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Description of BUB

- Launched in March 2012 in time for the preparation of the 2013 National Expenditure Program (NEP) with DBM-DILG-DSWD-NAPC JMC 2012-1

  - Two-fold objective
    - Promote more participatory planning and budgeting processes at national and local level with genuine involvement of grassroot organizations and communities
    - Ensure funding for projects identified by 609 targeted poor LGUs in their Local Poverty Reduction Action Plans (LPRAPs) are included in the budgets of participating national government agencies (NGAs)
Objectives of study

- To examine how the key steps in the planning and prioritization of projects under the BUB for the FY 2016 cycle (as provided under JMC 5-2015) are implemented on the ground in terms of:
  - Extent of CSO participation in BUB
  - LGU-CSO engagement
  - Integration of BUB process in local planning process

- To report on the progress and identify bottlenecks in the implementation of sub-projects identified during the FY 2013 BUB process

- To provide insights on areas for further improvement for the subsequent rounds

* Assessment is focused on process rather than results
Coverage

Municipalities covered

- Agusan del Norte
  - Butuan City (urban) *
  - Buenavista (rural KC) *
  - Las Nieves (rural KC) *
- Camarines Sur
  - Goa (urban) *
  - Lagonoy (rural non-KC) *
  - Libmanan (rural KC) *
- Antique
  - San Jose (urban-KC)
  - Sibalom (rural-KC)
  - Barbaza (rural KC)
- Zamboanga del Norte
  - Dapitan (urban)
  - Polanco (rural non-KC)
  - Mutia (rural KC)

* Municipalities covered in assessment conducted by IPC (Ateneo) for FY 2013 BUB cycle
Study Sites in Agusan del Norte *

Butuan City (urban-KC)  Buenavista (rural-KC)  Las Nieves (rural KC)
Study Sites in Antique

San Jose (urban-KC)  Sibalom (rural-KC)  Barbaza (rural KC)
Study Sites in Camarines Sur *

Goa (urban)  Lagonoy (rural non-KC)  Libmanan (rural KC)
Study Sites in Zamboanga del Norte

Dapitan (urban)  Polanco (rural non-KC)  Mutia (rural KC)
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### Extent of CSO participation

**Summary indicator of CSO participation** – share of projects identified by CSOs/ BDC VCs in total cost of LPRAP projects for FY 2015

**Variation in share of CSO/ BDC-VC in total cost of LPRAP projects** – due to differences in more intermediate indicators of CSO participation (including local political interference in a number of elements of areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGU-identified</th>
<th>CSO/BDC VC - identified</th>
<th>Jointly identified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agusan del Norte</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butuan City</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Nieves (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antique</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose (Urban KC)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibalom (KC)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbaza (KC)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camarines Sur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagonoy</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libmanan (KC)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zamboanga del Norte</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapitan</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polanco</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>11.0**</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutia (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.0***</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Include road projects, also a priority of the LGU
** CSO projects include those which are identified during CSO assembly
*** Jointly identified by CSO reps and BDC-vice chairs
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation (in the BUB process)

1. Inclusiveness of CSO assembly
2. Quality of CSO participation in CSO assembly
3. Quality of output of LPRAP workshop
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

1. Inclusiveness of CSO assembly
   - Who were invited/ How invitations were made
     ✓ CSO mapping conducted in most areas – CSO maps include both LGU-accredited and non-LGU-accredited CSOs
     • CSO mapping still incomplete; incentive issue (e.g., Zambo Norte)
     ✓ In a number of areas, not all CSOs in map were invited due to budget constraint, e.g., San Jose, Polanco
     ✓ Some cherry-picking of CSOs evident in some areas, e.g., Dapitan, Goa, Libmanan
     ✓ In Camarines Sur – still highly dependent on LGU-accredited list
     ✓ JMC 5-2014 calls for open invitation – notice posted in conspicuous place but some CSOs did not see notice
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

