An Inventory of Studies in Good Urban Governance
and Security of Tenure

Ms. Delia Josef
Director
Philippine Institute of Environmental Planners

When Dr. Brillantes approached our president, Comm. Francis Dagñalan, for a collaboration of our organizations regarding this GUG activity, we readily agreed because as planners, we are also into a lot of activities related on urban revitalization which we had last year and we intend to have another regional conference by 2004 but on a national level, we have some plans as our president was saying, to come up with maybe, a best implemented plan, or a best enforced zoning ordinance, which we would still to discuss with DILG because they also have their own best practices.

As planners in our inventory, we encountered several terminologies. You would note we have safer cities, healthier cities, bankable cities, inclusive cities, sustainable cities. It would seem like these are tall orders for our urban managers. It is timely that LGA came up with a capability building framework on urban management. And I am thinking, what type of competencies should urban managers have? Urban management should be defined so we will have a common terms of reference. The Institute of Housing Studies is Rotterdam, Netherlands defined urban management as the continuous activity of mobilizing, controlling and applying diverse resources in a coordinated manner to plan, program, build, operate, maintain and safeguard public services and the environment in order to achieve the sustainable development objective of city governance. This include among others, financial governance, service delivery, capital investment planning, spatial planning, land management and environmental protection. It would seem like these are supposed to be the functions of an urban manager. Our local chief executives here with us today would attest that they could not achieve all these in one sitting. Most of the best practices they have are a result of strategic projects.

As Atty. Gil Cruz noted earlier, we have now two cities who received the Dubai Awards, I'd like to present some indicators used by Asiaweek, in coming up with its lists of 40 Best Cities in 1999. Asiaweek came up with the following indicators for their top 40 cities: average income per capita; public education spending per capita; ratio of house price to quality measured through dust suspended per particulates per cubic meter; vehicles per km of city road; and criminal case per

10, 000 population. For these indicators, note that top three are from Japan (1) Tokyo, (2) Fukuoka, (3) Osaka. Singapore is No.4 while Taipei is No.5. The rest who made it to top 10 are Hongkong, Bandar Seri Begawan, Kuala Lumpur and Beijing. Our Cebu and Metro Manila made it as NO.14 while Davao City is No.19. In 1999, Hanoi is 22, Bangkok is 26, Jakarta is 35. Maybe these cities have now overtaken us, if we will come up with another list. However, with the current GUG initiatives, other Philippine cities may have made it to the fop list by now.

There is also what we call the human development index (HDI). Life expectancy is the first indicator, income as well, and that the top in this HDI is Canada followed by Sweden. This is international and is more stringent. The Asiaweek listing of the best cities can serve as benchmark for our cities to come up with their own indicators.

Newsweek has came up with a list of Places to Avoid against eight yardsticks of quality of life as follows: **public health** measured in terms of infant deaths per thousand live births; **public safety** measured in terms of murders per a hundred thousand people; **air pollution** measured by average number of days with poor air condition; **housing** measured in terms of percent of houses with water and electricity; **living space** measured in terms of number of persons per room; **peace and quiet** measured in terms of levels of ambient noise; **traffic flow** measured in terms of miles per hour traveled during traffic hours and **education** measured in terms of percent of children in secondary schools. Newsweek's list of fop places to avoid due to poor health is **Dhaka** in India and **Karachi** in Pakistan. **Manila** is the fop city with poor public safety followed by **Taipei;** With worst air pollution are **Delhi** of India and **Man** of China; **Calcutta** and **Delhi** have poor housing, with crowded living spaces are **Guangzhou** of China and **Lahore** in India; the noisiest cities are **Karachi** and **Madras;** with the slowest traffic during rush hours are **Manila** and **Bombay;** while the cities with the lowest percentage of children in secondary schools are **Lahore** and **Dhaka.**

We cannot really prevent urbanization because by 2010, about thirty Asian cities will have more than 5 million inhabitants and the Philippines will be 58% urban. Singapore is 100% urban now, Indonesia is 28%, it will be 44% urban and Thailand is 22%, it will be 35% urban.

