Monitoring Social Accountability:

Stocktaking Report

La Salle Institute of Governance

Monitoring Social Accountability: Stocktaking Report

**Monitoring Social Accountability:
Stocktaking Report**

Published in 2012 by

La Salle Institute of Governance
De La Salle University
Taft Avenue, Manila

Project Management Team

Project Director:	Dr. Francisco A. Magno
Project Manager:	Redento B. Recio
Stocktaking Consultants:	Rachel Aquino
	Ma. Ella Oplas
Web Manager:	Rundell Ato
Research Assistant:	Monica Edralin
Training Assistants:	Chndyli Tara Rogel
	Jacelle Soleil Manara
	Jessa Pacheco

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

AIP	Annual Investment Plan
ANSA-EAP	Affiliated Network for Social Accountability-East Asia and the Pacific
BAC	Bids and Awards Committee
BL	*Bantay Lansangan*
BMFI	Balay Mindanaw Foundation Inc.
BTTAG	Budget Tracking for Transparent Accountable Governance
CARP	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program
CBCP	Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines
CCAGG	Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government
CDAP	Community Direct Assistance Program
CGRC	Citizens Governance Report Card
CISFA	Comprehensive and Integrated Social Finance Act
CMS	Check My School
COA	Commission on Audit
CODE-NGO	Caucus of Development Non-Government Organizations
COMELEC	Commission on Elections
Coop	Co-operative
CRC	Citizens Report Card
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CY	Calendar Year
DA	Department of Agriculture
DAR	Department of Agrarian Reform

DBM	Department of Budget and Management
DEEM	Differential Expenditure Efficiency Measurement
DepEd	Department of Education
DLSU	De La Salle University
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DOH	Department of Health
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
EBJFI	Evelio B. Javier Foundation, Inc.
FDP	Full Disclosure Policy
FEJODAP	Federation of Jeepney Operators and Drivers Association of the Philippines
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Fiscal Year
GAA	General Appropriations Act
GOLD	Governance and Local Democracy
G-Watch	Government Watch
HUDCC	Housing and Urban Development Coordinating Council
IAR	Inspection and Acceptance Report
ICODE	Iloilo Caucus of Development NGOs
INCITEGov	International Center for Innovation, Transformation and Excellence in Governance
IPD	Institute for Popular Democracy
KII	Key Informant Interview
LAD	Land Acquisition and Distribution
LAN	Local Area Network
LAPP	Local Anti-Poverty Planning
LDC	Local Development Council
LEAD for Health	Local Enhancement and Development for Health
LGC	Local Government Code of 1991
LGUs	Local Government Units
LSIG	La Salle Institute of Governance

LWUA	Local Water Utilities Administration
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MINCODE	Mindanao Coalition of Development NGOs
MPI	Material Project Information
MSH	Management Sciences for Health
MSI	Management Systems International
NAMFREL	National Movement for Free Elections
NEDA-ICC	National Economic Development Authority Investment Coordination Committee
NGA	National Government Agency
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OMB	Office of the Ombudsman
PARC	Provincial Agrarian Reform Council
PBGs	Performance-Based Grants
PBSP	Philippine Business for Social Progress
PDAF Watch	Priority Development Assistance Fund Watch
PEM	Public Expenditure Management
PETS	Public Expenditure Tracking System
PhilGEPS	Philippine Government Electronic Procurement System
PhilDHRRA	Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas
PHILSSA	Partnership of Philippine Support Services Agencies
PNBMP	Philippine National Budget Monitoring Project
POW	Program of Work
PSD	Public Service Delivery
PTA	Parent- Teachers' Association
PWI	Procurement Watch, Inc.
RCA	Rapid Capacity Assessment

RUSS	Road Users Satisfaction Survey
SGH	Seal of Good Housekeeping
SONA	State of the Nation Address
SSL3	Salary Standardization Law 3
SWS	Social Weather Station
TAN	Transparency and Accountability Network
TAG ME	Transparency and Accountability in Governance Monitoring and Evaluation
TB	Tuberculosis
UDHA	Urban Development and Housing Act
UP-ALL	Urban Poor Alliance
UP NCPAG	University of the Philippines National College of Public Administration and Governance
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Acknowledgements

Preface

This **Stocktaking Report** is an integral aspect of the project "Institutionalizing Civil Society Monitoring of Public Service Delivery to the Poor." The project aims to promote transparency and accountability through the development of knowledge partnerships among local universities, local government units, and civil society organizations (CSOs). The report identifies monitoring initiatives, tools and approaches, their applications, contributions, and their limitations; classifies the initiatives and tools according to their use in the program management cycle; and identifies challenges faced by CSOs in monitoring public services.

The Stocktaking Report is guided by social accountability, a requirement of civil society monitoring of public services. Civil society monitoring of public services in the Philippines is grounded on the basic democratic principles of good governance, which goes hand in hand with transparency and accountability. The right to monitor, on the other hand, is founded on international human rights principles on participation, on provisions of the 1987 Philippine Constitution, on the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC), and various national laws and policies promoting public accountability. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) provide CSOs with performance targets that enable them to monitor public services and program outcomes.

The stocktaking reveals that CSO monitoring initiatives and tools were used in budget formulation, in policy and budget analysis, and in public expenditure/input tracking. The bulk of surveyed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) initiatives and tools in the Philippines are in public expenditure/input tracking. They are largely implementation-focused (as opposed to results/outcome-focused). Among the notable changes in CSO monitoring in recent years is the use of information communication technology in various formats.

The challenges to CSO monitoring of public services include barriers to access to information, delays in budget legislation, and the frequent use of budgets as a political tool. They also include the lack of rules and transparency in the governance of many budget items such as lump sum appropriations, gaps in public audit functions in audit agencies, and a general lack of public interest in the budget, except for instances involving the misuse of public funds.

Project Description

De La Salle University (DLSU), with support from the World Bank (WB), is managing a three-year collaboration project titled "Institutionalizing Civil Society Monitoring of Public Service Delivery to the Poor" (2010-2013). The project aims to promote transparency and accountability by enhancing the capacity of selected CSOs and government agencies to undertake joint government-civil society monitoring of local public service delivery, especially to the poor. This was done through the development of knowledge partnerships among local universities. The major stakeholders of the project include select local government units (LGUs), universities, CSOs, and national government agencies (NGAs).

The project has four (4) major components: 1) Stocktaking and development of local multi-stakeholder knowledge partnerships; 2) Capacity development for local knowledge partnerships; 3) Assessing the application of local tools and approaches for monitoring public service delivery; and 4) Knowledge management. The Stocktaking Report is an integral aspect of Component 1, and focuses on monitoring initiatives, approaches, and tools, to track public service delivery.

Objectives of the Stocktaking Report

The report aims to:

1. Identify monitoring initiatives, tools and approaches, their applications, contributions, and limitations
2. Classify the monitoring initiatives and tools according to their use in the project development cycle
3. Identify the challenges faced by CSOs in monitoring public services.

Scope of the Report

The stocktaking effort covers an inventory of monitoring initiatives, tools and approaches developed and/or used by CSOs either jointly with or independent of their national and local government agency

counterparts. Initially, the stocktaking meant to cover monitoring initiatives in four (4) public service sectors: housing, social welfare, education and health. However, the report was later expanded to accommodate other notable efforts in other service areas. It also documented initiatives found in three (3) project sites: 1) Pavia, Iloilo; 2) Pinamungajan, Cebu; and 3) Sibulan, Negros Oriental. In addition to the monitoring initiatives documented in three (3) project areas, the Report also includes those monitoring initiatives undertaken by local CSOs to monitor national or local government programs implemented in their localities.

The stocktaking is not meant to provide an exhaustive list of all the monitoring initiatives and approaches in the Philippines. Rather, the stocktaking illustrates and describes how CSOs conduct monitoring activities. The report provides contextual information on initiatives and approaches whenever possible. While evaluation is part of the program cycle and is almost always mentioned in the same breath as monitoring, this Report did not include efforts by CSOs to evaluate public service delivery.

Analytical Framework for the Stocktaking

Definition of Monitoring

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2002a) defines monitoring as a continuous function that uses the systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are associated with each other too often that one is not mentioned without the other. They are distinct from each other, but are complementary and interlinked. Monitoring gives information on *where* a policy, program, or project is at any given time (and over time) relative to respective targets and outcomes. It is descriptive in intent. Evaluation, on the other hand, gives evidence *why* targets and outcomes are or are not being achieved. It seeks to address issues of attribution and contribution. Of particular emphasis here is the expansion of the traditional M&E function to focus explicitly on outcomes and impacts.

Woodhill (2005) views M&E as two overlapping spheres of activity and information.[1] Generally, 'monitoring' focuses more on the regular collection of data, while evaluation involves making judgments about the data. In theory, monitoring is viewed as a regular activity while evaluation is a more periodic occurrence.

Evaluation complements monitoring. When a monitoring system shows evidence that the efforts are going off track (for example, the intended users of a program or a project is not using the services), then good evaluative information can help clarify the realities and trends noted by the monitoring system. For example, if annual

---

[1] In "*M&E as Learning: Rethinking the Dominant Paradigm,*" a book chapter prepared for Monitoring and Evaluation for Soil Conservation and Watershed Development Projects, World Association of Soil and Water Conservation, 2005

performance information is presented in isolation, without the context and benefit of program evaluation, there is a danger of drawing incorrect conclusions regarding the cause of improvements or declines in certain measures. Simply looking at trend data usually cannot tell us the effectiveness of government program interventions.

Organizations and their funders are increasingly thinking about how evaluation findings can be shared and used to learn about approaches to service delivery, so that success can be replicated, services can be improved, and policy can be influenced. Lessons can be learnt from initiatives and projects that do not work, so these findings should be shared as well.

Monitoring Initiatives, Tools and Approaches

This stocktaking offers the following definitions:

Monitoring initiatives. There are three types of monitoring initiatives:

1. Those that are government initiated;
2. Those initiated by civil society; and
3. Those monitoring exercises conducted jointly by government and CSOs.

In this stocktaking report, monitoring initiatives are those projects, programs or efforts put together by CSOs either by themselves or in partnership with government, donor organizations, media, the academe, church or business groups that aim to exact accountability from government, improve government performance, help formulate policy advocacy agendas, or curb corruption.

