

**GOVERNANCE AND LOCAL DEMOCRACY (GOLD) SITES
INDICATOR RESULTS
1995, 1996 and 1997**

GOVERNANCE AND LOCAL DEMOCRACY PROJECT

February 1998

**Implementation of the Governance and Local Democracy Project
Project No 492-0471
Prepared by the Associates in Rural Development, Inc
Under Contract No 492-0471-C-00-5089-00
With USAID/Philippines**

This Report, "Governance and Local Democracy (GOLD) Sites Indicator Results 1995, 1996 and 1997," was made possible through support provided by the U S Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of the Governance and Local Democracy Project, Contract No 492-0471-C-00-5089-00. The report was written by Steven Rood, Policy and Indicators Measurement Specialist for ARD, Inc, which manages the GOLD Project. The opinions expressed herein are the author's, and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID.

**GOVERNANCE AND LOCAL DEMOCRACY (GOLD) SITES
INDICATOR RESULTS
1995, 1996 and 1997**

February 1998

USAID Strategic Objective

"Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies"

USAID Results Package in Support of the Strategic Objective

Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas

The Manila mission of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has set for itself a strategic objective, "Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies" In order to move towards this objective, a package of desired results was devised, which are summarized as representing "Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation" In order to produce this package of results, the Governance and Local Democracy (GOLD) Project is being undertaken This report summarizes three years of data collected to help indicate progress in producing the package of results, in pursuit of the larger strategic objective

BACKGROUND

The Governance and Local Democracy (GOLD) Project

The Local Government Code of 1991 actualized the Filipino people's commitment to democratic governance and sustainable development As an enabling instrument, that landmark legislation opened immense opportunities for local development initiatives and for greater community participation in governance In the years since the Code's implementation, communities and their local governments have responded with enthusiasm and creativeness, resulting in remarkable gains

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) wished to support activities in the area of democracy and governance, and thus designed the *Governance and Local Democracy (GOLD) Project* The Project is designed to demonstrate that local communities can, in fact, accelerate the development process and improve government performance in the delivery of services through a decentralized system of governance Consistent with the tenets of local autonomy, the GOLD Project hopes to achieve this through a strategy of *assisted self-reliance* and provision of technical support on a *demand-driven* basis Under this strategy, a local government seeks support in areas of concern that the community itself defines

The GOLD Project is implemented by the participating Local Government Units (LGUs) Providing service support to the LGUs are the project contractor, Associates in Rural

Development (ARD), Inc and NGO Grantees, Philippine Business for Social Progress and the Evelio B Javier Foundation CODE-NGO undertakes networking among non-government organizations with respect to the Local Government Code Implementation is coordinated and facilitated by a Project Steering Committee, which was in the past chaired by the National Economic and Development Authority, and is currently chaired by an officer of the League of Provinces The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Department of Interior and Local Government

The project concentrates its efforts on nine provinces and two cities These were selected for the project in two batches (see box) The GOLD Project strategy is to support these local communities in their efforts to

- Enhance participatory decision-making processes,
- Achieve improved performance in governmental operations,
- Strengthen supportive organizational linkages at the local community and national levels, and
- Address policy roadblocks that constrain local governance and development

The strategy is premised on *assisted self-reliance*--using external resources not so much to produce direct results as to strengthen local capacities to initiate and manage activities that benefit the community It means working with the public and private sectors on activities that bring about development It also means supporting local communities--their LGUs and NGOs--on a *demand-driven basis* i e , giving support in those areas where assistance is most needed as defined by the local communities themselves

GOLD Sites
<u>Since July 1995</u>
Nueva Vizcaya
Bulacan
Palawan
Capiz
Bohol
Cotabato Province
Sarangani
General Santos City
<u>Since May 1996</u>
Naga City
Negros Oriental
Lanao del Norte

GOLD Project activities fall under five general categories

- 1 Strengthening of Participatory Mechanisms,
- 2 Local Government Action Areas, which are
 - Financial mobilization and management,
 - Development investment prioritization and promotion, and
 - Environmental planning and management,
- 3 Support for the Leagues of Local Governments and NGO Networks,
- 4 Policy Support, and
- 5 Institutionalizing Communication, Replication and Feedback System

This report is part of the fifth activity, as it brings to the public results of indicator measurement efforts undertaken by the ARD/GOLD team These indicators focus on the first two activities Strengthening of Participatory Mechanisms, and Local Government Action Areas

Objectives, Results, and Performance Indicators

USAID in its activities worldwide is undertaking to "manage for results " This requires the agency to clearly identify both objectives and corresponding performance indicators to determine whether the objectives are being met

The USAID mission in Manila is pursuing its democracy and governance activities in support of a general "Strategic Objective "

- Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies

The GOLD Project itself is one set of activities aimed at the overall Strategic Objective. This particular set of activities is aimed at producing a more specific "Results Package "

- Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas

Given the abstract nature of these objectives and desired results, it took considerable effort to design indicators that would measure whether these were being achieved in the GOLD sites, and to track changes over time. The aim was a set of performance indicators that would, in a quantitative fashion, measure progress towards the intended results, in service of the stated Strategic Objective. In essence, a performance indicator is a dimension of the objective or results. There are many possible dimensions, and not all can be covered in a reasonable time, at reasonable expense, so some choice was needed.

The most important characteristic of indicators is that they are valid measure of objectives or results. Any indicator is just one measure of how well a particular activity is going. Beyond this, an indicator should be useful for managers in their assessment of progress, practical to measure, and (if possible), comparable to other measures being used within USAID. In order to designate the indicators, a series of activities was undertaken. Consultants from the United States were called in to assist in the effort.¹ They had a wide range of discussions both within USAID, and with persons involved in local governance in the Philippines. After their report was submitted in October 1995, meetings and workshops were held in Manila among USAID and ARD/GOLD personnel, and a final list of indicators was approved by USAID.

