediate because the process is slow." NGO 2 replied affirmatively that they have accomplished some projects with the cooperation of the Mayor and the Sangguniang Bayan (local legislative body) "so without the support of the SB, we could not exactly do our own because with the approval of the SB in some of our projects...so if our relation with them is not good there might be, what is this, they might go against the project and

we could not accomplish that.” NGO 3 declared that “we cannot deny that there are really some people who cannot be satisfied with what is given instead of being thankful for the help.” NGO 4 has been inactive for 10 years while NGO 5 described:

NGO 5: I cannot really say it is effective because there are farmers who have negative attitude, there are those who are partially positive and there are those who are really positive. We cannot really please everyone. There are those who are active but there also inactive ones. Some when they receive the loan they become inactive, the others even do not pay.

NGO 6 averred that they are effective because the “people see our sincerity in doing those things.” On the other hand, according to NGO 7:

NGO 7: Yes, very effective but the problem is in the implementation. I don’t know if you know the factor behind it, it has something to do with political beliefs, something like that...

NGO 8 has been inactive for several years while NGO 9 declared that they are effective. Meanwhile, NGO 10 composed of health workers revealed:

NGO 10: It is. For example in the far flung areas if there are no health workers then the rural health midwives will never become successful. Our help is really big.

For its part, NGO 11 of the Local Health Board declared that they have not implemented PPAs together with the local government.

Subsequently, a focus group discussion was conducted among ordinary citizens of the municipality. The focus group discussion was conducted in three sessions on 22 July 2011 at 10:00-12:00 noon, at 1:00–3:00 and at 3:00-5:00, attended by ordinary citizens such as housewives, farmers, and the self-employed with a total of 30 participants. Questions include their awareness of the presence of NGOs, their interaction, the role of NGOs in service delivery, responsiveness, the representation of NGOs in the LSBs, and NGOs partnership with the LGU.

The participants to the discussion were asked if they are aware of the presence of NGOs and the replies were varied. A minority of them replied that they are familiar with some of the NGOs enumerated while a few revealed that they are aware because they are member of a certain NGO. A few of them are quite aware of a specific NGO because of an infrastructure project that the NGO facilitated. Half of them are aware of some NGOs although they are not aware what

they are for while others stated “depends which part of the municipality you come from.” The others, however, got to know of the NGOs when they were enumerated to them during the discussion.

When they were asked: *How do you interact with the NGOs?* A few said they interact with NGOs when they need something from them while others say they interact because they are a member of the NGO. Most of them though have not experienced any interaction with the NGOs because, as they say, “they do not come to us.”

On the question: *What is the role of the NGOs in service delivery?* The citizens expressed their ideas that the NGOs are there to assist the persons in need, to facilitate community participation and to provide what the government cannot. A few argued that “we do not know because we are not members of the NGOs, only those who are members get to benefit from their services.” However, they believe that NGOs are “formed to deliver services.” A minority contended that the role of NGOs in service delivery depends on the sector they represent.

The citizens were asked if the NGOs are responsive to their needs and the answers were varied. Again, a few of them declared that it depends on the sector they represent specifically those involved in the Local Health Board and the Local School Board. However, most of them said they have not heard of some NGOs, and such that they “have not felt the presence of other NGOs.” Ultimately, the citizens averred that the NGOs “can help somehow” and they can help augment their needs.

In terms of representation, the citizens were asked: *What do you think of NGOs representation in the Local Special Bodies?* Most of them replied that the NGOs only represent their group and that some of the NGOs enumerated do not actually represent their interests. Some declared:

“We do not feel that they represent us because there is no consultation.”

“We are not properly represented.”

A few said “we are not sure because we do not know them.” They also said that some NGOs are good at first then they disappear. The citizens went as far as saying:

“They are the ones who only know if there are ‘blessings’.”
 “We cannot avail of the ‘blessings’ if we are not a member.”

The blessings referred to by the citizens are those finances or goods or infrastructure support that some NGOs receive from the local government or other institutions.

Consequently, the citizens were asked: *How do you assess the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs?* One of the respondents declared:

“Those who availed (of the services) can probably speak or comment on that but for those who have not received any cannot speak.”

However, most of them said they do not feel there is a partnership because they “do not really represent us” while others said they feel the partnership because they are a member of an NGO. In other words, those who do not belong to any NGO cannot speak about the partnership. One respondent suggested that:

“The NGOs who should be members of the Local Special Bodies should have membership in the whole municipality so that we can also feel them and that every barangay can also suggest...some kind of an umbrella group so that it will reach the top.”

4.2.1 Analysis of Research Finding

The analysis will take into consideration the performance of the municipality, the meetings and outputs of the local special bodies, and the answers of the respondents to questions relative to the hypothesis.

Municipal Development Council (MDC)

The MDC is the primary planning body responsible for development planning activities in the local government units. In the 2010 performance assessment the recommendation shows that the consultation process should be improved in relation to development planning. However, as of June 2011 only one meeting was conducted by the MDC and no member-NGOs were even

present (Table 4.1, see page 143). Similarly, both the 2010 Annual Investment Plan and the Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013 reflects the vision of participatory governance in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. PPAs involving NGOs in various fields of governance were integrated in those plans. In the same vein, the local officials and a department head averred that their meetings are consultative and that NGOs get financial assistance from the local government. They also said they were aware that NGOs have better ideas, that there is a sharing of ideas between them so that the LGU will know what the problems of the NGOs are to help the LGU in their governance. They recognize that when there is presence of NGOs the LGU is “forced to provide or address their needs.” However, the NGOs speak otherwise because they revealed that they have not participated in any decision-making ever since the MDC was constituted, which shows that the plans mentioned above were prepared without NGO involvement thus lacking in consultation. It also shows that the LGU focuses more on meeting the needs of the NGOs rather than involving them in basic policy-making. One local official even declared that if NGOs request financial assistance from them they include them in their 20% Development Fund for their projects which means that they may be responsive but they do not encourage input, they passively accept it.

All the NGOs declared their PPAs fit with the agenda of the LGU on service delivery because their objectives are geared more to that aspect. However, it is understandable for some NGOs to say so because they derive some financial support from the local government. Ironically, one department head declared that the LGU do not have many activities that involve the NGOs which is why the NGOs do not participate that much.

It should be noted that of the five NGOs in the MDC, three of them are small groups, not widely-organized, whose members are based in one or two barangays while two are municipal-wide. Ironically, one municipal-wide organization has been inactive for 10 years.

Thus, planning in the MDC is neither participatory nor consultative. Though the mechanism is in place, the relationship is not effective.

Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)

The municipality's performance in social governance shows there is a need to improve, among others, peace, security and disaster risk management, such that the Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC) and Local Council for the Protection of Children should be strengthened, ensure the annual financial allocation to the Katarungang Pambarangay (village justice system), strengthen the Local Disaster Coordinating Council, and enhance local government readiness to manage the risks of disasters, including relief, other associated services and rehabilitation.

The first and only meeting under the present administration as of June 2011 was held on March 2011 (Table 4.1, see page 143). Two NGOs were present out of the four who are members of the MPOC. However, the minutes showed non-participation of the NGOs present in the deliberation and discussion. On the other hand, the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan (IACPSP) for 2011 reflects several PPAs with NGO collaboration.

The local officials and department heads maintained that the NGOs are cooperative and active and that they also give their ideas and opinions. However, it was revealed that of the four NGOs in the MPOC only two are actually participative while one NGO has been inactive for several years and the other one is not really active and is based in only one barangay (village), thus limiting its functionality. Although one department head recognized the role of two participative NGOs, another department head declared that he has not collaborated with any NGO which creates an absurd situation because it tells of a lack of common purpose among department heads in the local government as far as peace and order is concerned. Nevertheless, the local officials and some department heads recognized the collaboration that they have with NGOs in service delivery such as conduct of community service, maintenance of peace and order, enforcement of ordinances and information dissemination. One department head noted appropriately that the concern of peace and order is not only the responsibility of one sector. They recognize however that in order to provide excellent service there is a need to strengthen the partnership.

On the other hand, the NGOs revealed their participation in decision-making by attending the meetings of the MPOC but not in the planning sessions for the public safety plan. One NGO has been inactive for several years and another is semi-active yet remains a member of the MPOC while another NGO declared they cannot remember missing any meetings but during the meeting mentioned above they were absent. The NGOs maintained that their collaborations with the LGU are very effective despite not having been involved in the planning sessions.

It is obvious that there is no effective relationship between the LGU and the NGOs despite them saying that it is effective. The NGOs have just become mere partners of the LGU without regard to whether the partnership is effective or not. Ironically, one cannot have effective partnership if the other is too weak as in the case of the two NGOs.

Municipal Health Board

The performance of the municipality on social governance suggests that the Municipal Health Board have to do more to improve the quality of primary health care and curative services, and improve the quality of child care services.

As the Local Government Code of 1991 requires, meetings should be held on a monthly basis or as often as may be necessary however, as of June 2011 and under the present administration, the Municipal Health Board met only twice (Table 4.1, see page 143). The NGO attended only once however there is no showing of any participation in the deliberation.

The local officials and health personnel acknowledged that the NGO is an effective partner in all health services. They also acknowledge the vital contribution of the NGO in the effective delivery of services because through them they are able to reach out to their targets especially in far-flung areas and that through them they are able to learn the needs of the people. However, when asked about their participation in decision-making in the Health Board the NGO declared that it is the municipal health officer (doctor) who identifies the PPAs and presents it to the body for approval. It is absurd that the NGO is knowledgeable of the needs of the people as

recognized by the local officials and health personnel yet they do not take part in the preparation of PPAs. Ironically, the NGOs do not have PPAs of their own as they are dependent on the PPAs of the local government.

There is a lack of real partnership between the two sectors. A perusal of the circumstances reveals that the NGO is an effective partner in the implementation of the PPAs but not in the identification thereof because real decision-making is lodged with the LGU.

Municipal School Board

In terms of education services, the Municipal School Board has to do more to advance the cause of those in need of quality education and the suggested actions are to invest the Special Education Fund in actions that improve the quality of human capital such as the establishment of a Scholarship Fund for poor but qualified students, and to establish or improve the quality of the Alternative Learning System.

Only one meeting was held under the present administration, contrary to the provision that meetings of the Municipal School Board be held monthly or as often as may be necessary (Table 4.1, see page 143). The lone meeting, held on March 2011, was for the purpose of approving the budget (Special Education Fund) for priority education projects by the Local School Board.

A department head who is a major player in the Municipal School Board has consistently maintained that they have effective collaboration and service delivery with the NGO because of their good relations. However, the department head revealed that in all their programs in their department they try to convene the NGO to present the programs for their approval. This reveals that they do not always convene the NGO and when they do they merely ask for their approval, they do not seek and accept input. Ironically, during that lone School Board meeting the NGO declared he agreed with what the school head presented. The NGO was not even aware there is a Special Education Fund, yet he was one of those who approved the budget during the meeting.

Table 4.1 Local Special Bodies (Municipality of B) – July 2010 – June 2011

Local Special Body	Mandated Number of Meetings Under the LGC of 1991	Number of Meetings Actually Held		Number of NGOs Under the Executive Order (EO)	Number of NGOs Present	Extent of Participation of NGOs	Source
		Frequency	Date				
Municipal Development Council (MDC)	Once every six months or as often as may be necessary	Once (1)	October 2010	5	None	-	Resolution (excerpt from the Minutes of MDC Meeting)
Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)	-	Once (1)	March 2011	4	2	Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues	Minutes of Meeting
Municipal School Board	Once a month or as often as may be necessary	Once (1)	March 2011	1	3	Voted for the approval of the budget	Resolution
Municipal Health Board	Once a month or as often as may be necessary	Two (2) times	July 2010	1	None	-	Minutes of Meeting
			August 2010	1	1	Did not participate at all in the discussions and deliberation of issues	-same-

Table 4.2 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) statements on how effective are the services they deliver with the LGU

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	PPAs the NGOs Practice Towards the Development of LGU	Effectiveness of Services Delivered with LGU Collaboration
1	MDC	Environmental Youth Group	One (1) Barangay	A small number of out-of-school youths (approximately 50)	-economic such as vegetable gardening, hog raising and sari-sari store (micro-convenience enterprise)	-very effective although the results are not immediate because the process is slow
2	MDC	Group of Professionals	Municipal	A small group of professionals who are mostly teachers (approximately 100)	-historical celebrations, putting-up of historical projects	-very effective
3	MDC	Women's Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of women (approximately 100)	-joins in the celebration of the Women's Month, partner's with the Mayor and the Department of Agrarian Reform in some projects, gender and development programs	-some are not satisfied
4	MDC	Farmers Cooperative	Municipal	A large group of farmers (approximately 1000)	-inactive for 10 years	-
5	MDC	Farmers Group	Two (2) Barangays	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-they do not have PPAs that they initiate on their own, the LGU prescribes for them	-cannot say if it is effective
6	MPOC	Brotherhood Organization	Municipal	A moderate organization composed of men (approximately 400)	-civic actions such as cleanliness drive, maintenance of peace and order through augmentation in traffic management and intelligence networking in the barangays	- very effective
7	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-peace and order programs and solid waste management	-very effective though implementation is hampered by political beliefs
8	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-inactive for several years	-

9	MPOC	Farmers Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-does not have PPAs of their own, they rely on the LGU; semi-active for several years	-effective
10	Health Board	Health Workers Group	Municipal	A moderate group of health workers (approximately 200)	-their PPAs are LGU initiated	-very effective
11	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 3000)	-does not have its own PPAs	-none

The NGO went on to reveal that they have no PPAs of their own and that they have not collaborated with the LGU in service delivery. The contradicting statements between the two vital players in the Local School Board show that there is a lack of real and effective partnership between the LGU and the NGO.

In Table 4.1 (see page 143), there is a clear pattern that meetings are not regularly conducted as expected under the provision of the Local Government Code of 1991 and although NGOs were present in some meetings, they do not figure prominently as far as participation in the discussions is concerned. Thus, it can be observed that first, it appears that the failure of the local government to conduct meetings regularly avoids involving the NGOs, if the conduct of meetings were regularly held, the NGOs would have had greater opportunity to participate; second, the failure on the part of the NGOs to attend the meetings appears to indicate that the NGOs do not understand why the local government involves them. The NGOs were not properly oriented to their role in local government. Third, the local government does not bother involving the NGOs because they do not see why they should be involved, the lack of knowledge and understanding about decentralization and the Local Government Code of 1991 hampers NGO involvement; and fourth, compared to larger municipalities like Municipality of A, smaller municipalities have a hard time getting the NGOs to work, due to their minimal attendance at meetings.

In Table 4.2, (see pages 144) the statements of the NGOs on the PPAs that they practice towards the development of LGU and the effectiveness of services delivered with LGU collaboration can be carefully examined. In terms of representativeness of the NGOs based on type and the PPAs that they practice towards the development of the LGU, it can be drawn from the table that some NGOs have impact not only on the sector that they represent but also in other concerns, while other NGOs either do not have their own PPAs because they rely on the LGU or they are inactive. For example, NGO 1, which is an environmental youth group have PPAs that are geared to economic development, NGO 3, which is a women's group, not only is concerned with gender and development programs but also agrarian concerns, NGO 6, which is a brotherhood organization is not only concerned with peace and order but also environmental concerns. On the other hand, NGOs 5, 9, 10 and 11 rely on LGU-initiated programs while NGOs 4 and 8 have been inactive for several years. In terms of scope of NGOs, there are four NGOs that are barangay-based such as NGOs 1, 3, 5 and 9,

and the rest are municipal-wide. Barangay-based NGOs limit representation because they are supposed to represent the entire municipality. The size of the NGOs makes a difference, smaller and moderate-sized NGOs have more PPAs than larger NGOs like NGOs 4 and 11.

In terms of effectiveness of services delivered with LGU collaboration, there is no particular type of NGO that determines effectiveness because they are all effective according to the advocacy or sector they represent except those that have been inactive and have not collaborated with the LGU (NGOs 4, 8 and 11). On other hand, the scope of coverage of NGOs have disparities because there are NGOs that are effective but are barangay-based such as NGOs 1 and 9, and there are municipal-wide NGOs that are also effective; however, there are also municipal-wide NGOs that are inactive or have not collaborated with the LGU. Size of NGOs seemingly makes a difference although not necessarily the larger the better because there are smaller and moderate NGOs such as NGOs 1, 6, 7 and 10 that are more effective than larger NGOs.

There are several observations here. First, in general, NGO representations are interest-oriented. Second, barangay-based NGOs limit wider representation no matter how effective they are in their respective barangays. Third, size does not matter in determining effectiveness. Fourth, although the MDC and the MPOC have broader functions, they require no specific type of NGOs as members such that they represent narrow interest groups focused only on specific issues instead of broad-based constituencies. Fifth, in the Municipal School Board and the Municipal Health Board, sector-specific NGOs which are required under the Local Government Code of 1991 are more effective. Sixth, sector-specific representation is more appropriate than multi-sectoral representation.

The Municipality of B has complied with all the requirements of the Local Government Code of 1991 as far as putting in place the mechanism for LGU-NGO partnership. However, there is a strong indication that there is indeed a lack of consultation in the Municipal Development Council. In the MPOC, although there are NGOs that are active in the implementation of PPAs, in the planning they are not a part thereof. Likewise, in the Local Health Board, the NGO involved is a vital part in the implementation of the PPAs of the LGU but they have not taken part in the identification thereof. On the same vein, the

NGO in the Local School Board has not had the chance to participate in the planning or implementation of PPAs.

During the Focus Group Discussion, it was revealed that the ordinary citizens are not familiar with some NGOs or are not even aware that they exist at all. A few of them are aware of some NGOs although they have no idea what are they for. A number of them are aware of certain NGOs because they are members therein. In terms of interaction, most of the citizens have not had any interaction with the NGOs because as they say “they do not come to us.” A few said they got to interact with some NGOs because they need something from them. The citizens, however, recognize the role of the NGOs in service delivery such as when they give assistance to persons who are in need, when they facilitate community participation and when they “provide what the government cannot.” They widely believe though that NGOs are formed to deliver services. As to responsiveness of the services of NGOs, the citizens contended that it depends on the sector that they represent; however, most of them declared that they have never felt the presence of some NGOs. Ultimately, the citizens asserted that the NGOs “can help somehow.” In terms of representation, most of the citizens averred that the NGOs in the Local Special Bodies represent only their group and not the interest of the people because there is no consultation among ordinary citizens. As to how they assess the partnership of the LGU and the NGOs, the citizens do not sense there is partnership at all.

As shown, the LGU and the NGOs have not shown effective partnership in all aspects of collaboration and service delivery. It can be observed from the documents, the lack of consultation in the planning process for the PPAs, the lack of partnership in the implementation and the observations of the ordinary citizens. Thus, the mechanism is not effective, much less complied with.

4.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

This section hypothesizes that: *Opportunities for NGOs to participate are great however, this has not been realized.*

It reports on the findings to questions that would establish the notion that despite the opportunities NGOs are given to participate however this has not been realized. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials and department heads and NGO representatives who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

The local officials and department heads involved in the local special bodies were asked questions on NGO participation: *What is the extent of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of PPAs?*

Local Official 1 averred that their decision-making is consultative. On the other hand, Local Official 2 of the MDC who was interviewed on 04 July 2011 described:

Local Official 2: As of now, not so much, it is because we have not really used our 20% DF, it is only last week that the Sangguniang Panlalawigan (Provincial Legislative Body) approved our 20% DF. Right now I have not really witnessed as our project has just been approved.

I: Based on your experience as Punong Barangay (village chief) before and automatically a member of the MDC, what was your experience in that aspect?

Local Official 2: Previously the MDC would allocate P1.4 million for the barangays so we divide that to the 14 barangays and we have P100,000.00 each. Sometimes the LGU would implement it itself or they would deposit it to our account for implementation.

I: What about the participation of NGOs before?

Local Official 2: Previously there are only a few NGOs unlike now. We used to give them financial assistance but now they have prospered. There are also NGOs that help us financially but there are also NGOs that we help financially. There are NGOs who are active and there are others that are no longer active.

Local Official 3 of the MPOC contended that NGOs also participate and give suggestions in decision-making. Health Personnel 1 of the Local Health Board stated how the representative of the NGO participates:

Health Personnel 1: She is there and she participates actively.

I: Are her ideas being listened to?

Health Personnel 1: Yes but when it comes to the budget she cannot participate that much, she is constrained.

Department Head 4 of the Local School Board described how the representative of the NGO participates:

I: What is the extent of participation of the (NGO President) in those PPAs?

Department Head 4: They also suggest if they want something but then during that meeting as far as I can remember all my suggestions were approved by the members present including the NGO President.

I: How is the participation of the NGO President during that meeting?

Department Head 4: He gives suggestions also.

I: Are his suggestions being listened to also?

Department Head 4: Yes. Everyone present during that meeting was given the time to talk.

Me: Does he suggest for a particular PPA for example?

Department Head 4: Yes especially for the school because (NGO President) is very active.

I: What about if he feels he is opposed to the program, does he talk?

Department Head 4: Yes, but so far with the meetings we had and even during meetings in the school he is okay. He is convinced that the ideas presented to him were okay.

I: In terms of participation of the (NGO) have you encountered any problem there?

Department Head 4: He is very participative. Every time we call for a meeting he makes sure that he is present.