Monitoring tools. In this stocktaking report, monitoring tools are data or information-gathering instruments or mechanisms used by social monitors to aid their monitoring initiatives. Examples of monitoring tools are: client satisfaction surveys, governance report cards, and monitoring inspection reports. Monitoring tools describe how the data are gathered, analyzed, and presented.

Various social disciplines employ a huge variety of data-gathering techniques. These methods are used and combined in a variety of ways by civil society monitors to obtain information – either

4

quantitative or qualitative data - based on a set of monitoring indicators. Monitoring tools are rarely understood by themselves. It must be linked to the objectives and the particular stakeholders that the monitoring initiative wants to reach.

Monitoring approaches are the combination of tools and initiatives that make up a particular monitoring strategy which defines the objective of the monitoring effort, articulates the stakeholders involved, and formulates the monitoring tools - including how the data gathered will be analyzed and interpreted. The monitoring approach shows the distinction among monitoring initiatives. An approach can be externally driven or conducted by an outsider. It can be participatory, involving the beneficiaries themselves. It can be rapidly executed, as in rapid assessments, or it can be long-standing and sustained over a period of time.

Social Accountability Framework

This stocktaking makes use of the **social accountability framework** of the World Bank (Malena, et.al., 2004). Social accountability in the public sector refers to building accountability that relies on civic engagement, wherein ordinary citizens and civil society participate, directly or indirectly, in exacting such accountability. Social accountability conjures practices that emphasize evidence-based and direct interaction between citizens and their government counterparts, e.g., citizen monitoring and evaluation of public service delivery. The institutionalization of public accountability mechanisms is also more effective and sustainable, as they become part of the processes, thus, part of the rewards and sanctions system of government.

Social accountability, thus, leads to three outcomes or results:

1. Improved governance by exacting accountability from public officials
2. Increased development effectiveness through improved public service delivery and more informed policy design, and
3. Empowerment by expanding the freedom of choice and action of poor people.

The effectiveness and viability of social accountability mechanisms should thus be measured according to the following factors:

1. Political culture and context that determine the parameters for social accountability
2. Citizens' access to reliable public documents and data that serve as bases for social accountability activities
3. Availability, accessibility and utilization of independent media that allow public discussion of public issues
4. Capacity, legitimacy, representativeness, responsiveness, and accountability of civil society actors
5. Capacity and effectiveness of state machinery in responding to citizen demands, producing records and accounts, running accountability mechanisms, building partnerships
6. Synergy between state and civil society actors
7. Institutionalization by state organizations of the grievance and redress system that empowers the state's own checks and balances

Monitoring and Public Service Program Cycle

Government programs and projects go through a program cycle developed before they are delivered or made available to citizens. It does not – and should not - come about overnight. A basic program cycle includes policy making, planning, budgeting, execution, monitoring and evaluation.

Policy making refers to the process by which the government translates its political vision into programs to deliver services. Here, policy makers discuss how to concretize their ideas. Hence, promoting good practice in policy making is essential to the delivery of quality outcomes. Monitoring results can be very useful in providing the government with inputs especially in identifying priorities, given the competing demands from its citizens. They provide the check and balances necessary to guide the policy makers in the steps that will be taken to realize a goal in their governance.

Program development refers to the process wherein an engagement arises between the policy makers and representatives of the public in planning, implementing, and evaluating plans of action addressing the identified needs and issues. This is the area where civil society engages the government by providing inputs on the set of plans of action on the policies made. The result of a monitoring at this point will be able to provide critical evidence for the government and civil society on the most effective types of government programs to undertake.

Planning is the part wherein strategies are developed to map the future of the policy to be implemented. Resources, quality, and risks are discussed. Though financial plans are usually placed in the planning stage, this report made it a separate process. As in the experience of CSOs, monitoring of some tools focus on the budget part of the program development. Monitoring initiatives can provide comparisons over time that could help identify good, bad, and promising practices. Results are helpful at this point since they give guidance on what should be avoided and what should be replicated.

Budgeting in the government refers to the critical exercise of allocating revenues and resources to attain the economic and social goals of the country. It entails the management of government expenditures to create the most impact from the production and delivery of goods and services. Monitoring results are utilized in scrutinizing the budget process, from preparation to authorization, execution and accountability.

Implementation refers to the actual conduct of the policy, which is the public service itself. Monitoring at this period looks into how the service is put in operation, examining the results in accordance with the strategies designed in the planning stage

Stocktaking Methodology

Inventories of existing initiatives done in the recent past provided extensive discussions on the reasons for or context of the initiatives, on the profile of the developers or initiators of the efforts, on the resource requirements, and on the actual results of the initiatives such as improved service delivery, reduced leakage of government resources and empowerment of the poor.

The Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific (ANSA-EAP) compiled 13 CSO-initiated procurement monitoring programs and tools in the Philippines from 1986 through 2011. The report combined programs and forms that serve as tools in monitoring various stages of the procurement cycle. It analyzed the tools used for the Infrastructure Monitoring of the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government (CCAGG), G-Watch's Textbook Count, the Public Bidding Checklist of Procurement Watch, the Medicine Monitoring Project of NAMFREL, the Internal Revenue Allotment Watch of the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP), the Philippine Development Assistance Fund (PDAF) Watch of CODE-NGO, Observer's Diagnostic Report of Procurement Watch, the *Bantay Lansangan* Road Monitoring Tool, the *Bantay Eskwela* Procurement Watch, the Differential Expenditure Efficiency Measurement Tool of Procurement Watch, G-Watch's monitoring tool for Bayanihang Eskwela, and the ANSA-EAP Score Card. One of the major findings of the report is the focus of existing tools on the contract implementation stage (i.e., checking if mechanisms ensuring the delivery of right quantity and quality of goods are in place). There is also a considerable number of tools that monitor or at least mention the bidding stage. Only a few tools address the monitoring of the planning stage. What is clear is that these tools do not utilize information communication technology (ICT) and standardized databases.

The ANSA published work *Social Accountability Practice in the Philippines: A Scoping Study (2010)*, discussed the experiences in civic engagement. The stocktaking focused on the lessons that could be gleaned out of the experiences. Another ANSA-EAP publication, *Social Accountability Stocktaking Reports: Philippines (2012)*, grouped the initiatives in terms of their mechanisms for achieving

results, including a categorization of their target audience, clients, and results.

A **stocktaking template** was developed from the review of related literature to profile collected monitoring tools and approaches. This template was used to standardize the data collection of the stocktaking initiative and classifying/ clustering the tools and approaches.

The first draft of the report was presented for inputs and validation in focused group discussions (FGDs) conducted in the cities of Cebu, Tuguegarao, General Santos and Legazpi.

Initially, this stocktaking was limited to tools and approaches that would satisfy the following criteria:

1. CSO developed and implemented. Government self-evaluation tools and approaches were automatically disqualified but tools developed by the government with clear, visible and legitimate participation by CSOs were included;
2. Existing and implemented tools; and
3. Implemented tools that monitor and evaluate four sectors namely housing, health, education, and social welfare.

In an effort to improve the stocktaking effort, sectoral classification was done away with and focus was instead directed to analysis of monitoring initiatives and approaches in terms of their use in the program cycle.

Context of Civil Society Monitoring of Public Services in the Philippines

The Philippines strives to be a democratic state. An essential attribute of democracy is good governance, which goes hand in hand with accountability and transparency. Fundamentally based on basic democratic principles, civil society monitoring of government services in the Philippines derives its rationale from the 1987 Constitution, human rights principles, the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC), and specific national laws and policies that promote transparency and accountability in public service.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution states that public office, being a public trust, makes all public officials and employees accountable to the people. It provides for impeachment proceedings for the nation's highest officials, reaffirms the role of the *Sandigan Bayan* as an anti-graft court, and created the office of the Ombudsman which has the power to act on any complaints by citizens on any public official, employee, office or agency, and recommend their removal or prosecution. The 1987 Constitution also respects the role of independent peoples' organizations to pursue their legitimate and collective interests through lawful means (Art. XI).[2]

The 1991 Local Government Code is a comprehensive law. It defines the structures, powers and responsibilities in local governance in the Philippines. A set of rules and responsibilities provided by the Code mandates each and every local government unit (LGU) to deliver basic services in accordance with their fiscal capacity and to the physical area they govern.

As democratic representation is essential to the effective implementation of the transfer of responsibilities to LGUs, the Code also encourages peoples' participation in all aspects of governance, which paves the way for the flourishing of civil society organizations. Among the LGC's provisions that provides avenues for peoples' participation in local governance are mandatory consultations, initiative referendum, and recall, and mandatory public hearings. Probably the most relevant provision for citizen participation in the

---

[2] See also Art. XIII Sec. 15 and 16

governance processes is the creation of Local Special Bodies. Local special bodies are semi-autonomous units in which civil society organizations and the private sector are represented, and are attached to local governments that perform specific responsibilities in support of mandated duties and responsibilities of LGUs. These are ideally the source of evidence-based, bottom-up planning along sectoral issues. The Local Development Councils, one of the six Code mandated bodies[3], serve as the "mother" local planning structure and are mandated by law to ensure that pro-poor programs are included in the medium-term and annual investment plans.[4]

The passage of the LGC has put the spotlight on local government units (LGUs), particularly on the huge responsibility that was entrusted to them, as well as the amount of resources that are now at their disposal to effectively discharge the devolved functions. Under the LGC, at least 20 percent of their internal revenues should be set aside for development projects to be used for specific programs, projects and activities in furtherance of the development agenda of the government. For Calendar Year 2010, the 20 percent local development funds (LDF) of LGUs amounts to Php53 billion.

Since the Code's enactment, along with the increasing public clamor for greater accountability, a good number of citizen undertakings on monitoring and evaluation of public services have emerged and influenced public services in varying levels of success. Among these are Citizen Score Cards, Procurement Watch, G-Watch, Social Watch, Local Government Watch, and the Social Housing Watch. In February 2009, the government established the Performance Based Incentive Policy,[5] which provides for an incentive framework to rationalize national government intergovernmental transfers to

---

[3] There are six Code-mandated local special bodies that LGUs are mandated to create: the Local Development Council, the Local Health Board (LHB), the Local School Board (LScB), the Local Peace and Order Council (LPOC), the Pre-Qualification, Bids and Awards Committee (PBAC), and the Peoples Law Enforcement Board (PLEB)

[4] See Local Government Code Sections 34-36, on role of NGOs and peoples' organizations; 5 Sections 37-38 on Pre-qualification, Bids and Awards Committee, Sections 69-75 on Recall, Sections 98-101 on Local School Boards, Sections 102-105 on Local Health Boards; Sections 106-115 on Local Development Councils; Sec. 116 on Local Peace and Order Council; and Sections 120-127 on Local Initiative and Recall

[5] See http://www.dilg.gov.ph/programproject.php?id=6). However, other documents indicate it was implemented in 2010 in 30 4th-6th class municipalities (see draft DILG memo Circular 20111419. http://www.dilg.gov.ph/PDF_File/issuances/ memo_circulars /DILG-Memo_Circular-2011419-f61c77c9ba.pdf

LGU towards improving LGU performance in governance and delivery of basic services, linking incentives to the achievement of a set of performance targets.

