

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### Key Principles<sup>1</sup>

#### Principle One

National government should work with local governments, civil society institutions, and the business sector in clearly identifying the country's anti-poverty framework and strategies. It is clear that the national government<sup>2</sup> should take the lead. This is because the people and the international community have given it the mandate and legitimacy to do so. In addition, only the national government has the resources and the political reach to initiate and carry out the process of developing this framework.

Although it takes the lead, the national government should abide by the principles of participatory and gender-sensitive development. Major stakeholders – other national government agencies, local governments, civil society, peoples organizations – should play an essential role in formulating anti-poverty strategies. There is growing agreement that participation is a basic principle of anti-poverty programs. Only through the meaningful involvement of stakeholders, especially the poor, in policy setting, resource-allocation, and program-formulation can there be broad ownership of AP3s.

It should be recognized at the outset that the process would be laborious and time-consuming. Unfortunately, the process has no shortcuts. It should be understood that the process of getting all stakeholders meaningfully involved is as important as the immediate end itself.

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that as used in this report, “principles” are meant to be accepted rules of action; or fundamental, primary, or general truths from which others are derived. They also serve as basic references for the requirements of well designed AP3.

<sup>2</sup> It is the National Anti-Poverty Commission that by law (RA 8425) should take the lead in the development of an anti-poverty framework. In fact, the NAPC has conducted extensive consultations during the first half of the year 2000 with various sectors throughout the country in the design and formulation of the National Anti-Poverty Action Agenda (NA3).

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### .Key Principles<sup>1</sup>

#### Principle Two

Economic growth and investment plans should complement and strengthen the impact of anti-poverty programs. Economic growth is not a sufficient response to poverty. There is also the fundamental issue of distributing the gains of growth. Lack of access to and control by poor households of assets such as land, capital, and skills, prevent them from taking advantage of the opportunities offered by economic growth. It should be understood, however, that asset ownership alone does not automatically translate into sustained improvements in well being.

At the local level, there have been many economic programs funded by various sources, such as national government agency funds, special funds of district representatives also referred to as "pork barrel funds," donor funds, and the like. For the most part, these have been either fragmented – that is, not part of an integrated development framework for the specific geographic area – or disjointed and not clearly linked to a broader anti-poverty strategy. For an anti-poverty program to be meaningful, it should be clearly connected with economic development activities. That is to say, anti-poverty values should be visible in the economic and investment plans of a given area. .

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that as used in this report, "principles" are meant to be accepted rules of action; or fundamental, primary, or general truths from which others are derived. They also serve as basic references for the requirements of well designed AP3.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### .Key Principles<sup>1</sup>

#### **Principle Three**

There should be continuous capacity building for both the community and government bureaucracy in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of AP3s. Capacity building should cover these areas –

- Social preparation
- PIME skills to ensure synergy of economic and AP goals
- Participatory approaches in the design and implementation of AP3
- Information-based decision-making.

Capacity building is a comprehensive, long-range and local-term intervention. It should involve all relevant stakeholders, including government, business sector, and civil society. This is why anti-poverty interventions cannot be fast-tracked. Enormous investments should be made in social preparation and, eventually, in the monitoring and evaluation of projects. Meaningful involvement of stakeholders at the start through intensive social preparation is indispensable.

Finally, it is very important to develop capabilities in developing an accurate information base to help in making rational and focused decisions.<sup>2</sup> This is where the MBN data gathering tools and techniques have proven to be invaluable and in some cases, been used to overcome political pressure that may have been used to distort the decision-making process.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that as used in this report, “principles” are meant to be accepted rules of action; or fundamental, primary, or general truths from which others are derived. They also serve as basic references for the requirements of well designed AP3.

<sup>2</sup> In many local governments, this responsibility is lodged in the local planning and development office.

<sup>3</sup> A recent example was the implementation of the Estrada administration’s *Lingap para sa Mahihirap Program* wherein the poorest 100 families per province were identified and targeted for special assistance by the government. In cases where accurate MBN data was available, it was not difficult for the concerned agencies (the LGU, the DSWD and the DILG) to identify such families. However, where such data was not available, the decision to identify the 100 poorest was done arbitrarily. There are cases, though, where the local chief executive’s political preferences in choosing the 100 families were rejected by the local planning and development officers who used MBN data as their basis.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### .Key Principles<sup>1</sup>

#### **Principle Four**

An anti-poverty program should have champions – from the national down to the local levels (provincial, city, municipal and barangay levels), and across agencies and sectors. Committed and qualified staff in the government bureaucracy and contracted groups should support them.

