

J.P.E.
492-0304
DT
4/18/83

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT
OF RSC/CDAP ON CITY GOVERNMENT

PERLA E. LEGASPI

June 7, 1982

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF RSC/CDAP
ON CITY GOVERNMENT

Summary of Findings

I. General Planning and Development Capabilities

1. The RSC/CDAP program has not expanded the general planning capabilities of city governments.

The cities under review were participants in the Urban Development Program of the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development. As such, they had already a planning structure with a planning and development staff even before the existence of the CDAP program. The CPDS in this case, had been exposed to the planning process long enough to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge in planning before the cities joined the RSC/CDAP program.

2. The focus of the planning process has been shifted from the city level to the barangay level.

Under the CDAP program, the planning process starts at the barangay level where a situational analysis of the barangay is made and the identification of the "poorest of the poor" segment of the community is conducted. This identified target group is responsible for the drawing up of projects to be undertaken by themselves. There is active involvement of target beneficiaries in the identification and selection of projects. /³The role of the CPDS has been broadened -- from planners to project implementors.

Under CDAP operations, the CPDS does not only prepare and formulate plans but implements projects as well. They

can now monitor and supervise projects more clearly. Nevertheless, the CPD has not established a monitoring/evaluation scheme for projects.

II. Institutionalization of RSC/CDAP Processes and Procedures

1. RSC reimbursements are usually delayed which affects the prosecution of other projects.

City governments are constrained financially to implement projects because of more complex and bigger demands from the city residents. As such, the city treasurer has to wait for reimbursements of projects before releasing some amount of money to start with the implementation of other projects. Inasmuch as reimbursements are usually delayed, the implementation of other projects are also delayed.

2. The "seed" money has lost its import and is no longer necessary.

The "seed" money has not been helpful to the city governments. Most of the time, the "seed" money has reached the city governments when projects are already in full swing.

3. Approval of projects at the RSC has been delayed such that people at the barangay level has lost their interests in the projects.

The delays in the approval of projects at the RSC has a devastating effect on gaining the confidence and trust of the people in the CPDS and in the city government for the prosecution of social action projects. Most of the time, the city government has to wait for word from Manila which does not come for sometime. This situation indicates the lack of communication system between RSC and the city governments.

4. The CPDS needs further skills training to make them more effective in their work.

There is a need to upgrade the skills of the CPDS in the preparation of project designs, project monitoring and evaluation and community organizing. As found out, the staff has difficulties in coming up with good project designs. The CPDS does not also follow any monitoring nor evaluation scheme for projects. Moreover, the CPDS has encountered difficulties in the initial stage of group/association formation because the staff does not know how to integrate themselves with the poor.

5. The city governments have been operating the program without RSC guidance.

In terms of the provision of direct consultancy services most especially in the preparation of project designs and project implementation, the guidance/assistance of the RSC is not felt at the city level. No follow-ups are conducted to know whether the skills and knowledge acquired from the training programs provided by RSC, are being applied in actual operations. No field visits are also made by RSC staff to look into the implementation of projects.

III. RSC/CDAP Operations Within the Context of People's Social Action Projects

1. The CPDS office is undermanned.

The CPDS has a limited work force which ranges from 9 - 21 personnel. Inasmuch as the staff performs various functions and responsibilities, e.g., formulation and execution of development plans and programs of the city; coordina-

tion with other national line agencies in the integration of plans and programs; and coordination in the implementation of programs/projects in the city such as BLISS, KKK, BWP, etc., the CPDS cannot work full-time on social action projects. The prosecution then of projects is on a limited scale.

2. The CPDS is not field-oriented.

The staff do not go to the field regularly for a number of reasons. First, the pressure of work at the office prevents them from going to the field regularly. Second, the staff are not given any stipend nor allowances for fieldwork. Third, there is no internalization of the concept of participation and the relevant poverty issues attendant to it.

3. Generally, the process of group formation, the identification of the target group and the selection of viable projects by the beneficiaries themselves, is not adhered to, by the CPDS at the barangay level.

In some barangays, the beneficiaries of projects do not belong to the poorest segment in the community. This may be due to the fact that the selection of beneficiaries was done by the barangay captain.

In some cities, the identification and selection of projects is done by the CPDS. Projects on livestock dispersal, sewing machines, and the like are cases of "dole-out" where the beneficiaries just receive the commodities.

4. There is a need to develop the capabilities of target beneficiaries.

In order to make the associations of the poor viable, the capabilities of the members must be developed and upgraded.

Of particular importance is the training on leadership, group dynamics and simple management procedures.

IV. Attitudinal Impact

1. There is no awareness of CDAP program/operations among city officials, e.g., mayor, vice-mayor, Sangguniang Panglungsod members, treasurer, etc.