In line with the Performance-Based Incentive Policy, the DILG initiated the Performance Challenge Fund to stimulate local government to put premium on performance in order to avail themselves of financial support to jumpstart and sustain local economic development initiatives for poverty reduction in their localities. The Performance Challenge Fund is a financial incentive awarded to qualified LGUs for local development initiatives aligned with the national government's programs for the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), tourism and local economic development, disaster risk reduction and management and solid waste management.

The Benigno Aquino, Jr. administration also instituted the Seal of Good Housekeeping (SGH), a project which recognizes LGUs with good performance in internal housekeeping, particularly in the areas of local legislation, development planning, resource generation, resource allocation and utilization, customer service, and human resource management and development, as well as in valuing the fundamental of good governance. In the SGH program, LGUs are required to adhere to the Full Disclosure Policy (FDP) of the government and must have no adverse findings from the Commission on Audit (CoA) in order to receive the Performance Challenge Fund from the government. The fund is an incentive to LGUs in the form of counterpart funding to high-impact capital investment projects in the Annual Investment Program (AIP) and funded out of the 20 percent Local Development Fund consistent with national goals and priorities. It seeks to rationalize national government intergovernmental transfers to LGUs, and encourages alignment of local development initiatives with national government development agenda and priorities.

The FDP requires all LGUs to post their budget and finances, bids, and public offering in government websites, newspapers of general circulation, or in any conspicuous and appropriate places to promote transparency and accountability.

Republic Act 6713, the Code of Conduct for Public Officers of 1989, states that public officials and employees have an obligation to make government documents accessible to the public. In 2003, the

Government Procurement Reform Act was passed. This law enabled CSOs to be involved in all stages of public procurement activities as observers. National agencies were mandated to invite at least two observers to sit in its proceedings in all stages of the procurement process.

The Benigno Aquino, Jr. administration took a few more steps to open many "windows of engagement" for promoting good governance and transparency in the country. President Aquino's electoral platform on "Kung Walang Corrupt, Walang Mahirap" (greater social accountability) is embodied in two important national documents: the Open Government Action Plan 2012 and the Philippine Development Plan for 2011-2016, with chapters on Good Governance and the Rule of Law.

A specific avenue provided by these national policies is through the expansion of CSO involvement in the budgeting process of national government agencies. Under Joint Memorandum Circular No. 1, s. 2012, the Human Development and Poverty Reduction Cluster and the Good Governance and Anti-Poverty Cluster, together with the Department of Budget Management (DBM) and the Department of the Interior Local Government (DILG), have joined forces to pioneer the open governance initiative for the localization of poverty reduction through a "bottom-up" approach to government planning and budgeting.

The "bottom-up" budgeting approach was applied to the preparation of the 2013 national budget, to help ensure that the development needs of the 609 identified poorest municipalities/cities are addressed and to harmonize the budget with the delivery of services of the national agencies through more inclusive and participatory governance process.

This approach recognizes the vital role of the CSOs in making poverty reduction initiatives more effective and in strengthening participatory and decentralized budgeting. Indeed, the CSOs' involvement is a relatively unique feature of this planning and budget process. It gives way to continuous efforts of the government to expand the meaningful collaboration between the participating

national government agencies (NGAs), local government units (LGUs) and CSOs in crafting the 2013 budget.[6]

Among the guiding posts for national and local development planning are the MDGs, formulated by the United Nations General Assembly in September 2000 to alleviate hunger and poverty in the member states by 2015. The MDGs were translated into national goals, and serve as one of the guideposts for LGUs in designing local anti-poverty programs and services. The MDGs provide measurable indicators of performance for national and local governments which CSOs could reliably use for monitoring outcomes of public services.

---

[6] CODE-NGO in http://code-ngo.org/home/component/content/article/43-front/275-new-hope-for-the-2013-budget-process.html accessed 15 May 2012

Use of Monitoring in the Program Cycle

The tools and approaches utilized by CSO initiatives are used in the different stages of the program cycle: in program and policy preparation, planning, budgeting, implementation, and post-implementation monitoring and evaluation. In many instances, however, initiatives cannot be confined to a single part of the cycle.[7]

Below are some examples of how citizen monitoring initiatives are used in stages of the program development and management cycle.

Participatory Policy and Budget Formulation

This involves direct citizen/CSO participation in formulating public policy and budgets (i.e., in proposing projects and allocating funds). Participatory policy formulation has become an increasingly common trend, particularly with the introduction of the poverty reduction strategies at the national level, and community-driven development initiatives at the local level. Participatory budget formulation is less common at the national level and usually occurs at the local level. This is especially true in the Philippines after the enactment of the Local Government Code. Another approach to participatory budget formulation is when civil society actors prepare alternative budgets to influence budget formulation by expressing citizen preferences. In 2001 to 2002, for instance, the Philippine Governance Forum of the Ateneo School of Government initiated the Budget Advocacy Project. It was designed to increase budget literacy among the public and promote civil society participation in the budgeting process.

In President Aquino's Open Government Action Plan 2012, in crafting the 2012 National Budget, six national government agencies

---

[7] For instance, in the LG-Watch initiative, social accountability tools developed were used repetitively throughout the program cycle. Public expenditure tracking is used during the agency's accountability reporting which happens from January to March of every year, during the monitoring and evaluation and pre-budget preparation (April to June) and finally during the budget authorization, review and implementation stage (mid-October until December). This can also be said about the *Bantay Lansangan* initiative monitoring the pre-construction, construction and post-construction phases of school building projects.

and three government corporations piloted the consultative budget preparation process with CSOs in 2011.[8]

Transparency and Accountability in Local Governance

The La Salle Institute of Governance (LSIG) developed a tool under its Transparency and Accountability in Local Governance in the Philippines project. This tool is a set of mechanisms assessing transparency and accountability systems in key cities and municipalities. Mechanisms are defined as rules, organizations, and processes that deter abuse of power and promote transparency and accountability in governance. This initiative shows the presence or absence, effectiveness, and accessibility of "in law" and "in practice" mechanisms. It tells open-minded and responsive local government officials their strengths and gaps in terms of transparency and accountability.

To measure the mechanisms, 175 "in law" and "in practice" indicators, were developed. The indicators are scored by local researchers who need to provide evidence to substantiate their mark. De jure or "in law" indicators are rated as "yes" or "no" or existence or non-existence (e.g. "in law, there are requirements for the independent auditing of the asset disclosure forms of members of the local council") while "in practice" indicators are assigned a score from zero to 100 (e.g. "in practice, the regulations governing the grant of public concessions, such as contracts for government projects or the procurement of goods and services, to family members and relatives of city/municipal officials are effective").

Government-Watch (G-Watch's) Rapid Capacity Assessment

At a local level, the Rapid Capacity Assessment (RCA) is an example of a CSO initiative at the participatory budget formulation stage. It aims to assess:

---

[8] SONA 2011 Technical Report, page 9-10. Departments which piloted the consultative process were those in the social and economic services sectors with the biggest budgetary allocation, namely: Education, Health, Social Welfare, Public Works, Agriculture and Agrarian Reform. Pilot government corporations were those with large government subsidies, particularly the National Food Authority, National Housing Authority and National Home Mortgage and Finance Corporation.

1. The baseline capacity of the LGU in social accountability application and practice, and
2. The current level of good governance (particularly transparency, accountability and efficiency) of the LGU.

The RCA result was used as basis for the service delivery to be covered by the G-Watch application. The baseline data were used to assess the project results after the project implementation.

It included competency assessment and good governance survey in the three public service delivery areas: environment (infrastructure for waste water management), housing (for informal settlers) and health (*barangay* health services). The parameters of the public service delivery monitoring and assessment are: efficiency, sustainability and participation.

The tool was developed by the Ateneo School of Government and the G-Watch Philippines. Among other places, it was cascaded to Dumaguete City for execution through the Silliman University.

The respondents in the key informant interviews (KIIs) were the: CSO leaders, representatives from the academe, the City Administrator, and heads of offices in the three identified areas of environment, housing and health. In addition to the KIIs, a series of Focused Group Discussions (FGDs) with the KII respondents and members of their offices and organizations was also conducted to validate the results of the KII. Part of the methodology in the RCA is the conduct of actual observation on LGU initiated activities with the participation of the CSOs.

The RCA found that health service is considered the most critical public service delivery area to be monitored. Thus, the monitoring subject was directed in the said public service. After consultation with the health office of the City Government, G-Watch Philippines and the partner CSOs decided to focus the monitoring in the provision of drugs and medicines. The results of the RCA were used to develop the tool on Community Monitoring of the Local Government Unit Provision of Drugs and Medicines (which is described in section 5.3.4).

Population, Health and Environment Database Monitoring System

Another local initiative which illustrates the partnership with CSOs at this stage of the program cycle is the Population, Health and Environment Database Monitoring System being implemented by the Iloilo Caucus for Development, in partnership with eleven (11) municipal governments in Central and Northern Iloilo. It also includes the Northern Iloilo Alliance for Health and Development and the Provido-Calinog-Bingawan, a local government health consortium. The project, which started in January 2010, receives financial support from the European Union.

The project's primary goal is the institutionalization of social contracts for transparent and accountable governance and effective population, health and environment service delivery. Thus, it is also referred to as TAG-PHE.

The TAG-PHE tool covers three primary areas namely health, population and environment. It focuses on participatory local governance initiatives and interventions to assist partner LGUs in identifying their development priorities and needs in order for them to be eligible for funding by the European Union- Municipal Support Fund.

Integral to the TAG-PHE approach is the profiling of each of the 11 partner LGUs, including the conduct of surveys, spot mappings, conduct of participatory local governance orientations, and the review of the annual investment plans (AIP) of the target *barangays* in the partner LGUs.