In general, a "champion" is an anti-poverty program's "lead advocate". The champion increases the chances for continuity and sustainability of the program during transition periods, as when there is a change in government administration. The case studies demonstrate the importance of AP3 champions. The champion could be a local chief executive or an official attached to a national agency official (such as the CIDSS worker or a local government operations officer of the DILG). The concept of AP3 champions received a boost when the Ramos administration carried out its Social Reform Agenda. Champions for certain sectors (for example, the DILG for local capability building) were designated at the national and local levels. Apart from being able to pinpoint accountabilities later, this also firmly established which national government agency was responsible for implementing program.

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that as used in this report, "principles" are meant to be accepted rules of action; or fundamental, primary, or general truths from which others are derived. They also serve as basic references for the requirements of well designed AP3.

**CHAPTER III**  
Lessons Learned toward a System of Good  
Governance Indicators for  
Poverty Program Assessment

## Key Principles<sup>1</sup>

### **Principle Five**

To be sustainable, an anti-poverty program should have creative revenue mobilization strategies. The development experience in the Philippines is replete with programs and projects whose lifespans were determined almost exclusively by the availability of funding. The funding source could be provisions in the General Appropriations Act, special projects of national government agencies, pork barrel of district representatives, or local or foreign donor agencies. It is necessary to build into an AP3 a component for mobilizing funding sources to ensure continuity beyond the project life. An effective mechanism is counterpart funding and resource sharing by local governments and other stakeholders. The collection of modest users' fees also might be considered. Passing local ordinances that require using a portion of the local budget for AP3s is another possibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> It must be noted that as used in this report, "principles" are meant to be accepted rules of action; or fundamental, primary, or general truths from which others are derived. They also serve as basic references for the requirements of well designed AP3.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Transparency**

This means having reliable information about an AP3 available to and accessible by the public. Equally significant is the process of transparency. How are decisions arrived at? How was the project designed? How were target partners identified?<sup>2</sup> Were genuine consultations with the stakeholders conducted? Additionally, transparency could be ensured by the following:<sup>3</sup>

- Availability of accurate and up-to-date information about the extent of poverty in the community;
- Presence of a community data board;
- Regular updating of information;
- Public awareness of where to get information about AP3
- Easy availability to the public of accomplishment reports and other pertinent documents from design and implementation of AP3;
- Regular dissemination to the public of criteria used for selection of beneficiaries in poverty alleviation programs;
- Availability of information about the process of selection;
  - Presence of feedback and/or built-in corrective mechanisms to obtain inputs from stakeholders.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

<sup>2</sup> An example was the selection of the 100 poorest families under the Estrada administration's *Lingap Para sa Mahihirap* program. Transparency as a governance indicator requires that the process of selection of target families be made clear according to a set of criteria.

<sup>3</sup> These belong to the "checklist" used to operationalize the various indicators. This is incorporated in the tools that could be used in developing governance indicators for the assessment of AP3s.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### Accountability

This refers to the responsible use of power to advance public welfare through an AP3. Those carrying out an anti-poverty project must answer for how effectively they fulfilled the objectives of the project. In this context, an AP3 should be performance-based and time-bound.<sup>2</sup> Among the specific measures that can be included in the checklist to determine whether accountability is being observed are the following –

- There is an office for the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of AP3;
- Expected outputs of this office are concrete and measurable;
- Roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders are well-defined;
- Process for measuring outputs is well-defined;
- Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the AP3 is conducted regularly;
- Timely and necessary changes are made based on the findings of M&E;
- Performance audit of concerned officials include attainment of AP3 objectives;
- There are performance measures for civil society and other stakeholders;
- Auditing rules and procedures facilitate the implementation of AP3;
- Audited reports and schedules of AP3 are posted in public places.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

<sup>2</sup> "Performance-based and time-bound assistance" was among the fundamental principles identified in the NA3 prepared by the NAPC.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Leadership**