Generally, the city officials do not know the objective/thrust or primary concern of CDAP. Nonetheless, many officials know that the city government has been appropriating funds for the implementation of projects on FAR basis. They even acknowledge the financial assistance given to the city government by RSC/CDAP.

2. The influence of RSC program is seen at the nature of project funded out of local financial resources.

Before the introduction of RSC, majority of the prosecuted projects were on infrastructure. Under the CDAP program, more local projects are non-infra or income-generating. The emphasis on non-infra is very evident. However, this is attributed more to the requirements of the CDAP program which enable the cities to get financial assistance, rather than to the concern on equity issues or participation by the city government administration.

3. Appropriations for social action projects have increased from 1979-1982.

Generally, the appropriations for social action projects have increased considerably through the years. The budgetary trend is to allot a bigger amount for income-generating projects as exemplified in the case of Iriga. However, the

effect/influence of the program on the city government seems to be superficial. The city governments have appropriated a big amount for social action projects primarily because they get reimbursements and not because the city officials are more concerned with the issues of poverty, equity and participation.

Methodology

The CDAP cities under review are Legazpi, Iriga, Naga and Lipa. San Pablo, a non-CDAP city, is included in the list to have a wider context than the CDAP cities.

Data-gathering was done primarily through interviews with city officials, i.e., mayor, vice-mayor, some members of the Sangguniang Panglungsod, city treasurer and budget officer, and with the CPDS of each city, i.e., city development coordinator, social action officers, training officer and sociologist. Interviews were also conducted with RSC officials, Mr. Pabs Pañares, the director, and Miss Amy Calda, staff member.

The evaluator went to some barangays in each city to visit some project sites and to interview some beneficiaries of projects. In Legazpi, the evaluator visited a needlecraft project and was able to interview the business manager of the "Association of the Poor" as well as some members. In Iriga, barangay San Nicolas was visited to see a rabbit-raising project and a waterworks system. In Naga City, the evaluator was fortunate to go to two barangays, Calauag and San Felipe, to talk to some beneficiaries of several projects -- communal poultry raising, vegetable raising, goat dispersal and sewing machines. The evaluator also went to the site of the projects on sewing machines and cattle-fattening in Lipa City. The insights gathered in the field were of tremendous help to the evaluator.

Aside from primary data, secondary data were used. Planning documents were analyzed such as the framework plan prepared before the introduction of the CDAP program and the social action development plan with the annual implementation plan. The budget of each city from 1979-1982, was also scrutinized. The existing organizational and functional charts of each CPDS office were examined together with the plantilla of personnel in order to know the present qualifications, work experience and training programs/courses attended by each staff member. The functions and responsibilities of each staff were gathered through their PDF forms in addition to the interviews held with the staff. The files of the Secretary to the Sangguniang Panglungsod were also looked into to know the resolutions passed by the Sangguniang Panglungsod pertinent to the planning and implementation of social action projects.

The evaluator also made use of the evaluation reports prepared by Morton J. Tenzer in September 1980 and James B. Mayfield in November of 1981.

A briefing session was held with Mr. Randy Cummings, Project Officer of USAID/Philippines where he explained and discussed the background and the rationale of the CDAP program vis-a-vis the PDAP program.

Impact of RSC/CDAP

1. General Planning and Development Capabilities

Before the entry of the CDAP Program into the local scene, the cities of Legaspi, Iriga, Naga and Lipa were all involved in the Urban Development Program (UDP) of the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development. As participant cities, they were required to create the City Planning and Development Board/Council to serve as a planning body charged with the powers and functions of preparing a comprehensive and integrated development plan/program designed to achieve an effective employment or utilization of physical human and other resources of the city. As part of the requirements, the cities had also to establish a City Planning and Development Office with at least 8 core positions, namely: 1) City Development Coordinator; 2) City Urban Planner; 3) Economist; 4) Fiscal Analyst; 5) Project Analyst; 6) Statistician; 7) Sociologist; and 8) Management Specialist.

The CPDS serves as the technical arm of the Planning Board/Council by providing support and assistance in the formulation and preparation of a comprehensive plan/program for the city; assisting in the formulation of development policies and objectives; assessing the needs and potentials of the city through community surveys; and providing technical assistance and services to other offices relative to urban development planning.

Personnel Complement

Basically, the composition of the CPDS has not changed much since the inception of the CDAP program. In Naga, a training officer has been added to the core staff as well as some administrative support staff such as stenographer, statistical aide, draftsman, clerk and driver or utility worker, making a total force of 17 personnel. On the other hand, Legazpi City has a total work force of 21, 9 of whom belong to the administrative support staff and the rest are technical personnel, including 1 Sr. Planning Officer. In Iriga City, the staff is composed of 16 personnel, 7 of whom are administrative employees. The CPDS office has a City Agriculturist which is not present in the other cities. Lipa has the least number of personnel. There are only 9 staff members to man the CPDS office.

