

I. BACKGROUND

The complexities of the environment in which local government units (LGUs) in the Philippines operate require local governance stakeholders to be more attuned to the priority needs of the localities. New paradigms need to be developed to fill the gaps and draw the paths towards building empowered communities.

For almost twelve years of decentralization, there have been an increasing number of capacity building providers in the area of local governance. Academe, training institutions, and even individual experts, and consultants have been tapped to implement capacity building programs for LGUs. The common aim is to provide knowledge and information to local government officials and their technical staff as well as equip them with the necessary skills to perform their mandates under a decentralized regime.

The Local Government Academy (LGA), as the national orchestrator for capacity development of LGUs, is confronted with the task of bringing together the key actors in the delivery of capacity development interventions. In relation to this task, LGA is taking the challenge to map the capability building institutes and their course offerings and other programs.

At present, there is an information gap pertaining to the number and types of local governance training and research institutes. More importantly, there is lack of information concerning the types and quality of the programs that these institutes offer. In relation to this, the absence of standards in terms of the content and effective delivery of capacity building programs fosters the proliferation of below par capacity building providers as well as mediocre capacity building interventions, less to mention the overlapping and duplication of services offered to LGUs. Moreover, continuous provision of appropriate course curriculum and methodologies to address increasing demands for new and appropriate skills and approaches in governance remains to be desired. The use of innovative approaches that facilitate and foster learning (e.g. information exchange, visits, dialogues, and others) are limitedly applied or maximized to generate the desired impact and changes.

These challenges have been the primary bases for the establishment of the Local Governance Training and Research Institutes Philippines Network (LoGoTRI-PhilNet). Among its immediate development objective is to strengthen the capacities of local resource institutions (LRIs) to deliver responsive, appropriate, transparent, accountable, and quality capacity building interventions on a sustained basis.

One cost-effective means of building capacities of these institutes is through networking and promoting cooperation among them. Many of these institutes have expertise or experience in a particular field, which others lack. Encouraging advisory services, exchange of staff and information, joint-training workshops as well as comparative research and documentation of good and bad practices are relevant in building their respective capacities. As first step towards establishing the LoGoTRI-PhilNet, this National Convention of the Local Resource Institutions was organized.

The general objective of the National Convention of Local Resource Institution is to establish the Local Governance Training and Research Institutes Philippines Network (LoGoTRI-PhilNET). The specific objectives include:

1. Developing the Local Resource Institutions (LRIs) Competency Assessment Framework (CAF);
2. Crafting the Vision, Mission, and Goals;
3. Identifying and prioritizing programs and activities; and
4. Developing the Charter of the Network.

Patterned after the Local Government Training and Research Institutes (LOGOTRI) in Asia and the Pacific, LGA facilitates the establishment of LoGoTRI-PhilNet as the country's response to rationalize and direct capacity development efforts in local governance and institute mechanisms towards a sustained, responsive, and progressive capacity development among key stakeholders.

II. OPENING SESSION

September 10, 2003

The opening program started around 9:00 am with singing of the Philippine National Anthem and a Prayer led by Mr. David Joy S. Semilla. Executive Director Marivel C. Sacendoncillo of the Local Government Academy (LGA) welcomed the participants to the three-day workshop. She mentioned that this National Convention of Local Resource Institutions is a follow through activity of the gathering of the Institute of Local Government Administrations (ILGAs) last February 2003. The ILGAs are partners of the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) in providing capability-building interventions to local government units. Of the more than 70 invitations sent to former ILGAs, Centers of Local Governance (CLGs), training and research institutions, and non-governmental organizations with programs on local governance, forty institutions from all over the Philippines participated in the event.

Director Sacendoncillo pointed that the Convention is aimed at establishing a Network that creates synergy and common vision for local resource institutions that shall work harmoniously towards a common goal of strengthening the capabilities of local governments units. The Executive Director puts emphasis on the important role of LRIs in transforming local governments into self-reliant communities. She is optimistic that the network can agree on a common vision although they have their own priorities and niches. She encourages the participants to make use of the three-day workshop as an opportunity to craft common vision and objectives, identify what they can do for the LGUs, and how they can strengthen their own capacity as an institution to respond to the challenges of the LGUs. Towards the end of her message, she reported that the LRIs have been strong partners of the Local Government Academy from the past, at present, and in to the future.

