

Philippines-Australia
Local Governance Development Program



LGDP



Australian Government

AusAID

An Australian Government, AusAID Initiative

MIGEDC PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

C o n t e n t s

I.	Background	5
II.	Program Effectiveness	5
	Achievements	5
	Changes to Design	10
	Assessment of Management	10
	<i>Risk Management</i>	11
	<i>Procurement</i>	11
	<i>Coordination with Partners and ODA</i>	12
	<i>Counterpart Contributions</i>	12
	<i>Involvement of Stakeholders</i>	12
	<i>Overall Management</i>	13
III.	Efficiency	13
	Qualitative Assessment of Costs and Benefits	13
	Value	14
IV.	Impact and Sustainability	15
	Gender and Environmental Considerations	17
V.	Relevance of Program	17
	Context in Relation to the Regional Development Plan	17
	Performance Indicators and Modality	18
VI.	Lessons Learned	18
	Program Design	18
	MIGEDC Partnerships – Structures and Systems	19
	Addressing Barriers to Local Economic Development	20
	Policy Environment supporting MIGEDC	21
	MIGEDC Capacity Building	22
	Internal Coordination of AusAID’s Local Level Programs	23
	External Coordination with other ODA	23

VII. Recommendations	23
Program Design	23
MIGEDC Partnerships – Structures and Systems	24
Addressing Barriers to Local Economic Development	24
Policy Environment supporting MIGEDC	25
MIGEDC Capacity Building	25
Internal Coordination of AusAID’s Local Level Programs	25
External Coordination with other ODA	26
VIII. Conclusion	26

A p p e n d i c e s

- A. Logframe
- B. List of Initiative Reports
- C. Capacity Building

Abbreviations & Acronyms

ACR	Activity Completion Report
AST	Administrative Support Teams
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BSC	Balanced Scorecard
CDD	Curriculum Development Division
DILG	Department of the Interior and Local Government
DPWH	Department of Public Works and Highways
DTI	Department of Trade and Industry
GADC	General Agreement on Development Cooperation
GIS	Geographic Information System
GOLD	Governance and Local Development
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IDA	International Development Agency
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LADP	Local Area Development Partnership
LGDP	Local Governance Development Program
LGPMS	Local Government Performance Monitoring/Management System
LGU	Local Government Unit
MERG	Monitoring and Evaluation Review Committee
MIDC	Metropolitan Iloilo Development Council
MIG	Metro Iloilo and Guimaras
MIGEDC	Metro Iloilo Guimaras Economic Development Council
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority
NGA	National Government Agency
NGO	Non-Government Organization
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PA	Partnership Adviser
PAG	Project Advisory Group
PAHRDF	Philippines Australia Human Resource Development Facility
PDF	Philippines Development Forum

PoA	Packages of Assistance
PRMDP	Philippines Regional Municipal Development Project
PSC	Project Steering Committee
TWG	Technical Working Group
UP	University of the Philippines
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

I. Background

The Local Governance Development Program (LGDP) was an initiative of the Australian Government, managed by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), developed in close consultation with the Government of the Philippines (GoP). The goal of the LGDP was originally to improve local government delivery of basic services with the purpose of improving the effectiveness of LGU governance structures and systems. This was modified in the final design to focus on improving local economic development by strengthening LGU partnership structures and systems. A detailed synopsis of the history behind the LGDP and the rationale for the program can be found in the Design document.

The original design emphasized the need to adopt a long term approach and was designed as a 10 year, 3 phased program. The LGDP had four components:

1. Strengthen capacity and development of Pilot LADPs to identify and address critical constraints to local economic development.
2. Policy development and reform to assist LADP implementation.
3. Support donor coordination to improve LADP implementation.
4. Set up program management arrangements to support Phase 1 and develop the design for the longer term program.

Activities and verifiable indicators are outlined in the Logframe in Appendix A.

Phase 1 was designed to inform subsequent phases, however, in July 2007 Government partners were advised that LGDP Phase 2 and 3 would not proceed. This impacted on several of the program's components.

II. Program Effectiveness

Achievements

The program design proved highly effective in achieving the desired results and gaining significant levels of commitment from all stakeholders. The demand driven approach, decentralized management, and flexible funding arrangements meant the stakeholders could adapt to emerging needs effectively.

The following achievements were realized:

1. Strengthened capacity and development of MIGEDC to identify and address critical constraints to local economic development
--

1.1 Established the foundation to support implementation of activities.

- A comprehensive list of all training sessions and workshops were given as shown in Appendix C. The Packages of Assistance also included significant capacity building programs and these are also listed.

- The structure of MIGEDC was strengthened with the following interventions:
 - Built the capacity of related project steering committees in tourism development, infrastructure development, environmental management by identifying gaps in current technical working group structures and mechanisms
 - Established MIG Information Technology (IT) Team to coordinate information technology activities across MIGEDC member municipalities and to support demonstration projects, including e-TRACS and GIS.
 - Formulated an MIG IT action plan for MIG LGU systems integration and improved services. This program supports MIGEDC to set-up shared IT Service for GIS-based land use planning, tax revenue assessment and business permit systems in the future. Extensive IT training was undertaken, some of which was coordinated with AusAID's LAMP II program.
 - Conducted a range of workshops with MIGEDC technical working groups and Council members to achieve consensus on key issues and actions for MIGEDC. A MIGEDC issues paper was prepared as the basis for developing a development strategy and to focus LGDP interventions on critical issues.
 - Completed MIGEDC development roadmap to guide strategic priorities. The program supported MIGEDC to develop a strategic plan to harmonize development efforts of LGUs in the region, covering eight areas of collaboration: basic services, land use management, infrastructure development, public safety and security, economic promotion, tourism development, environmental management, and special projects. The MIGEDC Roadmap 2010 represents the constituents' commitment to nurture partnerships to care for their social welfare, environment and economic development. By bringing together key public and private organizations and stakeholders, the roadmap identifies strategic goals for the next five years.
 - As a response to the LGDP intervention, there is now a planning system of tourism and infrastructure planning in MIG operating with many stakeholders involved in the process.
 - MIGEDC organizational profile has been completed using technical assistance from PAHRDF to prepare for the development of an organizational development plan.
 - MIGEDC completed various capacity development training programs that included strategy mapping, project management, harmonization of planning, information technology and networks, tourism development, promotion and marketing, policy planning and customer service enhancement.

1.2 - Develop capacities of the MIGEDC to prepare, implement and manage priority packages of assistance.

The MIGEDC adopted Strategy Mapping and the Balanced Scorecard process to identify priority packages of assistance. The MIGEDC implemented 2 strategic packages and a foundation capacity development package. This has ensured a broader level of stakeholder commitment and participation. Each package included a capacity building framework and was conducted with a “learning by doing” philosophy. Specific achievements included:

- Completed tourism strategy and actions plans. The integrated tourism strategy and action plans hopes to harmonize and build synergies among member LGU tourism strategy plans, policy and legal frameworks, capacity development initiatives, marketing and investment promotion, and focus efforts towards raising the level of income of poor communities. Consulting firm, Asia Pacific Projects, Inc. (APPI) supported MIGEDC in achieving this project.
- Tourist Information Center: Designed the tourist information center and website, and the preparation of travel brochures, maps and an investment brochure.
- Completed a draft MIG Integrated Urban and Regional Infrastructure Plan to guide regional infrastructure projects. The plan includes an integrated urban-rural infrastructure plan, detailing a series of conceptual designs and feasibility studies including a master plan for a regional road network, seaport upgrades, growth corridor development, solid waste management, and an integrated water resource profile for the region. The plan is supported by a marketing plan and capacity development framework.
- Established information technology as foundational project to enhance inter-local alliance and to promote connectivity and information sharing between LGUs by establishing common geospatial and socio-economic databases. This supports integrated regional planning, environmental management, infrastructure development and agricultural suitability mapping.
- Completed various capacity development activities as part of the tourism and infrastructure development projects in addition to activities which enhanced organizational leadership and human resource development, project management, local finance, and capital investment programming and marketing.