The local officials and department heads were also asked whether the collaboration of the LGU and NGO and effective delivery of services failed or succeeded. Local Official 1 said that they have good partnership because they go to the community and that the said partnership is much stronger now. Local Official 2 on his part recognized that the resources of the municipality are limited and that they lack the manpower to go to the far flung areas which the NGOs can do. However, Local Official 2 acknowledged that there is a need to strengthen the partnership some more and that NGOs may have ideas that are much better than those of the LGU. On the other hand, Department Head 1 expressed that the LGU-NGO collaboration is very effective and that the LGU needs the NGOs to make the implementation more efficient, that the LGU cannot do it alone. Local Official 4, on the other hand, argued:

I: Do you think these services that had collaborations with the NGOs are effective?

Local Official 4: It is also effective but we cannot say that all the NGOs take part.

I: Do you think the partnership of the LGU and the NGOs are effective?

Local Official 4: Yes.

I: Why is it effective?

Local Official 4: The Mayor approaches them especially when he wants to disseminate something.

I: In general, do you think the LGU needs the NGOs to implement the PPAs?

Local Official 4: Yes they are needed but sometimes the NGO can also be a hindrance.

I: Why are you saying that?

Local Official 4: Sometimes they go against because some of them are identified thru politics that is why they refuse to cooperate.

Department Head 2 also expressed that “so far it is good but it should be strengthened some more to provide excellent service to the people.” Health Personnel 1 stressed that they have very successful collaboration with the health NGO in service delivery:

I: What can you say about that effective collaboration?

Health Personnel 1: The nature of our work entails really reaching out to the people and besides we only have one station for every 3 barangays (villages) and the target areas are really far flung so through them you can reach out to your target. Like in data gathering or communication towards the people you really have to employ them.

I: You can say you have a successful partnership with the (NGO)?

Health Personnel 1: Yes.

I: Coming from the LGU, why do you say it is successful?

Health Personnel 1: Because they can help to reach out in delivering the services.

I: And you recognize that they are really needed?

Health Personnel 1: Yes and through them we are able to learn the needs of the people.

Department Head 4 of the Local School Board contended:

I: You said the collaboration with the NGO is very effective in terms of delivery services in your PPAs, why do you think it is effective?

Department Head 4: Maybe because of the good relationship of the stakeholders and administrators of the school because if you have good relations with them they would also treat you in a good way and maybe because also of the good heart of the people of (Municipality of B)...

I: In your SEF you have the PPAs, how is the coordination with the (NGO) in implementing...?

Department Head 4: I don't see any problem with the (NGO).

I: Last question, in your opinion the collaboration within the Municipal School Board is a success?

Department Head 4: I could say it's a success based on my own experience.

I: In your opinion the LGU need the NGO, the (NGO) in particular?

Department Head 4: Yes.

Me: Why?

Department Head 4: Because they are the ones who could give us the support, they are one of our most important stakeholders in the implementation of our department's PPAs so without the (NGO) I could say we can survive but we can survive very thinly, something like that.

I: It would be difficult without them?

Department Head 4: We would have difficulty implementing without their support especially that we have this school based management in every school so the (NGO) being one of our stakeholders I could say they are the 'bread and butter' because they are the one who is just around the corner.

Four out of seven local officials and department heads averred that LGU-NGOs collaboration and effective service delivery is successful while two of them expressed that there is a need to strengthen the partnership. One local official believes that partnership is much stronger now.

On the other hand, the NGOs were asked questions about participation and their skills and resources as part of the Local Special Bodies. The question asked: *What is the extent of your participation in the LGU (planning → implementation → evaluation)?*

NGO 1 which is an environmental group and member of the Municipal Development Council contended that she also participates "when there are programs being presented or being deliberated and then we give our inputs." They have not participated in the implementation much less in the evaluation of PPAs. NGO 2 which is a historical research group maintained that he has not attended any activity of the MDC since it was organized and they became a member. NGO 3, a women's group, stated that:

NGO 3:...Previously there was this planning for the 20% Development Fund which we have observed for the first time but the projects are already there, we were only asked to approve it.

NGO 4 which is a farmers group seemed to affirm what NGO 3 stated:

I: In terms of participation, do you participate in the decision-making in the LGU?

NGO 4: When I am in the meeting I also give suggestions. Lately all the NGOs were called and we had an election that's why I was placed there in the MDC after that I have not received any communications.

I: Previously do you also participate?

NGO 4: For as long they invite us I participate. My point is that this is for the good of the municipality.

I: This time as member of the MDC, you have not been invited?

NGO 4: I have not received any communication.

I: Were you also a member of the MDC before?

NGO 4: Yes but we were not being invited anymore.

I: You don't attend meetings then?

NGO 4: No because we are not invited.

I: You mean to say you have not participated during the planning or in the implementation.

NGO 4: One time I was there but we were told of the projects and the corresponding budget, it was presented to us for approval?

I: There was no planning?

NGO 4: Nothing like that!

I: In the implementation you did not participate too?

NGO 4: No.

I: You mean to say the projects are presented pro-forma?

NGO 4: Yes, there was no consultation. The way I see it they do not like me around probably because I really talk when I see something inappropriate. What they probably want is just use me that is why they are antipathetic towards me.

NGO 5, another farmers group and MDC member, expressed that he cannot say that much about participation because he was only invited once. In the implementation, they only implement their own program. NGO 6 of the MPOC expressed that they have not really participated in the planning of PPA but they join in the implementation. NGO 7 which is a transport group described their participation in the planning and implementation:

I: As member of the MPOC, how do you participate in the decision-making of the PPAs?

NGO 7: The LGU invites us to meetings of the MPOC. We have exchange of ideas and I am one of those who also contribute for the good of the LGU.

I: Do they listen to your suggestions?

NGO 7: Yes, they also listen.

I: What about in the implementation?

NGO 7: The plan is good but as far as implementation is concerned I find a little problem with it because we have very good plans but there is no sustainability. That is what we have been saying that we actually have many laws and ordinances but the problem is the implementation besides there is not enough people to implement them.

I: How is your participation in the implementation?

NGO 7: We are always ready to participate even if the instructions are verbal we still carry that but there should be someone who is a point person in case there are problems in the implementation. That person should be the one to take action to the problems during the implementation. For example we have this problem with the motorcycle parking because there have been designated areas for every barangay with the corresponding marker but the problem is there is no law enforcer that takes charge in case there are violations which always happens thus causing disarray in the area.

I: In those problems how do you participate in the implementation?

NGO 7: How I wish to participate but...

I: Do you think the LGU should be the one to initiate?

NGO 7: Of course because they are the lead agency, we in the NGO just support them.

I: What about if you call the attention of the LGU?

NGO 7: We did that. Actually we have an internal agreement within our group about our own parking and the PNP supports us on that, you cannot just park anywhere other than in our designated parking space otherwise you would be penalized.

I: So the problem is the implementation?

NGO 7: Yes, there is no sustainability. It is always good at the beginning but there is no follow through.

NGO 8 expressed that they have not attended any activity or meeting of the MPOC while NGO 9, a farmers group, have attended all the meetings. On the Local Health Board, NGO 10 maintained that it is the municipal health officer (doctor) which identifies the programs and present it to the body for their approval. However, they are a vital partner in the implementation of health programs. NGO 11 of the Local School Board expressed that he has no idea what the Special Education Fund (SEF) is and that he has not been involved on the PPAs of the municipality.

In terms of representation, the NGOs were asked on the nature of their interaction with the citizens. NGO 1 which is based in one barangay stated that they interact with parents, barangay (village) officials and members of their group. NGO 2 which is a research-oriented group and NGO 3, based in only one barangay, have meetings. NGO 4 which is a farmer's group, has been inactive for 10 years, although when they were still active their interaction was on a daily basis because they occupy some stalls in the municipal public market. NGO 5, a farmer's group operating in two barangays, conducts a monthly meeting with its members. NGO 6 interacts with the citizens only when they have projects or activities in the community while NGO 7 which is a transport group does consultations with their clients on transport-related matters. NGO 8 has been inactive for several years while NGO 9 which operates in only one barangay interacts with the citizens in their barangay through meetings and information dissemination. NGO 10 of the Local Health Board interacts through the conduct of surveys to update the data of the barangays while NGO 11 of the Local School Board has not conducted any meeting. Subsequently, some of the NGOs were asked: *How often do you interact with the citizens?* NGO 1 meets on a monthly basis while NGO 2 says "not exactly very often." NGO 5 has monthly meetings while NGO 6 is activity-based, so is NGO 7. NGO 8 is inactive while NGO 9 is trying to be active again after a hiatus. NGO 10 interacts on a regular basis as they conduct their health-related services and activities by themselves or with the local government health personnel:

NGO 10: Right now we are partners on DOTS (Directly Observed Treatment Short-course) for the treatment of tuberculosis (TB). We also go to those who have illnesses to check if they have taken their medicines. We assist those who are sick for a check-up in the center. If we have a catchment of about 30 households, we really go to them to check on those who have children so they can be immunized or to remind them of the scheduled immunization.

On the other hand, NGO 11 has never interacted with the citizens or even among its members.

In terms of resources, NGO 1 expressed that they have manpower, however they derive their financial resources from the municipal and provincial government previously given to them. The financial support they received from the government is utilized for livelihood programs of their members. NGO 2 stated that their resources are limited and that they come from donations, solicitations and membership from the members. Their projects are funded by the local government. NGO 3 had funds coming from the national, provincial and municipal government and from a national-based NGO which they utilized for livelihood projects for their members. NGO 4 has been inactive for ten years however they have financial resources that they loaned to members and non-members which have not been paid. NGO 5 is a farmers group based in two barangays (villages) organized by the local government to implement financial assistance from the national government, which they loaned to their members for the purchase of seedlings, fertilizer and labor. They also have minimal amount from their annual dues and membership fee. NGO 6 derives its resources from their monthly dues, donations and solicitations. NGO 7 which is a transport group derives its resources from the so-called cooperative share from their members for every commercial trip of the vehicle. NGO 8 has been inactive for several years and has no funds. NGO 9 is a farmers group based in one barangay and obtained its resources from the local government, which they loaned to members. They also have minimal membership fees. NGO 10 which is a health NGO has very minimal registration fees and annual dues. They have no donations, solicitations or fund-raising activities. On the same vein, NGO 11 of the Local School Board does not have any resources.

Some of the NGOs were then asked their opinion on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services. NGO 1 contended that their partnership is effective because of the trust that the LGU has with their NGO and the desire of the LGU to help the youth. NGO 2 opined both are supportive of each other's projects. NGO 4 which has been inactive for many years:

I: ...do you believe that the LGU-NGO collaboration is ineffective?

NGO 4: Most probably with us only because they cannot dominate. With the others maybe they are effective because they can use them. My point is collaboration is good if it is for the development of the municipality but not when it is used to tolerate indiscretions.

I: You mean to say that the collaboration was not a success?

NGO 4: Maybe not totally, it is halfhearted. The way I see it, it is done for compliance but in truth the administration is not doing it right.

NGO 6 averred that their partnership is effective because the LGU find them sincere and “that we are always there anytime they need us.” NGO 7 which is a transport group declared that they have a very effective partnership “because we have systematic parking of our vehicles, bickering among the drivers has been evaded now...in the solid waste management program we have ordered the van operators and jeepney operators to gather their trash and put them in the garbage cans.” NGO 10 expressed that they have a very effective partnership. Ultimately, the NGOs were unanimous in expressing their ideas that the LGU needs the NGOs because there are activities that the LGU cannot do without the NGOs, that good ideas come from the NGOs, that the implementation would be more efficient when there is NGO partnership, that health programs will not prosper with an NGO, and that the LGU “cannot do it alone if they will not tap external support.” However, most of the NGOs strongly believe that there is a dire need to strengthen the partnership further.

In the focus group discussion with ordinary citizens as mentioned previously, several questions were asked that focused on participation and the participatory opportunities available to them.

On the question: *Do you have the opportunity to participate in decision-making and in service delivery?* Most of the participants expressed their participation in decision-making during the barangay (village) assembly or meetings in the barangay. However, a few of them contended that they also participate at the municipal level through their barangay officials and during public hearings. Most of the participants declared that they have not participated at the municipal level. In service delivery, most of the participants help in their personal capacity to those people in need such as facilitating information dissemination, facilitate communication to far flung areas especially those that cannot be reached by any means of transportation, through a bayanihan (cooperative undertaking by group of people given for free) to those who are really poor in the construction of their house and in cases of emergency

and disaster volunteers their services to victims. There are those who volunteer their services in health related activities, to the elderly and to those persons with disabilities (PWDs). One volunteers in monthly feeding of malnourished children provided by a national-based NGO.

The citizens were asked: *What prevents you from participating?* They were one in saying they did not participate, providing a variety of reasons what prevents them from participating in decision-making in the local government such as:

- “Our knowledge is limited.”
- “We are not being consulted that’s why we do not know.”
- “We are ashamed to approach them.”
- “Because of politics.”

On the other hand, what leads them to participate in decision-making is for them to have some personal knowledge, they also want to know what is going in the barangay (village) and what is being talked about while one citizen wants to share the knowledge acquired in farming. In service-delivery, they participate:

- “Because I care for my neighbors or fellow human beings.”
- “In times of emergency or disaster.”
- “I feel happy when I give help especially to those who have problems.”
- “I feel contented when I provide voluntary services in the health center through the feeding programs.”
- “To help others.”
- “For the good of the community.”
- “So that we can be helped also.”
- “My kid is one who benefits from the service.”

However, what prevents them from participating in service-delivery:

- “When I am busy with other undertakings.”
- “You cannot be there all the time.”
- “When we are busy with work so we prioritize our daily needs first.”
- “Financial reasons.”
- “Lack of communication.”
- “No one will take care of my kids.”
- “When I am busy.”
- “I have to prioritize my work first.”

The citizens expressed suggestions that might encourage them to participate in decision-making and in the delivery of services:

- “If we are informed and involved.”
- “We must be informed of what these programs are all about.”
- “Clear reasons why I am invited (communications).”
- “Communication or information must be clear enough for us to understand.”
- “We should be given invitations so we can attend.”

Most of the participants to the discussion maintained that they are not aware of the opportunities to participate in the local government. However, the only instance that they know they can participate is during the barangay (village) assembly or if they are invited or involved by the local government, which is rare.

They were asked the question: *How do you interact with the local government in the delivery of services?* They expressed that they interact with the local government through the barangay officials such as when they approach first the barangay officials before they can go to the municipal level. Some interact through agents or personnel of the local government such as those from the health, agriculture and social welfare office. Others declared that they have not interacted with the local government while others shared:

“If there is a project and it has not been implemented though we know it should be implemented then we interact with them.”

4.3.2 Analysis of Research Findings

The analysis will take into consideration the performance of the municipality, the meetings and outputs of the local special bodies, and the answers of the respondents to questions relative to the hypothesis.

Municipal Development Council (MDC)

As mentioned, the Municipal Development Council is the primary planning body of the municipality and as revealed in the 2010 performance report, the local government needs to improve the consultation process in development planning. Meetings are not regularly conducted and planning sessions are not held. One meeting was conducted but without NGOs present.

One local official contended that their decision-making in the MDC is consultative while another official declared that there are active NGOs just as there are also NGOs that are not active in the MDC. Moreover, the local officials and a department head maintained that the collaboration between the LGU and the NGOs are effective and therefore successful

because of the good partnership, that the resources and manpower of the local government are limited and that there is a need for NGOs to make the implementation of PPAs efficient.

On the other hand, the NGOs contended that they have not attended nor been invited to any planning activity or meetings of the MDC thus they have not participated in the decision-making. As to the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services, the NGOs in the MDC have varied ideas. Some of the NGOs who received some funding from the local government maintained that the partnership is effective while one which has not been active for many years contended that the collaboration is not a success because “it is done for compliance but in truth the administration is not doing right.”

It is without doubt that there is no consultation as far as planning for PPAs by the MDC is concerned. The performance report for 2010 reveals this; as of June 2011 no meeting or planning activity has been conducted for that year. Again, the conduct of meetings and planning sessions are indicators of effective consultation with members and with the NGOs in particular. Planning sessions are great opportunities for NGOs to participate but they were never given a chance.

Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC)

As the 2010 performance report suggests, the MPOC should be strengthened. The local officials averred that the NGOs in the MPOC participate and give suggestions however one local official opined that sometimes the NGOs can also be a hindrance because some of them are identified through their political leanings, thus affecting the implementation of PPAs.

On the other hand, the NGOs are willing participants in the implementation, but they have not taken part in the planning activities. Notably, one NGO has been organizationally inactive for several years yet remains a member of the MPOC.

A perusal of the Integrated Area Community Public Safety Plan for 2010 and 2011 reveals several PPAs which require LGU-NGO partnership in implementation. However, the

NGOs involved in the MPOC have PPAs in partnership with the LGU that are entirely different from what is stipulated in the Public Safety Plan.

Thus, there is no consultation in the planning for the PPAs relating to peace and order concerns, much less involvement of NGOs in the implementation thereof. Again, opportunities for active NGOs to participate are great but this has not been realized.

Municipal Health Board

As of June 2011, the Board met only twice and the NGO attended only once contrary to the provision of law that meetings be conducted monthly or as often as may be necessary. As to participation of the NGO in the decision-making, the health personnel maintained that the NGO is “constrained” by lack of knowledge in budgeting. However, in the implementation of PPAs on health by the local government, the NGO is a vital partner.

The NGO declared that planning for the PPAs by the Municipal Health Board is done by the health officer which presents it to the Board for approval. The lack of skills in budgeting has constrained the NGO from participating in the preparation of PPAs as the notion suggests; however, the NGO is full of knowledge of the situation on the ground but this has not been utilized. The NGO had the opportunity to participate but this has not been realized.

Municipal School Board

Only one meeting was held by the Municipal School Board as of June 2011 contrary to the provision of law that meetings be conducted monthly or as often as may be necessary. As to participation of the NGO in decision-making for the approval of PPAs, a department head maintained that the NGO also gives suggestions and is given the time to talk. The department head went on to recognize the importance of the NGO in the programs of the Local School Board such that without them it would be difficult to implement programs. The declaration of the department head contradicts the statement of the NGO that that they have not been involved in the PPAs of the LGU and that they are not even aware of the Special Education Fund where the Local School Board is being held accountable.

Table 4.3 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) – Participation and Resources

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Resources (Manpower; Financial)	Participation in Planning	Participation in Implementation
1	MDC	Environmental Youth Group	One (1) Barangay	A small number of out-of-school youths (approximately 50)	-Manpower -Funds came from provincial and municipal government	-Participates when there are programs to be presented or deliberated	-None
2	MDC	Group of Professionals	Municipal	A small group of professionals who are mostly teachers (approximately 100)	-Donations -Solicitations -Membership fees -Projects are funded by the municipal government (e.g. historical markers)	-None	-None
3	MDC	Women's Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of women (approximately 100)	-Funds came from national, provincial, municipal government and national NGO	-Based on previous experience, projects were already pre-determined, they were only asked to approve it	-None
4	MDC	Farmers Cooperative	Municipal	A large group of farmers (approximately 1000)	-None -Have receivables from non-paying members	-Affirms the statement of NGO 3 -Inactive for 10 years	-
5	MDC	Farmers Group	Two (2) Barangays	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-Fund from the national government through the LGU -Minimal amount from annual dues and membership fees	-Not much, only invited once	-Implements their own programs only
6	MPOC	Brotherhood Organization	Municipal	A large organization composed of men (approximately 400)	-Monthly dues, donations, solicitations	-None	-Have joined in the implementation
7	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-Cooperative share from members	-None	-Have joined in the implementation but programs are not sustainable

8	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-None	-Inactive for several years	-
9	MPOC	Farmers Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-Funds came from the municipal government	-Attended all the meetings -Semi-Active	-
10	Health Board	Health Workers Group	Municipal	A moderate group of health workers (approximately 200)	-Very minimal amount from registration fees and annual dues	-Programs are predetermined	-Widely involved in the implementation of programs
11	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 3000)	-None	-Programs are predetermined; not even aware of the Special Education Fund (SEF)	-None

Table 4.4 Non-Government Organizations (Municipality of B) – Interaction with the Citizens

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Interaction with the citizens	
					Nature	Frequency
1	MDC	Environmental Youth Group	One (1) Barangay	A small number of out-of-school youths (approximately 50)	-Interacts with parents, barangay officials and group members	-On a monthly basis
2	MDC	Group of Professionals	Municipal	A small group of professionals who are mostly teachers (approximately 100)	-Through meetings	-Not regularly
3	MDC	Women's Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of women (approximately 100)	-Through meetings	-Not regularly
4	MDC	Farmers Cooperative	Municipal	A large group of farmers (approximately 1000)	-Has been inactive for 10 years	-
5	MDC	Farmers Group	Two (2) Barangays	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-Through meetings	-Monthly
6	MPOC	Brotherhood Organization	Municipal	A large organization composed of men (approximately 400)	-Through projects or activities	-Project-based
7	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-Through its passengers	-Issue-based (e.g. increase in fares)
8	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A moderate group of transport operators and drivers (approximately 200)	-Has been inactive for several years	-
9	MPOC	Farmers Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of farmers (approximately 100)	-Through meetings and information dissemination -Semi-active	-Tries to be active again after a hiatus
10	Health Board	Health Workers Group	Municipal	A moderate group of health workers (approximately 200)	-Through the conduct of surveys and health related services	-On a regular basis based on services given to the community
11	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren (approximately 3000)	-None	-None

In Table 4.3 (see page 160), there is no specific type of NGO that determines effective participation in planning and implementation. Most if not all of the NGOs have not participated in planning while three (NGOs 6, 7 and 10) out of eleven NGOs have participated in implementation. A number of NGOs have expressed that programs are predetermined; they are presented only for approval. In terms of scope, only municipal-wide NGOs (NGOs 6, 7 and 10) have participated while barangay-based NGOs have not. Size matters in implementation because only larger (NGO 6) and moderate-sized (NGOs 7 and 10) have been involved while smaller NGOs have not participated.