After the welcome message of the Executive Director, Ms. Daphne Purnell acknowledged the presence of the participants representing various institutions. A total of forty (40) local resource institutions from all over the Philippines have participated in organizing the Network. The legal status of participating LRIs is as follow:

- 1 Government Entity, whether autonomous or a department
- 29 State Universities and Colleges

10 Private Entities, which consisted of non-government organizations or private universities

The Local Government Academy being the organizer of the National Convention is not counted in the list.

Representatives from partner agencies were present during the opening program to express their support. Among them were Ms. Ma. Luisa Rosales, Program Coordinator of UN-Habitat and Mr. Austere A. Panadero, Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG). Ms. Rosales in behalf of UN-HABITAT Philippines expressed her support to LGA for taking the lead role in establishing the Network. She considers the LRIs as strong partners of national government in nation building and capacity development. She reminded the participants of the importance of bridging the gap among LRIs, as there are many programs and projects in UNDP and UN-HABITAT where support of LRIs is crucial. Among the new projects that will be undertaken by LGA together with the UN include:

1. Good Urban Policies and Enabling Legislation, which concern on unpacking of the Local Government Code to simplify and assess its impact; and
2. National Replication Program of Local Environmental Planning and Management (L-EPM) that will share the lessons learned pilot cities in the Philippines, particularly the Cagayan De Oro experience.

Assistant Secretary Austere A. Panadero reported about the various best practices of local governments that may be replicated in other areas. He urged the participants to take stock of certain milestones in terms of delivering capability building to LGUs, assess the accomplishments, and support the continuing programs being undertaken by the DILG to chart the future. The LGUs have changed with the enactment of the Code, he said. LGUs nowadays have become more competitive and innovative. With this trend, LRIs need to encourage LGUs to appreciate best practices and share these to others. It is also opportune to engage as many service providers as possible given the dynamic capacity development environment. He also asked the participants to ponder on how

capability building is being done and encouraged them to respond effectively to the demands and push for more LGU innovations.

Asec. Panadero also pointed that training is only one aspect of capability building. Other aspects such as joint researches, coaching, field visits, and similar learning events need to be explored as well. He viewed the network as a good avenue to improve the delivery of capacity development in local governance. This, according to him, is a welcome development and will serve as an effort to renew partnership with the academe and NGOs as major capacity development providers. Through the gathering, he added, insights from the LRIs can be gathered and agreements as to cooperation can be pursued not only through training but also in undertaking research. He ended his message with the statement: *“Coming Together is the Beginning, Keeping Together is Progress, and Working Together is Success”*.

Ms. Purnell presented the overview of the three-day activity. She mentioned that the workshop was held to facilitate a national network of LRIs for a more united and complementary effort in helping LGUs. Towards the end of the activity, the following were hoped to be achieved:

1. Formation of LOGOTRI-PhilNet;
2. Formulation of the vision, mission and goals as well as the charter and operational modalities of the network;
3. Formulation of an Accreditation and Quality Standards System; and
4. Identification of Core Competencies of LRIs.

The methodologies involved to attain the outputs were paper presentations, workshops, and consensus building. She also outlined the schedule of activities for the three-day activity.

III. ISSUES PAPERS PRESENTED

September 10, 2003

THE LGU INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

By Assistant Secretary Austere A. Panadero, Department of the Interior and Local Government

This presentation is composed of three parts. The first part talks about the background and brief review of major challenges in capacity development. The second part talks about the DILG's response in addressing the major challenges. The third part is the presentation of the evolving framework on institutional capacity development for LGUs.

The general results from DILG's Local Productivity and Performance Measurement System (LPPMS), which allows local government units to evaluate themselves in the "efficiency, effectiveness, adequacy and equity" of the services they provide, there have been positive trends and improvements in way local government manage their affairs (e.g. most of them have local development plans). He explained the trends in LGU Organization and Management wherein a number of LGUs have become more innovative in their efforts to improve organizational capacities in performing their functions. However despite the positive trends, there is still no clear measure of the level of LGUs' capacities and how they apply these newly acquired capacities. In addition, there is no mechanism of ensuring that the capacities are indeed applied and sustained. Among other related issues and challenges are:

1. Lack of coherence and complementation of capacity building programs and interventions,
2. Inadequacy of relevant policies and sufficient resources to support capacity development efforts,
3. Absence of performance and capacity development standards,
4. Non-tracking of capacities among LGUs and other stakeholders in local governance,
5. Inability to sustain capacity building efforts,
6. Institutionalization of CB interventions, and
7. Sources of funding.