2. Supported policy development and reform to assist MIGEDC implementation

2.1 – Identified national and local administrative structures, procedures and policies for reforms and a strategy for MIGEDC implementation.

The most important reform undertaken was the implementation of harmonised and synchronised planning, investment programming, revenue administration, budgeting and

expenditure management within and between neighbouring municipalities and National Government Agencies. This helps to facilitate partnerships by aligning budgeting and planning processes. The guidelines for this initiative were provided by Joint Memorandum Circular No. 1 2007 signed by the Department of Finance, National Economic Development Authority and Department of Interior and Local Government. LGDP provided support to implement this circular in the LADP Pilot sites as the first in the Philippines. The process adopted is a model for strengthening the national government-local government interface, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and supporting coordinated and synchronized planning. The results of the pilot implementations will be used by DILG to assist in developing strategies to implement the process for all municipalities.

To support the JMC, the LGDP also introduced Integrated Spatial Planning as a planning tool for stakeholders to get involved in developing an integrated spatial vision for the MIG region. The process is now being adapted for use in completing and refining the Metro Iloilo Guimaras Physical Framework Plan and MIGEDC Roadmap and the individual LGU development plans.

Other achievements included:

- Holding local meetings with policy advisory group to survey and assess policies that have relevance to LGU partnerships, revenue generation, capacity building and local economic development. These meetings included NEDA, DILG, DTI, HLRB, and academe.
- Incorporating policy reviews in the Packages of Assistance to address specific sectoral issues to assist development of strategies for implementation across a range of sectors.
- Integrated Spatial Planning workshops and developing guidelines for implementation.
- Undertook various inventories of plans and programs to assist in alignment of development plans
- An inventory of data bases and plans of MIGEDC member local government units was created and these were aligned with national, regional and local policies, goals and strategies.
- Assisted with Executive-Legislative Agenda Development Workshops of three LGUs and the preparation of Iloilo City Development Agenda

3. Supported donor coordination to improve MIGEDC implementation.

3.1 Documentation of lessons and recommendations based on discussions with donors.

- Undertaking an inventory of ODA projects for MIGEDC to identify opportunities for collaboration. A report was published on project profiles and distributed to stakeholders.

- MIGEDC documented the donor coordination lessons learned with the hosting of a two-day Iloilo PDF Forum, bringing together donors, local government representatives, NGOs and NGAs to review best practices and discuss strategies to better coordinate donor assistance at the local level. Lessons learned from the forum were provided to the PDF WG on Local Governments and Decentralization.
- Prepared and distributed the LGDP Update Bulletin to share ODA project experiences. Regular meetings were also held with donor agencies like the Canadian International Development Agency, AusAID's Land Administration and Management Project, Japan International Cooperation Agency and Germany's GTZ.
- Joint activities were undertaken between LGDP and LAMP II, in terms of combined computer training, and between PAHRDF and LGDP in terms of organizational development assistance
- Case studies of the Local Area Partnerships in Western Visayas have been prepared to identify lessons and experiences in managing LGU cooperative undertakings.
- Collaboration has been undertaken with the City Development Initiative for Asia (ADB- GTZ) to fund feasibility studies emanating from the Infrastructure Strategy.

3.2 - Developed strategy paper on coordination of AusAID activities in LGUs.

- Provided inputs to the discussion paper on ODA coordination was prepared based on workshops held with the Philippine Development Forum Working Group on Decentralization and Local Government in Iloilo City.

4. Set up program management arrangements to support Phase 1

4.1 – Established Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Phase 1.

- A monitoring and evaluation framework was developed based on Strategy Mapping and the Balanced Scorecard. It was submitted as part of the Implementation Plan and has been progressively developed to accommodate the Packages of Assistance. These require short term performance indicators to evaluate the sub-contractors and LADP performance, and longer term measures to determine the impact of the intervention.
- Training in the M&E framework was conducted with LADP staff and the Project Assurance Teams. The Balanced Scorecard Approach is now being adopted for a range of inter-LGU project activities.
- The metrics of the M&E Framework adopted by the LGDP was aligned with the Local Government Performance Monitoring System (LGPMS). Changes to Design:

Changes to Design

1. Cancellation of Phase 2

During July 2007 the LGDP Team were advised that Phase 2 would not be supported and that the program would be consolidated as part of the Rural and Private Sector Development Strategy.

2. Inclusion of JMC harmonized planning and budgeting system

An additional support for integrated spatial planning to support the Joint Memorandum Circular on harmonized budgeting and planning was done. In addition there was less emphasis on policy research and local economic development, and more of a focus on capacity building activities to support the two pilot areas including the development of information systems and inter-LGU project management guidelines.

3. Two-month transition plan

To accommodate the MIGEDC concerns regarding the termination of Phase 2, a transition phase was proposed to extend the project by 2 months to allow additional time to consolidate capacity building exercises, market outputs to ODA and finalise Package of Assistance outputs to quality standards.

4. PAHRDF support discontinued

In addition to the termination of Phase 2, AusAID reduced its future funding for PAHRDF during the time when LGDP had prepared for coordination between the two programs. The implication was that the organizational reviews being conducted in collaboration with the PAHRDF in Iloilo-Guimaras could no longer be supported in terms of organizational development and reform. The impact of this decision was not fully understood by AusAID at the time, but the cancellation of the LGDP and PAHRDF programs in Iloilo was a significant set back for MIGEDC.

Assessment of Management

Project management **adopted a decentralized approach**, with National Government Agencies only involved in an advisory capacity. Offices were established in Manila where the Program Director was located, and Iloilo where the Partnership Advisor was located. The LGDP dealt directly with the Metro-Iloilo Guimaras Economic Development Council.

To manage the Packages of Assistance, **Project Boards and Project Assurance Teams were established**. The Project Board included representatives from all key stakeholders chaired by the head of the LADP, and the Project Assurance Team comprised local subject matter experts that understood local project requirements and could advise the Board on the performance of the sub contractors. National Government Agencies and Academe were involved in Project Assurance Teams where appropriate.

Risk Management

One of the major risks anticipated was the political and administrative processes relevant to the elections in May 2007. In order to ensure it did not have an impact, the **MIGEDC sought an exemption through COMELEC** for involvement in the LGDP project activities.

Other risks included **delays due to procurement and approval processes of the PoAs**. These were mitigated by ensuring a high degree of specificity in activity designs and securing support and commitment from MIGEDC counterparts to expedite review and approval of the outputs.

One unanticipated risk was the **uncertainty for future support by AusAID for the longer term program** irrespective of LGDP performance. While counterparts had shown a high degree of commitment with an appropriate level of resources, AusAID were in the process of reviewing longer term strategies and decided not to support Phase 2 of the program in July 2007. The LGDP had raised significant expectations through its emphasis on a long term approach to partnership development, and a decentralized and demand driven philosophy. The decision not to proceed with Phase 2 required a refocus on managing expectations and the need to design a transition phase to provide an opportunity for outputs to be adopted by other donors or official development assistance programs.