The indicators were grouped into two categories: whether they pertained to the overall Strategic Objective, or to the more specific "Results Package "

For the Strategic Objective, "Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies," the indicators are:

- The Percent of Citizens Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are Being Addressed by Local Government Units
- Number of NGO Representatives Actively Participating in Local Special Bodies (as mandated by the 1991 Local Government Code)

For the more specific Results Package, "Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas," seven indicators were defined:

¹ F. Richard Gaeta and Lawrence C. Heilman, "Recommendations for Performance Indicators for USAID/Philippines' Democracy and Governance Strategic Objectives" (Washington, D.C. Report Prepared by Management Systems International for The Office of Governance and Participation, USAID/Philippines, and Center for Democracy and Governance, USAID/Washington, October 1995)

- 1 The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Investment Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation
- 2 The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Environmental Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation
- 3 The Number of Target Local Government Units in which The LGU has a Monitoring System with NGO or PO Participation
- 4 The Number of Target Local Government Units in which Information Regarding Resources, Expenditures, and Operations is Available to The Citizenry
- 5 The Total Amount of National Revenues Allocated to Target Local Government Units
- 6 The Net Amount of Self-Generated Revenues Collected by Target Local Government Units
- 7 The Number of Target Local Government Units Securing Credit from For-Profit Institutions

In early 1996, the ARD/GOLD team worked with individuals and institutions in the GOLD sites in order to measure the indicators for each site for the 1995 reporting year. The process was repeated in early 1997 for 1996, and then in late 1997 for 1997. (The measurement round was moved to the end of the reporting year to increase the time period available for reporting the results to USAID/Manila.) The following sections describe the process of measurement, and the results obtained.

THE MEASUREMENT PROCESS

As part of its commitment to assisting local communities to achieve self-reliance, the ARD/GOLD technical team identified institutions in the GOLD sites (see box). To the greatest extent possible, these GOLD Site Research Institutions were chosen based on their commitment to the locality, and ability to accept research technology transfer. A number of the

GOLD Site Research Institutions
Aldersgate College (Nueva Vizcaya)
Social Weather Stations (for Bulacan)
Ateneo de Naga
Palawan NGO Network, Incorporated
Gerry Roxas Foundation (Roxas City, Capiz)
Divine Word College (Tagbilaran, Bohol)
Silliman University (Negros Oriental)
Mindanao State University—Iligan Institute of Technology (for Lanao del Norte)
Notre Dame College of Midsayap (Cotabato)
Mindanao State University—General Santos City (for Sarangani)
Business Resource Center (General Santos City)

research institutions were based in the academe, while in two provinces NGOs were tapped--the Palawan NGO Network, Inc and Gerry Roxas Foundation in Capiz.

The Social Weather Stations as the foremost independent academic survey organization in the Philippines, was tapped for technical assistance to the GOLD Site Research Institutions. For all GOLD project sites the sampling and question design methodology of Social Weather Stations was adopted to measure citizen sentiment. For Bulacan, Social Weather Stations was tapped to directly

undertake the survey. Having one site surveyed by Social Weather Stations itself provided a "control" to help insure the quality of work in all the GOLD Sites.

In 1996 and early 1997, individual consultants from around the country were contacted to provide technical assistance to these institutions to pursue research. By late 1997 GOLD Site Research Institutions were working together (e.g., researchers from Divine Word College in Tagbilaran went to Silliman and Gerry Roxas Foundation) to crosscheck institutional styles in survey research.

The ARD/GOLD team coordinated the efforts of the GOLD Site Research Institutions and their individual consultants

Workshops were held in January 1996, January 1997, and October 1997 (see box) These brought together representatives of the GOLD Site Research Institutions and other consultants The objective of the workshops was to insure a common understanding of the indicators, and of the research methodologies utilized to measure the indicators

Two general research strategies were followed in the GOLD sites First, a Social Weather Stations-style public opinion survey of 150 respondents in each site focused on how citizens (chosen by probability methods) viewed their local government Personnel from the Social Weather Stations trained GOLD Site Researchers for each round of indicator data gathering By late 1997, a series of manuals (for GOLD Site Research Institutions, for Field Interviewers, and for GOLD Site Trainers) had been developed by Social Weather Stations for distribution, in order to insure the sustainability of comparable survey data in the separate sites

The second strategy allowed the Gold Site Research Institutions to assess other indicators by utilizing key informant interviews, focused group discussions, and similar qualitative research techniques The definitions of these indicators were discussed in detail so that each GOLD site research institution would know how to evaluate the information from key informant interviews or focus group discussion In late 1997, when less focus was needed on the survey technology, more attention was given to these qualitative research techniques The Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs (CSP/PA) of Ateneo de Manila University was tapped to provide training on focus group discussion and key informant interviewing, and qualitative data analysis After the training workshop in October 1997, researchers from the CSP/PA assisted GOLD Site Research Institutions in late 1997 and early 1998 in analyzing the qualitative data that had been collected

The financial indicators, on the other hand, were gathered in Manila The Bureau of Local Government Finance of the Department of Finance collects Budget Operations Statements from local government units These Statements allow determination of national government revenues flowing to the localities, and the net revenue collected by the local governments In addition, the Philippine National Bank and Land Bank of the Philippines were asked how many local government units had secured credit from their institutions By October 1997 the borrowing behavior of local government units was being studied by the GOLD Site Research Institutions, for more accurate results

While the research was being undertaken in the first quarter of 1996 and 1997, ARD/GOLD personnel visited each research site, and coordinated work with the GOLD site research institutions and their individual consultants By late 1997, such close supervision was deemed not necessary as GOLD Site Research Institutions gained experience and capacity

<p style="text-align: center;">Three Rounds of Data Collection</p> <p>For 1995</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training Workshop in January 1996, involving Social Weather Stations• Data Collection in February 1996 <p>For 1996</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training Workshop in January 1997, involving Social Weather Stations• Data Collection in February 1997 <p>For 1997</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Training Workshop in October 1997 involving Social Weather Stations and Ateneo's CSP/PA• Data Collection in November-December 1997

As results were submitted to the ARD/GOLD office they were checked for consistency of methods and definitions. Generally, some questions were posed to the research institutions, and answers transmitted back, before both the ARD/GOLD team and the GOLD site research institutions were convinced of the accuracy of indicator results for the GOLD site.

This report consolidates indicator data for the 1995 and 1996 reporting years, as gathered in early 1996 and 1997, and the 1997 reporting year, as gathered in the last quarter of 1997.

In what follows a discussion and table are devoted to each indicator. The indicator is discussed, and a table presenting the site-level results for 1995, 1996, and 1997 is included. In future editions of this report, ARD/GOLD will merely add columns to this table—one column per year.

