



A vision for the future
**International Conference on Agrarian Reform and
Rural Development (ICARRD)**

Porto Alegre, Brazil • 7-10 March 2006

**A CASE STUDY
ON
WHAT DETERMINES THE POLICY IMPACT OF LOCAL
NEGOTIATIONS?
AND
THE OUTCOME REPORT OF THE THEMATIC DIALOGUE
HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2006**

**A PROCESS AND A CONTRIBUTION IN PREPARATION FOR ICARRD
"NEW CHALLENGES AND OPTIONS FOR REVITALIZING RURAL COMMUNITIES"**

**Submitted By Orient Integrated Development Consultants, Inc (OIDCI)
in collaboration with the FAO – Philippines-Australia Technical Support
for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (PATSARRD)**

January 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. This Thematic Dialogue Report presents the final output of the preparatory activities for the forthcoming “International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) to be held in Brazil on March 2006. These started with the conduct of a comparative case study sponsored by FAO-PPLG entitled “What Determines the Policy Impact of Local Negotiations,” which provided the basis for selecting the theme of the dialogue conducted through a national stakeholder workshop held on January 10, 2006 at the Soriano Hall, SEAMEO Innotech Building in Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.

2. The theme of the workshop focused on the problems and constraints hampering people participation in the Philippines based on the findings of the FAO-PPLG study. The workshop provided the venue for a more thorough multi-stakeholder discussion of these findings; validate and analyze the issues involved and the interventions being carried out, if any, to address them; draw the lessons learned from these interventions; and determine the possibilities for future cooperation in the pursuit of agrarian reform and rural development

3. Although the participants generally agreed on the FAO-PPLG findings, contrasting views and opinions were aired on strategies to enhance people participation at the local level. Other important issues were also raised but these were already beyond the scope of the workshop and would need more time to discuss. In order to address these issues, a request was made for the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) to sponsor again another dialogue, which was favorably responded by the DAR Undersecretary who attended the workshop.

4. There was a consensus that policies and mechanisms to promote active people participation are not lacking in the Philippines. This is mandated in the new Philippine Constitution that provides the overall framework; which is, in turn, translated into enabling laws and executive orders that institutionalize the mechanisms and processes and provide policy guidelines for implementation by such national government agencies as DAR, Department of Agriculture (DA), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC), and the Local Government Units (LGUs) at all levels (barangay, municipal, and provincial).

5. Despite the policies and established mechanisms, people participation is admittedly still limited to a few if not select stakeholder groups due to problems and constraints that hamper active and meaningful participation, namely: i) restrictive and/or unclear guidelines on representation; ii) inappropriate and/or under-utilization of existing mechanisms; iii) limited stakeholders’ capabilities and institutional resources; iv) inadequate support; v) political interference, differences, or inaction; vi) negative cultural traits; and vii) adverse external factors.

6. Concrete interventions have been undertaken to address the problems and constraints, such as those brought up for discussion during the workshop and as mentioned in the FAO-PPLG Study. Mostly foreign-assisted programs and in the area of advocacy and capacity building, these interventions include: i) CIDA-assisted Local Government Support Program (CIDA-LGSP); ii) ADB/NDF-assisted Mindanao Basic Urban Services

Sector Project (MBUSSP); iii) *Gawad Galing Pook* program; iv) the NGO Networks for Barangay Bayan Governance Consortium (BBGC) and the Civil Society Alliance for Local Governance Citizens' Network (LGCNet); and v) the Philippines-Australia Technical Support for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (PATSARRD).

7. Lessons were gained from these interventions, reflecting on the positive effects of adopting the participatory approach of implementing development programs/projects, such as: i) it helps in maximizing use of available resources; ii) it reduces likelihood of contentious confrontation; iii) it enhances trust in government; iv) it ensures continuity of plans despite changes in leadership; and v) it facilitates program/project planning, identification of needed legislative action and building stakeholder support and ownership. On the other hand, the negative effects of weak participation and the factors behind it were also learned and were subsequently considered in formulating proposed measures to improve the approaches and sustain the achievement in these programs.

8. Lessons were likewise gained by CSOs involved in agrarian reform and rural development programs in the country. These are, namely: i) the local elite is capable of reversing agrarian reform gains, through money lending, land purchase, leaseback arrangements, and outright eviction; ii) the devolution of power and resources to the LGUs increases the power of the local elite; iii) decentralization without property reform brings greater politicization of land issues; and iv) problems encountered in existing Government-CSO partnership is associated with such internal issues as limited consultation and overlapping roles.

9. Furthermore, academic staff doing community works in the ARC and non-ARC areas in the province of Aklan, had learned that cultural values are among the driving forces or motivations for stakeholders to participate in local social dialogue or negotiations. These provide clues for a better understanding of the local political dynamics and the participation of community-based CSOs in local social dialogue or negotiation.

10. The preparatory activities that culminated in a national stakeholders' workshop, have raised a number of possibilities for future cooperation to achieve active and meaningful people participation. The first possible area of cooperation is in terms of concerted support for the continuing advocacy effort to address the problem of political interference and inaction and related issues. This may be done by sustaining the on-going program of disseminating and encouraging good and best practices in local governance; and by encouraging mass action to confront the issues and, at the same time, enhance civil society vigilance and solidarity.

11. The second possibility is for the strengthening of functional collaboration between government and CSOs at the local level, which could be achieved through: i) conduct of regular joint executive-legislative councils meetings to synchronize plans and ensure support; ii) adoption of measures to strengthen CSO representation especially in the Local Development Council (LDC); and iii) adoption of alternative strategies, such as harnessing of positive rural values, and LGUs entering into collaborative arrangements with neighboring LGUs to address common development issues.

12. The third possibility is for facilitating the utilization of existing mechanisms at the local level, particularly the LDCs and the Barangay Assembly. The LDCs should be given enough leeway to fully perform its tasks to formulate development plans and coordinate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects; while the Barangay Assembly should be utilized not just as a mechanism for direct citizen participation but as a political training ground and jump-off point for the poor and marginalized groups to get organized and become active players in the country's development scenario.

13. The fourth possibility is for institutional capacity building to address the limited multi-stakeholders' capability to perform respective roles in a participatory set-up. This may be done through a training program that is designed in a participatory manner, with modules on value formation and enhancement of organizational, administrative, technical, financial and managerial capabilities, as well as community organizing and leadership skills. The program may focus on key stakeholder groups, such as: i) local chief executives; ii) LGU staff; iii) LDC members; iv) key CSO members; v) key personnel of DILG, DAR, DA, DENR, and NAPC.

14. The fifth possibility is for the provision of funding support to enable the existing mechanisms, especially the LDCs, to effectively perform its mandated functions. One approach is to source this from: i) regular budget appropriation of the LGU; ii) congressional sources, e.g. Countryside Development Fund otherwise known as "pork barrel;" iii) contribution from the private/business sector; and iv) foreign donors. An alternative is to deputize capable NGOs to serve as LDC secretariat in the case of LGUs that cannot afford to support it.

15. The sixth possibility is for information dissemination that is aimed to promote clear understanding on the importance of people participation in development undertaking. This may be pursued through continuous Information, Education and Communication (IEC) campaign done in coordination with the media and paying attention to what people want and need to know.

16. Finally, the seventh possibility is for the establishment of effective system of monitoring and feed backing. This would include adopting appropriate scheme and key performance indicators for the conduct of participatory monitoring and evaluation to be led by the LGU in close collaboration with the CSOs, with oversight function performed by DILG. The system should enable stakeholders to communicate with each other and give feed back on actions taken based on the decisions or agreements reached previously in a participatory manner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	5
ACRONYMS	7
PART I. CASE STUDY	9
1.0 Background	9
1.1 Objectives	9
1.2 The FAO-PPLG Study	10
1.3 Presentation of the report	11
2.0 Policy Framework	11
2.1 The 1987 Philippine Constitution	11
2.2 Enabling Laws	11
2.3 The Institutional Mechanisms	12
2.31 Mechanisms Pursuant to CARL	12
2.32 Mechanisms Provided in the MCSF	12
2.33 Mechanisms Pursuant to AFMA	13
2.34 Mechanisms Pursuant to SRPAA	13
2.35 Participatory Mechanisms of DENR	14
2.36 Mechanisms Pursuant to the LGC	14
3.0 Initial diagnostic of the problem: difficulties and constraints	16
3.1 Restrictive and/or unclear guidelines on representation	17
3.3 Limited Stakeholders' Capabilities and Institutional Resources	18
3.4 Inadequate Support	20
3.5 Political Interference, Differences, or Inaction	21
3.6 Negative Cultural Traits	22
3.7 Adverse External Factors	22
4.0 Concrete modality of the intervention carried out	23
4.1 Advocacy for Participatory Governance	23
4.2 Institutional capacity-building	24
4.3 Capacity-building for primary stakeholders	25
PART TWO: PROCEEDINGS OF THE THEMATIC DIALOGUE	26
5.0 Views from diverse stakeholders: The National Stakeholder Workshop	26
5.1 Overview	26
5.2 Background	27
5.3 Objectives of the dialogue	28
5.4 The Programme	28
5.5 Participants	28
5.6 The proceedings: Introductory Session	29
5.61 Overview of Activity and Presentation of ICARRD	29
5.7 Presentation of the background of the FAO-PPLG study	29
5.8 Presentation of Papers	30
5.9 Reactions to Discussion Papers	33
5.10 Plenary Session/Open Forum and Debate	36
5.11 Closing Program	42

6.0	Lessons learned from the Thematic Dialogue and challenges identified	42
6.1	Challenges for ICARRD	42
6.2	Lessons gained from foreign-assisted projects	43
6.3	Lessons gained from foreign-assisted projects	44
6.4	Effects of limited GO-CSO institutional partnership mechanism	45
6.5	Cultural Values as Driving Forces of Local Social Dialogues or Negotiations	45
6.6	Other Motivating Factors	46
 PART THREE: POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE COOPERATION		47
7.0	Possibilities for Future Cooperation	47
7.1	Continuing Advocacy Efforts	47
	7.11 Dissemination of Good and Best Practices in Good Governance	47
	7.12 Encourage Mass Action as a Lobbying and Solidifying Organizational Tool	47
7.2	Functional Collaboration	48
	7.21 Conducting Regular Joint Executive-Legislative Council Meetings	48
	7.22 Adopting Measures to Strengthen CSO Participation in the LDC	49
7.3	Exploring alternative strategies	49
7.4	Utilization of Existing Mechanisms	50
	7.41 Utilization of the LDCs	50
	7.42 Utilization of the Barangay Assembly	50
7.5	Institutional Capacity Building	51
	7.51 Priority Stakeholder Groups	51
	7.52 Design Formulation	52
7.6	Funding Support	53
	7.61 Establishing Sustainable Fund Sources	53
	7.62 Deputizing NGOs as Alternative	53
7.7	Information Dissemination	53
	7.71 Conduct of IEC	53
	7.72 Coordination with Media	53
	7.73 Addressing what people want and need to know	53
7.8	Monitoring and feedback	54
	7.81 Establishing the scheme and indicators	54
	7.82 Conduct of participatory monitoring	54
	7.83 Follow-through and Feed Backing Activities	55

ANNEXES available on ICARRD website:
http://www.icarrd.org/en/icarrd_docs_case.html

ACRONYMS

ACPC	-	Agriculture Credit Policy Council
ADB	-	Asian Development Bank
AFMA	-	Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (RA 8435)
ANGOC	-	Asian NGO Coalition for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development
ARC	-	Agrarian Reform Community
ASU	-	Aklan State University
AusAID	-	Australian Agency for International Development
BARC	-	Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee
BDC	-	Barangay Development Council
CARL	-	Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law
CBCRM	-	Community-Based Coastal Resource Management
CDA	-	Cooperatives Development Authority
CEZA	-	Cagayan Economic Zone Authority
CLOA	-	Certificate of Landownership Award
CSO	-	Civil Society Organization
CUP	-	Cooperative Union of the Philippines
DA	-	Department of Agriculture
DAO	-	Department Administrative Order
DAP	-	Development Academy of the Philippines
DAR	-	Department of Agrarian Reform
DENR	-	Department of Environment and Natural Resources
DILG	-	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DOLE	-	Department of Labor and Employment
EO	-	Executive Order
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAO-PPLG	-	FAO Participation, Policy and Local Governance
FIDA	-	Fiber Industry Development Authority
FPA	-	Fertilizer and Pesticides Authority
GO	-	Government Office
HSDC	-	Human Settlements Development Corporation
IRA	-	Internal Revenue Allocation
IRR	-	Implementing Rules and Regulations
ICARRD	-	International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development
JICA	-	Japan International Cooperation Agency
KALAHÍ	-	<i>Kapit Bisig Laban Sa Kahirapan</i>
KFC	-	KALAHÍ Farmers' Center
KIs	-	Key Informants
LCE	-	Local Chief Executive
LDC	-	Local Development Council
LGC	-	Local Government Code (RA 7160)
LGU	-	Local Government Unit
LSB	-	Local Special Body
LiveCor	-	Livelihood Corporation
MAFC	-	Municipal Agriculture and Fisheries Council

MAO	-	Municipal Agriculture Office
MARO	-	Municipal Agrarian Reform Officer
MASS-SPECC	-	Mindanao Alliance of Self-Help Societies -- Southern Philippines Education Cooperative Center
MCSF	-	Magna Carta for Small Farmers (RA 7607)
NAFC	-	National Agriculture and Fisheries Council
NAPC	-	National Anti-Poverty Commission
NATCCO	-	National Confederation of Cooperatives
NCIP	-	National Commission on Indigenous Peoples
NEDA	-	National Economic and Development Authority
NFA	-	National Food Authority
NFARMC	-	National Fisheries and Aquatic Resources Management Council
NGO	-	Non-Government Organization
NIA	-	National Irrigation Administration
NNC	-	National Nutrition Council
ODISCO	-	Organic, Diversified, Integrated, Scientific, Cooperative
PARC	-	Presidential Agrarian Reform Council
PARCCOM	-	Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committee
PATSARRD	-	Philippines-Australia Technical Support for Agrarian Reform & Rural Development
PBSP	-	Philippines Business for Social Progress
PDC	-	Provincial Development Council
PhilDRRA	-	Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources of Rural Areas
PO	-	People's Organization
PPI	-	Philippine Peasant Institute
PPInc	-	Philippine Planters Incorporated
PRRM	-	Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement
RAFC	-	Regional Agriculture and Fisheries Council
RDC	-	Regional Development Council
SEC	-	Securities and Exchange Commission
SEAMEO	-	Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization
SRA	-	Social Reform Agenda
SRPAA	-	Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act
TOR	-	Terms of Reference
TWG	-	Technical Working Group
UNDP	-	United Nations Development Programme
UP	-	University of the Philippines
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development
VICTO	-	Visayas Cooperative Development Center

PART ONE: CASE STUDY

1.0 Background

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations engaged the services of the Orient Integrated Development Consultants, Inc. (OIDCI) in collaboration with the Philippines-Australia Technical Support for Agrarian Reform & Rural Development (PATSARRD) to organize a Philippine National Stocktaking and Thematic Dialogue: “New Challenges and Options for Revitalizing Rural Communities”. This was held on January 10, 2006 at the Soriano Hall, SEAMEO Innotech Bldg., in Diliman, Quezon City as preparatory activities for the forthcoming International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (ICARRD) to be hosted by Brazil on 7-10 March 2006. The Philippines is one of the countries involved in these preparations, and is deemed to have already completed the first step of stocktaking exercise in examining local and national participatory mechanisms through the conduct of a case study entitled “What Determines Policy Impact of Local Negotiations” that was part of a larger FAO-PPLG comparative case study that also involved Brazil.