Procurement

LGDP followed the Commonwealth's Procurement Guidelines and Coffey's quality management processes. Given the short time frames for the procurement of professional services to undertake the Packages of Assistance the process was expedited by:

- Researching market conditions to target potential firms for bidding
- Providing a high degree of specificity in the contracted services to limit the scope for variations
- Being outcome and output focussed and allowing proponents to specify the mix of inputs within specified time and resource limits
- Specifying the total value of the contract to ensure proponents developed proposals within the resource and time limits.

It should be noted that even with well established procurement processes and an understanding of the market, the process still took approximately 3 months once the specifications had been agreed upon. Typically these processes can take between 3 and 6 months depending on market competition. In this case we also involved local stakeholders in the tender assessment process as part of the capacity building program. This probably added to the time frames but ensured local stakeholder support and ability for stakeholders to follow the project assessment process through to completion of the project by gaining a detailed understanding of the original bids and technical requirements.

Management of consultants was in most cases delegated to the Partnership Advisor where the project was being carried out in the pilot areas, or under the Project Director in Manila when they were required to address issues across the program. For each PoA the Partnership Advisor

reported to a Project Board and was supported by a Project Assurance Team to ensure the quality of the consultant's outputs met expectations of stakeholders.

This approach appeared to work successfully because it not only engaged the local stakeholders in the process, achieving a greater level of ownership and commitment, but it also assisted in the development of local project management skills as part of the capacity building initiatives. This was supported by an Inter-LGU Project Management Course.

Under this approach, local experts and stakeholders were involved from project inception and prioritization, through to final assessment of outputs. The process can now be supported locally and applied to future downstream initiatives.

Coordination with Partners and ODA

Extensive coordination with National Government Agencies and ODA was undertaken at the MIGEDC level. It conducted and funded a regional workshop which raised the awareness of local issues such as ODA coordination, project funding, and the inadequate resourcing of some decentralization policies.

At the MIGEDC level the LGDP conducted donor coordination meetings and workshops to discuss convergence issues and opportunities for donor collaboration. It should be noted that the LGDP organized an ODA project presentation in Iloilo for the PDF Working Group. In many instances this was the first time project staff was fully aware of the other activities occurring within the region and almost immediately identified opportunities for collaboration.

A number of new initiatives emerged from these discussions, however many of these were opportunistic rather than strategic. One clear recommendation from this initiative is that all ODA projects need to have an explicitly funded component that emphasizes ODA coordination to reduce duplication and improve aid effectiveness. Coordination comes at a cost to consulting firms and hence will not necessarily happen unless it becomes a requirement for efficient and effective aid delivery.

Counterpart Contributions

Counterpart contributions have been a critical input in project implementation. Consistent with the provisions of the Subsidiary Arrangement for the LGDP, the MIGEDC provided counterpart contributions as follows:

- Salary costs for all LGU staff involved for the duration of the Program
- Provision of venues, office space, local resource persons and logistical support of the MIGEDC

Involvement of Stakeholders

One of the key lessons learned from previous interventions, and featured in the design document (AusAID, 2006), is that improvement in local governance will require long-term sustained effort to address systemic issues and that a shift from a focus on single municipalities to partnerships will create the critical mass to address these problems at a broader level. A pragmatic approach, that is

demand driven, responsive and flexible, will encourage local ownership and wider stakeholder involvement. These are the guiding principles underpinning the sustainability of this program.

A key principle underpinning organizational sustainability is stakeholder management and this was emphasized throughout the implementation of the program. This is seen as one of the most important aspects of this decentralized approach because it encourages local ownership, not only by government partners but also by the private sector, academia and the community. The other important feature underpinning the sustainability of the LGDP is the simultaneous approach to addressing policy issues and donor coordination, particularly at the local level. This resulted in the support necessary for institutional changes and processes required for successful LADP development and inter-LGU project prioritization, planning and implementation.

Overall Management

The Program objectives of Phase 1 involved a significant learning and development component focusing on partnership development, policy reform and donor coordination. The overall management used a decentralised management model with Partnership Advisors coordinating activities to develop a demand driven approach and to ensure local ownership and responsibility for the outcomes. This was a very effective decentralized management model because it ensured ongoing local support and interaction while providing for coordination with NGAs and ODAs at the national level. MIGEDC provided additional support staff with the LGDP Partnership Advisor adopting the roles of coordinator, facilitator, project managers, mentors and advisors. This was supported by the fact that both advisors were local staff, have peer respect and recognition, and have extensive support networks which enabled them to mobilise resources and engage stakeholders efficiently and effectively. The overall philosophy was also to stress the importance of involving and engaging stakeholders throughout all stages of the process and to encourage a “learning by doing” approach to implementation. This approach was appreciated by local stakeholders.

Given the importance on learning and development during Phase 1, there was also an emphasis on knowledge and information management to ensure the lessons learned during this Phase can be used to inform the design of future programs. The management model emphasised ongoing reporting and accountability, and the use of a website for information management, communication and marketing.

III. Efficiency

Qualitative Assessment of Costs and Benefits

Although this is a subjective assessment, the program was viewed as having a significant and positive impact on the partner governments. There is a perceived efficiency of the program, in spite of a short –term project period as shown by the following:

- a. The LGDP has well established local office, established quality systems, an IT support unit and information systems, an administrative support unit, a technical resources pool and established procurement processes. It was able to mobilise quickly and efficiently in the time frame, and to allocate additional resources when required to address emerging problems.
- b. The Partnership Advisor is local and had well established stakeholder networks. This enabled them to mobilise stakeholder support quickly and achieve a high level of engagement and commitment.
- c. The local partnership arrangements (with Canadian Urban Institute) resulted in significant cost sharing of office facilities and immediate startup.
- d. The project was demand driven and the use of the Imprest Account funds was dictated by the MIGEDC. This resulted in a process where the value of the grant to local administration was appreciated.
- e. The Packages of Assistance were managed through a local Project Assurance Team. For the reasons stated above, these teams had a local appreciation of the value of the grant and were given responsibility to extract the greatest value for money from consultants. They had experienced many ODA consultancies managed by external agencies that failed to hold the consultants accountable for the quality of the outputs in relation to the needs of the government and original tender specifications.
- f. The donor coordination activities and partnership arrangements achieved a higher level of stakeholder involvement and commitment, and cost sharing with other organisations, than expected. In addition it is expected there will be significant downstream effects as many activities are adopted by partner organizations.
- g. The use of locally based consultants for the Packages of Assistance increased value for money based on the results to date. Although the tenders were advertised internationally, it became clear that locally based experts had the knowledge and expertise to deliver these particular interventions more efficiently. These interventions were not new to the Philippines and local expertise was available.
- h. Stakeholders also were of the opinion that the benefits derived from the program far outweighed the costs. In fact there are demonstration activities of capacity development activities like the tourism information kiosks, tourism website and brochure that were completed apart from the trainings conducted

Value

For the reasons stated above, the program delivered value for money to the MIGEDC based on the original design and the impact it had. The national government agencies will be able to use the results of many of the studies which will be presented to them in December 2007 before end of the Program.

The greatest value from the program will be achieved if other ODA support the outputs from the LGDP or MIGEDC implement investment strategies through NGAs, ADB or other lending institutions; or the private sector invests in the region based on the united vision of the partners.

The termination of Phase 2, however, means that the program did not achieve maximum value for money for AusAID. Phase 1 was established as a learning and development Phase for a longer term program and hence the significance of the results are now questionable in the short term. Many elements can be adapted for future programs in particular:

- Establishing local area development partnership arrangements through a local Partnership Advisor and creating shared services.
- Approaches to donor and project coordination at the local level.
- Using Strategy Mapping and Balanced Scorecard techniques for establishing local economic development priorities and monitoring and evaluation frameworks.
- Approaches to integrated spatial planning.
- Integrated tourism strategies as a basis for determining local economic development programs and projects
- Integrated infrastructure development planning based on synchronised budgeting and planning processes.