The indicator based on citizen surveys is discussed first, and then all the other indicators that focus on local government units. These indicators gathered regarding local government units were either gathered in the field by GOLD Site Research Institutions, based on focus group discussions or key informant interviews, while revenue and taxation data were gathered in Manila.

Annex A contains detailed GOLD site results for the Strategic Objective Indicator:

- The Percent of People Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by LGUs ”

The three tables in Annex A, for 1995, 1996, and 1997, include details as to which problems citizens are citing in the several sites as their priority concerns.

Annex B contains the 1995 to 1997 total results in another set of tables, constructed in the USAID format. The USAID indicator format includes the numbering system used by USAID, as well as the targets hoped to be achieved over the next few years. Future editions of this report will fill in the appropriate cells of this table.

RESULTS FROM PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY OF CITIZENS

Strategic Objective Indicator

Percent of Citizens Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by LGUs

The overall Strategic Objective being pursued by GOLD is “Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies.” One indicator of whether this is being achieved is whether citizens feel government is responding to their concerns. This indicator was specified as:

- “Percent of Citizens Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by Local Government Units ”

In each GOLD site, 30 barangays were chosen by probability methods, and within each chosen barangay five respondents were chosen by a rigid system, using probability methods. The

result was that samples of 150 respondents each were drawn in each GOLD site, to represent the GOLD site as a whole (not the individual parts--municipalities or barangays) That is, while the method allows us to make statements about the province as a whole (or the city as a whole for General Santos and Naga City), statements cannot be made about the components of that local government unit--the component cities, municipalities, or barangays

Listing of sites	Percent of Citizens Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by LGUs			
	BASELINE	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL		52	46	47
BULACAN		37	41	43
CAPIZ		22	36	37
COTABATO		33	50	56
GENERAL SANTOS		21	23	24
PALAWAN		36	28	34
SARANGANI		34	38	33
NUEVA VIZCAYA		33	39	44
<i>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</i>		36%	40%	43%
LANAO DEL NORTE			57	55
NAGA CITY			28	21
NEGROS ORIENTAL			50	51
		<i>WEIGHTED AVERAGE</i>	43%	45%
TARGET %			35%	40%

In order to precisely measure the "Percent of Citizens Who Feel their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by Local Government Units," a series of questions were used² First, each respondent was presented with a list of services that local government could provide (such as street repairs, controlling illegal gambling, or maintaining health centers) and asked how much of a problem each was for their province (or city, in the case of General Santos and Naga City) Then, for the same list of services, the respondents were asked what the local government was doing about them

The exact text of the questions, and the results of the surveys per sites for 1995 to 1997 are contained in three tables in Annex A, at the end of this report These tables specify, for each GOLD site, which problems were cited as the most serious and what percentage of respondents felt the local government was "definitely doing something" about those problems

² This is an adaptation of a method used by the Asian Institute of Management The results of a survey undertaken by the AIM Policy Forum in October 1995 are reported in The Citizen as Customer Citizens Feedback and Local Government Performance in Cagayan de Oro City by Emile P Bolongaita Jr And Eduardo L Roberto (Makati City AIM Policy Forum Policy Research Paper, January 1996) A second survey is reported in Emile P Bolongaita, Jr 'A Tale of Two Districts The Citizen as Customer in Makati City (Makati City AIM Policy Forum Policy Research Paper No 3, May 1996) Permission to utilize this methodology is gratefully acknowledged

RESULTS FROM INDICATOR RESEARCH AT LOCAL GOVERNMENT UNIT LEVEL

The next several indicators to be discussed (the second Strategic Objective Indicator and five indicators for the Results Package) were based on research at the level of the local government unit. They involve counting whether each local government unit (municipality, city, or province), or the non-government organizations operating in them, satisfied certain conditions.

The research teams were provided with a common set of definitions for the indicators, and these definitions were discussed at the January workshops held in 1996 and 1997, and the October 1997 workshop. It was emphasized in the training workshops that each GOLD Site Research Institution was to devise methods of gathering the data to arrive at the indicators for each local government unit. Key informants knowledgeable about local affairs could be interviewed ("key informant interviewing"). Or, it might be more efficient to gather a number of persons in the locality to discuss these particular matters (a "focus group discussion").

The justification for these methods has to do with the nature of the indicators. These indicators have to do with characteristics of local government units, not the opinions of citizens. Instead of an opinion survey (for the data reported in the previous section), the GOLD Site Research Institutions relied on well-informed persons to help them characterize each municipality and city within the province, and the province as a whole. It may be that as few as three well-informed individuals needed to be contacted about a particular LGU--e.g., municipality or province. On the other hand, it may be that disagreements were so strong that a lengthy group discussion among a number of people would be necessary before the GOLD site institution's researchers could be confident about the answers being given.

The procedure was to arrive at the indicator for each municipality or city within a province, and for the province itself. These separate results were then summed for each GOLD site.

If different key informants disagreed, the researchers were asked to document the diverse answers as much as possible (e.g., listing NGOs alleged to be active in Local Special Bodies, describing the plans alleged to be devised with citizen participation, etc.). Then the GOLD Site Research Institution, using the researchers' local knowledge, made a judgment, documented and defended that judgment. Aware of the natural tendency among residents to want to make their local community shine in such terms of these indicators, GOLD Site Research Institutions were asked always to crosscheck in order to be certain they arrived at good data about the indicators.

The preliminary results calculated by the GOLD site research institutions were then submitted to the ARD/GOLD office for checking. Generally, some questions were posed to the research institutions, and answers transmitted back, before both the ARD/GOLD team and the GOLD site institutions were convinced of the accuracy of the indicator readings for their GOLD site.

Strategic Objective Indicator

The Number of NGO Representatives Actively Participating in Local Special Bodies

This indicator was chosen as broadly applicable in all sites, since NGO participation in Local Special Bodies is mandated under the 1991 Local Government Code. The focus was on the code-mandated local special bodies: Development Council, School Board, Health Board, Pre-qualification, Bids and Awards Committee, and Peoples Law Enforcement Board.