Conducted on the second quarter of last year (2005), the study looked into the various aspects of people participation in local negotiation and policy-making processes. It provided valuable background information for discussion as part of the preparatory activities in the Philippines for ICARRD and as the basis for selecting its talking points for the Thematic Dialogue, namely, the issues surrounding the identified problems and constraints that hinder active and meaningful people participation in the country.

Thus, consistent with the TOR, the preparatory activities have been directed at the policies and programs to promote/encourage people participation in the Philippines, with the aim of highlighting innovative and new modalities of present and future collaboration and partnership between the government, the NGOs and CSOs, and the private sector in the country, as well as with the donor agencies. The whole exercise is envisioned to provide examples of policies and practices that are concretely implemented, and analyze the different perceptions and reason for that by the different stakeholders and their representatives.

1.1 Objectives

The objective of the Thematic Dialogue in the Philippines, therefore, is to provide a venue to reflect upon the experiences in people participation in improving access, use and management of natural resources and other rural inputs, as part of agrarian reform and rural development of the country.

The Dialogue was also parallel to the objectives of ICARRD, such as:

- **To promote understanding, learning and constructive dialogue** to address agrarian reform, sustainable rural development, and rural poverty issues through the creation of a lasting platform of monitoring and evaluation of best policies and practices and the progress on agrarian reform and rural development;
-

- **Sharing experiences, fostering recognition, improved willingness, and concrete actions** by the international community, governments, producer organizations, civil society organizations, and others **to enhance international cooperation and promote more equitable, transparent and accountable access to land and natural resources.**

1.2 The FAO-PPLG Study

The FAO-PPLG Study was conducted based on the assumption, along with six hypotheses that the study had validated, that improved participation in policy making provides a better basis for decision-making and enhances commitment and ownership among stakeholders that are keys to the attainment of sustainable development. With field work conducted on the second quarter of last year (2005), the final output consists of two parts: i) a *working paper*, which outlines the broad national trends, key linkages, and principal drivers of participation; and ii) *case studies*, which analyzes the incentive structures of stakeholders to engage in dialogue and the best possible scale and level to promote multi-stakeholder and negotiation processes.

Specifically, the *working paper*: i) assessed the policy framework and institutional mechanisms for participatory processes in the Philippines; ii) identified the different types of stakeholders and what factors motivate them to participate in these processes; iii) delved into the issues, problems and constraints to these processes; and iv) proposed measures for promoting effective participation.

The *case studies* specifically: i) examined the actual experiences in multi-stakeholders' collaboration, participation, and governance of livelihood projects in selected communities; ii) determined the elements that helped improve the local negotiation processes and effectively fed the policy cycle of livelihood support programs; iii) identified the factors that facilitated and hindered the stakeholders' participation in the local negotiation processes; iv) highlighted the key elements useful to the participatory policy making processes; v) validated the six hypotheses in the TOR; and vi) recommended measures to improve participatory policy making and local negotiation processes based on the results of the investigation.

While the working paper used historical and in-depth techniques of analyzing information obtained from secondary sources, the case studies employed key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and direct observation techniques to gather primary data, complemented by previously obtained secondary ones. The case studies were conducted in two selected rural barangays, namely, Sibalew and Badiangan, in the municipality of Banga, province of Aklan, located in Panay Island in the Western Visayas region (Region VI) of the Philippines.

¹² Barangay is the smallest political subdivision in the Philippines, which is under the jurisdiction of the lowest level LGU that is also called "Barangay" (with capital **B**); a municipality is composed of a number of barangays, and is under the political jurisdiction of the next higher level LGU called "Municipality" (with capital **M**); and a number of municipalities constitute a province under the jurisdiction of the highest level LGU called "Province" (with capital **P**).

1.3 Presentation of the report

This report is divided into three parts, namely: Part One, include: i) Background; ii) Policies and Mechanisms for People Participation; iii) Problems and Constraints; iv) Modality of Intervention; v) Lessons Learned; and Part Two, include: the Outcome of the Proceedings of the Thematic Dialogue Workshop held on 10 January 2006; and Part Three, covers the Possibilities for Future Cooperation.

2.0 Policy Framework

2.1 The 1987 Philippine Constitution

The new Philippine Constitution, which was ratified in 1987, provides the overall policy framework for promoting and encouraging people participation in the development undertakings of government. It declares that the State “shall encourage non-governmental, community-based, sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation (Art. II Sec. 23);” that the “right of the people and their organizations to effective and reasonable participation at all levels of social, political, and economic decision-making shall not be abridged;” and that the State shall, by law, “facilitate the establishment of consultation mechanisms” to achieve the objective (Art. XIII Sec. 16).

2.2 Enabling Laws

Pursuant to the constitutional mandate, enabling laws were enacted to ensure people participation in: i) policy formulation, planning, implementation and monitoring of national development programs, like agrarian reform and rural development; by providing for the establishment of participatory mechanisms by the respective implementing agencies such as, namely, the DAR, DA, DENR, and NAPC; and ii) local governance as well as planning, implementation and monitoring of local development programs and projects in all Local Government Units (LGUs) at all levels (barangay², municipal, and provincial).

The first set of laws includes: the “*Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law of 1988*” or CARL (RA 6657), the “*Magna Carta for Small Farmers of 1992*” or MCSF (RA 7607), the “*Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act of 1997*” or AFMA (RA 8435), and the Social Reform and Poverty Alleviation Act of 1997 or SRPAA (RA 8425); and the second set, the “*Local Government Code of 1991*” (RA 7160). In addition to these laws, administrative orders are issued outlining policies to encourage active people participation. These include DENR’s Administrative Order Nos. 120, 24 & 76.

2.3 The Institutional Mechanisms

2.31 Mechanisms Pursuant to CARL

The mechanisms to encourage and enable people participation in the implementation of agrarian reform in the Philippines are established by the DAR in the following areas of concern:

- *Policy-formulation:* The Presidential Agrarian Reform Council (PARC) is created, with members that include representatives of farmers and landowners and, together with the DAR (formerly Department of Agrarian Reform or DAR), has the power to issue rules and regulations, whether substantive or procedural, to carry out the objectives of the law. The PARC decides based on information and recommendation submitted by the Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating Committees (PARCCOMs), which, in turn, based its decision on those submitted by the Barangay Agrarian Reform Committees (BARCs).
- *Project implementation:* Pursuant to the law, DAR has forged a partnership with particular NGOs to implement projects through DAO 1-88 and 11-89, such as with PHILDHARRA, NATCCO, MASS-SPECC, and VICTO. Projects jointly undertaken with other agencies with DAR as lead agency likewise serve as mechanisms for active participation, such as PATSARRD, a project funded by AusAID and executed by FAO. Through this project, DAR implements a strategy, called Agrarian Reform Community (ARC) Development Strategy, which treats each ARC as a convergence point in the delivery of services and resources by partner institutions intended for Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries (ARBs).
- *Project development and human resource development:* DAR has likewise an institutionalized collaboration with NGOs, such as LIKAS and People's Livelihood Foundation, Inc. for project development; and the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) and ODISCO, for human resource development.

2.32 Mechanisms Provided in the MCSF

The *MCSF* provides for the establishment of participatory mechanism for the yet unorganized poor and marginalized small farmers by means of: i) establishing self-help organizations of small farmers to enable them to participate in an organized manner; ii) allocation of seats for officials of said organizations in the Boards of government agencies involved in agriculture and farmers' welfare; and iii) designating the DA as the primary and coordinating agency to carry out these provisions. However, not much has been implemented so far pursuant to this law, as explained later on under the topic on Problems and Constraints.

2.33 Mechanisms Pursuant to AFMA

Implemented through the DA, two major institutional mechanisms for people participation are established pursuant to AFMA:

- The National Agriculture and Fisheries Council (NAFC), which serve as DA's participatory arm for policy-making, planning, and program/project monitoring and evaluation as reiterated in DAO No. 34 series of 2000 and DAO No. 09 series of 2002, with the National Farmers' Advisory Board as among its members and with component counterparts at the regional, provincial, municipal levels (RAFC, PAFC, and MAFC); and
-

- Collaborative partnership with POs and NGOs in the implementation of programs/projects, such as conduct of capability building training for project beneficiaries, like the Management Training and Assistance Program in collaboration with the NAFC and the CUP, and the Integrated Rural Financing Program with the PBSP; or in carrying out projects under the various DA programs, like DA's collaboration with CUP.

2.34 Mechanisms Pursuant to SRPAA

To encourage and enable people participation in the social reform and poverty alleviation programs of government, SRPAA provides for the following:

- Designation of the LGUs at all levels (Province, Municipality, and Barangay), through the respective Local Development Councils, to be responsible for the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the National Anti-Poverty Action Agenda in their respective jurisdiction.
- Membership of 14 sectoral representatives in the NAPC, each respectively representing the same number of basic sectors as enumerated in the Act, and the position of vice-chairperson (to be elected by these representatives) in the NAPC.
- Institutionalization of the KALAHI Program for poverty reduction per Memorandum Circular 33 issued by the President in 2002, which establishes three-tiered mechanism for multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder participation in implementing SRA pursuant to the Act, namely: the National KALAHI Convergence Group, the Regional KALAHI Convergence Groups, and the Local Poverty Reduction Action Teams at the provincial and municipal level.
- Creation of the National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) under the Office of the President as the coordinating and advisory body for the implementation of the SRA, which thus absorbed the powers and functions of the Presidential Commission to Fight Poverty (PCFP), the Social Reform Council (SRC), and the Presidential Council for Countryside Development (PCCD).

2.35 Participatory Mechanisms of DENR

DENR's institutional mechanisms for people participation include:

- An NGO desk, a special unit of DENR, created to coordinate DENR-NGO collaboration
 - A Management Committee created to manage specific program/project, e.g. the "debt-for-nature swap" program involving the HARIBON and the WWF
 - Collaborative tie-up with the academe, e.g. UPLB-IESAM and Ateneo de Manila-IPC in the Upland Development Working Group
-

- NGO-managed “clearing house” for NGO Networks that are involved in natural resource management, namely, the DENR-NGO desk
- Multi-stakeholder consultation through meetings, focus group discussions, and public hearings for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

2.36 Mechanisms Pursuant to the LGC

The Code provides for the establishment of institutional mechanism for people participation in local governance in each of the three levels of LGUs: Barangay, Municipality or City, and Province. Accordingly, three opportunities for people participation were instituted as follows:

- 1) The right of the people to directly engage in governance through the processes of recall, initiative and referendum. The power of recall gives the registered voters the right to change an elected official through the legal process. They may also directly propose, enact or amend any ordinance passed by the Sanggunian (legislative council) through the legal processes called “local initiatives”. The power of “referendum” on the other hand, gives the people the right to approve or reject any ordinance enacted by the Sanggunian.
- 2) The right of the local communities, either directly or through civil organizations, to be consulted on programs and projects of national government, prior to their implementation. Government agencies are required to consult with the communities during the planning phase of the projects.
- 3) The third declaration enjoins LGUs to allow the participation of the private sector in local governance, particularly in the delivery of basic services, as an alternative strategy for sustainable development.

The Code mandates the creation of Local Special Bodies (LSBs) in each LGU in all three levels to thus encourage and enable active people participation through organized representation in local legislation and in the planning, implementation and monitoring/evaluation of programs and projects. It prescribes the number of seats as well as the accreditation and selection of representatives of POs, NGOs, and the private sector in each of these bodies, namely: a) Local Development Council; b) Local Prequalification, Bids and Awards Committee; c) Local Health Board; d) Local School Board; e) Local Peace and Order Council; and f) People’s Law Enforcement Board.

Among the LSBs, the Local Development Council (LDC) has the largest composition³ and most significant in terms of people participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of development programs/projects. Among others, the LDCs take charge of preparing the development plans of LGUs and have it approved by the respective legislative council (Sanggunian). Thus, the Barangay LDC prepares the Barangay Development Plan, which is endorsed and incorporated in the Municipal Development Plan prepared by the Municipal LDC. The latter plan is, in turn, endorsed for incorporation in the Provincial Development Plan prepared by the provincial LDC.

The provincial plan is subsequently consolidated by the secretariat of the Regional Development Council (RDC) and incorporated in the Regional Development Plan for adoption by the Council. The RDC is chaired on a yearly-rotation basis by the provincial LCEs (governors) of the constituent provinces of the region, while NEDA regional staff whose director co-chairs the RDC mans the secretariat.

Lastly, the Code has strengthened the Barangay Assembly, another mechanism for active people participation at the barangay level. The Barangay Assembly, which is composed of all residents of legal age in the barangay, is now vested with the power to: a) initiate legislative processes by recommending to the Barangay Council the adoption of measures (through ordinance or resolution) for the welfare of the barangay and the municipality as a whole; b) decide on the adoption of local initiative as a legal process whereby the registered voters in the barangay may directly propose, enact or amend any barangay ordinance; and c) hear and pass upon the periodic report of the Barangay Council concerning its activities and finance.

To enable the Barangays to exercise its new powers and perform multiple participatory functions, the Code empowers them to levy taxes, fees and charges that shall accrue exclusively to them; and to undertake other revenue-raising measures, to boost their financial resources aside from their share in the Internal Revenue Allocation (IRA) that is distributed regularly to all LGUs by the national government.

A summary of the various institutional mechanisms established pursuant to law, by concerned national government agencies and local government units is shown by territorial level below:

Agency	Territorial Level				
	National	Regional	Provincial	Municipal	Barangay
Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)	-Presidential Agrarian Reform Council		-Provincial Agrarian Reform Coordinating		-Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee

³ The LDC is composed at different LGU levels and chaired by the Local Chief Executive (LCEs), as follows: i) Barangay: Bgy Chairperson as chair, all Bgy Kagawads (or councilmen), NGO/PO representatives, and representative of the congressman; ii) Municipality: Mayor as chairperson, all Bgy chairpersons, chairperson of the Committee on Appropriation of the Municipal Council, NGO/PO representatives, and representative of the congressman; and iii) Province: Governor as chairperson, all mayors of component municipalities, chairperson of the Committee on Appropriation of the provincial Board, NGO/PO representatives, and representative of the congressman.

Agency	Territorial Level				
	National	Regional	Provincial	Municipal	Barangay
	(PARC)		Committee (PARCCOM)		(BARC)
Department of Agriculture (DA)	-National Agriculture and Fisheries Council (NAFC)	-Regional Agriculture and Fisheries Council (RAFC)	-Provincial Agriculture and Fisheries Council (PAFC)	-Municipal Agriculture and Fisheries Council (MAFC)	
Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)	-GO-NGO Collaborative Tie-up		-Project-based Environmental Impact Assessment	-Project-based Environmental Impact Assessment	-Project-based Environmental Impact Assessment
National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC)	-National KALAHI Convergence Group	-Regional KALAHI Convergence Group	-Provincial Poverty Reduction Team	-Municipal Poverty Reduction Team	
Local Government Units (LGUs)		-Regional Development Council	-Provincial Development Council (PDC) & other special bodies (LSBs)	-Municipal Development Council (MDC) & other special bodies (LSBs)	-Barangay Development Council (BDC) & special bodies (LSBs) -Barangay Assembly

3.0 Initial diagnostic of the problem: difficulties and constraints

Despite the mechanisms established by the government and the organizational facilitation provided by CSOs, active and meaningful people participation has been generally limited and restricted to a few if not select stakeholder groups, effectively excluding the poor and unorganized sector of society. As pointed out in the FAO-PPLG Study, this is due to a host of problems and constraints hampering the process.