According to Asec. Panadero, the DILG came up with strategies to address these challenges. Some of the key efforts include:

1. The Local Governance Institutional Capacity Development Facility (LOGIC),
2. The Urban Management Development Program (UMDP), and
3. The Good Governance Facility for Adaptation and Replication (GO-FAR)

Asec Panadero reported that LOGIC aims to strengthen the capacities of three major groups, namely: (a) the *DEVELOPMENT ENABLERS* that include the national government agencies, (b) the *DIRECT PARTNERS* which are the local government units, and (c) the *DEVELOPMENT PROVIDERS*, which are mainly the local resource institutions. These majors groups according to him are the key players in the Capacity Development environment.

The LGU Institutional Capacity Development Framework is work in progress that identifies the core institutional competencies of LGUs to render outstanding performance in the delivery of basic services and other key decentralization elements (e.g. administration, environmental management). The Ateneo School of Government prepared a study for the DILG identifying the core competencies of selected LGUs with outstanding performances or best practices in areas of governance, administration, service delivery, economic development, and environmental management. The core competencies identified were:

- a. **Leadership:** Envisioning, organizing and analytical skills, such as articulating strategic objectives of a vision that inspires commitment, suggesting creative ideas and encouraging confidence and commitment to consider innovative strategies;
- b. **Management:** Capability to plan and organize, select qualified human resources, and handle budgeting and financial responsibilities with the use of information in a strategic manner;
- c. **Technical:** Capability to perform a specialized function systematically with rigor, such as local development planning; agricultural development planning, local health care delivery; policy formulation and implementation;
- d. **Ethical:** Recognizes the ethical dimensions of governance, such as preserving personal and organizational integrity and promoting professionalism; identifies alternatives in difficult ethical choices; analyzes

systematically the conflicting considerations supporting different alternatives; and formulates, defends, and effectively carries out a course of action necessary to maintain personal and organizational integrity; and

- e. **Political:** Capability to influence people, resolve conflicts, build cohesiveness, develop coalitions and gain resources and approvals from relevant authorities and other stakeholders, and establish collaboration and convergence (intra- and inter-LGU)

Assistant Secretary Austere A. Panadero ended his presentation by challenging the local resources institutions of crafting their common competency assessment framework and work closely in developing modules and other interventions to strengthen the core competencies essential for institutional development of local governments.

THE ROLE OF LRIs IN BUILDING THE CAPACITIES OF LGUs

By Executive Director Marivel C. Sacendoncillo, Local Government Academy

Another paper presentation was that of Director Marivel C. Sacendoncillo, which discussed some of the continuing challenges to capacity building and how the local resource institution could response to it. In the areas of capacity development interventions, the following challenges are apparent, as reported by the Director:

1. Information gap in terms of the type and number of LRIs providing CB to LGUs;
2. Type and quality of the programs being delivered;
3. Absence of standards in terms of content and effective delivery of programs; and
4. Lack of continuous provision of appropriate program to respond to the demands of LGU.

One way to address these challenges is establishment of a Network that shall strengthen the capacities of local resource institutions (LRIs) to deliver responsive, appropriate, transparent, accountable, and quality capacity building interventions on a sustained basis. Director Sacendoncillo pointed that there is no need to compete among LRIs, as clients are tremendous. There are about 4,500 barangays, 1,500 municipalities, 115 cities, and 79 provinces, where local officials and institutions need to be capacitated.

In response to these challenges, Director Sacendoncillo enumerated some of the strategies that may be undertaken. These strategies could be in the form of networking and creating an enabling mechanism for the network to continuously improve the quality of services delivered to LGUs and dissemination of best practices wherein the network could assist the LGUs in replicating models through the coaching strategy.