The first question to be answered for any local government unit was whether the Local Special Bodies were active in the first place. It is common knowledge that in many places these bodies are not being convened as mandated in the 1991 Local Government Code.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of LGUs M=municipality C=City P=Province	Number of NGO Representatives actively participating in Local Special Bodies			
	BASELINE	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)		55	29	42
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)		67	110	125
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)		10	46	89
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)		40	68	98
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)		13	14	10
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)		23	61	60
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)		54	40	33
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)		31	34	34
TOTAL	293		402	491
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)			39	53
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)			8	17
NEGROS OR =26(22M 3C 1P)			137	132
	TOTAL		586	693
TARGET #			250	400

The next question was whether NGOs themselves in an open process designated the NGO members of the Local Special Bodies. (See Article 64 of the Implementing Rules and Regulations of the 1991 Local Government Code.) It is often the case that even if these bodies are active, the participating NGOs had been designated by the mayor or members of the Sanggunian. In such a case, the NGO representatives could not count for the purpose of this indicator.

Once Local Special Bodies have been identified as active, and the NGO Representatives as duly designated, the last judgment is whether said NGO representatives are truly active. This truly calls for informed judgment, and is one of the reasons why local institutions were tapped to accomplish the data gathering. It was hoped that their local knowledge would assist them in making this judgment.

Since what is being counted is NGOs, one NGO represented on several Local Special Bodies counts only once. This is because the repeated membership of a single NGO would not mean that participation was broader. By "NGO" we meant any non-governmental organization cooperatives (common at the municipal level), civic organizations, development NGOs, etc. For purposes of counting, a network representing several NGOs/POs counts only once, but separate local chapters of an organization could be counted in each municipality.

Results Package Indicator

The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Investment Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation

Here, "investment plan" is used in a general sense, not to mean the "Annual Investment Plan" produced by every local government unit. By "investment plan" is meant a *conscious choice* among several means to an expressed goal, over a multi-year period, which uses local government unit resources to address the sustainable development of the community.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of LGUs M=municipality C=City P=Province	The number of target LGUs implementing investment plans developed with effective citizen participation		
	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	12	7	10
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	13	2	9
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	3	8	11
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	0	5	14
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	1	1	1
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	2	5	11
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)	6	0	0
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	4	2	8
TOTAL	41	30	64
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)		7	8
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)		0	0
NEGROS OR =26(22M,3C, 1P)		10	16
	TOTAL	47	88
TARGET #		40	65

This definition is meant to emphasize that social investments, and "soft" infrastructure, are just as important as "hard" infrastructure, like roads, etc.

We also wanted to emphasize that the "investment plan" involves the use of local resources. It does not refer to a plan to attract investment or resources from elsewhere.

In measuring whether this plan exists, we did not necessarily need to look at the written "plans" produced by all local government units. These documents are often "wish lists," avoiding the hard choices on how to use the local government unit's own resources.

Instead of relying on these plans, the GOLD Site Research Institutions attempted to determine, by interviewing or discussing, and by crosschecking, whether the local government was implementing a plan or program aimed at developing the community, using local government resources. In addition, the plan needed to be developed with effective citizen participation. In measuring this indicator, no judgment is expressed about the wisdom of the plan. As long as the motivation for the plan is for the development of the community, it was counted as an "investment plan."

By "effective citizen participation" is meant some process which allows ordinary citizens to express views early enough in the planning process to make a difference, and the government expresses its judgment about whether it will take these views into account. This participation cannot be just a comment on something that already has so much momentum that views of citizens cannot be taken into account.

On the other hand, "effective citizen participation" does not imply that government and NGOs/POs cannot disagree. Government officials still retain the right to overrule citizen input--knowing that electoral judgment will be faced at the end of the current term of office.

The results for this indicator show that over one-third of local government units in GOLD sites are implementing investment plans developed with effective citizen participation. In some local governments, recent turnover in leadership means that new plans are not yet being implemented. In other local governments, while there are plans being implemented, they were not developed with effective citizen participation.

Results Package Indicator

The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Environmental Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The number of target LGUs implementing environmental plans developed with effective Citizen participation		
	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	15	14	15
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	7	8	10
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	4	8	13
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	2	7	12
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	0	0	0
PALAWAN = 25(23M 1C 1P)	5	8	8
SARANGANI = 8 (7M 1P)	4	4	0
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	1	2	5
TOTAL	38	51	63
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)		8	9
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)		0	0
NEGROS OR =26(22M,3C 1P)		9	16
TOTAL		68	88
TARGET #		70	90

This indicator is similar to the previous indicator, but refers to “environmental” plans. Such plans focus on some aspect of the environment that the community has decided is important. Again, no judgment is made on the wisdom of the choice of environmental aspect--this is up to the local community concerned.

With respect to the environment, the GOLD project team felt it worthwhile to specify what was meant by “plans”--a multi-year program to achieve an environmental goal, including related activities. A plan would need to address the question of continued effort.

This specification aimed to emphasize that isolated efforts would not count. Episodic, once a year, “Clean and Green” activities or occasional tree planting would not count. Sustained, year-round “Clean and Green” or tree planting would count if they included related activities (e.g., citizen education, or watershed protection) and how to sustain such activities over a multi-year period.

Given the activities of outside entities with respect to the environment, it was also necessary to emphasize that these must be programs to which local government programs are truly committed. These environmental programs could not be a local government just giving its *pro forma* acceptance to ideas from an NGO or the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Once again, there is recognition of the importance of the GOLD site research institution exercising judgment based on local knowledge, in order to determine the depth of commitment by the local government unit to the environmental plans in question.

The remarks about “effective citizen participation” made with reference to the previous indicator also apply here. The participation must have had the possibility of making a difference, and if the government decided not to agree with the citizens it was at least a considered judgment.

The baseline number of environmental plans is roughly the same as that for investment plans. However, given the widespread concern with the environment, a slightly higher target was set.

Results Package Indicator

The Number of Target Local Government Units in which the Local Government Unit has a Monitoring System with NGO or PO Participation

This indicator was perhaps the most difficult to measure due to confusion between what GOLD wanted to measure by this indicator, and what many local government units are doing. Many “monitoring teams” have been set up to monitor the progress of infrastructure projects, or to monitor some illegal activities. Neither of these is what this indicator means.