In the Philippines, Metro Manila is our primate city. In other parts of the country several cities are coming into formal and informal arrangements in the delivery of basic services. Apart from Metro Manila and Metro Cebu there were proposals for a Metro Baguio as well as for a Metro Batangas, Metro Legaspi, Metro Iloilo; Metro Bacolod; Metro Cagayan de Oro and a Metro Davao . All these initiatives at aggrupations are geared towards better delivery of urban services. The most densely occupied cities in the Philippines right now are No.1 Manila, followed by Pasay and then Mandaue and then Kalookan. Because of urbanization, we normally have this flooding problem, especially in Metro Manila. Note that these occur in Malabon, elsewhere, there is Las Vegas and Russia.

I can attest to my own city's transformation into one of the better - managed cities in the Metropolis today. When we decided to put up residence in Metro Manila, we scouted around and my first requirement was the accessibility to good elementary and high schools and later College or University's for my kids to spare

them the hassle of travel time never mind my long commute to work. Prior to the improvement in our city, my colleagues rarely volunteered and would excuse themselves whenever there's a nees to stay after office hours. The reasons vary from their cars might break down due to roads that are in such bad state of disrepair in fact I almost gave birth prematurely during our house construction stage but I loved the rolling character of our subdivision akin to my birthplace, the City of Pines. The other reason, the roads are often flooded after heavy downpours.

Come election time, I seriously evaluated the credentials of all the Mayoralty candidates and put my chance on a technical person. I thought he might make a difference since most of our problems were infrastructure related. And he did for the first three years risking not to be re-elected due to his unpopular projects. But he made it through three elections in a row mainly because we saw the positive physical transformation of our city.

As a "Galing Pook" screener I evaluated all the projects that made my city a Hall of Famer. It is deserving having started as a city that I initially considered a basket case. The project's were simple: sidewalk improvement and greening; jogging' paths and parks along the riverbanks; barangay talyer, rescue 161, squatter relocation among others. I will leave the elaboration to our Mayor MCF.

Let me now veer away from being a macro thinker, having been a national government bureaucrat for the past twenty pious years, and be a-micro thinker so I could share with you what is generally considered as a livable city. As a benchmark for our LCEs, to make if simpler, we would like to live in a city where we feel secure, where there are job opportunities, where housing is affordable, with open spaces and parks for leisure, with potable water, where clinics, markets, shops, and schools are accessible and where taxes are reasonable. I think all these can be achieved if our local chief executives would do their jobs.

The foregoing was an introduction on our bases for the inventory of organizations that are into GUG / ST initiatives. Since this is our first attempt, the presentation was in a very raw form as it is still a work in progress.

Studies and Initiatives on Good Urban Governance

Dr. Alex Brillantes, Jr.
Director
Center for Local and Regional Governance

Over the past decade, the notion of good governance has occupied a central role in the development and underdevelopment discourse. It has been argued that good governance was the "missing link" in the analysis of the failure of development strategies of many countries in the third world. In other words,

"development" and progress have been elusive not because of poor economic growth, but because of poor, or generally bad governance. Bad governance was manifested in graft and corruption, excessive red tape, bureaucratic inefficiency, lack of participation, lack of transparency and accountability, among others. It as therefore within this context that it was argued that the promotion of good governance - epitomized by transparency, accountability, participation, continuity, predictability, and the rule of Jaw, among others, would help conquer the continuing malaise of underdevelopment manifested by general poor quality of life. For instance, in the case of graft and corruption, the argument was quite simple: where there is transparency and accountability, there would be less graft and corruption, and as a consequence, more resources would be spent for programs and projects that would improve the quality of life of the people.