Effective leadership means there is a clear and strategic long-term vision and mission for the AP3. The vision and mission are owned by all stakeholders and arrived at through consensus. Leadership is a very critical factor in the design, implementation, and success of an anti-poverty program. This is illustrated in the case of Dao, Capiz, where the mayor played an important role as an anti-poverty advocate. The case study of Balete, Aklan, shows that the champion does not have to be the highest local official. In Balete, the local CIDSS worker championed the program between changes in administration and provided program continuity. The role of leadership was also illustrated in the case of the agrarian reform communities in Bulacan. Also an important function of effective local leadership is managing and containing partisan politics at the local level. The general idea is to attempt to equate the values of good governance with good politics. In the checklist of effective AP3 leadership are the following –

- LGU leadership has a clear and consistent anti-poverty vision and mission;
- Development of network and linkages with other institutions, local, national and international;
  - Ability to attain AP3 targets despite constraints;
- Ability to aggressively pursue resource generation and mobilization for AP3;
- Ability to ensure the accuracy and reliability of information on poverty;
- Value of merit over patronage upheld in the implementation of AP3;

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

- Ability to build consensus and manage conflict among competing interests in the AP3.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Participation**

This means that the poor and the vulnerable, especially women, have a voice in decision-making. It also means there are participative mechanisms among stakeholders. It is imperative that the community participate in the design and implementation of AP3s. This is illustrated very clearly in the experience of Pangantucan, Bukidnon. In the checklist to determine whether there is effective participation are the following –

- Presence of mechanisms to encourage participation and obtain feedback from stakeholders;
- Marginalized sectors represented;
- Regular meetings of multisectoral bodies;
- Involvement of civil society in the entire AP3 process (situational analysis, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation);
- Incentive provided by LGU to encourage public-private-civil society partnerships;
  - Policies and ordinances enacted by local government to ensure participation of the poor and the vulnerable;
  - NGO/PO representatives are bonafide members of their sectors.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Interdependence**

This means synergy among AP3 key stakeholders through appropriate linkages. Interdependence also includes the presence of smooth relations between AP3 actors, that is, between national government-local government, private sector-government, vertical, horizontal, and so on. This is seen in the case of the San Roque Multi Purpose program where coordination and convergence resulted in successful resettlement projects.

It must be emphasized that the roles of stakeholders must be clearly defined. At the local level, the MTWGs (Municipal Technical Working Groups) played an important role in implementing the CIDSS programs in Balete, Aklan. It showed the importance of horizontal coordination among implementing institutions at the municipal level. Nationally initiated programs can succeed if these are flexible enough and easily adaptable to local situations. In this case, the role of national government agencies is clearly defined and limited to technical assistance and framework setting. For its part, the LGU and local community "localizes" or "indigenizes" the program through specific projects and activities. Interdependence can be determined by referring to the following checklist –

- Harmony and congruence of AP3 objectives and activities;
- Joint sharing of resources between institutions;
- Presence of counterpart sharing mechanisms and schemes;
- Exchange of expertise and training;

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

- MOUs/MOAs between NGAs, LGUs, NGOs and or POs in the design and implementation of AP3s.

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Responsiveness and Flexibility**

This refers to the capability of local government units to indigenize national AP3s to correspond with local situations. Flexibility should be built into the design of an anti-poverty program. The national government could provide the overall framework; however, local implementors should have enough leeway to adapt the program to local conditions. This was illustrated in the case of the implementation of the CIDSS in Dao, Capiz, and in Pangantucan, Bukidon. The case of the San Roque Multi-purpose Resettlement Project likewise illustrated the importance of a flexible AP3. The checklist for responsiveness and flexibility includes –

- Presence of participatory mechanisms to determine the needs of the poor and develop a relevant anti-poverty project;
- Inclusion of AP3 in local development and investments plans;
- Presence of mechanisms that allow for changes and adaptation;
  - Presence of a specific anti-poverty project for women;
  - Presence of M&E mechanisms to track the effectiveness of the project;
  - Plans revised according to results of participatory M&E.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

## CHAPTER III

# Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

### GOVERNANCE INDICATORS<sup>1</sup>

#### **Compliance, Consistency and Rule of Law**

This means that the anti-poverty project is consistently implemented according to the agreed upon framework and strategies. This also means that decisions regarding the project are well informed, not arbitrary, and based on well-defined policies. Following is the checklist for this criterion –

- Activities implemented according to the AP3 schedule;
- Resources allocated according to the AP3 schedule;
- Presence of corrective mechanisms to address implementation lags.

---

<sup>1</sup> The development of these indicators of governance benefited from a number of other studies including "Strengthening Public Finance and Planning for LGUs," a study prepared for the Asian Development Bank and the Department of Budget Management (ADB-TA 3145-PHI, 1999-2000).