The goal of this indicator is to measure oversight and transparency in government operations.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The number of target LGUs in which the LGU has a monitoring system with NGO or PO participation		
	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	3	0	1
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	1	0	0
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	1	1	2
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	2	3	13
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	1	0	0
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	7	8	9
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)	5	1	1
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	2	2	1
TOTAL	22	15	27
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)		2	3
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)		0	0
NEGROS OR =26(22M,3C,1P)		0	3
TOTAL		17	33
TARGET #		20	60

So here is meant "monitoring" some local government operations which people feel are important. The "system" need not necessarily be comprehensive, but must involve more than one sector of interest. The focus is public activity involving expenditures of public funds.

By this distinction, monitoring "illegal logging" would not count. On the other hand, monitoring local government action against illegal logging would count as one part of a broader system.

A monitoring team that inspects infrastructure projects, being too narrowly focused, would also not count, unless it was part of a broader system.

So, "system" implies (a) overseeing several aspects of LGU operations, and (b) efforts that have continued for more than one year.

By "NGO/PO Participation" we mean that the person or persons involved have to reflect a constituency/group, they cannot be merely acting on their own as private citizens. However, we do not insist that the NGO/PO person be formally designated by the constituency/group. To qualify under this indicator, a local government official could name persons to be part of the system as long as these persons truly represent a non-government constituency.

The requirements of this indicator are quite strict and we see this reflected in the low number of local government units that qualify. Correspondingly, the target set is only fifty percent of GOLD site local government units by the end of the project.

Results Package Indicator

The Number of Target Local Government Units in which Information Regarding Resources, Expenditures, and Operations is Available to the Citizenry

This indicator does not refer to whether citizens are informed. Rather, whether the citizenry within a local government unit could become informed, if they wished, about local government operations. Rather than a survey measuring citizen awareness, assessment of this indicator requires a judgment about what is possible in the local government unit.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The number of target LGUs in which information regarding resources, expenditures, and operations is available to the citizenry		
	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	14	13	13
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	5	4	8
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	1	4	5
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	7	2	7
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	0	0	0
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	0	1	2
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)	3	0	0
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	1	4	5
TOTAL	31	28	40
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)		0	0
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)		1	1
NEGROS OR =26 (22M,3C 1P)		6	12
	TOTAL	35	53
TARGET #		30	70

By "resources" is meant revenues, loans, etc., and by "operations," on-going programs, projects and their objectives. The goal is to allow citizens to know, if they wished, the results of participation and input into the policy process.

By this token, it is not required that confidential information about internal LGU operations such as personnel evaluations, and the like, be available.

However, it was stipulated that the information must be "available"--in some form that can reasonably be understood. For example, budgets, annual reports, and the like are not sufficient here unless there is an effort to translate bureaucratic jargon into plain language. In some local government units, this plain language is the local language, in others it is English or (more rarely outside of Central Luzon, Filipino). The point is that the information must be in ordinary, simple language. Thus, the mere posting of official documents would not be sufficient.

By “to the citizenry” we mean that any citizen can get the information, either by going to the local government offices, or through newspapers, radio etc. Is there an effort to make citizens aware? Local Government Units can make use of the media. Could citizens gain access to more information if they were interested, or would the concerned local official be reluctant to divulge information?

Results Package Indicator

The Number of Target Local Government Units Securing Credit from For-Profit Institutions

One of the areas of emphasis in local governance is access to innovative methods of finance, rather than just relying on current income to accomplish programs and projects. This indicator measures the extent to which target local government units have utilized loans or bond flotation from “for-profit” institutions—banks, government financial institutions, or investment houses.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The Number of Target LGUs Securing Credit from For-Profit Institutions Since 1992		
	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	3	4	8
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	4	7	7
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	2	2	10
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	5	8	16
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	0	0	1
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	5	8	8
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)	3	3	3
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	8	10	10
TOTAL	30	42	63
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)		3	3
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)		1	1
NEGROS OR =26(22M,3C,1P)		1	8
	TOTAL	47	75
TARGET #			45

Thus far, none of the target local governments have floated bonds, so the indicator essentially measures loan activity.

Data were gathered for 1995 and 1996 from the LandBank and Philippine National Bank by requesting a summary statement per site of how many local governments have availed of loans from those institutions. These are the two institutions that have historically been active in the provision of loans to local governments.

Inasmuch as the identity of borrowers is confidential, the banks provided merely a listing per GOLD site, which makes it difficult to crosscheck these data. In the last round of data

collection, for 1997, a more aggressive effort was made at the local level to gather these data for each and every LGU in the GOLD sites

Note that Build-Operate-Transfer agreements (and their variants) are not included in this indicator, as they do not involve credit

This indicator is a cumulative total, since the implementation of the new Local Government Code in 1992. The cumulative nature is justified as a measure of the spread of exposure to credit finance among local governments

It is clear from the data that local government units have been aggressively pursuing loans as part of their resource mobilization strategies

REVENUE AND TAXATION INDICATORS GATHERED IN MANILA

Results Package Indicator

The Total Amount of National Revenues Allocated to Target LGUs

This indicator is meant to measure the commitment in concrete terms by the national government to meaningful decentralization. Only if they have resources will local governments be able to carry out service delivery. Only if those resources are predictable will local government units be able to plan.

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The Total Amount of National Revenues Allocated to Target LGUs (Internal Revenue Allotment plus LGU Share from the Exploitation of National Wealth--in Million Pesos)			
	BASELINE	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	645 843	695 156		
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	660 848	718 609		
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	431 380	449 508		
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	495 410	592 344		
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	214 438	228 614		
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	1041 488	1124 500		
SARANGANI = 8 (7M, 1P)	244 102	257 255		
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M, 1P)	286 628	294 55		
LANAO N = 23 (22M, 1P)	308 177	300 939		
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)	100 485	112 537		
NEGROS OR =26(22M 3C 1P)	791 818	828 754		
TOTAL	5220 617	5602 766		
TARGET #				

Thus, the national revenues in question are the Internal Revenue Allotment (which not only is the largest source of funds, but is also quite predictable) and the local government shares in the

exploitation of national wealth This latter is not as predictable as the Internal Revenue Allotment, but local officials feel that it should indeed be just as predictable

The data source is the Budget Operations Statements, which local governments are supposed to submit to the Bureau of Local Government Finance Certain difficulties attend both the submission of these documents and their quality In a few cases, the documents were not available In others, the data were produced to a different standard than should have been required These cases were quite few

In general, these data will be available only with a time lag It will only be after July in the following year that Budget Operations Statements are available (for example, July 1998 for 1997 data)