AusAID did not require the development of a longer term design or a process guide relevant to the second and third phase and therefore many of the lessons learned would not be applicable to immediate needs.

IV. Impact and Sustainability

The impact of the project in MIGEDC has resulted in strengthening the existing formal relationships between member Local Government Units (organized with an MoA) and introduced new concepts, tools and techniques. MIGEDC was already supported in its development by the CIDA-Canadian Urban Institute. The LGDP provided additional resources to implement some tangible projects that built stakeholder commitment towards the partnership arrangement. It demonstrated how the partnership could be used as leverage to attract support. The initiatives started by MIGEDC through LGDP assistance are now being supported by the City Development Initiative of Asia – a project supported by the ADB and German Development Bank. This facility will support feasibility studies for the infrastructure proposals identified in the two packages of assistance as priorities.

In addition to the many capacity building activities, the LGDP has initiated the Information Technology Support Team with extensive training, software and equipment. This process evolved late in the program but will be instrumental in developing shared services and communications between member LGUs. Iloilo City have received funding from the Logofind initiative of the World Bank for computerization of local government processes, in addition they have received support

from GTZ and LAMP II for computer system development. Underpinning these activities is the support being provided by the Guimaras IT/GIS team who have over 10 years experience in GIS. They will provide support to the e-TRACS and GIS initiatives for pilot testing. All of these initiatives will build some momentum towards computerization of local governments in the region. The MIGEDC IT Technical support group will continue to build expertise and assist LGUs under the partnership arrangement.

Tangible outcomes that suggest the program will have sustainable impacts include:

- Strengthening of the relationship with CIDA's Partnership Program which continues to provide support for IT and harmonised planning activities.
- Support from the CIDA Partnership Program to support the implementation of some of the outputs from the Packages of Assistance.
- Confidence created in the partnership approach to manage large projects using a structure project management arrangement, performance management using balanced scorecard and LGPMS participatory approaches, and project assurance teams incorporating local expertise.
- Increased capacity of MIGEDC to provide project management, business development and ODA coordination functions. It is anticipated that the Local Government partners will invest more in a full time secretariat to provide these services on an ongoing basis.
- Making sure there is integration of employment and enterprise development in the development strategies for the local economic development agenda.
- Creating an advocacy role in integrating gender concerns in tourism planning, the Executive Legislative Agenda, and harmonized planning systems.
- On-going revision of the MIG Physical Framework Plan as a result of lessons learned from LGDP activities.
- Application of lessons learned and information gathered from tourism development and implementation capacity building activities by tourism stakeholders
- Positive interest of the Iloilo Provincial Treasurer to adopt the E-TRACS
- Incorporating increased rigor and competency in performance management of MIGEDC through the use balanced scorecards and strategy mapping.

The adoption of a transition plan that focuses on the development of LGU financing framework to support MIGEDC's Projects. One of the main shortcomings of LGDP is the absence of a clear and coherent strategy on financing the outputs of the packages of assistance and improving LGU revenue generation and management. We believe that this area will need to be a major underpinning of LGDP outputs. There is a compelling need to develop a framework for strong private sector participation in LGU infrastructure development. Encouraging the private sector to take a proactive role in financing LGU development projects will need a serious consideration. This will entail conscious effort to reshape the rules, prepare a platform for information and advisory

services, provide structures for consultation, monitoring and improved coordination among oversight agencies.

MIGEDC is preparing itself for a smooth transition to sustain the gains achieved with LGDP. MIGEDC will reconfigure its level of effort and focus on doable actions within the context of its resources and capacity. MIGEDC will begin to prepare itself for changes in ODA priorities and expectations and adopt a coordination and advisory role in relation to local ODA activities.

Gender and Environmental Considerations

Gender equity and environmental impact considerations were incorporated in the terms of reference for each of the Packages of Assistance where appropriate. The tourism plan highlighted the impacts of tourism on women and children. Environmental sustainability is one of the main criteria in project prioritization

The monitoring and evaluation framework, based on the balanced scorecard approach, included indicators segregated by gender where applicable.

V. Relevance of Program

The LGDP was highly relevant to MIGEDC and a preferred delivery mechanism.

Context in relation to the Regional Development Plan

As a program, the project design was directly relevant to the regional and local development strategy. It is consistent with the new development framework of improving economic growth opportunities through improved accountability, participation and transparency. In terms of a long term program, the LGDP was incompatible with future directions and was superseded by other initiatives. However, there are a number of elements that are directly relevant to the current directions:

- Strategy Mapping and the use of the Balance Scorecard approach which is being adopted more widely by DILG
- Integrated Spatial Planning and GIS development which supports infrastructure planning, asset management and regional development planning
- E-TRACS development which provides tools for revenue enhancement
- Inter-LGU Project Management which can assist LGUs to work together more effectively to solve common issues
- Tourism strategies which can be used to determine priorities for regional development based on market needs.

Performance Indicators and Modality

The performance indicators for Phase 1 were largely qualitative due to the nature of the program. The modality which could be described as hybrid, consisting of a facility with program based activities, provided for flexibility, a demand driven approach and decentralized management. This mode of operation met the needs of partner governments and gave the managing contractor and AusAID some latitude in terms adapting to emerging needs.

Innovative aspects of the mode of operation included:

- A decentralized approach dealing directly with Local Government Units.
- Use of a demand driven approach whereby the LADP, through participatory approaches with stakeholders, determine the strategic use of funds to address barriers to local economic development.
- Governance arrangements established with Local Area Development Partnerships of an informal and formal nature.
- Donor coordination included as an explicit component to evaluate local coordination effectiveness.
- Partnership Advisor was located in pilot location and working directly with MIGEDC to facilitate capacity building, technology transfer, donor coordination and local program administration.

An assessment of the appropriateness of the initiative is affected by the decision to not proceed with Phase 2. **The program would have been designed differently if it was to be a short term program only.** There would have been less investment in project management overheads and establishing the groundwork for a longer term initiative. It is likely that the Packages of Assistance would have been predetermined and built into the design to ensure they could be completed within the timeframe.

VI. Lessons Learned

Program Design

1. Given the original design was based on the assumption of a long term investment in partnership development, the level of commitment given by MIGEDC, based on a proposed longer term program that was to be determined based on performance, resulted in a level of political and institutional embarrassment. MIGEDC was highly committed to the program and it was not anticipated that AusAID would terminate the LGDP without a performance appraisal.
2. A flexible, demand driven program requires an agile and responsive managing contractor to be able to meet expectations and adapt to emerging needs. The ability of the Managing Contractor to mobilise quickly, work with established administrative processes and procedures,

and set up local offices and communications within the first month, made it feasible to achieve the level of outputs required by local partners within the time frame.

3. The flexible and decentralized project management approach allowed the project team to quickly respond to emerging needs and opportunities. This was an important element in the success of the program, particularly when partnership arrangements are maturing, and stakeholders needed to see positive outcomes in the short term before they commit significant resources for longer term programs.
4. Locally based Partnership Advisor, with extensive government, private sector and NGO connections, made it possible to build stakeholder relationships quickly and harness widespread support and interest in the program..
5. Managing expectations was difficult in a demand driven and flexible program design. For similar programs there is a need to provide for strategic as well as emerging opportunistic interventions. This was accommodated in the LGDP by retaining funds for a flexible “Package of Assistance” specifically addressing foundation capacity building initiatives required by the MIGEDC. The other packages of assistance were developed using a more strategic approach.
6. Marketing the efforts of the MIGEDC as part of an ongoing advocacy program was considered essential to ensure ongoing commitment. It was important to operate in an open and transparent way in order to alleviate suspicion that the program was being controlled by dominant municipalities. It was necessary to provide program descriptions, plans and strategies to stakeholders using all available communication channels such as websites, email, meetings, workshops, press releases and bulletins. This approach appeared to increase the willingness of stakeholders to contribute knowledge and ideas to all components of the program.