Generally, the CPDS of each city possess the necessary qualifications called for by their respective positions. With the exception of the CDC of Naga who joined the CPDS in 1980 due to the change in political leadership in the city, they also have the work experience considering the fact that most of them have been with the planning staff since 1975.

However, the qualifications of the staff members holding the position of "sociologist" are open to questions. It appears from the plantilla of personnel that the sociologist of Legazpi City is the only one with a degree on Sociology, whereas, two sociologists are holders of a degree of Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education and

one is a Bachelor of Arts degree holder; major in English. The Orientation then of these three personnel is quite different from the kind of work orientation called for by the position of a "sociologist" within the context of people participation in projects.

Plans and Programs/Projects

As part of the requirements of the UDP, the four cities were able to come up with a framework plan before 1977 based on a socio-economic profile prepared by the CFDS. Community surveys were conducted in the preparation of the said profile. The existence of these planning documents show that the CPDS has already been exposed to the planning process and has acquired the planning skills to a certain extent even before the cities joined the RSC/CDAP program.

A look at the framework plans of the cities under the UDP reveals that there were enunciated policies of the city governments to increase rural income through the implementation of certain programs, i.e., cottage industries, expanded fish program, livestock, etc., designed to generate income among the residents, particularly those people residing in the villages (barangays). The City of Naga for instance had recognized the lack of economic opportunities in the rural areas, hence, the city government had stated in its policy guidelines the prioritization of programs/projects in giving opportunity to the lower-middle and low income groups of the community. Towards this end, the city government had prioritized the implementation ^{of} agriculturally - based projects such as animal dispersal for livestock and poultry and vegetable project. This holds true with the City of Legazpi where

social welfare and community development was said to be oriented towards the concept of people-government participation. Along this line, several programs/projects were lined up such as hog and rabbit dispersal, fishpond project, demonstration farms on Masagana 99, etc. Likewise, cognizant of increasing/supporting the farmer's income, the city governments of Iriga and Lipa had enunciated policies on:

- 1) giving massive local government support to the livestock dispersal programs of national agencies based in the city;
- 2) encouraging the development and/or revival of indigenous craftsmanship, culture, handicrafts, etc.

Programs/projects, i.e., hog dispersal, cattle fattening, sinamay weaving, etc. were then proposed to be implemented. Although the above-mentioned projects are income-generating, these are not considered to be local projects in the sense that these are not funded and implemented solely by the city government. These projects are funded by the national agencies located within the jurisdictional area of the city government; hence, they are the main responsibilities of the national agencies. For instance, the development of cottage industries is being implemented by NACIDA; the setting up of demonstration farms and livestock dispersal are being implemented by the Ministry of Agrarian Reform; and the fishpond projects by the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources. The role of the city government is just supportive in nature such as conducting massive information campaign in the barangays and by encouraging the residents to engage in such kind of projects. This does not mean, however, that the city governments do not prosecute their own local projects. They do implement some but

these projects are more on infrastructure such as construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, markets and slaughterhouse, barangay centers and the like. The funding of these projects is taken from the 20% development fund of the city. A cursory glance at the expenditures from the development fund would show, however, that this fund is not only spent for infrastructure projects but used also for political purposes such as the holding of referendums and the development of barangay brigades.

What is discernible at this point is the kind of projects being implemented by the city government under the CDAP program. The emphasis is shifted from infrastructure projects to income-generating or social action development projects as shown in the list below:

<u>City</u>	<u>Projects</u>
Naga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manpower Skills Development Training - Community Assistance: Sewing Machines - Health & Nutrition Center - Livestocks Animal Chain Dispersal Program - Community Vegetable Project - Community Poultry Raising - Carabao Chain Dispersal - Cottage Industry Development Program
Iriga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deep Well - Rabbit Raising - Motor Pool - Motor Supply System - Ginger Production - Local Resources Development Center
Legazpi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sanitary Toilet Construction - Needlecraft: Distribution of Sewing Machines - Saraodan sa Barangay (Buy and Sell) - Repacking Project - Skills Training for Battery-Making, Repairs & Maintenance - Management Skills Training - Bagoong Processing - Hollow Blocks Manufacturing

- Lipa
- Sewing and needlecraft
 - Carpentry & Masonry
 - Livestock Raising
 - Social Action Mobile Service Center
 - Construction & Improvement of Water System
 - Self Employment Assistance, e.g. Buy & Sell, Sari-Sari Store and Cattle Fattening

The listed projects are planned and implemented by the city government, financed and assisted by local and RSC/CDAP funds respectively.