The data were crosschecked wherever possible against the 1995 tables in the 1997 National Budget Submission, and the 1996 tables in the 1998 National Budget Submission

Results Package Indicator

The Net Amount of Self-Generated Revenues Collected by Target LGUs

This indicator focuses on the ability of local governments to generate their own resources rather than relying on transfers from the national government in the form of the Internal Revenue Allotment Generating local resources requires political will on the part of local officials in their interaction with local constituents In addition, by focusing on "net" resources the indicator measures efficiency of revenue collection efforts

Listing of sites, with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The Net Amount of Self-Generated Revenues Collected by Target LGUs (Local Taxes less Estimated Cost of Collection--in Million Pesos)			
	BASELINE	1995	1996	1997
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	23 952	95 326		
BULACAN = 25 (24M, 1P)	331 174	383 506		
CAPIZ = 18 (16M, 1C, 1P)	23 428	31 472		
COTABATO = 19 (18M, 1P)	25 342	25 212		
GEN SAN = 1 (1 C)	66 325	86 742		
PALAWAN = 25(23M 1C 1P)	17 334	56 272		
SARANGANI = 8 (7M 1P)	8 097	8 087		
N VIZCAYA = 16 (15M 1P)	2 810	6 753		
LANAO N = 23 (22M 1P)	8 069	10 84		
NAGA CITY = 1 (1 C)	35 783	52 632		
NEGROS OR =26(22M 3C 1P)	49 468	59 862		
TOTAL	591 782	816 704		
TARGET #		160		

By "self-generated" is meant local taxes, such as the real property tax, business tax, community tax, and the like. Local fees, rentals, and income from public enterprises are not included, even though these sources might constitute a considerable portion of local government revenue. The reason is that data for these sources would be subject to considerable variation and therefore would be difficult to collect reliably.

The resource is "net," after deducting for the costs of collection. These costs are reflected in the budget for the assessor's office, and some portion of the budget for the treasurer's office. After consultation with local treasurers and consultants knowledgeable on local treasury office, an estimate of thirty percent was arrived at as a conservative factor for the portion of the budget of treasurers' offices that are devoted to collecting local taxes.

Thus, "net" resources was computed as local taxes, less the assessor's budget, less thirty percent of the treasurer's budget.

Note that extraordinary expenditures, such as those for general assessments, or computers, were not treated separately. At any given time, some LGUs will be doing it, and others not. Thus, they will be automatically averaged over time.

The same remarks about data source and quality as were made for the previous indicator apply to this indicator. The data source is the Budget Operations Statements, which local governments are supposed to submit to the Bureau of Local Government Finance. Certain difficulties attend both the submission of these documents and their quality. In a few cases, the documents were not available. In others, the data were produced to a different standard that should have been required. These cases were quite few. The data were cross-checked wherever possible against the 1995 tables in the 1997 National Budget Submission, and the 1996 tables in the 1998 National Budget Submission.

We see in the data above that the site with the greatest net production of revenue is Bulacan. Bulacan is very close to Metro Manila and is rapidly industrializing and urbanizing, making its ability to collect significant taxes unsurprising. Similarly, both Naga City and General Santos are able to have significant net revenues from taxation.

At the other end of the spectrum we have provinces such as Nueva Vizcaya and Lanao del Norte³, which are poor and contain no cities, which tend to have low net revenue collection.

Comparing City Net Revenue with Overall GOLD Site Net Revenue		
Listing of sites with their respective number of Local Government Units M=municipality C=City P=Province	The Net Amount of Self-Generated Revenues Collected by Target LGUs (Local Taxes less Estimated Cost of Collection--in Million Pesos) (1996)	
	City Net Revenue	Total for Site
BOHOL = 49 (47M, 1C, 1P)	90 7566	95 3261
PALAWAN = 25(23M, 1C, 1P)	23 0492	56 2721

³ The City of Iligan, geographically within the province of Lanao del Norte, is not a "component" city. Thus, it does not count as part of the GOLD project.

The two GOLD sites with the most rapid increase from 1995 to 1996 are Bohol and Palawan. Both of these sites contain a component city (Tagbilaran and Puerto Princesa, respectively)--but the role of the city in the increase is different in these two sites. As we can see from the table, below, in Bohol the City of Tagbilaran dominates the results--almost all of the net revenue for the entire GOLD site was derived from the city. In Palawan, on the other hand, while Puerto Princesa does indeed have buoyant net revenues, those revenues form less than half the net revenues for the GOLD Site as a whole.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The indicators discussed in the preceding pages have revealed progress in the institution of responsive, participatory, transparent local government with adequate financial resources.

Both of the Strategic Objective Indicators--citizens feeling that local governments are responding to their priorities, and NGOs being active in local special bodies--have seen steady increases. Likewise, the Results Package Indicators focusing on responsive planning--for investments and for the environment--have increased as previously targeted by USAID/Philippines.

The two Results Package Indicators having to do with transparency--looking at monitoring systems and the availability of information--have been increasing but at a slower rate.

There have been particularly strong increases in the Results Package Indicators having to do with finances--accessing loans, receiving resources from the national government, and generating local revenue through taxation. This increase reflects the concern local government officials have to increase the resources at their disposal.

For the remaining years of the GOLD project, the indicators will be gathered annually. As the results of the indicator exercise become more widely available, they may well generate pressure for even better performance at the local level.

One of the most important side benefits of the GOLD indicator effort is the encouragement in the localities of research by the GOLD Site Research Institutions. Some of the institutions had a long history of research, and needed little encouragement to engage in indicator activities relevant to local governance. Other institutions had little prior experience, but were eager to learn. In all instances it is clear that civil society is strengthened as local governments and local researchers interact to produce more knowledge of the state of decentralized democratic governance.