The FAO-PPLG Study has initially identified these problems and constraints that were validated, corroborated and enriched with additional information during the workshop. These are as follows.

3.1 Restrictive and/or unclear guidelines on representation

Pursuant to the Code, NGOs and POs applying for accreditation and thus be qualified to have a seat in the Local Special Bodies (LSBs) are required to: i) be first formally registered with duly authorized agency (e.g. SEC, CDA, DOLE, etc.); ii) have at least a one-year track record in project development and implementation; iii) submit financial

data; and iv) submit other documentary evidence of their legitimacy and track record, namely, board resolution applying for the organization's accreditation, Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, list of officers and members, program of work and area of operation, and accomplishment report.

The enumerated requirements would automatically disqualify, if not discourage, the large majority of civil society organizations (CSOs), especially the small community-based POs, from applying for accreditation simply because they are not or cannot be registered due, in turn, to financial and/or technical constraints. Many LGUs make it even harder for the CSOs to qualify, by: a) lengthening the track record requirement to three years; b) requiring submission of duly audited financial statements instead of just a simple financial report prepared by the treasurer and reviewed by the auditor and the members of the organization; and c) requiring the submission of the documentary proofs in seven (7) copies instead of just one (1), which is expensive [cf. Navarro, *op. cit.*].

On the other hand, practical guidelines or procedural manuals are inadequate to help in the conduct of effective participation and orderly meetings. DILG guidelines on local planning have yet to be published in a form that is easily understandable to less technically minded LDC members.

Unclear guidelines are also noted in other agencies. In the case of the DA, the EO 116 reorganizing its organizational structure does not have clear definition of "people." As a result, the actual composition of DA's mechanism for representative participation (NAFC, RAFC, PAFC, and MAFC) is dominated by big business interests and large farmers' organizations. The majority of small organizations and unorganized groups of small farmers, fisher folk and landless rural workers are left out.

3.2 Inappropriate and/or Under-Utilization of Existing Mechanisms

In performing its multiple developmental tasks, the LDC can only decide when it meets and is duly assembled for the purpose. But as observed, the LDCs meet infrequently. The Local Chief Executives (LCEs), who act as chair of the LDC, tend to find it unnecessary to call a meeting more than the mandated regular number of once in six months. They also tend to practically dictate the agenda of the meeting and leave no room for CSOs to bring in their own agenda [cf. Navarro, *op.cit.*].

Recently, there are changes in the system of budgeting the LGU's 20% Development Fund, and there is virtually no chance for CSO representatives to influence the manner of allocating the fund. The allocation of funds to specific projects and activities is now left to the discretion of the LCE; thus, instead of lobbying within the LDC, the CSOs must have to do so directly with the LCE, a situation that only increases LCE's "power of the purse" [*Ibid*].

At the DA, there is a reported bias in the selection of farmer-representatives favoring those coming from government-sponsored organizations. In getting representatives from farmers' groups, the general practice is to select them, for instance, from *Samahang Nayon* and farmers'/fishermen's associations, or from large farmers' organizations that are

collaborating with DA, such as the FFF and CUP, leaving out the others especially the militant ones critical to government.

Lack of mutual awareness and understanding of each other's functions/roles, approaches, principles for effective partnership, which characterizes the relationship between NGO, PO and government personnel involved in GO-NGO-PO joint undertaking, has hampered effective utilization of this collaborative mechanism. There are persisting attitudinal problems, particularly mutual suspicion towards each other that is rooted in the historical development of civil society in the country; some NGOs are labeled outright as subversives. In general, NGO/POs are treated as mere implementers of projects instead of partners in the strict sense of the word.

Implementation of the Magna Carta of Small Farmers, which would have facilitated active participation of the poor, unorganized and marginalized farmers in the informal sector, is half-hearted and inconsistent with the spirit of the law. The self-help organizations that are supposed to be organized with DA's assistance are instead represented by pre-existing large farmers' organizations (e.g. FFF) in some of the Boards of government agencies involved in farmers' welfare. On the other hand, there is failure in appointing farmer-representatives to the rest of the concerned agencies, namely: NIA, LiveCor, NNC, FIDA, FPA, ACPC, HSDC, and PPInc.

Under-utilization of the existing participatory mechanisms of DAR at the local level is revealed in the reported status of the BARCs, which seems to be still the situation nowadays, to wit: i) almost three-fourth of BARCs were improperly organized; ii) about the same number of BARCs have not been functioning; and iii) only a little over one-fourth of the BARCs, and less than half of the BARCs involve their communities in the planning and implementation of BARC activities, respectively [FAO-PPLG: based on FAO1994 report and consultation with stakeholders].

3.3 Limited Stakeholders' Capabilities and Institutional Resources

Among primary stakeholders, particularly those belonging to the category of poor project beneficiaries, active participation especially during the pre-implementation planning stage is reportedly constrained by their being hard-pressed to make both ends meet. They have no time and resources to spare for this, much more so if the location of the activity is relatively far to them. This is the reason why in various CBCRM projects, active participation during this stage is limited to village leaders, government officials and staff.

Implementation agencies involved in project design were reported to be often unfamiliar with, and had limited capacity in, participatory development approaches. In other instances, involvement of Working Group members during project implementation suffer from recurrent staff changes despite their being representatives of key stakeholders due to limited resources to maintain the staff. This results to distractions if not discontinuities to operation.

LGUs are generally claimed to have limited experience and capacity to carry out social marketing and advocacy programs on the essential roles and responsibilities of key

stakeholders and major players in local development efforts. There is also lack of awareness of project opportunities not only on the part of the LGUs but the rural communities as well due to dearth of information and limited access to resource holders [Panadero, *op.cit.*].

In view of LGU's limited capacity for improved community mobilization and broad participation of constituencies, the important process of organizing, managing and documenting participatory planning and implementation process are not properly undertaken at the local level. Together with the other constraints, these are major barriers to people participation that are aggravated by the absence of coherent coordination mechanism and functional collaboration between and among LGUs, CSOs and the private sector groups [*Ibid.*].

Sharing his thoughts on this issue, a farmer-leader who is known for his years of leading the most militant farmer organization in the country lamented at the way farmers are supposedly encouraged to participate in local development undertakings. Speaking in Filipino, he claimed that "*ang susi ng pag-unlad ay ang sama-samang pagkilos ng mga dukha*" (or "the key to progress is the united action of the poor"). But the strategy employed by government has always been to divide-and-rule the poor, which is the country's largest but marginalized sector of the population, he said.

"*Lahat ng paraan sa pag-unlad ay sinasabi sa amin, bukod ang pagsama-sama, at sa halip na sama-sama, hinuhubog kaming mga dukha na magkanya-kanya*" ("We are told about everything to achieve progress except acting in a unified manner; and instead of uniting, we the poor are conditioned to think and do things only for our own individual selves.")

The limitations on the part of POs and NGOs are seen in terms of: a) inadequate knowledge and understanding on the developmental role of the LDC and the other LSBs; b) lack of appreciation on why it is important for POs and NGOs to participate in local development planning, program implementation, monitoring and evaluation; and c) lack of knowledge on how the LDC operates and the skill to participate and influence the decision-making process in the LDC [Navarro, *op.cit.*].

3.4 Inadequate Support

Failure of government to provide budgetary support has resulted in the half-hearted implementation of the Magna Carta of Small Farmers. DA has failed to organize self-help organizations of small farmers and have them represented by the national officials of these organizations in the identified Boards of concerned government agencies pursuant to the law, thereby perpetuating the exclusion of poor small farmers from participating in the policy-making processes of agencies that are vital to their interest.

Inadequate or otherwise no budgetary support is also reported for the other laws that would have supported government's effort to encourage broad-based people participation. These laws are, namely: the Agriculture and Fisheries Modernization Act (RA 8435); the Social Reforms and Poverty Alleviation Act (RA 8425); the Philippine Fisheries Code

(RA 8550); the Countrywide Industrialization Act (RA 7368); and the Small Business Guaranty and Finance Corporation Act (RA 6977).

At the local level, there is an utterly inadequate fund to enable the LDCs to effectively perform its multifarious functions. LGU fund for LDC activities, such as conduct of community assemblies, public forums and consultations and other mandated tasks, is negligible. This adversely affects participatory governance as these social preparation activities are essential to project identification, plan preparation and implementation [*Ibid.*].

Each LDC ought to have a secretariat to handle not only the documentation of its meetings, but more importantly, the search for, collection, and dissemination of information to the members prior to the meeting, so that the members are fully prepared when they come to the meeting. In the absence of a secretariat, LDC meetings are ill-prepared and there is hardly any monitoring of follow-on activities that are conducted based on decisions reached during the meeting [*Ibid.*].

Furthermore, leadership support that ought to come from LCEs (especially mayors and governors) who chair the LDC is also lacking. Many LCEs treat the CSO representatives as trouble-makers and thus accommodate only those CSOs that they or their spouses may have organized [Ponce, *supra*]. Other LCEs think active CSO's participation in the LDCs would only diminish their authority to make decisions. LCEs' reluctance to allow CSOs to fully participate in LGU's decision-making processes is manifested either in LCE's lack of interest in attending LDC meetings; LCEs dictating the agenda of said meetings; or LCEs delaying the invitations to prevent CSOs from attending the meetings [*Ibid.*].

Considering the limited CSO membership, a quorum during LDC meetings can still be obtained even if not a single CSO representative is present. This is because a quorum merely requires a simple majority of 50% + 1 of the members attending [*Ibid.*].

At this point, it is interesting to note the information given by a participant civil society leader that actually not all CSOs are enthusiastic about joining the LDC, and for that matter the other LSBs. The reason behind is that, given the situation where the CSO representatives are outnumbered during meetings and can thus be conveniently overruled during the deliberation, they are apprehensive that their members will blame them anyway if the LDC makes a decision that is not favorable to their organization.

As the agency tasked to exercise general supervision over LGUs, DILG is noted to be also lacking in providing the needed support, such as to effectively monitor how the LCEs are managing the LDCs. There are reported cases of DILG field personnel, particularly the Local Government Operations Officers, covering up for governors and mayors who failed to convene their respective Provincial Development Council (PDC) and Municipal Development Council (MDC) pursuant to the LGC's Implementing Rules and Regulations (IRR). These officers submitted fabricated reports that the concerned PDCs and MDCs were meeting regularly [Navarro, *op.cit.*].

3.5 Political Interference, Differences, or Inaction

Political interference is one of the common hindering factors to participation and development. This takes place when vested personal or political interest of stakeholders takes precedence over public interest. When projects are implemented even if these are not included in the locally-approved development plan or based on the needs of constituents due to accommodation of favored group or party; or if certain areas are excluded from projects' priority coverage due to low votes cast in past elections; or if POs and NGOs are not accredited due to political reasons, people lose trust and interest to participate in the development process [cf. Panadero, op.cit.].

Local political interference is considered a perennial problem and difficult to address not only because there are no specific provisions in the LG Code that could prevent it but more so because the local political dynamics are inherently personal [Ibid.]. This problem is compounded by differences and conflict of interest between the elected members of the Executive and Legislative Councils. These adversely affect the priority development needs expressed by the communities and the complementation of local development plans and investment programs with local budgetary appropriation [Ibid.].

The most obvious "political inaction" that has hindered meaningful people's participation in local negotiations towards rural development is the failure of the Congress of the Philippines, particularly its "upper chamber", the Senate, to pass the enabling legislation that is needed to put into effect the constitutional provision (in Article X, Section 9 of the 1987 Constitution) that mandates "legislative bodies of local governments (to) have sectoral representation (LSR) as may be prescribed by law" [Navarro, op.cit.].

The constitutional provision on LSR is reiterated in the LG Code, particularly in the sections on composition of the Sangguniang Bayan (Municipal Council) and the Sangguniang Panlalawigan (Provincial Board). The Code provides that there shall be three sectoral representatives; one (1) from the women; one (1) from the agricultural or industrial workers; and one (1) from the other sectors, including the urban poor, indigenous cultural communities and disabled persons [Ibid.]. The Lower House passed a version of the bill during the 12th Congress, but the needed Senate companion bill was not. Hence, it has become necessary to re-file the bills in both Houses for passage by the 13th Congress.

The reasons advanced by those against the passage of the law are: a) many LGUs cannot afford the additional expense that the three (3) additional sanggunian members would entail in terms of salaries, allowances, office spaces, etc.; and b) the LSR is "unnecessary" because the existing sanggunian members already represent all the voters within the LGU area of jurisdiction; and b) the existing members of the sanggunian, many of whom come from the elite, are worried that the sectoral representatives will only dilute their authority and power [Ibid.].

3.6 Negative Cultural Traits

There are two Filipino traits, observed especially among rural farm households, which usually affect their effective participation in negotiation and various development processes. These are as follows:

- *Patronage relationship.* Patron-client relationship is present in Philippine rural communities. People who use to receive material favors from a person and are unable to give him/her something in return tend to become subservient to the latter. Thus, during negotiations, consultations, or issue discussions, these people will support and be on the side of the one to whom they are indebted even if they are not in favor of his/her stand on the issue at hand [cf. *Ibid.*].
- *Non- Confrontation trait.* Another cultural trait that hinders active participation at the local level is the Filipino trait of non-confrontation and silence in the face of potential controversy or conflict. Rather than confronting the issues and sources of conflicts directly (especially during dialogues and negotiations), many have the tendency to set aside the problem, hoping that over time, the issue would just fade away.

Even during the workshop, where the participants were expected to be vocal, the non-confrontational trait was somehow manifested. A CSO leader from a militant women organization, for instance, could not raise the issue that has embroiled her organization for some time now because she wanted to avoid embarrassing a participant who was previously involved in it; and, thus, maintain the friendly atmosphere that pervaded during the workshop. The issue is about the CLOAs (Certificate of Landownership Award) that were earlier awarded to a group of agrarian reform beneficiaries but were later on cancelled in favor of the former landowner.

3.7 Adverse External Factors

There are reported external factors that affect active stakeholders' participation. Among beneficiaries of DAR and CBCRM projects, these factors are: i) peace and order problems; ii) landowner interventions; iii) land conversion and slow land processing process that demoralize the beneficiaries; and iv) fear of threats and confrontations from those who are opposed to the project.

Considered most common, as pointed out additionally during the workshop, is the perceived aversion of the LCEs to share authority and power that cannot be avoided in a the participatory approach to development planning and management. This perception causes POs and NGOs to shy away from participation or just take a passive stand as member in the LDC. POs and NGOs who are members of the LDC would not openly oppose or protest the autocratic leadership of the LCE for fear that they may lose LCE's favor considering that a lot of decisions, such as allocation of funds, is left to his discretion [cf. *Ibid.*].

Another common factor, as likewise pointed out in the workshop, is the attitude of the military establishment, particularly the intelligence operatives, who sees in every active and militant PO or NGO a “communist sympathizer” or, worse, a “communist front”. This happened to the POs and NGOs who openly opposed the granting of a permit to a mining company in the northern part of the country. For voicing out their opposition during public hearings conducted by the Sangguniang Panlalawigan (Provincial Board), their leaders were branded as “anti-government” and suffered such harassment as military surveillance activities done usually to suspected “communists” or “communist supporters and sympathizers;” some even got killed in the process [*Ibid.*].