Planning & Implementation Activities

As mentioned earlier, the CPDS has been engaged in planning activities since 1975. It appears however, that the kind of approach used in the planning process under the UDP is different from the approach emphasized and utilized by the CPDS under the CDAP program.

Under the UDP, the formulation of a comprehensive development plan/program follows the following steps:

- 1) The CPDS conducts a community survey to assess the city's needs/problems and potentials.
- 2) Based on the surveys, the staff prepares a socio-economic profile of the city, a document which contains the physical, demographic, social, economic and political/administrative characteristics of the area.
- 3) Working on the basis of the profile, the staff makes a situational analysis of the area.
- 4) Plans, programs and projects are drawn up based on the situational analysis of the area.

During the formulation of the framework plan, task forces were created and under each, several sub-sectors were formed. These forces and sub-sectors were composed of representatives from the line agencies

operating within the city and representatives from the private sector, such as civic/religious organization, business and agricultural sector, etc.

In the case of Naga, a Barangay Planning Seminar-Workshop was conducted by the CPDS, the output of which was a barangay framework plan which was later on inputed to the whole planning process. There was some kind of a barangay participation in the planning process.

If we look at the whole process, it could be noted that there was participation from both government and private sectors in the preparation of the comprehensive development plan, although the drawing up of programs/projects was based on the perception of situational needs/priorities of the representatives comprising the task forces.

Thus, under the UDP, the identification of programs/projects was done at the city level and was not brought down to the barangay level where target beneficiaries were supposed to identify their own projects based on their own perception of needs and priorities. This seems to be the significant difference in the planning approach/strategy being used under the CDAP program. Following the CDAP approach, the CPDS makes a situational analysis of the barangay where the "poorest of the poor" segment of the barangay is identified. This identified target group is responsible for drawing up the projects to be undertaken through an association formed by themselves, with the assistance of the CPDS. The emphasis then under the CDAP approach is the active involvement of target beneficiaries in the identification and selection of projects to be undertaken by themselves.

Again in the implementation of projects, a difference appears to loom large before and after the city governments joined the CDAP program. As has been mentioned, the programs/projects listed in the framework plans in all the four (4) cities are sectoral programs/projects. As such, they are implemented primarily by the national

line agencies within their areas of concern. The city government has a very limited role in the implementation of such projects, primarily because the city executive does not exercise any supervision and control over these offices. Secondly, the projects are funded by national agencies. The most that the city government can do is to monitor the progress of the projects. The CPDS just coordinates and monitors the implementation of these projects. A different situation occurs under the auspices of the CDAP program where the implementation of social action development projects are within the control and supervision of the city government. Under this condition, the CPDS are the implementors of projects and they can monitor and evaluate projects more closely. The staff can introduce a lot of innovations/changes into the project/program as it progresses. However, it is sad to note that in all the cities, the CPDS has not established a monitoring/evaluation scheme for social action projects. What the staff does is to attend meetings of village associations once in a while and would depend on the minutes/records kept by the secretary of the association. The CDC gets a verbal report on the status of social action projects from the various action officers during staff meetings. Sometimes, when a problem crops up, the officers of the barangay association go to the CPDS office and get the advice of the action officer concerned or the CDC himself. All of these activities are done unsystematically.

Moreover, none of the CPDS of the 3 cities of the Bicol region has done an evaluation of projects. To a limited extent, Lipa has attempted to assess the problems in the implementation of projects through the use of questionnaires. Whether the projects have attained their objectives or not, whether the projects have a socio-economic

not know.

II. Institutionalization of the RSC/CDAP Processes and Procedure

A lot of procedures are required of cities in the CDAP program. For one, the city governments have to put up a counterpart fund for the social action projects and the RSC/CDAP reimburses the amount. A "seed" money (15%) is also provided by RSC to start the implementation of the project. As found out, these procedures have initially affected the operations of the city governments. Reimbursements are usually delayed and this affects the prosecution of other projects lined up for implementation. City governments are constrained financially to implement projects because of complex and bigger demands from the city residents. Thus, the city treasurer has to wait for reimbursements before releasing some amount of money to start with the implementation of other projects. The "seed" money has not been helpful. Most of the time, the "seed" money has reached the city governments when projects are already in full blast. In this case, the "seed" money loses its import and is no longer necessary. However, an innovation has been made to more or less minimize the problems encountered in the reimbursement and seed money procedures. What the city governments have done so far is to establish "trust funds" for social action projects. Reimbursements are kept as "trust funds" and do not go to the general fund of the city governments. In this way, the implementation of social action projects are not delayed.