Monitoring the Scope for Performance-Based Grants (PBG)

The Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD) is a non-profit research and advocacy institute that seeks to enhance the capabilities of NGOs, POs and progressive political groups. IPD sought to generate knowledge and convene groups with the capacity to serve as reference points and advocates for a reform of the patronage-based national budget process. It has been expanding the scope for performance-based grants (PBGs), and thus reducing the scope for discretionary forms of national government support for devolved services. Its activities included:

1. Review and documentation of economic theories and hypotheses that might explain the existence of continuing national government support for devolved services;
2. Identification of constituencies for performance and formula-based grants,
3. Inventory of existing PBGs in order to identify and propose areas into which PBGs can be expanded; and
4. Identification of LGUs and sectoral needs where PBG's might be introduced.

IPD focused on expanding the scope for PBGs in water provision, with an emphasis on demand driven proposals. It also conducted advocacy on performance-based fund flows coming from the local level (LGUs and CSOs) regarding how national agency budgets for water should be disbursed. In line with this, it developed local level proposals for implementing rules and regulations to govern the Php1.5 billion water fund at the Department of Housing; conducted workshops of local stakeholders on service provision to "commercially unviable areas" in water districts; and disseminated information derived from these activities to a wider range of stakeholders.

The initiative's outputs included:

1. Research on PBGs – this research shows how they work, where they might work best, how they can be implemented in the Philippines; It also developed a model legislation/ a model ordinance from national government agencies which shows implementing rules and regulations governing access to grants based on performance in delivering basic services that LGUs and communities can adapt to put water PBGs in place more easily;
2. Advocacy of the rules-based dispersal of funds for LGUs with officials at various levels, including two major water providers, the Department of Health (DoH) and Local Water Utilities Administration (LWUA) and members of the House of Representatives and Senate. In particular, IPD sought to extend the use of the rules of the National Economic Development Authority – Investment Coordinating Council (NEDA-ICC) governing national government support for devolved services from the DOH to LWUA; and
3. Hands-on work with selected LGUs and communities on how to proceed with implementing PBGs for water in their areas.

While IPD's initiative has a specific focus, it concretely addressed the large issue of the stealthy rolling back of the spirit of the 1991 Local Government Code (LGC) in recent years. IPD took the approach of conducting both general research and applied policy work in a particular area, in this case, concrete guidelines for budgeting for local water provision. Similarly, IPD worked at the national and local levels to help build local constituencies for national level reforms.

Participatory Budget Analysis

CSOs review budgets in order to assess whether allocations match the government's social commitments. This may involve analyzing the impact and implications of budget allocations, demystifying or simplifying the technical content of the budget, raising awareness about budget-related issues, and encouraging and undertaking public education campaigns to improve budget literacy.

At the local level, whether or not citizens have participated in budget formulation, efforts to publicize and encourage debate around the contents of local budgets can enhance public understanding of budget issues and encourage civic engagement in its implementation and monitoring. CSOs also play a key role in reviewing, critiquing and building public awareness about policies in key areas, such as poverty reduction, gender equity, environmental protection, employment, and social services.

Bantay Pabahay Para sa Maralita (Social Housing Watch)

The *Bantay Pabahay Para sa Maralita* (Social Housing Watch), made a budgetary analysis of key government agencies involved in social housing. It also monitored and assessed select social housing projects in terms of their adherence to the stipulated budget allocation, quality of service, and appropriateness to the needs of the urban poor.

Under this monitoring initiative, the Partnership of Philippine Support Agencies, Inc. (PHILSSA) produced a research on the development and implementation of socialized housing budgets across relevant agencies; a policy brief on the national budget for social housing; a comprehensive and accessible manual on housing budget tracking; and an advocacy agenda based on PHILSSA's research for

22

concerned CSOs (especially the UP-ALL coalition). Other accomplishments include: applied monitoring in selected areas; participation in committee hearings related to the 2010 budget for housing; presentations of research and recommendations in such venues as meetings conducted by the Housing Urban and Development Coordinating Council (HUDCC) on the Comprehensive and Integrated Social Finance Act (CISFA) and Urban Development and Housing Act (UDHA), in line with the Senate Sunset Review of the two laws on April 15 and 20, 2009; and organization of *Bantay Pabahay* Advocates, a network of CSO leaders with expertise in housing budget issues.

Budget Tracking for Transparent Accountable Governance (BTTAG)

The Transparent Accountable Governance Program of the Asia Foundation initiated the Budget Tracking for Transparent Accountable Governance (BTTAG) as part of its good governance modeling. This was done with support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), in partnership with the Mindanao Coalition of Development NGOs (MINCODE) through the Balay Mindanaw Foundation Inc. (BMFI). BTTAG, by collaborating with the LGUs in budget tracking, aimed to increase transparency and accountability in the local budget process of 20 Mindanao local governments, and to improve CSO access to local government fiscal information, especially the budget**.** BTTAG monitored the budgeting process of local governments from budget preparation and review authorization to execution, to determine if local governments' budgets were aligned with their respective plans and programs and reflected the needs of the local citizens.

Department of Agrarian Reform Budget Monitoring Project

For this monitoring initiative, the Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas or PhilDHRRA, a network of 66 NGOs involved in a wide-range of development activities in rural Philippines, aimed to establish a mechanism for civil society monitoring of the Department of Agrarian Reform's (DAR) budget and pilot it at the provincial level. PhilDHRRA sought to ensure proper use of funds and to provide an alternative source of information on the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP) implementation. The project had four objectives:

1. To write and publish a manual for field monitoring of CARP land acquisition and distribution (LAD) and support services delivery projects, including the development of field monitoring, validation and evaluation tools;
2. To conduct a training of staff members of the PhilDHRRA Secretariat and PhilDHRRA member organizations in field monitoring of CARP LAD accomplishments and support services delivery projects;
3. To conduct field monitoring of CARP LAD accomplishments and support services delivery projects vis-à-vis the approved and released CARP budget for 2008 in the province of Compostela Valley as a pilot effort; and
4. To disseminate the data and field monitoring reports generated by the project to stakeholders.

Under its follow-on grant, PhilDHRRA sought to distill the findings from its project-funded research on the DAR budget into a policy brief for legislators, and disseminate the findings and tools to a wide audience through a forum for stakeholders in agrarian reform at the national level, and to regions beyond the pilot region covered under the first grant.

PhilDHRRA produced a systematic methodology for monitoring DAR land distribution and support services, including indicators and a sampling framework. It also came up with a detailed, easily understood guide for the methodology's implementation by local partners ("A Guide in Monitoring the Department of Agrarian Reform's Land Distribution and Support Services"). It capacitated a cadre of field monitors, conducted the actual monitoring and documentation in one province, analyzed DAR budgets (including the 2007 DAR budget and its fund sources), analyzed regional appropriations, assessed performance that links DAR's budget to its accomplishments, and reviewed the audit reports of the Commission on Audit (COA) based on data from the Presidential Agrarian Reform Council (PARC), the DAR, DBM, and COA. PhilDHRRA also compared regional appropriations, and compiled significant audit report observations. It also reviewed the 2009 budget, focusing on the Bicameral Report on the proposed General Appropriations Act (GAA).

Participatory Public Expenditure/Input Tracking

This involves citizen groups tracking how the government actually spends public resources, to identify leakages or bottlenecks in the flow of financial resources or inputs. Typically, groups employ actual users of government services, assisted by CSOs, to collect and publicly disseminate data on inputs and expenditures.

Public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS) track the flow of public funds and determine the extent to which resources actually reach the target groups. The surveys examine the manner, quantity, and timing of releases of resources to different levels of government, particularly to the units responsible for the delivery of social services, such as health and education. PETS are often implemented as part of a larger service delivery and facility surveys which focus on the quality of service, characteristics of the facilities, their management, and incentive structures (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank, 2004).

Examples of these in the Philippines are the Budget Monitoring Project, Medicine Monitoring Project, and the *Bantay Lansangan* Initiative.

Monitoring the Budget of the Department of Agriculture (2008-2009)

CODE-NGO is a network of 12 networks of civil society organizations representing more than 2,000 organizations (NGOs, peoples' organizations, and cooperatives). The project, funded under CODE-NGO's first grant, had five objectives:

1. To train 50 leaders of national networks and regional NGO/PO/coop networks in five (5) regions in national budget analysis and monitoring;
2. To promote greater understanding of the DA's budgeting structure and process;
3. To craft a shared analysis of and recommendations for the budget process and content of the DA, particularly its 2008 approved budget and its proposed/approved budget for 2009;
4. To advocate for these recommendations in the DA and Congress; and

5. To form an informal learning and action network (LAN) of NGO/PO/Coop leaders committed to continuously study, monitor and undertake advocacy/lobbying activities related to the DA budget process and content.

Under its follow-on grant, CODE-NGO sought to familiarize CSOs with the 2009 DA budget, as approved by Congress. It also aimed to build the capacity of network members to maximize their engagement in agriculture and fisheries councils, and/or other mechanisms at national and local levels, with regard to budget advocacy and budget monitoring.

CODE-NGO engaged in a number of research and publication efforts under this initiative. Among these efforts, perhaps the most notable is the policy brief "Of Scams and Lump Sums: The Need for Greater Transparency and Accountability in the Department of Agriculture Budget Process."

Public Expenditure Tracking Survey in Iloilo City

The project Governance and Local Democracy (GOLD), implemented by the Iloilo Caucus of Development NGOs or ICODE, used the Public Expenditure Tracking Survey to track the flow of public funds. The ICODE is a network of NGOs operating within the province of Iloilo in collaboration with the Provincial Monitoring and Evaluation Committee. The project conducts CSO-government monitoring and assessment of various development and public service delivery projects in the province of Iloilo. It is funded by PhilDHRRA, Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), and USAID-GOLD.

The project focused on the area of infrastructure development in health and education. Among these infrastructures were daycare centers, solar dryers, fencing, street lighting, waiting sheds, construction of school buildings and other educational facilities in the municipal level. It also included other programs such as Aids to Municipalities and the Poverty Alleviation Programs.

The public expenditure tracking survey was used to track the flow of public funds from the provincial government to the target municipalities and *barangays*. It also helped in determining the extent to which resources actually reached the target groups. This tool used the participatory monitoring and evaluation approach.

The survey assessed public expenditures of public service delivery projects implemented with funding from the Community Direct Assistance Program, Special Education Fund, Aids to Municipalities, Poverty Alleviation Programs and many others.