Director Sacendoncillo firmly believes that LRIs should take on the role of an enabler, a provider, and partner in the environment of capacity development. The LRIs are considered strategic partner of LGA in building the capacity of the LGUs wherein resources in terms of knowledge, technology, funds and personnel can be shared. The role of LRIs as provider, according to Director Sacendoncillo, can be in the form of training or technical assistance, module development, documentor or researcher. Through the network, a resource center could be established and shall continue advocate for excellence in local governance.

Director Sacendoncillo also discussed the imperatives of identifying the niche of each LRI so that expertise can be maximized and access to information on the performance of LGUs. The DILG has put in place three (3) systems in assessing the strengths and weaknesses as well as ensuring compliance to laws. These systems are:

1. The Local Governance Performance Monitoring System (LGPMS),
2. The Citizen's Satisfaction Index System (CSIS), and
3. The Development Watch (DevWatch).

Finally, Director Sacendoncillo presented the summary of findings from the questionnaire administered to assess the profiles of participating LRIs. These findings are attached as annex to this report.

IV. WORKSHOP 1 HIGHLIGHTS

Developing the LRI Competency Assessment Framework (CAF)

Day 1, September 10, 2003

The first workshop deals with the development of LRI Competency Assessment Framework (CAF). In developing this, the information presented by the speakers could be used as reference. The expected output of this workshop is a *competency assessment framework for LRIs* that will be developed by identifying the core competencies and its respective indicators.

Mr. Gil Resol presented the definitions of *competency*, *core competencies*, *organizational competency*, and *indicators*. This was made to provide perspective of the framework the participants were about to develop. After agreeing to the definitions, the participants were then divided into six (6) groups.

The groups were tasked to discuss on the focus question: “***What do you think are the core competencies of LRI to deliver quality capability development interventions to the local governments?***” The technology of participation was utilized to elicit ideas from the participants. The ideas were then processed in plenary to come up with the required output. There were debates as to the definition of core competencies because it appeared that the groups had different interpretations or definitions of core competency. Some groups looked at the core competencies as the qualities of a good LRI, without tying it up with the concept of membership to the network. Others viewed it as the minimum competencies LRIs must possess so that they can contribute to the strengthening of LGU competencies. Some even pushed for the adoption of the five (5) competencies as enumerated in the study done by the Ateneo School of Government (i.e. leadership, management, technical, ethical and political). The participants finally agreed that the core competencies would be the minimum competencies of LRIs that facilitate LGUs to realize and harness its own competencies.

After the long debate, the group came to a consensus to adopt the following as the core competencies of LRIs:

- ✚ Research Capability
- ✚ Human Resource Competency
- ✚ Training Facilities

- ✚ Linkages and Partnership
- ✚ Delivery System

A group was tasked to enhance the output and classify the indicators that need to be included under each of the competencies identified. The final Competency Assessment Framework (CAF) is attached in the annexes.

V. WORKSHOP 2 HIGHLIGHTS

Crafting the Vision and Mission of the Network

Day 2, September 11, 2003

The outputs expected of the second workshop are Vision and Mission statements of the LoGoTRI-PhilNet. At the start of the workshop, Mr. Bong Antonio, who facilitated the workshop, briefly presented the definition of the vision, mission, and goal so that the participants will be guided. After the agreeing on the definitions, the participants were requested to “**write a word or a phrase**” in colored cards given of what they think could be vision of the Network. All words and phrases written were posted in the board for the participants to validate.

During the processing, some of those written as vision turned out to mission, as these validated and based on the agreed definition. The facilitator with concurrence of the participants classified the ideas into vision and mission. The participants whose cards were considered as vision, were assigned as visionaries and those whose cards were considered mission, were assigned as missionaries. The function of the visionaries and the missionaries were to craft the vision and mission respectively based on the various cards considered.

The afternoon session started with the presentation of the vision and mission statement that the “visionaries” and “missionaries” formulated. The output was presented in a plenary session for the participants to comment. Some participants gave their own ideas on how the vision and mission should be stated. After a lengthy discussion, the participants agreed on the following as the vision and mission of the Network.

Vision

The premier network of empowered and responsive local resource institutions promoting excellence in governance

Mission

LoGoTRI-PhilNet acts as a catalyst of change for local government unit (LGU) institutional development by providing relevant programs and services to empower the participation of the civil society and the private sector for good governance.