It might be assumed that the level of resources of NGOs may affect their level of participation in the LGU both in planning and implementation. However, a perusal of each NGO's participation vis-à-vis their resources seem to speak otherwise (Table 4.3, see page 160). Almost all of the NGOs have not participated in planning sessions while more than half have not participated in implementation. NGO 1, which derived its funds from the provincial and municipal government, barely participated in the planning previously and even less in implementation. NGO 2, whose resources come from donations, solicitations and financial aid from the municipality, has not participated in planning and implementation. NGO 3, which also obtained its funds from the provincial and municipal government, has not participated in planning and barely participated in the implementation of some programs. NGO 4 does not have resources as they have been inactive for about 10 years. NGO 5, whose resources come from annual dues and membership fees and substantial aid from the national government for their projects, has not participated in planning and implements only their projects. NGO 6, which has resources from monthly dues, solicitations and donations, participated in meetings but not in planning sessions; however, they participate in the implementation of peace and order programs. NGO 7, which is a cooperative, obtains its resources from the cooperative share and participated in meetings but not planning sessions although they have participated in the implementation of some programs with the LGU. NGO 8 does not have resources of its own and has been inactive for several years. NGO 9, which has been semi-active for several years, got its resources from the municipal government and from membership fees, has participated in meetings but not planning sessions, and implements only their projects. NGO 10, which receives very minimal membership fees and monthly dues, has not attended any planning session and only implements programs of the

LGU; they do not have programs of their own. NGO 11 does not have any resources and they have not participated in planning or implementation activities.

Thus, it can be derived that: first, NGOs have never been an important part in planning as programs are predetermined; second, scope makes a big difference, barangay-based NGOs are not appropriate partners of the LGU; third, the size of the NGO should be considered in involvement; fourth, those that have no resources have not participated; fifth, having adequate resources appears to be a necessary condition but does not appear to be a sufficient condition as some NGOs with adequate resources do not participate; and sixth, giving government resources do not guarantee or induce participation.

Four of the NGOs derived their funds from the local government for their programs, one NGO is organized by the local government to avail of a national government funded project, two NGOs have been organizationally inactive for several years and do not have funds, two of the NGOs are dependent on membership dues and solicitations, and two NGOs have no resources at all. A perusal thereof would reveal that the NGOs involved in the Local Special Bodies are financially incapable of standing on their own such that they need financial support for their PPAs. On the other hand, as to their PPAs that they practice towards LGU development, other than those that have been idle for several years and those that do not have PPAs of their own because they are dependent on the LGU, there are also NGOs that provide capability building and skills training programs for the citizens through economic, institutional, peace and order, and environmental concerns.

As to interaction of the NGOs with the citizens (Table 4.4, see page 162), there is no specific type or scope of NGOs that is more effective when it comes to interaction with citizens, all of them interact based on the nature of their advocacies and the frequency is activity-based or project-based. In terms of size, smaller groups such as NGOs 1 and 5 interact more frequently than moderate-sized and larger NGOs. Other than NGOs 1 and 5, which interact on a monthly basis, the rest of the NGOs interact depending on the frequency of their programs and projects, although the health NGO conducts its activities on a regular basis as vital partner of the LGU in all its health programs. Aside from the two organizationally inactive (NGOs 4 and 8) and one semi-active (NGO 9) NGOs, the NGO involved in the Local School Board (NGO 11) has not interacted with the citizens much less

conducted meetings with its own members. There are two observations from this: first, there is relatively limited contact for active NGOs while there really is no contact for inactive and semi-active NGOs; and, second, there is no clear pattern; the NGOs are not really representing the opinions of their constituency though they may be representing their interests in a general fashion.

Consequently, the ordinary citizens expressed that they have not participated in decision-making in the municipal level only in the barangay (village) but some of them believe that they participate in the municipal level through their barangay (village) officials. This clearly shows that the citizens are not aware that their participation is lodged through the NGOs in the Local Special Bodies. In service delivery, the citizens have in one way or another participated in their personal capacity. It is worth nothing that some of the citizens expressed the reason that prevents them from participating in decision-making is due to politics and the lack of consultation. On the other hand, what prevent them from participating in the delivery of services is the financial constraints. Consequently, the citizens argued that they should be informed so they can participate. Nevertheless, they are not aware how they can participate in the municipal government except at the barangay level. However, they interact with the municipal government through its personnel, implementing some programs and services.

The local officials and department heads agree that NGOs are vital partners of the LGU. However, the NGOs have not been given opportunities to participate in the planning and implementation of PPAs. Planning of the PPAs has become the constant activity of just one partner, the LGU. In the implementation, there are NGOs that are visibly active, but this could be because it is convenient for the LGU to involve them to make the implementation effective and efficient. The NGOs not only have financial constraints though they may have manpower such that voluntary services may be tapped. However, quite a number of them either have not been functional or have limited functionality. Indubitably, although the LGU is still not open to the idea of collaboration, the NGOs are quite weak.

4.4 CONCLUSION

In Valuing Fundamentals of Governance in the LGPMS, the performance of the municipality failed in both transparency and participation. In order to be transparent it was suggested that the local government should maximize the use of communication channels (Bulletin Board, Public Information Office or Desk, the print or broadcast media, a website, public fora) so that the public would know its plans, programs, services and special events. The strengthening of NGO participation in Local Special Bodies and Citizen Feedback system, including the maximization of NGO engagement in development projects, were the suggested actions to contain effective citizen participation. Transparency and participation are two issues that intertwine in LGUs. For the LGUs to be transparent, the citizens should be given the opportunity to participate in local governance not only because they are the ones affected by the policies to be implemented but because they know the situation on the ground.

In the Municipality of B, transparency and participation still remain an issue after the Local Government Code was enacted in 1991. The analysis of research findings support the recommendation above, that there is no effective LGU-NGO relationship despite the mechanism and that the NGOs were not given the opportunity to participate because the LGU is not open to the idea of collaboration while, on its part, the NGOs lack the resources, functionality and representativeness.

The local officials and department heads have always averred they have consultative meetings and active NGO participation in local governance; however, the documents and the declarations of NGOs have shown that they have not participated in planning and barely participated in PPA implementation. On the other hand, there is a large disconnection between the NGOs and ordinary citizens. Ordinary citizens neither felt the representation of NGOs in the Local Special Bodies nor have they experienced any interaction with NGOs as a form of consultation. Several issues can be inferred from the circumstances. First, planning sessions and meetings are not being conducted such that real decision-making in the Local Special Bodies are constantly done by one sector, the local government. The assertion by the local officials and department heads that NGOs have better ideas seems misplaced because PPAs are presented only for approval, not for input from members of the LSBs. On the other hand, in the implementation of PPAs the NGOs get recognized because their participation makes implementation easier and more efficient for the LGU. In return, one particular NGO gets an incentive in the form of insurance for its members because of their extensive

participation in the implementation of health programs. Second, attention must be paid to the functionality of NGOs. Of the 11 NGOs in the LSBs, 2 have been inactive for several years while 4 are barangay-based, 4 of them have received funding from the government for their projects and 2 are dependent on the PPAs of the local government. It is ironic that those that have been inactive remain members of the LSBs and those that are barangay-based get to be members also despite their limited coverage, which raises the question of appropriateness of representation. Subsidization of NGOs has not increased their participation in the LSBs. Third, scope of NGOs greatly matters because barangay-based NGOs limit wider representation in the LSBs. Fourth, sector-specific representation is more appropriate than multi-sectoral representation such as that in the MDC and MPOC. Fifth, there is no real partnership between the two sectors as ordinary citizens vehemently declared that they do not sense there is partnership at all between the LGU and the NGOs. The lack of consultation on the ground attests to this.

It is worth noting that there are several notions relating to politics. One local official observed that NGOs can sometimes be a hindrance because some of them are identified through their political leanings, thus affecting effective implementation of PPAs. There is partiality from the point of view of the local official but the observation may be understandable since some of the NGOs have leaders who are local officials, which brings to fore the notion that NGOs would have to be politically friendly to the administration to become members of the LSBs. On the other hand, ordinary citizens asserted the influence of politics for their failure to participate such that those who are politically friendly to the administration get to participate.

Nevertheless, the observation of one ordinary citizen about the representativeness of NGOs in the LSBs seems appropriate. The NGOs who should be members of the LSBs should have municipal-wide membership so that every barangay would be represented and their suggestions would “reach the top.” This is a valid observation since an NGO with membership from each barangay can easily gather information and ideas from different parts of the municipality thus affecting participatory and consultative interaction with the citizens. Consequently, it is observed that public information on NGOs seems lacking such that if more information were available, they would have to be more active and accountable both in meetings and to the public.

One NGO noted that the involvement of NGOs in local governance seems a matter of compliance to policy and that the administration is actually not doing it right. The statement seems to summarize the circumstances surrounding LGU-NGOs partnership in Municipality of B. As was shown, the evidence would lead us to conclude that there is no effective LGU-NGO relationship. The opportunities for NGOs to participate may have been great but this has not been realized not only because the LGU is not open to collaborate but because the NGOs generally are weak.

CHAPTER 5

Comparison of a Larger and a Smaller Municipality

How decentralization affects the people's ability to participate in decision-making may depend on the size (e.g. resources, population) of the local government. An avenue for decision-making processes through partnership they may be able to come up with services that will be truly effective and responsive to the people's needs. Hence, this chapter will explore the issue through a comparison of whether the resources of a large and small municipality may have a bearing on the partnership and in the effective delivery of services, such that the larger the municipality the greater the resources would be. Thus they become more effective in contrast to the small municipality, or they may make difference at all. Furthermore, equipped with more substantial resources and manpower it is assumed that larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with NGOs.

5.1 COMPARATIVE PROFILE

Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 illustrated the profile of the Municipality of A and the Municipality of B. Thus, the comparison will dwell on the salient features of both municipalities ascertained in previous chapters that establish their size in relation to the hypotheses.

5.1.1 Municipal Profile

Population

The size of the population can be seen as a determining factor in the size of the local government. The Municipality of A clearly has the bigger population; in 2009 it had about 75,000 inhabitants and a growth rate of 1.97%. Meanwhile, the Municipality of B had 25,000 inhabitants in 2010 with a growth rate of 1.42%.

Education

Educational institutions abound in the Municipality of A, as there are 77 private and 563 public schools, including pre-school, technical and tertiary education. Two educational institutions even offer post-graduate courses. On the other hand, the Municipality of B has 19 public and 2 private educational institutions, including pre-school, vocational and tertiary education. The literacy rate of the Municipality of A is 98% while in the Municipality of B literacy is 85%. It is understandable that the number and the availability of educational institutions in the Municipality of A can be seen as a significant contributor to its higher literacy rate.

Health Care

In terms of health care, Municipality of A shows significant disparity on the accessibility of health facilities and services with Municipality of B. Municipality of A has numerous public and private health facilities and services such as a public hospital run by the provincial government, several private hospitals and a municipal health center. All the barangays (villages) have public health stations manned by municipal and barangay health workers. There is a large number of public and private medical professionals that caters to the public. On the other hand, Municipality of B has a public hospital run by the provincial government, a municipal health center and one private medical clinic. Only half of the barangays have public health stations. Accordingly, the performance report states that health care delivery is considered adequate in Municipality of A while Municipality of B needs an upgrade.

Peace and Order

In the Municipality of A, the ratio of police with the population, generally at 1 police for every 500 population, fall short as there are only 59 police personnel in a population of about 75,000. However, the maintenance of peace and order is complimented by the municipal auxiliary police, funded and maintained by the local government. In 2009, the total crime volume was 1828 crime incidents and the crime solution efficiency rate was about 79%. Meanwhile, Municipality of B has 22 police personnel for a population of about 25,000. The total crime volume in 2009 was 239 and the crime solution efficiency rate was 91%. The ratio of police to the population is larger in the Municipality of B yet crime

incidents are much higher in Municipality of A. This could be attributed to the large population and its highly urbanized characteristic. It is common that the larger the more difficult to control.

Economy

Municipality of A is considered the center of trade in the Province of Z. Business ventures range from small to large-scale and most of the businesses are engaged in wholesale, retail and services while a considerable number engage in manufacturing, production and in the restaurant business. There are about 18 banking institutions, 1 is owned by the national government while the rest are private. There is one shopping center owned and operated by the local government. While Municipality of B has only small scale business ventures, it has 1 private bank and a small number of lending institutions. This goes to show that there is a great deal more economic activity in the Municipality of A than in the Municipality of B.

Road Network

Geographically, the Municipality of B which has a land area of about 11,000 hectares is bigger than the Municipality of A which has about 5,000 hectares. However, the road network in Municipality of A is much more developed than that of the Municipality of B. The road network in the Municipality of A consists of about 139 kilometers of national, provincial, municipal, barangay and subdivision classifications, 39% of which is concrete and the rest is asphalt and gravel. Municipality of B has about 150 kilometers of national, provincial, municipal and barangay roads, 17% is concrete while the rest are asphalt, gravel and dirt roads.

Water Supply System

Municipality of A has a local water supply which serves about 78% of the households while Municipality of B has its own local water supply system which serves only 5% of the households. Although Municipality of A may need to invest more to supply the water needs of the remaining households, Municipality of B needs considerable investment in the water needs of its households.

Power Supply

About 98% of the households in the Municipality of A have power supply compared to 77% in the Municipality of B. Power is not a development need in the Municipality of A however in Municipality of B it needs considerable investment. The location and accessibility of the households contribute to the high utilization of power supply in Municipality of A which cannot be said of Municipality of B, due to accessibility issues such as terrain and geographical locations of the households.

Communication

Both Municipality of A and Municipality of B have landline and mobile services as well as postal, telegraphic and messenger services. Both also have cable television providers while newspapers circulate on a daily basis. However, Municipality of A has several radio stations and the local government even operates its own radio station. In this sense, information is more available in the Municipality of A.

Transportation Services

Motorized tricycles are the most common means of transportation in the Municipality of A; however, there are also tourist buses and vans that cater to local and foreign tourists as there is an international airport located therein which is considered to be one of the busiest airports in the country. Terminals and parking facilities for buses and jeepneys can also be found in the municipality. On the other hand, the most common form of transportation in the Municipality of B is the motorcycle although there are a number of vans, motorized tricycles, jeepneys and trucks plying certain destinations in and out of the municipality.

5.1.2 Local Government Personnel

To complement the respective local chief executives in running the municipality, Municipality of A in 2009 had about 300 personnel employed by the local government, 213 of whom are permanent and 70 casual while Municipality of B in the same year had about 90

personnel, 53 permanent and 37 casual. The employment of personnel in a local government unit depends on its financial capability such as its income (internal and external sources) and the limitation provided by the Local Government Code of 1991. Although Municipality of A has a higher income and could employ more personnel than it does, there are limitations under the Local Government Code of 1991 which must be observed.

5.1.3 Local Government Resources

In 2010 alone, Municipality of A had a local income of about P 87,000,000.00 while the share from the national tax which is the Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA) was about P 77,000,000.00 or a total of P 164,000,000.00 annual budget for the year. Thus, the dependency of the local government to the national government in terms of budget is only 47%. On the other hand, Municipality of B had, in 2010, a local income of P 7,500,000.00 and its IRA was P 40,000,000.00 or a total of P 47,500,000.00. Its dependency to the IRA was 84%. As shown, Municipality of B has an annual budget that is only one-fourth that of Municipality of A. The high dependence of Municipality of B to the IRA is due to its very low income.

In summary, under the Local Government Code of 1991 the share of the local government units in the Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA) is determined according to population and equal sharing. Municipality of A has a much bigger population hence it avails of a much bigger share from the national internal revenue taxes compared to Municipality of B. The essence of providing more shares for bigger populations is because of bigger demand for social services such as health, education, maintenance of peace and order, economic opportunities, provision of infrastructure facilities such as road networks and other physical facilities, accessibility to information and transportation and other basic services.

Based on the salient features provided above, Municipality of A has a much higher literacy rate because of the accessibility of educational institutions. Health care services are considered adequate in Municipality of A while in Municipality of B they are hardly accessible. In the maintenance of peace and order, it is understandable for Municipality of A to have a much higher crime volume than that of Municipality of B owing to its much bigger

population. Power and water supply services are widely availed of in the Municipality of A, so is access to information and transportation.

5.2 HYPOTHESIS 3

This section resolves the hypothesis: *The larger the local government unit the more effective it is to address the needs of its constituents.*

Thus, it reports on the findings regarding questions that would help ascertain the answers to the idea that larger LGUs, because of their vast resources are more effective in addressing the needs of the constituency, although the responsibility is much bigger also. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials and department heads and NGO representatives who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

5.2.1 Municipality of A

The direction that the LGU wants to tread is best embodied in the programs, projects and activities (PPAs) that it seeks to implement. Nevertheless, these PPAs are reflective of the aims of the administration as it governs during its term. These PPAs embody the vision that serves as guide for the leaders so that at the end of their term appropriate services would have been delivered to the constituents. In the Municipality of A, the vision of the administration is reflected in the Local Development and Investment Plan/Program (LDIP) together with its corresponding strategic directions and, eventually, the PPAs to set the action. In this section, the vision and strategic directions are weighed up together with the statements of the local officials, department heads, NGOs and the ordinary citizens to see how effective the local government is in addressing the needs of its constituents.

The Local Development and Investment Plan/Program for 2011-2013 of the Municipality of A coincide with the term of the present administration. The plan was crafted during the later part of 2010 upon the start of the term of the local officials and it covers three major sectors: general public services and utilities sector, economic services sector, and social services sector. The plan involves the practical vision and strategic directions for each

sector. It should be noted that the vision and strategic directions of the municipality in the three major sectors have very wide citizen involvement.

In the general public services sector, the vision statements foresee effective and good governance, strong community participation, life promoting environment, sustained food security, sound resource generation and fiscal management. The strategic directions to attain those vision involve the strengthening of networks/linkages with different stakeholders such as people's organization, civil society organizations, national government agencies, among others; strong political will; strengthening of economic enterprise development; enactment of new revenue measures and policies; complete implementation and strengthening of management information system; regular monitoring of income and expenditures, and; provision of administrative tool on human resource management, revenue generation, ecological solid waste management, coastal resource management, environmental code, operations manual and other development and monitoring instruments (Local Development and Investment Plan/Program for 2011-2013).

In economic services sector, the vision statements foresee the municipality to be the center of eco-tourism, staple food, shelter, and people working together for self-sufficiency towards upliftment of quality of life and valuing rich culture and historical identity. The strategic directions to attain this vision include upgrading agro-fishery technology; organizing farmers, fisher folks, small and medium association into cooperatives and partners in governance; provide an investment-friendly environment; provision of adequate and upgraded infrastructure support facilities such as a public market, a food and transport terminal, farm to market roads, among others; capability building in partnership with local and national line agencies, civil society organizations, non-government organizations, people's organizations and the private sector, with more focus on product design and production, packaging and marketing of agricultural products, cooperatives, small and medium enterprises development, among others; and institutionalize comprehensive program for cultural and historical development (Local Development and Investment Plan/Program for 2011-2013).

In the social services sector, the vision statements involve sub-sector provision on education, social welfare, housing and basic utilities, health, and protective services and

disaster management. The vision statements in education foresee a people-oriented organization committed to a culture of excellence, a school system where teachers are caring, empowered, competent and accountable, administrators strive and are able to provide adequate resources and utilize modern/appropriate technologies that enhance teaching and learning and the family, community and other sectors of society actively support educational endeavors, and an educational program that is child-centered and value-driven. The strategic directions to attain this vision seek to provide affordable, accessible, quality education to the people through formal and non-formal delivery modes so that the strategic direction can serve as basis for a holistic, lifelong learning process. In social welfare, the vision statement is to advocate for the protection and promotion of the social rights and welfare of the poor, disadvantaged individuals, families and communities, thus improving the quality of life. Its strategic directions are to come up with new innovative techniques and approaches for social capital development that are accessible and responsive to local needs, and establish and strengthen community partnership and network of cooperation for the protection, welfare and upliftment of disadvantaged individuals, families and communities. In housing and basic utilities, the vision statements foresee that people live a modest life with social equity and justice, a decent shelter of their own, free from hunger and fear of eviction as a community of God-fearing people. The strategic direction to attain the vision is to make available low-cost housing and relocation sites for landless, informal settlers and the underprivileged to a more livable and humane environment in partnership with the various stakeholders of the community. In health, the vision statement foresees provision of a quality, adequate, sustainable and efficient health delivery system, competent, dedicated and empowered health providers and stakeholders, and upgraded health facilities. The strategic directions include the strengthening of the Local Health Boards and Inter Local Health Zones, and strengthening networks/linkages with people's organizations, non-government organizations, civil society organizations and the private sector. Under protective services and disaster management, the vision statement sees a community wherein the people's way of life, integrity, welfare and well-being and institutions are well protected and enhanced for sustainable development. The strategic directions to attain those vision seeks to ensure provision of a people-centered protective services philosophy rather than a punitive one; provide a strong economy and ecologically balanced community through public/private initiative and partnership; develop cultural cohesiveness and moral consensus among its people towards peace, security and progress; socio-political stability inspired by patriotism and pride to participate vigorously in

the pursuit of the municipality's development goals and objectives; and modernization of facilities and equipment for protective services and disaster management (Local Development and Investment Plan/Program for 2011-2013).

The direction of the administration during its term has been established and this could be corroborated by the local officials and department heads as they implement the PPAs. Further, it is necessary to solicit the ideas of NGOs as they partner with the local government. Consequently, how effective these services are can best be established from the ideas of the ordinary citizens.