At the CPDS level, some procedures are required of the staff members such as the following:

- 1) Preparation and submission of Social Action Development Plan which should be updated every year;
- 2) Submission of an Annual Implementation Plan, accompanied by a resolution of the Sangguniang Panglungsod and the corresponding appropriated amount for projects;

- 3) Submission of individual projects proposals. A proposal would include a pre-implementation picture of the project based on a socio-economic profile of the barangay; a resolution of the barangay council; and a profile/list of members and officers of the formed association. If the project is on infrastructure, the plans and specifications or a feasibility study of the project is required.

Apparently, the CPDS follows/adheres to the above-mentioned requirements. Sometimes deviations are made in order to suit local needs and conditions. Nevertheless, some project proposals are not approved by the RSC because of certain deficiencies. Naga for example was not able to submit four project proposals in 1981 because certain requirements were not complied with. The lease contracts for the proposed sugar plantation and communal piggery projects are still under negotiations; hence, the non-compliance. On the other hand, the city of Legazpi has met the requirements and has submitted project proposals to RSC for approval. At the RSC's end, approval of project has been delayed such that people at the barangay level has lost their interests in the projects. This has a devastating effect on getting the confidence and trust of the people in the CPDS and in the city government for the prosecution of projects designed supposedly for improving the lot of the disadvantaged groups. Most of the time, the city government has to wait for word from Manila which does not come for sometime. This situation indicates the lack of communication system between RSC and the city governments.

At this juncture, a question is raised as to whether project designs or feasibility studies should emphasize the technical/financial aspects of projects or whether stress should be made on social sound-

ness analysis? Based on the comments of the staff, the CDAP requirements fall along the technical side of projects rather than on the social aspects of projects. This might run counter to the concept of "people participation" which is the orientation of the whole program.

The CPDS of Iriga looks at the preparation of project proposals as burdensome on their part, most especially on the preparation of feasibility studies. Despite changes in the requirements where projects costing less than ₱100,000.00 no longer need feasibility studies, project designs are still required. The staff finds difficulty in preparing designs which delays the submission of proposals to RSC. To them, small projects costing around ₱10,000.00 - ₱20,000.00 should no longer require a more detailed technical project design. Requirements then should be based on the type/kind or size of the project.

Technical Assistance Provided by RSC

RSC provides the city governments with assistance on training programs for staff development, foremost of which is the package development training program which deals on the preparation of feasibility studies, social action development plans, socio-economic profile and orientation on the CDAP concept. Specialized courses are also given such as social planning, developing social indicators, project planning and management, and rural enterprise development. Consultancy services are provided in local financial management and in community participation by the American consultants of the program.

According to the CPDS, assistance in training programs and consultancy services has helped improved their capability. It has boosted their confidence in their jobs with the acquired skills and knowledge. For one, some staff members have been trained in preparing feasibility

studies. However, demands of their work point to the deficiencies in the preparation of project designs. As mentioned, some social action projects do not need feasibility studies but just project designs and it is in this area where the staff has difficulties in coming up with good project designs.

A cursory glance at the list of training programs/courses attended by the CPDS reveals that a lot of training programs/courses have already been attended by the staff. Some of these are on development planning, project management, training trainers, future leaders program, project feasibility study and community development for people's participation. Despite the exposure to these courses, the CPDS still needs some skills development on particular areas of project management to make them more effective in their work. Of particular importance is the upgrading of their skills in project monitoring and evaluation. As found out, the CPDS does not follow any monitoring nor evaluation scheme for projects. There is a need to identify critical feedback elements at key levels during program implementation stage as well as the need to review decisions and to make follow-ups at key levels. At this point, development of skills in financial management and control and benefit-monitoring system would be of tremendous help to the staff.

Another deficiency exists in the evaluation of projects. Practically all of the staff do not have any training/orientation on program evaluation and they do not really do any "honest to goodness" evaluation of projects in the field. A training then on this area is called for. Perhaps some selected beneficiaries can attend the training together with the staff in order for them to get the necessary skills in evaluation, in preparation for the phasing-out of the operations of the CPDS in their respective projects. This would provide the mechanism for the identification of beneficiaries with the CPDS.

The Need for RSC/CDAP Guidance/Support

At this point in time, is there still a need for support from RSC/CDAP? If we take support to mean provision of assistance in the form of training programs/courses for CPDS and target clientele, then, there is a need for a continued support from RSC. This is one area where RSC can help in the upgrading of skills and knowledge of the CPDS.