**CHAPTER III**  
**Lessons Learned toward a System of Good  
Governance Indicators for  
Poverty Program Assessment**

**TOOL #1. PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPING ANTI-POVERTY  
PROGRAMS  
AND PROJECTS (AP3)**

PRINCIPLES	CHECKLIST OF INDICATORS
<p>1. National government with local government institutions, business groups and civil society should clearly define the anti-poverty framework and strategies following the principles of participatory and gender-sensitive development.</p> <p>The AP3 framework strategies should</p> <p>a. identify mechanisms and processes of collaboration and convergence between and among stakeholders</p> <p>b. ensure focused targeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> National council that includes NGAs, LGUs, private sector groups and civil society with corresponding structures in the local level (e.g., LDC)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate executive and legislative collaboration</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Transparent PIME</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Surveys conducted (e.g., needs Assessment, base-line data, capacity gaps assessment) using participatory research approaches</li> </ul>
<p>2. Economic growth and investment plans should complement and strengthen objectives and impact of anti-poverty programs and projects (AP3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Orientation should be articulated in national and local government policies and programs, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MTPDP</li> <li>- Existing LDP and/or LPAP</li> <li>- Local Investment Plan</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Multi-sectoral consultations at all levels</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clear strategies in the LDP, LIP, LPAP linking economic and AP goals, (e.g., social and physical infrastructures are part of the AP framework)</li> </ul>

PRINCIPLES	CHECKLIST OF INDICATORS
<p>3. There should be continuing capacity-building for both the community and government bureaucracy in the design and implementation of AP3, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social preparation</li> <li>- PIME skills to ensure synergy of economic and AP goals</li> <li>- Participatory approaches in the design and implementation of AP3</li> <li>- Information-based decision-making</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Plan of action for collective partnership agreement arrangements from design to monitoring and evaluation</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Collaborative activities identified in the implementation of the Plan of Action</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Clear information and education campaign on the value, tools and approaches of participatory development</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Basic, accurate and updated poverty data (Taking of from existing poverty related data gathering instruments, such as MBN and ARC tools)</li> </ul>
<p>4. There should be champions of the anti-poverty programs and projects from the national to the local levels (provincial, municipal and barangay) and across agencies and sectors.</p> <p>a. should be supported by committed and qualified staff in the government bureaucracy and contracted groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Identified and committed champions of AP3 (e.g., Local chief, executive, NGA officials or functionaries, barangay captains, civil society and private sector leaders)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Availability or presence of</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Competent staff in the bureaucracy</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Skilled Civil society/private sector partners/counterparts</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate services contracted out</li> </ul>
<p>5. AP3 should have creative revenue generation and mobilization strategies for sustainability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Realistic action plan to generate resources</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Diversified sources of funding (eg. loans, grants, budgetary appropriations, user fees) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- External</li> <li>- Local</li> <li>- Traditional and Non-Traditional</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Local ordinance to protect and prioritize budget for AP3</li> </ul>

**CHAPTER III**  
**Lessons Learned toward a System of Good  
 Governance Indicators for  
 Poverty Program Assessment**

**TOOL #2. GOVERNANCE INDICATORS OF ANTI-POVERTY**

**PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS (AP3)**

INDICATOR	DEFINITION	QUESTIONS
1. Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Accessibility to and availability of reliable information about the AP3 by the public</li> <li>➤ Examples of information include: government rules, regulations, policies, guidelines, program of work, bidding procedures and results, financial statements, contracts, etc)</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there accurate and up-to-date information/data about the extent of poverty in the community? Is this available to the public?               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Is there a community data board? What kind of information and data are provided? Is the board regularly updated? Who gathers the data board and records them on the board?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Does the public know where they can access information about AP3?</li> <li>3. Are reports and other pertinent documents from design and implementation of AP3 easily available to the public?</li> <li>4. Are the criteria used for selection of beneficiaries in AP3 (health care, livelihood, credit, etc.) made available?               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1. Is information on the process made clear?</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Are there feedback or built-in corrective mechanisms established to obtain inputs from stakeholders?</li> </ol>