One dimension in the whole discussion on good governance is "good urban governance." Indeed, urbanization has been a major development in the world and in the Philippines today. Based on present trend, it has been predicted that by year 2010, more than half of the Philippine population will be living in urban areas. Urbanization brings accompanying problems of pollution, squatting, traffic, floods, and the like. Urbanization increases the pressures on the already very stressed and stretched resources of the communities. It is therefore imperative for urbanized and rapidly urbanizing communities -mostly cities -to cope with the demands of living -and surviving - brought about by the demands of urbanization. It has been within this context that the notion of "good urban governance" emerged.

Hence, many local and international agencies have sharpened the focus of their efforts from general "good governance" to "good urban governance." Various international institutions such as the United Nations and the World Bank have crafted development interventions and assistance that would contribute specifically to the attainment of good urban governance.

For instance, this has been manifested in the City Development Strategy framework of the World Bank. There is also the Partnerships for Urban Learning (PUL) recently initiated by the World Bank Institute. The Global Campaign for Good Urban Governance co-organized by the UNCHS (Habitat), Citynet, the ESCAP and TUGI identified the following as fundamental in the campaign: decentralization (building democracy from bottom up), municipal management and capacity building (building dynamic cities), transparency and engagement (rights and responsibilities go hand in hand), integration of the poor and marginalized (working together, living together), municipal finance (government, citizens and business working together) and urban environment (partnerships and livable cities.) To a certain extent, the above initiatives are supposed to contribute to the attainment of the millennium development goals. These are the following:

1. eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. achieve universal primary education
3. promote gender equality and empower women
4. reduce child mortality
5. improve maternal health
6. combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. ensure environmental sustainability

8. develop a global partnership for development

It is also within the context of the above that the CLRG conducted an initial desk. survey reviewing the various studies on good urban governance as initiated by various stakeholders i.e., from the academe, national government agencies, local governments, international agencies and donor institutions and *of* course networks of institutions at the local and national level. The whole idea is to "map out" these various studies if only to contribute to the understanding of the whole state of good urban governance studies and perhaps help to "make sense" *out* of this all and contribute to the praxis *of* good urban governance by identifying and sharpening the focus of such interventions. The following is a discussion of the results of **this indicative initial survey.**

Local

Commonly addressed by the academic institutions' and the professional organizations is the information component. As expected, a concentration of activities is observed on research, publications, educational courses and trainings as well the provision of venues for debates and discussion such as conferences. Most notable activities are those entailing the assessment of performance of local governments. These are the City Competitiveness program[2] and the Local Productivity and Performance Measurement Systems[3]. Initiatives mainly focus on the capability building of LGUs.

On the government itself, it is gathered that most activities are handled at the national instead of the local level. At the national level, agencies can be grouped according to the focus of their endeavor. HLURB is for planning and policy formulation, for the provision of the 'proper' policy environment, we have the HUDCC, the Senate and the Congress Committees. The Executive branch is also engaged in policy directions, prominent today is GMA's KALAHI, and the previous administrations' Phil. Agenda 21. The most active arm of the government in this concern, the DILG, is heading towards varying directions. DILG is looking at both rural and urban development and LGA is viewing the need for urban development and management. On the whole, DILG serves as the monitoring body, deducing from its performance measurement projects, incentives program and development watches. LGA acts as its training arm.

Identified stakeholders from the local governments are few. The League of Cities of the Philippines directs its efforts on best practices recognition and the implementation of locally coordinated but international initiatives such as City Development Strategies, Philippine Regional Municipal Development, Philippine Healthy Cities Network. ULAP focuses on networking.

The Civil Society, though empowered, is not quite engaged in the area of GUG yet. Most initiatives are on networking and information drive and most attention is paid on the other campaign, the Secure Tenure.

International

Five major stakeholders are prominent: PUF, WBI, UN HABIT AT, UNEP and UNDP. Noteworthy is the common concern of these agencies on the environment

and governance .[4] Parallel to the GUG program, UNDP has its The Urban Governance Initiative (TUGI) and Local Initiative Facility for Urban Environment (LIFE). Other than that, WBI also sees participation as prime in its agenda. HABITAT sees participation and development as intertwined as well as security (used in the GUG definition).