Questions are put forward that relate to the priorities and resources of the local government, the direction of the NGOs and the previously asked questions in Chapter 3 relating to the resources and the PPAs of the NGOs towards LGU development, questions to ordinary citizens regarding services available to them, the responsiveness of the LGU and the previously asked questions in Chapter 3 relating to awareness of the presence of NGOs, their interaction, role in service delivery and responsiveness.

Local Official 1 was asked about his priorities for the Municipality of A during his term. He contended that there are a lot of things to be fixed such as the drainage system, the roads, the street lights, repair of the health center as well as the garbage disposal system.

On the other hand, Department Head 8, interviewed on 30 June 2011, who takes charge of the budget of the local government, was asked: *What are the resources (financial, human and technical) to implement the programs, projects and activities (PPAs) of the LGU?*

I: What are the financial resources of the Municipality?

Department Head 8: Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA), business income including market and slaughterhouse, external sources such as loans, borrowings.

I: Any collateral for the loans?

Department Head 8: Yes, the market.

I: What about foreign funds?

Department Head 8: Yes, we received before from CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency)

I: What about technical assistance?

Department Head 8: CIDA also provided trainings on plan preparation, software, development plans.

I: What about donations?

Department Head 8: During Typhoon Frank we received cash donations.

I: Other donations?

Department Head 8: Medicines from Philippine charity Sweepstakes Office (PCSO), conduct of medical missions, donations to STAC (Stimulation and Therapeutic Activity Center) such as equipments.

I: The income of the municipality is higher than the IRA you receive?

Department Head 8: Yes, only 45% dependency from the IRA.

I: Do you provide funding to local NGOs?

Department Head 8: We did before. We provided funding to (NGO, not a member of the LSBs) for their projects such as the charcoal making project and the repair of the bamboo bridge.

I: What else have you funded?

Department Head 8: We provided seed money to (NGO, not a member of the LSBs).

I: Other than those mentioned?

Department Head 8: No more.

I: Do you think the funding that you provided to those NGOs were effective?

Department Head 8: Yes, the charcoal making project is successful.

I: Does (NGO) pay the LGU for the funding you gave?

Department Head 8: No, it is sort of financial help to the members to improve their economic condition.

Department Head 8 articulated the financial capability of Municipality of A such as the internal and external sources of income and the previously availed aid from a foreign funding agency which also provided technical assistance on the preparation of vital documents of the local government. The municipality also received donations in the form of cash and equipment for its various social services. It is remarkable though that the municipality previously extended funding to an NGO which became successful and helped improve the economic condition of its beneficiaries.

Meanwhile, most of the NGOs were asked about their organization's vision, mission, goal or objective. Thus, NGO 2 which is a local chapter of a nationwide business organization noted:

I: What is the vision of your organization?

NGO 2: When we put up our organization, we were told to represent the business industry in dealing with business groups from other places, so it was purely at that time for the interest of the business people.

I: What is your objective as of now?

NGO 2: We want a stronger voice, influence in the development particularly the development of business opportunities and economic growth in our town or in our province.

NGO 3 which is municipal-wide transport group elucidated:

I: As an NGO, what is the vision of your group?

NGO 3: We want to strengthen the Federation. We also want to organize a provincial federation but due to lack of financial capability we cannot do that but we are trying to source out funds from political leaders who are willing to help, though many have given their pledge we are still waiting for it. We also want to put-up our own gasoline station that only members can avail, there have been two establishments that are trying to help us and the processing is now on-going in Manila.

An environmental group, NGO 4, stated that their vision is to “foresee a cleaner, greener and healthier environment.” To attain their vision, they commit themselves “to support and promote programs for a healthier community.” Thus, their goals include the education of the community to address environmental concerns through various local initiatives such that they are always ready to help the LGU. They also intend to enlist the support of law-enforcers, concerned groups and committed individuals in implementing environmental laws by conducting clean-up drives every month in accordance with an existing ordinance and the law on Solid Waste Management. Also, to advocate policies and practices for the care, protection and conservation of the ecosystem and tree planting activities. Lastly, they intend to establish linkages and draw support from local, national and international agencies and organizations.

NGO 5 is originally a youth organization identified with a certain political figure, which later on was converted into a group advocating unity in the province when the political figure got elected into a higher position, thus funding comes from his office. They provide trainings to cooperatives, scholarship programs to the youth and assist in the organization of cooperatives.

I: What are the objectives of the foundation?

NGO 5: We (also) conduct trainings to cooperatives. We institute cooperatives too and then we provide scholarships to the youths. [Political figure] has this scholarship program and NGO 5 is the partner of that in the implementation. We coordinate in schools then we give qualifying examinations and the tuition fee is coursed through us for payment to schools.

On the other hand, NGO 7 which is a women’s group whose focus is on women’s rights and empowerment averred that their vision is that the rights of women be promoted for them to be productive members of the community as well as help be provided to other people in the community. NGO 9 which is a local chapter of an international civic oriented organization based in the United States:

I: In simple words, what is the vision of your group?

NGO 9: Well, the way I saw the country when I retired, I think there were so many things that had to be done that I thought was right and of course mostly our government I am not satisfied especially this corruption so I thought I would contribute my small efforts to minimize that if possible, that is one...and to help, I really found that the children, there are even children that I found are not even going to school, that was my thrust since I joined the group.

I: What is the main focus of (NGO 9)?

NGO 9: Well, we are a service club and of course we receive instructions from the headquarters in Chicago and they give us what they are focusing on like for instance a few years ago we were focusing on clean water, that is also one project that we also work on and community service mostly.

While NGO 11 composed of medical professionals whose membership is province wide where they have members in every municipality. Their members are both from the private and the government sector.

I: Does your group have the Vision or the Mission?

NGO 11: Actually, we are under the (national organization), we don't have the Constitution and By-Laws because we are the local component of (national organization). It is uniform all over the country. We were established in 1957.

As established in Chapter 3, the resources of the organizations involve voluntary provision of services by their members as well as financial support. Nevertheless, most of the organizations derive their financial resources from their members, from other individuals and from fund raising activities. However, it is worth noting that the organizations have networking and linkages with other organizations, international and local, that provide them substantial assistance for their programs, projects and activities. Thus, the organizations are without question capable of providing support by themselves or through their networks that the local government can tap. A perusal of the PPAs of the NGOs tells of the various undertakings that they provide on their own to the community in partnership with other government and non-government entities. They have shown their capabilities in implementing different social, economic and environmental programs in the municipality.

Subsequently, during the conduct of the focus group discussion held in five sessions in the Municipality of A, several questions were asked regarding the services delivered by the LGU and NGOs.

On the question: *What services are available for you?* The ordinary citizens enumerated the services they have availed as well as the services availed of by the general public from the government, national and local, from the NGOs, and from other entities.

“As barangay health workers, we have free hospitalizations from government hospitals.”

“PhilHealth cards which provides for discount in the hospitalization as well as medical bills.”

“Financial support for hospitalization from the LGU and from political leaders.”

“Family planning and counseling from the health center.”

“Fertilizer for agricultural plants from the LGU.”

“Bridges connecting the barangays (villages).”

“Feeder roads to the barangays (villages).”

“Seedlings such as rice and hybrid corn from the LGU.”

“Monthly vaccination for infants at the barangay health center.”

“Weighing of children at the health center.”

“Concreting of barangay (village) roads by the national, provincial and municipal government.”

“Supervision by agricultural technicians from the LGU.”

- “Dog vaccinations by the LGU.”
- “Health center provides medicines, prenatal services and vaccination of infants.”
- “Alternative learning system for over-aged out-of-school youths for qualification to higher education provided by the Department of Education.”
- “Infrastructure such as barangay (village) roads and streetlights.”
- “Relief goods during disasters.”
- “Loans from NGOs and lending institutions.”
- “Community outreach programs such as medical and dental mission of NGOs.”
- “Scholarship from the LGU and the NGO.”
- “Trainings for livelihood opportunities from the LGU and the NGOs.”
- “Public transport services.”
- “Infrastructure such as the construction of drainage system that prevents flooding on the streets.”
- “Maintenance of unpaved roads in the barangays (villages).”
- “Day care services provided by the barangays (villages).”
- “Livelihood assistance provided by the government and the NGOs.”
- “Free elementary and secondary education in public schools provided by the national government.”
- “Scholarships in tertiary education given by the NGOs.”
- “Senior citizen cards which gives 20% discount to specific needs, commodities or services.”
- “Garbage disposal system.”
- “Livelihood assistance such as hog dispersal provided by the government as well as loans from NGOs.”
- “Supplemental feeding provided by the LGU and NGOs for malnourished children.”
- “Power and water supply.”

The participants in the focus group discussion were asked: *What do you think of service delivery?*

The ordinary citizens had varied answers based on their experiences and observations. Most of the citizens replied that the services given are *ningas cogon*, inadequate or insufficient. *Ningas cogon* has been stereotyped as a Filipino trait of embarking on new projects with much energy and enthusiasm only to lose interest before the project takes off or before it is completed. However, most of them also declared that infrastructure projects are built when election time is near. In the same vein, help pours in when election time comes. They have also observed that disaster relief goods are given discriminately such that only friends and relatives avail of it. They also contended that the poor are not really given the right medical and hospitalization services.

On the other hand, the majority of the citizens observed that the maintenance of peace and order has been effective because they have felt some sense of security in the community. They also acknowledged the community outreach programs of the NGOs which provide free medicines and free medical and dental services. A few of them averred that some services are effective and necessary and help meet the needs of the people.

One focus group member theorized that services provided by the NGOs lessen the obligation of the government. The citizen has captured the essence that when there is partnership between the LGU and the NGO there is a probability that services will be given collaboratively thus the responsibility of the local government would be shared with the NGO. On the other hand, if, by itself, the NGO provides the service it eases the responsibility and the amount of service by the local government when the local government extends the same to its constituency.

As established in Chapter 3, only a few of the citizens are aware of some NGOs while others are not. Few also are aware of some NGOs but they are not aware of their functions. The citizens get to interact only with some NGOs during the conduct of community outreach programs or when they avail of their services. As to the role of the NGOs in service delivery, the citizens recognize the big role the NGOs play especially that the services are free and help the poor. However, a few of them were apprehensive such as when scholarship programs are provided by an NGO to those who are politically supportive, disaster relief goods are given to those the NGO know only, and the services the NGO provide that is coursed through the barangay leaders, because they lack the people on the ground, are given according to political inclination. As to responsiveness of the services delivered by the NGOs, the citizens contended that they are responsive at some points but not all the time. The citizens are coming from a point of view where there are NGOs that provide services that can address their needs (e.g. medical and dental missions, feeding programs, livelihood programs, among others) but that does not mean that they are obligated to provide service all the time.

On the other hand, the citizens were asked: *Are the services delivered by the LGU responsive to your needs?* Most of the citizens answered “not all the time” while they acknowledge that there are some services that are responsive and some are not. The majority of the citizens believe that the services delivered by the LGU are inadequate, insufficient and unreliable and that the LGU can only provide so much. However, there are quite a number who said that the LGU is responsive during disaster as well as in providing financial support for payment of hospitalization bills. Notably, a few of them stated that “you will not be prioritized if you are not on the same political party (as the administration)” and you will receive the services “if you are close to the local official.”

Subsequently, the ordinary citizens were asked: *Is the LGU is responsive to their needs*. Most of the citizens averred that the LGU is not really responsive however “you have to be self-reliant and not depend too much” on the government and that “maybe the budget is not enough, they just manage what is there.” They took notice of the improvements in the LGU such as the public market and infrastructure facilities such as roads and the drainage system. However, the citizens brought to the fore such environmental issues as the inadequate garbage disposal system, improper dumping of wastes and improper solid waste management. On the other hand, there are specific instances where the citizens expressed:

“Road concreting has been provided towards the Barangay Captain’s (village chief) house (because he is the Barangay Captain).”

“Have to pass through the Barangay Captain (village chief) to ask for help from the Municipal Officials.”

Moreover, the citizens observed that:

“They provide when you need their assistance, but the residents feel embarrassed to ask for their help.”

“If you belong to a different political party you will not be able to avail.”

“Politics is the reason why we are ashamed to ask.”

“Dispersal (hog) is given to those who are politically aligned or a family member of a political leader.”

“Yes especially if you are close to the people in the administration.”

Most citizens maintained that “actions are delayed.” However, one of the ordinary citizens declared that the LGU is responsive because “my child has been hired to work in the local government” and therefore it helped in meeting their needs.

5.2.2 Municipality of B

As in the previous section, the direction that the LGU wants to tread is best embodied in the programs, projects and activities (PPAs) that it seeks to implement. Nevertheless, these PPAs are reflective of the aims of the administration as it governs during its term. These PPAs embody the vision that serves as a guide for the leaders so that at the end of their term appropriate services would have been delivered to the constituents. In the Municipality of B, the vision of the administration is reflected in the Municipal Development Plan together with its corresponding strategic directions and, eventually, the PPAs to set the action. In this section, the vision and strategic directions are weighed up together with the statements of the local officials, department heads, NGOs and the ordinary citizens to see how effective the local government is in addressing the needs of its constituents.

The Municipality of B has in its Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013 the practical vision and strategic directions in three service sectors, the general public, social and economic service sectors. In the general public services sector, the municipality has for its practical vision strengthened and improved public service participatory governance by both public and private stakeholders taking part in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public satisfaction and interest. Its actual statements to attain the vision are to improve professionalism in the line of works and services, and organizational strengthening in work flow for consolidation towards professionalism of the delivery of services, increase collection of taxes and revenues, smart financial flow, and regular coordination of offices and committees (Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013).

In social services, the practical vision is effective delivery of social services through pro-active response and efficient means that would redound to the developmental process of the quality of life of the constituents. The actual statements to attain the vision are to strengthen the capacities and delivery of services in a pro-active response to enhance and improve the quality of life by the stakeholders, and revitalize the pro-active response to health care, reproductive health care and nutrition services, ecological solid waste management, a forest land use program, coastal management, a community based forest mangrove management program, a gender and development program, a senior citizens program, youth and other social services activities (Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013).

Under economic services, the practical vision seeks to enhance gender sensitive and earth-friendly economic activities towards a participatory approach for a sustainable economy in the upliftment of the communities and constituents. The actual statements to attain the vision seek to implement measures that are both human and earth-friendly in a sustainable concept of economic development of the localities and constituents, upgrading and strengthening of infrastructure such as farm to market roads, market facilities, and economic enterprise facilities, and develop target areas in the barangays for tourism, and promotion of high yielding crops, livestock and marine production to increase agricultural productivity and to develop livelihood opportunities and support entrepreneurial initiatives of individuals and people's organizations (Municipal Development Plan for 2011-2013).

The direction of the administration during its term has been established and this could be corroborated by the local officials and department heads as they implement the PPAs. Further, it is necessary to solicit the ideas of NGOs as they partner with the local government. Consequently, how effective these services are can best be established from the ideas of the ordinary citizens.

Questions were put forward that relate to the priorities and resources of the local government, the direction of the NGOs and the previously asked questions in Chapter 4 relating to the resources and the PPAs of the NGOs towards LGU development. Questions were put to ordinary citizens regarding services available to them, the responsiveness of the LGU and the previously asked questions in Chapter 3 relating to awareness of the presence of NGOs, their interaction, role in service delivery and responsiveness.

Local Official 1 was asked what his priority projects are during the present term and he contended that among his projects would be to put up and LGU irrigation dam. Because most of the farmers are dependent on rainfed farming, he averred that the dam would help improve the economic condition of the farmers. His other priority projects are to improve the collection of fees from businesses, especially those that are transient, and to collect building permit fees from those who build houses or structures, which he said was not done during the previous administration.

With regards to the resources of the local government, Department Head 5 who takes charge of the budget of the local government, interviewed on 07 July 2011, elucidated:

I: What are the financial resources of the Municipality?

Department Head 5: IRA, revenues, taxes, business licenses, market.

I: What about the economic enterprise?

Department Head 5: Market, water, Municipality of B College.

I: What about external sources?

Department Head 5: If the Mayor solicits from the national government.

I: What about coming from those outside of the government?

Department Head 5: We have none.

I: Do you provide funding for NGOs? Like financial assistance?

Department Head 5: We do not.

I: What about loans or grants that you give them?

Department Head 5: We have nothing like that.

I: How about support to NGOs?

Department Head 5: For the women's group we provide some funding, also for the senior citizens, the disabled...

I: What about to farmers, cooperatives, associations?

Department Head 5: If they solicit from us the Mayor gives them some donations or financial assistance, that's our support to them.

Department Head 5 described the external and internal sources of income of Municipality of B. What is remarkable about the statements of the department head is that they do not provide financial assistance to NGOs, they provide only as a form of support when the NGOs solicits it.

On the other hand, several NGOs were asked of their vision, mission, goal or objectives. NGO 1, which is an environmental group, described their goals, to help the youth, to participate in the Clean and Green program and the environment, and at the same provide the youth livelihood. However, their focus is more on the environment. NGO 2 which is a historical research group:

I: What is the Vision of your group?

NGO 2: Our vision has relation to history like celebration of the death of heroes, celebration of anniversaries of historical events, to do research something like that.

I: What is your objective why you organized this?

NGO 2: Of course our objective is to celebrate historical events and to put up some civic projects that has relation to historical events like the project that we are taking now is the project of the veterans that we are putting up in Barangay (X), we have there our veteran's park, those are our projects. So we relive the life of the veterans who sacrificed for our democracy.

NGO 3 which is a women's group has for its vision the empowerment of women in their barangay. Meanwhile, NGO 5 which is a farmer's group based in two barangays stated:

I: What is the vision of you group?

NGO 5: We wanted to help the farmers especially those who are poor so that their economic situation will improve. If there is no assistance from the government it would be difficult for us to get by with our lives because we don't have the resources.

I: What is the objective of the association?

NGO 5: Since the government then had a program to increase rice production thru financial assistance so we formed the group to avail of it. The government gave us P 422,000.00 for us to manage so we loaned it to our members for the purchase of seedlings, fertilizer and for the labor at a very low interest of 1%. We are supposed to return the amount to the LGU upon full payment by the members of the loan.

The objective of NGO 6, involved in peace and order, is to help in the programs of the LGU, especially those programs that need their help, while NGO 7 which is a transport group aims to serve the people of the Municipality of B in terms of transportation and services however the local government has also involved them in the solid waste management program. On the other hand, NGO 9, which is a farmers group, has for its objective to be

productive and helpful to benefit their members while NGO 10 is composed of health workers and aims to help the barangays on health matters.

In terms of resources, four of the NGOs derived their funds from the local government for their programs, one NGO is organized by the local government to avail of a national government funded project, two NGOs have been organizationally inactive for several years and do not have funds, two of the NGOs are dependent on membership dues and solicitations, and two NGOs have no resources at all. A perusal thereof would reveal that the NGOs involved in the Local Special Bodies are financially incapable of standing on their own such that they need financial support for their PPAs. On the other hand, as to their PPAs that they practice towards LGU development, other than those that have been idle for several years and those that do not have PPAs of their own because they are dependent on the LGU, there are also NGOs that provide capability building and skills training programs for the citizens through economic, institutional, peace and order, and environmental concerns.

During the conduct of the focus group discussion by the ordinary citizens in the Municipality of B which was held in three sessions, several questions were asked regarding the services delivered by the LGUs and the NGOs.

The ordinary citizens enumerated the services they have availed as well as the services availed of by the general public from the government, national and local, from the NGOs and from other entities. The question was: *What services are available for you?*

“Infrastructure roads (that made it easier for us to bring our products to the market).”

“Livelihood assistance from the government.”

“The health center provides free immunization, vaccination, pre natal services.”

“Indigency program (payment of hospital bills, among others).”

“Partial payment (that the local government provides) of hospital bills.”

“Free medicines from the government.”

“From local officials: payment of hospital bills and bail for court cases.”

“Free seedlings from the local government.”

“Casual work in some infrastructure projects.”

“Free elementary and secondary education.”

“Networking from relatives and friends who know of some doctor to avail of treatment with lesser pay or at a discounted rate.”

“Community service such as cleanliness drive.”

“Rescue operations during calamities.”

“School supplies for elementary students from the NGOs.”

“Loans from cooperatives and other entity.”

“The health center provides vaccination and immunization of infants, free medicines, de-worming, anti-rabies medicines, supplemental feeding.”

“College scholarships.”

‘The Agricultural Office provides seedlings, sometimes fertilizers and vaccination of carabaos.’

“Farm-to-market roads to ease the delivery of farm products to the nearest market.”

“Senior citizen cards.”

“School supplies, vitamins, weighing of children by a provincial NGO.”

“Water system provided by the local government and the NGO.”

“Seedlings for farming.”

“STAC provides relief to PWD.”

The ordinary citizens were also asked: *What do you think of service delivery?* The majority of the ordinary citizens recognized the services to be very helpful while others believe that it can help somehow. A few of them though acknowledged that farm products can now be brought to the market easily. However, quite a number of the participants to the discussion expressed that “if you belong to the same political group as that of the official you will receive more otherwise you will only get a little,” referring to the local government.

A majority of the ordinary citizens are aware of the existence of some NGOs while the others are not. As to how they interact with the NGOs, a few contended that they get to interact when they need something from them while most of them have not experienced any interaction.

As to the role of NGOs in service delivery, the ordinary citizens believe that NGOs exist to provide service; however, most of them maintained that those who are members get to benefit from them. Whether NGOs are responsive to their needs, the ordinary citizens believe it depends on the sector they represent. The maintained however that the NGOs can help somehow.