INDICATOR	DEFINITION	QUESTIONS
2. Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Responsible use of power to advance public welfare through AP3 based on</li> <li>➤ Clear definition of roles of key stakeholders the principle of stewardship and the consent of the governed</li> <li>➤ Performance measures and mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there an office responsible for the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of AP3? Are the expected outputs of the office concrete and measurable?</li> <li>2. Are the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders well defined?</li> <li>3. Are AP3 activities monitored and evaluated? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. Is the process for measuring outputs well defined?</li> <li>3.2. Is monitoring and evaluation of AP3 conducted regularly?</li> <li>3.3. Does M&amp;E of AP3 allow for timely and necessary changes in implementation?</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Are there planning tools used for M&amp;E of AP3? (E.g., log frame, PERT-CPM, Ghantt chart, work plan, etc.)</li> <li>5. Is the attainment of AP3 objectives included in the performance evaluation of concerned officials?</li> <li>6. Are there also performance measures for civil society and other stakeholders involved in AP3? Are they evaluated based on these performance measures?</li> <li>7. Do auditing rules and procedures facilitate the implementation of AP3?</li> <li>8. Are audited reports and schedules of AP3 (e.g., LINGAP) posted in public places?</li> </ol>

INDICATOR	DEFINITION	QUESTIONS
3. Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Provision of clear and strategic long-term vision and mission for AP3</li> <li>➤ Vision and mission are owned by all and arrived at through consensus of key stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the leadership able to translate the AP vision and mission to AP3?</li> <li>2. Does the leadership of the community actively develop its network and linkages with other institutions, local national and international?</li> <li>3. Is the leadership able to attain AP3 targets despite constraints, e.g., financial, political and administrative?</li> <li>4. Is the leadership aggressively pursuing resource generation/mobilization for AP3?</li> <li>5. Does the leadership ensure the accuracy and reliability of information on poverty?</li> <li>6. Does the leadership uphold merit over patronage in the implementation of AP3?</li> <li>7. Are leaders able to facilitate consensus building and manage conflict among competing interests in AP3?</li> </ol>

INDICATOR	DEFINITION	QUESTIONS
4. Participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The poor and the vulnerable, especially the women, have a voice in decision-making, either directly or through legitimate intermediate institutions representing their interests</li> <li>➤ Presence of cooperative and collaborative mechanisms and processes among AP3 key stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there mechanisms to encourage participation and obtain feedback from the stakeholders of AP3? (e.g., TWGs, PARCOM, MPCs)</li> <li>2. Are there sectoral representatives for the marginalized communities, such the the urban poor, peasants, women, etc. in the local special bodies and Sanggunians?               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 Do the LSBs meet regularly?</li> <li>2.2 Are minutes of the meeting kept?</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. At what point has civil society been involved in AP3 (situational analysis, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation)?</li> <li>4. Are there incentives provided by local government to encourage public-business sector-civil society partnership inAP3?</li> <li>5. Are there policies and ordinances enacted by local government to ensure participation of the poor and vulnerable especially in AP3? (design, implementation , monitoring and evaluation of AP3)</li> <li>6. Are the NGO/PO representatives bona fide members of their sectors?</li> </ol>
5. Interdependence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Synergy between and among AP3 key stakeholders through appropriate and functional linkages and collaboration/ complementation/ supplementary activities</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there harmony or congruence of AP3 objectives and activities?</li> <li>2. Is there joint sharing of resources, financial and otherwise between these institutions in the design and implementation of AP3?</li> <li>3. Is there exchange of expertise and training?</li> <li>4. Are there MOUs/MOAs between and among NGAs, LGUs, NGOs, and/ or POs in the design and implementation of AP3?</li> </ol>

INDICATOR	DEFINITION	QUESTIONS
6. Responsiveness and Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Capability of LGUs to indigenize (i.e., localize and adapt) national AP3s to meet specific and unique local needs, including simple procedures to ensure timely and relevant action.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there participatory mechanisms, (e.g., surveys, public consultations, barangay assemblies, neighborhood clusters, etc.) to determine the needs of the poor and develop relevant AP3?</li> <li>2. Are AP3 included in the Local Development and Investment Plan?</li> <li>3. Are there mechanisms that allow for changes and adaptation in the implementation of AP3? (e.g., MOA, internal feedback mechanisms)</li> <li>4. Do AP3 empower the women? Are there specific AP3 for the women?</li> <li>5. Are there monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to track the effectiveness of AP3? Are plans revised accordingly?</li> </ol>
7. Continuity and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Capability of key stakeholders to build on the gains of AP3 of the previous administration</li> <li>➤ Institutions and processes to continue efforts and innovations for AP3</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are AP3 implemented during the previous administration evaluated?</li> <li>2. What organizational mechanisms have been built upon?</li> <li>3. Are the same AP3 personnel involved in spite of changes of administration?</li> <li>4. Are there continuing efforts to augment resources in the short- and long- term?</li> </ol>
8. Compliance, Consistency and Rule of Law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Consistent implementation of AP3 according to AP3 framework and strategies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Decisions on AP3 are informed, not arbitrary, and based on well-defined policies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are specific activities implemented according to AP3 schedule?</li> <li>2. Are resources allocated according to AP3 schedule?</li> <li>3. Are there implementation lags? Are these due to administrative (e.g., lack of funds) and/or political factors (e.g., partisan politics)</li> <li>4. Are there corrective mechanisms to address these lags?</li> </ol>