The networks, the international alliance formed are mostly extensions of the international aid agencies initiative to further the participation of the concerned cities.

From this simple discussion, many questions arise. Are the initiatives interrelated, interconnected or isolated from each other. Who are the main beneficiaries (geographical location)? Is there actually redundancy, uniformity or uniqueness of each stakeholders undertakings? Should there be a clear delineation of initiatives to put order into all these? One thing is clear though: there should be integration of all the stakeholders in decision- making to ensure sustainability of city development.

[1] major ones are: SURP, CLRG-NCPAG, AIM Policy Center, SDRC of La Salle, UP CIDS, CSPPA - Ateneo and URC.
[2] of AIM Policy Center
[3] of CLRG-NCPAG
[4] WBI has MEIP * UCMP, UN HABITAT has its GUG, UEF, GUG and UMP while UNEP is engaged in SCP.

Ang Bahanggunihanan:
The National Agenda for
Good Urban Governance and Secure Tenure

Ms. Luisa Rosales

National Facilitator Philippine Urban Forum

Bahanggunihanan is a play of five Filipino words, "bahaginan" (sharing), "sanggunian" (consultation), " bayanihan" (cooperation), "tahanan"(home), "pamamahala" (governance). It is a consensus result of an existing process of bringing together key stakeholders in the urban governance & shelter sectors, facilitated by PUF in 2001 and a result also of the launching of two global campaigns in the Philippines, the campaign for Good Urban Governance and Secure Tenure. We proceeded from operationalizing a national framework called the National Urban Development and Housing Framework (NUDHF) which provided the directions for the drafting of the Bahanggunihanan. The Bahanggunihanan is the operationalization of the NUDHF of 1999-2004 based on the principles of GUG and ST. Drafted in 1999, we can fully say that the NUDHF has never been fully implemented nor fully grounded on felt needs of local stakeholders. NUDHF's overall objective is the presentation of an organized and

interrelated collection of urban policies that will hasten the arrival of the benefits of urbanization while alleviating many of its costs. Its specific objectives are as follows:

- rationalize and direct the urbanization process to harness urbanization as a strategy for globalization and economic growth
- build cities as platforms to promote democratization and participatory governance
- utilize cities to address poverty and to deliver social services particularly to the poor; and
- encourage the development of local governments that have the capacity to address urbanization issues and concerns

Note that the document itself is national in nature and therefore, does not contain local application and that is where we wanted to come in to, at the end of the day, put accountabilities and to realize that the local level is where the action is. If it is primarily a local problem, then the action is there as well. That is why we launched two campaigns, the first one being the GUG campaign.

Ms. Rosales as she discussed
the details of the Bahanggunihanan

Led by 31 mayors, norms of good urban governance were translated into a national framework with city-level indicators that became the basis for the formulation of city action plans for GUG. Over-all, the GUG campaign in part of the vision of inclusive cities.

The Vision of Inclusive Cities: the <u>GUG Campaign</u>

The League of Cities of the Philippines in 2001 adopted a 7-point action agenda anchored on the twin pillars of Poverty Reduction and Good Governance. These are:

1. *Equity* of access to decision-making processes and basic necessities of urban life.
2. *Security* of individuals in their living environment.
3. *Efficiency* in the delivery of public services and in promoting local economic development.

4. Sustainability in all dimensions of urban development to be bale to balance the social, economic and environmental needs of the present and future generations.

5. Decentralization of responsibilities and resources based on the principles of subsidiarity and accountability.

6. *Transparency* and *Accountability* of decision-makers and all stakeholders.

7. *Civic Engagement and Citizenship.* People are the principal wealth of cities. Living together is not a passive exercise.