ANNEX A DETAILED SITE RESULTS FOR SOI 4
“Percent of Citizens Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by LGUs”

The following three pages contain tables showing the detailed results on this indicator, and contain the exact question texts asked of the probability respondents

The tables are divided into three sets miscellaneous services that were often cited as serious problems, crime-related services, and basic services

For each site, the top three problems are shown in shaded areas (four are highlighted for General Santos City in 1995, since there was a tie for the number-three problem) At the bottom of the table we have the percentage of respondents who felt government is “definitely doing something” about the top three problems

The 1995 table shows, for instance, that the top three problems in Nueva Vizcaya are flood control, control of illegal gambling, and control of holdups or theft Thirty-three percent of respondents felt that their government was definitely doing something about these priority problems

In 1995, on this indicator, the percent of citizens who feel their priority concerns are addressed, the province of Bohol ranked on top The most serious problem is street repair, but a majority of respondents feel their local government units are doing something about the problem The province of Capiz (street repairs and flood control) and General Santos City (various crime problems, followed by illegal logging) obtain the lowest ratings

In 1996, Lanao del Norte (a new GOLD site) ranked highest Street repairs, ensuring drinking water, and providing electric services were the top three services mentioned, 57 percent of respondents felt that the local government was definitely doing something about these three problems General Santos again ranked the lowest, followed by Naga City and Palawan

In 1997 the best performing GOLD site was Cotabato, where respondents worried most about street repairs, controlling hold-ups and theft, or controlling drug pushing Naga City and General Santos continued at the bottom, reflecting the more cynical attitudes of urban dwellers

On the bottom line of each table there is noted the weighted (by population size) average for this indicator Each GOLD site's percentage is adjusted for their populations size so that large populations, such as in Bohol, count more in the computation

This weighted average is taken as the "Percent of People Who Feel Their Priority Concerns are Being Addressed by Local Government Units " The results are 36% in 1995, 43% in 1996, and 45% in 1997 This steady increase is a very encouraging result

1995 Percent of People Who Feel their Priority Concerns are Being Addressed by Local Government Units

Let's now talk about a set of local services that residents expect of their local government. I am going to read each item. As I read each one, please tell me how much of a problem you personally believe this is for this province/city of yours."

- The entry in each cell is the percentage who rated the problem as "very serious" or "quite serious"
- The three services rated in each site as the most "serious problems" are highlighted

"Now, let's look again at those local services you just rated. This time, will you tell me how much you personally think your current local government is doing or not doing about each one of them?"

- At the bottom of each site's column, the percentage who feel the government "is definitely doing something" about the top three problems is entered

% rating each service as a "Serious Problem" for the province/city	Bohol	Bulacan	Capiz	Cota-bato	General Santos	Nueva Vizcaya	Palawan	Saran-Gani
Problems Often Cited as Serious								
Street Repairs	61%	29%	71%	57%	35%	33%	40%	35%
Flood Control	40%	23%	72%	33%	59%	50%	28%	51%
Stop Illegal Logging	31%	22%	53%	36%	67%	34%	41%	53%
Providing Electric Services	27%	13%	46%	35%	33%	14%	54%	23%
Crime								
Control Holdup/Theft	41%	36%	47%	37%	72%	37%	16%	56%
Control Illegal Gambling	43%	42%	32%	43%	67%	47%	23%	49%
Control Illegal Drug Pushing	37%	52%	41%	26%	78%	27%	20%	53%
Maintaining Peace and Order	18%	25%	25%	25%	40%	19%	11%	29%
Basic Services								
Ensuring Drinking Water	23%	18%	47%	14%	23%	16%	35%	21%
Maintaining Health Centers	18%	14%	34%	12%	28%	17%	15%	16%
Maintain Elementary & High Schools	20%	17%	28%	11%	30%	10%	21%	23%
% who feel their government is definitely doing something" about the top three problems	52%	37%	22%	33%	21%	33%	36%	34%

GOLD-Wide Weighted Average of Percent of Citizens Who Feel Local Government is "Definitely Doing Something " 36%

1996 Percent of People Who Feel their Priority Concerns are Being Addressed by Local Government Units

'Let's now talk about a set of local services that residents expect of their local government. I am going to read each item. As I read each one please tell me how much of a problem you personally believe this is for this province/city of yours.'

- The entry in each cell is the percentage who rated the problem as "very serious" or "quite serious"
- The three services rated in each site as the most "serious problems" are highlighted

Now let's look again at those local services you just rated. This time, will you tell me how much you personally think your current local government is doing or not doing about each one of them?"

- At the bottom of each site's column, the percentage who feel the government "is definitely doing something" about the top three problems is entered

% rating each service as a "Serious Problem" for the province/city	Bohol	Bulacan	Capiz	Cotabato	Gen Santos City	Lanao del Norte	Naga City	Negros Oriental	Palawan	Sarangani	Nueva Vizcaya
Problems Often Cited as Serious											
Street Repairs	41	24	33	31	39	57	17	54	36	40	47
Flood Control	34	34	41	34	57	36	59	45	18	53	36
Stop Illegal Logging	30	21	43	26	62	41	59	43	30	57	39
Providing Electric Services	27	10	31	23	31	43	26	44	44	36	28
Crime											
Control Hold-up/Theft	44	32	38	41	70	40	51	40	9	50	30
Control Illegal Gambling	43	40	35	43	52	38	51	43	10	43	39
Control Illegal Drug Pushing	51	49	48	42	81	40	69	49	18	51	33
Maintaining Peace & Order	23	12	21	17	51	22	31	26	5	27	23
Basic Services											
Ensuring Drinking Water	19	25	32	20	32	45	25	33	37	23	23
Providing Medicines	42	23	39	26	39	40	25	31	32	15	29

% who feel their local government is "definitely doing something" about the top three problems	46%	41%	36%	50%	23%	57%	28%	50%	28%	38%	39%
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

GOLD-Wide Weighted Average of Percent of Citizens Who Feel Local Government is "Definitely Doing Something " 43%

1997 Percent of People Who Feel their Priority Concerns are Being Addressed by Local Government Units

Let's now talk about a set of local services that residents expect of their local government. I am going to read each item. As I read each one, please tell me how much of a problem you personally believe this is for this province/city of yours.

- The entry in each cell is the percentage who rated the problem as "very serious" or "quite serious"
- The three services rated in each site as the most "serious problems" are highlighted

'Now, let's look again at those local services you just rated. This time, will you tell me how much you personally think your current local government is doing or not doing about each one of them?