There is also a perceived collusion between landowners and some DAR field personnel. This has discouraged many farmers from pursuing negotiations to obtain their rights as agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs). Were it not for the encouragement and support of NGO-advocates of agrarian reform as well as from honest and well-meaning DAR personnel who have supported their struggle for years, these farmers would have not continued or resumed their participation in local negotiations for agrarian reform and rural development [*Ibid.*].

4.0 Concrete modality of the intervention carried out

Concrete interventions have been undertaken to address the address the above-enumerated problems and constraints, such as those brought up for discussion during the workshop and those mentioned in the FAO-PPLG Study. These are mostly foreign-assisted programs and in the area of advocacy for good governance and capacity-building.

4.1 Advocacy for Participatory Governance

To effectively advocate participatory governance, efforts have been exerted to synthesize the broad range of lessons learned and document best practices to provide concerned stakeholders and key players with practical examples and guide for future decision-making and action [Panadero]. The DILG in close collaboration with the alliance of civil society organizations and donor agencies has been organizing cross-visits (*lakbay-aral*), peer-to-peer exchange of experiences and lessons learned, giving of awards and recognition for exemplary LGUs, governance exposition and interactive forums [*Ibid*; cf. Brillantes].

On-going programs and projects advocating participatory governance include:

- The CIDA-assisted Local Government Support Program (CIDA-LGSP) organized the 2004 Governance Expo, which showcased and documented the best practices in effective governance of selected LGUs across the country.
 - ADB/NDF-assisted Mindanao Basic Urban Services Sector Project (MBUSSP) organized an LGU Forum on Urban Governance in 2004 as an advocacy tool to encourage peer-to-peer exchange of experiences and lessons learned among 15 local chief executives (LCEs) in community consultation, subproject preparation and implementation for urban infrastructure.
-

- Gawad Galing Pook promotes and advocates effective governance by recognizing the initiatives and good practices of LGUs in pursuing local development projects that manifested people's empowerment, efficiency in program service delivery, transferability and sustainability.
- NGO Networks for Barangay Bayan Governance Consortium (BBGC) and the Civil Society Alliance for Local Governance Citizens' Network (LGCNet) promote and advocate development efforts focused on the barangay governance by mainstreaming planning and budgeting, resource mobilization, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in the barangay development process.

4.2 Institutional capacity-building

In order to strengthen LGU effectiveness in participatory governance, institutional capacity building program is pursued in the ADB/NDF-assisted (MBUSSP), with investment support for essential urban infrastructure proposed by the LGUs. The project is executed jointly by DILG, Land Bank of the Philippines, and LGU as the implementing partner. The project provides technical assistance and advisory services in:

- Project management support for social marketing and advocacy programs, developing appropriate management systems and procedures, participatory results based monitoring and evaluation
- Subproject preparation and implementation involving social preparation process with proponent LGUs and participating sectoral groups such as market vendors association, transport association, water users' association, etc.

The Philippine-Australia Technical Support for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development (PATSARRD) is another foreign-assisted project that is geared at building multi-stakeholders' capacities for effective participatory implementation of programs and projects at the local level [FAO-PPLG]. It is funded by AusAID with the FAO as executing agency and the DAR as lead implementing agency. It involves application of innovative development approaches that include participatory planning using the tested Farming Systems Development model, and the establishment of market linkages and agribusiness enterprises to ensure sustainability of project-supported livelihood undertakings of agrarian reform beneficiaries (ARBs). Adopting the strategy of convergence to achieve the social reform and poverty alleviation goals of the government [cf. SRPAA, 2.1.3.4 *supra*], PATSARRD aims to:

- Increase ARBs' capability to influence their well-being by incorporating cost-effective, participatory planning processes into regular DAR and LGU operations;
 - Strengthen and establish mechanisms for cooperation among government departments, LGUs, universities, private firms, donors and other institutions working to improve ARB economic and social conditions;
-

- Develop innovative approaches to beneficiary economic development (on-farm and non-farm), including marketing and microfinance services, with emphasis on private sector involvement; and
- Manage and monitor the projects, with particular attention to institutionalizing activities and processes within DAR and other agencies and to ensure gender and social equity.

As part of the overall strategy, the project establishes the KALAHI Farmers Center (KFC), which serves as a major venue for coordinating the different activities of participating agencies and civil society organization, as well as for support services to beneficiaries.

4.3 Capacity-building for primary stakeholders

A gender-specific capacity-building project is also implemented with foreign-funding assistance. This is the Social Protection for Women Vendors in Mindanao program that is implemented in MBUSSP-assisted areas by DILG with funding support from the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) and aimed order to develop the capacity of poor women to participate in development undertaking. The program includes organizational strengthening, livelihood and micro-enterprise ventures, maternal care and health and nutrition. As the executing agency, DILG engages the services of an NGO partner, the Notre Dame Foundation, to manage project implementation.

PART TWO: PROCEEDINGS OF THE THEMATIC DIALOGUE

5.0 Views from diverse stakeholders: The National Stakeholder Workshop

5.1 Overview

The national stakeholder workshop was held on January 10, 2006 and participated in by representatives from respective government agencies, civil society organizations, academe, and foreign donor agencies (see Proceedings of the Workshop in *Annex A*). Prominent discussants, lead reactors and key participants led the discussions during the workshop. The discussants' papers⁴ generated revealing information and constructive comments from reactors and participants. The discussions revolved mainly on the problems and issues as identified in the FAO-PPLG Study and presented at the early part of the workshop, and on related issues on local governance, decentralization and devolution of powers from the national to the local government units (LGUs).

During the workshop, the discussants, reactors and participants generally agreed and validated the findings of the FAO-PPLG Study. The discussions enriched these findings with corroborative information and suggestions, while contrasting views and opinions were aired on the strategies and priorities to enhance people participation at the local level. Inside the session hall, however, some participants were still hesitant to share information or raise issues that were potentially controversial and instead talked about these during break period with a small group of fellow participants. A representative of a militant women organization opted to just submit after the workshop a position paper detailing the analysis of issues from their group's standpoint.

While expressing gratitude for being invited to the workshop, one participant from civil society, with accordance from many CSO representatives who nodded their heads, requested for a follow-up dialogue or a continuing one if possible, to enable them to discuss further certain issues that they feel are vital to their common interest but are already outside the scope of the workshop. Concerns were expressed that the outcome of the workshop if brought to ICARRD does not carry many of their positions that are particularly relevant to agrarian reform. They asked the DAR Undersecretary who stayed on till the end of the first-day activity for DAR to sponsor another dialogue, which the latter favorably reacted and promised to bring the matter up to the DAR Secretary for consideration particularly in the context of the national report preparation for ICARRD.

⁴ Conrado S. Navarro, Trustees and Senior Vice-President, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM), "People's Participation in Local Negotiations towards Rural Development: View from the Paddies;" Austere A. Panadero, Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), "Harnessing Participatory Governance in Revitalizing Rural Communities;" and, Alex B. Brillantes Jr, Professor and Dean, UP National College of Public Administration and Governance, "New Challenges and Options for Revitalizing Rural Communities: The Imperatives of Decentralization and Local Autonomy." Lead Reactors to the papers were: Nathaniel Don Marquez, ANGOC Director; Jose-Marie Ponce, ex-DAR Secretary and CEZA Administrator; Dolores de Quiros-Castillo, NAPC Assistant Secretary; and Ben Malayang III, Senior Fellow of the Development Academy of the Philippines and In-coming President of Silliman University [see annexed Proceedings of the Workshop for their reaction papers].

This section reports the proceedings of the National Stocktaking and Thematic Dialogue on Options and Challenges for Revitalizing Rural Communities held on January 10, 2006 at SEAMEO, Innotech, Quezon City. It is organized in two parts. The first part describes the organization and processes of the dialogue, its objectives, and outputs. It also reviews the main debates and conclusions of the forum. The second part provides detailed reports of the thematic session. These include summaries of the three presentations, and plenary discussions. The report has benefited greatly from the input of the discussants and reactors.

5.2 Background

Rural development is the central element of any effort to benefit rural population. However, the needs of rural areas where three-fourths of the world's poor live have been afforded low priority in policy making and resource allocation. These trends have created very challenging conditions to address the increasing problems of rural areas in developing countries. The time has come for a renewed commitment to agrarian reform and rural development, through the identification of new challenges and options for revitalizing rural communities.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is taking the lead in increasing the renewed international commitment by organizing an International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, in Porto Alegre, Brazil on March 7-10, 2006. The conference will primarily serve to review different experiences of agrarian reform carried out in different countries by analyzing the program's intricacies - impacts, processes, mechanisms and the actors involved - in order to develop proposals for future action.

An issue paper for each of the following themes will be presented at the ICARRD Conference:

- policies and practices for securing and improving access to land and promoting agrarian reform;
- building local capacities to improve access to land, water, agricultural inputs and agrarian services to promote rural development and a sustainable management of natural resources;
- new opportunities to strengthen rural producers and communities;
- agrarian reform, social justice and sustainable development, and
- food sovereignty and access to resources.

For the Philippines, the document paper to be presented in this conference will be a case study entitled "What Determines the Policy Impact of Local Negotiations: A Comparative Study in the Philippines." Also referred to as the "FAO-PPLG" study, the case study identified the factors that hinder the participation of stakeholders in local negotiations. It was conducted in two rural barangays, namely, Sibalew and Badiangan, in the municipality of Banga, province of Aklan located in Western Visayas by a team of researchers from the Aklan State University (ASU).

The study aims specifically to: i) assess the policy framework and institutional mechanisms for participatory processes in the Philippines; ii) identify the different types of stakeholders and what factors motivate them to participate in these processes; iii) understand the issues, problems and constraints to these processes; and iv) identify the measures for promoting effective participation.

The purpose of the National Stocktaking and Thematic Dialogue was to validate the findings of the study to be presented at the ICARRD.

5.3 Objectives of the dialogue

The specific objectives were as follows:

- orient participants on the specific issues in the FAO-PPLG Study (Section 2.6: What Determines the Policy Impact of Local Negotiations?);
- discuss both the positive and negative aspects of these underlying issues;
- propose joint actions and identify mechanisms for collaboration; and
- consolidate the salient discussion points into a paper to be presented to the ICARRD.

5.4 The Programme

The programme was organized in five parts: (i) opening session; (ii) introductory session; (iii) presentation of papers; (iv) reactions to the papers; (iv) plenary session/open forum; (v) challenge for ICARRD; and (vi) closing session.

The introductory session consists of activity overview and presentation of the ICARRD. In the presentation of papers, participants had the opportunity to listen to three papers by selected experts, but most of the time was devoted to group discussion and exchange of experience. The open forum and exchange of experience followed.

The activity programme is shown in Annex 1.

5.5 Participants

A total of 55 participants representing, the following institutions and organizations were in the dialogue.

- Departments of Agrarian Reform and Interior and Local Government, Cagayan Economic Zone Authority, and the National Anti-Poverty Commission
- The United Nations system agency: Food and Agriculture Organization
- Academe
- Non-government organizations
- Civil Society Organizations, including private sector

Majority of the participants are policy makers and practitioners in agrarian reform and rural development. The complete list of participants is shown in *Annex 2*.

5.6 The proceedings: Introductory Session

The one-day dialogue officially started with an opening ceremony highlighted by the welcome remarks of DAR Undersecretary Gerundio C. Madueno and the keynote address of Mr. Ramesh C. A. Jain, FAO Resident Representative in the Philippines (see *Annex 3 & 4*, respectively).

DAR Undersecretary Gerundio C. Madueno delivered the welcome remarks, on behalf of Secretary Nasser Pangandaman, expressing hope that the dialogue be an opportunity to come up with a more broad-based integrated development strategy that will form part of the country's presentation paper in the forthcoming International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development in March 2006. He was also optimistic that the participants will be able to propose joint actions and collaborative mechanisms for the improvement of access to land and alleviation of poverty and threats posed by globalization, liberalization, industrialization, urbanization and increasing out-migration of the youth from the rural areas.

He also cited the achievements of the agrarian reform program in reducing rural poverty from 47.6% in 1990 to about 45% in 2000 and now 34%. According to him, through the 16 on-going foreign-assisted projects, support services were expanded, agrarian justice was delivered more swiftly, and infrastructure services such as farm-to-market road, irrigation system, post harvest facilities and basic services like potable water, solar power, health and education were provided in some areas. He also mentioned the contribution of DAR's convergence efforts with the Departments of Agriculture and Environment and Natural Resources in the development of coastal areas, farmlands and upland areas.

Mr. Ramesh C. A. Jain, FAO Resident Representative in the Philippines, in his keynote speech emphasized the centrality of agrarian reform in the in the global effort for poverty reduction and sustainable development. According to him despite considerable improvements in food production over the last 50 years, food security still remains a problem in many parts of the world. He called for a renewed commitment for agrarian reform and rural development in light of the Millennium Development Goal to halve poverty by 2010.

5.61 Overview of Activity and Presentation of ICARRD

Ms. Rosalud dela Rosa, ICARRD Secretariat, pointed out in the activity overview that ICARRD sees agrarian reform and rural development as a necessary strategy to reduce poverty. According to her, the proposal to convene ICARRD was unanimously approved by the FAO Council in 2005 in support of the 1996 World Food Summit and the Millennium Development Goals. See powerpoint presentation in *Annex 5*.

5.7 Presentation of the background of the FAO-PPLG study

The FAO-Participation, Policy and Local Governance (PPLG) study entitled "What Determines the Policy Impact of Local Negotiations: A Comparative Study in the

Philippines served as the key reference for discussion. It was presented by Dr. Rogelio Lopez of the Orient Integrated Development Consultants, Inc. (OIDCI). This study is a general assessment of the participatory processes in the Philippines and its impact on policy at the local and national levels. Specifically, it looks into the institutional framework and mechanism for people participation and the impact of local negotiation on policy.

Dr. Lopez said that the conduct of the study was actually inspired by the realization that people's participation should be promoted not just in the project implementation stage but also in the policy-making stage.

The study came up with a *working paper* that outlines national trends, key linkages, and principal drivers of participation; and *case studies* that document what actually takes place at the field level. The case studies were conducted in Barangays Sibalew and Badiangan in the municipality of Banga, province of Aklan, Region VI, by a team of researchers from the Aklan State University (ASU). Key Informant interviews, focus group discussions, and direct observation techniques were used to gather primary data, complemented by previously obtained secondary information.

He emphasized that while there are abundant policies and mechanisms for people's participation in this country, there are problems and constraints that hamper their utilization. He particularly drew attention to the following: (i) restrictive and/or unclear guidelines for people's representation in local negotiation mechanisms; (ii) inappropriate and under-utilization of existing mechanisms for people's participation in local negotiations; (iii) limited stakeholders' capabilities and resources; (iv) inadequate support; (v) political interference or inaction; (vi) negative Filipino traits or value system; and (vii) adverse external factors discouraging people to participate.

He also identified measures to address these problems and these are: i) continuous information dissemination; ii) participation of stakeholders in all phases of development; iii) incorporation of lessons learned and good practices in national government policies; iv) strengthening of the LDCs; v) provision of continuous and comprehensive capability-building programs to all stakeholders; vi) immediate response to negotiation results/agreements; and vii) provision of capable and credible facilitators during negotiations.

He concluded that aside from these proposed measures there had been suggestions to explore alternative strategies to attract multi-stakeholders' participation in local negotiations. One possible strategy is to harness the positive Filipino values underlying the traditional *bayanihan* mode of cooperation.

A copy of the Executive Summary of the PPLG Study and powerpoint presentation of Dr. Lopez is in *Annex6a&b*.