The <u>Secure Tenure Campaign</u>

From the recognition that not everyone is equal in the city, the Secure Tenure campaign addresses this inequality by mainly giving voice to the most marginalized. Essentially, the campaign talks about adequate shelter for all. Housing as major component, addressed by our city governments. Urban poor people's organizations and NGOs working on urban poverty issues have articulated ST as a primary solution based on their needs and experiences in working on social housing. The four components of the ST campaign are:

- preventing and addressing forced evictions
- preventing and rectifying distant relocation
- promoting forms & realization of security of tenure instruments
- assessing the implementation of the Urban Development and Housing Act after 10 years.

In the ST framework, note that good governance was mentioned as a component not just systems or policies but as perspectives on the part of people working in government on how they perceive the poor. What were saying is good urban governance requires also a shift on the perspectives of LGUs on who the poor is. Therefore, it takes partnership with the very beneficiaries that the LGUs serve.

Both campaigns contributed to what we call the Inclusive Cities. These two campaigns came together in a process called the Bahanggunihanan. This is a synthesis of relevant outcomes from national level consultation process, and a series of validation workshops.

So what is the **Bahanggunihanan?** It is a successful attempt to capture in essence the objectives, process and desired outcomes of the good urban governance and secure tenure campaign in the Philippines. The five-point action agenda advocated by the Bahanggunihanan which assigns accountabilities and responsibilities, sets a time frame and determines resource requirements and commitments:

Agenda 1: Empowered People's Organizations and Brgy Governance
We say again that the heart of the campaigns is people empowerment. We are looking at empowering grassroots organizations, NGOs and barangays as unit of governance towards ensuring that their full participation on national and local activities, to promote a culture of

good civic engagement and good citizenship. The POs themselves committed to strengthen their ranks and organize themselves into a national network - POSTNET. And then the institutionalized people's day consultation led by the Liga ng mga Barangay.

Agenda 2: Access to Quality and Affordable Housing and Basic Services
This talks about promoting adequate shelter for all, and other services.

Agenda 3: Rational Use of land Resources
This seeks to provide a policy framework for the rationale and just allocation, utilization, management and development of land resources. We are saying that increases in urban management supply shall be encouraged without compromising environmental integrity.

Agenda 4: Effective Urban Development & Management
This is the most developed agenda at this time because it has gone through a series of intense consultations and processes as well. It talks about the management of everyday affair.

Agenda 5: Strengthened and Institutionalized Philippine Urban Forum
This points out the role of media. We are doing good but do the people know? We're tapping info a resource that has been kept untapped. Naga city has promised to start the creation of PUF in Bicol, to lead this process.

Bahanggunihanan is not a perfect document, we do not want a perfect document. What we want is a workable one. We're bringing in development agencies, business. And at the end of the day, we have to put our money where our mouth is and so we are mobilizing resources for this agenda.

Capacity Development Framework for Urban Management

Ms. Marivel Sacendoncillo

Executive Director
Local Government Academy, DILG

This initiative was really part of our effort to enhance the programs that we are implementing in the Academy as a training arm of DILG. Everything has been said about the challenges we are facing as far as urbanization is concerned and our task is to help in the effort of preparing our LGUs in managing urban development in this country. The current thrust of urban development in the Philippines is focused on building sustainable urban communities. The advocacy of building sustainable urban communities pertains to the current generations' ability to meet

their needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations. Human development is at the core of sustainable urban communities guided by the principles of Sustainable Urbanization.

This framework I am presenting this morning is a result of a study done by the Academy with the help of some experts and this has gone through consultations already but I have to admit, this is still a work in progress. At the moment, the Philippines uses two major urban paradigms: (1) Sustainable Urbanization and (2) the League of Cities - led Inclusive Cities Approach. The framework for capacity-building is based on these.

Sustainable Urbanization is a dynamic process that brings together linkages between cities and their environment at all levels, and incorporates population, economic and socio-cultural indicators to ensure a sustainable environment. Programs on sustainable urbanization move beyond urban vs. rural concerns to encompass the reality of urban growth and provide solutions to promote a sustainable living environment.