1. **Inclusiveness of CSO assembly**
   o Reasons for non-attendance in the Assembly of invited CSOs
     ✓ Lack of money for transport, e.g., CamSur
     ✓ Need to earn income on part of CSO rep
     ✓ Conflict with other meetings – has to do with **when** invitation was issued
     ✓ Losing interest in BUB because of slow implementation of projects, e.g., Barbaza and San Jose
     ✓ Lack of interest – indication of political issues a, e.g., CamSur
     ✓ Self selection based on political affiliation (e.g., Buenavista)

N.B. Many areas now reimbursed transport expense of CSOs, e.g., CamSur, San Jose
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation (in BUB process)

1. Inclusiveness of CSO assembly

2. Quality of CSO participation in CSO assembly
   - Representatives of CSOs which attended CSO assembly
   - Extent of CSO participation in CSO Assembly
   - Selection of CSO reps in LPRAT and CSO signatories
   - Quality of Poverty Situation Analysis – what is output of PSA?
     Application of evidenced-based planning

3. Quality of output of LPRAP workshop
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

2. **Quality of participation of CSO assembly**

   - Representatives of CSOs which attended CSO assembly
     - Some sectors are “over-represented” e.g., 4Ps, SEA-K associations
     - Poor attendance of certain important sectors – e.g. in CamSur in earlier cycle, CSOs from far-flung barangays which also happened to be poorer; attendees mostly from poblacion
     - Presence of non-marginalized/ non-neutral groups – less evident now but still true of barangay employees associations, e.g., Polanco
     - Absence of BDC VCs, e.g, San Jose because BAs not yet complete
2. Quality of participation of CSO assembly

- Qualitative aspects of CSO participation in CSO Assembly
  - CSO reps in FGDs report:
    - Feeling free to speak and of being listened to for the first time
  - FGDs suggest importance of prior preparation of CSOs – some came ready with list of projects they have pre-identified as a group; suggest need for CSOs to prepare prior to CSO assembly
  - FGDs suggest a greater degree of awareness/understanding of and ability to articulate the needs of communities as well as overall sense of empowerment in some KC munis (e.g., Las Nieves, Libmanan)
    - May be attributed to amount of social preparation in KC areas
    - Some variation evident as well – between areas new to the KC and areas that have gone thorugh several rounds
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

2. **Quality of participation of CSO assembly**
   - Selection of CSO reps in LPRAT and CSO signatories – generally followed JMC
     - Issues related to federated CSOs with only 1 rep attending vs non-federated CSOs with many reps attending
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

2. Quality of participation of CSO assembly
   - Quality of Poverty Situation Analysis
     - What is output of PSA?
       - Identification of problems & solutions/strategies in a generic sense (e.g., Goa, Libmanan)
       - Identified problems, solutions/strategies and specific projects (e.g., Sibalom, Lagonoy)
     - Application of evidenced-based planning
       - Not evident that data even when available is used in identifying problems, and solutions/strategies
         - Lack of data
         - Outdated data (e.g., most of CBMS)
         - Some data with BHWs not used
       - “common felt” needs – might be reasonable in context of KC but might be problematic in non-KC areas
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation (in BUB process)

1. Inclusiveness of CSO assembly

2. Quality of CSO participation in CSO assembly

3. Quality of output of LPRAP workshop
   - Provenance of long list of projects considered
   - Who participated in prioritization?
   - How was project prioritization done?
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

3. Quality of output of LPRAP workshop
   - Provenance of long list of projects considered
     o Is there reference to list prepared during the CSO assembly?
     o Is list prepared during LPRAP WS itself?
   - Who prepares long list of projects?
     o Initially, LGU and CSOs separately proposed their own list of projects, which are subsequently combined to form long list
     o LPRAT break-out groups organized along sectoral lines composed of LGU officials and CSOs who jointly come up with their list – typically discussion here appear to be dominated by LGU reps who are more articulate
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

3. Quality of output of LPRAP workshop
   - Who participated in prioritization process
     - LPRAT members during LPRAP WS
     - LPRAT and non-LPRAT members
   - Other issues
     - Presence of Mayor in LPRAP workshop
     - Too much dependence on menu is selecting projects
Breaking down this thing called CSO participation