As LRIs endeavor to act as catalysts of change in an environment of sustainable partnership, it promotes and practices good governance through integrated and concerted action.

VI. WORKSHOP 3 HIGHLIGHTS

Identifying the Goals and Activities of the Network

Day 2, September 11, 2003

The expected outputs of the third workshop are statements of the goals of the Network and the proposed activities to achieve each goal. Based on the stated vision and mission, the goals were classified into five (5) major components: *participatory interventions, integrated and concerted effort, catalyst of change, training program and services, and sustainable partnership.*

The participants were grouped five (5) to work on the goal statements for each of the components. The groups were tasked to identify some activities that the network can pursue from 2003-2007 under each component. **Table 1** presents the agreed goals and proposed activities for each goal.

Table 1: Goal Statements and Proposed Activities of the Network

GOAL	ACTIVITY	TIMEFRAME
<p>Goal 1</p> <p><i>To adopt a holistic institutional development or reform framework for integrated and concerted action by installing functional systems and mechanisms including but not limited to the sharing of best practices, innovations and resources.</i></p>	<p>Local pool of trained facilitators of participatory local decision making</p> <p>Survey of LGU compliance with local plans</p> <p>Consultation workshops for framework building</p> <p>Sharing of best practices, innovations and resources</p> <p>Training and re-tooling program</p> <p>Come up with updated directory of LRI and their technological packages and expertise.</p> <p>Provide a venue for continuing mutual exchange and enhancement of technological packages among LRIs.</p> <p>Formulate guidelines of strategic alliances among LRIs in the delivery of technical packages</p>	<p>2004 – 2007</p> <p>2003</p> <p>2003</p> <p>2003</p> <p>2004 (1st quarter)</p>
<p>Goal 2</p> <p><i>To ensure institutional development of member LRIs and the network through the establishment of quality standards, accreditation schemes and academic consortia.</i></p>	<p>Develop quality standards and accreditation scheme</p> <p>Launch QS/AS</p> <p>Develop and present concept paper</p> <p>Develop program and/or curriculum</p> <p>Conduct validation workshop to output final consortium program</p>	<p>2 months after adoption of PhilNet Charter</p> <p>By the third month</p> <p>Within 6 months of year 1</p> <p>Within the first year</p> <p>Month after year 1</p>
<p>Goal 3</p> <p><i>To spouse good governance principles and values by strengthening grass-roots democracy and promoting transparency and accountability.</i></p>	<p>Promote cooperativism and entrepreneurship among local folks</p> <p>Voters IEC: Candidates' Fora at barangay Level</p> <p>Activate barangay development councils</p>	<p>2003 – 2007</p> <p>Before 2004 Elections</p>

GOAL	ACTIVITY	TIMEFRAME
	Report cards of Local Officials Citizen's feedback mechanisms (e.g. opinion polls) in pilot LGUs	
	Updated directories of local NGOs/Pos in each LGU Development of citizen's charter handbook (Study NAGA City model)	2003 - 2007
Goal 4 <i>To develop and implement relevant programs and services that would enhance the LGUs' technical, ethical and leadership capacities as well as those of the CSOs and the private sector for good governance.</i>	TNA/Consultation Module development/Acquisition/Enhancement Training (on-ste/off-site) Consultation/Mentoring Evaluation/Impact assessment/Monitoring Research survey Linkaging TNA-Review Feedbacking	2003 – 2007
Goal 5 <i>To establish and strengthen partnership between and among the network, LGUs and other stakeholders/ organizations.</i>	Marketing and advocacy programs Partnership institutionalization Data-access program Training program Monitoring and evaluation program Coaching and mentoring program	2003 – 2007

The activities identified in each goal will be validated and finalized during the upcoming follow through activities in November 2003.

VII. WORKSHOP 4 HIGHLIGHTS

Crafting the Charter of the Network

Day 2, September 11, 2003

The expected output of this workshop is a draft charter of the Network that shall be ratified during the follow through activity in November 2003. A draft Charter, which is patterned after the LOGOTRI Asia Pacific were provided to the participants, who were grouped into seven groups. The task of each group is to comment the proposed Charter using the following guidelines:

1. What provisions need to be enhanced and how it should be stated?
2. What need to be deleted? and
3. What need to be added?