In terms of the provision of direct consultancy services most especially in the preparation of project designs and project implementation, the assistance of the RSC is not felt at the local level. After the training, no follow-ups are conducted to know whether the skills and knowledge acquired from the training are being applied in actual operations. There are no field visits made by RSC to look into the implementation of projects. What the RSC staff does is to look at the project proposals submitted and determine whether all the requirements pertinent to the proposals are met. But even then, delays in the approval of projects are experienced by cities. The delays are attributed more to the Manila staff rather than to the non-compliance of certain requirements by the CPDS. Under these conditions, there is no meaningful guidance from the RSC staff. It can be said then that the cities have been operating the program without RSC guidance.

Nevertheless, this situation can be improved. A more open communication system between RSC and the CPDS should be established such that the approval or disapproval of projects would be relayed/disseminated immediately to the CPDS. In this way, the local staff would be able to know whatever deficiencies exist in the proposals.

III. RSC/CDAP Operations within the Context of People's Social Action Projects

The whole CDAP operations is anchored on a development strategy/ approach -- the involvement/participation of the "poorest of the poor" in the barangay in income-generating projects (social action projects in CDAP parlance) designed to improve their socio-economic status in the community. This approach as operationalized by the CPDS at the barangay level, adheres to the following process: 1) identification of the target groups in the barangay -- the "poorest of the poor", based on a survey conducted by the CPDS; 2) dialogues or meetings conducted by the CPDS with the target beneficiaries re CDAP program; 3) group formation-beneficiaries form themselves into an association of the poor; 4) identification of problems with corresponding solutions; 5) listing of possible projects; 6) CPDS sets guidelines for viable projects; and 7) implementation of selected viable projects.

The whole process stresses the involvement of the beneficiaries from project conceptualization to project implementation and it likewise highlights the critical role of the CPDS in implementing such kind of a development strategy at the barangay level.

Inasmuch as the CPDS are the implementors of the participation strategy, an assessment of their role in social action projects is called for.

Staff Component and Work Load in Social Action Projects

The CPDS performs various functions and responsibilities relative to city government operations. Some of these functions center on the preparation, formulation and execution of development plans and

programs of the city; coordination with other national line agencies in the integration of plans and programs as well as coordination in the implementation of programs/projects within the city, such as RWP, BLISS, KKK, etc.; zoning administration; and the prosecution of social action projects under RSC/CDAP program. Considering that the CPDS has a limited work force which ranges from 17 - 21 personnel, one wonders how the staff can meet all of the demands of their respective jobs. On the whole, the CPDS office is understaffed.

Based on interviews and PDF forms, not all of the staff are directly involved in social action projects. In Naga for example, only two of the staff members (sociologist and training officer) are actively involved in social action projects particularly in the formation of organizations/associations in the barangays. Nevertheless, some of the staff, i.e., urban planner and economist, assist in the preparation of project designs or feasibility studies. In Legazpi, staff members are assigned as action officers of projects. As such, they are held responsible for their own respective projects. Naga, on the other hand, has three technical staff directly involved in CDAP projects. Other staff members help or prepare project designs and feasibility studies. Similarly, Lipa has only two staff members assigned as social action officers.

It can be noted from the above that the CPDS has a limited number of personnel to work full-time on social action projects. This problem hampers the implementation of projects such that projects are prosecuted on a limited scale.

Are the staff field-oriented? Interviews with the CPDS and beneficiaries reveal that the staff do not go to the field regularly. At the initial stage of group/association formation, the staff or

action officers are with the beneficiaries quite often. But at the later stage of project implementation, they are no longer visible in the barangays.

A number of reasons are given for this lack of field orientation. First, the staff are saddled with so much work at the office which prevents them from going to the field regularly. Second, the staff are not given any stipend nor allowances in going to the barangays. This lack of incentives does not motivate them for field work. At this point, it may be worthwhile to mention here that the staff of Iriga are given per diems in the amount of ₱15.00/day in going to the project sites. Thus, comparatively speaking, the staff of Iriga are seen more often in project sites than the other staff members of other cities. The third reason has something to do with "commitment." Is there an internalization of the concept of participation and the relevant poverty issues attendant to it? Apparently, the staff members have not yet internalized equity/poverty issues which would have propelled them to work for the betterment of the disadvantaged group. It may be important to point out here that the CPDS had been exposed to city government operations as technical staff and not as implementors of projects. As such they had not been exposed to the implementation of projects which requires field work. Their role now in social action projects is seen in a different context.

Formation of Village Associations

Under CDAP operations, an association of the poor is required to be formed before a project can be implemented. Thus, the number of associations formed would depend on the number of projects imple-

mented in the barangay. However, the number of associations is not as important as the process of group formation. What is critical in the operationalization of the participation concept is how the association is formed or organized. For it is in the process which gives meaning to people involvement/participation.