3. **Quality of output of LPRAP workshop**
   - How was project prioritization done?
     - Each LPRAT member asked to rank long list of projects and projects with highest “score” gets top priority
     - Open but unstructured discussion
## Extent of CSO participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGU-identified</th>
<th>CSO/BDC VC - identified</th>
<th>Jointly identified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agusan del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butuan City</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Nieves (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose (Urban KC)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibalom (KC)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbaza (KC)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarines Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagonoy</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libmanan (KC)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamboanga del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapitan</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polanco</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>11.0**</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutia (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.0***</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Include road projects, also a priority of the LGU
** CSO projects include those which are identified during CSO assembly
*** Jointly identified by CSO reps and BDC-vice chairs

- **Summary indicator of CSO participation** – share of projects identified by CSOs/BDC VCs in total cost of LPRAP projects for FY 2015
- **Variation in share of CSO/BDC-VC in total cost of LPRAP projects** – due to differences in more intermediate indicators of CSO participation (including local political interference in a number of elements of areas)
Lessons learned

What went happened in Butuan City? 15% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- Summary indicator looked good but ....
- Some CSOs were clearly not invited to the assembly ostensibly because of budget constraint
- LPRAT co-chair is CSO rep of a new CSO; prominent personality in area who is “friend of mayor” who dominated LPRAT discussions; proposed bamboo plantation project
- During LPRAP workshop, wife of LPRAT CSO co-chair and wife of Regional BUB coordinator attended and were allowed to propose projects during LPRAP workshop
- During LPRAP workshop, BUB coordinator unilaterally decided which of the projects proposed by the participants will have their budgets reduced to fit the BUB funding allocated to the city
- In last round, mayor proposed agro-forestry project but CSOs did not agree simply because CSOs did not think that mayor should get his way even if they think mayor’s proposal is good; in this round, reforestation project proposed by IP rep
Lessons learned

What happened in Buenavista? 44% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- Not all CSOs in CSO map were invited because of budget constraint
- Most CSO leaders who attended CSO assembly were aligned with Mayor
- BDC VCs who were aligned with governor felt election of LPRAT members was “luto”
- Mayor convened expanded LDC meeting immediately after LPRAP workshop during which, upon the behest of the mayor, some projects identified during the LPRAP workshop were replaced and budgets of others were changed
Lessons learned

What went happened in Las Nieves? **12% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU**

- All CSOs/ BDC VCs were invited to CSO assembly although one CSO complained that invitation came late

- Pre-identified LGU project with project cost equal to LGU counterpart

- Empowered, articulate BDC VCs and CSO reps

- Menu driven – proposed projects simply chosen from the menu

- Instead of simply dividing BUB budget by number of barangays as in previous round, in this round each CSO LPRAT member were “entitled” to one project
Lessons learned

What happened in San Jose? 65% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- CSO mapping available; not all active CSOs invited because of budget constraint but no evidence of bias in selection (CM from AFON decided which CSOs to invite)
- No BDC VCs attended CSO assembly because Barangay Assembly not done yet
- During CSO workshop, problems and strategies analyzed but not identification of projects which CSOs were asked to do as “homework”
- Fewer CSO reps than LGUs reps attended LPRAP workshop (WS)
- CSOs presented CSO assembly output during LPRAP WS; LGU department heads also presented list of proposed projects; KC area coordinator presented identified KC projects to avoid duplication
- LGU department heads were able to convince CSOs that the LGU proposed projects will benefit more people
  - Not evident that CSOs were pressured into agreeing with LGU proposals
Lessons learned

What happened in Barbaza? 62% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- All CSOs in CSO map invited to CSO assembly
- CSOs identified problems and strategies during CSO assembly but CM helped CSOs identify projects in post CSO-assembly “revalidation: workshop with area coordinator
- CSOs and BDC VCs not as active as LGU reps during LPRAP WS; LGU reps advised CSOs to propose projects which are easier to implement
Lessons learned