MIGEDC Partnerships – Structures and Systems

1. Strengthening structures and systems needs to be pursued through the development of targeted shared service arrangements and a common vision for regional development. MIGEDC is well established in terms of governance arrangements but now need tangible projects with which to secure longer term resource commitments.
2. Developing structures and systems around shared information technology and communications is a good catalyst for developing wider shared service arrangements. These can result in immediate benefits, in terms of information access, automation of government processes and improve customer services, as well as improving partner communications and information sharing.
3. One of the most significant impediments to partnership approaches in terms of regional investment, is the lack of an agreed spatial vision. There is a plethora of investment plans and programs required by Local Governments but none that describe the full spatial implications of planning and development policy in a simple integrated form that the majority of stakeholders can relate to easily. Many plans are produced to satisfy administrative requirements but are not

actually referred to for implementation of development strategy. Significant reform is required in the planning system if inter-LGU partnership approaches are to be effective. On ground development shows little correlation with development plans. Most development is market driven and opportunistic, often in response to nationally driven infrastructure programs, which can undermine local development strategies.

4. The collocation of ODA activities in one office improved coordination of activities and helped to identify opportunities for collaboration. In Iloilo the LGDP shared the offices of the Canadian Urban Institute, which in turn became a focal point for a number of ODA meetings. The concept of developing a local ODA coordination and management unit should be explored where LGUs have several ODA programs. This provides a one-stop-shop for ODA information sharing and can assist in data collection and facilitating stakeholder meetings. Ultimately this role could mature into an ODA advisory service that identifies overlaps and gaps in donor programs and assists LGU partners to deal with ODA applications and access to funds.

Addressing Barriers to Local Economic Development

1. The process of identifying barriers to local economic development was based on a strategic planning process¹ involving a range of key stakeholders and government representatives. The selection of priority intervention activities (Packages of Assistance) was based on achieving consensus amongst participants often using qualitative data, anecdotal evidence, and existing development and investment plans. While this democratic approach will encourage greater commitment by stakeholders if they believe their priorities are being met, there is a high level of uncertainty about the impact the intervention will have in addressing fundamental barriers. It would be preferable if this process could be tempered with a systematic modelling approach that introduces all of the considerations for economic sustainability such as:
 - a. population dynamics
 - b. consumption and production
 - c. land availability and suitability
 - d. skills, labour force and employment opportunities
 - e. carrying capacity and resource limits
 - f. environmental sensitivity and biodiversity
 - g. transport, energy and infrastructure
 - h. water resources
 - i. health, housing and education

¹ Strategy Mapping – Norton and Kaplan 2005

2. If GIS facilities and geostatistical data are readily available, the first step in this process would have been to undertake spatial analysis using a regional economic development model to inform participants of probable barriers and options. This would have led to integrated spatial planning and the identification of regional priorities supported by baseline data and clearly defined assumptions. This framework would have then been available to model the various strategies developed through the packages of assistance (tourism, infrastructure)
3. An efficient and effective local government is closely correlated to a region's level of private sector investment. Private sector investment is a key driver of local economic development. In this regard the foundation capacity building support such as HRD, Information Technology and Organizational Development cannot be underestimated as essential activities for the government to pursue in order to improve efficiency.

Policy Environment supporting MIGEDC

1. The Local Government Code 1991 supports partnership arrangements between Local Government Units and, if necessary, the development of joint enterprises and resource sharing mechanisms. However, the National Government lacks detailed operational guidelines on approaches to Local Area Development Partnerships like MIGEDC and the benefits and costs are poorly understood. In addition, lending agencies such as the Asian Development Bank, World Bank and Land Bank do not appear to provide incentives for LGUs to enter into partnership arrangements to borrow funds. The risk assessment of partnership arrangements is also not undertaken. Loans are granted on the aggregated borrowing capacity of individual LGUs in any joint financial arrangement. There are now financial institutions and products that allow borrowing at the sub sovereign level, however, the issue of partnerships and associated risk reduction is not determined. This arrangement therefore does not provide the incentive for LGUs to partner to achieve a lower cost of capital and greater borrowing capacity.
2. The other main policy areas affecting partnership development is the adoption of consistent policies and standards by LGUs in areas of common function such as HR, IT, administration, procurement, waste management etc. This would allow greater interoperability between municipal governments, including staff exchange, and the eventual development of common shared service arrangements or a common shared service center. All National Government Agencies need to be mandating standards in a range of areas where it makes good sense to do so and which can facilitate improved sharing of resources. These should be reinforced by ODA adoption, as outlined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.
3. Policies on staff interchanges between LGUs should be assessed. Staff should be encouraged to work across LGUs on the basis they can retain tenure and the right of return. This will facilitate the development of shared service centers to address specific common issues between partner LGUs. National Government policies need to accommodate the release of local expertise on the basis they assist neighbouring LGUs. It then becomes feasible to establish Inter-LGU support networks for systems such as TRACS.

MIGEDC Capacity Building

1. Effective capacity building programs require substantially more time than has been allocated for this learning and development Phase, particularly considering the parallel activities occurring in areas such as tourism, infrastructure planning, agricultural value chain analysis and water supply systems. Ideally, the design required at least 18 months to see more tangible outcomes.
2. Building and retaining the capacity of MIGEDC to support inter-LGU services and systems is a significant issue. The program ensured that all activities involved local stakeholders and staff to increase knowledge and information sharing. In addition formal training programs on IT, project management and spatial planning were undertaken for MIGEDC staff and committees to perform their roles more effectively. Information systems were being deployed to address the issues of revenue generation and efficient government operations. It is important that a holistic view of MIGEDC is undertaken to address a range of capacity building initiatives simultaneously to create self reinforcing processes.
3. MIGEDC needs to develop greater capability in business development processes. There is a significant role for MIGEDC to take on a business and investment planning role for LGUs and private sector partners, using ODA activities as the catalyst for local economic development opportunities.

Internal Coordination of AusAID's Local Level Programs

1. Internal coordination of AusAID local level programs is relatively minor and appears to occur opportunistically. Coordination increases the cost of transactions and hence unless it is factored into the cost of the project, or there are immediate incentives such as economies of scale, coordination will not be actively pursued at the local level.
2. There is also a lack of information about programs at the local level. Although details about program goals and objectives are readily available, details about specific on ground activities are not. Regular project meetings are required to exchange information between local programs and identify areas for collaboration. Immediate results were obtained through this simple process.
3. AusAID could also benefit from implementing GIS technology locally. This system could be used to map all project activities in relation to other national and ODA programs and strategic plans. It would be a useful tool for communicating what is happening where and to provide the means to plan interventions more strategically. The Government of the Philippines has significant amounts of digital geographic information freely available (topographic, social, economic and environmental data) which would greatly assist AusAID in its planning and design missions. Without GIS technology and expertise, AusAID cannot capitalise on the available information resources.