The tool was translated to *Ilonggo*, and looked into how the various municipalities and *barangays* actually sourced out the funds, procured the materials, and managed the implementation and completion of the project. It likewise probed into the factors that might have hindered and/or facilitated the quality of the implementation as well as the ways to improve program implementation.

The survey was conducted in the barangays and municipalities through personal interviews with the implementers of the various projects. It was supplemented by FGDs that were participated by the beneficiaries.

Bantay *Banay's* Public Procurement Report in Cebu

The Public Procurement Report, facilitated through the Bantay *Banay* Program in Cebu, was intended to measure the effectiveness and efficiency in the procurement process of select government offices. The report of the observers was supposed to benefit the same government agency being monitored as the reports are fed back to them after being processed.

The Philippine Procurement Network envisioned that the report will red-flag and hopefully prevent irregular activities and undertakings of the Bids and Awards Committees (BAC) in the conduct of procurement procedures. Essentially, the conduct of the monitoring was expected to achieve a two-pronged objective: primarily, to inform the observers about the important role of the citizens in the procurement process and at the same time check the regularity of the various aspects, processes, and documentation involved in the conduct of the procurement procedure. Hence, in the case of Cebu, any documented irregularity or anomaly will be communicated immediately to the Cebu BAC which, in turn, will liaise the report back to the agency concerned for appropriate actions.

The ultimate ends of this monitoring initiative were to provide information and to change policy. Thus, the volunteers needed to

undergo an Observers' Training-Workshop. The training intended to orient the observers about the new Public Procurement Act and the need to conduct monitoring, as well as for the local team to customize the generic tool from the Philippine Procurement Network. As of 2010, there were 70 trained BAC observers prepared for deployment. However, their actual deployment largely depended on invitations expressed by government agencies. Therefore, absence of such invitation meant no deployment.

Based on the initial data shared by *Kaabag sa Sugbo*, since 2010 the public services the observers were able to monitor were primarily on social welfare and infrastructure, under the regional offices of DSWD and DPWH, respectively. However, until this writing, the Observer's Reports are still being processed by *Kaabag sa Sugbo*. This delay was due to the non-availability of funding support for the foundation.

Transparency and Accountability in Governance Monitoring and Evaluation (TAG ME)

TAG-ME was jointly undertaken by ICODE and twelve (12) LGU partners (municipalities) in the province of Iloilo, with funding support from the British Embassy.

As suggested by its name, the initiative's primary goal is to promote transparency and accountability in government. In particular, it monitored and evaluated the implementation of three (3) social programs related to health and education infrastructures, and poverty alleviation in two (2) municipalities or LGU partners in each of the five (5) Congressional districts in the province, plus the lone (1) district of Iloilo City. To do this, the project used two important criteria: the presence of provincially funded projects with a total cost of Php50,000 and above; and accessibility for monitoring and evaluation. The three (3) social service projects in each LGU partner were selected through random sampling.

TAG ME enhanced the participatory monitoring and evaluation tool developed under the auspices of the Provincial Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (PMEC), composed of the Provincil Planning Development Office (PPDO) as Secretariat, ICODE and other NGOs, local chief executives (LCEs), and representatives of the DILG, the private sector and the funding agency.

In 2005-2006, the TAG-ME project monitored and evaluated a total
of 18 province-funded projects, with three (3) projects per LGU (two
LGUs per district). It was able to track public expenditures for multi-
purpose public infrastructure projects implemented through the
Community Direct Assistance Program (CDAP), construction of
school buildings, and education related infrastructures funded by the
Special Education Fund (SEF), and poverty alleviation programs.

This project used structured interviews for implementers and focus
group discussions (FGDs) for beneficiaries, all conducted in the
Ilonggo vernacular. It surveyed the manner by which funds are
sourced out and spent. It also surveyed other aspects of the
implemented projects, i.e., project type, procurement methods,
project implementers, perceived facilitating and constraining factors
in project implementation, level of people's participation as well as
areas of improvement in the project development cycle.

Differential Expenditure Efficiency Measurement (DEEM)

The development of DEEM started with Procurement Watch in the
mid-2000s. The increasing need to prevent corruption and design
programs with more impact have led to a tool measuring corruption
by comparing market prices and the cost of items in procurement
activities. The procurement audit tool had a pilot run in the health
sector in 2005, and in 2009, it was fine-tuned to adapt to the
education sector to be used by the *Bantay Eskwela* initiative.

The DEEM utilized tools that examine key government documents
produced at each of the three (3) stages of the procurement process:
monitoring the procurement bidding stage, the contract
implementation phase, and conducting a procurement audit to
validate procurement outcomes. The data were entered into ten (10)
forms that collected relevant information about the procurement.
Each form covered a specific stage of the procurement process.

Procurement Watch analyzed the summary sheets to identify
inconsistencies and other potential irregularities in the procurement
process. In addition to time efficiency, another major aspect of the
DEEM tool was to determine cost efficiency, consisting of two
components: Fund Flow Analysis and Market Survey Analysis.

During the pilot test of DEEM at a government hospital, Procurement Watch achieved interesting results. Investigators found a certificate signed by a hospital official justifying a contract with a particular company on the ground that it was the only company that could make good-quality Vitamin C available to the hospital. Given the number of Vitamin C brands available in the Philippines, DEEM implementers found the claim doubtful. If the contract was bidded out, the hospital would likely have saved money, since the Vitamin C brand provided by the selected vendor is one of the most expensive on the market.

DEEM provided encouraging results. These included better or lower prices because of transparency and better delivery performance because of community participation and involvement in monitoring of inventory.

This tool and forms mentioned had limitations. First, the detailed checks for inconsistencies were not applicable to agencies that do not strictly follow procurement rules and regulations and second, the use of DEEM required that the users or monitors have access to all (or most) procurement documents of the government agency being monitored.

Medicine Monitoring Project of National Movement for Free Election (NAMFREL)

The Medicine Monitoring Project, implemented in 2004 by NAMFREL, looked into the DOH's procurement of drugs, medical supplies, laboratory needs, infrastructure, equipment, and supplies. The project set out to address the availability and affordability of essential drugs and medicines in DOH hospitals and CHDs across the country, targeting availability and affordability of medicines. The project intervention came out of the observation that citizens had been prevented and commonly barred from access to low cost and high quality medicines. Causes identified were inefficient procurement processes, inaccurate deliveries and poor distribution, as well as inadequate warehousing and stocking of essential medicines.

 A total of 72 public hospitals and 16 regional centers were monitored. The tools and data collection methods used in this initiative looked into three aspects. First, the Observers Diagnostic Report provided third party assessment on the procurement of

30

pharmaceutical and non-pharmaceutical products. Second, the delivery monitoring tool compared the quantity of the delivered goods to the hospitals and regional centers vis-à-vis the Purchase Orders, Delivery Receipts, and Inspection and Acceptance Report. Third, the inventory monitoring tool assessed the Requisition Issuance Slip and the Monthly Issuance Slip obtained from the Hospital Supply and Pharmacy Offices.

NAMFREL agreed with the DOH to monitor, track and follow a variety of procurement activities, using its existent network of over 100 NAMFREL chapters nationwide to mobilize volunteers and CSOs from within the communities. Volunteers engaged in:

1. Monitoring procurement activities in every hospital and regional health offices managed by DOH;
2. Monitoring delivery of essential medicines in selected hospitals and regional health offices;
3. Monitoring inventories, warehouses and medicine stocks as well as hospitals' and CHDs' internal systems for checking inventories; and
4. Monitoring distribution of essential pharmaceutical products to entitled hospital recipients.

Local chapter leaders conducted capacity building workshops and built coalitions with local CSOs to carry out the tasks. It educated volunteers to successfully monitor the various reporting formats used by hospitals, suppliers, and the procurement secretariat.

NAMFREL included a warehouse and pricing survey monitoring component. The price monitoring represented a lesson learnt from a previous project phase to help the DOH Bids & Awards Committee officers to determine what a reasonable budget for the purchase of drugs and medicines should be.

Since the inception of the program in 2004, NAMFREL noticed the following improvements in the health sector:

1. The reputation of the DOH dramatically increased based on scorecards completed by both government and civil society as well as validated through public opinion surveys.
2. The availability of essential medicines improved considerably.

3. The discrepancy in the delivery of the drugs and medicines to hospital and regional health offices was reduced significantly.
4. Most of the hospitals and regional health offices and BAC officers became more responsive to the role of NAMFREL volunteer-observers in the various stages of the procurement process.
5. Bidding prices became more competitive and reflected a more realistic market price.

An important lesson learnt is the importance of the role of champions to push toward greater transparency and accountability. Securing the support of the DOH as well as the head of individual hospitals has been vital to ensure success in following through with the various monitoring exercises initiated.[9]

Bantay Lansangan (Road Watch)

Citizen-led initiatives for promoting transparency in public construction have a 25-year history in the Philippines. The oldest, formed in 1986, is the Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government or CCAGG, which established itself as the country's pioneer citizen road monitoring group. *Bantay Lansangan* (BL) was formed to reduce corruption in the DPWH through greater transparency. In addition to CCAGG, partners and members of BL include the Transparency and Accountability Network or TAN, the Automobile Association of the Philippines, the Federation of Jeepney Operators and Drivers Association of the Philippines (FEJODAP), and the associations of bus operators.

BL is a multi-sector initiative that aimed to enhance the delivery of quality national road services. It intended to increase the transparency and accountability in the road construction and maintenance operations of the DPWH.

Road monitoring was focused on two aspects: actual physical characteristics of the roads as determined by road monitors and feedback from road users. Actual physical condition concerned the

---

[9] Excerpts taken from http://ptfund.org/2012/04/monitoring-medicines-procurement-philippines/ accessed on July 1, 2012. Project completion reports (PCRs) and Project completion assessments (PCAs) can be accessed at www.ptfund.org under the "Where-we-work" tab. The NAMFREL website can be accessed at http://www.namfrel.com.ph/v2/home/index1.htm

planned versus actual implementation and the project's quality. Feedback consists of comments and suggestions from road users on the quality and responsiveness of the road project as well as perceptions on the performance of the DPWH.