5.8 Presentation of Papers

Three discussants representing the NGO, academe, and government sector were invited to validate or expound on the findings of the study. They are former DAR Undersecretary

Conrado Navarro, [PRRM](#)'s Senior Vice President, Dr. Alex Brillantes, Dean of UP's National College of Public Administration and Governance, and DILG Assistant Secretary Austere Panadero.

Mr. Conrado Navarro's paper, "People's Participation in Local Negotiations Towards Rural Development: View From the Paddies, validates the factors that have hindered the participation of stakeholders in local negotiations towards rural development based on his own experience as an NGO rural development practitioner and as a former DAR Under-Secretary. bureaucrat .

On the *restrictive and/or unclear guidelines for people's representation in local negotiation mechanisms*, he said that the experience of many of PRRM's partner people's organizations (POs) validates this completely. A number of these POs were deprived of the opportunity to participate in local negotiations because they had not been formally registered. Another restrictive, or at least unclear, guideline is the one that requires a PO to have a one-year track record in project development and implementation before it can be accredited. This has also been stretched to three years to make sure that the applicant PO or NGO is a legitimate organization and not just a "fly-by-night" entity that was put up simply to avail of development grants from government or foreign donors as was the case of the Dutch funded agrarian development program in the 80's, the DRDAP. POs and NGOs found it difficult to comply with this requirement because some LGUs count the 3-year timeframe only from their registration. For example, a PO that has been in existence for five years but has only been registered for two years, still lack one year of track record to qualify for accreditation even if it has achieved a lot during its five years of existence.

On the *participation of stakeholders in all phases of development*, he said that numerous development programs/projects are found to be impractical and irrelevant to the target beneficiaries because they were not involved in the identification and planning of these projects. They are only made to participate in the implementation. He also emphasized that when people are involved in identifying what projects benefit them, they attain a sense of ownership and this ensures the sustainability of that program or project.

Mr. Navarro's paper confirms that most people, especially those in the rural areas, do not have an appreciation of the Local Development Council's (LDC's) concept as a major venue for people's participation in local governance. His personal experience as NGO representative in a provincial development council (PDC) and co-vice chair of the council for the civil society sector reveals that this mechanism is not only underutilized in terms of being a venue for addressing the people's priority needs, but was also largely ineffectual as a development forum. He said that while the 1991 Local Government Code mandates the LDC to meet at least every six months, the PDC in which he was co-vice chair only met at most once every six months because its chair, the Provincial Governor, did not deem it necessary to call a meeting more than what the LGC specifies. Also, concerns of civil society were not included in the agenda. If included, these were not taken up.

A copy of the paper by Mr. Navarro and powerpoint presentation is in **Annex 7a & b**.

Dr. Alex Brillantes' paper, "New Challenges and Options for Revitalizing Rural Communities: The imperative of Decentralization and Local Autonomy," provided a broad

ranging perspective on local governance, giving emphasis on the role the national and local government play in fostering community empowerment and in promoting participatory governance at the local level. His discussions on the measures to effective participation focused on certain preconditions, which have been shown to contribute to more effective local governance and participation:

- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities for different levels of government.
- Strong communication and accountability mechanisms between central government, local government and local communities.
- Adequate capacities in planning and financial management.
- Adequate financial resources available at the local level.
- Strong central government (for regulation, standard setting, policy drive and monitoring).

Furthermore, there is a need to strengthen local government capacity, particularly in relation to the local government financial management, human resource management, planning, coordination and internal accountability mechanisms.

A copy of the paper by Dr. Brillantes and powerpoint presentation is in *Annex 8a & b*.

In his paper, “Harnessing Participatory Governance in Revitalizing Rural Communities,” *DILG Assistant Secretary Austere Panadero* discussed a broad range of local governance issues including decentralization strategies, role of the private sector in local governance particularly in the delivery of basic services, as an alternative strategy for sustainable development, the role of LDC as a major venue for people’s participation in local governance, and the challenges that hinder effective participatory governance.

He stated that participatory governance offers many advantages. However, there are factors that hinder effective participatory governance. Among the key constraints that have been identified relate to the institutional capacities of the LGUs, local resource constraints and the perennial internal political conflicts and differences.

ASec Panadero said that in response to the emerging challenges and critical concerns to pursue effective people’s participation, appropriate measures should be adopted to strengthen the concerted efforts of the national and local governments, civil society organizations, the private sector groups and the general public. Major priorities include: maximizing the role of the LDCs; a more focused capacity building program for effective participation; a broader participation of rural communities and their organizations in preparing executive-legislative agenda; mandatory allocation of local budget for social marketing, advocacy and social preparation process; and the adoption of a periodic project monitoring and impact evaluation.

A copy of the paper and powerpoint presentation by ASec Panadero is in *Annex 9a & b*.

5.9 Reactions to Discussion Papers

Invited to give reaction to the presentations were Mr. Nathaniel Don Marquez of ANGOC, Former DAR OIC Secretary Jose Marie Ponce of Cagayan Economic Zone Authority

(CEZA), NAPC Assistant Secretary Dolores de Quiros-Castillo, and Dr. Ben Malayang III, Senior Fellow of the Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) and incoming President of the Silliman University. The paragraphs that follow summarize the reactions and views of the reactors.

Referring to the FAO-PPLG study, Mr. Marquez pointed out the centrality of agrarian reform in local governance and the task of "revitalizing rural communities". In his view, two related questions should be addressed within the context of participation: the objective of participation and the impact of participation. He also echoed what the agrarian reform civil society has been advocating: *That agrarian reform is a question of pro-farmer national-level policy and political will to implement it at the ground level.* Other salient points he discussed are listed below.

- Access to land is vital and has diverse meanings to various sectors of society. To most poor families, it means access to a source of livelihood, enhanced food security, an increased sense of security and resilience. For indigenous people communities, it is the right to self-determination, cultural integrity and autonomy.
- Many past agrarian reform legislations were never fully implemented due to the following: lack of political will, official policies often lack continuity and ability of rural elites to regain the lands distributed to the peasants.
- Agrarian reform is a continuing political process since it involves changing power relations. Even after legislative reforms are instituted, there is need for constant public vigilance and pressure to influence governments to exert political will for agrarian reform. Hence, after 19 years of CARP implementation, mass actions continued to be used for agrarian reform (i.e., street protests, hunger strikes, and through court cases).
- Decentralization offers contrasting advantages in relation to agrarian reform. While it increases people's access to local services and programs and enables people to demand more services from their local government, it also increases the power of local elites to reverse efforts at social reform since most local governments are manned by the local landed elite. Hence, this is likely to reinforce political patronage and feudal dependence – the same values that agrarian reform itself seeks to change.
- As agriculture gets increasingly feminized, existing laws should give equal property rights to women. It is not sufficient to advocate for new agrarian reform legislations and policies; equal attention should be given to those existing laws and practices that curtail equal property rights for women.
- Conflicts and disputes continue to plague the agrarian reform program. There have been overlaps in land related reforms. In some areas for instance, tenurial rights have been granted to upland dwellers under the Integrated Social Forestry program, or land certificates given to lowland farmers under CARP – covering lands under pending ancestral domain claims.

A copy of Mr. Marquez' reaction paper is in *Annex 10*.

Jose Mari B. Ponce, Chairman, Cagayan Economic Zone Authority and former DAR Undersecretary for Support Services Office, said that the three papers are good and the views expressed by the authors reflect their respective orientations.

He said, the paper presented by Mr. Conrado Navarro showed not only his experience as an NGO practitioner but also as a bureaucrat. As a bureaucrat, he was able to show the dimensions and the problems of local governance. He agreed to Mr. Brillantes' statement that there is no decentralization without financial devolution or decentralization. Similarly, he noticed that ASec Austere Panadero's paper was based from the ASec's government's point of view.

Another common ground he observed among the three papers is that they recognize the role played by CSO in the development process. He said that some LGUs have grown to realize the role of the civil society in the development process, particularly in their LDCs; and others see them though as a threat to their interests. He explained that this is the reason why some LGUs showed resistance in accrediting these organizations.

Mr. Ponce drew attention to the role played by the CSO in the implementation of agrarian reform from the identification of beneficiaries' stage to land distribution. With their participation, there was less resistance from the landowners to be covered by the program. They were also a great help when the Agrarian Reform Communities Development strategy was first implemented in 1992. Thirteen years later, they are still here and have grown tremendously in number because their involvement in the delivery of support services has been accepted not only by the farmers themselves but by the people's organization, the national government, and project donors. He also acknowledged the help of the civil society in accessing for the additional P50 billion budget of DAR in 1998. It was through them that DAR was extended for 10 years. He wondered what the CSO could do when it expires in 2008.

He emphasized that partnership, even in a very limited way, can produce tangible results. This is one thing that sets Philippines apart from the rest. And this is what the Brazilian Government would like the Philippines to share. In conclusion, he said the solutions to the problems he presented may not be in the four walls of the Innotech conference hall nor anywhere else in the country but maybe in Porto Alegre.

Transcription of Mr. Ponce's reaction points is in ***Annex 11***.

Assistant Secretary Dolly de Quiros-Castillo's reactions raised the following points:

- People's participation, a dynamic and multi-faceted phenomenon, requires a holistic and integrated approach.
 - To understand and harness people's participation one should understand who the stakeholders are and what participation means. Participation can mean many things depending on how one uses the term. Its definition may focus on the process or on the goals, outcome and its contribution. Other definitions would describe the implementer of the action, the factors that influence it, and the venue where it takes place. Different
-

interpretations of participation have evolved in development discourse from the 1970s to the present.

- Participation strengthens social cohesion and inclusiveness that can generate trust, which is crucial in implementing social and economic reforms. In other words, ensuring that the basic sectors participate in decision-making would deepen trust building so that the poor would welcome reform initiatives from the government.
- Hindrances to participation are rooted in the inequitable relationships and arrangements over natural, financial, social and physical resources, structures and institutional processes, opportunities and capacities.
- Ensuring people's participation in essence is not only an add-on but a must do as provided for in the highest law of our country, the constitution and all other related laws that provide for their inclusion of people/basic sector as partners in development, whether it be on macro concerns or sectorally based agenda.

A copy of Assistant Secretary Castillo's reaction paper is in *Annex 12*.

Dr. Ben Malayang III said that while the three papers give several insights on how improved participation in policy making provides a better basis for decision-making and for strengthening development policy. Furthermore, he reacted that the papers described (i) how participation translates to improved stakeholders' ownership of and commitment to the policies, (ii) the constraints to participation, and (iii) how overcoming the constraints could open up opportunities for sustainable development. He emphasized that decentralization and devolution are fundamental national strategies to achieve greater citizen participation in the country.

In summary, he highlighted the following key observations which he considered as important: (i) understanding of the value and occurrence of participation (and of their constraints) is mainly anecdotal and descriptive; (ii) the three papers actually provide the steps to eventually achieve a more analytical and predictive understanding of participation; (iii) autonomy must accompany devolution and decentralization to achieve meaningful development (Brilliantes); (iv) ASec Panadero sees the need to address certain institutional and systemic issues within the DILG and the LGUs themselves so that local decisions can be integrated into national development policies; and (v) understanding the constraints identified by Mr. Navarro is a step toward understanding the dynamics - and the predictability - of how participation translates to policy.

A copy of Dr. Malayang's reaction paper is in *Annex 13*.

5.10 Plenary Session/Open Forum and Debate

The floor was opened to the participants to raise their inquiries, reactions from presentations or clarifications. Several participants gave their additional reactions to the presentations. The highlights are as follow:

Dr. Alex Brillantes of UP NCPAG explained that the comment of Dr. Malayang about decentralization and many of the “advances over the years are in a sense anecdotal, but he thinks this really provides an agenda for a collective people’s involvement in the whole course of rural development, decentralization, etc.

He said, “maybe the time has now come for us to collectively come together to make an honest to goodness study of what has been the impact of devolution/decentralization on poverty. Can you attribute a certain percent of the GNP or whatever, but these are different aspects. That is why this whole thing about developing integers is very important. So I guess the whole point of my very short discussion is that it’s time for us to come up with empirical and quantifiable indicators on what really can be attributed, what percentage of growth, and what percentage of poverty reduction could be attributed to this whole strategy of decentralization and local autonomy. So I should react on the comment on ‘anecdotal’. It has some basis but I think we really should push the envelope further in the paddies now.”

Mr Eduardo Hernandez representing landowners from the Visayas in the PARC commented that there is a need to have an independent party audit of land distribution under the agrarian reform program to be able to assess the effectiveness of land distribution in the Philippines.

Ka Jimmy Tadeo also pointed out that the civil society should consider making collective actions to address agrarian reform issues and attained real rural development, rather than doing things individually which he called “band-aid” development.

FIAN's Fr. Rod Anoran and PEACE's Dong Calmada pointed out that food security should also be the focus of the discussions, the fact that it is related to MDG and Rome Declaration on Food Security, which was one of the motivations for the holding of ICARRD 2006. There should also be an attempt to push our government to implement the Voluntary Guidelines for the progressive realization of the human right to adequate food and be free from hunger.

Mr. Ed dela Torre of Education for Life commented how could the PO, or NGO or DAR integrate agrarian reform in the local government programs/plans and vice versa. He said that the challenge now is how to put PO/NGO and local government efforts together and use it as an enabling environment towards agrarian reform and rural development. He emphasized that initiatives on development should not always come from the center (National Government) but also from the local farmers themselves. He suggested the need to sharpen (strengthen) the locals so that they can contribute to agrarian reform and rural development, in terms of strategies or modalities they gained from their experiences.

Dr. Connie Gultiano from San Carlos University in Cebu underscored and reiterated what Dr. Malayang and Dr. Brillantes have said about the need for more scientific basis for establishing antecedence, determinance and causes of different modalities of participation as well as the consequences of these modalities in different ecological settings. She agreed because that also came out in their studies. She added that aside from that, similar scientific studies would also be very helpful in the area of agrarian reform. She said they

have a study that links population dynamics and land tenure systems; and she stressed the need to broaden the whole idea of population dynamics (not just in the realm of gender), which is very crucial to rural development.

She further explained, “Simple case is the high fertility in rural areas compared to urban areas. What happens if you distribute lands? But in one or two generations, these lands are very much fragmented because of high fertility. Then it was mentioned and there was no follow-up about rural-urban migration of our youth. What happens to rural development if child dependency ratio and old age dependency ratio is very high in rural areas? What happens to your productive age group in the rural areas? So this kind of integration in such studies on rural development even in the realm of agrarian reform is, I think, very important.”

Mr. Pablo Rosales of the Kilusang Mangingisda (Fishermen’s Association) noticed that not much have been discussed on fishing communities and resources in the coastal areas in relation to rural development. He emphasized that the fishers and farmers both composed the rural communities. He said that they (fishers) would like to be assured that they be included in the development projects in the rural development, instead of extracting them out in coastal areas in favor of privatization (resorts) and mariculture in the municipal waters.

Mr. Noel de Luna, Attache for agriculture responded that FAO are doing studies on artesanal fisheries. He said the studies are available on the FAO website. Regarding the government’s effort on fishery development, he mentioned that the Philippines had signed its agreement to the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, which have implications on the policy making on the national, regional, provincial and municipal levels. He added that from the past two years, the Philippine government had also signed and agreed to the treaty (IUU) on unreported and unregulated fishing; and FAO were submitting reports in relation to the treaty every now and then as required.