Meanwhile, the ordinary citizens were asked: *Are the services delivered by the LGU responsive to your needs?* The majority of the participants contended that the services delivered by the LGU are a big help especially to those living in mountainous areas while others believe that the services can help but they are not enough.

On the question: *Is the LGU responsive to your needs?* Most of the ordinary citizens believe that the LGU is not exactly responsive or the services that they deliver are not enough.

5.2.3 Analysis of Research Findings

A comparative profile of the two municipalities would show that Municipality of A has much bigger resources and population as well as the potent presence of social, economic and infrastructure services and facilities compared to Municipality of B. It is expected that with the vast resources and network it can utilize, Municipality of A would be able to address effectively the needs of its constituents. One of the evident networks that it can effectively make use of would be the non-government organizations (NGOs). Its LDIP for 2011-2013 even provides a multi-sectoral approach to service delivery considering the vast responsibility that it has being a premier municipality. However, as shown in Chapter 3 the municipality fails to tap properly the NGOs despite having all the resources and skills. On the other hand, Municipality of B has limited resources even the NGOs are dependent on the support of the Municipality. However, despite the difference in resources and NGO status, there is no difference between the two municipalities as far as effectiveness of service delivery is concerned. The services of both municipalities are not responsive, and are inadequate and unreliable. In addition, both municipalities engage in political patronage and influence peddling in delivering the services.

Both municipalities have shown a considerable number of services that they intend to implement for the next three years as embodied in the Local Development and Investment Plan (LDIP) 2011-2013 for Municipality of A and the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) 2011-2013 for Municipality of B. It is notable though that both plans intend to involve multi-sectoral participation in the implementation of services in all sectors (general public, economic, social) particularly the NGOs and the private sector. However, as previously noted in Chapter 3, a perusal of the participation of NGOs in planning (Table 5.1, see page 190) in the MDC of Municipality of A would show that they have not been involved in any planning activity which means that in the preparation of the LDIP, which is the mandate of the MDC, the NGOs generally were not given the opportunity to participate or be consulted. One of them is not even aware that they are a member of the MDC. On the other hand, as was noted in Chapter 4, in the Municipality of B, most of the NGOs have not participated in any planning activity which means that the MDP was prepared without NGO involvement. Although NGO 1 said that they participate when there are programs to be presented or deliberated, both NGO 3 and NGO 4 maintained that, based on their previous experience, the

Table 5.1 Non-Government Organizations: Comparison – culled-out from Table 3.3 and 4.3

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Participation in Planning	Participation in Implementation
Municipality of A			
1	MDC	-none	-the LGU trusts them as partner in some programs
2	MDC	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-none
3	MDC	-widely participated in planning for traffic management but not with the MDC	-has not been widely involved in implementation
4	MDC	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-have not heard of the MDC
5	MDC	-recommend good PPAs	-monitoring of PPAs
6	MDC	-not aware that they are a member of the MDC	-
7	MDC	-none	-none
8	MDC/ MPOC	-none	-none
9	MDC/ MPOC	-consultative	-only in the solid waste management program
10	MPOC	-none	-none
11	Health Board	-has not been extensively involved	-partly involved
12	School Board	-the school head lists down their need then present it to the board	-follows that of the school
Municipality of B			
1	MDC	-Participates when there are programs to be presented or deliberated	-None
2	MDC	-None	-None
3	MDC	-Based on previous experience, projects were already pre-determined, they were only asked to approve it	-None
4	MDC	-Affirms the statement of NGO 3 -Inactive for 10 years	-
5	MDC	-Not much, only invited once	-Implements their own programs only
6	MPOC	-None	-Have joined in the implementation

7	MPOC	-None	-Have joined in the implementation but programs are not sustainable
8	MPOC	-Inactive for several years	-
9	MPOC	-Attended all the meetings -Semi-Active	-
10	Health Board	-Programs are predetermined	-Widely involved in the implementation of programs
11	School Board	-Programs are predetermined; not even aware of the Special Education Fund (SEF)	-None

Table 5.2 Several NGOs with Vision, Mission, Goal or Objective vis-à-vis LGU Vision/Strategic Direction

NGO	Type of NGO	Vision, Mission, Goal or Objective	Sector (LGU Vision/Strategic Direction in LDIP 2011-2013)	Effectiveness of Services Delivered with LGU Collaboration
Municipality of A				
2	Business Group (a local chapter of a nationwide organization)	-A stronger voice in the development of business opportunities and economic growth	-Economic services sector: provision of investment friendly environment -Social services sector: provide strong economy and ecologically balanced community through public/private initiative and partnership	-there is room for improvement
3	Transport Group	-To strengthen their organization (organizational development)	-None	-somehow effective
4	Environmental Group	-Vision: a cleaner, greener and healthier environment -Mission: support and promote programs for a healthier community	-General public services sector: provision of administrative tool on ecological solid waste management, coastal resource management, environmental code	-very effective because they do not deal with political matters, only their advocacy
5	Youth Group advocating unity	- provide trainings to cooperatives, assist in the organization of cooperatives and scholarship programs to the youth	-Economic services sector: Organize farmers and fisherfolks, small and medium association into cooperatives and partners in governance	-it is effective
7	Women's Group	- the rights of women be promoted for them to be productive members of the community as well as help be provided to fellowmen and the community	-Social services sector: advocate for the protection and promotion of the social rights and welfare of the poor, disadvantaged individuals, families and communities	-they have not collaborated yet with the LGU; they are still waiting
9	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	-community service	-All sectors	-their feeding program is very effective
11	Medical Professionals	- serve as an authoritative source of information regarding health, disease and medical practice; and promote the practice of medicine in the context of Philippine life and culture.	-Social services sector: the strengthening of the Local Health Boards and Inter Local Health Zones, and strengthening network/linkages with people's organizations, non-government organizations, civil society organizations and private sector	-target patients are well served in medical and surgical missions
Municipality of B				
1	Environmental Youth Group	-youth development and environmental awareness	-Social services sector: revitalize the pro-active response to ecological solid waste management , youth activities	-very effective although the results are not immediate because the process is slow

2	Group of Professionals	-celebration of historical events -carry-out civic projects that has relation to historical events	-None	-very effective
3	Women's Group	-women empowerment	- Social services sector: revitalize the pro-active response to gender and development program	-some are not satisfied
5	Farmers Group	-economic development of farmers	-Economic services sector: implement measures that are both human and earth-friendly in a sustainable concept of economic development of the localities and constituents, upgrading and strengthening of infrastructure such as farm to market roads, market facilities, economic enterprise facilities and develop target areas in the barangays for tourism, and promotion of high yielding crops, livestock and marine production to increase agricultural productivity and to develop livelihood opportunities and support entrepreneurial initiatives of individuals and people's organizations	-cannot say if it is effective
6	Brotherhood Organization	-help in the programs of the LGU	-General public services sector: strengthened and improved public service thru participatory governance by both public and private stakeholders by taking part in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation towards public satisfaction and interest	- very effective
7	Transport Group	-to serve the people through transport services	-None	-very effective though implementation is hampered by political beliefs
9	Farmers Group	-to be productive and helpful to benefit their members	-Economic services: develop livelihood opportunities and support entrepreneurial initiatives of individuals and people's organizations	-effective
10	Health Workers Group	-to help the barangays on health matters	- Social services sector: revitalize the pro-active response to health care, reproductive health care and nutrition services	-very effective

programs were predetermined and they were only asked to approve them. Also in Table 5.1, in the implementation of programs, five of the NGOs in Municipality A were involved while in some way, six have not experienced any involvement. One of them has not even heard of the MDC. In the Municipality of B, most of the NGOs have not been involved in the implementation of programs of the local government and two of them are inactive while one is only semi-active. Thus, it is noted that, first, size of the LGU does not matter in multi-sectoral NGOs, and, second, the smaller municipality had limited participation in multi-sectoral policy.

In both municipalities, the high ranking local official articulated their priorities during the present term which involves more infrastructure development. However, while the local officials of Municipality of A intend to develop the facilities to improve services, infrastructure development in the Municipality of B is focused more on the economic upliftment of its citizens especially the farmers. As was shown in the profile of the municipalities, both are involved in agricultural production however Municipality of A has far more developed agricultural facilities that cannot be found in the Municipality B thus the prioritization by the local official.

The department heads which takes charge of the budget of the two municipalities stated that they have previously provided support to NGOs. However, the budget given to the NGOs are in the form of support. There is no constant ongoing relationship between the LGU and the NGOs as far as sustainability of the partnership is concerned.

Both Municipality of A and Municipality of B have set their directions as elucidated in the LDIP 2011-2013 and MDP 2011-2013, respectively. Most of the NGOs expressed their respective vision, mission, and goal or objective that serves as a guide in the implementation of their programs. How the direction of the NGOs match-up with that of the local government is shown in Table 5.2 (see page 192). As was shown in Chapters 3 and 4, in terms of effectiveness of services delivered with LGU collaboration, there is no particular type of NGO that determines effectiveness because they are all effective according to the advocacy or sector they represent, except that in the Municipality of B there are NGOs that have been inactive or have not collaborated with the LGU such as NGOs 4, 8 and 11. In the Municipality of A, it is quite obvious that the NGOs fit the local government's vision/strategic directions according to

Table 5.3 Non-Government Organizations– Participation, Resources and Opinion

NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Participation in Planning	Participation in Implementation	Resources (Financial; Manpower)	Opinion on the Status of LGU-NGO Collaboration and Service Delivery
Municipality of A								
1	MDC	Foundation (Culture and Arts)	Provincial	A small group of professionals based in Mun. of A	-none	-the LGU trusts them as partner in some programs	-manpower -fundraising -donations -funds from Filipinos in the US -funds from a national government agency -entrance fees	-coordination or collaboration has not been maximized -they look forward to a stage where LGU would fund their programs
2	MDC	Business Group (a local chapter of a nationwide organization)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-none	-membership fees -annual dues	-there is room for improvement
3	MDC	Transport Group	Municipal	A larger number of transport drivers and operators	-widely participated in planning for traffic management but not with the MDC	-has not been widely involved in implementation	-none	-increase the collaboration
4	MDC	Environmental Group	Municipal	A small group of concerned citizens	-none (they attended planning sessions of the solid waste management board but not the MDC)	-have not heard of the MDC	-none	-lack of political will on the part of some political leaders -the LGU lack the people to do the job alone
5	MDC	Youth Group advocating unity	Provincial	A moderate number of individuals	-recommend good PPAs	-monitoring of PPAs	-funds from a government official	-LGU need the NGOs more
6	MDC	Women's Group (exclusively)	Municipal	A small group of women	-not aware that they are a member of	-	-monthly dues from members	-increase collaboration and

		mixed race)			the MDC		-voluntary contributions from members	partnership -needs massive campaign
7	MDC	Women's Group	Municipal	A large organization of women	-none	-none	-solicits assistance from other organizations -fund from the LGU -fund from the local officials	-NGOs are needed as partners because the LGU cannot do it alone
8	MDC/ MPOC	Business Group (exclusively mixed race)	Municipal	A small group of businessmen	-none	-none	-annual dues -some amount from a private school and cemetery that they run	-NGO participation can encourage transparency
9	MDC/ MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people	-consultative	-only in the solid waste management program	-fund-raising activities -donations	-no corruption will happen if there is LGU-NGO partnership
10	MPOC	Civic Group (local chapter of an international organization)	Provincial	A moderate number of business and professional people	-none	-none	-membership fees -support from their international counterpart	-strengthen the relationship
11	Health Board	Medical Professionals	Provincial	A large group of medical practitioners	-has not been extensively involved	-partly involved	-no financial resources but has table manpower, professional manpower, technical resources, human resources	-the collaboration is not enough -there are still other programs that the NGO should be involved in
12	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren	-the school head lists down their need then present it to the board	-follows that of the school	-solicitations -pledges from members	-NGOs should participate more -PPAs of the school board should have the guidance of the NGO

Municipality of B								
NGO	Local Special Body Membership	Type of NGO	Scope	Size	Participation in Planning	Participation in Implementation	Resources (Manpower; Financial)	Opinion on the Status of LGU-NGO Collaboration and Service Delivery
1	MDC	Environmental Group	One (1) Barangay	A small number of out-of-school youths	-Participates when there are programs to be presented or deliberated	-None	-Manpower -Funds came from provincial and municipal government	-It is effective because of the trust of the LGU on their group
2	MDC	Group of Professionals	Municipal	A small group of professionals who are mostly teachers	-None	-None	-Donations -Solicitations -Membership fees -Projects are funded by the municipal government (e.g. historical markers)	-Both are supportive of each other's projects
3	MDC	Women's Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of women	-Based on previous experience, projects were already pre-determined, they were only asked to approve it	-None	-Funds came from national, provincial, municipal government and national NGO	-Need to strengthen the partnership
4	MDC	Farmers Cooperative	Municipal	A large group of farmers	-Affirms the statement of NGO 3 -Inactive for 10 years	-	-None -Have receivables from non-paying members	-Ineffective -Partnership is for compliance only
5	MDC	Farmers Group	Two (2) Barangays	A small group of farmers	-Not much, only invited once	-Implements their own programs only	-Fund from the national government through the LGU -Minimal amount from annual dues and membership fees	-Need to strengthen the partnership
6	MPOC	Brotherhood Organization	Municipal	A large organization composed of	-None	-Have joined in the implementation	-Monthly dues, donations, solicitations	-They are effective because they are always

				men				available when the LGU needs them
7	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A large group of transport operators and drivers	-None	-Have joined in the implementation but programs are not sustainable	-Cooperative share from members	-Very effective especially on transport rules and solid waste management program
8	MPOC	Transport Group	Municipal	A large group of transport operators and drivers	-Inactive for several years	-	-None	-Need to strengthen the partnership
9	MPOC	Farmers Group	One (1) Barangay	A small group of farmers	-Attended all the meetings -Semi-Active	-	-Funds came from the municipal government	-Need to strengthen the partnership
10	Health Board	Health Workers Group	Municipal	A large group of health workers	-Programs are predetermined	-Widely involved in the implementation of programs	-Very minimal amount from registration fees and annual dues	-Very effective partnership
11	School Board	Parents and Teachers Group	Municipal	A large group of parents and teachers of schoolchildren	-Programs are predetermined; not even aware of the Special Education Fund (SEF)	-None	-None	-Need to strengthen the partnership

the sector they represent; in other words the representation is sectoral. As an example, NGO 2 which is a business group matches the direction of the local government in the economic services sector while a group of medical professionals are in the social services sector particularly on health. However, the transport group whose aim is organizational development, does not fit well in any sectors of the local government. Municipality of A seems lacking in direction as far as strengthening of NGOs is concerned. Meanwhile, in the Municipality of B, the direction of the NGOs vis-à-vis that of the local government is also sectoral. As an example, NGO 3 which is a women's group whose aim is women empowerment, fits well in the social services sector specifically in the gender and development program, while NGO 9, which is a farmers group whose aim is economic development, is in the economic services sector. On the other hand, a group of professionals (NGO 2) whose aim is the celebration of historical events does not seem to fit well in the priorities of the local government. The same is true of NGO 7, which is a transport group although transport services could very well be an important factor for the efficient delivery of services. It is thus observed that, first, representation of NGOs is sectoral, and second, having a shared vision leads to more effective participation.

NGO resources such as financial means and personnel do not seem to indicate effective participation (Table 5.3, see page 195). In the Municipality of A, most of the NGOs that have limited or no resources have not been involved in planning and implementation although NGO 5 and NGO 11 has in some way taken part in the implementation of some programs. NGOs with large resources such as NGO 1 have not been involved in planning but have participated in the implementation of some programs, while NGO 10 has never been involved. Although NGO 11 does not have many resources, they have participated in the implementation of health programs because of manpower and expertise. On the other hand, in the Municipality of B, several NGOs have funding coming from the government (national, provincial, and municipal) but they implement programs on their own and were never involved in planning, much less in the implementation of programs of the local government. Those with limited resources (NGO 6 and NGO 7) have never joined in planning; however, they have participated in the implementation of programs of the local government. Those NGOs that have no resources and are inactive have never been involved in any way. Thus, resources (financial and manpower) of NGOs, however large or limited they are, do not guarantee effective involvement in the local government. It could also be observed that, first,

the larger LGU gave no money to NGOs which means that there is less corruption, or second, although the smaller LGU did give money to NGOs, it did not increase participation, which means that the NGOs are not accountable for the money that they are given. Consequently, the ordinary citizens enumerated the different social, economic, agricultural, infrastructure and financial support services that they have availed of from the national and local government as well as from NGOs. The observations of the ordinary citizens about the services they or their family have availed of are varied but almost the same in both municipalities. In the Municipality of A, they recognize the effective maintenance of peace and order programs by the local government and the community outreach programs by the NGOs while in Municipality of B they believe that infrastructure roads have eased the delivery of farm products to the nearest market. However, the citizens in Municipality of A have noticed that the services are *ningas cogon*, inadequate and insufficient and quite a number of the citizens in both municipalities expressed that services are given with political undertones, such as when infrastructure projects of the local government are built when election time is near in Municipality of A and that services by the local government in the Municipality of B are delivered based on the political inclination of the beneficiaries. The ordinary citizens also observed in the Municipality of A that both the local government and the NGOs prioritize their friends and relatives when they provide relief goods during disasters.

In both municipalities, the ordinary citizens commonly expressed that they are not familiar with some NGOs in the Local Special Bodies and that the only instance they get to interact with the NGOs is during the programs and services that they deliver. The ordinary citizens in the Municipality of A, as previously stated, noted that the services by the NGOs are given selectively while in the Municipality of B they stated that only members of the NGOs get to benefit from their services.

On the responsiveness of the services by the NGOs, the ordinary citizens in both municipalities believe that they can help somehow, but they are inadequate. On the other hand, the ordinary citizens in both municipalities believe that the services by the local government are insufficient and not exactly responsive. Nevertheless, in both municipalities the ordinary citizens observed that some services are delivered based on political inclination or the *palakasan system* (influence peddling)

5.3 HYPOTHESIS 4

This section dwells on the hypothesis: *Larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of the substantial resources and manpower that they can utilize to reach out to the NGOs.*

Hence, it reports on the findings on the questions that would help answer the idea that larger LGUs because of their substantial resources and manpower are more effective in cooperating with NGOs. Questions were put forward during the interviews to local officials and department heads and NGO representatives of Municipality of A and Municipality of B who are involved in the local special bodies and to citizens during the focus group discussions.

In the earlier part of this Chapter it has been established that Municipality of A is a much larger local government unit than Municipality of B.

5.3.1 Municipality of A

In Chapter 3, several questions were asked of the local officials, department heads, NGOs and ordinary citizens that relates to the present hypothesis. Thus, there is a need to reiterate the opinions of the respondents in this section. The local officials and department heads were asked questions about the kind of collaboration that the local government has with the NGOs, the extent of NGO participation in the decision-making for the approval of PPAs, the services that the LGU delivers in collaboration with the NGOs and how effective are these services. On the other hand, the NGOs were asked how they participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU, the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery and the factors that aid or hindered its effectiveness, and their resources. Consequently, the ordinary citizens were asked their assessment of the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs.

When the local officials and department heads were asked about the kind of collaboration that the LGU has with the NGOs in the MDC they averred that the NGOs are

active and that they take part in planning and implementation of PPAs; however one of them contended that there is “no full participation because most of the NGOs are hesitant, they put limitations on their selves so it is the LGU which has the major role.” The same answers were brought forth in the MPOC. In the Local Health Board, the department heads maintained that they have “coordinative efforts” with the NGO. While in the Local School Board, there was no mention as to involvement of the NGO in planning and implementation but a department head opined that the NGO has no complaints and that they “check whatever is given by the School Board” to the schools.

As to the extent of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of the PPAs, the local officials and department heads maintained that in the MDC the NGOs are invited to the meetings and that they also give suggestions, they also conduct a planning activity and that the ideas of the NGOs are incorporated in the plan for the approval of the body. In the MPOC, they conducted a planning activity and it was participatory and consultative while in the Local Health Board the NGO just “fit-in” because they are not aware of the programs of the local government as most of the members of the NGO are private practitioners. In the Local School board, they listen to the ideas of the NGO and the discussion is “free flowing.”

On the services delivered with the collaboration of the NGOs, the local officials and department heads mentioned community outreach programs such as medical and dental missions and the vegetable nursery managed by one NGO. Peace and order programs such as police response, rescue, public safety, police visibility and traffic management and regulation. Educational services such as repair of school buildings, and provision of books and equipments. However, when they were asked to describe the effectiveness of the services they deliver in collaboration with the NGOs, the answers were varied. One local official said it is on a “case-to-case basis” while others declared they are very effective but one of them acknowledged that “although the resources are limited but the cooperation is enormous.”

The NGOs, on the other hand, were asked how they participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU. Their responses were varied; some of the NGOs in the MDC averred that they have participated in the identification and formulation of PPA, however the others asserted they have not been invited to any planning activity, while others

went as far as declaring that they are “not aware that they are a member of the MDC” or they have not heard of the MDC. In the MPOC, some of the NGOs responded they attended meetings but not the planning while one attended a planning activity. Both the NGOs in the Local Health Board and the Local School Board contended they are being consulted.