To assess the actual physical condition and quality of road projects, BL used various road monitoring tools that emphasized evidence-based assessment of road conditions. One was a monitoring questionnaire that asked volunteers or monitors to rate the road's condition and identify and describe road-related problems. There were various monitoring forms used, depending on the type of infrastructure and on the stage of implementation. For example, on-going road construction required a different monitoring form than a bridge project or a newly completed road project. Another monitoring tool was the BL Procedures Manual for Road Construction and Maintenance, which was the guide used by BL road monitors in analyzing and rating a road project. For feedback, BL conducted a survey and used the BL Road User's Satisfaction Survey (RUSS).

A road monitoring form contained information on the road project such as location, name of project, project cost, and contractor, among others. There were also spaces provided for pictures for photo evidence showing pavement failures and distresses, including measurements and location.

RUSS was used to generate the views of citizens on the road's quality and on the over-all performance of the DPWH. The BL RUSS was a three-page survey that asked respondents' basic information such as frequency of road utilization and type of vehicle being used. It also measured the degree of satisfaction of the respondents about the road, the condition of traffic, and the respondents' sense of road safety. BL RUSS also asked the user's satisfaction rating of the DPWH. While part of the road monitoring, the results of the RUSS were also inputs to the Road Sector Status Report Card – a citizen performance assessment tool focused on the DPWH, released annually by BL.

Based on the Protocol guiding DPWH-civil society engagement, the findings of road monitors were presented to and discussed with the concerned District and Regional Offices of DPWH who were expected to address actionable issues and concerns at their level after a monitoring round. BL members and partners then forwarded their report to the BL Secretariat which consolidated the reports into

a Monitoring Report. The Secretariat endorsed the consolidated report to the Secretary of the DPWH and convened a forum where the findings of the monitoring were presented to the public.

Bantay Lansangan, undertaken while public works were on-going, yielded findings about massive corruption in public works. CCAGG developed a monitoring tool to determine progress of road and bridge construction and repair. The identified procurement and implementation problems, and the strong advocacy for good governance contributed to the plugging of leaks and the enhancement of procurement and implementation processes.

Bantay Lansangan used tools such as perception survey questionnaires to gather inputs from road monitors and road users for a road sector status report card. It reviewed available records in DPWH units and evaluated the condition, capacity, operations, and maintenance of national roads and bridges, as well as road safety. *Bantay Lansangan* also measured efficiency through a public expenditure tracking survey designed to monitor whether public funds actually reach communities. The survey collected information on the availability, amounts, and timing of released funds, project implementation, procurement processes, contracting, and performance of contractors and staff.

Bantay Lansangan worked closely with the COA, which was persuaded by the former to obtain and verify project information as part of its routine functions. *Bantay Lansangan* also worked closely with PhilGEPS—an electronic government procurement system — which agreed to use its system for the disclosure of project information. This included providing training to COA staff and developing a business plan for PhilGEPS to ensure it can eventually become self-funded.

The initiative was replicated in various localities in the country. In Region 7 alone, a total of 170 road construction projects were monitored since 2009. The data generated from BL-RUSS intended to inform DPWH about the opinion as well as recommendations of road stakeholders about the country's road system, ultimately effecting necessary policy changes. The results generated by this tool formed part of the Road Sector Status Report Card for 2009.

Text Book Count Initiative

The Textbook Count initiative is a formal partnership between the DepEd and the Ateneo School of Government (ASG) through its G-Watch program. It was conceived to help ensure the efficiency and reliability of government's procurement and distribution of textbooks for elementary and secondary schools.

The Textbook Count initiative monitored the DepEd's delivery of textbooks and teachers' manuals. CSOs observed the procurement process of books and manuals and upon delivery of these materials, the volunteers or monitors counted the materials and checked their physical appearance. If they found discrepancies or errors, they reported these to the Government Watch or G-Watch, which then reports these to the DepEd. The Textbook Count used an Inspection and Acceptance Report or IAR as its monitoring tool. The filled-in IARs formed part of the monitoring system and the planning efforts of the DepEd.

The Textbook Count's participation in the procurement process and its use of the IAR enhanced the transparency and efficiency of procured textbooks and materials and the physical quality and quantity of the delivered goods. The observer's report and the IAR supported the program implementation which ultimately delivered the textbooks to DepEd regions.

Bayanihang Eskwela (Citizens' Monitoring of School Building Construction Projects)

Bayanihang Eskwela is a civil society initiative that monitored the construction of public school buildings. This effort, as well as the monitoring tools and the approaches that it utilized, were developed by the G-Watch Program of the Ateneo School of Government. Bayanihang Eskwela monitored the bidding and awarding of school building contracts, the construction of the buildings, the quality of the established infrastructure, and the process by which all of the stages were done.

Bayanihang Eskwela began out of the observation that government had a weak monitoring capacity and mechanism. The DPWH could only monitor ten percent (10%) to 15 percent of its 30,000 projects yearly. As a result, some of the school buildings reportedly lacked

tangible items like walls and floors. G-Watch wanted to fill this gap by conducting third party monitoring through citizens' participation.

G-Watch sought the involvement of parent-teachers associations, Boy Scouts of the Philippines, student leaders, and village heads to serve as volunteers or community monitors. It partnered with the DepEd, DPWH, and the Office of the Ombudsman (OMB) to generate support for CSO involvement in the whole initiative. It tapped school principals as mobilizing figures in the effort. In 2007, *Bayanihang Eskwela* was pilot-tested in 30 schools in Luzon with 336 community monitors.

The *Bayanihang Eskwela's* monitoring tool was a checklist that had both English and Filipino translations. The checklist, which showed the compliance and non-compliance to the school building program of work or POW, was used to complement the efforts of the DPWH to construct school buildings, and to improve its procurement process in the choice of bidders and materials. The checklist was divided into three stages namely, pre-construction, construction, and post-construction. Through the Monitoring Profile, the Checklist and photos the volunteers were able to send to G-Watch, and then to DepEd, DPWH, and the Office of the Ombudsman, they were able to share their findings on overpricing, semi-standard quality of products, and progress on the construction of the building.

These initiatives showed that civil society in the Philippines was able to develop a substantial set of tested tools for social accountability. Most of these tools focused on monitoring actual outputs against what the implementing agency promised or planned to deliver. There were also a good number of initiatives and tools focused on budget monitoring, especially on big budgeted items of critical basic services. This focus could be due to priorities the CSOs have set, the presence of serious gaps in public service delivery, and more opportunities for rent-seeking activities.

These initiatives indicated the high degree of sophistication that civil society in the Philippines attained in the area of engaging government, by networking in creative configurations with various segments such as business, the media, the Church, the academe and in regional (i.e., Asia Pacific) formations of like-minded groups.

Challenges in Monitoring Public Service Delivery in the Philippines

Malena, et al (2004) proposed several critical factors that account for success of social accountability initiatives:

1. Political context;
2. Access to information;
3. Civil society capacity;
4. State capacity
5. State-civil society synergy; and
6. An independent media.

Among these six critical factors, the Philippine context showed that the most challenging areas for successful CSO engagement in monitoring public services are the access to information and state-civil society synergy (more specifically, in budget monitoring).

Access to Information as a Continuing Challenge

Although Filipinos have a legal right to access to communication, there is no established legal route for them to petition access to government records. The actual practice of many citizens testifies to the highly uneven willingness or preparedness of government offices to provide information, as well as the poor quality of the information actually provided. This is also seen from the country's low score in the 2008 Global Integrity Report under the category of Civil Society, Public Information and Media category, which even dropped one point from the 2007 score of 69. The proposed Freedom of Information Act is an important step towards addressing this problem.

In the field, monitoring of highly technical information, such as the quality of engineering works, can be difficult for lay people. Monitoring is also difficult without a continuous presence at the construction site. This was glaringly shown by the BL initiative. The particular challenge for BL is that it required the proactive disclosure of information. Access to Materials Procurement Information (MPI) should enable stakeholders in government, the private sector, and civil society to hold the procuring entity accountable for its

37

performance and expenditure in delivering the project. In turn, this enhanced accountability is expected to result in improved efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of infrastructure. BL found the task of collecting and collating the MPI challenging. Information had to be extracted from documents belonging to the procuring entity or its client organization, the government. The process was hindered by poor document management. Documents were held in different offices often scattered across the country. The reluctance of procuring entity to cooperate sometimes added to the challenge.

BL opted not to disclose the assurance team reports due to the sensitivity of the findings. They chose instead to engage with the procuring entities informally, to try to improve the management of the construction projects. Over the long term - when dozens of procuring entities are likely to be disclosing regularly on hundreds of projects - the only viable means of disclosure is through a routine operational requirement within the procuring entity. Procuring entities will need to improve their capacity and capability to allow them to mainstream disclosure.

While extensive data on the national budget exist, there is a lack of transparency on the nature and content of the national budget at all levels of the budget process. The proposed national budget is accessible to the public, but once the budget is approved, only information contained in the General Appropriations Act is available. The non-availability of public-friendly information is due to technical, political and other reasons that include the following:

1. While a wealth of information exists at the agency level on the national budget, such data cannot be readily disseminated due to the absence of a well-functioning, integrated financial management information system in the government that links all components of financial management, from budget planning to accountability. Such a system is being developed but is in its infancy and needs strong support.

2. Under the Macapagal-Arroyo administration, there was deliberate withholding of budget information, often on the pretext of safeguarding national security. This was most notable in Fiscal Year 2007, when the executive clamped down the release of information in reaction to charges of high-level corruption in the wake of the scandal engendered by the failed procurement of the national broadband network project. Government employees

now tend to decline release of information in the absence of explicit approval from high-level officials. This problem will lessen with the passage of the Freedom of Information (FOI) Bill.

3. Government officials also lack knowledge on what information they can and should release legally, and purportedly lack resources to make information readily available.

All these challenges tend to encourage reliance by NGOs seeking information on personal contacts and building relationships in government. While contacts will remain important, there is a need to continue to develop more automatic, reliable, replicable mechanisms for getting information.

Various CSOs have begun to take advantage of information communication technologies to aid in their monitoring work. The use of geographical information systems through google maps, for instance, was used to monitor road construction projects under the BTTAG initiative. PhilGEPS, a government portal for construction information, is now being used by *Bantay Lansangan* to obtain material procurement information. Texting and instant messaging are becoming part of many monitoring tools and methods for obtaining and sending information.

In addition, various interactive websites have been put up by monitoring initiatives to maximize the reach to citizens. One notable example is checkmyschool.org (CMS), a participatory monitoring project which aims to promote social accountability and transparency in the education sector. It works on a blended approach by combining digital media and community mobilization.