Ms. Elvira Baladad of the Pambansasng Kongreso ng mga Kababaihan sa Kanayunan made a reaction on Atty Hernandez’ point regarding the possibility of having a third party that would audit the accomplishment of the distribution of 5.5 million hectares of land under the agrarian reform. She said, she would like to know the update of the land distribution; and if lands are being distributed why there are still rising incidences of poverty in the rural areas. She added that the government has not provided enough resources to the farmers; that is why they are still farming and selling palay

USec Madueño of the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR) explained that DAR have program on coastal fisheries also. He said that the government has the so-called convergence initiatives with the Department of Agriculture, Department of Environment and Natural Resources and DAR under the agri-business development program of our President.

On the mechanisms used to monitor the distribution of lands under the agrarian reform, USec Madueño elucidates that there is the so-called PARCCOM, PARC and Agrarian Reform Council, wherein there is a mechanism to the regional, provincial and in fact up to the Barangay level that monitors the accomplishments of land distribution. He emphasized

that civil society, private sector monitor the implementation of DAR. He believes that if this mechanism is active, and in some areas it is, we can actually monitor the issues and concerns or actions taken on the ground. He added that it is not practical to always find the solution from the national, when the solution is actually at the local level. That is why he believes that there is a mechanism and it is a matter of effective implementation of that mechanism.

Carmencita Flores of Sentro Saka, Inc. agreed with Mr. Dela Torre's observation that case studies presented in the dialogue is limited considering that the paper will be brought to ICARRD. She asked what was the rationale behind the focus of the study on local participation or local negotiation process for the Philippines; and she would like to be clarified if they could still suggest FAO to have another consultation to really discuss on the access to land and promoting agrarian reform.

Ms. Rosalud dela Rosa of ICARRD Secretariat responded, "As I mentioned earlier, we only have 6 months to prepare this international conference so the easiest way for FAO was to find entry points on how to open this dialogue process within the supported programs that are already in place with FAO. This was one of them, which is an entry point for us to bring about these kinds of dialogue processes. Now, there is another case study that has been brought forward to us by Parfund. Unfortunately, Butch Olaño did not make it today, but he would have wanted to present a case study here. There is also another case study mentioned by ANGOC and we would welcome more case studies from NGOs if they are willing to submit it. I think that would make this process really very healthy. Now the voluntary national report is a government voluntary initiative where one of the purposes was to also integrate your views that are coming out of this process to the report that the government will be preparing. In other countries, there are also different processes happening. It has been very complicated for us secretariat how to manage this because our deadline is 31st January. And you have to give us your reports by then. If you can, I will make sure that we will integrate them. I can give you deadline up to 7th of February. But we have to get all the outcomes. First is you present your case study and most of these case studies are "cut and paste". You probably have them already. And in fact what I want to mention here, which I have been talking about with some of our fisherfolks group. This process is just the beginning. We are very very pleased with the interest of the participants and we hope you will give us those boxes that we will bring to Porto Allegre because we are not going to reserve these issues here and the idea of Chelly was that we are not here to resolve these issues. In fact, we'd rather have more disagreements that we cannot resolve here to Porto Allegre and that is how we are going to learn from others and we can share them with others. Feel free to send us your case studies, email messages that you want to integrate in this report. You probably have mentioned them when you gave your inputs on the microphone but it is not enough. May be you have boxes of experiences happening in your community that you want to present to us. We are very hungry for examples and this is exactly why we are here. So I would encourage all of you to log on to our ICARRD mail box and submit your boxes that you want us to bring to ICARRD. And hopefully we could put all these boxes into the outcome of this meeting. Please be very active and I think it would be the wealth of this process if you can give us your inputs."

Ms. Teresita Vistro Amihan of the National Federation of Peasant Women commented that there was no mention of the achievement of DAR on agrarian reform in relation to women. She elucidated that in the DAR report in 2002 only 26% of agrarian lands were distributed to women all over the Philippines. She also noted that in one province, there was no peasant woman who was given a CLOA. She added that international studies show that women who were given access to land produce positive effect not only to their family, but also to the whole development of their communities. How come it is too difficult here in the Philippines to acknowledge women's right of access to land, she asked.

Mr. Enrico Cabanit of the Pambansang Ugnayan ng Nagsasariling Organisasyon sa Kanayunan representing Mindanao Farmer Workers Development Council agreed with Atty Hernandez' suggestion to have a third party audit for the distribution of agrarian lands.

He noted that there was no mention of agrarian reform program in the President's State of the Nation Address (SONA). He thinks the government has no political will to implement the agrarian reform that is why it was never mentioned in the SONA. He acknowledged that PARC is involved in the documentation of agrarian reform, but he posted several questions such as: "how to review the 344 million GMA hybrid rice; the questionable 30 million Calawag project in Quezon province; the 728 million being investigated at the Senate; why there is no funds in the Congress; why Senator John Osmena slashed the agrarian reform funds; what does DAR do to cover banana plantation; what happened to the Direct Land Transfer, etc.

The time for the open forum was running out, hence the Ms. Tita Ragragio, the facilitator solicited the decision of the body if they still want to continue on with the open forum. Mr. Dela Torre suggested to continue the open forum so that many could participate. He suggested a semi-organize open forum by having a guide question that is supposed to be used in the groupings. Ms. Tita Ragragio, the facilitator, read the guide question: "Having heard the presentations and the reactions, and based on your experiences, what solutions do you recommend to make people's participation effective and meaningful." The recommendations and proposals should be responding to the seven issues presented in the papers of Dr. Lopez and Mr. Navarro, she further explained. She enumerated the following hindering factors as mentioned in the papers presented. 1) Restrictive and unclear guidelines for PO/NGO representation in local special bodies, 2) Inappropriate under utilization of existing mechanism for participation, 3) Limited resource and capabilities of stakeholders, 4) Lack of needed support for political interference of inaction, 5) negative value system, and 7) adverse external factors that affect local level participation.

Ms. Luz Ani also encouraged the participants to share their experiences in the field and the problems they encountered and how they were able to resolve it. She added that if there are other issues based on their (participants) experience that were not included in the seven issues identified in the study, they could also share it. Ms. Elvira Baladad clarified if the issues on participation refer only to agrarian reform and rural development, because participation in local negotiation is a broad term. Ms Luz Ani responded that participants to focus on participation in local governance that pertains to agrarian reform and rural development only.

The dialogue then made way for further critique from the floor, mostly from the civil society organizations. The overall reaction was that the theme selected for the Philippines-people participation in local negotiations--is not directly linked to agrarian reform and rural development. The thematic dialogue could have started the linking of the two had Brillantes and Panadero attempted to touch on agrarian reform. They should have studied how agrarian reform has been pushed in the context of local governance. It was only Navarro's paper that mentioned agrarian reform but this touched only on the use of mass actions in agrarian reform. Other reactions documented are the following:

Mr. dela Torre suggested to think positively this way: "Agrarian Reform has its own processes.. DAR, civil society engagements, partnership, donor agencies, land lord resistance, urbanization, etc. He said that the Hypothesis is that "we have participatory processes in local governance experience in the Philippines, not necessarily on agrarian reform and rural development.

He asked which of these mechanisms in local governance based on our experience has helped push ARRDR? How can we improve these mechanisms in the light of the limitations, he added. He thinks all comments should be based on the participants' own personal experience of integration and non-integration. He advised the participants to make comments on how representation of farmers in local governance can be improved, and to identify to what extent such participation could be used against them also. Lastly, he advised the participants, particularly the civil society to initiate participation, because often times they refuse to participate.

Mr. Conrado Navarro of PRRM agreed with Mr. dela Torre, however, he commented that it would be difficult to create a linkage between AR and local governance, precisely because of the reason that of all the programs of the government, AR is difficult to localize. Negros wants to localize AR, but it was resisted there, he cited. The problem is how to transfer the experience on participation in local governance through AR at the local level, may be in support services, Navarro added.

Mr. Diosdado Calmada of the Philippine Ecumenical Action for Community Empowerment Foundation, Inc. (PEACE FI) added that AR is difficult to localize because of the problems in the local elites. He also cited that the Philippines is a signatory of the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights and in 1996, FAO organized the Food Summit. He said he is looking for the role of FAO on advocating adequacy in food and since it is also our country's commitment. Likewise, he wants to know if the output of ICARRD would result to monitoring indicators to check if countries are on the right track on agrarian reform and rural development.

Ms. Baladad suggested that the proposed dialogue (to be sponsored by DAR) to talk about more on the issues on agrarian reform be held immediately, if possible on the following week after the Thematic Dialogue, so that they could bring the results to ICARRD also.

Ms. Rosa Antes of the Australian Agency for International Development relayed that one of the issues raised by donors is the number of planning process in the locality from the Barangay level to the provincial level. She said there are too many planning documents that needed to be done. She informed the participants that in one locality there are many

donors; and each donor have their own specific requirements on reporting and planning processes that needs to be done. She noticed that sometimes the capability of the local government unit(s) is being stretched too thinly, because of the different requirements of the donors even from the national government agencies, she noticed. She recommended considering strengthening the existing local development councils rather than creating new mechanisms to be able to meet the requirements of the donors; push for what has been already legislated and just strengthens it.

Dr. Robert Saladar of the Aklan State University relate that in the Case Study in Aklan they found out that there are a lot of things happening in the local level that are not seen in the upper level of management. He said, the beauty of the study was that the limitations that add color to the study and can be used to help improve what our country really needs today.

Furthermore, he agrees with what Mr. Ponce said that the answer to all our inquiries might be in Porto Alegre. He encouraged everyone to gather all experiences on agrarian reform and rural development and together consolidate it and transform it to policy and programs that would help people in the rural communities. He also pointed out that there is a need to recognize that each one has deficiencies, rather than finding faults in the system, each one should admit that somehow each one became a victim of our own cultural traits.

Mr. Clint Bangaan representing the Tebtebba Indigenous People's International Center for Policy Research and Education emphasized the need to recognize the need of the Indigenous People (IPs) to participate in agrarian reform and rural development concerns. He said the challenge for FAO is how to bring in the concerns of the IPs and recognize their rights to food security and land.

Overall, the civil society groups felt that the Thematic Dialogue does not give a fuller picture of the very real and difficult issues of agrarian reform in the Philippines that was only limited to "people participation in local negotiations" and many felt that they were not satisfied if the outcome of the Thematic Dialogue would be the only paper did not commit to be part of the process of formulating or coming up with the final paper on "people participation in local negotiations", it beingfor the country's theme for the ICARRD. Instead, they suggested DAR to come up with a government report on ARRD in consultation with agrarian reform groups, to make sure that the report reflects the interests of civil society.

Agreeing to this sentiment, FAO's Rosalud dela Rosa further asked the participants to submit case studies, which they think, are relevant for the ICARRD. According to her, FAO is very much interested to know all experiences and issues possible toso be brought and shared at that ICARRD with the idea of learning from each other's experiences and learning new solutions. can tackle these and act accordingly. She further sought the participants' participation in the e-conference that is being held until end of January.

5.11 Closing Program

The one-day activity ended in simple closing program.

In his message, *DAR USec Madueño* said that the task ahead for the Department is tremendous considering that the agrarian reform program has served only about 46% of the 2 million agrarian reform beneficiaries. This means 54% are still unserved. This does not include the ARBs in non-agrarian reform communities (ARCs). Also, there are still 12,000 agrarian cases for resolution. He also mentioned the many development strategies the Department undertakes with the participation of ARBs like the ARC strategy. There is also the Program Beneficiaries Development that builds the capabilities of farmer beneficiaries and their organizations. In the ARCs, infrastructure development that opened irrigation facilities, farm-to-market roads, and storage facilities, has been credited with being responsible for increased market access and increased off-farm and non-farm incomes. He also noted the gains achieved from foreign-assisted programs, most of which are now undertaken jointly with LGUs. Development plans like the ARC Development Plan and the KALAHI Agrarian Reform Zone Plans are prepared in coordination with the LGU.

In his closing statement, *Mr. Noel de Luna*, Attaché for Agriculture, Rome, congratulated the participants for a very fruitful exercise not only in preparation to the International Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development but also as a review of their collective experience in people's participation and decision-making. The activity was able to identify the elements that improve local negotiation processes. According to him, sustainable development can only be attained if various stakeholders are committed to do it and have an ownership in the process. For this to happen, stakeholders must participate in policy-making. As a concluding statement, he said the international community looks upon the Philippines as one of the best models in agrarian reform and rural development. For this reason, they are looking forward to a bigger participation of the Philippines in the coming ICARRD (see *Annex 14*).

6.0 Lessons learned from the Thematic Dialogue and challenges identified

6.1 Challenges for ICARRD

During the Thematic Dialogue workshop, Mr. Edicio dela Torre stated that agrarian reform is subject to the push and pull of political forces. It was definitely not easy to translate this program into reality. According to him, approaches vary on how this program had to go through. What approach should be taken? The one that is threatening or the one that raises pity. He is certain that an intensified discussion about this will take place in the ICARRD in Brazil.

He presented three challenges for ICARRD to address. First, will agrarian reform be able to achieve the Millennium Development Goals? Also, is the ICARRD a global conference to market local possibilities? Is there any global hope? The second challenge, will agrarian reform succeed through a global, national and local approach? The third challenge concerns the civil society organization, the marginalized sector of society, and small farmers.

Mr. de la Torre put the context of the discussion as needing to respond to the broad topic of agrarian reform and rural development *versus* what was put on the discussion table that deals only on local participation, negotiation and governance.

The complex contexts of addressing the enabling environment (such as those effective participation that we want to put in place) *versus* the real situations of production systems are not addressed in the Thematic Dialogue presentations. He cautioned participants with “summit fatigue” (from WCARRD to ICARRD) and challenged them what can make ICARRD different given such very limited resources.

The choice of uprising and revolution that is being called by the others may perhaps not equate to reform. What would be necessary, in his opinion, is to put what is happening in the local news (what is happening at the local communities), which should be brought at the global level. He reminded participants on the need to value public words (words that are publicly spoken), which should be practiced by Civil Society Organizations, NGOs and governments.

The need for a combined case studies bringing local participation to central government at ICARRD – showing synergy effect and the effect of aggregating small contributions will be necessary. ICARRD provides the enabling environment for the Philippines stakeholders to capture what is happening at the local, national and global levels. The fact that civil societies are not too well organized is something that should be reflected upon. He called the attention of the participants to join the MDG road and to join with the Brazilians on the road to ICARRD. The need for a collective position, choosing the fight, setting the goals and priority actions should all be taken into consideration.

6.2 Lessons gained from foreign-assisted projects

Based on experiences in the CIDA-LGSP, the lessons gained in participatory implementation of development programs are [Panadero]:

- Participation helps the LGU maximize the use of their resources;
- Participation reduces the likelihood of contentious confrontation before the LGUs;
- Participation enhances trust in Government;
- Participation ensures continuity of plans despite changes in leadership;
- Participation helps in:
 - Accurate identification of problems, issues, needs and concerns;
 - Proper identification of programs and projects;
 - Proper identification of needed legislative action; and
 - Building stakeholders’ support and ownership of the Executive-Legislative Agenda.