External Coordination with other ODA

1. The most important aspect of coordination is information sharing and raising awareness of initiatives at critical decision points. Obtaining information about initiatives in any given area requires substantial research. There is no single point of contact for information on ODA or NGO initiatives.
2. Substantial efforts were made to prepare an inventory of ODA initiatives during the preparation of the LGDP design document. Awareness of initiatives is increased through the PDF which provides a forum for information sharing on ODA activities with the mechanisms to determine and affect longer term priority setting. However, there is no central point of contact for an inventory of ODA proposals, active projects or completed programs, let alone the large number of NGO projects. The document prepared for the LGDP was in fact distributed for use by the PDF as a working inventory. Although NEDA maintain a database of ODA Projects, these cover only large programs and are not geographically coded or complete. Most project activities are discovered through personal contacts and project research.
3. ODA coordination was achieved during the LGDP with many downstream benefits now anticipated through the anticipated adoption of many of the outputs by other agencies and lending institutions. However, the termination of the LGDP Phase 2 undermined many efforts. This is an example of how the lack of certainty of some programs can impact on coordination efforts of others, resulting in a higher degree of caution and risk aversion.
4. It was also noted that less than 0.5% of ODA is directly managed by Local Government Units. This does not support the principles of subsidiarity and decentralization. Greater effort should be made to present ODA opportunities directly to LGUs in order to develop their capabilities for managing projects and programs, preferably in a partnership arrangement to create scale efficiencies.

VII. Recommendations

Program Design

1. Decentralized and demand driven program designs should be adopted more widely for more effective delivery of aid and local partnership development, provided they operate within a strategic envelope that addresses regional and national priorities. Successful proof of concept projects emanating from these demand driven approaches should then be marketed as local investment opportunities.
2. AusAID needs to develop an appropriate Exit Strategy for programs that they wish to terminate based on future strategic directions rather than performance. The process AusAID used to terminate the LGDP and not continue Phase 2 without an assessment or stakeholder consultation needs to be reviewed to ensure political/institutional embarrassment is avoided.

3. Management of information resources emanating from completed projects needs to be addressed by AusAID as a matter of priority. AusAID need to develop a clearinghouse for all initiative reports, and information developed and compiled for project websites. This material is the intellectual property of AusAID and should be made available to other projects and programs so that they can quickly build on previous initiatives and continue to develop AusAID's knowledge base. This information should be geocoded to ensure it can be accessed by geographic area as well as sector, and be available to all ODA through AusAID's website. There are many examples of duplication of effort by AusAID and other ODA because of lack of awareness of project reports and activities due to poor records management and staff turnover.

MIGEDC Partnerships – Structures and Systems

1. All partnership approaches require significant investment in relationship building based on a detailed stakeholder assessment. Building trusted relationships takes time so it is recommended that future programs adopt a longer term strategy and explicitly focus on relationship building as a core component.
2. Partnerships should be encouraged by using shared service models. This arrangement would allow LGUs to enter into multiple partnerships for any given area based on using or developing service provider-consumer arrangements. This dynamic arrangement allows municipalities to enter into partnerships based on service level agreements, to encourage economies of scale, and transfer of expertise.

Addressing Barriers to Local Economic Development

1. A consistent MIGEDC Economic Modelling Framework should be developed to help areas understand drivers of local economic development in LGUs. These models should be based on spatial analysis and not just aggregated statistical information derived from out of date national statistics. These models will help to assist stakeholders understand the relationship between population growth, infrastructure capacity, employment generation, transport and accessibility, environmental sensitivity and natural carrying capacity.
2. All local government agencies need to address poor information management practices to make information more accessible to evaluate economic development options. There is a significant problem between nationally authorised statistics and local knowledge. Consultants analysing local economic conditions need to be able to access local statistical information and understand the difference between regionally aggregated statistics and projections, and local data collected through administrative or mapping processes..
3. MIGEDC structure needs to incorporate a business development and advisory role to leverage from ODA coordination and LGU investment planning. MIGEDC should have the capacity to link private sector investment with LGU investment strategies supported by ODA activities and plans.

Policy Environment supporting MIGEDC

1. The Government of the Philippines implement JMC No 1 Series 2007 on Harmonised Budgeting and Planning using integrated spatial planning techniques to spatially represent national government policies at the local level and assist regional areas understand the implications. These processes help to engage all stakeholders in the regional development process.
2. DILG should develop operational models for shared serviced arrangements between municipalities based on collective capacity to optimise economies of scale and service delivery. DILG should provide this to Municipal and Provincial Governments as a menu of options to deliver more effective services at a reduced cost.
3. Financial institutions undertake research into risks associated with LGU partnership lending arrangements and develop financial products and services that provide incentives for LGUs to implement formalised partnerships and shared service models.
4. Based on priority shared services, NGAs should focus on developing consistent operating standards to facilitate interoperability and reporting between LGUs and NGAs.

MIGEDC Capacity Building

1. PAHRDF develop an organizational development model for LGUs based on establishing shared service arrangements and computerization of office functions and customer services.
2. MIGEDC should investigate the development of a SME business development role using leverage from LGU partnership arrangements and as a source of information about ODA activities.
3. The Inter-LGU Project Management guidelines should be further developed to include shared services and shared production arrangements.
4. GIS should be seen as an essential technology for LGU operations, particularly to support major projects and ODA interventions. GIS can be used for strategic analysis as well as functions such as asset management (e.g. roads and infrastructure).

Internal Coordination of AusAID's Local Level Programs

1. AusAID need to include a component in all designs on donor coordination to explicitly fund a resource, particularly with large projects, to undertake an ODA coordination role to improve aid effectiveness. If each program establishes a coordination role then all programs will be funded to attend workshops and meetings on opportunities for collaboration and implementing collaborative exercises.
2. AusAID need to develop a clearinghouse for all project information resources (reports, presentations, manuals etc) for each completed project so that they are accessible to other ODA and local counterparts.

3. AusAID needs to improve its induction program to provide a kit that includes information on project activities, their location and type of intervention. AusAID should also provide access to contacts and basic project data on past, current and planned programs. This will allow project officers to identify opportunities for collaboration that may not be obvious to program managers because of technical details.
4. AusAID should develop GIS capacity to map and monitor the extent of interventions – spatially and temporally, and make this accessible to other ODA. AusAID could use this spatial information system to assist with program planning and selection of areas for priority intervention based on geographic analysis.

External Coordination with other ODA

1. Through the PDF and NEDA Regional Office support the establishment an Internet portal for ODA activities, including, where practical, NGO and NGA development activities. Project information should be geographically encoded so that activities can be reported by geographic area to identify gaps or duplication in ODA efforts. The facility should be available to ODA for data entry, and available to the wider community for reporting and information sharing. The Portal should operate at the local as well as national levels. Local area development partners could assist in uploading information about local ODA programs through an authorised contact. The maintenance of the Portal could be outsourced and funded through a common ODA funding scheme.
2. The PDF should develop a business case for the development an ODA Quarterly Journal that can be published and distributed to all municipalities and practitioners/consultants in the ODA industry. This journal would contain best practice examples from the industry, recent publications, an ongoing registry of project activities (reported from the Portal), and provide a market space for grants, loans and consultancies.

VIII. Conclusion

The LGDP was an effective design based on the assumption of a long term program. The termination of Phase 2 meant that AusAID did not receive maximum value from the program although this did not affect the deliverables for the Partner Governments.

Generally delivery of activities exceeded expectations in most areas, although some remain undefined and nebulous due to the range of other ODA research activities (for instance ADB Technical Assistance program evaluating the Local Government Code which will also look into support for shared resources) and hence final drafts of discussion papers need to be completed prior to January 2008. Other components, in particular the Packages of Assistance are still to be fully completed (due end of November 2007) and the Information Systems training and development occurred late in the program and will now be completed for pilot testing in January 2008.

The termination after 13 months meant that many tangible outcomes could not be satisfactorily measured in terms of LADP strengthening, the ability to manage large ODA projects, and the ability to attract ODA funds to support the program's outcomes.