The digital media are composed of the website, social media, and mobile technology that allow people to share information and send feedback. Its community mobilization approach involves partnership building with different stakeholders such as the school stakeholders, local school board, private sector, and government agencies. On its first year, CMS was able to establish its presence in 245 schools in the country through the help of the information intermediaries or "Infomediaries." Through the infomediaries, schools were able to connect to the CMS' digital media such Facebook and Twitter. School information and issues were reported faster to DepEd and other authorities using email and mobile phones.

Another example is taxikick (http://www.taxikick.com/), an online monitoring initiative that reports abusive taxi drivers. The online tool helps the Land Transportation Franchising Regulatory Board (LTFRB) regulate abusive taxi operators and drivers. The simple and easy-to-use online tool allows the passengers to report abusive taxi drivers in a website, which emails the report to LTFRB at the end of the day.

As civil society organizations become more adept in the use of information and communications technology (ICT), a wider variety of ICT tools are expected to be maximized in the coming years.

Budget Monitoring Challenges

Experience shown by the Budget Watch and Social Watch initiatives pointed to budgets as the most concrete starting point for CSO monitoring of government services, as budgeting is predictable and cyclical. At the local level, harnessing the local development councils as the avenue for developing pro-poor programs and projects shows the investment programming process as the most critical area of engagement by CSOs. One particular avenue that has direct links with the annual budget is the Annual Investment Plan (AIP). Thus, advocates for poverty reduction should seek to participate in the formulation of the AIP.[10]

At the national level, the experience of the various budget monitoring projects culled the following challenges in their budget monitoring initiatives:

1. Frequent delays in the passage of the annual General Appropriations Act (GAA) by Congress, or the failure to pass the GAA entirely, creating a "reenacted budget" scenario where the previous year's budget is considered authorized for the second year in a row - While a reenacted budget technically does not constrain expenditure tracking nor participation of citizens in monitoring, it does create delays in many planned development activities of government and effectively hands over to the President legislative powers to appropriate, subject to the last-approved budget provisions, by way of Congressional default.

---

[10] Poverty Incidence Monitoring Field Operations Manual, UP Planades, February 2004.

2. The frequent use of the national budget as a political tool to attract political support or dissuade political dissent – this was exemplified by the practice of past administrations to release funds allocated to specific Congressional districts represented by the political opposition.

3. Lack of rules and transparency governing many national budget line items - such as lump sum appropriations,[11] off-budget accounts[12] and disbursements to LGUs, and

4. Gaps in public audit functions and audit agencies.

The government has, however, embarked on a serious effort to reform the budget system over the past ten years with the introduction of Public Expenditure Management (PEM) principles and tools towards improving budget plans, programs, processes and information systems.

---

[11] Lump-sum appropriations include the Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA), Priority Development Assistance Fund (PDAF), Department of Public Works and Highways Congressional Allocation (DPWH-CA), and School Building Program (SBP) (Government of the Republic of the Philippines, 2010)

[12] Off-budget accounts refer to accounts and funds that are not subject to annual appropriations by Congress and are accounted for separately under a different set of books (INCITEGov, 2009)

Conclusions and Ways Forward

Citizens' participation has been one of the strengths of Philippine governance. CSOs partner with government in promoting transparency, accountability and public participation in the preparation, authorization, execution and monitoring of the national budget. At this point, there is still a need to document and analyze the extent to which social accountability initiatives have improved delivery or design of public service although some of the earlier ones such as *Bantay Lansangan* and Textbook Count have already indicated positive results.

There are substantial sets of tested tools for social accountability. Most of these tools focus on monitoring actual outputs against what the implementing agency promised or planned to deliver. There are also a good number of tools and initiatives focused on budget monitoring, especially on big budgeted items of critical basic services. There could be several reasons why these are justifiably so: priorities; serious gaps in public service delivery; and opportunities for rent-seeking activities.

Budget monitoring/tracking requires serious technical work. For instance, the task of simplifying the budget structure so that the public could better understand and appreciate it requires a lot of capacity-building efforts. This is an entry point for academic institutions seeking to engage in social accountability efforts. Universities can contribute in promoting citizens' better understanding of budget processes and producing analytical tools to examine possible gaps and irregularities.

This Report highlights the role of "outsider" monitors, i.e., monitoring conducted by external (CSO) groups for better public service delivery. In the future, as monitoring and evaluation become more developed, sustained and systematized, it is expected that more "insider" monitoring (i.e., conducted by implementers themselves) other than those mandated by national government (e.g., CBMS, LGPMS), that are localized and sector-specific using participatory methods and developed jointly with CSO could be instituted as a continuing practice in government agencies and local government units.

Finally, the Report identifies several steps to broaden and deepen the capacities of CSOs in monitoring public services. Through the following concrete strategies, it is hoped that efforts to institutionalize joint CSO-government monitoring are sustained:

1. Knowledge sharing on capacity development programs and monitoring tools that can be done through seminars and series of regional round table discussions with select universities and NGOs involved in monitoring work.

2. Knowledge management, using the knowledge outputs produced through this project. LSIG will also build a database of literature on social accountability practices and results on improving public service delivery. The general public can have access to these materials through the project's website and the planned Governance Knowledge Hub (GKH) to be housed at the DLSU Learning Commons.

3. Knowledge alliance in monitoring public services, starting with the local partners of this project. LSIG will form a loose network of CSOs including universities that are involved in monitoring of public service delivery projects. As knowledge institutions, partner schools will play a crucial role in this alliance of CSOs.

4. Inclusion of CSO monitoring in university curricula. Knowledge generated through this project will be integrated into relevant university courses and outreach programs, with particular emphasis on important roles of universities in joint monitoring. A series of consultations with partner schools to identify opportunities for this curriculum integration will be done.

References

Aceron, J. 2009. A Public-Private Partnership Fairy Tale? G-Watch's Textbook Count Story, a seminar on Preventing Corruption. Venetian Macao Resort Hotel, Macao.

Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific. 2012. Social Accountability Stocktaking Reports. Ateneo School of Government.

Affiliated Network for Social Accountability in East Asia and the Pacific (ANSA-EAP) and the Government Watch (G-Watch) Project, 2010. G-WATCH GUIDE: Your Partner in Monitoring Government Programs, Ateneo School of Government.

Ajam, T., & Engela, R. 2010. Implementing a Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System in South Africa. ECD Working Paper Series No. 21. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Asian Development Bank. 2007. Improving Local Governance and Service Delivery: Citizen Report Card Learning Tool Kit. Quezon City.

Asian Development Bank. 2006. Philippines: Performance Measurement at the Local Level. Quezon City.

Asian Development Bank. 1999. Technical Assistance to the Republic of the Philippines for Strengthening Results Monitoring and Evaluation. Quezon City.

Bamberger, M. 2006. Conducting Quality Impact Evaluations under Budget, Time and Data Constraints. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Bamberger, M. 2004. Influential Evaluations: Evaluations that Improved Performance and Impacts of Development Programs. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Barns, J.R. 2003. Engaged Governance: An Overview of the Philippine Experience, a paper presented at the Interregional Workshop on Engaged Governance. Colombo, Sri Lanka.

Belisario, M.C., Chua, Y., Tuñgol-Esguerra, N., & Esguerra, J. 2009. A Study of Anti-Corruption Initiatives in the Philippines' Construction Sector. Pasig City: Procurement Watch, Inc.

Caddy, Joann & Peixito, Tiago. 2006. Beyond Public Scrutiny: Stocktaking of Social Accountability in OECD Countries.

Caucus of Development NGO Networks. 2010. Civil Society Assessment of the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 2004-2010. Quezon City.

CODE-NGO. 2012. New Hope for the 2013 Budget Process. Available at http://code-ngo.org/home/component/content/article/43-front/275-new-hope-for-the-2013-budget-process.html. Accessed 15 May 2012.

Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Government, Inc. 2011. Abra Water and Irrigation System (AWIS) Watch Project, a seminar on Monitoring and Evaluation of Eight LWUA Projects in Abra. Abra.

Cook, J.R. 1997. Monitoring & Evaluation Capacity-Building Study. Sydney, Australia: Australian Agency for International Development.

Construction Sector Transparency Initiative Briefing Notes. 2007. In http://www.constructiontransparency.org/view/document.shtml?f83001-tvifxos, accessed last August 8, 2012.

Plecerda, Jowil. October 2011. Email Interview.

Cuenca, J.S. & Manasan, R.G. 2010. Benefit Incidence of Public Spending on Health in the Philippines. Discussion Paper Series No. 2010-36. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Makati City.

Cuenca, J.S. 2008. Benefit Incidence Analysis of Public Spending on Education in the Philippines: A Methodological Note. Discussion Paper Series No. 2008-09. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Makati City.

Dawkins, Z., & Hall, J. 2010. School-based Procurement Watch Project (Bantay Eskwela), Philippines. Commonwealth of Australia.

De La Salle University. 2009. Request for IDF Financing: Institutionalizing Civil Society Monitoring and Assessment of Public Service Delivery to the Poor. Manila, Philippines.

Development Academy of the Philippines. 2002. Report Card Survey on Specific Services of Nine Cities in the National Capital Region. Pasig City.

Estrella, M., & Gaventa, J. 1997. Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review. IDS Working Paper 70. Manila, Philippines.

Government of the Republic of the Philippines. 2010. Philippines' Policy Improvement Process Plan of Action: Millennium Challenge Corporation Indicator on Control of Corruption.

G-Watch, Ateneo School of Government. 2009. Terms of Reference: Bayanihang Eskwela [Community Spirits for the School] Monitoring of Government School Building Projects through G-Watch Public-Private Partnership and Community Participation. Quezon City.

G-Watch, Ateneo School of Government. 2007. Bayanihang Eskwela: The Citizens' Monitoring of School Building Construction Projects. Quezon City.

INCITEGov. 2009. Off-Budget Accounts. In http://incitegov.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/INCITEGov-Off-Budget-Accounts.pdf, accessed last August 8, 2012

International Council on Human Rights Policy. 2005. Local Governments and Human Rights: Doing Good Service. Versoix, Switzerland.

Krafchik, W., & Ramkumar, V. 2005. The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Auditing and Public Finance Management. The International Budget Project.

Mackay, K. 2007. How to Build M&E Systems to Support Better Government. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Malena, C., Forster, R., and Singh, J. 2004. Social Accountability: An Introduction to the Concept and Emerging Practice. Social Development Papers: Participation and Civic Engagement. Paper No. 76. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Management Systems International. 2009. Philippines National Budget Monitoring Project: Final Report. Washington, D.C.