In Chapter 3, the NGOs were asked of their opinion on the status of LGU and NGO collaboration in service delivery. NGO 1 contended that the coordination and collaboration has not been maximized and that they look forward to a stage where the local government would fund their programs. NGO 2 maintained that there is room for improvement while NGO 3 and NGO 6 stated that there is a need to increase the collaboration and partnership. Meanwhile, NGO 4 contended that the lack of political will of some leaders and the lack of manpower on the part of the LGU affects the implementation of programs. NGO 5 believes that the local government needs the NGOs more than the NGOs needs them, as NGO 7 said, NGOs are needed as partners because the LGU cannot do it alone. NGO 8 said NGO participation can encourage transparency and as NGO 9 put it bluntly “no corruption will happen if there is LGU-NGO partnership.” NGO 10 wants that the relationship be strengthened since, as NGO 11 puts it, the collaboration is not enough and there are still other programs the NGOs should be involved in. NGO 12 believes that the NGOs should participate more and that the PPAs in the School Board should have the guidance of the NGO. However, worth noting is that one of the NGOs are led by a high ranking local official.

The resources of the organizations involve voluntary provision of services by their members as well as financial support. Nevertheless, most of the organizations derive their financial resources from their members, from other individuals and from fund raising activities. However, it is worth noting that the organizations have networking and linkages with other organizations, international and local, which provide them substantial assistance for their programs, projects and activities. Thus, the organizations are without question capable of providing support by themselves or through their networks that the local government can tap.

Meanwhile, the ordinary citizens where asked how they assess the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs. The citizens contended that it depends on what specific sector the NGOs come from. The group of medical professionals is effective in their medical

missions. The transport group is very effective in their services. However, most citizens replied that the partnership is not enough or it is insufficient, that only they (LGU-NGO) know about the partnership, that some of the NGOs do not actually represent the interest of some of them, that they have not really felt that there is a partnership, or that the partnership is weak. A few of them though, qualified their ideas about the partnership and gave their observations:

“For relief goods, it is better that it is given by the NGO itself and not pass through the government so that the intended beneficiaries would be reached.”

“It is much better if the services by the local government would be delivered in partnership with the NGO to better reach the intended beneficiaries.”

“It is an effective means to provide check and balance in the local government.”

“Government projects are better implemented if the implementation is in partnership with NGOs.”

Others, on the other hand, approved of the idea that government projects are better implemented if it is the NGO that implements them and that they do not trust the government in the implementation of some projects. Most maintained that service is slow or weak if done by the local government alone; however, they also contended that if it is the NGO alone who will provide the service it would also be slow or weak since they are not obliged to provide it in the first place. Some suggested there is a need to strengthen the partnership between the LGU and NGO and that it should be sustainable.

5.3.2 Municipality of B

As stated in the previous section, same questions in Chapter 4 were put to the local officials and department heads, the NGOs and the ordinary citizens of the Municipality of B in relation to the present hypothesis.

On the kind of collaboration that the LGU has with the NGOs, the local officials and department heads averred that in the MDC their meetings are consultative; however one of them contended that the NGOs “do not participate that much because the LGU does not have that much activities that involve them.” In the MPOC, they described the NGOs to be “cooperative and active” while in the Local Health Board the NGO is under the direct supervision of the Health Unit in the local government. In the Local School Board, they collaborate with the NGO when there are activities.

As to the extent of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of PPAs, the local officials and department heads averred that in the MDC their meetings are consultative, the NGOs in the MPOC participate and give suggestions, the NGO in the Local Health Board also participates but “not so much about the budget because she (the NGO representative) is constrained,” and the NGO in the Local School Board also gives suggestions and is participative during their meetings.

The same set of local officials and department heads were asked about the services that the local government delivers with the collaboration of the NGOs. They acknowledged the services that they deliver with NGO collaboration such as community service and maintenance of peace and order, livelihood programs, farm to market roads, infrastructure projects, seminars and training, information dissemination, health care services, and literacy programs. They contended that the services are effective because the NGOs can help with manpower especially in reaching out to far flung areas. However, one local official asserted that not all NGOs take part.

On the other hand, the NGOs were asked how they participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU. The NGOs in the MDC asserted that they have not attended any meeting of the MDC however one of the NGOs contended that during the previous administration when they had a meeting there was “no consultation in the identification of PPAs for the 20% Development Fund, it was already drafted beforehand for approval by the group.” In the MPOC, the NGOs have participated in the meetings but not in the planning sessions. In the Local Health Board, the lone NGO who attended the meeting only once noted “the doctor (municipal health officer) would identify the programs then present it to the body for approval” while the NGO in the Local School Board attended the meeting only once and agreed with what the district supervisor of the Department of Education presented, but he had no idea what the Special Education Fund is which is one of the subjects under the law by the Local School Board. One of the NGOs in the MDC has been inactive for ten years while one NGO in the MPOC has been inactive for several years and another one has been partially active.

In Chapter 4, the NGOs were asked of their opinion on the status of LGU and NGO collaboration and service delivery. NGO 1 believes they are effective because of the trust of

the LGU in their group while NGO 2 contended that both parties are supportive of each other's projects. NGOs 3, 5, 8, 9, and 11 maintained that there is a need to strengthen the partnership. Meanwhile, NGO 4 declared that they are ineffective because the partnership is for compliance only. On the other hand, because they are always available when the LGU needs them NGO 6 said they are effective while NGO 7 there is a very effective partnership between them especially on transport rules and in the solid waste management program. NGO 10 simply stated they have a very effective partnership. However, one of the NGOs is headed by a local official and one of the high ranking local officials is an active member of the same NGO.

In terms of resources, four of the NGOs derived their funds from the local government for their programs, one NGO is organized by the local government to avail of a national government funded project, two NGOs have been organizationally inactive for several years and do not have funds, two of the NGOs are dependent on membership dues and solicitations, and two NGOs have no resources at all. A perusal thereof would reveal that the NGOs involved in the Local Special Bodies are financially incapable of standing on their own such that they need financial support for their PPAs.

Consequently, the ordinary citizens were asked: *How do you assess the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs?* One of the respondents declared:

“Those who availed (of the services) can probably speak or comment on that but for those who have not received any cannot speak.”

However, the majority of them said they do not feel there is a partnership because they “do not really represent us” while others said they feel the partnership because they are members of an NGO. In other words, those who do not belong to any NGO cannot speak about the partnership. One respondent suggested that:

“The NGOs who should be members of the Local Special Bodies should have membership in the whole municipality so that we can also feel them and that every barangay can also suggest...some kind of an umbrella group so that it will reach the top.”

5.3.3 Analysis of Research Findings

In the Municipality of A, the local officials and department heads asserted that the LGU collaborate and coordinate well with the NGOs and that planning activities involving the NGOs are participatory and consultative. However, NGOs did not corroborate these claims. The NGOs have varying answers as far as participation in decision-making in the local government is concerned. Some of the NGOs assumed they have participated and have been consulted but others cannot say the same. Some of them went as far saying that they are not aware they have become a member of the MDC, in particular. The idea of one local official that NGOs are hesitant and limit their own participation seems misplaced because the responsibility to encourage participation is vested in the local government. In the Municipality of B, the local officials and department heads described the collaboration with NGOs as consultative and that the NGOs are cooperative. The NGOs, however, failed to corroborate the statements by the local officials and department heads. Either no meetings were conducted by the local special bodies or the meetings were not regularly held. There is no consultation as programs are predetermined and presented to the body for approval during the meetings. Ironically, when one department head declared that the NGOs do not participate that much because the LGU does not have that much activities that involve them seem to imply the lack of partnership between the LGU and the NGOs. NGOs have been mandatorily placed in the Local Special Bodies to take part in the planning and implementation of government programs and this has not been realized.

In the Municipality of A, the local officials and department heads and NGOs have varying ideas as to effectiveness of their collaboration and service delivery. The local officials and department heads themselves do not even have unanimity, others say they are effective and the cooperation is enormous while one local official believes it is on a “case-to-case basis” because there are some services that may have been delivered effectively while others are not. There is also no unanimity on the part of the NGOs, while others believe cooperation between them makes it effective, others believe there is a need to enhance and maximize the partnership to make it effective. Others believe the LGU do not involve them in some activities that they should be involved in. Also, the NGOs have noted that there are local officials who practice partisan politics when they engage with NGOs. The lack of coherence between the ideas of the local officials and department heads and NGOs suggests there is no real or actual partnership between them. On the other hand, in the Municipality of B, the local officials and department heads recognized some services which they have

provided with NGOs participation that are effective such as maintenance of peace and order, health related services, livelihood programs, education and other socio-economic services because they believe that the LGU cannot afford to provide for the whole municipality due to limited resources. As to effectiveness of collaboration and service delivery, some NGOs have been inactive for several years yet they remain members of the local special bodies. It is understandable that some NGOs which received funding and incentives from the LGU believe it is effective. Others have not experienced any partnership at all.

Subsequently, in the Municipality of A, the ordinary citizens seem to affirm the notion that there is no real or actual partnership. Effective partnership depends on the sector the NGOs represent especially in the delivery of services, as with some NGOs they do not feel there is partnership or the partnership is weak. They contended though that government services would be better implemented with NGO participation. While in the Municipality of B, most of the ordinary citizens do not feel the partnership because the NGOs really represent their interests. A few, however, feel there is partnership because they happen to be members of some NGOs.

Meanwhile, how both municipalities cooperate with the NGOs, taking into account their size and resources they do not seem to have any difference at all. In Table 5.1 (see page 190), most of the NGOs in the Municipality of A have not experienced having participated in planning and implementation especially those in the MDC and MPOC. NGO 11 has somehow been involved in the Health Board however NGO 12 has not had any participation both in planning and implementation in the School Board. In the same vein, in the Municipality of B, the NGOs in the MDC and MPOC hardly participated both in planning and implementation of programs, two of the NGOs are even inactive while one is semi-active. Although NGO 10 of the Health Board is an indispensable partner of the LGU on health services, they have not participated in planning as programs are predetermined. NGO 11 of the School Board has not been involved at all. Thus, it can be said that, first, size of the LGU does not matter in multi-sectoral policy; second, the smaller municipality has limited participation in multi-sectoral policy, and, third, in the MDC and MPOC which have multi-sectoral NGOs, policy formulation is less focused and more complex and that seems to be introducing barriers to participation.

On the other hand, on the views of the NGOs on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery in the Municipality of A, as shown in Table 5.3 (see page 195), the NGOs regardless of type, scope and size believe that the partnership is weak and that there is a need to strengthen the relationship. As an example, NGO 1, which is a culture and arts foundation, believes that coordination has not been maximized while NGO 3, which is a transport group, expressed that there is a need to increase the collaboration. NGO 3, a women's group, maintains that there is a need for a massive campaign for an increased LGU-NGO partnership while NGO 11, which is composed of medical professionals, believes that there are still other programs that the NGOs should be involved in. On the other hand, the scope of the NGOs does not matter when the NGOs gave their opinion on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery. Provincial-wide NGOs such as NGOs 1, 10 and 11, believe that collaboration is not enough and there is a need to strengthen the partnerships while municipal-wide NGOs such as NGO 3 believe there is a need to increase the collaboration, and NGO 7 expressed that NGOs are needed as partners because the LGU cannot provide the services alone. Meanwhile, NGO 4, which is a small organization, declared that the lack of political will of some leaders hampers the implementation of programs, while a large group such as NGO 12 believes that NGOs should participate more and NGO 9, which is a moderately sized group and a local chapter of an international organization, averred that no corruption will happen if there is LGU-NGO partnership.

In the Municipality of B, large and small NGOs regardless of type and scope have varied views. For example, NGO 3, a women's group, NGO 5, a farmer's group, NGO 8, a transport group and NGO 11, which is a parents and teachers group, are one in saying that there is a need to strengthen the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs. In terms of scope, both municipal-wide and barangay-based NGOs such as NGOs 3, 5, 8, 9 and 11, also believe that there is a need to strengthen the partnership. In terms of size, small NGOs such as NGOs 3, 5, 9 and large NGOs such as NGOs 8 and 11 believe that there is a need to strengthen the partnership. However, large NGOs like NGOs 6, 7, 10 and small NGO 1 believe that the partnership is effective, despite not having been involved in the planning of programs. One large NGO, NGO 4, which has been inactive for 10 years, strongly contended that the partnership is ineffective and that the involvement of NGOs is for compliance only.

Notably, NGOs in the Municipality of A have noteworthy views such as when NGO 1 expressed that they look forward to a stage where the LGU would fund their programs, NGO 4 maintained that some political leaders lack the political will to engage in partnership with NGOs, NGO 5 said the LGU needs the NGOs more, NGO 8 said NGO participation can encourage transparency, while NGO 9 believes that there will be no corruption if there is LGU-NGO partnership. These kinds of opinions cannot be found in the Municipality of B.

It could be observed that, first, NGOs in the larger municipality have stronger views than in the smaller municipality, and second, the type, scope and size of the NGOs do not determine effective participation.

In summary, the notion that the larger LGU is more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of substantial resources and manpower do not hold true in the case at hand. Both local officials and department heads of the two municipalities remained optimistic as to the LGU's collaboration with the NGOs; however, the NGOs do not corroborate this. Even the ordinary citizens are skeptical about the partnership. There is no concrete evidence that there is correlation between the size of the LGU and the effectiveness of their partnership with the NGOs.

5.4 CONCLUSION

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, the people's ability to participate in decision-making may depend on the size of the local government unit and its ability to come up with services that will be truly effective and responsive to their needs. In that sense, the resources of the local government unit may have a bearing on the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs which represent the people. NGOs, in any sense, as partner of the LGUs become the conduit or channel both in identifying the people's needs and, consequently, satisfying those needs with programs, projects and activities that are responsive. NGOs are conduits because they know and are familiar with the people on the ground. In addition, equipped with substantial resources and manpower there is a notion that larger LGUs are effective in cooperating with NGOs compared to the smaller LGUs.

First, a comparative profile of the two LGUs established that Municipality of A is much larger than Municipality of B. Although both are imbued with the same services and facilities that they need to deliver to their constituents, there is a marked difference in size (e.g. resources, population, availability and accessibility of facilities) between the two. If Municipality of A seeks to improve the services that they provide as much as they have enough infrastructures, Municipality of B intends to develop their infrastructure especially in agriculture to uplift the economic condition of farmers. Essentially, these services would be effective if they would be planned-out and delivered by the local government with the NGOs as partners. However, as was shown, size of the LGU does not seem to indicate effective partnership as both municipalities failed to involve the NGOs in decision-making and seldom involved them in the implementation of programs. On the other hand, the goals and objectives of the NGOs in relation to that of the LGU shows that they are sectoral and the citizens seem to affirm this because they are not familiar with some of the NGOs, although they are familiar with others because of the activities that they conduct. Subsequently, common to both municipalities are the services by the LGU and the NGOs which are given either based on political inclination or through the *palakasan* system (influence peddling).

Second, it cannot be confirmed that larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with smaller LGUs. The incoherence between the statements of the local officials and the NGOs in both municipalities would imply that there is inconsistency as far as involvement of NGOs is concerned. The local officials would always say they involve the NGOs while the NGOs assert they do not. It seems that the involvement of the NGOs in both municipalities is only on paper. The NGOs hardly corroborated the statements of the NGOs on the effectiveness of their partnership. Worse, in the Municipality of B, NGOs that have been inactive for several years are still involved. Thus, although Municipality of A has substantial resources and manpower these have not played an important factor in involving effectively the NGOs. Hence, size of the local government does not indicate effective cooperation.

Therefore, it cannot be said that the size of the LGU plays an important factor in determining the extent of collaboration between the LGUs and the NGOs. The involvement of NGOs is only on paper, just a mere compliance to policy.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

The writing of this thesis was initially inspired by the perception that NGO – local government collaboration can hardly be felt or their performance visibly seen. There are two reasons for this. First, the planning and implementation of programs, projects and activities that require NGO – local government collaboration cannot be felt by the citizens. Second, there is no concrete proof of the output between NGO – local government collaboration.

The research was conducted by assessing the validity of four hypotheses which were derived from the argument that the effectiveness of the collaboration between the LGUs and the NGOs can be deduced through interviews and focus group discussions and from the outcome of their performance. The first hypothesis postulated that effective LGU-NGO relationships are hardly felt or visibly seen despite the existing mechanisms. Data was analyzed to find out the collaboration and partnership of the LGUs and the NGOs in decision-making and implementation of PPAs as well as the representativeness of NGOs in the LSBs. In both larger and smaller municipalities it was found that the mechanisms are in place yet they were not utilized appropriately. NGOs rarely participated, if at all in the planning process, although a number of NGOs somehow got to be involved in the implementation of PPAs. Due to lack of consultation on the ground ordinary citizens have not really felt there is an LGU-NGO partnership.

The second hypothesis posits that opportunities for NGOs to participate are great; however, participation has not been realized. The analysis of data dwelt on the extent of participation of NGOs in decision-making, the failure or success of the partnership, the resources of NGOs as indicative of effective participation as well as participatory opportunities available to ordinary citizens. In both municipalities, the LSBs do not regularly conduct the mandated meetings which mean that the NGOs have not participated in basic policy-making processes in the LGU. Planning outputs are pro-forma; they are presented for approval without NGOs taking part in formulation. The resources of NGOs do not indicate effective participation, although in some way the LGUs utilize the NGOs in the implementation of PPAs.

The third and fourth hypotheses use a comparative analysis between a larger and a smaller municipality. The third hypothesis postulates that the larger the LGU the more effective it is in addressing the needs of its constituents, taking into consideration the presence of NGOs as conduits between the LGUs and the ordinary citizens. The analysis of data related to the priorities and resources of the LGU and the NGOs, the responsiveness of their services and the NGOs' interactions with citizens. In both municipalities, NGO resources do not guarantee effective involvement in the LGUs. Although the smaller LGU provided money to a number of NGOs, this did not ensure their participation, which shows that the NGOs are not held accountable for the money they are given. As expressed by the ordinary citizens, both the LGUs and the NGOs engage in politicking (e.g. patronage and influence peddling) in providing their services to the people.

The fourth hypothesis posits that larger LGUs are more effective in cooperating with NGOs because of the substantial resources and manpower that they can utilize to reach out to them. Data was analyzed on the kind of collaboration the LGUs have with NGOs, the extent of participation of NGOs in decision-making, the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery, NGO resources, and citizens' assessments of LGU-NGO partnerships. It was shown that the size of the LGU does not indicate effective cooperation with NGOs; there is no unanimity between the statements of local officials and the NGOs in either of the two municipalities, as far as collaboration is concerned. Although NGOs in the larger municipality have stronger views than in the smaller municipality, the size of the NGO does not determine effective participation. The NGOs were not given the chance to participate in basic decision-making in either LGU. The size of the LGU does not matter in multi-sectoral policy-making, such as in the MDC and MPOC, since policy formulation is less focused and more complex and that seems to be introducing barriers to participation. Although sector-specific NGOs are heavily involved in the Municipal Health Board and Municipal School Board, it seems that NGOs in the smaller municipality have a hard time participating.

In terms of broader issues, this thesis highlights certain aspects of the LGU-NGO relationship which may have policy implications. Size of the LGU does not matter in multi-sectoral policy representation (such as in the MDC and MPOC) in terms of participation in planning and implementation, because they have not exactly participated. However, smaller municipality has a harder time involving the NGOs, especially when some of them have been

inactive or have limited scope. The involvement of inactive and limited-scope NGOs raises the questions on proper representation in the LSBs because it defeats one of the objectives of the Constitution and the Local Government Code of 1991 which is citizen participation or participatory governance.

The evidence presented in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 basically validated the hypotheses on effective LGU-NGOs partnership. It is essential to point out that the significance and value of the findings in this thesis should not be overemphasized. There are some limitations which would affect their general applicability and usefulness. First, in terms of scope, the thesis is based on a case study in one larger and one smaller municipality. This may limit the applicability of the study to LGUs with larger jurisdictions such as cities and provinces. The second limitation concerns methodology. Due to the nature of the subject matter, there is the possibility that the context in which the semi-structured interviews were performed would have influenced interview responses especially the interviews with local officials and department heads. They might have been reluctant to admit that the partnership between the LGU and the NGOs were not effective. Since the interviews were conducted face-to-face with only the interviewer and the interviewee present, it is possible that interviewee answers would have been different if others had been present.

One of the elements of decentralization is the reversal of the concentration of administration from the center, conferring some administration to the local government. Thus, as is the common perception, efficient provision of public goods would be improved, demand for services would be easily conveyed, accountability and political skills of local government officials would be strengthened, and, most of all, it could be a training ground for citizen participation and political leadership. As Irvin and Stansbury (2004) aptly observed, local government officials are able to explain their reasons for pursuing policies that, at first glance, would not be popular to the public, and the prospect of a more cooperative public is the impetus to obtain acceptance as a prerequisite to successful implementation. Formulated policies might be more realistically grounded in citizen preferences and the improved support from the public might create a less divisive, combative populace to govern and regulate. Thus, a policy that is well grounded in citizen preferences might be implemented in a smoother, less costly fashion because the public is more cooperative when the policy is implemented.

The concept of participatory governance through LGU-NGO partnership is a highly contentious issue. The 1987 Philippine Constitution recognizes the right of the people and their organizations to participate in social, political and economic decision-making. Subsequently, the Local Government Code of 1991 provided the mechanisms for them to become active partners in the pursuit of local autonomy as well as in cooperative undertakings in the delivery of certain basic services, capability-building and livelihood projects, among others. It is in those mechanisms where the people's and their organization's rights to participate were gauged to substantiate the common belief that they have not participated enough or have not participated at all. As Fisher (1992) fittingly theorized, non-government organizations may interact closely with the local government and play a strong role in local development activities, and the active involvement of local organizations is a key factor in influencing the degree of benefits reaching the poorer citizens.