The Process. Usually the CPDS follows a similar pattern in facilitating the organization of the poor in the barangay. For purposes of illustrating the process, the experience of Legazpi and Naga is cited.

The CPDS of Legazpi programs the visitations to selected barangays four months before the onset of the new calendar year. A team composed of the social worker, sociologist and management analyst - schedules the meetings in one barangay with the permission of the barangay captain. The latter is requested to invite the poorest member of his barangay to these meetings.

The first meeting usually starts with a situational analysis of the barangay. Information on per capita income, employment patterns and opportunities, total number of households, number of skilled and non-skilled workers, resources available, etc. are presented to the target group. This is followed by the identification of their own problems. A brainstorming session led by the CPDS team, takes place where people are asked for solutions. The list of solutions is done at the blackboard where everybody can see. A number of possible projects are enumerated and analyzed. The H:-10 Index of Analysis is then made on the projects using the criteria of number of beneficiaries, resources and commitment. As the clientele zeros in on one project to be implemented, the CPDS team facilitates the formation of an association comprising the beneficiaries of the project. The design-

ing of the project and the preparation of feasibility studies are done by the staff since the beneficiaries lack the necessary skills and knowledge. The process of project conceptualization to project implementation takes almost a year.

In the case of Naga, the experience is quite different. The fieldworker from the CPDS asks data on "poverty level" and household characteristics of the area from the barangay captain. The latter identifies the families who belong to the "poorest among the poor" in the barangay. In a meeting called for by the barangay captain, the field worker/staff briefs the beneficiaries on the CDAP program and how the project (previously selected by the CPDS) would be implemented.

Comparing the two cases, it seems that the experience of Legazpi is more attuned to the concept of people participation than that of Naga. What is distressing in the Naga case is the selection of the kind of project to be implemented in the barangay. The CPDS identifies and selects the project at the office and the barangay captain selects the beneficiaries. This clearly shows the non-involvement of the target beneficiaries in the whole process.

As revealed further in interviews with the beneficiaries of projects, the staff has encountered difficulties in the initial stages of group/association formation, primarily because the staff does not know how to integrate themselves with the poor. This is important in getting the trust and confidence of the poor. In Iriga for instance, it took almost three months for the beneficiaries of a rabbit-raising project to agree to group themselves together simply because they were wary of the intention of the staff. They even solicited the assistance of a nun to stay with them during meetings. It was only when the nun gave her go-signal that the beneficiaries grouped themselves into an association and agreed to start implementing the project.

What seems to be lacking then on the part of the CPDS are the skills on integration, an integral part of community organizing. This calls for a further training on community organizing which would make them more effective in fieldwork.

The Beneficiaries. In some barangays, the beneficiaries of projects do not belong to the poorest segment of the community. This may be due to the fact that the selection of beneficiaries was done by the barangay captain. In one of the barangays in Naga City, the beneficiaries appear to be well-off as indicated by their house structure. Moreover, the barangay beneficiaries are engaged in more than two social action projects provided by the city government. Thus, in one barangay, four projects -- communal piggery, vegetable raising, needlecraft, and goat dispersal -- benefit one selected group of beneficiaries. When asked why a situation exists, the CPDS explains that the barangay residents are very active, most especially the barangay captain in implementing all the projects. This kind of approach used by the CPDS is defeating the purpose of the whole exercise -- that of selecting the "poorest of the poor" and in turn giving to the people the opportunity to identify their own problems and implement viable projects within their own limitations and resources.

The rationale of the formation of groups/associations is for the beneficiaries themselves to manage/run their own affairs within the context of the project they are implementing. Since most of them are not learned, a lot of management problems within their own associations has been reported to the CPDS which calls for training on leadership, group dynamics as well as the development of skills on simple management procedures.

IV. Attitudinal Impact

Is there an awareness of CDAP program/operations among city officials, i.e., Mayor, Vice-Mayor, SP Members, Treasurer, etc.? If awareness would mean knowledge of objectives/thrust or primary concern of CDAP, then generally, the city officials are not aware of the program. However, many officials know that the city government has been appropriating funds for the implementation of projects on FAR basis. They acknowledge the financial assistance given to the city by RSC/CDAP.

To a certain extent, some city officials of Legazpi City are aware of the concern of the CDAP program. In interviews with two members of the Sangguniang Panglungsod, they stated that the projects being implemented in the city are now more concerned with participation where people are asked to be involved in the selection of projects. According to them, before the city government joined the CDAP program, the Sangguniang Panglungsod appropriated certain amount for projects which were conceived and prepared by the city officials/CPDS. But under the CDAP operations, the target clientele does the identification of problems and the selection of viable projects.

Although there is an awareness of the program as exemplified by the Legazpi's case, this is not pervasive among other officials of other cities.