**What happened in Sibalom? 50% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU**

- All CSOs in CSO map invited to CSO assembly
- BDC VCs in LPRAT were not elected but selected by LGU because area coordinator not aware of BUB process
- CSOs identified problems, strategies and specific projects during CSO assembly; these were presented during LPRAP WS
- During LPRAP WS, LGU department heads pointed out to CSOs the problems encountered in implementation of livestock dispersal project in previous round (procurement and sustainability); LGU department heads also reminded CSOs to think about sustainability of projects
Lessons learned

Common observations in Antique

- Not all Barangay Assemblies conducted prior to CSO Assembly
- CSO proposed projects were smaller in scope with fewer beneficiaries and, thus, had lower project cost compared with projects proposed by which were mostly infra
- New to KCs; not all BA conducted at the time of CSO assembly; BDC VCs not as active as CSO reps in LPRAT
Lessons learned

What happened in Goa? **100% of total cost of all BUB projects are projects identified by LGU**

- Open invitation; not all CSOs in CSO mapping done by CM were actually listed in Notice of CSO assembly; but invitees to CSO assembly included some non-LGU accredited CSOs;
- Invitation letter silent as to reimbursement of travel expense incurred in attending CSO assembly
- One of the reasons cited for non-attendance in CSO assembly – politics/ lack of interest
- During CSO assembly, CSO participants identified problems and broad strategies
- Selection of CSO reps in LPRAT done by sector

- **LPRAP Workshop**
  - Low attendance of CSO reps (5 out of 10); more LGU reps than CSO reps during workshop
  - CSO Assembly output not presented
  - Strong presence/ influence of mayor during LPRAP workshop
  - Only one project (water supply project proposed by mayor) included in the LPRAP list of projects
Lessons learned

What happened in Lagonoy? 21% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- Open invitation to CSO assembly; CSOs in Notice of CSO assembly included a good number of non-LGU accredited CSOs; but 2 CSOs in list of LGU-accredited CSOs were not invited
- Invitation letter specified that travel expense incurred in attending CSO assembly will be reimbursed
- Improved representation of CSOs in CSO assembly with farmers/ fisherfolks and CSOs from north and eastern coastal areas (i.e., poorer areas) represented
- During CSO assembly, CSO participants identified problems, strategies and specific projects
- Selection of CSO reps in LPRAT done by sector

LPRAP Workshop
- Good attendance of CSO reps
- CSO assembly output presented and validated/ discussed
- Changes in LPRAP list of projects after LPRAP workshop and prior to submission to RPRAT
  - although CSOs and LGU identified equal number of projects during the workshop, budget allocation to individual projects done after LPRAP workshop – budget allocated to CSO-identified project is small compared to project jointly identified by CSOs and LGU
Lessons learned

What happened in Libmanan? 28% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU

- Invitees to CSO assembly confined to list of LGU- accredited CSOs; but not all in list were actually invited
- Invitation letter specified that travel expense incurred in attending CSO assembly will be reimbursed
- One of the reason for non-attendance in CSO assembly – frustration with previous BUB round
- During CSO assembly, CSO participants identified problems and strategies but not specific projects
- 2 CSOs which were not members of LPRAT attended LPRAP WS
- LPRAP Workshop
  - Good attendance of CSO reps
  - CSO assembly output presented and validated/ discussed
  - Changes in LPRAP list of projects after LPRAP workshop and prior to submission to RPRAT
  - Second LPRAP workshop conducted after Barangay chairmen complained about original LPRAP list of projects resulting in reduction in budget allocated to CSO-identified projects in favor of new projects proposed by Barangay chairmen
Lessons learned

What happened in Dapitan? 55% of total cost of all BUB projects are projects identified by LGU

- Invitation
  - LGU cherry-picked CSOs invited to CSO assembly;
  - Former vice-mayor invited to participate as business sector rep and was elected CSO co-chair
  - Overrepresentation of 4Ps and SEA-K reps