The study showed that there was failure to involve the NGOs in planning and basic policy-making processes and there was weak involvement in the implementation of programs, projects and activities which defeated the mandate imposed on LGUs. It appears that local governments do not yet get the point why NGOs should be involved. This lack of involvement is evident in the notion by the citizens that they do not feel there is real partnership between the LGU and the NGOs. NGOs are supposed to provide the check-and-balance in decision-making and in the delivery of services; however, these were not realized. Decision-making where there is supposed to be NGO participation is still lodged with the local governments while service delivery has oftentimes been provided through political patronage and/or *palakasan* system (influence peddling). Thus, it seems that the NGOs do not understand why the local government units involved them. Although NGOs possess local knowledge and understand local needs, these were not utilized to full advantage by the local governments.

Generally, the stages of collaboration include both participatory planning or policy formulation, and implementation. Participatory planning or policy-making entails collaborative undertaking to better address the problems and issues at hand which will redound to the benefit of the constituency if implemented. However, the way the planning processes were done or even the lack of the process has defeated the concept of participation

at a very early stage of collaboration. Lack of participation at this stage simply derails the intention of providing a responsive policy. The implementation stage is supposed to be the end point of collaboration in the process; although local governments, as shown here, have in one way or another engaged with some NGOs in program and project implementation, the lack of participation during the planning and policy formulation stage undermines the process.

Previously, it has been noted that the extent of participation of NGOs in LGUs in the Philippines varies from one jurisdiction to another. There are LGUs where the participation of NGOs begins and ends with their accreditation for inclusion in the LSBs, after which the LSBs become inactive, thus the LGU-NGO relationship ceases. Other LGUs have high levels of participation while they explore ways of involving the NGOs; there are others that lag behind and are stuck in the old form of governance. There are areas where participation is determined by the perception of the local chief executive towards NGOs, especially where the local chief executive and their constituents are unenlightened by the motivation and spirit of decentralization (Co, 2002).

Thus, it appears that this aspect of decentralization in the Philippines has hardly been realized.

Strengthening LGU-NGOs relations is indeed a difficult task. Hence, the recommendations are directed towards strengthening of the mechanisms, reinforcing the mandate of the LGUs and empowering the NGOs. The involvement of NGOs begins during the accreditation process by the Sanggunian (local legislative body), wherein the LGUs conduct an inventory of existing NGOs in the municipality for accreditation purposes, after which they are called to a meeting for the conduct of election from among themselves to choose who will represent the people in the Local Special Bodies. This process determines which NGOs will be involved during the entire term of the local officials. This is the crucial stage for it involves choosing the appropriate NGOs to be engaged thus there should be a mechanism that ensures only appropriate NGOs will be chosen. First, there should be a mechanism that will ensure that the election of NGOs for representation to the LSBs is actually conducted and the outcome properly observed. This is to warrant that engagement of NGOs is not tainted by politics to prevent a situation where, as previously noted that, the

participation of NGOs is determined by the perception of the local chief executives towards NGOs (Co, 2002) and the appointment of NGO representatives to the LSBs are exercised as a political consideration (Ramiro et al, 2001). Second, the sector of the NGOs must be considered in choosing the representation in the MDC and MPOC because, unlike in the School Board and Health Board where NGO representatives are sector-specific, the representation of NGOs in the MDC and MPOC under the Local Government Code of 1991 is multi-sectoral without regard to which sector they must come from. In this case, it is recommended that the mechanism should specify by category which NGOs should be involved such as, but not limited to, those that are occupational (e.g. farmers, fisherfolks, transport operators, vendors), professional (e.g. engineers, physicians, lawyers), service-oriented or civic, or identity-based (e.g. women, elderly, disabled persons, urban poor, business sector). That way the composition of NGOs would have broad-based constituencies. Third, the scope of the NGOs should be municipal-wide, not limited to one or two barangays, so as to ensure a wider constituency. As was shown, barangay-based NGOs have limited scope whose presence in the LSBs has hardly been utilized. Fourth, the mechanism should expressly state the prohibition of local officials from representing their groups in the LSBs to prevent questions of political bias. Treating local officials as NGO representatives can be a mechanism for closing groups to non-officials. Fifth, there should be a monitoring mechanism that would ensure participatory decision-making processes to avert the presentation of pro-forma or predetermined programs, projects and activities thereby encouraging transparency. As shown by the thesis, the citizens were largely deprived of representation, these recommendations are meant to ensure appropriate representation in the LSBs.

On the part of the LGUs, the recommendations include first, LGUs should keep a database of all NGOs to keep track of their activities, such as changes in the composition of officers and memberships, those NGOs that have become inactive, or their programs and projects, among others. Second, LGUs should be required to submit monthly reports on the accomplishments or activities of the LSBs to the DILG to ensure regular conduct of meetings and planning sessions, among others, as a monitoring mechanism. Third, NGOs should be provided the corresponding remuneration during involvement in any activity to encourage attendance and participation. If local officials and government personnel are paid allowances

to attend conferences, seminars or meetings, so should NGO leaders or representatives be paid when they attend the activities of the LSBs. On the other hand, after missing several meetings NGOs should be replaced in the LSBs to ensure their attendance and accountability. Keeping a database of NGOs would serve as a guide for LGUs as it would ease the identification of partners not only in the LSBs but also in other program undertakings. Monthly reports are meant as a monitoring tool that would determine compliance to policies. Remuneration for NGOs expenses is a must, especially when NGO resources are limited.

On the part of the NGOs; first, those that have been inactive should refrain from representing their groups and inform the LGU of their status. This situation raises the question, how do you strengthen the partnership when one side is weak? Second, the stability and capabilities of NGOs should be strengthened for them to become effective partners of the LGUs. Third, there should be mechanisms to link NGOs to people.

Taking into consideration the findings on the ground, the appropriate strategies could very well be summarized by Irvin and Stansbury (2004) when they described the ideal conditions for citizen participation by constructing effective participatory practices such as the careful selection of a representative group of stakeholders. This holds true on the composition of NGOs in the MDC and MPOC. They also recommend a transparent decision-making process to build trust among the participants; clear authority in decision-making; competent and unbiased group facilitators, to encourage NGO attendance and participation; conduct of regular meetings, the opposite of which is very prevalent; and adequate financial resources to support the group process during the potentially long learning and decision-making process, to encourage participation.

For future research, there are many issues that relate to this thesis that remain unaddressed, some of which are, or will be, of great importance. The thesis has examined just one aspect of decentralization; there exist other issues that could be studied. One of these issues would be a study on the level of political maturity of local officials in the dispensation of decentralized powers, duties and responsibilities provided by the Local Government Code of 1991. The long history of colonization and autocratic rule in the Philippines has influenced the values in the discharge of powers at the local level. Local level politics is a personal fight between contending local elites or influential people and the capture of political position, as

previously stated, (because of decentralization and local autonomy) gives rise to more power to local officials especially in the handling of state resources and in the performance of their functions, which is seen as another opportunity to distribute patronage. Another issue that could also be studied, since a strong finding has been established in this research, is the multi-sectoral and sector-specific representation of NGOs in terms of their representativeness and effectiveness in the Local Special Bodies. It has policy implications because sector-specific representation has its specific target group in the community and it is doing well in its partnership with the LGUs while multi-sectoral representations can hardly be noticed as far as representativeness and effectiveness are concerned.

Another issue that has been found in this study is that the subsidization of NGOs in the Philippines has not been effective. Subsidizing the NGOs needs to be re-thought. There should be a mechanism that would hold the NGOs accountable because if they are not held accountable the subsidization becomes a form of patronage which affects representativeness in the LSBs. Patronage is worse because it makes the delivery of services subject to political orientation. Again, future research projects could concentrate on these issues, attempting to locate policies and regulations to tackle decentralization issues.

A key aspect of contemporary decentralization in the Philippines is debureaucratization, the essence of which is participatory governance at the local government level. Effective citizen participation in the local government democratizes the process of policy-making and the implementation of programs, projects and activities, improving service delivery and enhancing democracy. However, much still needs to be done to capture the essence of decentralization, especially on citizen participation, embodied in the Local Government Code of 1991.

Appendix A

Information Sheet (Interview)

June 02, 2011

Dear _____,

Mabuhay!

I am studying for my Master of Arts major in Political Science degree at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. As part of the requirements for my degree, I am undertaking some research for my thesis which explores the effectiveness of Local Government Unit – Non-Government Organization (LGU-NGO) collaboration in local governance. This research is funded by the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) as part of my scholarship.

In conducting this research the result will shed light on the actual relationship between the LGU and the NGOs and if it differs according to the size of the local government unit, and participatory opportunities available for NGOs as well as the extent of their participation. It may also aid in improving the participation and relationship of the LGU-NGOs and help them identify their strengths and weaknesses to improve their partnership.

This research will be available as an unpublished thesis at the University of Canterbury and there is also a possibility that the research will be published in scientific or academic journals. It is also possible that the findings of the research will be utilized to amend the Local Government Code of 1991 for a meaningful LGU-NGO partnership.

Given your expertise in this field, I would like to invite you to participate in my research. As a respondent you will be interviewed for not more than an hour. If there are matters that arise from my other data collection where your views will be significant, I hope that I can contact you to organize a follow-up interview which will not exceed half an hour in length.

The interview will revolve around the topics about your participation, and your professional and personal opinions towards LGU-NGO partnership in local governance. The interview will be recorded using a digital voice recorder. If you are not comfortable with this method, please advice the researcher and notes will be taken instead.

If you are willing to participate, I ask that you sign and return the attached consent form that indicates your willingness to participate in the study by giving it directly to the researcher, or by using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope, or by e-mailing a copy to the

researcher not later than a week after you received this letter. Please be assured that your responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Pseudonyms will be given to names of each respondent as well as the name of the organization (unless otherwise specified by the respondent or group members) to maintain anonymity. No identifying information will be used if the results of this study are to be written for publication, for oral presentation or for any general discussion. Transcriptions of interviews and analysis of field notes will be undertaken solely by the researcher. If you wish to have a copy and to check the accuracy of your interview transcription, please advise me during the interview.

During the research, data will be kept in the researcher's safe filing cabinet and personal computer with an anti-hacking device. All data obtained from this study will be stored in a secure facility at the University of Canterbury, College of Arts, Department of Political Science, for a maximum period of six years after the research has been completed. The data will then be destroyed using the University's secure destruction service.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may also withdraw your participation and the information you have provided for the study by contacting me prior to July 19, 2011 by phone, mail, or email.

Contact details: Address: Department of Political Science

College of Arts

University of Canterbury

Private Bag 4800

Christchurch 8140

New Zealand

E-mail: cor20@uclive.ac.nz

Mobile +639185031319
Number:

This study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee (UCHEC). If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study please contact the Researcher or the Supervisor.

I hope that you will be able to participate. It will be an honour for me to work with you in this research.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully,

CARMELO FLAVIANO ORBISTA
Master of Arts major in Political Science
E-mail: cor20@uclive.co.nz
Mobile Number: +639185031319

Supervisor:

JIM OCKEY, Ph.D.
Supervisor
E-mail: J.Ockey@pols.canterbury.ac.nz

Appendix B

Information Sheet (Focus Group Discussion)

June 02, 2011

Dear _____,

Mabuhay!

I am studying for my Master of Arts major in Political Science degree at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand. As part of the requirements for my degree, I am undertaking some research for my thesis which explores the effectiveness of Local Government Unit – Non-Government Organization (LGU-NGO) collaboration in local governance. This research is funded by the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) as part of my scholarship.

In conducting this research the result will shed light on the actual relationship between the LGU and the NGOs and if it differs according to the size of the local government unit, and participatory opportunities available for NGOs as well as the extent of their participation. It may also aid in improving the participation and relationship of the LGU-NGOs and help them identify their strengths and weaknesses to improve their partnership.

This research will be available as an unpublished thesis at the University of Canterbury and there is also a possibility that the research will be published in scientific or academic journals. It is also possible that the findings of the research will be utilized to amend the Local Government Code of 1991 for a meaningful LGU-NGO partnership.

A focus group discussion will be conducted as part of the research. As a resident of the municipality, I would like to invite you to participate in a 2-hour discussion with other residents of the municipality.

The discussion will revolve around the topics about your professional and personal opinions towards LGU-NGO partnership in local governance. The discussion will be recorded using a video recorder. If you are not comfortable with this method, please advise the researcher and notes will be taken instead.

If you are willing to participate, I ask that you sign and return the attached consent form that indicates your willingness to participate in the study by giving it directly to the researcher, or by using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope, or by e-mailing a copy to the researcher not later than a week after you received this letter. Please be assured that your

responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Pseudonyms will be given to names of each respondent as well as the name of the organization (unless otherwise specified by the respondent or group members) to maintain anonymity. No identifying information will be used if the results of this study are to be written for publication, for oral presentation or for any general discussion. Transcriptions of interviews and analysis of field notes will be undertaken solely by the researcher. If you wish to have a copy and to check the accuracy of your interview transcription, please advise me during the interview.

During the research, data will be kept in the researcher's safe filing cabinet and personal computer with an anti-hacking device. All data obtained from this study will be stored in a secure facility at the University of Canterbury, College of Arts, Department of Political Science, for a maximum period of six years after the research has been completed. The data will then be destroyed using the University's secure destruction service.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may also withdraw your participation and the information you have provided for the study by contacting me prior to August 15, 2011 by phone, mail, or email.

Contact details:	Address:	Department of Political Science
		College of Arts
		University of Canterbury
		Private Bag 4800
		Christchurch 8140
		New Zealand
	E-mail:	cor20@uclive.ac.nz
	Mobile Number:	+639185031319

This study has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee (UCHEC). If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study please contact the Researcher or the Supervisor.

I hope that you will be able to participate. It will be an honour for me to work with you in this research.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully,

CARMELO FLAVIANO ORBISTA
Master of Arts major in Political Science
E-mail: cor20@uclive.co.nz
Mobile Number: +639185031319

Supervisor:

JIM OCKEY, Ph.D.
Supervisor
E-mail: J.Ockey@pols.canterbury.ac.nz

Appendix C

Consent Form (Interview)

Supervisor

Email: J.Ockey@pols.canterbury.ac.nz

Consent Form

Research Title: Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Participation in Local Governance in the Philippines

I confirm that I am of legal age (above 18 years old) at present and I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a respondent in the research. I give my consent for the interview to be recorded by (___) a digital voice recorder or (___) manual note (please tick one) and I agree to be contacted for a follow-up interview if needed. I also consent to the publication of results with my understanding that my anonymity will be preserved. I understand also that I may, at any time, withdraw my participation from the research, including the withdrawal of any information I have provided prior to July 19, 2011 by directly contacting the researcher at the given contact details.

Name: _____

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Appendix D

Consent Form (Focus Group Discussion)

Supervisor

Email: J.Ockey@pols.canterbury.ac.nz

Consent Form

Research Title: Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Participation in Local Governance
in the Philippines

I confirm that I am of legal age (above 18 years old) at present and I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a discussant in the focus group discussion as part of the research. I give my consent for the discussion to be recorded by () a digital voice recorder or () manual note (please tick one). I also consent to the publication of results with my understanding that my anonymity will be preserved. I understand also that I may, at any time, withdraw my participation from the research, including the withdrawal of any information I have provided prior to August 15, 2011 by directly contacting the researcher at the given contact details.

Name: _____

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Appendix E

GUIDE QUESTIONS FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW

Questions for Local Chief Executives, other local officials and department heads

Individual Background Data

The background of the informant is necessary to establish relevance.

(Sample questions)

1. What is your role in the local government unit (LGU)?
2. How long have you been a resident of the LGU?
3. How did you end up running/working in the LGU?

Organizational Information

Information on the organization's objectives will be needed to establish direction in meeting its goals through the realization of programs, projects and activities (PPAs).

(Sample Questions)

1. What are the vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) of the LGU?
2. What are the resources (financial, human and technical) to implement the programs, projects and activities (PPAs) of the LGU?

Participation

It is necessary to establish the efforts toward effective collaboration by the LGU with NGOs in program planning and implementation.

(Sample Questions)

1. What kind of collaboration does your organization have with NGOs?
2. What is the extent of NGO participation towards decision-making for the approval of PPAs?

Service Delivery

The ultimate goal of collaboration between the LGU and the NGOs is effective delivery of services, thus there is a need to look into the effectiveness of such collaboration.

(Sample questions)

1. What are the services delivered with the collaboration of the NGOs?
2. How effective are these services?

Summing-up Questions on LGU-NGO Collaboration and the Effective Delivery of Services

1. What is your view about the effectiveness of LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery towards the development of the LGU?
2. Do you believe that LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services (failed/succeeded) in the LGU, and why?

Appendix F

GUIDE QUESTIONS FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW

Questions for NGO (Non-Government Organizations) Leaders

Individual Background Data

The background of the informant is necessary to establish relevance.

(Sample questions)

1. What is your role in the NGO?
2. How long have you been a resident of the local government unit (LGU)?
3. How did you end-up in this line of work?

General Questions about the Organization

Information on the organization's objectives will be needed to establish direction in meeting its goals through the realization of programs, projects and activities (PPAs).

(Sample Questions)

1. What are the vision, mission, goals and objectives (VMGO) of your organization?
2. What are the resources of your organization and where it is coming from?
3. What programs/projects/activities (PPAs) does your organization practice towards LGU development?

NGO Participation towards LGU's Development

It is necessary to see the collaborative efforts of NGOs with the LGU and the effectiveness of service delivery resulting from such collaboration.

(Sample Questions)

- ***Participation***

1. How does your organization participate in the decision-making for the development of the LGU?
2. What is the extent of your participation (planning → implementation → evaluation)?

- ***Service Delivery***

1. How do the PPAs of your organization fit with the LGU agenda on service delivery?
2. How effective are the services delivered by the organization with LGU collaboration?

- ***Representation***

1. What is the nature of your interaction with citizens?
2. How often do you interact with the citizens?

Summing-up Questions on LGU-NGO Collaboration and Effective Service Delivery

1. Do you believe LGU-NGO collaboration and service delivery is effective? If yes, what factors aid in its effectiveness? If no, what are the factors that hinder its success?
2. What is your general opinion on the status of LGU-NGO collaboration and effective delivery of services?

Appendix G

QUESTIONS FOR THE FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Service Delivery

1. What services are available for you?
2. What do you think of service delivery?

Participation

1. Do you have the opportunity to participate in decision-making and in service delivery?
2. What leads you to participate? What prevents you from participating?
3. What might encourage you to participate more?

On NGOs

1. Are you aware of the presence of NGOs?
2. How do you interact with the NGOs?
3. What is the role of NGOs in service delivery?
4. Are the NGOs responsive to your needs?

On Local Government

1. Are you aware of the opportunities available to participate in the local government?
2. How do you interact with the local government in the delivery of services?
3. Are the services delivered responsive to your needs?
4. Is the LGU responsive to your needs?

Summing-up Questions

1. What do you think of NGOs representation in the Local Special Bodies?
2. How do you assess the partnership between the LGU and NGOs?