Similar positive lessons were gained in the PATSARRD. Recent assessment made on the project has also revealed of problems and constraints that led the formulation of comprehensive measures to protect and maintain the development momentum achieved by the project. Reflective of the lessons gained as well as the identified problems and constraints, these measures are summarized as follows:

- Ensure clear understanding among implementing partners of the strategy of convergence employed in the project - by establishing a good data base and clarification of project objectives and partners' roles and responsibilities;
- Synchronize partner's activities - by selecting common priority areas with at least existing basic infrastructure facilities, agreeing on unified goals, areas, plan and priorities without establishing a new organizational structure, interface with other convergence projects, create appropriate shared delivery mechanism, and develop partner organizations and agencies as a team;
- Strengthen communication among partners and stakeholders – by conducting continuous information dissemination and holding of regular meetings among partners;
- Provision of management and technical staff support – by getting the commitment and competent support of the management and the technical staff of partner organizations and agencies;
- Enhance manpower capabilities – by promoting value formation among partners, and providing human resource development and capability-building program;
- Improve planning, implementation and monitoring systems – by incorporating market considerations in development plans, monitor the projects regularly, collaborate with the private sector, and replicate positive experiences; and
- Develop and strengthen local structures – by strengthening the Local Development Councils and developing the LGUs as lead institutions in poverty reduction programs.

6.3 Reversals in Redistribution Program and Potential Adverse Impact of Decentralization

The lessons gained by NGOs involved in agrarian reform and rural development related activities in rural communities reflect the realities of agrarian reform implementation at the local level as seen from the standpoint of civil society organizations. These are summarized in the reaction paper of one of the four (4) reactors during the workshop [Marquez] as follows:

- Even if agrarian reform policies are successfully instituted, political elites tend to reverse the reform gains during succeeding administrations.
 - Experience also shows that rural elites have been capable of regaining the land redistributed to peasants, and do so through money lending, land purchase, leaseback arrangements, and outright eviction. [Marquez].
-

- Considering the existing political situation, where the local government is controlled by the landed elite, devolution merely increases the power of the local elite to consolidate their assets and thwart efforts at reform. Increasing such power of the elites is likely to reinforce political patronage and feudal dependence – values that agrarian reform seeks to change.
- Decentralization without property reform brings greater politicization of land issues, which manifests in various several forms, e.g., i) wholesale conversion of land to other uses to avoid agrarian reform; ii) granting of public leases and concessions to kin and favored businesses; iii) manipulation of production records to influence land valuation; iv) harassment of local activists and farmer groups; and v) withdrawal of support for those advocating agrarian reform.
- There has been wide appreciation on the importance of the ongoing Land Administration and Management Project (LAMP). However, good and efficient as it is, it is *not* land reform.

6.4 Effects of limited GO-CSO institutional partnership mechanism

From the same perspective of civil society groups, assessment of GO-CSO institutional partnership mechanism that tackles access to land by basic sectors (farmers/farm workers, urban poor and indigenous people) gives results indicating, among others, that:

- Discussion of cross-sectoral land issues, such as land conversion, is mainly limited to government agencies.
- Accomplishments and continuity of programs highly depend on political will of incumbent government officials.
- Turfing/overlapping roles of government agencies on some functions delay accomplishments.
- Questions arise as to whether local constituencies are adequately informed of national-level discussions and agreements [Marquez].

6.5 Cultural Values as Driving Forces of Local Social Dialogues or Negotiations

While engaging in community work with farmers in nearby ARC and non-ARC areas, academic staff from the Aklan State University (ASU) had gained lessons in people participation which were inputted into the FAO-PPLG case studies report and referred to during the workshop by the ASU representative. These pertain to findings on social relationships and dynamics that serve as driving forces or motivation for people to participate in social dialogues or negotiations at the community level, namely:

- Kinship relationship and/or reciprocity (or *pakikisama*) values oblige a person to participate if he/she is invited by a close relative or friend.
-

- Leadership status likewise obliges a person to participate lest he/she loses the esteem from his/her group or suffers guilt feelings or shame (*hiya*, in Filipino) for failing to meet his/her group's expectation.
- Strong religious commitment, such as among members of some Christian Charismatic group in the country, motivates a person to participate in negotiations that deal with improving the community, an activity that the group normally associates with service to God.

Although not much discussed during the workshop, the lessons gained by the academic staff provide clues to fully understand the local political dynamics. This is especially so at the barangay and municipal levels where primary social relationships of people exert strong influence on their behavior; either positively or negatively, depending on their impact on the larger scheme of things. The same relationships underlie the behavior of PO and NGO representatives, assuming they are both members of the same community even if their respective organizations vary in purpose and program of activities;⁵ and differentiate their behavior from those who are not from the same community.

6.6 Other Motivating Factors

Other motivating factors were also identified in the lessons gained in ARC and non-ARC areas covered by the FAO-PPLG case studies as well as in other areas where implementation of development projects had adopted participatory approaches [FAO-PPLG Study]. These factors are:

- Counter-parting scheme with project beneficiaries;
- Capability building: introduced new technology and skills;
- Livelihood development, e.g. provision of supplemental livelihood;
- Government support (e.g. funding and grant of rights);
- Material/credit assistance and other privileges; and
- Commitment of participating agencies and organizations.

⁵ POs, as distinguished from NGOs, are those that are organized by the members for the purpose of pursuing their own individual interest; while NGOs are aimed to serve the interest not of its own members but of its defined group of beneficiaries or the public at large [cf. FAO-PPLG Study].

PART THREE: POSSIBILITIES FOR FUTURE COOPERATION

7.0 Possibilities for Future Cooperation

The preparatory activities that culminated in the national stakeholder workshop have raised a number of possibilities for future multi-stakeholder cooperation premised on active and meaningful people participation as a strategy to achieve sustainable agrarian reform and rural development in the Philippines. These possibilities are in the areas of: i) continuing advocacy for meaningful participation; ii) strengthening of functional GO-NGO-PO collaboration; iii) effective utilization of existing participatory mechanisms; iv) building up of institutional capacities; v) provision of funding support; vi) information dissemination; and vi) monitoring and feed backing.

7.1 Continuing Advocacy Efforts

7.11 Dissemination of Good and Best Practices in Good Governance

Advocacy for good governance, focused on people participation, transparency and accountability, is one challenging area of cooperation to address the issues of political interference and related issues impinging on agrarian reform and rural development. This could be done by sustaining the present programs of disseminating and encouraging good and best practices through peer-to-peer exchange of experiences, cross-visits (lakbay-aral), and giving of appropriate awards recognizing exemplary initiatives at the local level, such as: the Galing Pook Award; Hamis Awards; Konrad Adenauer Medal of Excellence; DILG Awards, e.g. Clean and Green, Gawad Pamana, Sajid Bulig, etc; and the Local Government Leadership Award. The activities may include:

- Encouraging local governments to participate and submit applications to such awards, or encourage competition in a positive sense; and
- Identifying outstanding local leaders who could serve as inspiration for other local leaders.

7.12 Encourage Mass Action as a Lobbying and Solidifying Organizational Tool

Mass action may have to be boosted with broader multi-stakeholder participation to lobby for the passage of vital legislation and, thus, address the problem of political inaction; and, at the same time, enhance multi-stakeholder vigilance and organizational solidarity. The Agenda of Action may include the following:

- Intensify the lobbying for the passage of the LSR law presently spearheaded by Task Force Local Sectoral Representation (TF-LSR), together with the Local Government Support Program (LGSP), the Barangay-Bayan Governance Consortium (BBGC), and the Task Force Participatory Local Governance (TF-PLG), by involving the mass organizations of women, industrial and agricultural workers, urban poor, indigenous peoples, disabled persons, and other sectors who stand to benefit from the passage of this law. The call to action should include
-

support for the political plans of legislators who will vote for the law, and rejection in the polls of those who will oppose it.

- Lobby for the legislation of a Land Use Act, as has been endorsed by civil society groups as early as 1996 under Agenda 21 of the Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) but the draft bill has been languishing in Congress since then.
- Promote a genuine, development-oriented mass action of the poor (or the dukha) suitable to the political environment at the local level. As revealed during the workshop, current modes of mass action have been generally suitable only to the center of national government (Metro Manila), where media support is readily accessible.
- Advocate new community organizing (CO) strategy focusing on integrated area development, looking into ‘ecological zones’ as defined by watershed systems rather than political boundaries, linking-up producers with consumers [Marquez; Brillantes].
- Advocate the need to consider population changes and dynamics (e.g. population growth, relative densities, dependency age ratio) and the trend towards increasing feminization in the agricultural sector that leaves prime responsibility for farming and household incomes to the women, and translate these into suitable gender-oriented policies and programs in agrarian reform and rural development [cf. Socorro Gultiano et al, Population Dynamics, Land Availability, and Adapting Land Tenure Systems: Philippines, A Case Study (a research project funded by FAO), 2003].

7.2 Functional Collaboration

7.21 Conducting Regular Joint Executive-Legislative Council Meetings

To ensure that the formulated local development plan by the LDC that incorporates priority needs of rural communities is provided with appropriate local budgetary support and appropriation, functional collaboration between the Executive and Legislative Councils should be established. This could be achieved through concerted and enlightened efforts pursued by the LGU (through its executive branch headed by the Brgy Chairman, Mayor or Governor respective of levels, and legislative branch led by the Vice-Mayor or Vice-Governor at the municipal and provincial levels); and the civil society organization and private sector groups that are represented in the executive council through the LDC.

7.22 Adopting Measures to Strengthen CSO Participation in the LDC

In order to ensure broad and functional participation of CSOs in the LDC, the following measures may have to be implemented:

- Treat the provision in the Local Government Code on 25% CSO representation in the LDC as minimum, not maximum size of representation; as such, the LGU should endeavor to include as many CSOs as there can be accredited in the province, municipality or barangay, even if they would already equal or even outnumber the non-CSO members in the LDC.
- The IRR of the Local Government Code should have a provision that an LDC decision is only valid if at least the majority of the CSO representatives are present regardless of how they voted during the meeting.
- DILG should reinstate the system whereby the detailed allocation of the 20% Development Fund is discussed, debated and agreed upon in the LDC and not just left to the discretion of the LCE.
- Relax the requirements for accrediting CSO representation, e.g.: i) waive the formal registration requirements and substitute it with other proof of legitimacy, like written endorsement or testimony of integrity and track record by respected officials or civic leaders, ii) submission of audited financial statements should not be compulsory; a financial report reviewed by the members of the organization is sufficient; iii) documentary proofs should be submitted in just one (1) copy, not seven (7) copies.

7.3 Exploring alternative strategies

Alternative strategies for enhancing multi-stakeholder participation may have to be explored, such as follows:

- Harnessing positive rural values. The alternative of complementing existing practice of providing material incentives, such as presently practiced in foreign-assisted projects, has to be explored. Attention may be given to the possibility of harnessing the positive rural values underlying cherished traditional modes of cooperation such as the bayanihan, which was done during the Magsaysay administration in the 50's. This would need in-depth study to identify these values, which could be done through a collaborative effort of agencies involved in cultural reawakening and promotion programs in the country, like the DECS and its attached offices, the DOT and the Academe.
 - Explore the effectiveness of Inter-LGU collaborative arrangements. Given the limited tenure of elected local officials, LGUs may be encouraged to enter into collaborative arrangements with neighboring LGUs to address common development issues. This can be done by studying and examining the experiences of LGUs that have collaborative tie-up with each other, such as: Metro Naga, BLIST (Baguio, La Trinidad, Itogo, Sablan and Tuba in the Cordillera region, the Cagayan-Iligan Corridor, CAMANAVA, (Caloocan, Malabon, Navotas and Valenzuela).
-

7.4 Utilization of Existing Mechanisms

7.41 Utilization of the LDCs

There should also be concerted effort on the part of concerned national government agencies led by DILG, the LGUs at all levels, civil society organizations, the private/business sector to utilize the LDC by encouraging and providing it with the opportunity to fully perform its mandated functions.

At the municipal and provincial levels, the functions of the LDC are:

- To formulate long-term and medium-term and annual socio-economic development plans and policies
- To formulate medium-term and annual investment programs
- To appraise and prioritize socio-economic development programs and projects
- To formulate local investment incentives to promote the inflow and direction of private investment capital
- To coordinate, monitor and evaluate the implementation of development programs and projects

At the barangay level, the functions of the LDCs are:

- Mobilize people's participation in local development efforts
- Prepare barangay development plans based on local requirements
- Monitor and evaluate the implementation of national or local programs and projects
- Perform such other functions as may be prescribed by law or competent authority

7.42 Utilization of the Barangay Assembly

The Barangay Assembly could be the only local institutional mechanism as identified in the FAO-PPLG Study that, if properly utilized, can facilitate direct and broadest people participation. Being composed of all residents and vested with powers that can be exercised to address the problems and needs of the poor and marginalized groups, the body can serve as political training ground and jump-off point for this sector to get organized and be active players in the country's development scenario, pursuing their interest in a unified manner (the "sama-samang pagkilos ng mga dukha" or "united action of the poor", as propounded during the workshop) with functional representation in the LDC.

To properly utilize the Barangay Assembly, concerted effort may be exerted by the DILG that has overall supervisory functions over the LGUs; the DA, with its mandate to implement the Magna Carta of Small Farmers; the NAPC that is tasked to organize the basic sectors at different levels of local governance; the civil society organizations, particularly those with the mission and capability for community organizing; and the private/business sector organizations that are conscious of their "corporate social

responsibilities” and have the three “Ts” (Time, Talent, Treasure) to share in the overall endeavor.

7.5 Institutional Capacity Building

As pointed out in the FAO-PPLG Study, the limited capabilities of the various stakeholders hinder many of them to effectively perform their mandated development-oriented functions. There is a need to provide, especially the key stakeholders, with continuous training programs consisting of awareness, skill, and the various aspects of institutional strengthening that include value formation and enhancement of organizational, administrative, technical, financial and managerial capabilities, as well as community organizing and leadership skills.

7.51 Priority Stakeholder Groups

The capacity building program may be directed at the following priority stakeholder groups:

- **Local Chief Executives (LCEs):** These include the barangay chairmen, municipal mayors and provincial governors. The training may focus on participatory development approaches to enable them to appreciate the importance of people’s participation in local governance. It may also include study visit to LGUs where the LCEs are already practicing participatory development approaches and can demonstrate how such approaches have resulted in better governance and, by extension, better re-election chances for them.
 - **LGU staff:** Designated LGU staff may undergo interactive workshops and hands-on training in the documentation of best practices in participatory governance. The training may be undertaken with the assistance of the Local Government Academy and the Gawad Galing Pook secretariat.
 - **LDCs:** The LDC members may be trained on the basic elements of development planning, monitoring and evaluation. This may be conducted in close collaboration with the NEDA, DILG and civil society organizations.
 - **CSOs:** The civil society organizations may be trained on how local development plans and budgets are formulated and promulgated, as well as on the skills of planning, monitoring and evaluation so that they can effectively participate in the formulation, promulgation, monitoring and evaluation of local development plans and budgets at the barangay, municipal and provincial levels.
 - **National government agency key personnel:** Key personnel of such national agencies as the DILG, DA, DAR, DENR and NAPC who are involved in field operations and coordination work with the various stakeholders may also have to undergo appropriate training, especially on clarification of roles under a partnership set-up with civil society organizations and donor agencies.
-

7.52 Design Formulation

DILG, together with the other concerned national agencies (DAR, DA, DENER, NAPC), with the assistance of concerned government and non-government training institutions of the country (e.g. the network of Association of Schools of Public Administration of the Philippines or the Local Government Training and Research Institutions), may initiate the formulation of a capacity building program and subsequent preparation of training designs on participatory governance and development approaches, incorporating the inherent needs and requirements and defining the required output and expected impact of the program on local development initiatives.

The design of training programs for local governments should be made with the participation of the local government units and the concerned civil society organization. It should also include consultation with the target stakeholder groups. This means that they should be intensively consulted about their training needs. It is suggested that, considering their position, the training of the LCEs should adopt a more pragmatic and practical approach to the transfer of knowledge and skills, and foster a peer-to-peer exchange of experiences and lessons learned from successful approaches already undertaken by other LGUs.