The comments of each group on the Charter would be presented in a plenary of the following day.

Presentation of Comments on the Draft Charter

Day 3, September 12, 2003

The morning session was devoted for group presentations of their comments on the proposed charter. The comments and suggestions of each of the seven groups are enclosed as one of the annexes in this terminal report.

After the presentation of comments on the draft Charter, the participants pointed that the following concerns need to be address immediately. **Table 2** shows t he areas of concern and agreements on the proposed Charter.

Table 2: Issues and Agreements

Area of Concern	Agreement
1. Name	<p>LoGoTRI-PhiNet (Local Governance Training and Research Institutes-Philippines Network) garnered 28 votes and won over GOGOTRI-PHILNET (Good Governance Training and Research Institutes-Philippines Network) with only 3 votes.</p>
2. Membership	<p>a. <u>Charter Membership</u> Charter members - those LRIs who are represented in this Convention and would like to be part of the Network (institutional membership only)</p> <p><u>b. General Membership</u></p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <i>Regular</i> - institutions (with right to vote and to be voted upon) o <i>Associate</i> – decide later through board resolution o <i>Honorary</i> – decide later through board resolution
3. Structure	<p>a. <u>General Assembly</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o (Institutions only for time being) o National and Regional Assembly (Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao, NCR) <p>b. <u>Board of Directors</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 9 members to be elected at large by the general assembly o 7 Officials who will comprise the EXECOM to be elected from among the Board members : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 President 4 Vice Presidents (Luzon, Visayas, Mindanao, NCR) 1 Treasurer 1 Auditor 1 Secretary (<i>NOT member of the BOARD -- to be appointed by the President</i>) o The BOARD can create committees
4. Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o LGA as interim Secretariat o Elected Secretariat will sponsor the secretariat
5. Fees	<p>i. <u>Entitlements: What is it for us?</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project procurement - No need for accreditation of programs

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional share from fees and projects - Access to shared databases - Access to services (e.g. training, Asia-Pacific link) - First choice in geographic areas with respect to programs offered (<i>niche</i>)
	ii. <u>How much?</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Membership fee = P5,000 - Annual fee = P2,000
	iii. <u>Sharing of resources and annual dues?</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National = 40% - Regional = 60%
	v. <u>Funds Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Network opens own account <hr/>

A group of local resource institutions coming from Manila agreed to integrate all the comments on the proposed Charter, which will be presented for ratification in the upcoming events.

VIII. ISSUES AND COMMENTS

Presented below are the various issues raised during the National Convention of Local Resource Institutions.

As to the sustainability of the ILGA: What is the status of the ILGAs? Where did we fail? Was there a system for monitoring and evaluation to ensure continuity in the implementation of the PPAs of ILGAs? What is its impact on the quality of life of the people?

✚ *Change in leadership in the institutions has an effect on the programs of ILGA*

- ✚ *ILGA was fund-driven/largely dependent on the seed money; there were also flaws in the design*
- ✚ *The network should create a mechanism to ensure sustainability*
- ✚ *Look at ILGA as an experience and learn from it*
- ✚ *The ILGA is an institution-DILG engagement. The network being proposed is a partnership among LRIs wherein sharing of resources, technology and expertise can be done, this not an engagement with DILG anymore.*

What would be the role of ILGA in relation to the PhilNet?

The ILGA or the institution will be a member of the Network where there will be linking of resources and expertise.

Will the network be a degree granting institution given the proposed consortium?

The network can adopt various modalities. Consortium is just one of the modalities being proposed that can be undertaken by the network.

There was an impression, as floated in the presentation, that all LGUs have the resources. There is a need to clarify whether these LGUs are in the same playing field because there are 4th – 6th class municipalities who are having difficulties in terms of resources.

- ✚ *Yes, there is a need to segment the capacity of LGUs to pay for CB services*

- ✚ *Many LGUs can afford to pay for services if they want to e.g. Updating the Local Revenue Code, many LGUs availed of the program because they need this for fund sourcing*
- ✚ *LGUs don't have equal capacities to pay for training programs*
- ✚ *There is a need for the network to design programs that are more affordable (e.g. coaching strategy)*

We should not always look at LGUs as customers. There are a lot of LGUs that have distinguished themselves and are now learning sites. They should also be considered to be a part of the network that is being proposed.