Effect/Influence on City Administration

Is the concern of equity issues or participation felt at the city government level? If we look at the policies enunciated by the city administration, the concern on the socio-economic status of the poorest segment of the community is very evident as stated earlier in the report. Several programs/projects had been implemented, i.e.,

hog and poultry raising, green revolution, etc. before CDAP operations took place in the cities, to augment the meager income of the poor. But, the emphasis on people participation in projects was not evident.

The concern on participatory development is supposed to be operationalized at the barangay level under the CDAP program. But as found out, some cities do not let the concept of participation work where the barangay captain selects beneficiaries of projects (the beneficiaries may not belong to the disadvantaged group) and the CPDS selects the project to be implemented. This strategy is still remnant of the "dole-out" mentality.

The influence of RSC program is seen at the nature of project funded out of local financial resources. As mentioned earlier in the report, before the introduction of RSC, majority of the prosecuted projects were on infrastructure. Under the CDAP program, more local projects are non-infra or income-generating. The emphasis was shifted from infra to social action projects. This is attributed more to the requirements of the RSC program in order to partake of the financial assistance than to the concern on equity issues or participation by the city government administration.

Budgetary Allocation for Social Action Projects

The cities have appropriated considerable amount for social action projects. From 1979 - 1982, the appropriations vary from one city to another as shown below:

<u>C i t y</u>	<u>Amount of Appropriation*</u>			
	<u>1979</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>
Legazpi	₱ 151,233.55	₱ -	₱ -	₱ 657,000.00
Naga	229,124.60	110,000.00	444,850.00	-
Iriga	400,000.00	372,833.25	1,517,617.34	1,230,000.00
Lipa	192,598.90	190,598.88	290,248.60	254,131.20

*Taken from the files of the CPDS.

The above figures reveal that the appropriations for social action projects have increased considerably through the years. In the case of Naga, the appropriation for 1980 decreased but increased the following year. This may be attributed to the change in political leadership in the city in 1980. Based on an interview with the Assistant City Treasurer of Naga, around P200,000.00 was not spent in 1979 (during the time of the Sibulo administration) and was reverted to the general fund of the city. Iriga on the other hand, had a large amount of appropriation in 1979. But this was not spent for CDAP projects. It was only in 1980 when some of the appropriated amount was spent for social action projects. According to the coordinator, the Mayor appeared to be skeptical of the FAR scheme and was only convinced when the amount of P10,000.00 spent for a catwalk project was reimbursed immediately to the city government. Thus, in 1981, more than a million pesos was allotted for CDAP projects, taken from the infrastructure fund of the city government. Lipa had a lesser amount appropriated for projects, taken from its 20% development fund.

If we look at the budgetary trends, it's quite positive for the CDAP program. However, if we try to look further, the effect/influence of the program on the city government as far as the budgetary allocation is concerned, seems to be superficial. The city governments have appropriated a big amount for social action projects because of the reassurance that they get back more of what they have put in ^{to} the kitty. This is not due to the fact that the city officials have internalized the concept of participatory development and equity issues. This then does not present a bright picture for RSC/CDAP considering that the program has been in operation for almost five years now.

PSC/CDAP Directions

Should the program continue for another five years? Should the coverage be expanded to include more participant cities?

The concept of participatory development is laudable. However, there are many constraints/problems in the operationalization of the concept. For one, the process of group formation, the identification of the target group and the selection of viable projects by the beneficiaries themselves is not generally adhered to by the CPDS at the barangay level. Cases of "dole-out" are still evident in the giving of projects to the beneficiaries, e.g., livestock dispersal, sewing machines, etc., where the beneficiaries do not have the benefit of selecting and designing their own project. This is not participatory in the true essence of the word.

The program attempts to develop the capabilities of city governments but there is no conscious effort to develop as well the capabilities of the target beneficiaries. If the program would be continued for another five years, then attempts should be made towards developing the capabilities of the target clientele. It is not enough that the program works toward improving the capabilities of city governments in delivering the goods and services. What is also important at this point is to look at the recipients of these development efforts. If development is participatory in nature, then the target clientele should be assisted in upgrading/improving their capabilities in order for them to contribute more meaningfully to the whole developmental process.

The question of expanding the coverage of the program should be examined in the light of existing financial resources of city governments. Apparently, the program tends to help more the cities which

are financially capable of advancing certain amount for social action projects. Most participant cities in the program are classified as first and second class cities according to income. What about cities which lack the financial resources? The third, fourth or fifth class cities? Would they be left out simply because they cannot afford to put in something into the kitty? Shouldn't they be given the priority to receive such kind of assistance? The present scheme of the program tends to create more inequalities among cities and thus aggravates more the problem of polarization.