- Project identification and prioritization
  - Separate CSO and LGU lists of projects
  - LPRAP projects finalized during the workshop different from projects submitted to the RPRAT;
  - Some projects requested from the office of the mayor were included in the long list
  - Barangay beneficiaries for some projects selected based on presence in LPRAP workshop
Lessons learned

What happened in Polanco? **33% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU**

- Output of CSO assembly not utilized during the LPRAP workshop
- Unequal distribution of participants in break-out groups during the LPRAP workshop; some groups with no CSO reps
- Use of data to support some projects proposed
- Post-LPRAP WS changes in list submitted to RPRAT with allocation to LGU-proposed projects adjusted upwards and allocation to CSO-proposed projects reduced
Lessons learned

What went happened in Mutia (KC)? 13% of total cost of all BUB projects are for projects identified by LGU with another 80% of projects jointly identified by CSOs and LGU

- Summary indicator looked good but ....
- Participation in KC not continous; barangay level PSA results used were that of the previous year when the Mayor with MPDC rather than the ACT facilitated the barangay assemblies
- Unusual composition of LGU reps in the LPRAT (e.g. SB secretary, SB chair on infra instead of Appro)
- Active participation of Mayor in LPRAP workshop
Lessons learned

Critical factors that affect CSO participation

- Inclusiveness in issuing invitations
- Trust issues of CSOs – may lead them to opt out of the process;
- CSO reps identifying problems, solutions / strategies and projects during CSO assemblies
- CSOs given space to provide inputs in framing long list of projects considered for LPRAP prioritization
- Capacity of CSOs in identifying and preparing projects (Antique)
- Strong presence of Mayor in process
- Post-LPRAP WS intervention by LGU
Overview of presentation

- Background/ objective of study
- Findings
- Conclusions
Some improvement in CSO participation from previous round is evident

- Improvement in summary indicator in 2 out of 3 LGUs in Agusan del Norte
- But there is disconnect in problems & issues identified during the CSO assembly and LPRAP projects
Some improvement in CSO participation from previous round is evident

- Improvement in summary indicator in 2 out of 3 LGUs in Camarines Sur
Improvement from previous round is evident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSO / BDC VC-identified</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LGU-identified</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSO-identified</td>
<td>BDC VC-identified (for KC munis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount (PhP M)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount (PhP M)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount (PhP M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agusan del Norte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butuan City</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenavista</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Nieves (KC)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarines Sur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagonoy</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libmanan (KC)</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negros Occidental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagay</td>
<td>22.0 *</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinigaran</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauayan (KC)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quezon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumaca</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauban</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio (KC)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Extent of CSO participation in FY 2015 round**
Extent of CSO participation