It can be concluded that ODA agencies also need to place greater emphasis on the principles espoused in the Paris Declaration and place greater focus on decentralized management of major programs. This approach is required as an incentive for developing Local Area Development Partnerships and building local capacity to manage large inter-LGU projects.

Although the program was considered ambitious within the time frame, it was clear that the demand driven approach and decentralized management structure helped to accomplish many of the outputs expediently. The process of identifying local needs to address barriers to economic development through participatory workshops, coupled with a process of strategic alignment with national and regional programs, strengthened commitment to the LGDP at all levels.

A p p e n d i x A
Logframe

Annex A. Local Governance Development Program – Logical Framework Version 3 – February 2007

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>Goal</p> <p>To improve local economic development by strengthening and improving the effectiveness of LGU partnership structures and systems</p>	<p>LGU partnership structures develop and implement effective regional economic development strategies.</p> <p>Increase in regional economic development activities by private sector.</p> <p>Increase in local productivity and employment.</p>	<p>Local Government Performance Monitoring System.</p> <p>Number of targeted economic development projects developed under partnerships.</p>	<p>Political stability and ongoing support</p> <p>Institutional and government reforms adopted.</p>
	<p>Purpose</p> <p>To strengthen and improve the effectiveness of LGU partnership structures and systems to manage and facilitate local economic development.</p>	<p>Coordinated response to improving regional economic development.</p> <p>Increase in quality and quantity of basic services through LGU cost sharing.</p> <p>Improved development and implementation of programs and projects across LGUs.</p>	<p>LGPMS data.</p> <p>Organisational analysis of performance and competencies.</p> <p>Number of inter-LGU funded projects.</p> <p>Structured inter-LGU meetings.</p> <p>Change management report.</p> <p>Focus group discussions.</p>	<p>Political and institutional commitment to regional development</p> <p>Sharing of services is supported by LGU partners.</p>
1	<p>Objectives</p> <p>Strengthen capacity and development of pilot LADPs to identify and address critical constraints to local economic development.</p>	<p>Number of activities to improve institutional capacities of targeted LADPs.</p> <p>New policies and procedures identified for local reform agenda.</p>	<p>Progress reports and completion report.</p>	<p>Resistance to institutional and governance reforms is addressed.</p> <p>Donor coordination continues.</p>
2	<p>Policy development and reform to assist LADP implementation.</p>	<p>Consensus on new coordination strategies in LGUs developed by donors and by LADPs</p>	<p>Report on Policy Recommendations.</p>	
3	<p>Support donor coordination to improve LADP implementation.</p>	<p>Design elements for long-term LGDP identified.</p>	<p>Implementation Plan and Process Guide – design recommendations</p>	

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
4	Set up program management arrangements to support Phase 1 and develop the design for the longer-term Program.	Program arrangements for Phase I established (Implementation Plan accepted for Phase 1; M&E Framework established.	PDF working group reports on donor coordination strategies and policy reform.	
Components (Phase 1)				
Component 1 – Objective : Strengthen capacity and development of pilot Local Area Development Partnerships (LADPs) to identify and address critical constraints to local economic development				
1.1	Output Establish the foundation to support implementation of activities.	Governance arrangements established. Consensus on needs analysis to identify capabilities required for implementation. New change management and human resource management plans completed.	Agreements on Governance arrangements. Organisational needs analysis report. Reports on activities implemented in 6 month and 9 month progress reports. Change management and human resource development plans.	LADP structures have the capacity and willingness to change and improve.
	Indicative Activities			
1.1.1	Undertake organisational needs analysis based on situation assessment			
1.1.2	Develop and implement package of assistance for foundation capacity building			
1.1.3	Establish LADP project management and governance arrangements			
1.1.4	Prepare HR and Change Management Plans / Organisational development strategy			
1.2	Output Develop capacity of the LADP to prepare, implement and manage priority packages of assistance.	New capacity building activities for LADP support. Packages of assistance identified and agreed to by LGUs and LADP.	Progress reports (6&9 months) Packages of assistance developed and submitted for approval Packages approved for implementation.	Identified packages are appropriate to needs. AusAID will approve “demand driven” packages identified by the LADPs. Other donors are willing to support packages.
	Indicative Activities			
1.2.1	Prioritize and develop packages of assistance for approval and tender			
1.2.2	Implement Packages of Assistance			

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
1.2.3	Develop designs for packages to be funded by other donors / stakeholders			
1.3	Output Identify 6-8 additional pilot LADPs for Phase 2.	Agreed selection criteria developed. Registrations of interest received from LADPs. 6-8 LADPs identified that meet the criteria for Phase 2.	Report on selection criteria. List of proposed LADPs submitted to AusAID	Other LGUs/LADPs are interested in participating and joining the program. AusAID supports the development of Phase 2.
	Indicative Activities			
1.3.1	Review LADP structures and success factors			
1.3.2	Develop criteria for LADP selection, registration and assessment			
1.3.3	Prioritize LADPs for Phase 2 and report to AusAID			
Component 2 – Objective: Policy development and reform to assist LADP implementation				
2.1	Output Documentation of lessons and policy recommendations based on Phase 1 implementation and from other on-going partnership activities.	More research recommendations on policy reforms and improvements of partnership programs and processes.	Report on lessons from partnerships (Phase 1 and others) and policy recommendations.	Documentation on the experiences of other Local Government partnership programs is available to support research goals. Cooperation of other agencies.
	Indicative Activities			
2.1.1	Develop LADP policy advisory committees			
2.1.2	Conduct local policy reviews and research			
2.1.3	Prepare discussion/issues paper to formulate policy recommendations			

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
2.2	Output Identification of national and local administrative structures, procedures and policies for reform and a strategy for pilot implementation.	More research recommendations on policy reforms and improvement of administrative structures, procedures and processes. Pilot strategy developed.	Report on recommendations. Strategy document for pilot implementation.	Willingness of NGAs for potential policy reforms. NGAs and LGUs can identify policy issues that impede partnership development and remove barriers to local economic development.
	Indicative Activities			
2.2.1	Work with the PDF through facilitated workshops to document national and local reform priorities			
2.2.2	Document findings and prepare issues papers			
2.2.3	Prepare final report for AusAID on reform initiatives			
Component 3 – Objective: Support donor coordination to improve LADP implementation				
3.1	Output Documentation of lessons and recommendations based on discussions with donors.	New recommendations on improving donor coordination	Report on recommendations for donor coordination in LGUs	There is proper documentation of experience of other donor programs. Cooperation of other donors.
	Indicative Activities			
3.1.1	Regular meetings/workshops with donors to discuss donor coordination strategies			
3.1.2	Prepare document summarizing recommended approaches			
3.2	Output Develop strategy paper on coordination of AusAID activities in LGUs	Strategy paper developed	Strategy paper documented and presented AusAID	Clear support from AusAID on local governance support.