**CHAPTER III**

## Lessons Learned toward a System of Good Governance Indicators for Poverty Program Assessment

TOOL #3. ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR GOVERNANCE INDICATORS IN AP3

INDICATORS	INDICATORS CHECKLIST	SCORES		
		1	2	3
TRANSPARENCY	<input type="checkbox"/> Availability of accurate and up-to-date information about the extent of poverty in the community			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of a community data board			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular updating of information			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Public knows where they can access information about AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Accomplishment reports and other pertinent documents from design and implementation of AP3 are easily available to the public			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Criteria used for selection of beneficiaries in AP3 are disseminated to the public			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Information of the process of selection is available			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of feedback and/or built-in corrective mechanisms to obtain inputs from stakeholders			
ACCOUNTABILITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Identified office for the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Expected outputs of this office are concrete and measurable			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Well-defined roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Well-defined process for measuring outputs			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular conduct of monitoring and evaluation of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Timely and necessary changes made in the implementation based on M & E results			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance audit of concerned officials include attainment of AP3 objectives			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures for civil society and other stakeholders			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Auditing rules and procedures facilitate the implementation of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Audited reports and schedules of AP3 posted in public places			
LEADERSHIP	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of clear and consistent AP vision and mission articulated by the LGU leadership			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively developing network and linkages with other institutions, local, national and international			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to attain AP3 targets despite constraints			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to aggressively pursue resource generation and mobilization for AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to ensure the accuracy and reliability of information on poverty			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Value of Merit over patronage upheld in the implementation of AP3?			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Ability to facilitate consensus-building and manage conflict among competing interests in AP3			

INDICATORS	INDICATORS CHECKLIST	SCORES		
		1	2	3
PARTICIPATION	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of functional mechanisms to encourage participation and obtain feedback from stakeholders of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of sectoral representation for the marginalized communities			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular meetings of these multisectoral bodies			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Minutes of meetings kept			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Involvement of civil society in AP3 from situational analysis, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Incentive provided by LGU to encourage public-private-civil society partnerships in AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of inter-sectoral and inter-governmental partnerships in AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Policies and ordinances enacted by local government to ensure participation of the poor and vulnerable especially in AP3			
INTER-DEPENDENCE	<input type="checkbox"/> NGO and PO representation are bona fide members of the sectors they are representing			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Harmony and congruence of AP3 objectives and activities			
RESPONSIVENESS AND FLEXIBILITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Joint sharing of resources, financial and otherwise between institutions in the design and implementation of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Exchange of expertise and training			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of participatory mechanisms to determine the needs of the poor and develop relevant AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Inclusion of AP3 in Local Development and Investments Plans			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of mechanisms that allow for changes and adaptation in the implementation of AP3			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of specific AP3 for women			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to track the effectiveness of AP3			
CONTINUITY AND SUSTAINABILITY	<input type="checkbox"/> Revision of plans according to results of participatory M& E			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation of AP3 implemented during the previous administration			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Useful and functional organizational mechanisms established by the previous administration built upon and strengthened			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Effective AP3 policies implemented despite of changes in administration or regime			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Same AP3 personnel involved in the previous administration retained			
COMPLIANCE, CONSISTENCY AND RULE OF LAW	<input type="checkbox"/> Continuing efforts to augment resources in the short- and long-term			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Activities implemented according to AP3 schedule			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Resources allocated according to AP3 schedule			
	<input type="checkbox"/> Presence of functional corrective mechanisms to address implementation lags			

1 = Unsatisfactory    2 = Satisfactory    3 = Very Satisfactory