Sustainable urbanization is currently being advocated by the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) and programmed as one of the rallying concerns of the Philippine Business Agenda 21. The Mainstreaming Sustainable Development Project (MSD) implemented by the Agriculture Staff of NEDA and the PCSD Civil Society Counterpart also utilizes some concepts of sustainable urbanization in selected urbanizing
municipalities.

The LCP-led *Inclusive Cities* Approach on the other hand ensures Secure Tenure and Good Urban Governance, a twin campaign assisted by the Philippine Urban Forum. The League of Cities of the Philippines is at the forefront of the GUG campaign implemented in the 31 CDS- Sites and Secure Tenure is being championed by Urban Poor Peoples Organizations in the National Capital Region, Bicol, Visayas and Mindanao.

The process of mainstreaming Sustainable Urbanization is currently anchored on the following programs and strategies:

I . The **City** Development **Strategy** implemented in seven pilot cities under the CDS 1 tranche: Dapitan, Dipolog, Lapu-Lapu, Olongapo, Roxas, Sagay, San Fernando and in 31 other Philippine cities under the CDS 2 tranche. The City Development Strategy is the process by which top city executives and their constituents acting in partnership with the private business sector, civic society, academe and national government agencies decide on what actions to take in developing and sustaining a desirable living environment for its constituents.

2. Another strategy currently being utilized is the **Philippine** Regional **Municipal Development Project** (PRMDP). The PRMDP is premised on the development problems associated with rapid urbanization resulting in an ability of cities to meet either the current demand for services or the demand expected to be generated by future population growth. PRMDP is being implemented in Bacolod, Cagayan de Oro, Iligan, Tagbilaran, Puerto Princesa, and General Santos.

3. The *Philippine* **Agenda 21** is the country's sustainable development blueprint. Implemented under the guidance of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development, PA 21 encompasses rural-urban concerns with the private and business sector playing a crucial role in urban centers through the Business Agenda 21. A special focus is given to some local government units through the PCSD-led project, Mainstreaming Sustainable Development (MSD).

4. *KALAHI* is the Poverty Reduction program of the Arroyo Administration. The program revolves around four (4) core strategies: Asset Refonn; Human Development; Employment and Livelihood Opportunities; and, Participation in Governance. KALAHI is being implemented in selected Urban and Rural Communities nationwide.

These programs and strategies are anchored on the thrusts of the **Medium-Term Development Plan** and in part reflect some of the aspirations of the **National Urban Development and Housing Framework.** The programs that are implemented along the four identified streams that make up the urban development strategy in the Philippines consider as well the following concerns:

(a) Gender-Responsiveness
(b) Local Environment Management Protection
(c) Land Administration and Management
(d) Safer Cities
(e) Integrated Area Development

Based on the above context, efficient and responsive Urban Management clearly requires addressing and managing a wide range of issues, demands and interest (both individual and institutional) as reflected in the paradigms, programs and strategies.

As such, the government unit should be able to perform varied management functions from a coherent and coordinated manner. Effective management of these functions will ensure that the government will implement programs and strategies that are aligned with the national thrusts of the government as well as realize the needs of the stakeholders and meeting its internal environment and capacities.

From there we move on determining what are the functions of urban management. Initially, we were able to identify six, but after consultation, this was expanded to nine. These are:

1. Marketing
   Consists of identifying effective demand -market research, communicating the purpose and services of the organization -external relations, and obtaining the necessary resources of people, information,' capital and power to deliver services and achieve organizational purpose -promotion.

2. Operational Management
   Consists of the day-to-day operation of the LGU and involves careful budgeting of resources, efficient administration, and continual monitoring and control of the LGU operations.

3. Information Management

Consists of research and other data gathering methods, classification of data, storage and retrieval and dissemination of information to key players in urban management.

4. Financial Management

Consists of financial planning of revenues and expenditures, sourcing of funds and careful monitoring and control of expenditures. Also includes the generation and mobilization of funds to support programs and projects.