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	Indicative Activities			
3.2.1	Discuss options with team leaders and project managers at the local and national levels			
3.2.2	Prepare report based on discussions, case studies and recent research			
Component 4 – Objective: Set up Program management to support Phase 1 and develop the design for the longer-term program.				
4.1	Output Establish Management structure to implement Phase 1	Offices established in LADPs and made operational. Inputs (PD, PA, TE, AST) procured.	Functioning program offices. Quarterly progress reports.	Proposed project management arrangements are appropriate.
	Indicative Activities			
4.1.1	LGDP Mobilisation and establishment of offices / equipment procurement			
4.1.2	Establish reporting systems			
4.1.3	Completion of Procedure / QA Manual			
4.1.4	Completion of Implementation Plan			
4.1.5	Development of communication / stakeholder plan / knowledge management systems			
4.1.6	Establish PAG Secretariat			
4.1.7	Prepare activity completion report summarising findings and design recommendations			
4.2	Output Refinement of LGDP Design Framework into a long term program design.	Draft LGDP Program Design Document completed and submitted by end of Phase 1.	Draft LGDP Phase 2 Project Design Document.	Relevant guidance provided by AusAID and Partnership Advisory Group.
4.2.1	Prepare process guide for inclusion in Activity Completion Report to inform Phase 2			

Code	Description	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
4.3	Output Establish an M&E system for Phase 1 and design M&E framework for Phase 2&3	M&E system established for Phase 1. M&E framework for Phase 2 integrated into LGDP PDD.	M&E reports, documentation of meetings. Draft LGDP Phase 2 Project Design Document.	M&E system effectively captures and provides relevant information
	Indicative Activities			
4.3.1	Review existing M&E systems and develop framework for LGDP			
4.3.2	Undertake training for LADPs to monitor project activities using balanced scorecards			
4.3.3	Develop web-based facilities for monitoring and reporting			
4.3.4	Prepare recommendations for Phase 2.			

A p p e n d i x B
Status of Initiative Reports

Status of Initiative Reports

Report	Status (as of Nov 2007)/ Comments
Implementation Plan	Completed and Accepted.
MIGEDC Road Map 2010 Profiles and Situation Assessments	Completed and Accepted.
PDF Working Group on Decentralization and Local Government – Discussion Papers and Presentations	Completed. Presented to PDF Working Group in February 2007
MIGEDC Organizational Needs Assessments and HR/Change Management Recommendations	Draft in progress. undertaken by PAHRDF for MIGEDC. Ongoing support through PAHRDF
MIGEDC Spatial Planning Framework and Plans	Draft completed. Undertaken to support JMC process
MIG – 01 Tourism Strategy and Master Plan Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIG Integrated Tourism Strategy and Action Plan • MIG Integrated Tourism Investment Concept Papers • MIG Tourism Kiosks and Website (www.visitmetroiloiloguimaras.com) • MIG Tourism Brochure 	Draft final report due end of Nov 2007
MIG – 02 Integrated Infrastructure Strategy Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MIG Integrated Urban and Regional Infrastructure Strategy • Sta Barbara-Iloilo City Growth Corridor Plan • Solid Waste Management Framework Plan • Pre-Feasibility Study on Ecological Port for Iloilo City and Guimaras • Integrated Water Resource Profile • Central Business District Revitalization 	Draft final report due end of Nov 2007.
MIGEDC Capacity Building Framework and Development Program	In progress based on final PoA outcomes (To be completed for workshop in January)
Case studies of the Local Area Partnerships in Western Visayas	Completed
Policy Paper on” Issues and Reforms to Sustain LED: The Case of MIGEDC”	Completed
MIG Information Technology Plan	Draft completed

A p p e n d i x C
Summary of Capacity Building Activities, Workshops and Meetings Conducted (Oct
2006 – Nov 2007)

**Summary of Capability Building Activities, Workshop and Meeting Conducted
November 2006 to November 2007**

Name of Activity	Date	Day	No. of Participants		
			Male	Female	Total
A. Project Management Training/Monitoring and Evaluation					
1. LGDP Workshop	14-15 November 2006	Day 1	58	26	84
		Day 2	45	22	67
2. MIGEDC Scorecard & Project Prioritization	30 November 2006		15	14	29
3. MIGEDC Another Next Big Thing	6 December 2006		63	32	95
4. PDF Pre-Donor's Forum	8 January 2007		13	7	20
5. Forum on Enhancing Coordination & Management of ODA by LGUs	25-26 January 2007	Day 1	56	46	102
		Day 2	34	39	73
6. Project Planning Workshop	8 February 2007		12	10	22
7. MIGEDC Write-shop on LGDP Priority Projects	15-16 February 2007	Day 1	26	17	43
		Day 2	19	12	31
		Day 1	32	12	44
		Day 2	11	7	18
8. LGDP Monitoring & Evaluation Workshop	26-29 June 2007	Day 3	20	3	23
		Day 4	10	5	15
		Day 1	11	11	22
		Day 2	9	10	29
9. Inter-LGU Proj. Mgt. Training	15-17 July 2007	Day 3	9	10	29
10. Consultation/Validation Workshop on LGDP Guidebook for the Inter-LGU Partnership Arrangements	25-26 October 2007	Day 1	7	5	12
		Day 2	4	5	9
11. MIGEDC Advisory Board Meeting	3 May 2007		4	4	8
12. 1st Joint Board Meeting	5 June 2007		18	6	24
13. 1st Joint Project Support Team Meeting	6 June 2007		27	17	44
14. PRMDP Workshop	25-26 July 2007		18	8	26
15. Meeting with CONCEP	8 August 2007		6	2	8
16. MIGEDC IT Team Meeting	31 August 2007		7	7	14
17. PAT & PSC Meeting	4 September 2007		36	19	55
18. MIGEDC Council Meeting	11 September 2007		18	10	28
19. MIG 01 PAT and PSC Meeting	17 October 2007		5	4	9
20. MIG 02 PAT Meeting	6 November 2007		6	4	10
21. Local Chief Executives' Infrastructure Forum	10 November 2007		29	19	48
C. Integrated Tourism Action Plan (MIG 01)					
22. MIG 01 1st Joint Stakeholders' Consultation	5 July 2007		53	28	81
23. MIG 01 2nd Stakeholders' Consultation	31 July 2007		12	5	17
24. MIG 01 Focused Group Discussion	1 August 2007		5	4	9
25. MIG 01 Capacity Building Workshop	2-3 August 2007	Day 1	5	9	14
		Day 2	9	17	26
26. MIG 01 3rd Stakeholders' Consultation	18 September 2007		31	23	54
27. Tourism Appreciation Workshop	19 September 2007		7	10	17
28. APPI Customer Service workshop	3 October 2007		8	18	26
29. Policy Planning Development Workshop	7-8 November 2007	Day 1	3	9	12
		Day 2	3	7	10
30. Tourism Product Development & Marketing	20-21 November 2007	Day 1	6	11	17
		Day 2	13	10	23
D. Integrated Urban and Regional Infrastructure Plan					
31. MIG 02 Workshop No.2	7 August 2007		16	7	23
32. MIG 02 Focused Group Discussion	7 August 2007		9	2	11
33. MIG 02 Workshop No. 3	10-11 October 2007	Day 1	25	10	35
		Day 2	16	5	21

E. Information Technology					
34. Introduction to Geographical Information Systems (GIS)	20-21 September 2007	Day 1	20	11	31
		Day 2	16	8	24
35. Training on Basic Networking	24-25 September 2007	Day 1	9	3	12
		Day 2	9	2	11
36. Training on Managing Windows Server 2003	26-28 September 2007	Day 1	7	3	10
		Day 2	5	3	8
		Day 3	5	2	7
37. Training on Linux Systems Administration	1-5 October 2007	Day 1	7	4	11
		Day 2	7	4	11
		Day 3	5	4	9
		Day 4	6	4	10
		Day 5	6	4	10
38. My SQL Training	14-16 November 2007	Day 1	6	0	6
		Day 2	5	0	5
		Day 3	6	0	6
39. ArcView GIS Training	26-30 November 2007	Day 1	10	3	13
		Day 2	10	3	13
F. Other LGDP/MIGEDC Activities					
40. JMC Orientation	10 July 2007		16	13	29
41. Focused Group Discussion on JMC Harmonization	7 September 2007		7	7	14
42. IC ELA Formulation Workshop	21 September 2007		33	28	61
Total			1,026	666	1,712