McNeil, M., & Mumvuma, T. 2006. Demanding Good Governance: A Stocktaking of Social Accountability Initiatives by Civil Society in Anglophone Africa. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Institute.

Oertel, S., Gebre, A., Kourouma, M., & Said, T. 2004. Best Practices in the Participatory Approach to Delivery of Social Services. Ababa, Ethiopia: Economic Commission for Africa.

Office of the Ombudsman. 2010. The Integrity Development Review Assessment for Local Government Units. Quezon City.

PGexchange. 2012. Policy and Planning. Available at: http://pgexchange.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=57&Itemid =131. Accessed 08 August 2012

Philippine Development Plan, 2011-2016.

Reyes, C.M. 1998. Institutionalizing a Poverty Monitoring System in the Philippines. MIMAP Research Paper No. 40. MIMAP Project Philippines. Makati City.

Romero, S.E. 2011. Social Audit Toolbox for Philippine Civil Society Organizations, downloaded from http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/ PNADO264.pdf. Accessed 25 June 2011.

Talbot, C. 2010. Performance in Government: The Evolving System of Performance and Evaluation Measurement, Monitoring, and Management in the United Kingdom. ECD Working Paper Series No. 24. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Transparency & Accountability Network. 2009. Understanding Social Accountability, a powerpoint presentation. Partnership Center, Quezon City.

The World Bank. 2004. Monitoring & Evaluation: Some Tools,
Methods & Approaches. Washington, D.C.

The World Bank. Philippine Case Studies. 2012. Available at:
http://www.worldbank.org/socialaccountability_sourcebook/Regional
database/philippines.htm

Woodhill, Jim. 2005. M&E as Learning: Rethinking the Dominant
Paradigm, a book chapter prepared for Monitoring and Evaluation for
Soil Conservation and Watershed Development Projects. World
Association of Soil and Water Conservation.

Appendix

Summary of Monitoring Initiatives and Tools

Initiative	Description	Tools
1. *Bantay Banay* Public Procurement Report in Cebu	Initiated by the Philippine Procurement Network, the report red flagged and prevented irregular activities and undertakings of Bids and Awards Committees (BAC) in the conduct of procurement procedures in select public services (e.g. social welfare, infrastructure). The monitoring expected to achieve a two-pronged objective: to inform the observers about the important role of the citizens in the procurement process, and check the regularity of the various aspects, processes, and documentation involved in the conduct of the procurement procedure. Any documented irregularity or anomaly was communicated immediately to the Cebu Bids and Awards Committee who, in turn, liaised the report back to the agency concerned for appropriate action.	Bids and Awards Committee (BAC) Observers' Report Form
2. *Bantay Lansangan* (BL)	BL is a multi-sector initiative that aimed to enhance the delivery of quality national road services, and to increase the transparency and accountability in the road construction and maintenance operations of the DPWH.	Road Users Satisfaction Survey (BL-RUSS)
3. *Bantay Pabahay Para sa Maralita*	A local budget monitoring approach through the use of a step-by-step manual (written in Filipino).	Structured Interview Questionnaire

Initiative	Description	Tools
4. *Bayanihang Eskwela*	The tool, developed by G-Watch, monitored the construction of school buildings through the use of indicators such as adherence to procurement rules, quality of materials and building specifications.	Checklist
5. Budget Tracking for Transparent Accountable Governance (BTTAG)	BTTAG's aimed to increase the transparency and accountability in the local budget process of 20 Mindanao local governments, and to improve CSO access to local government fiscal information, especially the budget, by collaborating with the LGU in budget tracking. BTTAG monitored the budget process of local governments, from budget preparation and review authorization to execution, to determine if local governments' budgets were aligned with their respective plans and programs and reflected the needs of the local citizens.	Focus Group Discussion Guide Tracking Template
6. Department of Agrarian Reform Budget Monitoring Project	PhilDHRRA conducted an analysis of DAR budgets from 2007, including an overview of the DAR budget and its fund sources, analysis of regional appropriations, an assessment of performance that links DAR's budget to its accomplishments, and a review of the audit reports of COA, based on data from the Provincial Agrarian Reform Council (PARC), the DAR, DBM, and COA, using both quantitative and qualitative analysis (such as the allotment utilization index (AUI), comparison of regional appropriations, and compilation of significant audit report observations. PHILDHRRA also produced a systematic methodology for monitoring DAR land distribution and support services, including indicators and a sampling framework; a detailed, easily understood guide for the methodology's implementation by local partners, and actual monitoring in one province.	Allotment Utilization Index

Initiative	Description	Tools
7. Differential Expenditure Efficiency Measurement (DEEM)	DEEM is a civil society initiative that aimed to improve the delivery of government health services by demanding transparent public bidding, preventing fictitious delivery, and ensuring that the medicines reach the recipient hospitals and patients on time. One of its objectives was to measure the "actual" cost or the value that the government actually paid for a certain item, versus the "true" cost or the value of the item in a fair, open and competitive market. DEEM was developed by the Procurement Watch Inc. (PWI).	Comparative pricing matrix
8. Government-Watch (G-Watch's) Rapid Capacity Assessment (RAC)	The Rapid Capacity Assessment aimed to assess: the baseline capacity of the LGU in social accountability application and practice, and the current level of good governance (particularly transparency, accountability and efficiency) of the LGU. The assessment result will be used as basis for the service delivery to be covered by the G-Watch application, and baseline data that shall be used in assessing the project results after the project implementation. It included a survey in three areas: environment (infrastructure for waste water management), housing (for informal settlers) and health (*barangay* health services). The parameters of the public service delivery monitoring and assessment were: efficiency, sustainability and participation.	Competency Assessment Sheet Good Governance Survey Questionnaire

Initiative	Description	Tools
9. Medicine Monitoring Project	This project was implemented in 2004 by NAMFREL, this monitoring initiative monitored the Department of Health's procurement of drugs, medical supplies, laboratory needs, infrastructure, and medical equipment. The Coalition Against Corruption partnered with NAMFREL to implement the tool to monitor eight hospitals and three Centers of Health.	Observers' Diagnostic Report Delivery Monitoring Form Inventory Monitoring Form
10. Monitoring the Budget of the Department of Agriculture	The initiative trained leaders of national networks and regional NGO/PO/co-op networks in five regions on national budget analysis and monitoring; promoted greater understanding of the DA's budgeting structure and process; crafted a shared analysis of and recommendations for the budget process and content of the DA, particularly its 2008 approved budget and its proposed/approved budget for 2009; advocated for these recommendations in the DA and Congress; and formed an informal learning and action network (LAN) of NGO/PO/co-op leaders committed to continuously study, monitor and undertake advocacy activities related to the DA budget process and content. CODE-NGO also familiarized civil society organizations with the 2009 DA Budget, as approved by Congress; and built the capacity of network members to maximize their engagement in Agriculture and Fisheries Councils, and/or other mechanisms at national and local levels, with regard to budget advocacy and budget monitoring.	Budget Monitoring Tool

Initiative	Description	Tools
11. Monitoring the Scope for Performance-Based Grants	This initiative was implemented by the Institute for Popular Democracy, and focused on expanding the scope for performance-based grants (PBGs), and thus reducing the scope for discretionary forms of national government support for devolved services. Activities included: identification of constituencies for performance and formula-based grants, and establishment of the contrast with pork barrel or discretionary funds; inventory of existing PBGs in order to identify and propose areas into which PBGs can be expanded; and identification of LGUs and sectoral needs where PBGs might be introduced.	Inventory Form on existing Performance-Based Grants
12. Population, Health and Environment Database Monitoring System or Transparent and Accountable Governance (TAG) and effective population, health and environment (PHE) service delivery	Implemented by the Iloilo Caucus of Development NGOs in partnership with eleven municipal governments in Central and Northern Iloilo. The TAG-PHE tool covered three primary areas namely health, population and environment. It focused on participatory local governance initiatives and interventions to assist partner LGUs in identifying their development priorities and needs in order for them to be eligible for funding by the European Union- Municipal Support Fund.

Integral to the TAG-PHE approach is the profiling of each of the 11 partner LGUs including the conduct of surveys, spot mappings, conduct of participatory local governance orientations, and the review of the annual investment plans of the target *barangays* in the partner LGUs. | Focus Group Discussion Guide

Survey Questionnaire

Checklist of Documents to Review |
| 13. Public Expenditure Tracking Survey in Iloilo City | Implemented by Iloilo-Code, this monitoring initiative focused on infrastructure development, health and education (e.g. daycare centers, solar dryers, fencing, street lighting, waiting sheds, construction of school buildings) at the municipal level. Its primary goal was to track the flow of public funds from the provincial government to the target municipalities and | Public Expenditure Tracking Survey |

Initiative	Description	Tools
	barangays, and to determine the extent to which resources actually reached the target groups. It used the participatory monitoring and evaluation approach.	
14. Textbook Count	Developed by G-Watch, the tool monitored the procurement and delivery of textbooks by tapping civil society organizations, parent-teachers' associations and other community-based organizations to observe the textbook procurement and report on the book delivery (quality and quantity) to local areas.	Inspection and Acceptance Report
15. Transparency and Accountability in Governance Monitoring and Evaluation (TAG-ME)	This was an innovative tool jointly undertaken by ICODE and twelve (12) municipalities in the province of Iloilo with funding support from the British Embassy. TAG-ME monitored and evaluated the implementation of three social programs related to health and education infrastructures, and poverty alleviation in two municipalities or LGU partners in each of the five Congressional districts in Iloilo plus the lone district of Iloilo City. To do this, the project used two important criteria: the presence of provincially funded projects with a total cost of Php50,000 and above and accessibility for monitoring and evaluation. The three social service projects in each LGU partner were selected through random sampling.	Structured Interview Guide Focus Group Discussion Guide
16. Transparency and accountability in Local Governance	Developed by the LSIG, the project developed a set of mechanisms for transparency and accountability in Philippine local governance. The indicators were used in assessing transparency and accountability systems in ten (10) cities and municipalities.	Indicator-based Score Cards

La Salle Institute of Governance

Room 301, William Hall
De La Salle University
2401 Taft Avenue Manila
Telephone: 632-5244611 local 524
Telefax: 632-5271248
Email address: lsig@dlsu.edu.ph
website: www.lsig.org