- ✚ *Yes, the LGUs have their own outfit like Marikina and Bulacan.*
- ✚ *As LRIs, we should be able to spot possible partners.*

Those in Manila, more often than not, are granted ODAs. Mindanao and other outlying regions should also be recognized. The Secretariat being proposed by the Network is also biased for Manila-based institutions. There should also be secretariat in the regions. The general secretariat can be Manila-based, LGA for example.

- ✚ *E-procurement has allowed better bidding of possible contracts. It allows participation of a lot of service providers so LGA is now into e-procurement.*
- ✚ *LGA will initially take on the role of Secretariat on a temporary basis. Once the network is settled, the Secretariat will move around.*

Training program should not be taken as synonymous to capability building because it is just one of the necessary components of CB but not sufficient

enough. There is a need to strengthen LGU-LRI partnership in terms of developing the CB systems i.e. processes, tools, structure, data etc. and there should also be a mechanism for the LGUs to assess and improve these systems, that is where training comes in. It is noted that ODA projects are not being identified by LGUs, consultants do it for them; outputs were produced but not internalized or institutionalized. Partnering with LGUs should mean designing CB programs for LGUs, help them in sourcing the fund and assist them in the implementation.

That is where our role as enabler, provider and partner comes in, it really depends on the environment we are in.

The proposed network can be a good income generating program. Are technological packages available that we can offer our LGUs? Can these be sold?

Yes, LGA has available modules which the LRIs can access and share with the LGUs. They are not for sale, but LRIs can sell them, just acknowledge source.

There should also be a mechanism for internal monitoring and evaluation of member LRIs so that performance can be assessed to ensure sustainability of the network and not encounter failure after sometime as what happened with ILGA.

The network can come up with a system to address M&E, Accreditation and Quality Standards is one.

LRIs and all government agencies for that matter, should be ICT connected. The President should implement the ICT program of the National Computer Center. Many institutions are still not connected to the Net. This is a good avenue for

exchange of information. Maybe the President can provide from the Social Development Fund to finance the ICT of the network.

DILG does not have all the competencies that is why there is a need for partners and strengthen LRIs. The network could serve as lobbyist/advocate for policy reforms. The question is: are we ready to be partners? Money is not a question because all together we can look for money. What is important is how we can maximize the resources that are already available.

There should be safety nets for the plans of the network to prosper so as not to repeat the experience of the ILGA. SUCs do not have capital outlay so how can we proceed? The network should have a paradigm/mechanism so that the plans and programs will not be influenced by politicians.

There is a need for a foundation that could stand the test of time.

DILG Accreditation requirements - The number of years in managing training for the academe as one of the requirements is irrelevant.

There is a need to identify the niche of LRIs.

Enhance DILG-LRI relationship in the field.

IX. CRITICAL NEXT STEPS

Finally, the participants identified the critical next steps that need to be undertaken to ensure that the body can pursue with establishment of the network. Below are the next steps that the LRIs will undertake:

Critical steps	Activities	Lead Institution	Date
----------------	------------	------------------	------

Create e-group		Geodata	September 15, 2003
Finalize the Charter	Finalize the draft Charter (SEC Form of By-Laws and requirements) – Writeshop	Ateneo, SDRC-DLSU, TITA, LGA, Geodata, Dr. Adora	September 19, 2003
	Package Workshop Outputs	LGA	September 22, 2003
	Send draft charter to institutions	LGA	September 22-26, 2003
	Send back comments on draft charter to LGA	All Charter Members	October 6, 2003
Counting-In			3 rd Week of October
Sustainability Workshop (ratification of the charter)		Ateneo, SDRC-DLSU, TITA, LGA, Geodata	2 nd week of November
Launching of LoGoTRI PhilNet			
Donor's clinic			

The group, which was assigned to refine and integrate appropriate comments and suggestions of the draft Charter met at Local Government Academy last February 19, 2003. The final draft of the Charter is attached in the annexes of this report.