- **Summary indicator of CSO participation** – share of projects identified by CSOs/BDC VCs in total cost of LPRAP projects for FY 2015
- **Variation in share of CSO/BDC-VC in total cost of LPRAP projects** – due to differences in more intermediate indicators of CSO participation (including local political interference in a number of elements of areas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGU-identified</th>
<th>CSO/BDC VC - identified</th>
<th>Jointly identified</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agusan del Norte</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butuan City</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Nieves (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Antique</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose (Urban KC)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibalom (KC)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbaza (KC)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camarines Sur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagonoy</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libmanan (KC)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zamboanga del Norte</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapitan</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polanco</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>11.0**</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutia (KC)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.0***</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Include road projects, also a priority of the LGU
** CSO projects include those which are identified during CSO assembly
*** Jointly identified by CSO reps and BDC-vice chairs
Improvement in pace of sub-project implementation from previous round is evident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agusan del Norte</th>
<th>Butuan</th>
<th>Buenavista</th>
<th>Las Nieves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelined</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation on-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprogrammed</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved for 2015 implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Improvement in pace of sub-project implementation from previous round is evident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camarines Sur</th>
<th>( \text{Goa} )</th>
<th>( \text{Lagonoy} )</th>
<th>( \text{Libmanan} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{2013} )</td>
<td>( \text{2014} )</td>
<td>( \text{2013} )</td>
<td>( \text{2014} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{TOTAL NUMBER OF PROJECTS} )</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Completed} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{On-going} )</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Pipelined} )</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Validation on-going} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Reprogrammed} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{No feedback} )</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Discontinued} )</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Approved for 2015 implementation} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- Primary value of BUB process to LGU officials
  - Increased fiscal space for LGUs by providing them with an additional source of funding for LGU projects
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- **BUB adds value to project identification and prioritization process**
  - BUB process better enables LGUs to get information directly from the sectors whose needs and concerns are typically not considered and addressed in regular LGU planning and budgeting processes.
  - **Looking at the cup half full** - Despite the fact that not all of the projects that were actually included in the LPRAP are identified by CSOs/ BDC vice-chairmen, BUB process helps ensure that some of the projects that are needed from the perspective CSOs and local communities are able to secure some funding under the BUB.
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- BUB adds value to CSO participation in planning at local level
  - CSO participation in the LDC is typically limited to 25% of its total membership.
  - Although the LGC provides that NGOs shall choose their representatives to the LDC from among themselves, large degree of political interference in their selection
    - venue and processes governing said selection of CSO representatives to the LDC is not well spelled out in the LGC
    - CSO membership in the LPRAT is 50% compared to 25% in the LDC
    - Role of LDC typically limited to “approving” plans (i.e., LDP, AIP) prepared by LGU officials
  - However, little evidence that the processes installed in the BUB are actually integrated/adopted in the regular development processes of the LGU
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- BUB adds value to CSO empowerment
  - By giving the CSOs the opportunity to identify government projects that will improve their lives, BUB process has encouraged the basic sectors to organize themselves, and to become more active in LGU affairs
  - Also, provides venue for building CSO capacity through learning by doing; in Antique, NEDA reported to have provided CSOs some training on project preparation
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- BUB adds value to LGU-CSO relations
  - The BUB provides a more structured avenue for LGU-CSO interaction.
    - BUB provides LGU and CSOs with a venue to engage in open discussions and joint decision-making
    - BUB process has helped strengthen the relationship between the local government and the CSOs but relationship is fragile and history matters a lot
    - Process tends to build more trust between CSO and LGU
Overall assessment of BUB process & participation

- BUB adds value to inter-CSO relations
  - Some of the respondents in the KII and FGDs have pointed out that CSOs tend to focus on projects that benefit their sector, if not their specific organization only.
  - However, there is some evidence that situation is slowly changing as more CSOs are becoming open and supportive of other CSOs, by pushing for the interest of sectors other than their own.
Recommendations

1. Preparatory steps prior to BUB proper
   - Provide adequate time to prepare for actual conduct of BUB proper
     - Non-synchronization of BUB processes with KC processes

2. Social preparation
   - Continue to improve conduct CSO mapping
   - Promote federation of CSOs belonging to the same basic sector
   - Encourage CSOs to consult with their members prior to CSO assembly
   - Stronger support to CEAC process in KC areas; clarify role of ELDC
Recommendations

2. Social preparation
   - Sustain support/investment in social preparation of CSOs – budgetary resources as well as manpower (e.g., community organizers)
   - Enhance capacity of CSOs to improve quality of their participation
     - Especially in terms of project identification and project development
Recommendations

3. Conduct of CSO assembly
   - Issue invitation to CSO assembly at least 2 weeks prior to actual conduct
   - Continue to provide CSO participants in CSO assembly with logistical support to promote their attendance in CSO assembly
   - PSA output should include CSO identified-list of projects
Recommendations

4. LPRAP workshop
   - Establish and maintain barangay level data base that will promote evidence-based planning and train LGUs/CSOs on how to use
   - BUB guidelines should further clarify that only elected LPRAT members should participate in project prioritization
   - BUB guidelines should provide that CSO reps in LPRAT should present list of projects drawn up by CSOs during the CSO assembly
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