7.6 Funding Support

7.61 Establishing Sustainable Fund Sources

Provision of funding support is indispensable. As such, concerted efforts should be exerted to establish a sustainable source of this kind of support. The funds could be obtained from the following:

- **Regular budget appropriation:** The budgetary support for enhancing the role of the LDC and the conduct the public consultation and social dialogue may have to be made an integral part of the budget appropriation in the 20 percent development fund to be legislated by the LGU's legislative council (Sanggunian).
 - **Congressional sources:** This refers to the Priority Development Assistance Fund (PDAF) or Countryside Development Fund (CDF), otherwise known as "Pork Barrel" of the members of Congress (Congressmen and Senators) could be realigned for this purpose, LGUs may not find it too difficult to get a share of this funds, if only for the fact that the congressman especially has a representation in the LDC at all levels. Otherwise, some form of lobbying may have to be done during budget deliberation in congress.
 - **Private/business sector:** The potential contributions of the private sector, particularly business organizations that have the sense of "corporate social responsibility." A campaign for funding support from this group could be pursued through the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP), a corporate-led development foundation now composed of 160 socially responsible member corporations that are committed to making strategic contributions to improve the living conditions of the poor.
-

- Foreign donor: This includes the USAID, ADB, JBIC, AUSAID, CIDA, UNDP, World Bank, and FAO; and such international funding institutions as the Ford Foundation, the Asia Foundation, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, and so forth.

7.62 Deputizing NGOs as Alternative

LGUs that cannot support a secretariat for the LDC may consider designating capable NGOs operating within its territory to provide secretariat services to the LDC. The deputized NGO may then prepare an action plan and a budget proposal that can be submitted, with the endorsement of the LCE, to potential funding sources (e.g., PAGCOR, PCSO), local donors (including corporate foundations) and foreign funding institutions.

7.7 Information Dissemination

The FAO-PPLG Study has suggested that to encourage full support and cooperation, any new activity must be clearly understood and accepted by the various stakeholders. This could be achieved through effective information dissemination. During the workshop the possible activities for future cooperation in information dissemination were raised as follows:

7.71 Conduct of IEC

Information, Education and Communication (IEC) campaign may be undertaken to overcome any negative value that people may have on existing policies and programs and how are these implemented on the ground. The IEC campaign could be launched by the DILG, with the support of the Philippine Information Agency (PIA), government and private mass media, and the NGO community. Some NGOs, like those of the Alliance of Community Development Advocates (ACDA), a network of NGOs founded by PRM in Nueva Vizcaya, are already carrying out this kind of IEC campaign by themselves.

7.72 Coordination with media

The information dissemination efforts may be pursued with appropriate coordination with media. The latter plays highly influential role in the country and can call the attention of policy makers to consider in the formulation of policies the local issues and the lessons gained in the actual implementation of development programs and projects in rural communities. Media can also help in the conduct of IEC by coming up with feature stories or description of programs and projects that are successful and have resulted in greater benefits to people because they participated in the selection and prioritization, planning, implementation and monitoring of such programs and projects.

7.73 Addressing what people want and need to know

The IEC efforts may have to carry along information that people want and need to know. The queries of the participants during the workshop are reflective of what this information could be. Some of these queries are:

- What has agrarian reform done to improve the plight of women?
- What happened to the 5.5m hectares of land distributed under CARP? Ilan CLOA ang nabawi at isinauli sa may-ari? Ilan ang na-kanal? Ilan ang nakinabang? (How many CLOAs have been taken back and returned to the landowner? How many got derailed? How many have benefited?)
- What happened to the recovered Marcos wealth that is intended for CARP? Conflicts of interest related to the road development among beneficiaries and project-affected people
- Has FAO made a comprehensive study for fishermen who should really be helped in discussions capturing development?
- What has been the impact of decentralization and devolution to poverty?

7.8 Monitoring and feedback

In order to make sure that varied tasks and roles of different stakeholders are performed and whether the targeted outputs and objectives are achieved, an effective participatory monitoring scheme should be put in place through concerted effort of key stakeholders, again involving the national agencies such as the DILG, DAR, DA, DENR and NAPC; the LGUs at all levels; civil society organizations; and the private/business sector groups.

7.81 Establishing the scheme and indicators

Inasmuch as the participatory mechanisms at the local level are institutionalized in the LGU structure and operation, it is only logical that the LGU shall establish the scheme and develop key performance indicators for effective participatory data gathering and evaluation in close consultation with the other key stakeholders, starting with the DILG and other concerned national agencies, the civil society organizations and the private sector groups. The LGU shall also establish baseline data and define target values as basis for periodic monitoring achievements of performance indicators.

Three sets of indicators are suggested by civil society organizations to measure the success of effective participation. These are, namely: (a) the increased skills of the leaders, (b) increased activeness by the members and (c) better projection of the organization in the local community.

7.82 Conduct of participatory monitoring

Implementation of the scheme may be coordinated by the DILG, which shall serve as the lead agency, in close collaboration with the LGU and other key stakeholders and may include a secretariat housed in a local DILG office and manned by DILG field staff with possible assistance to be provided by assigned staff from other key stakeholders. Through the secretariat, DILG may thus:

- Assist the LGU in coordinating and monitoring the conduct of regular meetings of the LDCs; and
- Ensure that the designated staff closely monitor and report the real situation, such as the actual composition and operation of the LDCs, by adopting a system of verifying the accuracy of the information gathered by the monitoring staff.

7.83 Follow-through and Feed Backing Activities

Follow through activities and regular feed backing mechanisms are essential elements to sustain good rapport and commitment between and among stakeholders. These may be undertaken in terms of the following:

- A system should put in place to enable stakeholders to listen and respond, to make and keep promises, and maintain reciprocal relationship with each other.
 - Rapid action and feedback is of paramount importance; as such, the system should be able to deliver information and feedback to and from one stakeholder to another, and form a crucial connection between resource holders and users in a fast, accurate, and responsive manner.
-

ANNEXES

Annex 1 Programme of the Philippine National Stocktaking and Thematic Dialogue

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Philippine National Stocktaking and Thematic Dialogue:
“New Challenges and Options for Revitalizing Rural Communities”

PROGRAMME

8:00-9:00	REGISTRATION	Secretariat
9:00-10:00	OPENING PROGRAM	
	Opening Prayer	
	National Anthem	Ms. Mary Ann Z. Vargas <i>FAO-PATSARRD</i>
	Introduction of Participants	Mr. Aris Portugal <i>FAO-PATSARRD</i>
	Welcome Remarks	Sec. Nasser Pangandaman <i>DAR</i>
	Keynote Address	Mr. Ramesh C.A. Jain <i>FAO-UN</i>
10:00-10:15	WORKSHOP OVERVIEW AND PRESENTATION OF ICARRD	Ms. Rosalud dela Rosa <i>FAO ICARRD Secretariat</i>
10:15-10:30	BACKGROUND OF FAO-PPLG STUDY	Dr. Roger Lopez <i>OIDCI</i>
	PRESENTATION OF PAPERS BY DISCUSSANTS	
10:30-11:00		Mr. Conrado Navarro <i>PRRM</i>
11:00-11:30		Dr. Alex Brillantes <i>NCPAG</i>
11:30-12:00		Asec. Austere Panadero <i>DILG</i>
12:00-1:00	Lunch Break	
	REACTION TO PRESENTATION	
1:00-1:15		Mr. Nathaniel Don Marquez <i>ANGOC</i>
1:15-1:30		Mr. Jose Mari Ponce <i>CEZA</i>
1:30-1:45		Asec. Dolores de Quiros-Castillo <i>NAPC</i>
1:45-2:00		Dr. Ben Malayang III <i>DAP</i>
2:00-2:45	OPEN FORUM	Facilitators
2:45-4:00		Group Rapporteurs
4:00-5:00	CHALLENGES FOR ICARRD	Mr. Edicio dela Torre <i>Education for Life Foundation</i>
5:00-5:20		
5:20-6:00	CLOSING PROGRAM	
	Message	Usec. Gerundio C. Madueño <i>DAR</i>
	Awarding of Certificates of Participation	Mr. Ramesh C.A. Jain <i>FAO</i>
	Closing Remarks	Chairman Noel de Luna <i>Attache for Agriculture, Rome</i>

Annex 2 List of participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Government Agencies

1. USec Gerundio Madueño Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
2. Ms. Susan Leones Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
3. Ms. Herminia Fe San Juan Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
4. Ms. Ma. Celerina Afable Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
5. Ms. Liza Repotente Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
6. ASec Ruel Lucentelas Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD)
7. Mr. Renato dela Cruz Department of Agriculture (DA-ATI)
8. Ms. Li-ann de Leon League of Municipalities of the Philippines (LMP)
9. Mr. Bladimir Mansenido League of Municipalities of the Philippines (LMP)
10. Mr. Felizardo Virtucio Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) / National Economic Development Authority (NEDA)
11. Mr. Roberto Saladar Aklan State University (ASU)
12. Ms. Socorro Gultiano University of San Carlos (USC)
13. Mr. Noel de Luna Philippine Embassy in Italy

Non-Government Organizations

1. Mr. Edicio dela Torre Education for Life Foundation (ELF)
 2. Ms. Mary Ann Manahan Focus on the Global South, Philippine Programme (FGS)
 3. Ms. Bernardine Villar Philippine Agrarian Reform Foundation for National Development (PARFUND)
 4. Mr. Jaybee Garganera Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources for Rural Areas (PhilDRRA)
 5. Ms. Carmina Flores Sentro Saka, Inc. (SSI)
 6. Mr. Ernesto Lim Peoples' Campaign for Agrarian Reform Network (AR Now!)
 7. Mr. Edgardo Tongson Kabang Kalikasan ng Pilipinas (KKP)
 8. Mr. Enrico Cabanit Mindanao Farmer Workers Development Center (MFWDC)
 9. Ms. Teresita Vistro Amihan National Federation of Peasant Women (NFPW)
 10. Ms. Elvira Baladad Pambansang Kongreso ng mga Kababaihan sa Kanayunan (PKKK)
 11. Mr. Vicente Fabe Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PKSM)
 12. Fr. Rodrigo Anoran FIAN Philippines
-

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|--|
| 13. | Mr. Clint Bangan | Tebtebba Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education (Tebtebba) |
| 14. | Mr. Jaime Tadeo | Pilipinas/Alyansa ng mga Maliliit na Magsasaka at Mangingisda (PARAGOS) |
| 15. | Ka Pablo Rosales | Kilusang Mangingisda (KM) |
| 16. | Mr. Buddy dela Cruz | Kilusang Mangingisda (KM) |
| 17. | Mr. Jayson Lamcher | Legal Rights and Natural Resources Center, Inc. Kasama sa Kalikasan (LRNRCKK) |
| 18. | Mr. Diosdado Calmada | Philippine Ecumenical Action for Community Empowerment Foundation, Inc. (PEACE FI) |
| 19. | Mr. Abel Butor | Pambansang Kaisahan ng mga Magsasaka sa Pilipinas (PKMP) |
| 20. | Ms. Cora Bolong | Development Research Initiatives (DRI) |

Private Sector

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------|---|
| 1. | Atty. Eduardo Hernandez | Member, Presidential Agrarian Reform Council (PARC) |
|----|-------------------------|---|

International Organizations

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|
| 1. | Mr. Ramesh C.A. Jain | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| 2. | Mr. Arcadio Cruz | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| 3. | Ms. Rosalud dela Rosa | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| 4. | Mr. Edgar Guardian | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| 5. | Ms. Linda Dolatre | German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) |
| 6. | Ms. Rosa Antes | Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) |
| 7. | Ms. Masami Bolt | Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) |
| 8. | Mr. Arsenio Balisacan | SEARCA |

Presenters

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|
| 1. | Mr. Conrado Navarro | Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) |
| 2. | Dr. Alex Brillantes | National College of Local Governance and Administration (NCPAG - UP Diliman) |
| 3. | ASEC Austere Panadero | Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) |

Lead Reactors

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Mr. Jose Mari Ponce | Cagayan Economic Zone Authority (CEZA) |
| 2. | Mr. Nathaniel Don Marquez | Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC) |
| 3. | Dr. Ben Malayang, III | Development Academy of the Philippines (DAP) |
| 4. | ASEC Dolores de Quiros-Castillo | National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) |
-

Facilitators / Secretariat

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---|
| 1. | Dr. Rogelio Lopez | Orient Integrated Development Consultants, Inc.
(OIDCI) |
| 2. | Ms. Conchita Ragrario | OIDCI |
| 3. | Ms. Shirley Aquino | OIDCI |
| 4. | Ms. Eden Cagungun | OIDCI |
| 5. | Ms. Mylene Obach | OIDCI |
| 6. | Mr. Philip Acosta | OIDCI |
| 7. | Mr. Aristeo Portugal | Philippines-Australia Technical Support for Agrarian
Reform and Rural Development (PATSARRD) |
| 8. | Mr. Gomer Tumbali | PATSARRD |
| 9. | Ms. Luz Ani | PATSARRD |
| 10. | Mr. Alberto Aduna | PATSARRD |
| 11. | Mr. Jun David | PATSARRD |
| 12. | Ms. Editha Duldulao | PATSARRD |
| 13. | Ms. Hazel Gonzales | PATSARRD |
| 14. | Ms. Mary Ann Vargas | PATSARRD |
| 15. | Ms. Bea Mendinueto | PATSARRD |

LIST OF OTHER INVITEES (not present)

Government

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------|--|
| 1. | USec Demetrio Ignacio | Department of Environment and Natural Resources |
| 2. | Secretary Nasser Pangandaman | Department of Agrarian Reform |
| 3. | Manuel Gotis | Bureau of Local Government Development, DILG |
| 4. | Secretary Luwalhati Pablo | Department of Social Welfare and Development |
| 5. | Donato C. Endencia | Development Assistance Department, Land Bank of
the Philippines |
| 6. | Secretary Zamzamin Ampatuan | National Anti-Poverty Commission |
| 7. | Gerry Calderon | League of Mayors |

Private Sector

- | | | |
|-----|------------------|--|
| 8. | Gil Salazar | Philippine Business for Social Progress |
| 9. | Shiela Coronel | Philippine Center for Investigative Journalism |
| 10. | Rosemarie Valdez | Land Owner |

Academe

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--|
| 11. | Simeon Ilago | National College of Local Governance and
Administration, UP Diliman |
| 12. | Prudencio Gordoncillo | Institute of Agrarian Studies, UP Los Baños |

Civil Society Organizations/ Non-Government Organizations

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|
| 13. | Jose Noel Olano | Philippine Agrarian Reform Foundation for National Development (Parfund) |
| 14. | Cresente Paez | National Confederation of Cooperatives |
| 15. | Corazon Soliman | International Center for Innovation, Transformation and Excellence in Governance (INCITEGOV) |

International Organizations

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|--|
| 16. | Ute Huebner | German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) |
| 17. | Gerard Belanger | Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) |
| 18. | Kyo Naka | United Nations Development Programme |
| 19. | Thomas Crouch | Asian Development Bank |
| 20. | Rubens Anna Fedele | Embassy of the Republic of Italy |
| 21. | Joachim von Amsberg | World Bank |
| 22. | Jon Lindborg | United States Agency for International Development |
| 23. | Steven Rood | The Asia Foundation |
| 24. | Katsuyoshi Ishii | Embassy of Japan |
| 25. | Osamu Murata | Japan Bank for International Cooperation |
-