- At the bottom of each site's column, the percentage who feel the government "is definitely doing something" about the top three problems is entered

% rating each service as a 'Serious Problem' for the province/city	Bohol	Bulacan	Capiz	Cotabato	Gen Santos City	Lanao del Norte	Naga City	Negros Oriental	Pala-wan	Saran-gani	Nueva Vizca-ya
Problems Often Cited as Serious											
Street Repairs	39	25	39	41	34	55	19	37	29	34	37
Flood Control	19	32	38	27	44	28	55	35	25	41	22
Stop Illegal Logging	16	17	45	23	----	36	58	34	9	57	21
Providing Electric Services	17	9	32	32	34	37	27	39	40	32	36
Crime											
Control Hold-up/Theft	33	25	43	37	63	45	55	36	2	55	30
Control Illegal Gambling	41	34	39	31	63	37	57	43	3	46	32
Control Illegal Drug Pushing	39	55	51	33	75	44	71	46	5	59	31
Maintaining Peace & Order	15	12	27	19	39	37	35	23	1	39	20
Basic Services											
Ensuring Drinking Water	40	13	45	29	25	35	37	28	17	30	22
Providing Medicines	21	15	34	22	33	50	26	26	21	27	28

% who feel their local government is definitely doing something" about the top three problems	47	43	37	56	24	55	21	51	34	33	44
---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

GOLD-Wide Weighted Average of Percent of Citizens Who Feel Local Government is "Definitely Doing Something " 45%

ANNEX B USAID FORMAT TABLES
Indicator Data Reports along with Numerical Targets

Strategic Objective 6 Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies in Selected Areas				
S O Indicator 3	Number of NGO Representatives Actively Participating in Local Special Bodies			
Unit of Measure	NGOs are local non-profit Organizations Accredited by the LGU	Year	Planned	Actual
Source	Surveys are being conducted annually in the target LGUs, using local academic institutions or NGO networks, and official LGU Reports	Baseline 1995		293
Comments Why baseline in 1995 is higher than 1996 "planned" Planned figures were derived by consulting experts, who proved somewhat pessimistic Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 402) (1997 for the original 8 = 491)	1996	250	586	
	1997	400	693	
	1998	750		
	1999	1000		

Strategic Objective 6 Broadened Participation in the Formulation and Implementation of Public Policies in Selected Areas				
S O Indicator 4	Percent of Citizens Who Feel their Priority Concerns are being Addressed by LGUs			
Unit of Measure	Respondents will be selected by probability methods in targeted LGUs to ensure representation of all citizens	Year	Planned	Actual
Source	Local academic institutions or NGOs will collect original probability survey data under the direction of a USAID contractor	Baseline 1995		36%
Comments Why baseline in 1995 is higher than 1996 "planned" Planned figures were derived by consulting experts, who proved somewhat pessimistic Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 40%) (1997 for the original 8 = 43%)	1996	35%	43%	
	1997	40%	45%	
	1998	45%		
	1999	50%		

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 1 The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Investment Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation			
Unit of Measure Each City, province, or municipality will equal one LGU There are an estimated 211 LGUs in the target area	Year	Planned	Actual
Source Interviews of Planning Officers, elected officials, and NGO community leaders by local institutions under ARD, Inc supervision	Baseline 1995		41
Comments Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 30) (1997 for the original 8 = 87)	1996	40	47
	1997	65	88
	1998	100	
	1999	160	

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 2 The Number of Target Local Government Units Implementing Environmental Plans Developed with Effective Citizen Participation			
Unit of Measure An LGU can be any one of the 211 provinces, cities, or municipalities included in the project	Year	Planned	Actual
Source Interviews of planning or environmental officers, elected officials, and NGO community leaders by local institutions guided by ARD, Inc	Baseline 1995		38
Comments Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 51) (1997 for the original 8 = 62)	1996	70	68
	1997	90	88
	1998	130	
	1999	170	

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 3 The Number of Target Local Government Units in which the LGU has a Monitoring System with NGO or PO Participation			
Unit of Measure An LGU can be any one of the 211 provinces, cities, or municipalities included in the project	Year	Planned	Actual
Source Interviews of elected and appointed LGU officials, national government agencies, and NGO community leaders	Baseline 1995		22
Comments Why baseline in 1995 is higher than 1996 "planned " Planned figures were derived by consulting experts, who proved somewhat pessimistic Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 15) (1997 for the original 8 = 26)	1996	20	17
	1997	60	33
	1998	80	
	1999	105	

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 4 The Number of Target Local Government Units in which Information Regarding Resources, Expenditures, and Operations is Available to the Citizenry			
Unit of Measure	Year	Planned	Actual
Source Interviews with elected and appointed officials, the media, and NGO community leaders Perusal of publications	Baseline 1995		31
Comments Why baseline in 1995 is higher than 1996 "planned " Planned figures were derived by consulting experts, who proved somewhat pessimistic Comparing 1996 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 28) (1997 for the original 8 = 40)	1996	30	35
	1997	70	53
	1998	100	
	1999	150	

De

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 5 The Total Amount of National Revenues Allocated to Target LGUs			
Unit of Measure Million pesos	Year	Planned	Actual
Source LGUs' Budget Operations Statement	Baseline 1995		5221
Comments Data for this indicator only become available mid-year of the following year--there is always a one-year lag in the reporting of these data	1996		5602
	1997		
	1998		
	1999		

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 6 The Net Amount of Self-Generated Revenues Collected by Target LGUs			
Unit of Measure Million Pesos	Year	Planned	Actual
Source LGUs' Budget Operations Statements	Baseline 1995		592
Comments Data for this indicator only become available mid-year of the following year--there is always a one-year lag in the reporting of these data Why baseline in 1995 is higher than 1996 planned figures were derived by consulting experts who proved somewhat pessimistic	1996	160	817
	1997	176	
	1998	203	
	1999	254	

S O 6 Results Package 1 (RP 1) Effective Local Government with Broad-Based Participation in Selected Areas			
RP 1, Indicator 7 The Number of Target Local Government Units Securing Credit from For-Profit Institutions			
Unit of Measure Each City, province, or municipality will equal one LGU There are an estimated 211 LGUs in the target area	Year	Planned	Actual
Source Local Institutions and NGOs will survey LGUs, and this will be correlated with data from major financial institutions	Baseline 1995		30
Comments Comparing 1996 and 1997 with 1995 Later data pertain to 11 sites, while 1995 data pertain only to the original 8 sites (1996 for the original 8 = 42) (1997 for the original 8 = 63)	1996		47
	1997	45	75
	1998	60	
	1999	75	