

## **Inputs to the Pilot Plan on Tracking Governance Reforms**

**Rosemarie G. Edillon**

To many Filipinos, improving our quality of governance has become a cause of national pride. The conceptual framework will help to understand our state of governance and the corresponding societal affairs. Thus, the first task that needs to be undertaken is an evaluation study that utilizes this framework. Keeping in mind that our interest is to improve governance, the study needs to consider all dimensions and all the three societal affairs – economic, political and socio-cultural. Apart from an assessment, the study will provide specific inputs to a National Governance Agenda that includes, among others, projects and strategies that will improve governance. Note that a necessary component of this study is the development of a statistical framework to complement the evaluation.

In addition to the evaluation study, the TGR portfolio can undertake the activities discussed in the next paragraphs. This list is not meant to pre-empt the results of the study, but rather to anticipate the needs of the detailed Governance Agenda so that the tools necessary will have been pre-tested and ready for nationwide implementation.

For National Government Agencies and Civil Society Organizations:

- Capability-building program on understanding governance
- Small evaluation studies on sub-components of governance
- Drafting of a governance sub-agenda

The choice of the NGAs and CSOs will depend on the composition of those involved in the TGR portfolio. There must be correspondence with respect to the involvement of these groups in a societal affair. The capability-building program and the small evaluation study will make use of the TGR User's Manual. Apart from the results of the small evaluation study pertaining to a sub-component of a societal affair, these activities will lead to refinements in the Manual and the evaluation tools.

Statistics collected by official surveys and administrative data can be used to describe the “upper box” of the framework. A special survey is needed to answer the “lower box” of the framework. Surveys being done by private research firms and business groups can perhaps be re-configured to subscribe to the framework. For this, there has to be a series of advocacy forums among the latter to arrive at cooperative arrangements to accommodate the governance framework.

Evaluation of local governance presents a different case. The Local Governance Code ascribes LGUs with definite roles and responsibilities and the same time, transfers resources and revenue-generating capabilities. However, there are certain factors that dictate the upper bound of the impact of LGU efforts and most of these fall under NG control. We should also be aware of the fragmentation of responsibilities among LGUs – provincial, municipal, city and barangay LGUs. A short study may need to be conducted to adapt the conceptual framework to local settings. Correspondingly, there may be a need to revise the TGR User’s Manual and evaluation tools.

The next step is to conduct the same program to a group of LGU, say in one province including its component cities and municipalities and CSOs active in the province.

- Capability-building program on understanding governance and local governance
- Small evaluation studies on sub-components of local governance
- Drafting of a local governance sub-agenda

Note that the LGPMS can provide some of the information found in the lower box of the framework. However, the data will only cover local government units. A system will need to be developed to cover business, civil society groups and even national government. A bigger challenge, though, is to obtain information on the “upper box” of the framework at local levels given the fact that official surveys permit disaggregation down to provincial levels, only. (In fact, the provincially disaggregated variables cannot be used to compare performance between provinces.) We can probably derive information on the “upper box” in LGUs that have conducted province-wide Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS). Still, technical issues on noncomparability of data due to differences in time reference and nonsampling errors will need to be resolved.

The results of the pilot programs and evaluation studies will be used to develop a National Governance Agenda. Alongside a large-scale implementation of the capability-building programs, parallel efforts need to be done to build a broad-based constituency for good governance. This will probably include IEC campaigns to inform individuals, households, business groups, civil society and those in government, of their duties and roles in governance. We should package good governance as a good and like any other good, it comes with a price. The pilot programs and evaluation studies can also inform the design of these IEC materials, particularly with respect to content. We also need to undertake consensus building activities to arrive at common goals and short to medium term targets concerning each societal affair. And to ascribe urgency to this matter, there should be definite plans to monitor these accomplishments.

The development of the National Governance Agenda can be spearheaded by the NEDA or an office that is directly within the ambit of the Office of the President. If it is to be spearheaded by the NEDA, it must be clear that the authority comes from the NEDA Board. Alternatively, the OP can constitute an inter-agency task force composed of the NEDA Secretariat, DILG, the Planning groups of the Senate and Congress, and a counterpart group from the Judiciary branch.

The table on the next page summarizes the above pilot plan and the recommended timetable.