REFERENCES

“2009 Ecological Profile” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

“2010 State of Local Governance Performance Report” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

Abao, C. V. (2011). “Mapping and Analyzing Philippine Civil Society Organizations.” <http://www.USAID.gov.au/publications/pdf/cso-mapping-assessment.pdf#page=25> Accessed on January 4, 2012

Abidin, A. (2009). “When the Burden is Shouldered Alone: Experiences in Autonomy at Regencies and Municipalities.” In Holtzappel, C. J. G. & Ramstedt M. (Eds), Decentralization and Regional Autonomy in Indonesia (pp. 59-74). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; The Netherlands: International Institute for Asian Studies

Ahmad, J, Devarajan S., Khemani, S. & Shah, S. (2005). “Decentralization and Service Delivery. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3603”, Vol.1 (1), http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2005/05/12/000011823_20050512104803/Rendered/PDF/wps3603.pdf. Accessed 25 October 2011

“Annual Budget 2010” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Budget 2011” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Budget CY 2011” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Budget CY 2010” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Investment Plan (AIP) 2010” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Investment Plan (AIP) 2011” [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Investment Plan, Budget Year 2010” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Annual Investment Plan, Calendar Year 2011” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic793411.files/Wk%203_Sept%2017th/Arnstein_1969_Ladder%20of%20Participation.pdf Accessed 9 November 2011

Aziz, A. & Arnold, D. D. (1996). “Introduction”. In Aziz, A. & Arnold, D. D. (Eds) Decentralized Governance in Asian Countries (pp. 13-33). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Ltd.; California: SAGE Publications Inc.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Barns, J. R. (2003). “Engaged Governance An Overview of the Philippine Experience.” <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN014414.pdf> Accessed on 7 May 2012

Barriball K. L. & While A. (1994). “Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper.” Journal of Advanced Nursing, 19, 19(2) 328-335. Accessed on 21 August 2012

Bhatt, A (1995). “Asian NGOs in Development: Their Role and Impact.” In Heyzer N, Riker J. V. & Quizon A. B. (Eds.), Government – NGO Relations in Asia (pp. 42-65). London: McMillan Press; New York: St. Martin’s Press

Brillantes Jr., A. B. (1998). “Non-Governmental Organizations and Local development in the Philippines: An Overview.” In Tapales, P. D., Cuaresma, J. C., & Cabo, W. L. (Eds), Local Government in the Philippines: A Book of Readings, Volume II, Current Issues in Governance (pp. 377-394), Philippines: Center for Local and Regional Governance (CLRG), National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP)

Brillantes Jr., A. B. (2002). “Decentralized Democratic Governance Under the Local government Code: A Governmental Perspective.” In Tapales, P. D., Brillantes Jr., A. B.(Eds), Local Government in the Philippines: A Book of Readings, Volume III, Concepts and Practices in Decentralization (pp. 27-48), Philippines: Center for Local and Regional

Governance (CLRG), National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP)

Buček J. & Smith B. (2000). “New Approaches to Local Democracy: Direct Democracy, Participation and the ‘Third Sector.’” Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy 2000, volume 18, pages 3-16. http://www.humannageografia.sk/bucek/Bucek_Smith_EaP_2000.pdf. Accessed 1 November 2011

By the President of the Philippines (2009). “Executive Order 773, FURTHER REORGANIZING THE PEACE AND ORDER COUNCIL.” www.lawphil.net/executive/execord/eo2009/eo_773_2009.html. Accessed 31 October 2011

Cariño, L. & PNSP Project Staff (2001). “Defining the Nonprofit Sector: The Philippines.” <http://zunia.org/uploads/media/knowledge/philippines39csss.pdf> Accessed on 25 November 2011

Center for Local Governance (2000). “Decentralization and Democratic Local Governance Programming Handbook,” http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/publications/pdfs/pnach300.pdf Accessed 28 October 2011

Chan Robles Virtual Law Library (n.d.). The Local Government Code of the Philippines, <http://www.chanrobles.com/localgov.htm>. Accessed 20 November 2011

Chan Robles Virtual Law Library (n.d.). The 1987 Philippine Constitution, <http://www.chanrobles.com/philsupremelaw1.htm>. Accessed 05 November 2011

Clark, J. (1995). “The state, popular participation, and the voluntary sector.” World Development, 23(4), 593-601. http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic980025.files/Wk%2012_Nov%2018th/Clark_1995_The%20State_%20Pop%20Participation_%20Vol%20Sector.pdf Accessed 29 November 2011

Co, E. E. A. (2002). "Raising an Old question: Is There People's Participation in Local Governance?" In Tapales, P. D., Brillantes Jr., A. B.(Eds), Local Government in the Philippines: A Book of Readings, Volume III, Concepts and Practices in Decentralization (pp. 391-398), Philippines: Center for Local and Regional Governance (CLRG), National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP)

Colongan Jr., A. A. (2003). "What is Happening on the Ground? The Progress of Decentralisation." In Aspinal, E. & Fealy, G. (Eds.), Politics in Indonesia, Decentralisation and Demoratisation (pp. 87-101), Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies

Cornwall, A. (2002). "Locating citizen participation." IDS bulletin, 33(2), i-x. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/r4d/PDF/Outputs/CentreOnCitizenship/1052734364-cornwall.2002-locating.pdf> Accessed 9 November 2011

Cornwall, A., & Coelho, V. S. P. (2007). Spaces for change?: the politics of citizen participation in new democratic arenas (Vol. 4): Zed Books. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.115.649&rep=rep1&type=pdf> Accessed 9 November 2011

Dagnino, E. (2005). "'We all have rights, but...': Contesting concepts of citizenship in Brazil." In Kabeer, N. (Ed.), Inclusive Citizenship (pp. 149-163). New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) & Urban Resources and the Evelio B. Javier Foundation, Inc. (EBJFI) (2001). A Study on People's Participation in the Local Development Councils, Philippines: AusAID, Philippine-Australia Government Facility (PAGF), DILG

Devas, N. and Grant, U. (2003). "Local Government Decision-Making – Citizen Participation and Local Accountability: Some Evidence from Kenya and Uganda." <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pad.281/pdf>. Accessed 1 November 2011

Devere, H. (1993). Political Labels and Women's Attitudes. Department of Political Studies, Auckland, University of Auckland

DILG Memorandum Circular 2007-81. "Guide in the Accreditation of NGOs, POs and other Organized Groups, and in the Selection of their Representatives to the Local Special Bodies." www.dilg.gov.ph. Accessed 30 October 2011

DILG Memorandum Circular 2001-89. "Guide in the Accreditation of NGOs, POs and other Organized Groups, and in the Selection of their Representatives to the Local Special Bodies." www.dilg.gov.ph. 30 October 2011

"Draft Municipal Ecological Profile (2010)" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

Etemadi, F. (2000). "Civil Society Participation in City Governance in Cebu City. Environment and Urbanization." <http://eau.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/12/1/57>. Accessed 1 December 2011

"Excerpts from the Minutes of the Municipal Development Council held at the [Venue XXX] on Wednesday 27 October 2010" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

"Excerpt from the Minutes of the Joint Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction Management, Municipal Anti-Drug Abuse and Municipal Peace and Order Councils Meeting on March 10, 2011 at [Venue XXX] [Municipality of B] at 10:30 AM." Unpublished public document

"Executive Order No. 003, Series of 2011, Executive Order Re-organizing and Expanding the composition of the Municipal Peace and Order Council of the [Municipality of A, Province of A]." Unpublished public document

"Executive Order No. 004, Series of 2010, Executive Order Reconstituting the Composition of the Municipal Development Council of the [Municipality of A]." Unpublished public document.

"Executive Order No. 005, Series of 2010, Executive Order Reorganizing the Municipal School Board of the [Municipality of A, Province of Aklan]." Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 006, Series of 2010, Executive Order Reorganizing the Peace and Order Council of the [Municipality of A, Province of Aklan].” Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 006, Series of 2010, Reorganizing the Local Health Board, [Municipality of B].” Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 009, Series of 2010, Reorganization of the Municipal Peace and Order Council (MPOC) of [Municipality of B].” Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 010, Series of 2010, Reorganizing the Municipal Development Council, [Municipality of B].” Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 012, Series of 2010, Executive Order Reorganizing the Composition of the Municipal Health Board of the [Municipality of A, Province of Aklan].” Unpublished public document.

“Executive Order No. 014, Series of 2010, Reorganization of the Local School Board of [Municipality of B].” Unpublished public document.

Farrell, C. M. (2000). “Citizen participation in governance.” *Public money and management*, 20(1), 31-37. <http://www.uv.es/~fernandm/Farrell.pdf> Accessed 9 November 2011

Fischer, F (2006). “Participatory Governance as Deliberative Empowerment: The Cultural Politics of Discursive Space.” <http://arp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/36/1/19> Accessed 10 September 2012

Flick, U., von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (2004). “What is Qualitative Research? An Introduction to the Field.” In Flick, U., von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (Eds), *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. SAGE
http://sdhprc.ir/download/A_Companion_to_qualitative_research.pdf#page=268 Accessed on 28 August 2012

Frankish, C. J., Kwan, B., Ratner, P. A., Wharf Higgins, J., & Larsen, C. (2002). “Challenges of citizen participation in regional health authorities.” *Social Science & Medicine*, 54(10), 1471-1480.
<http://www.ualberta.ca/~dcl3/public%20participation%20and%20hc%20dm/public%20participation%20+%20health%20policy%20->

[%20pubmed/challenges%20of%20citizen%20participation%20in%20rha.pdf](#) Accessed 9 November 2011

Friedman, H. J. (1983). "Decentralized Development in Asia, Local Political Alternatives." In Rondinelli, D. A. & Cheema S. G. (Eds.), Decentralization and Development (pp.35-58). California: SAGE Publications, Inc; India: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

George L. A. & Bennet A (2005). Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences. Massachusetts: MIT Press

Haque, M. S. (2004). "Governance based on partnership with NGOs: implications for development and empowerment in rural Bangladesh." *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 70(2), 271-290. <http://profile.nus.edu.sg/fass/polhaque/iras-ptnr.pdf> Accessed 29 November 2011

Harris, R. L. (1983). "Centralization and Decentralization in Latin America." In Rondinelli, D. A. & Cheema S. G. (Eds.), Decentralization and Development (pp. 127-182). California: SAGE Publications, Inc; India: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Hofman, B., Kaiser, K. & Schulze, G. G. (2009). "Corruption and Decentralization." In Holtzappel, C. J. G. & Ramstedt M. (Eds), Decentralization and Regional Autonomy in Indonesia (pp. 99-113). Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies; The Netherlands: International Institute for Asian Studies

Hutchcroft, P. and Rocamora, J. (2003). "Strong Demands and Weak Institutions: The Origins and Evolution of the Democratic Deficit in the Philippines." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 3 (2003), 259-292. Accessed on 20 December 2011 from <http://www.tni.org/archives/archives/rocamora/demands.pdf>

Ife, J. & Tesoriero, F (2006). "Participation". In Ife, J. & Tesoriero, F. (Eds), Community Development (pp. 145-169). 3rd Ed. Australia: Pearson Education

Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). "Citizen participation in decision making: is it worth the effort?" *Public administration review*, 64(1), 55-65.

<http://graduateinstitute.ch/webdav/site/developpement/shared/developpement/mdev/soutienauxcours0809/Gironde%20Pauvrete/IrvinParticip.pdf> Accessed 9 November 2011

Ishii, R., Hossain, F., & Rees, C. J. (2007). "Participation in Decentralized Local Governance: Two Contrasting Cases from the Philippines."

<http://gr2tq4rz9x.scholar.serialssolutions.com/?sid=google&aunit=R&aulast=Ishii&atitle=Participation+in+decentralized+local+governance:+Two+contrasting+cases+from+the+Philippines&id=doi:10.1007/s11115-007-0043->

[2&title=Public+organization+review&volume=7&issue=4&date=2007&spage=359&issn=1566-7170](http://gr2tq4rz9x.scholar.serialssolutions.com/?sid=google&aunit=R&aulast=Ishii&atitle=Participation+in+decentralized+local+governance:+Two+contrasting+cases+from+the+Philippines&id=doi:10.1007/s11115-007-0043-2&title=Public+organization+review&volume=7&issue=4&date=2007&spage=359&issn=1566-7170) Accessed 7 May 2012

Iszatt N. (2002). "Legislating for Citizens' Participation in the Philippines." *Citizen Participation in Local Governance: Experiences from Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines*. <http://ipdprojects.org/logolinksea/resources/pdf/SEA%20Regional%20Paper6.pdf>.

Accessed 1 December 2011

Janoski, T. (1998). *Citizenship and Civil Society*. UK: Cambridge University Press

Kawanaka, T. (2007). "The Robredo Style: Philippine Local Politics in Transition."

<http://www.journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/kasarinlan/article/viewArticle/351> Accessed on 21 December 2011

Keese, J. and Argudo, M. (2006). "Decentralization and NGO-municipal government collaboration in Ecuador." *Development in Practice*, 16:2, 114-127.

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a743759771~frm=titlelink>.

Accessed 21 October 2010.

Khan, Z. R. (1996). "Decentralized Governance and its Impact on Rural Society." In Aziz, A. & Arnold, D. D. (Eds), *Decentralized Governance in Asian Countries* (pp. 63-79). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Ltd.; California: SAGE Publications Inc.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kothori, R. (1996). "Issues in Decentralized Governance." In Aziz, A. & Arnold, D. D. (Eds) Decentralized Governance in Asian Countries (pp. 34-41). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Ltd.; California: SAGE Publications Inc.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Kymlicka, W. (2002). "Citizenship Theory," Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction (pp. 285-326), Oxford: Oxford University Press

"Local Development Investment Program CY 2011-2013" [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

"Local Health Board Meeting, July 21, 2011, 9:00pm" [Municipality of A]. Unpublished public document.

"Local Health Board Meeting, Mayor's Office, 01/23/10" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

"Local Health Board Meeting, SB Hall, July 12, 2010, 8:30AM" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

"Local Health Board Meeting, [Venue XXX], August 23, 2010" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

Lister, R. (1998). "Citizen in Action: Citizenship and Community Development in Northern Ireland Context." *Community Development Journal*, vol. 33, no. 3 (1998), pp. 226-35

Magno, F. (1993). "The Growth of Philippine Environmentalism. Philippine Environmental Politics." *Kasarinlan*, Vol.9 No. 1, 3rd Quarter. <http://www.journals.upd.edu.ph/index.php/kasarinlan/article/view/928/927>. Accessed 1 December 2011

Manacsa, R. (1999). "The Formal Structures for Political Participation: The Electoral and Party Systems in the Philippines." *Politics and Governance (Theory and Practice in the*

Philippine Context). Department of Political Science, Ateneo de Manila University, Office of the Research Publications: Manila

Martin, S. (2009). "Engaging With Citizens and Other Stakeholders." In Bovaird, T. & Löffler, E. (Eds), Public Management and Governance (pp. 279 – 296). 2nd Ed. New York: Routledge; London: Routledge

Mathur, K. (1983). "Administrative Decentralization in Asia." In Rondinelli, D. A. & Cheema S. G. (Eds.), Decentralization and Development (pp. 59-76). California: SAGE Publications, Inc; India: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.; London: SAGE Publicaions Ltd.

McNabb, D. E. (2004). Research Methods in Political Science, Quantitative and Qualitative Methods. New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Morgan, D. (1988). Focus Groups as Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA., Sage

Mukhopadhyay, M. (2004). "Introduction: Gender, Citizenship and Governance." In A Global Sourcebook (pp. 13- 27). The Netherlands: KIT (Royal Tropical Institute)

Midgley, J (1986). "Community Participation: history, concepts, and controversies." In Midgley, J. with Hall, A., Hardiman, M. and Narine, D., Community Participation, Social Development and the State (pp. 13-45) London: Methuen & Co. Ltd; New York: Methuen & Co.

"Minutes of the Meeting of the Municipal Peace and Order Council of the [Municipality of A] held on December 16, 2010, 3:00PM at the 3rd Floor Municipal Building." Unpublished public document.

"Minutes of the Meeting of the Municipal Peace and Order Council of the [Municipality of A] held on April 16, 2011, 2:00PM at the 3rd Floor Municipal Building." Unpublished public document.

"Minutes of the Meeting of the Municipal Peace and Order Council of the [Municipality of A] held on June 29, 2011, 1:30PM at the 3rd Floor Municipal Building." Unpublished public document

“Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Local School Board of the [Municipality of A] held on August 25, 2010 at 2:30PM at the Office of the Municipal Mayor.” Unpublished public document.

“Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Local School Board of the [Municipality of A] held on November 09, 2010 at 2:00PM at the Office of the Municipal Mayor.” Unpublished public document.

“Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Local School Board of the [Municipality of A] held on January 21, 2011 at 3:00PM at the Office of the Municipal Mayor.” Unpublished public document.

“Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Local School Board of the [Municipality of A] held on May 24, 2011 at 1:00PM at the Office of the Municipal Mayor.” Unpublished public document.

“Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Local School Board of the [Municipality of A] held on June 3, 2011 at 9:00PM at the Office of the Municipal Mayor.” Unpublished public document.

“Municipal Development Plan, Year 2011 to 2013” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Municipal Integrated Area/Community Public Safety Plan (IA/CPSP), For the Year 2010” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Municipal Integrated Area/Community Public Safety Plan (IA/CPSP), For the Year 2011” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Municipal Profile 2011” [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document.

“Municipal School Board Resolution No. 1, A Resolution Approving the Budget for Priority Education Projects in the Municipal School Board of [Municipality of B].” 10 February 2010. Unpublished public document.

“Municipal School Board Resolution No. 1, A Resolution Approving the Budget for Priority Education Projects in the Municipal School Board of [Municipality of B].” 01 March 2011. Unpublished public document.

“[Municipality of A] Integrated Area/Community Public Safety Plan, For the Year 2011.”
Unpublished public document.

“[Municipality of A] Integrated Area/Community Public Safety Plan, For the Year 2010.”
Unpublished public document.

Ocenar, R.D. & Martir R. L (2002). “The Integrated Area Development Program in Irosin, Sorsogon.” In Tapales, P. D., Cuaresma, J. C., & Cabo, W. L. (Eds), Local Government in the Philippines: A Book of Readings, Volume II, Current Issues in Governance (pp. 399-449), Philippines: Center for Local and Regional Governance (CLRG), National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP)

Pant, M. (2005). “The quest for inclusion: Nomadic communities and Citizenship questions in Rajasthan.” In Kabeer, N. (Ed.), Inclusive Citizenship (pp. 85-98). New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Peters, G. B. (1998). Comparative Politics, Theory and Methods. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Potutan, G., Schnitzler, W., Arnado, J., Janubas, L. & Holmer, R. (2000). “Urban Agriculture in Cagayan de Oro: A Favourable Response of City Government and NGOs.” <http://puvep.xu.edu.ph/publications/urban%20agriculture%20in%20cdo.pdf>. Accessed 1 December 2011

Punch, K. F. (2005). Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. London, Sage

Ramiro, L., Castillo, F., Tan-Torres, T., Torres, C., Tayag, J., Talampas, R. & Hawken, L. (2001). “Community Participation in Local Health Boards in a Decentralized Setting: Cases from the Philippines.” *Health Policy and Planning*; 16 (Suppl 2):61-69. http://heapol.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/16/suppl_2/61. Accessed 1 December 2011

Ritchie, J., and Lewis, J. (2003). Qualitative Research Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA., Sage

Rocamora, J. (2002). "Political Parties in Constitutional Reform." Institute for Popular Democracy, Spring 2002. <http://www.tni.org/article/political-parties-constitutional-reform>
Accessed 20 December 2011

Rondinelli, D. A. (1983). "Decentralization of Development Administration in East Africa. In: Rondinelli." D. A. & Cheema S. G. (Eds.), Decentralization and Development (pp. 77-126). California: SAGE Publications, Inc; India: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Rondinelli, D. A. & Cheema S. G. (1983). "Implementing Decentralization Policies: An Introduction." In Rondinelli, D. A. & Cheema S. G. (Eds.), Decentralization and Development (pp. 9-34). California: SAGE Publications, Inc; India: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Rubin, E. L. (2008). "The Dangers of Citizenship." In Ciprut, J. V. (Ed), The Future of Citizenship (pp. 287-310). London: The MIT Press

"Salient Points Taken During the Expanded Municipal Development Council Meeting of the [Municipality of A], held at the Function Hall, 3rd Floor Municipal Building on October 01, 2010." Unpublished public document.

"Salient Points Taken During the Expanded Municipal Development Council Meeting of the [Municipality of A], held at the Function Hall, 3rd Floor Municipal Building on August 12, 2009." Unpublished public document.

Santiago, E. V. & Juaquin, M. E. T. "The Balilihan Countryside Action Program (2002)." In Tapales, P. D., Cuaresma, J. C., & Cabo, W. L. (Eds), Local Government in the Philippines: A Book of Readings, Volume II, Current Issues in Governance (pp. 451-484), Philippines: Center for Local and Regional Governance (CLRG), National College of Public Administration and Governance (NCPAG), University of the Philippines (UP)

Santos, M. (2012, January 3). "Over 248,000 crimes reported in 2011 – PNP." Philippine Daily Inquirer. Retrieved from <http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/121753/over-248000-crimes-reported-in-2011%E2%80%9494pnp>

Schmidt, C. (2004). "The Analysis of Semi-structured Interviews." In Flick, U., von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (Eds), A Companion to Qualitative Research. SAGE http://sdhprc.ir/download/A_Companion_to_qualitative_research.pdf#page=268 Accessed 28 August 2012

Sidel, J. T. (2004). "Bossism and Democracy in the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia: Towards an Alternative Framework for the Study of 'Local Strongmen'." <http://www.uio.no/studier/emner/sv/iss/SGO2400/h05/undervisningsmateriale/Sidel.pdf> Accessed on 21 December 2011

Smith, B. C. (1985). Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of the State. UK: George Allen and Unwin (Publishers) Ltd.

Snavely, K., & Desai, U. (2001). "Mapping local government-nongovernmental organization interactions: A conceptual framework." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 11(2), 245-264. <http://jpart.oxfordjournals.org.ezproxy.canterbury.ac.nz/content/11/2/245.full.pdf+html> Accessed 29 November 2011

Songco, D. A. (2006). "The Evaluation of NGO Accountability Practices and their Implications on Philippine NGOs." Philippine Council for NGO Certification. 2006. <http://www.hapinternational.org/pool/files/philippines-evolution-of-ngo-accountability-implications.pdf> Accessed 27 September 2011

"State of Local Governance Report (SLGR) CY 2010" [Municipality of B]. Unpublished public document

Suriyakumaran, C. (1996). "Devloution of Governance and Self-government in Sri Lanka." In Aziz, A. & Arnold, D. D. (Eds), Decentralized Governance in Asian Countries (pp. 239-254). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Ltd.; California: SAGE Publications Inc.; London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Taylor G. R. (2000). "Quantitative Research Method." In Taylor (Ed), Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research. Maryland: University Press of America; Oxford: University Press of America

Trumbull, M. (2000). "Qualitative Research Method." In Taylor (Ed), Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research. Maryland: University Press of America; Oxford: University Press of America

Tuaño P. (2011). "Philippine Non-Government Organizations (NGOs): Contributions, Capacities, Challenges." In Yu Jose, L. N. (Ed.), Civil Society Organizations in the Philippines, A Mapping and Strategic Assessment, Civil Society Resource Institute (CSRI) (pp. 9-46), Philippines. http://www.usaid.gov/development/economic/civil_society/philippines/cso-mapping-assessment.pdf Accessed 13 May 2011

Webler, T., & Tuler, S. (2000). "Fairness and competence in citizen participation." *Administration & Society*, 32(5), 566. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.124.5127&rep=rep1&type=pdf> Accessed 9 November 2011

Wengraf, T. (2001). Qualitative Research Interviewing. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage

White, S. C. (1999). "NGOs, civil society, and the state in Bangladesh: The politics of representing the poor." *Development and change*, 30(2), 307-326. http://www.hks.harvard.edu/hauser/PDF_XLS/AccountAndRep/11-Bangladesh-White-NGOs%20CS%20and%20State-1999.pdf Accessed 29 November 2011

Work, R (2002). "Overview of Decentralization Worldwide: A Stepping Stone to Improved Governance and Human Development." United Nations Development Programme. <http://biblioteca.unmsm.edu.pe/redlieds/Recursos/archivos/gestionestado/overview-decentralization-worldwide-paper.pdf>. Accessed 28 November 2011