5. Human Resource Management

Consists of personnel planning and control, education and training to ensure that staff are well- trained, motivated, and a system of values in the organization is communicated and shared by everyone.

6. Organizational Development

Consists of continuous analysis of the effectiveness, efficiency and economy of the LGU, design and modify the Structure and function to maintain its relevance in a changing situation and condition, and monitor and control the organization's functions and structure in a continuous basis.

7. Managing the Economy, Polity and Social Environments

Requires an in-depth understanding and ability to relate the local dynamics obtaining in the areas of polity, economics and social and cultural with the requirements of urban development.

8. Managing the Cultural Environment

Requires an orientation and perspective of appreciating and balancing development and culture with a special focus on the built environment of city centers vis-a-vis the historical and heritage conservation as a way of retaining the urban heritage landscape.

9. Strategic Management

Consists of strategic formulation, implementation and evaluation.

These functions are present in varying degrees in the urban development strategies. For instance, the function of marketing and information management appears to be very strong in the CDS strategy and PRMDP highlights efficiency in the function of organizational development and human resource management. Now, out of these functions, we were able to cull out the basic competencies urban managers should have. On a study we're conducting,

we're finding out that urban management is not lodged on an individual but on a team or a group.

Ms. Sacendoncilto, the speaker.

Recognizing that the nine (9) urban management functions are necessary to ensure competent urban management, urban manager competencies should then be built in three areas:

1) Managerial Competencies - focuses on the enhancement of the ability to manage limited resources, people management towards task achievement, ability to look at the external environment, maximize opportunities and identify external threats

2) Technical Competencies - these are the critical skills needed in performing the urban management functions. It involves enhancing the knowledge of the urban manager in the various function of urban management. Some of these courses are specific to certain functions/Sectoral areas.

3) Team Competencies - skills needed by key players in urban management to complement and support each other in carrying out the various tasks and demands in achieving the development of the locality.

Having thus identified the three (3) needed competencies; the LGA sees it fit to formulate the Urban Capacity Development Program in conjunction with an accreditation/certification program for Urban Managers in the country. This program envisions to contribute to the thrust of the Philippine government's vision of sustainable urban communities and to the global campaign of sustainable urbanization.

The capacity development program envisions to use three modalities

1. **Three Tiered Approach -** allows the urban manager to either master core knowledge, acquire sectoral expertise or train as a consultant on urban management.

2. **Ladderized Approach -** follows a set mandatory curriculum that starts with the transfer of core knowledge and progresses into sectoral expertise (e.g. solid waste management, traffic management, heritage conservation) and eventually qualifies the urban manager to graduate as a consultant for local governments.

3. **Demand Driven -** a menu type capacity development program that focuses on the immediate demands and needs of urban managers.
   This is the framework for capacity development. What is evolving as a framework for management of urban development in the Philippines, we saw three major components with the end of creating sustainable urban communities. A major component of course is urban governance being led by the LCP. The second component is urban citizenship currently being led by the POSTNET. The third component is promoting urban social responsibilities which will be led by the business sector. There are current initiatives right now being led by the Philippine Business for Social Progress bringing in the business sector into governance and building development.

Cutting - across all of this is capacity development and in the workshop we had two weeks ago, we were able to define some of the stakeholders that might want to take this role. Urban governance is basically a government role. Urban citizenship, a CSO and NGO role. Promoting corporate responsibility may be led by the business sector. Capacity development may be led by the academe and training institutions.

We look at national government as just a support arm. We also look at media as a very significant courier in urban development. As we all know, in the Philippines, the media is now in the position to influence how the country will be run. So the power of the media is probably one that we would have to contend or work on so that in can help in the development of the country.

So this is the resultant/evolved framework for managing urban development. And we'd be very glad to get your comments so that we could enhance further this framework.

The people's organizations represented.

The participants intently listening. Some of them come from the DILG, others from HUDCC

The presentors, Ms. Josef and M. Rosales with the participants.